

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 17 June 1982

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

QUESTIONS

STATE LIBRARY

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question that I asked on 10 June about the State Library?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Premier and the Leader of the Opposition visited the library on 4 June for the launching of the Banks Florilegium appeal. Neither stopped at the front desk either entering or leaving the library, therefore their presence at the time of the computer shutdown had absolutely no bearing on the decisions taken. Prior to the time of their visits a malfunction in a disk drive in the computer caused it to shut down. The maintenance staff from the computer supplier were called immediately and the fault was rectified.

During the period the computer was not functioning an estimated 485 books were borrowed. This borrowing was authorised by the Acting State Librarian in the knowledge that the anticipated loss rate from non-returned books issued during this period, based on experience in borrower habits, would be very small. His decision was confirmed by the Director of the department in order that the borrowers in the library at the time were not inconvenienced. In the near future the State Library will have in operation three portable units that will be used to cope with emergencies such as this. These units were ordered as part of the computer contract and they will be introduced into service as soon as they have been tested.

It should be noted that the one problem with the computer that has caused delays, namely the response time, has been largely cured. Not all the functions of the system are yet operating, but this has been done to stage its introduction to cause least inconvenience to borrowers and staff. The system is not causing big queues of borrowers and is in fact operating much more efficiently and is issuing a larger number of books than the previous photocharging system.

The situation that occurred at the State Library in May was caused as much by general problems associated with the working conditions at the front desk, and inflexible rostering arrangements, as the computer. A review of operations, which closely involved staff, has brought about far-reaching changes that have improved working conditions and solved problems that had long existed, but which indeed had not been recognised as such by the staff themselves.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister, in a few weeks time, indicate how many of the 485 books, which were borrowed without any record of them being noted, have been returned to the State Library?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will obtain that information.

RYE GRASS TOXICITY

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question on the disease of rye grass toxicity.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members will no doubt recall that I have, from time to time, sought

clarification of the position with regard to rye grass toxicity, which is a very serious disease affecting stock. I ask the Minister to ascertain from his colleague whether studies are continuing in order to try to find a satisfactory means of combating this disease. Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask his colleague to inform this Council of any progress that has been made? I would also ask whether you, Mr President, might care to comment on the matter, in view of your active interest in combating this disease and in view of recent discussions you have had on it.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer those matters to the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: I point out to the Hon. Mr Dawkins that research is progressing at the Waite Institute in South Australia and also in Western Australia, the two States that are at present most concerned about the problem.

TELEXES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question on communications with Algeria and Tunisia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Following my visit to Tunisia and Algeria in 1981, I asked the Minister of Agriculture a series of questions about why he sent telexes to the Governments of those two countries in an attempt to undermine my visit. In reply, the Minister of Agriculture first denied that he had communicated in any way with the countries concerned. Later, in answer to a question in the House of Assembly, he claimed that he was replying to communications that came from the Government of Tunisia. I was in Tunisia at the time that his telexes arrived. I was assured by officials of that Government that they had not sought any information from the Minister in South Australia and were quite bewildered as to why he should send a telex in an attempt to undermine my visit.

If the Minister has any factual information that inquiries did come from Tunisia or Algeria, could he make that information available? At present he has made this supposition without any such factual basis, and it is up to him to prove the contention he has made. Will the Minister make available the telexes that came from Tunisia and Algeria seeking information about my visit?

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

BUILDERS LICENSING BOARD

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about the Builders Licensing Board.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Some time ago, I raised in the Council certain problems that had occurred with the Builders Licensing Board, and particularly difficulties which the then Chairman of the board had raised with the Minister.

Since that time I have received further complaints about the administration of the Builders Licensing Act. It has been suggested to me that the policing of the Act has virtually ceased. The following are the major complaints: complaints from people about building work are not finding their way to the board; there are delays in the board making orders relating to the rectification of work; there has been a large increase in the number of unlicensed builders and no action is being taken to police them; and country areas of the State are not being policed as far as the legislation is concerned.

These complaints have been around now for some six months or so and certainly some of those complaints were raised by the Chairman of the Builders Licensing Board when he saw the Minister some months ago. It appears as though the difficulties have not been overcome. Accordingly, will the Minister conduct a review of the administration of the Builders Licensing Act to attempt to overcome these problems?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is not the case that the policing of the Act has virtually ceased: it is still going ahead. In regard to unlicensed builders, I am not aware that their numbers have increased. There has always been a problem in regard to unlicensed builders. It is not easy to ascertain their existence and it would require a great deal of work to inspect every building site and ascertain whether or not the builder is licensed. The Leader asked me whether I would conduct a review. I do not see any need for any kind of formal review, but I certainly will look at the areas the honourable member has mentioned and make a personal examination, with the assistance of my officers, of the matters raised, particularly the policing of the Act, the extent of the existence of unlicensed builders, and as to whether or not sufficient action is being taken to detect them.

BI-LINGUAL STAFF

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about bi-lingual and bi-cultural staff within the Department of Community Welfare.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I refer to the matter of bi-lingual and bi-cultural staff within the Department of Community Welfare. The Mann Report delivered to the Minister in July 1980 I have already criticised for its shallow approach to the ethnic question and its lack of expertise on the matter. However, I commend the Mann Committee on recommendation No. 64 on page 117. It seems obvious that adequate provision of welfare services to ethnic clients must start with the maximum use of existing staff resources. It is also obvious that these resources not only must be available, but must be known to be available.

Can the Minister say whether his department maintains a central register of all its bi-lingual staff? Does it include a working knowledge of dialects? Does the register identify the level of fluency of the staff in these languages and dialects? Does the department maintain a central register on the cultural and ethnic background of all its staff? Does this include information on their willingness and ability to work with a particular cultural or ethnic group? What training are the bi-lingual or bi-cultural staff given in working with their own ethnic people or other ethnic clients?

What support system exists at district office level and at other departmental levels for staff working predominantly with ethnic clients? What mechanisms are set up in the department to tap this experience? How is this experience used by the department? How is it passed on to other members of the department's staff? What is the department's policy in relation to the allocation of duties to bi-lingual or bi-cultural staff in the provision of services to ethnic clients? Finally, will the Minister indicate whether the department has any policy in relation to selective employment conditions and the location of staff in the provision of welfare services to migrants?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In a recent question the Hon. Mr Feleppa raised the general issue of services to ethnic communities. When he asked that question he mentioned the Campbelltown district office. There is one Italian-speaking social worker employed at that office. Following the

release of the Mann Report, the department has undertaken a number of initiatives in the provision of welfare services to ethnic clients and communities. The provision of these services has been based on an attempt to provide a broad range of services at each location, and, where necessary, be responsive to the needs of migrant groups.

Persons of ethnic background face similar welfare problems to the rest of the population. In addition, they experience problems derived from their condition as migrants or children of migrants. Usually these have been caused by lack or poor knowledge of the English language and cultural traits which can be quite different to the mainstream of Australian society.

The department and myself as Minister have undertaken several initiatives. First, the new Community Welfare Act Amendment Act, which will be proclaimed in the near future, makes it incumbent on the Minister and the department to take into account, among other things, the ethnic background, customs, attitudes and religious beliefs of the clients and ethnic groups it is providing or considering in the provision of community welfare services. Secondly, a new position of Ethnic Welfare Adviser is being created within the department at a senior level. It is the responsibility of the adviser to ensure that the department is advised on how the needs of ethnic clients can be best served within the resources available. In particular, the adviser is involved in providing support to staff in more difficult matters, conducting training sessions, maintaining liaison with ethnic communities and other organisations involved in the field of welfare.

The Hon. Mr Feleppa also referred to cultural awareness programmes. A number of successful training programmes on working with ethnic clients and groups have already been conducted. Another six are currently being conducted in various country areas of the State. The department is sponsoring these programmes using State and Federal funds. They are made available to other Government and non-government agencies. The response has been very positive and beneficial to both staff and clients. This is an initiative which has been pioneered by our department and which is expected to be developed in the future by other organisations as well.

The Hon. Mr Feleppa also referred to bi-lingual staff. Eight members of staff who possess languages other than English are used as accredited interpreters. Besides these, there are many other members of the staff whose own background is ethnic and who speak one or more community languages. These members of staff are found both in the professional social workers group and the clerical staff. The department has a policy to recruit and locate staff with bi-lingual and multi-cultural skills in areas of higher need. For example, in the Central Western Region where there is a higher concentration of migrants, there is also a higher concentration of these staff. Of the 14 staff at Thebarton, seven have a multi-cultural background. The eight staff for whom interpreter allowances are paid are located as follows:

Adelaide Community Welfare Centre (2), two languages.

Thebarton District Office (1), one language.

Woodville District Office (2), five languages.

Port Adelaide District Office (3), two languages.

It is anticipated that a survey will be undertaken to obtain a more complete picture of the spread of bi-lingual and multi-cultural staff across the department and its services.

Regarding welfare grants, approximately 10 per cent of funds from the Community Welfare Grants fund ethnic community organisations. Further grants are made to organisations which, although not specifically working with migrants, have a considerable number of ethnic clients. The sum of \$113 400 has been allocated to 18 groups for ethnic community welfare services in the 1981-82 Budget.

In relation to staff support and consultation, the Ethnic Welfare Adviser is available and is used as a consultant by staff working with ethnic clients. This is especially true in cases of a particularly difficult nature or where a specific referral to sources of help is required.

I now refer to a matter raised by the Hon. Mr Feleppa. The provision of information services to ethnic communities is currently being investigated in the department with a view to making these services more effective and better responsive to their needs and attitudes. A series of talks on welfare is also currently being delivered through Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated.

The Hon. Mr Feleppa asked a series of questions, several of which related to a register. Obviously, I cannot have detailed answers to all those questions, although I think that I have covered the matter fairly well. However, I will during the Parliamentary recess reply in detail by letter to the other matters that the Hon. Mr Feleppa raised and, of course, the replies can be inserted in *Hansard* when next Parliament meets.

VIDEO PORNOGRAPHY

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question regarding video pornography.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I noticed that the member for Norwood claimed in a press statement in today's *News* that the legislation that the Parliament passed recently banning unclassified film was self defeating. It is alleged that, as a result of the passage of that Bill, a vast demand has built up for video pornography for private viewing. As everyone knows, difficulties were being experienced in motels, or certainly in one motel (I know of others), where pornographic video films are shown late in the evening. This is an extremely difficult situation when parents who have children in their room are not aware of the availability of this outlet.

The Hon. Anne Levy: There was one complaint!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Just because there was only one complaint does not mean that no other people have the same problem. If the Hon. Miss Levy believes that that one complaint came from the only person who was upset by this problem, she ought to get around the community a little more. If the honourable member believes that this is not a problem, it is a long time since her children were young. I have a deep feeling about this sort of thing being available without the knowledge of parents.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Is the Attorney-General aware of this allegation? Also, does he consider that a problem has arisen, and whether action needs to be taken to correct the situation?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I was rather surprised when someone mentioned to me only a few minutes ago that this report was in this afternoon's *News*, because the amendment to the Film Classification Act has not yet even been assented to. That amending Bill was introduced 2½ weeks ago and passed the House of Assembly either yesterday or on Tuesday. I think that Mr Greg Crafter has, for purposes that escape me, endeavoured to develop a rather specious link between that legislation and video pornography; perhaps it has been done for publicity purposes.

I do not know why he thinks that that is good publicity for him. There has been no doubt from newspaper articles, the feature articles, in newspapers in South Australia as well as interstate that there has been a boom in home videos

and that the availability of video cassettes has also been booming. Certainly, it has been booming for more than the last three weeks—it has been booming for the last year or so.

As I indicated previously, it is difficult to police the availability of unclassified videos of a pornographic or violent nature because of the ease with which they can be smuggled into Australia and the ease with which they can be copied. I am surprised that there should be this specious link developed. I suggest it would be impossible to determine in the space of three weeks that there had suddenly been a boom in unclassified video cassette material. If Mr Greg Crafter has information about unclassified video cassettes being available for sale, he has the duty to report that to the authorities, because that in itself is a breach of the Classification of Publications Act. If it is unclassified and would not be classified under the Classification of Publications Act by the board established under that Act, it is illegal, and every citizen has a responsibility to notify appropriate authorities of information on a breach of the law.

I do not believe that this legislation, which was passed only this week in another place, is self-defeating. I do not believe by any stretch of the imagination that it has been responsible for a boom in unclassified video material and, in any event, I do not believe that many motels and hotels in South Australia make this sort of unclassified material available.

VICTOR HARBOR COUNCIL

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Local Government questions about Victor Harbor council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: In regard to the Victor Harbor council the Minister has said that he does not wish to interfere too much in the affairs of local government, and I can understand that. It is right and proper. However, that district council has been suspended and has lost interim development control. Surely interference with the council rightly and necessarily has taken place. We are now finding out that certain actions of doubtful legality transpired both in the approval of some finances in committee and in approval of building plans. Why is the Minister not now interested in following these matters through? Did a councillor mislead the council as the Ombudsman alleges in his letter of 19 January 1982? Did the councillor or a close relative benefit financially from misleading the council as alleged? If the councillor or a close relative did mislead or benefit financially, why is this matter not being further investigated? Will the Minister undertake to press the investigation into the matter raised by the Ombudsman? If not, why not? Will the Minister report his findings to this Council and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I go back into the history of this matter, because it is essential in view of what has just been said. The State Government was of the view that good local government was not being provided to the local community at Victor Harbor and, accordingly, the council was suspended late last year and an Administrator was appointed to attend to the affairs of the council. Other actions were taken at about that time associated with the same problem. Part of that was that the Ombudsman was asked to report on matters relative to the council. He was not asked by me but, as I understand it, by a local resident of Victor Harbor.

Also, apart from appointing Mr Arland as the Administrator, I initiated an inquiry into the council and its affairs under section 295 of the Local Government Act, and the report of that investigation was presented to me and duly

tabled in this Council. As a result of that document being tabled I was asked to also table a copy of the Ombudsman's report arising from his investigation and a copy of the letter from the State Planning Authority to the council in which some (not all, as the honourable member just said) of the interim development control was withdrawn.

When I forwarded a copy of the interim investigator's report under section 295 of the Local Government Act to the Administrator—I was bound under Statute to do that—I asked the Administrator to report back to me after he had received that report and perused it and, as I recall, I also asked him to comment upon the Ombudsman's report which would then have been in his hands. The Administrator's reply to that has been forwarded to me and is in my office at the moment. I have not had time to process it personally, but I will be doing so in the next week or two.

When I have further looked into the matter I will examine the specific questions that the honourable member has raised. I am quite happy to report to this Council on my deliberations after I have carefully perused the report from the Administrator. I stress, and this point was touched on by the Hon. Mr Milne, that the affairs of the Victor Harbor council are a local government matter. The less the State interferes with local government, the better. It is really in the hands of the local community and the Victor Harbor council to sort out its local government problems.

I believe that the community will do that. I am most anxious to withdraw the Administrator as soon as I can, and then the suspended council members will take their places in the council chamber again and have a reasonable period and opportunity in which to perform and show their abilities to the citizens of the district before the next election in October. If the Administrator can be withdrawn and councillors given a chance to take up the reins of administration once again in the normal way, electors of that district will watch their performance and pass judgment on whether they want to re-elect them or not. By that democratic process I hope that good local government will be returned to Victor Harbor. Some of the honourable member's questions dealt with a specific matter of apparently one councillor whose activities were mentioned by the Ombudsman. The matter which he has specifically raised will be incorporated in the reply that I will bring down to this Council after I have perused all the material and perhaps discussed the matter further with the Administrator.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: By way of a supplementary question, I thank the Minister for what he has said so far, but explain that there is a suggestion from the area of Victor Harbor that the information that the Minister is getting might be a cover-up of what was happening, not by the Minister but from somewhere else. If that cover-up is allowed to continue, the blame will fall on the Town Clerk. Will the Minister make certain that what blame there is falls in the right place and not on the Town Clerk, without further explanation from him?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There certainly will be no cover-up as far as I am concerned in regard to any matter at Victor Harbor or anywhere else. As I said a few moments ago, I must peruse in detail the administrator's report on the Ombudsman's report to me, and also on the investigation that my officers carried out. Whilst I appreciate the second question that has been asked, I cannot help but add that there have been many rumours scudding around Victor Harbor for almost 12 months now. As far as I am concerned, the sooner we can put the history of the unfortunate situation in local government behind us at Victor Harbor and look ahead in a positive manner to getting the council back into its proper role, the better it will be. I shall be very pleased if that occurs.

WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question on asbestos disposal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Recently, I raised several questions in this Council concerning the illegal and improper dumping and disposal of asbestos at the Garden Island tip by Waste Management Services. Many of the matters I raised were later denied publicly by Mr Glen McMahon. I have not yet received replies to those questions. However, I have been informed that following my question, a meeting was held in the South Australian Health Commission on 10 June. It was decided that some of the matters raised were outside the direct jurisdiction of the Health Commission. Letters were therefore sent to the Central Board of Health and the South Australian Waste Management Commission asking what action would be taken against Waste Management Services and the proprietor, Mr McMahon.

As a result of my questions and a letter from the South Australian Health Commission, I understand that the Central Board of Health has now directed that the asbestos already dumped improperly or incorrectly should be covered by three metres of earth to the satisfaction of the Department of Marine and Harbors; be covered by 100 millimetres of concrete of a specified standard; or removed entirely. This work is to be conducted under the supervision of the Health Commission.

The Waste Management Commission, which, of course, is responsible to the Minister of Local Government, has not, to my knowledge, yet responded. It has been asked by the Health Commission to consider the question of prosecution, among other things, of both Mr Glen McMahon and Waste Management Services. The problem is that Mr McMahon is a member of the Waste Management Commission and therefore a very real problem of conflict of interest may arise. Will the Minister give immediate and serious consideration to the removal of Mr McMahon from the Waste Management Commission because of this obvious conflict of interest?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As I recall, Mr McMahon is a member of the Waste Management Commission. He was originally appointed, I believe, by the former Government.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: We made a lot of mistakes.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: And you are getting worse. However, I think it proper that I should get a full report on this matter from the Waste Management Commission. I think the honourable member's previous question was directed through the Hon. Mr Burdett to the Minister of Health. It certainly did not come to me. I shall look into the matter, contact the Waste Management Commission and let the honourable member know the situation from the commission.

POLICE HANDGUNS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister of Local Government, representing the Chief Secretary, say, in view of the considerable concern expressed in the community over the past 12 months or so about the Government's decision to permit officers of the Police Force to wear exposed handguns, whether he is aware that last evening, during the sittings of this Council, members of the Police Force in the precincts of Parliament House were wearing exposed handguns. Will the Minister explain to the Council the Government's policy in regard to the wearing of exposed handguns within the precincts of Parliament House?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer that question to the Chief Secretary.

EYE DISEASES

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question on eye diseases in children.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Last year, during a visit to Canada, I noted that there was considerable publicity given to an eye disease—amblyopia or lazy eye—a disease of an insidious nature which causes blurring or obstruction in one eye. It applies to four in every 100 Canadian children. It is caused by poor alignment or a weakness in focusing, and the impairment effectively stops the development of the affected eye, since the brain compromises by relying solely on the good eye. According to the report I read, this disease takes root during the years when eye check-ups for children are not common—between 18 months and school age. Apparently, parents and child alike do not suspect that the disease is the cause of the resulting clumsiness and slow learning, even though the compensating eye may be inadequate in providing clear sight.

The report went on to claim that undiagnosed amblyopia can lead to permanent eye damage but, if caught early, treatment such as surgery, patching one eye or wearing corrective glasses is possible. Will the Minister say whether the Canadian experience is matched in South Australia? Are comprehensive eye tests currently provided for children of pre-school age so as to enable the detection of amblyopia or other eye diseases?

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: RESIGNATION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: With great reluctance, I seek leave, under Standing Order 173, to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I address you, Mr President, and members of this Council, particularly members on the side of this Council with whom I have sat in this place since 1975, both when the Party was in Government and now in Opposition. Almost everyone in this Chamber is aware of the controversy that has arisen since I saw fit at a convention of my Party last November to state particular views. I never sought to put the matter to a vote of my Party, something anyone at the convention has the right to do. I made almost an identical speech in respect of this same matter on the first day of this week, and it received wide prominence and publicity in the press. I made known to the press and other media what I said at that meeting. The statement I made was that I had not made up my mind about a particular matter and that I would make it up during the debate.

What I neglected to say was that I would make my mind up on the basis of not only the debate in Parliament or in the political sense, but that I would be persuaded by views from members of the public, members of my own Party, the district assemblies, and the Federal electoral council, and would be open to counselling by some members of my own Party in respect of the subject matter I had raised. The press put this question to me a number of times during the past few days, and I thought that I was able to answer truthfully and say that I had not been unnecessarily pressured

by members of my own Party or, indeed, by any other members of Parliament. I have now come to the point where I very much doubt that view.

Yesterday was the critical day, I informed the Leader of my Party, John Bannon, in his office of what I would do, so before I entered this debate I informed the Leader of my Party of what my intention was—that I would not vote away from the Party line on this matter. I was therefore astounded last night when, during the debate, I was told by way of interjection by my colleagues—apparently, the Leader is indicating he did not know that; it is his lookout. The fact is that I did say to him during the course of the afternoon that he should seek such information from the Leader, Mr Bannon. I was surprised and amazed that during the course of my speech last night interjections were made by members of my own Party to the effect that I was not wanted in Caucus. I was surprised because I thought that they knew my attitude. The thrust of the speech I was making was that, from the political point of view, power should reside with other than one person. I urged the Government, if it lost the vote on this matter, to take it to an election. The Government did not respond in that fashion.

During the early evening I was forced to suggest to my wife that she leave home and come to this building. The reason was that I had received a threat, not only to myself, but to my family. My silent telephone number and my address were known. The person who called gave a name and a set of circumstances in which he claimed he and his family were involved many years ago. I doubted this, as I endeavoured to assess the age of the person with whom I was speaking. I am still making every endeavour to find out who the person is. He gave certain information that tended to identify him in a particular area. I have not yet ascertained whether that name so appears there.

That was bad enough. This sort of thing has happened to me previously in respect of a number of committees on which I have served during my time in Parliament, and I have dealt with that problem in my own way. However, this was much more serious than that. Last night I never sought the assistance of anybody in respect of this matter, because I gradually started to form an opinion, and became suspicious of what was occurring. During the course of the debate and after the debate, some members of my own Party did not in any way, shape or form, in the Gallery and corridors of this place, accord to me manners becoming to persons with normal and decent principles. I go no further than that.

I approached my Leader in the corridor last night regarding this matter. He told me that he did not want to speak to me. He told me that he had not said that I was not wanted in Caucus. However, I have seen press reports and been told by all sorts of people that that was, in fact, so. I now wonder why I am being made the scapegoat by the Party of which I have been a member for almost 40 years. I do not understand a newspaper report that bets were being taken, and placed on the marble mantelpiece in the Leader's office about the way I would vote, when the Leader knew perfectly well how I would cast my vote last night.

I come back to the question of the threats. During the course of the debate last night I mentioned it and the course of events. I noted the gesture of one of my colleagues, who will remain nameless at this point. I wondered why; I made some quick observations, and I am 99.9 per cent sure that the set-up emanated from one of my colleagues, and that person removed himself from the precincts of this Chamber very quickly when it happened. Frown if you wish; the burden of proof, to a slight degree, still lies on me, but I have never heard of such an attitude being contemplated, let alone being put into effect.

I ceased to worry about that as much as I did about the threat. Before I came into this Chamber last night, I started to think about it and go over what was said, and came to the conclusion that it was not a serious call. I took that risk during the course of the night, if there was any risk.

I make the following statement to this Chamber with much regret: I directed a telegram be sent to the Secretary of the Labor Party this morning at 10 o'clock. It was received by Mr Schacht; he has acknowledged the receipt of that telegram. I am fully aware of what the rules of the Party provide in respect of resignations being accepted. I made clear that the telegram was intent of acceptance, and that I would make a statement in this place this afternoon. That is the way I see it. I find no alternative, in the twilight of my political career—perhaps in the twilight of my life, for all one knows—but to stand and make such an explanation in this place.

What I endeavoured to do in respect of this matter—a matter on which I had a pioneering attitude in the Labor Party movement and the industrial movement for a couple of score years—was put an individual view. I thought I had a right to make some observations on it. I have thought about the matter profoundly since November of last year and for some time before that. Whatever I may do about upholding the aims, traditions and policies of the Party regarding the outcome of the Bill before this Chamber, what happened last night was the most scurrilous thing that ever happened to me. I have never succumbed to that type of tactic in my life and I do not intend to start at the age of 61.

I make absolutely clear in respect of this Chamber that anyone who wants to make an approach in respect of a pair clearly does not have my authority. It is not my intention to resign from this place; I will be leaving before long anyway, when those responsible call the next election. I do not wish to elaborate any further regarding this matter. Should I find that this person exists in the area of identification to which I have referred, I most certainly will lay some form of serious charge in this Chamber. I thank honourable members for their indulgence.

RAINWATER TANKS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to a question I asked on 2 June about rainwater tanks?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Rainwater tanks are not provided to new metropolitan housing, including the areas of Salisbury, Gawler and Noarlunga. Existing metropolitan houses with rainwater tanks have the tanks replaced as they become unserviceable. Rainwater tanks are provided to all non-metropolitan housing as follows:

- (a) Single unit houses have 7 000 litre cylindrical galvanised iron tanks on stands, reticulated to laundries only.
- (b) Double units and other attached forms of rental houses have 2 200 litre cylindrical galvanised iron tanks on low concrete bases with a tap provided on the tank for drawing off water into a receptacle.
- (c) Government special sale houses, but the capacity is increased to 10 000 litres on Eyre Peninsula where Tod River water is the source of mains supply.
- (d) Elderly citizens and small villa flat units built in cluster type complexes are provided with tanks but at the rate of one tank to each group of four to six units.

Tanks are not provided in the metropolitan area because of the availability of an adequate and assured mains water

supply, the massive Government expenditure on filtration of the water and the comparatively high cost of water from rainwater tanks, which is estimated to be three to six times the cost of mains water. In country areas both quality and quantity of mains supply, where it is available, are much less assured, and tanks are provided in all instances.

BLUE TONGUE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about the disease, blue tongue.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members may be aware that about two or three years ago what turned out to be a relatively dormant, non-virulent strain of blue tongue was discovered in cattle in the Northern Territory. Despite the fact that this disease was discovered many hundreds of miles away from the location of any Australian sheep, the export of sheep from this country, except from Tasmania, was affected.

Has any progress been made in lifting this ban? Will the Minister use every endeavour to persist in efforts to get the hard-line attitudes of overseas countries relaxed, having regard to the fact that there has been no incidence of the disease in the southern States and the fact that the disease was non-virulent?

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: RESIGNATION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On behalf of the Labor Party, it is with considerable sadness that I am compelled to make this personal explanation, following the Hon. Mr Foster's statement and notification of his resignation from the Labor Party. After the events of the past few days it is difficult to feel anything but sadness and disappointment at the actions of the honourable member. His 2¼ hour contribution to the debate last night was a sad finale to what should have been a careful and rational debate about an important issue. As all fair observers would concede, the honourable member did no credit to the Parliamentary system or himself. The interjections were probably to be regretted but were an unfortunate response to the situation in which we found ourselves. What happened last night and over the past few days was the culmination of actions taken by the honourable member which commenced over 12 months ago. His actions and state of mind could originate from his disappointment at the Labor Party losing the election in 1979 and his being faced with spending his remaining years in Parliament on the Opposition back benches.

In the past 12 months he has raised a number of issues within the Parliamentary Labor Party which have led to threatened resignations by the honourable member. There was no substance in them, yet enormous time, effort and emotional energy has been spent by the Leadership, the Shadow Cabinet and Caucus in attempting to consult, console, conciliate and accommodate the actions and views of the honourable member. It has been difficult to deal with these situations on any rational basis. Every member of the Caucus will testify to the strain this has placed on everyone. This was to no avail, it is now clear that he had embarked on a course of action which would lead him to leave the

Labor Party. He must have realised the potential embarrassment that would be caused to the Party by his statement last weekend. That embarrassment has been compounded since Monday morning. His eventual decision to oppose the Bill and challenge the Premier to an election was to maximise that embarrassment. His actions were contrary to the wishes of his Caucus colleagues and the Party as a whole and were opposed to decisions on how the Party would deal with the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill.

I do not know whether he really intended to vote for the Bill when he made his speech last Monday or what his motives were. Nevertheless, no pressure was brought to bear on the honourable member to vote the way he did. I can only admit to feelings of profound disappointment. Norm Foster had been a valued friend and colleague both before our election to Parliament and since. However, it is impossible to condone his actions. He has let down the Labor Party and those many thousands of people in the community who have supported and fought for Labor ideals.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Council at its rising adjourn until Friday 18 June at 11 a.m.

In moving this motion, I seek to gain a majority of members to enable the Council to consider the important question of the third reading of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill, a procedure which is permitted under Standing Order 281, and to also complete any remaining business that may be left on the Notice Paper.

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PECUNIARY INTERESTS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Attorney-General:

1. Has the Attorney-General any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Attorney-General has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. Has the Minister any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

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

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Has the Minister any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Attorney-General:

1. Has the Premier any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Premier has such an interest, has he declared it to Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

5. Is the Premier aware of such an interest on the part of any other member of his Cabinet?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Attorney-General:

1. Has the Deputy Premier any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Deputy Premier has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine

grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. See 1.
3. See 1.
4. See 1.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. Has the Minister of Education any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

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

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Has the Minister of Agriculture any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Has the Minister of Environment and Planning any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Vide I.
3. Vide I.
4. Vide I.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Attorney-General:

1. Has the Minister of Transport any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
- 2, 3, 4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Has the Minister of Health any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has she declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Wine-grapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. See above.
3. See above.
4. See above.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. Has the Minister of Water Resources any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Winegrapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

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

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. Has the Chief Secretary any interest in a company or companies which have acquired wine grapes from growers on terms which evade the Prices Act determination on wine grape prices?

2. If the Minister has such an interest, has he declared it to the Premier and Cabinet?

3. If such a declaration was made, was it made before or after decisions on policy concerning possible prosecutions under the Act were taken?

4. If such a declaration was made, was it made prior to the South Australian Government decision to assist the wine grape pool established under the auspices of the Winegrapegrowers' Council that enables wine grapes to be purchased outside the provisions of the Prices Act?

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

1. No.
2. Not relevant.
3. Not relevant.
4. Not relevant.

SLOW WORKER PERMITS

The Hon. Frank Blevins, on behalf of the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: How many slow worker permits have been granted in each of the years 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982? Will the Minister specify criteria for and the circumstances in which such permits are granted, providing examples from the permits granted during these years?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The reply is as follows:

1. 1979, 38; 1980, 32; 1981, 27; 1982 (as at 8 June 1982), 7.

2. The assessment of workers who are unable to compete equally in the workplace involves verification of medical evidence, discussions with parents, guardians or other interested parties and the relative capacity of other workers in the job situation.

Permits are issued for a maximum period of 12 months at the expiration of which a further assessment is made. Applicants involve motor accident victims, mentally retarded, persons suffering with total deafness, and retired persons acting in passive occupations (for example, public convenience attendants—City of Adelaide).

ALICE SPRINGS COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICE

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: With regard to the Alice Springs Department for Community Welfare Office:

1. What are the functions of this office?
2. How many people are employed there?
3. What positions do they hold?
4. What are their duties?

5. How often do officers from the Alice Springs office visit the Aboriginal communities in the north-west of South Australia?

6. How many such visits have occurred since the office opened?

7. What was the cost of operating this office during the last financial year?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. The office is the base for welfare patrols which provide the services of the department to Aboriginal people in the north-west corner of South Australia.

2. On 3 June 1982, two officers.

3. 1: Supervisor, services for young offenders, and Acting Officer-in-Charge.

2: Community Welfare Worker.

4.

1. (a) To supervise programmes undertaken by Aboriginal young offenders in the area, and work with Aboriginal communities in achieving their involvement in more appropriate programmes for their young offenders.

(b) Administering the Alice Springs office.

2. To make available, on a visiting basis, the community welfare services offered from departmental offices, and to follow up matters arising as a result of departmental statutory responsibilities.

5. Approximately fortnightly patrols subject to weather and other uncontrollable factors.

6. Twelve. A considerable number of the patrols involved more than one officer.

7. \$103 445.13: Contingencies, \$24 932.13; Salaries, \$78 513.00.

FEMALE VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: Given that the unemployment rate for girls in South Australia is much higher than that for boys in the same age group:

1. What special initiatives are being taken by technical and further education to encourage girls to undertake vocational training in non-traditional areas?

2. Will such special courses be available in all the major TAFE colleges in the near future and, if not, why not?

3. What percentage of students taking pre-vocational transition trade courses are girls, and what percentage are boys?

4. What percentage of the transition education trade course budget is being spent on courses for girls, and what percentage for boys?

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

1.

Girls Can Go Further Campaign—November 1981. Introduction to trades course for girls at Regency Park Community College.

Women: South Australia's hidden resource campaign. Introduction to trades course for girls at Croydon Park College of Technical and Further Education.

Link course funding—Priority to link courses which provide young women with experience in non-traditional areas.

Trade and career awareness courses for teachers and lecturers.

Joint TAFE/Education Department career seminars for girls.

Media appearances/community speaking engagements. Pre-vocational (general) courses and vocational preparation courses.

2. The 'Introduction to trades course for girls' currently running at Regency Park Community College will, with

some modifications, also be run at Croydon Park College of Technical and Further Education later in 1982.

The department is aware that such courses do meet a very real and critical need in the 15 to 19 age group of young women. Since the introduction of this course, many mature age women have requested a similar course. I am hopeful that a pilot course for mature age women with training in non-traditional areas may commence as a pilot project in 1983. Preliminary discussions are being held at this stage.

The introduction to trades course for girls is being planned to run in 1983 at the following colleges:

1. Regency Park Community College.
2. Whyalla College of Technical and Further Education.
3. O'Halloran Hill College of Technical and Further Education.
4. Croydon Park College of Technical and Further Education.

The answer to the third and fourth parts of the question involves statistical information which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Reply to questions 3 and 4

	Per cent
3. Total percentage of female participants	10.2
Total percentage of male participants	89.8
4. 1. Total pre-vocational budget equals \$1 047 000 (i.e. \$800 000 from State Budget, \$247 000 from Federal Budget).	
2. Amount Spent on Girls:	
(a) Programmes for girls only	\$52 500
(includes proposed course at Croydon Park late in 1982)	equals 5 per cent
i.e. Regency Park course equals \$37 500	
Croydon Park course equals \$15 000	
(b) In the remaining programmes (total cost \$994 500) there were six girls enrolled (2 per cent of total).	

ENGLISH CLASSES

19. The Hon. Frank Blevins, on behalf of the Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: What special classes have existed in each of the years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982 where a non-English speaker can learn English as it applies to his trade, skill or profession?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The reply to this question involves statistical material showing the number of courses involved and the sectors to which they relate. I seek leave to have that information inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Special English Courses Related to Occupation						
Year	Courses		Subjects		Total	
	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T
1979	5	—	2	2	—	—
			Business English	English for nurses		
1980	2	—	1	2	—	—
			English for interpreters	English for interpreters		
1981	1	—	—	—	—	—
			Engineers, Doctors,	Dentists		
1982	2	—	1	1	—	—
			Dressmakers	Engineers		

English Courses in Industry (On-the-Job Courses)							
Year	Public Sector		Private Sector		Other		Total
	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	
1979	9	—	17	4	—	—	30
1980	6	—	7	46	6	—	65
1981	12	—	14	—	7	—	33
1982 (to June)	3	—	10	—	4	—	17

LANGUAGE TUITION

20. The Hon. Frank Blevins, on behalf of the Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: What special language tuition has been available to non-English speaking children immediately upon entering school in each of the years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In 1979 and 1980, full-time intensive English instruction was available to secondary students in the metropolitan area at the Gilles Street Language Teaching Centre, and special English classes were available in a number of primary and secondary schools throughout the State. In 1981 and 1982, these services were continued and augmented by the opening of the Port Adelaide Language Teaching Centre and two special literacy units for primary and secondary pupils who are non-speakers of English and are also illiterate in their mother tongue.

LITERACY AND NUMERACY

The Hon. Frank Blevins on behalf of the Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: What courses in basic literacy and numeracy were available to non-English speaking migrants in each of the years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the period from 1979 to 1982 the Adult Literacy Unit of the Department of Technical and Further Education has regularly conducted basic adult literacy and numeracy courses open to all adult members of the community wishing to improve their basic reading, writing and mathematics skills. Students with little spoken English are referred to an Adult Migrant Education Service also provided through the Department of Technical and Further Education. In 1979 basic adult literacy and numeracy courses were conducted through 23 metropolitan and country colleges of technical and further education. In 1980 an access learning centre was established designed to assist people to improve mathematics and English skills to a year 10 level. In 1981 special conversation group activity was instigated to meet the needs of a large number of adults for whom English is a second language.

MULTI-LINGUAL STAFF

The Hon. Frank Blevins on behalf of the Hon. C. J. SUMNER (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: How many multi-lingual staff and, in particular, school assistants, have been employed by the Department of Education in each of the years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Department of Education is not able to produce an answer to this question. The many degrees of multi-lingualism, the lack of multi-lingual assessment procedures and the diverse functions of teachers (which may or may not relate to multi-lingual ability) would render any attempt to answer it unproductive.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government):

I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the principal Act, the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1980, in order to enable the fees under the Act to be

fixed by regulation. The fees are presently set out in a schedule to the Act and have been fixed at their present levels since 1935. The amendments proposed will enable a new scale of fees to be fixed that is appropriate in terms of the present value of money and enable the scale of fees to be varied from time to time thereafter without the need to amend the Act. 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 is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 21 by removing the present provision for payment of a fee of twenty-five cents for the signing of a memorial of a judgment. Clause 4 amends section 31 by removing references to the payment of fees prescribed by the eighth schedule. Clause 5 amends section 40 which provides for the making of regulations. The clause amends the section so that provision is made for the making of regulations as to the fees to be paid for acts or things authorised or required to be done for the purposes of the Act. Clause 6 repeals section 42 which provides for the payment of fees set out in the eighth schedule. Clause 7 repeals the eighth schedule.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Opposition considers this to be a sensible and necessary measure and supports the Bill.

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

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 June. Page 4438.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have been amazed at some of the statements that have been made on this Bill by people both inside and outside Parliament. First, let me deal with some of the matters that were raised by members in this Council. The Hon. Mr Milne went through a very lengthy and obviously well-researched speech on this matter and put forward what in my view were some very positive views. He indicated that the United Farmers and Stock-owners had written to him and put forward one or two minor amendments. One matter did concern me, because he indicated that the U.F. and S. was trying to persuade the Government to lose the Bill.

Let me make it quite clear, because I have been concerned with the Bill in a minor way, that that has never been a proposition put forward by the U.F. and S. It has been keen to see the Bill passed, and I am sure that the Hon. Mr Milne would admit that it has been most accommodating in regard to the majority of matters raised by him and other members concerned with the Bill. Honourable members will be aware that discussions have taken place in relation to the Bill with people concerned about it. A degree of co-operation is important in this matter, yet there is one heavy stumbling block, in that the Bill relates considerably to the provision of perpetual or continuous leases, however one likes to call them. They are leases which provide security for station owners. This has been the principal point that the Government has been putting. Whilst the Government is concerned about the land, it believes that the pastoral land needs to be occupied on a permanent basis if we expect people to look after it permanently. The second point was a major point and concerned the question of access. The

Hon. Anne Levy discussed this matter in some detail, and I was interested in her statement, as follows:

Some sort of control may be desirable, but it should be done entirely on a regional basis. Until there is evidence of a great problem, no access rights should be diminished.

I emphasise the words 'until there is evidence of a great problem'. I knew then that the Hon. Miss Levy did not know much about the pastoral land or the problems faced by graziers because, if she went up there for other than May or September holidays and visited a few station owners, she might get some idea of some of the problems that occur.

One of the difficulties in persuading people of the problems associated with this land is the lack of knowledge that people have displayed throughout this debate, although I do not include the Hon. Mr Milne in that group. He has taken the trouble to meet the people concerned and discuss their problems with them. That does him much credit. Whether or not he is willing to support this Bill after those discussions, he will have to decide. However, in the case of the Hon. Miss Levy and the Hon. Mr Chatterton, the position is somewhat different. I assume that the Hon. Mr Chatterton has not visited many people either.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: I have—it is just that we have different friends.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That could well be so. I would be interested to know whether the honourable member would be prepared to go back to the terminating lease rather than the freehold tenure which I believe he has on his land. It is all freehold in the Barossa.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: It is not going back to perpetual lease.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It is interesting to note the attitude of members opposite. They are happy to retain their own freehold land but are not happy about other people getting a reasonable tenure. I now refer to the allegations made about our supporting this Bill because we intended to freehold the land. A threat has been issued by Mr Chatterton that, if he gets into office and this Bill is through, he will immediately reverse the Act.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It is a fact, not a threat.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: It is a promise.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Members opposite will interfere in a contract between the lessee and the Crown but they will not do anything with their own land in the Barossa. They are happy to have freehold land. Is that not hypocritical? I bet Mr Blevins has some freehold property at Whyalla.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I am happy for it to go to leasehold.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I respect the Hon. Mr Blevins' attitude because he is quite clear. He has a philosophy and a fundamental view on land, and I accept that. However, I find it difficult to accept the views of people like the Hon. Mr Chatterton who do not have the same attitude to their own circumstances because of their background. The Hon. Miss Levy also said that she had been to a lovely seminar in Broken Hill and she made the following statement on her return:

I had always thought that State boundaries were merely lines on a map, but as viewed from the satellite they are clearly lines on the ground, resulting from different conditions of land management either side of the boundary. It is interesting that close to Broken Hill, where these photographs were taken, the land on the New South Wales side is in far worse condition than that on the South Australian side. On the New South Wales side they have perpetual leases and on the South Australian side they do not.

That is an indication that she has been up there for only two days at a seminar. If she had got out of the train and questioned a few of the people who live in that area she would have found out the reason why. It is quite clear.

Shortly after the war those areas she travelled through were changed from soldier settlements to small pastoral leases. They were then put on to terminating tenures and after the completion of those tenures they could be leased back to the people who had them. The end result was degradation of the land. The reason was not that they were perpetual tenures but that they were originally terminating tenures. There has been vast improvement in the land since it went to perpetual tenure. It would have been a good idea if Miss Levy had got out of the train instead of sitting in it and taking photographs. The next statement she made was in relation to the problem of finance for pastoralists, as follows:

Certainly, not one documented case of difficulty in obtaining a loan due to tenure has been quoted to us. The opinion of many people to whom I have spoken is that, if people have difficulty in securing bank loans, it is because of their lack of economic viability and that tenure of any description will not alter the bank's opinion of their economic viability and hence their ability to obtain a loan.

That again shows quite clearly that she did not know anything about farming whatever and certainly not about that country.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Why is that?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Simply because one can be in a viable area but if there is a drought, which can go on for four or five years, it has a devastating effect. In areas east of Burra the land is totally destocked. The problem is that they have not got any stock. If they have no tenure on the land that is acceptable as a security, on what are they going to borrow? They have no stock on which to borrow and the banks will not accept the tenure that exists at the moment. I will later present my own case on that and will tell the Hon. Mr Chatterton what the banks told me in relation to their acceptance of terminating tenures and their acceptance of tenures as they get closer to the terminating date.

At the moment they are subject to short-term finance from stock agents in a large proportion of cases. The failure to give this perpetual tenure and the failure to give a greater degree of ability to borrow will not affect the large pastoralists. The Hon. Mr Chatterton and his Party will affect the smaller pastoralist with their proposition. The Government cannot be accused of passing this Bill on behalf of some unknown wealthy pastoralist. It is not the case.

This is the first Government that has set out to provide an improved basis for management of pastoral land. We made a clear statement before the last election that we intended to provide greater security of tenure for persons holding pastoral leases. This Bill does just that and it is a fundamental part of the Bill.

The Pastoral Act Amendment Bill recognises public concern for the State's sensitive outback lands, and the need to retain and strengthen controls over their use to ensure their conservation and continued sustained yield in the broadest sense. Recent years have seen a rapid emergence of alternative multiple land uses in the outback, particularly in relation to tourism and recreation. The Bill seeks to provide appropriate tenures and management measures to meet these needs, while providing protection for the unique environmental qualities of the lands. The Bill enhances the security of terminating leases by providing a right of renewal application between the twenty-second and thirty-fifth years of such lease terms.

In addition to existing provisions, control of land use intensity is to be enhanced by inviting lessees to submit management plans with all applications, including those for lease renewal. Such management plans will, if approved, be expressed in lease reservations, covenants and conditions, and be subject to review and change where appropriate each fourteen years. These provisions will apply to all leases after the passage of the Bill, which also provides a statutory statement of issues for which the Pastoral Board must have

regard in its land management decisions and recommendations.

It is our belief that, if arid land users are required to have regard for the long term or infinite productivity of such lands, it is reasonable that they be accorded a comparable long term or infinite interest in the leases of the land subject to appropriate reservations, covenants, terms or conditions. We have proposed in this Bill to grant perpetual pastoral leases. We strongly believe that terminating leases do not provide a stable and secure basis for management of either the land or the financial arrangements that are often necessary in any such enterprise.

Evidence exists in this and other States that permanent tenure of pastoral lands removes the motivation to employ devious and exploitive land use as terminating tenures approach expiry. Similar evidence also exists that permanent tenure provides stable, continuous collateral for financial requirements to meet seasonal and economic oscillation suffered by pastoral operators. The collective effect of permanent tenure thus enables pastoral operators to plan their land and financial management on a stable, long-term basis, and avoid renewable resource stresses occasioned by seasonal and economic variation. This factor is considered by the Government to be important in this State, where two-thirds of our pastoral enterprises are held by individual lessees and family enterprises of limited financial and labour resources.

We have provided additional input to the Minister through the Outback Management Advisory Committee, and this is totally new. The Bill establishes an Outback Management Advisory Committee comprised of representatives of public land use interests.

This committee will advise the Minister on matters and issues related to the management of outback lands and renewable resources, and will provide a forum for presentation and discussion of matters of public interest. It is considered that this particular committee could, to a large extent, handle the problem of access. The Bill provides that certain arrangements can be left to the lessee, contrary to what the Hon. Miss Levy said, and that it is possible for the Minister of the day to exempt lands from the lessee's control. Clause 60 of the Bill provides:

(2) The Governor may, by proclamation . . .

(b) declare any pastoral lands described or delineated in the proclamation to be exempt from the operation of this section.

This means that the Minister of the day can exempt particular stations where station owners are being unreasonable and it is felt that they are denying access unnecessarily. It allows for a variety of matters to be considered in relation to access. I accept that some station owners can be unreasonable and that there are people who desire access and should be allowed access to areas, even where the station owner says that this must not happen. I will come to the matter of access and the problems associated with it later, but I point out that it is possible for the Outback Management Advisory Committee to recommend changes in access, in spite of the fact that clause 60 of the Bill appears to be all-encompassing. The Minister said in his second reading explanation:

This Bill seeks to redirect the thrust of the Pastoral Act from its previous management criteria related to developmental improvements to one which emphasises management according to the condition of the land and its natural renewable resources.

Anyone who has read the original Act will be aware of this. We have, in my opinion, taken a major step towards providing a proper permanent basis for management both for the people concerned and the land itself. The amendments proposed to be added to clause 15 are a big part of that redirection. I shall have more to say on that later.

Let us look at the statements that have been used against the Government and this Bill. I have been surprised at the inaccuracy of some of the statements made on this Bill, particularly from the Conservation Council. The Conservation Council release on this Bill, which I have available for members to peruse, made a number of misleading statements which I shall answer in detail. The release said:

The amendments to the Pastoral Act were dishonest and effectively gave a huge and valuable area of public land to a small group of pastoral interests.

This is totally wrong. The pastoralists are already on the land and effectively own it but they are subject to short-term leases that can discourage long-term management. The Conservation Council then went on to predict the desertification of the pastoral land if this Bill was passed. Again, this is incorrect and totally misleading.

The Conservation Council alleges that this Bill, which will effectively tighten controls on the pastoral land and provide for a review of out-of-date leases, will lead to a lowering of management standards. That is a ridiculous proposition and one I am surprised was put forward. These two statements and a number of other statements resulted in a wedge being driven between the pastoralists and conservationists that will not easily be removed. There have been dishonest and incorrect inferences of general gross mismanagement by the pastoral industry thrown around. To infer that, if the Government provides security of tenure with proper management restrictions, this will in some way cause degradation of the pastoral areas is simply not correct. The Conservation Council release further said:

The amendments took what was the best Pastoral Act in Australia and reduced any real legislative control on the management of arid lands.

The council also stated that the legislation weakened the legislation enforcing adherence to lease covenants, particularly those relating to stock rates. Again, this is incorrect.

The Bill provides for a revision of covenants which include stocking rates before any perpetual pastoral lease is granted. This Bill provides for a 14-year revision of covenants and conditions, whereas the present Act provides only for 42-year reviews, so the review will occur three times as frequently. That in itself is surely an improvement on the power to control stocking rates.

The Bill provides for perpetual pastoral leases to be reverted to terminating leases if the covenants are breached. I regard this as an improvement. It is well known that, if a Minister of the Crown is faced with the prospect of terminating the lease because of a transgression of conditions, that Minister is very reluctant to take that step. There will be much less reluctance in the disciplinary measures to reduce a pastoralist from a perpetual lease to a terminating lease. It at least gives the people who are providing finance for the pastoralist a warning that their security is at risk. Therefore, there will be an additional disciplinary measure standing over the pastoralist. If the pastoralist continues to transgress, then the matter of forfeiture still stands. I will come to that again in a minute.

The Bill, by the addition of new clause 3a to section 44a of the existing Act, provides for co-ordinated control or management of all animal populations using the land. This is a new legislation control. Anyone who knows the pastoral country will know that. Goat populations are becoming an alarming problem in many areas, with up to 40 to the square mile being reported. Clause 44a of the Act is amended by new subsection (3a) which provides:

(3a) If the board is of the opinion that the condition of the land included in the lease of a lessee indicates that an animal population (other than stock) on the land is of such proportions that the land is likely to be permanently injured, the Minister may, by notice in writing to the lessee, require him—

- (a) within the time specified in the notice, to reduce the number of animals of a specified species (not being protected animals) to or by the number specified in the notice;
 - (b) in the case of protected animals, to apply, within the time specified in the notice, for a permit under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1981, for the destruction of a specified number of animals, and within a specified time of a permit being granted, to destroy the permitted number of animals;
 - (c) within the time specified in the notice, to advise the Minister in writing of the time at which and the manner in which he proposes to destroy, or reduce the number of, animals on the land;
- and
- (d) to comply with any other directions in the notice as to reducing or controlling animal populations on the land;

The present Act provides no such power for ordering this control. It applies similarly to kangaroos which, because of the reliable water supply provided by pastoralists, increase in numbers from time to time and require some measure of control.

That is an important change because there are pastoralists who need to be directed to reduce the number of goats and other animals on their properties, but particularly goats, as they are becoming an enormous problem. It is very disheartening to a pastoralist to find that a neighbour is not taking satisfactory measures and then finding that they quite often have to face up to their neighbour's problems. The Conservation Council further stated:

These amendments reduce the powers of a statutory authority, the Pastoral Board, to manage these lands and pass that power to the Minister of Lands.

The Conservation Council went further, in a summary of objections they issued, by stating the amendments show a dangerous shift in responsibility from a statutory authority to a politician.

It is clear that the Conservation Council did not have a full knowledge of the present Act. Section 15 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1976, states:

The board with the approval of the Minister shall:

- (a) deal with any lands;
- (b) decide upon the area, the boundaries of the land, the annual rent to be paid and the term to be granted in any lease;
- (c) consider, decide and if necessary accept or reject applications and thereupon report its decision to the Minister;
- (d) subdivide or alter the boundaries of any land applied for and adjust the rental and value of improvement;
- (e) deal with all other matters referred to it by the Minister.

It is clear from this section that power has always been vested in the Minister, with the Pastoral Board having the responsibility to take evidence, observe, consider, report and recommend appropriate action.

Under the new Act this power or authority can be delegated by the Minister to the Director-General of Lands, the Pastoral Board or specific departmental officers, and this is the first time this will be possible. Contrary to what the Conservation Council claimed, a shift can occur away from the Minister (where authority has always been vested) to the Pastoral Board or departmental officers by delegation of the Minister's powers. In addition, the board, under its powers in section 15, will take into account clause 8 of the Bill, as follows:

Section 15 of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by striking out paragraph (a);
- (b) by inserting after paragraph (c) the following paragraph:
 - (ca) recommend to the Minister the terms upon which leases should be granted and the covenants, conditions, exceptions or reservations that should be contained in leases;

and

- (c) by inserting after its present contents as amended by this section (now to be designated as subsection (1)) the following subsection:

(2) In exercising its powers under this Act in relation to any land, the board shall have regard to—

- (a) the resources of the land and the ways in which they may best be developed, managed or used;
- (b) the conservation of the natural environment;
- (c) the protection of existing improvements to the land;
- (d) the rights or privileges of Aboriginal people in respect of the land;
- and
- (e) such other matters as the board, or the Minister, thinks relevant.

This not only clearly lays out that covenants can be reviewed under the new perpetual pastoral lease but that the board will take into account proper land management, conservation of the environment and the rights and privileges of Aboriginals. This is the first time these factors have been introduced as part of outback management. It is an increase in legislative powers and discretion to the Pastoral Board, not a decrease as has been alleged. The Conservation Council further states in its press release, as follows:

In effect, the Bill gives a powerful group of some 241 pastoral interests a public resource covering a huge area of the State to do with as they please.

This is totally wrong. There will be no alteration to existing covenants unless they benefit the land. Restrictions have been introduced on the controlling of excess animals other than sheep and cattle. Covenants will be reviewed every 14 years instead of every 42 years. Now matters to be taken into account in allocating new perpetual pastoral leases will include management, conservation and the rights and privileges of Aboriginals. I know this has all been said before, but the whole of the case presented by the Conservation Council is based on the same incorrect facts and assumptions all through the document. The Conservation Council further stated:

The Bill provides no back-up, technical or enforcement, for a Pastoral Board given significantly wider responsibilities.

This statement is quite incorrect and in a sense contradicts the council's previous criticism. The Pastoral Board now has a professionally qualified and experienced senior rangelands officer who it is proposed in future will be a member of the Pastoral Board. This officer is the leader of a team of four pastoral and rangeland officers who are also professionally qualified and experienced technicians. The amendments also provide initiatives which will introduce a higher level of co-ordination henceforth with professional groups in other departments such as National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority. The Pastoral Board area of the Department of Lands is currently undergoing administrative reorganisation and up-grading to form a Directorate of Outback Management.

This reorganisation embodies appointment of the senior rangelands officer (as a member of the Pastoral Board), thus providing the board with a professionally qualified and experienced voice on the management of land and renewable resources. Over the past three years the board's professional officers have been actively engaged with the C.S.I.R.O. in the development of a Landsat image based resource inventory system to aid future monitoring of arid land resources condition and trend. This reorganisation, together with the upgrading of the technological equipment of the Pastoral Board, bringing to the board the status of a multi-dimensional outback management division, together with the enhanced statutory powers and controls previously referred to, are a clear indication of the Government's decision and resolve to henceforth manage arid lands more sternly and effectively.

The Conservation Council press release stated that the legislation relating to breaches of covenants by pastoral lessees has been weighted heavily in favour of pastoralists, and any action on the matter has been put in the hands of the Minister. This is wrong. This power has always been in the hands of the Minister. The only difference is that there

will be a review of covenants. There is no change in the ability of the board to penalise transgressions, except that the Minister may now delegate his powers to the board, and surely that is what the Conservation Council appears to want. The worst example of incorrect statement from the Conservation Council press release follows, and I quote. The Conservation Council said that:

Even where a pastoralist could be shown to be in the most flagrant breach of his lease covenants the worst punishment he might receive was to have his perpetual lease on the land converted to a fixed term lease of 21 years or part thereof.

When I read this I realised that the council had never read the original Pastoral Act or the amendments of 1976 because they would then have realised that the provisions of 44A with the amendments of 1976 read as follows:

(4) If a lessee fails to comply with the terms of a notice given to him pursuant to subsection (3) of this section—

(a) he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding two thousand dollars and a further fifty dollars for each day on which the offence continues; or

(b) the Minister may forfeit the lease.

(5) In any proceedings in respect of an offence against this section a document purporting to be a copy of a notice issued by the Minister shall, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be accepted as proof of the notice and its contents.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: How many leases have been forfeited?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is the whole point. The provision for forfeiture is not altered in the present Bill. Therefore, once more the Conservation Council has presented an incorrect statement. It did not understand that it could go further and the lease may be forfeited. It is important to realise that the Minister of the day is always reluctant to take the final step of forfeiture. It is a big step and must be thought about very seriously. It is a good move to have an in-between, disciplinary power as a warning prior to that final step. The Conservation Council also stated:

They render that cost of reacquisition of land so high that dedication of significant areas as conservation parks or reserves appears unlikely.

This statement is also incorrect. Valuation principles and the market place show indisputably that costs of resumption and market values of expiring and permanent tenures are insignificantly different. The resumption costs of pastoral enterprises is comprised predominantly of improvement, livestock and plant values which are unaffected by tenure provisions. This fact is supported by valuation principles and is demonstrated in the market place.

No doubt there will be further discussion on that in future. However, I indicate to the Council that there is very little difference in the values paid for the land involved in the market place. It is a fact of life that farmers generally value their properties on their economic return. That is how it has always been in terms of what farmers pay for land.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: What about perpetual lease land in pastoral areas?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: One can find variations. I am not happy about pastoral land being held under perpetual lease, but that is a matter of history. It is intended eventually to bring those perpetual leases under certain conditions. The Conservation Council also said:

No Government has ever seen fit to grant perpetual tenure to unlimited areas of arid land.

One-third of South Australian pastoral enterprises have enjoyed perpetual tenures, as provided by the Crown Lands Act, for almost a century. In New South Wales permanent tenure of arid lands has been available for upwards of 35 years in the form of western lands perpetual leases.

In Queensland the tenure system provides a right of progression from terminating pastoral, pastoral development, pastoral preferential tenures to grazing homestead perpetual

leases and grazing homestead freehold. Such progression in tenure status is subject to development of the land, and progressive surrender on tenure conversion of areas from the lease. In the Northern Territory an inquiry into pastoral tenures in 1980 recommended the introduction of perpetual pastoral tenures, and an appropriate Bill has since been submitted to the Legislature in Darwin.

The Conservation Council also said that the Government's proposal to provide perpetual tenure of arid lands is a clear indication of ultimate progression to the granting of freehold title to pastoral lessees. Such an assumption is quite incorrect and will not be supported by me, because I do not believe that this land should be freeholded; nor do I know of any Government member who believes that it should. The Government's view on this matter is clear. The Government's present policy of permitting perpetual lessees under the Crown Lands Act to exercise their statutory right to seek the freehold of their leases has no relevance whatsoever to the Pastoral Act or the proposed amendments which contain no statutory power to grant freehold title to pastoral lands. Moreover, the Minister has stated unequivocally that it is not his intention or that of the Government to provide such a statutory right in the Pastoral Act. The Government holds the firm view that the State's arid pastoral lands should continue to be held under leasehold tenures, subject to appropriate reservations, covenants, terms and conditions to regulate land use.

This statement by the Conservation Council was made, in my opinion, without a full understanding of the present Act and, unfortunately, it misled the public and, I think, the Opposition (although I am not sure about that), as well as the press, as one can see from the following headline that appeared in the *Age* shortly after the statement was made:

Law would give farmers a freehold of over 60 per cent of South Australia.

That was totally untrue. Neither the Pastoral Act nor the current Pastoral Act Amendment Bill provide the statutory power to enable the alienation of the fee simple of pastoral lands. Nor is it the intention of this Government to introduce such legislative power, other than its recently enacted determination in respect of Pitjantjatjara lands. The Conservation Council also said that South Australian pastoral lands are principally held by large pastoral companies under Australian and overseas ownership. This assumption is also quite incorrect.

In fact, every pastoral enterprise in South Australia is owned by individuals, families or companies who are South Australian-based and/or registered; 67.2 per cent of South Australian pastoral enterprises are held and managed by resident lessees and families; 23.4 per cent of South Australian pastoral enterprises are professionally managed for traditional pastoral family owners who, for reasons of retirement or family education or for other reasons, reside in the settled or urban areas; 9.4 per cent of South Australian pastoral enterprises are professionally managed for large pastoral companies, all of whom are, and have for up to 100 years been Adelaide-based, financed, and registered. The Government has also been criticised for spelling out more clearly rights of access and increasing penalties.

Access is a problem: station owners and managers spend a considerable amount of time chasing people who have failed to notify them of their presence. Why do they chase them or worry about them? First, they worry about people getting lost. Secondly, they suffer from amateur and professional shooters who from time to time tend to fail to recognise the difference between a rabbit and a horse—either that or they deliberately shoot horses. Valuable stock has been destroyed. Thirdly, people tend not to understand the effect of fire and the potential damage that can occur from even the most innocent looking camp fire. Fourthly, people

camp near dams and water points, many of them in positions that effectively cut off shy stock from water, and either cause them serious loss of condition or death. They have been known to steal plant and machinery including pumps, engines off wells, and tractors from outback areas.

Every time that a strange tyre track is seen on a station track it creates a feeling of uncertainty about either the destination or purpose of that vehicle, and inevitably means that it must be investigated. All station managers want is to be notified when people go off the tracks and roads through their stations, so that they know what is going on. This is particularly so, as the Hon. Mr Chatterton may know, in summer. If station managers did not examine every vehicle track and persons perished, they would never forgive themselves. That is a fact of life, because station owners are sensitive to the problems that occur on their stations. Also, one is not too sure of the position in relation to compensation provisions.

I refer also to the human side of this whole issue, at which I do not think the Hon. Mr Chatterton has looked. Certainly, I did not hear from the Hon. Miss Levy regarding this matter. It would be a good idea if she went and looked at other than the wild flowers. If she got to know the people, the honourable member might learn something.

Station owners of operations are some of the most decent people in this country. They help out their fellow man who gets into difficulties in outback areas without asking anything in return, and their hospitality to strangers is renowned throughout this country. They want access to more normal bank finance instead of always being beholden to stock companies which will only lend on sheep numbers, not on the land. Trustee companies cannot lend on present pastoral leases because they are terminating leases and are not registered securities under the Trustee Act, and trading banks will only lend on a very limited basis, if at all. Perpetual pastoral leases will provide access to a wider range of long-term finance than is available at present, particularly the smaller pastoralists, who are the majority. Their children, a large proportion of whom reside on the land, must be taught by correspondence. They must provide their own power. Many have access to radio only, no telephone, and their social life is often limited to a few occasions a year.

They do not just visit the pastoral lands in the May and September school holidays when the wild flowers are out and the temperatures cool. They are there during the summer heat and they ensure that water is available not only for their own livestock but also the natural fauna on a more regular basis than in the past, with the result that the numbers of natural fauna are in many areas actually increasing, despite culling programmes. Why do they stay there and work the land? They do so because they love it, and they want merely to ensure that the results of their labour can pass on to their offspring. I am strongly committed to the concept of perpetual pastoral leases, and I shall continue the fight for this while I remain in this Parliament. I believe that it is in the best interests of the land and the people on the land. Let me finish by reading a letter from the Western Land Commission which I believe sums up the case that I have put and is based on actual experience of perpetual pastoral leases.

I am sure that the Hon. Mr Chatterton read this letter, but I want to make sure that it is available to people outside. The letter, from the Western Lands Commission, is addressed to the Editor of the *Australian*, G.P.O. Box 4162, Sydney, and states:

Dear Sir,

Your reporter on the Parliamentary scene in South Australia (*Australian Weekend*—20 and 21 March 1982) referred to the South Australian Conservation Council's concern that the provisions for perpetual leases in South Australia's pastoral country would 'significantly weaken the Government's capacity to ensure

that proper environmental standards are maintained by pastoralists'.

I am not familiar with the provisions of the legislation, but the reported view that the legislation is 'the first step toward turning the arid land into a desert' has the same lack of credibility as the cry of many conservationists that 'kangaroos are an endangered species'. Perpetual lease means security of tenure for the lessee but can still be conditioned with covenants to safeguard the environment and other matters which the Government may feel responsible for.

It is well known that the lack of security of tenure and the consequent inability to borrow finance for the development of watering points and fencing, was a contributing factor to the devastation which occurred in western New South Wales in the 1890s. Although stock numbers in the 1880s built-up to excessive levels in relation to today's levels, they were not excessive in relation to the rainfall at the time. Had funds been available for watering points to enable the efficient utilization of the pastoral resource that is possible in western New South Wales today, it is likely that much of the devastation of that time would not have occurred.

The condition of the arid grazing lands in New South Wales continued to deteriorate until the majority of the big stations on term leases were broken-up to provide land for a closer settlement programme based on perpetual lease title, this having been introduced in 1932. The few term (i.e. non-perpetual) leases which remained into the 1960s and 1970s continued to be a problem to the administration as the holders tried to get the last mouthful of feed out of them before the expiry date.

By contrast, the security of tenure afforded by the lease-in-perpetuity, on which the western New South Wales grazing industry has been developed has been a major factor in the recovery of much of the country to the point where the huge scalds and claypans which were a feature of the forties and before, have disappeared under a sea of grass and perennial saltbush and bluebush has returned to areas where it had not been seen for 50-80 years.

As could be expected from the improvement in the condition of the arid rangelands, the Western Division of New South Wales has, over the last 30 years, increased productivity by 17.5 per cent compared with the previous 50 years.

The Minister of Lands in South Australia need have no qualms about the wisdom of making provisions for perpetual leases, provided that there are conditions which will enable the administration to deal with the occasional maverick who, through ignorance, cussedness or incompetence, is not able to manage his enterprise properly. Leases in perpetuity and sensible administration will encourage responsible landuse.

Yours faithfully,
R. W. CONDON,

Western Lands Commissioner

A report in today's *News* states:

Dr Hopgood said the A.L.P. accepted the arguments of leading environmental authorities that the granting of perpetual leases could lead to over-stocking, which could do great harm.

That shows a complete lack of understanding of the Bill, the original Pastoral Act and the present situation. It shows a complete lack of understanding of pastoralists on the land. It shows that the Opposition is setting out to oppose the Bill without being constructive. My comments do not apply to the Hon. Mr Milne, to whom I give much credit, and trust he will see his way clear to support this Bill, which I consider to be a great improvement. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMPANIES (APPLICATION OF LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1982)

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW BILL

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

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

That whereas the Parliament of South Australia by joint resolution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly adopted 26 and 27 September 1972, appointed 12 members of the Parliament as delegates to take part in the deliberations of a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof and whereas the convention has not concluded its business now it is hereby resolved:

- (1) That all previous appointments (so far as they remain valid) of delegates to the convention shall be revoked;
- (2) That for the purposes of the convention the following 12 members of the Parliament of South Australia shall be appointed as delegates to take part in the deliberations of the convention: the Hons. B. C. Eastick, and D. O. Tonkin, Messrs J. C. Bannon, G. J. Crafter, S. G. Evans, P. D. Blacker, T. M. McRae, and J. Mathwin, the Hons F. T. Blevins, M. B. Cameron, K. T. Griffin, and C. J. Sumner.
- (3) That each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until the House of which he is a member otherwise determines, notwithstanding a dissolution or a prorogation of the Parliament;
- (4) That the Premier for the time being, as an appointed delegate (or in his absence an appointed delegate nominated by the Premier), shall be the Leader of the South Australian delegation;
- (5) That where, because of illness or other case, a delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention, the Leader may appoint a substitute delegate;
- (6) That the Leader of the delegation from time to time make a report to the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council on matters arising out of the convention, such report to be laid on the table of each house;
- (7) That the Attorney-General provide such secretarial and other assistance for the delegation as it may require;
- (8) That the Premier inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this resolution.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the resolution be agreed to.

The resolution from the House of Assembly deals with the membership of the South Australian Parliament's delegation to the Constitutional Convention. The last delegation was fixed by Parliament four, five or more years ago. Among the membership was former Premier Dunstan and the former Leader of the Government in this House, the Hon. John Banfield. As the Government has had communications from the secretariat to the Australian Constitutional Convention asking for details of our current delegation, the Government believes it is important to make a decision before this session concludes. Accordingly, the House of Assembly has approved a resolution which revokes all previous appointments of delegates so far as they remain valid, and has moved to nominate eight members of the House of Assembly and four members of the Legislative Council.

The members of the Legislative Council nominated are the Hons Frank Blevins, M. B. Cameron, K. T. Griffin, and C. J. Sumner. In the House of Assembly, the membership nominated are the Hons B. C. Eastick and D. O. Tonkin and Messrs Bannon, Blacker, Crafter, Evans, McRae, and Mathwin.

As I understand it, the House of Assembly delegation follows the membership of the previous delegation in that there are four members from the Government Party, three members from the Opposition Party and one member from those who occupy the cross benches. The Legislative Council

again follows the structure of the previous delegation in that two members are from the Government Party and two members are from the Opposition Party. So, the structure of this delegation follows the precedent which has been established. I commend the motion to the Council.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: A representative at the previous Constitutional Convention was Mr Millhouse, and Mrs Heather Southcott took an interest in the matter. I give notice that I will be moving an amendment to this motion. The representation seems to me to be unfair. Mrs Southcott explained in another place that the Australian Democrats have a member in the House of Assembly, a member in the Legislative Council and five members in the Senate. Further, the Democrats have a greater proportion of the vote than has Mr Blacker's Party. It seems unfair for Mrs Southcott to be overlooked.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: How many members of the National Country Party are in the Senate and the House of Representatives?

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I concede that, but it is representation in the South Australian Parliament I am concerned about. The two major Parties have been divided according to their numbers as best one can, and there is proper representation from both Parties. I feel that this is most unfair and I therefore move an amendment—

The PRESIDENT: Will the Hon. Mr Milne write out his amendment and bring it up?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order. Is it in order for the Council to discuss this question prior to the Hon. Mr Milne moving his amendment? I wish to speak to the motion, not the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: I will allow the Hon. Frank Blevins to speak to the motion while the Hon. Mr Milne is writing out his amendment.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At this stage it would be a pity if the Parliament's proceedings got into some difficulty over what is, compared to the business we have been discussing, a relatively minor issue. My understanding of the proceedings in the House of Assembly was that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, supported the member for Mitcham being nominated to the Constitution Convention from this Parliament, rather than the member for Flinders. I do not know that of my own knowledge, as I was not there, but, on information I have, that is my understanding and, on that basis alone, it would be wise if the Council discussed the matter. It is essential that on a Constitutional Convention there be represented the widest range of views within the community. There is no doubt that the National Country Party in this State represents an extremely small minority of electors.

Apart from the member for Flinders, the Country Party has no representation in Parliament. When the Country Party has contested elections for the Legislative Council and the Senate it has received a very small vote indeed. However, the Australian Democrats represent a very sizeable minority in the community. If an Australian Democrat attends the convention, that would be proportional to their numbers in this Parliament and would be a reflection of their support within the community. If that argument was put to members on this side we would have to consider it very carefully.

I think it is also fair to say that, by and large, the Country Party's attitude to constitutional matters is very similar, if not identical, to that of the Liberal Party. Whenever it is necessary in any State or Federal Parliament, particularly Federal Parliament, the Country Party forms a coalition with the Liberal Party. Therefore, there are very few differences between the views of the two Parties. I believe that a

concentration of such views within the convention may be unwise, particularly if it is unnecessary. My understanding of constitutional conventions leads me to believe that it is extremely difficult to get any actual agreement about doing anything. I think the last convention was held in Hobart many years ago, so it may be extremely difficult to even get a meeting together.

I have been informed that one of the biggest problems with this type of convention is Queensland. All members are aware that for a number of reasons the Queensland Parliament is dominated by the Country Party. If the Country Party has this very negative view about the value of constitutional conventions, I believe that it would be less than desirable and would make the convention more difficult if we sent a member of the Country Party. In fact, it would be highly undesirable. There are very many constitutional matters to which Parliament and the convention should address themselves with the maximum amount of goodwill. To send as part of South Australia's delegation someone from a Party which appears to have no goodwill at all towards the convention and whose Parliamentary Leader in Queensland is actually hostile towards the convention I think would be doing the convention and its hosts a grave disservice. Some of the problems that hopefully will be discussed at the convention require very careful consideration. They are very important problems and, if necessary, I will outline some of them now.

However, I am sure that at this stage most people are aware of those problems, and that all would agree that, in 1982, we are in something of a bind with a Constitution that was drawn up early in 1901. In that year, the Constitution effectively was in control of the people of Australia. I would argue that we cannot go on operating in 1982 under a Constitution that has had very little revision since then.

So little progress has been made in revising the Constitution because it requires a referendum of the people to alter it. The rules and procedures laid down for such referenda almost ensure that they do not pass. If we are to do anything effective with the Constitution, we must do something about that problem. The question of how it can be solved can be debated at the convention. Perhaps all Parties could agree to supporting a referendum requiring a simple majority of the Australian population to enable a change to the Constitution to occur. At the moment, it is necessary to obtain a majority not just of the population but of the States and, if one major Party, not just a major Federal Party, opposes a referendum to amend the Constitution, history tells us that it is doomed to failure.

Also, along the same lines and dealing with the same problem, if a prominent political Party in one of the States or a couple of the States opposes a referendum (and this has happened over the past few years), that referendum is likely to fail. We could have a majority of Australians in favour of a change to the Constitution, but three smaller States, if they were opposed to it, would prevent any progress being made. I think that the Council would agree that that is totally undesirable, although I suppose that that is arguable. If the Hon. Mr Burdett feels that my statement is incorrect, I hope that he will participate in the debate.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I didn't say it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Perhaps it was the Hon. Mr Carnie. He has spoken in this Council before about the Constitution, and I would appreciate hearing his views on this motion. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.5 to 5.28 p.m.]

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I move to amend the resolution as follows:

In paragraph (2) strike out Mr P. D. Blacker and insert Mrs H. Southcott.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): The proposal in the Hon. Mr Milne's amendment is that Mrs Southcott should be a member of the delegation instead of Mr Blacker. We support the amendment for good reasons. Clearly, the Australian Democrats, which have two members in this Parliament, is the third Party in this Parliament. Mr Millhouse was a member of the convention. Mrs Southcott is a Democrat and has taken the place of Mr Millhouse. I suppose, against that, it could be put that Mr Blacker has greater seniority in the Parliament. Nevertheless, he is the member of the Country Party, and the only member of that Party in Parliament. On that basis, I believe that the appropriate person is Mrs Southcott.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I will reply briefly. I had no idea that there was going to be such a debate on this point, because otherwise I would have been more explicit in speaking to the motion. When Mr Millhouse was a member of the delegation he was one of two members on the cross-bench. Mr Blacker was the other. Mr Millhouse was the senior of the two on that occasion. Now three members sit on the cross-benches in another place. Mr Blacker is the longest serving. Mr Peterson, who is Independent Labor, has been there for the period of this Parlia-

ment, and Mrs Southcott has been a member for about three weeks. I understand that in another place the view was expressed that, on the basis of seniority, Mr Blacker was the logical choice for the delegation. I hope that the amendment will be defeated and that the resolution of another place, which essentially relates to membership, will not be defeated.

The Council divided on the amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, M. S. Feleppa, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne (teller), C. J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Noes (10)—The Hons J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

The PRESIDENT: Unfortunately, the Council is evenly divided. To allow the matter to be further considered, I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; resolution as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.37 p.m. the Council adjourned until Friday 18 June at 11 a.m.