

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 28, 1977

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations was removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoyed at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The SPEAKER: I have received from the honourable member for Mitcham the following letter dated July 28, 1977:

Dear Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform you that today, Thursday, July 28, it is my intention to move that this House at its rising do adjourn until 1.30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 2, for the purpose of considering a matter of urgency, namely, that in view of the great importance of replies to Questions on Notice this House, noting that last Tuesday, the first occasion this session for the answering of Questions on Notice, 20 questions out of a total of 51 asked went unanswered, request that the Government resume the practice, invariable until the last four weeks of last session, of giving an answer to all questions on the Notice Paper on the Tuesday next following their asking.

In my opinion, the matter raised is not one of urgency and I therefore rule it to be unacceptable as an urgency motion.

QUESTIONS

MEDIA MONITORING UNIT

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier arrange for the transfer of the media monitoring unit from the Premier's Department to a non-political area within the Public Service to ensure absolute independence and equal access for the Government, the Opposition and concerned members of the public alike? Following yesterday's disclosure of the Government's abuse of departmental teleprinter services for Labor Party political propaganda, extreme concern has been expressed about the Government's attempts to manipulate public opinion through the media. The media monitoring unit records all major news, public affairs, talk-back and other programmes in South Australia, and the recordings or transcripts are available to the Government immediately. This has become obvious from the instant Government response on the same day to certain items, both in the media and in this House. Requests for transcripts and recordings of T.V. and radio items, made by the Parliamentary Library at the request of

members (as required by the Government), are not being met for up to 48 hours after the items have gone to air. Long delays have now become the expected thing, although there are occasional exceptions. The Opposition is very much at a disadvantage because of this, and obviously the Government is prepared to allow the situation to continue, since the time advantage it has greatly strengthens its Big Brother use of the media monitoring unit.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is kicking a pretty tired can here.

Mr. Millhouse: There are sometimes delays of up to a fortnight. I have had that experience.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the delays have been as much as a fortnight, I shall be glad if the honourable member will give me details, and I will see that the situation is corrected. I would not have expected that that would be so. We have had a slight problem with the load of work in the media monitoring unit at times, but I would have expected that the honourable member would receive what he wanted before that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The spy system really only works for one side.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition talks about a spy system. I notice that honourable members opposite are so concerned about this that their own Party has announced in the newspaper that it will have not one but three such systems operating.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member ought to take a little more notice of what emanates from his Party office.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Deputy Leader was not talking about at whose expense this was; he called it a spy system. Apparently the honourable member thinks that spying for Liberals is all right but not for the Government.

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Now it is different. Apparently private spying is all right but public spying is all wrong. This is a whole lot of nonsense. There is no spying going on by the Government in that we keep a record of what has taken place upon the media. There is no difference between taking a tape of what happens on the radio and the Leader's remarking that he had a tape of a public debate which took place the other evening. There is no difference between what occurs in the media monitoring unit concerning television and radio and what happens in all areas of the public in keeping a clipping service of what appears in the newspapers. It is exactly the same operation.

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't you come back to the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have pointed out to the House previously that interjections which form supplementary questions take up the time of the House and, of course, invite rebuttal by whichever Minister is replying.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The media monitoring unit was established by the Government for Government use. At that time queries were raised in the House, and I said I would make facilities available so that honourable members had access to it. I am sorry, but I do not propose to transfer the media monitoring unit out to some other spot where I have to send officers to get the material.

Mr. Tonkin: It's all right for us, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From my experience as Leader of the Opposition, the Leader has very much more facility to deal with this matter than Ministers have,

because he has no administrative responsibilities except for the extra staff provided for him. The Leader has time to do these things, as I did when I was Leader of the Opposition. In consequence, I do not believe that he is at any disadvantage. If he thought he was, then of course he could easily take the action announced by his Party, namely, that it is going to set up its own series of systems (three of them) so that they are able to cross-check one another. That is a private political operation which the Liberal Party can afford, but the Labor Party would not be able to afford it. It is no different from his providing himself with some facilities at private expense, just as I did when I was Leader of the Opposition, and was required to do by the Liberal Governments at that time.

CAR PARK QUEUES

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Transport report on the outcome of the recent experiment to find ways of eliminating queues forming outside city car parks? The Minister initiated this experiment, which I understand concluded at the end of May, and I am interested to know whether a solution to the problem has been found.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There have been two special tests taken on this problem because of the Government's concern about the interruption that is occurring to the general flow of traffic in the city as a result of the queuing taking place at car parks. The two tests taken were in February of last year and May of this year. The results of both those studies are being evaluated, but no finality has been reached, although discussions are continuing with the Adelaide City Council which, of course, is responsible for these car-parking arrangements. I think it is sufficient to say that the Government's concern in this matter is demonstrated by the fact that when the Rundle Mall car park was mooted we required a completely new concept in relation to the problem of queuing in streets. Although it is a little early to come to a final conclusion, it would appear that the configuration that we insisted upon outside the Rundle Mall car park has solved the problem. If this is proved it will provide a useful guide to what action should be taken in the future. The studies undertaken in February last year and May this year are still being evaluated and it is too early yet to come up with any final conclusions.

TELEX MESSAGE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Why did the Premier assert yesterday in the House that the Acting Commissioner of Police had given permission for the use of the police telex facilities at Ceduna to convey Labor Party propaganda to one of its candidates, when the Acting Commissioner stated yesterday that he knew nothing about it? The Premier stated yesterday (as recorded in *Hansard*):

Of course, it is usual in outback places for police to be used to transmit messages that do not relate to the police; it is quite a common occurrence. However, permission was given for this telex . . .

The Premier then explained that the Acting Commissioner had given that permission. The Premier also stated that the Commissioner's office was approached, because it was the only listed telex the Premier's political officers could find in this area. In fact, a 10-minute scrutiny of the telex directory reveals that there are at least five others.

How does the Premier reconcile his statements in the House with what the Acting Commissioner said publicly yesterday?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The information I gave to the House was that which was given to me by the officers in my department concerned. The information was that they had rung the Commissioner's office, that they were told that the matter would be checked, and that they would be rung back when the operations had been checked. Five minutes later, permission was given. I have not discussed this matter with the Acting Commissioner of Police. The question was raised in the House yesterday whether he knew the contents of the message. I believe that he did not, and I assume that he simply assumed that an ordinary message was going through. It may well be that his lack of knowledge, as reported in the paper, was of there having been a message of this kind sent. I can perfectly appreciate that he may not have known, just as I at the time did not know. I think that that is the explanation of the matter. As to my officers not having found the list of local telexes, I will speak to them about that.

MOBILE LIBRARY

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Education provide any information concerning the mobile library now operating at Port Adelaide and Henley Beach? A mobile library has been operating in Port Adelaide and Henley Beach over the past four weeks, and reports I have received are that the library has been extremely well patronised. In fact, last Saturday morning it was reported to me that the librarian at the mobile library said that she might require extra assistance. I know that the library is really needed at Port Adelaide and that it is necessary for the Port Adelaide and Henley Beach councils to decide within the next 12 months whether the mobile library will be retained.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: People in those areas are certainly making clear that they appreciate the service now being provided. As the honourable member has indicated, the mobile library is being heavily used indeed. I have no specific figures to give to the House, although I understand that some kind of count is being taken. In view of the very encouraging response which the honourable member reports to the House and which my officers have reported to me, there is no doubt that this facility will be retained in the area for future use, quite apart from whatever else may happen.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier give the House an undertaking that in future the Government will revert to the practice, invariable until the final four weeks of the last session, of answering on the following Tuesday all questions put on the Notice Paper? Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your giving me a chance to ask this question, as you ruled that the matter was not one of urgency. Of 51 questions on the Notice Paper, 20, nearly half, remained unanswered last Tuesday. I remind the Premier of what he said in the House on April 6 of this year in making a Ministerial statement on this very matter. He referred to the fact that on the Tuesday preceding that day, a Wednesday, there had been well over 100 questions

on the Notice Paper, and he went on to say that it was frankly impossible to process in a week the detailed answers sought to that number of questions. He gave a warning that, if members persisted with that number of questions, the Government would not be able to answer them all. Subsequently, I tried, by way of an urgency motion, to raise the matter in the House. You, Sir, ruled that it was a matter of urgency, but I did not get support from any other member to raise it. No doubt that has encouraged the Government to do what happened last Tuesday when, first, there was no backlog of questions unanswered, because it was the second Tuesday of the session and therefore there were no questions left over; and secondly, there were only 51 questions on the Notice Paper, not nearly as many as had been answered habitually by the Government up to the last four weeks of the previous session, and yet only 31 of the 51 questions received answers. Four of the six that I asked were answered. I can see no difficulty in obtaining the information to answer the two left unanswered, and I come to the inescapable conclusion that the Government has used the excuse of many questions to avoid answering politically difficult questions, or at least to delay answering them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now in the area of debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Right. I will simply give one example, and that is not debate, but fact. On the last Tuesday of the previous session I had a question on the Notice Paper concerning grape prices and the grape harvest in the Riverland. No answer was given in Parliament, but on that very day a press release was made by the appropriate Minister giving the information to the public which I was denied in this House. There was no question of difficulty of getting that information. It was simply denied to me so that the Minister could make a public statement. I got a letter a fortnight after the session had ended. I take this opportunity by way of a question now, as I could not move an urgency motion, to protest most bitterly about this whittling away of one of the great functions of Parliament, which is freely to be able to question the Government. I ask for this undertaking so that the Government will not hide behind a hollow excuse and simply avoid answering questions which may be politically difficult for it until it suits it, if ever it does.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware that any question has been put on notice that the Government has found politically difficult to answer.

Mr. Millhouse: Then why were 20 out of the 51 not answered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Simply because the answers were not to hand from the departments concerned.

Mr. Tonkin: Perhaps they are to hand and you are now changing them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the Government which makes the answers. I do not know what the honourable member thinks he is talking about. The Government will endeavour to answer questions, but it is impossible for us to take officers off what are in many cases duties of quite high priority to devote their whole time, as is sometimes asked (very many man hours), to the kinds of question put on the Notice Paper at short notice. From the current Questions on Notice for next week, this is the sort of question that we get asked:

1. What are the amounts due and unpaid on consolidated revenue account as at June 30, 1977, for—

- (a) succession duties;
- (b) land tax;
- (c) business franchise;
- (d) pay-roll tax;
- (e) gift duties;
- (f) waterworks and sewers;
- (g) railways;
- (h) harbors;
- (i) irrigation and reclamation;
- (j) hospitals;
- (k) lands;
- (l) education; and
- (m) licensing fees?

And that is only the first part of the question, which continues:

2. How do these outstandings compare with each of the past two financial years?

3. What action is being taken for recovery and after what period?

4. What is the total amount written off in each category for the last and two preceding financial years?

Mr. Millhouse: If you genuinely can't give the reply, why not send a slip of paper to the member stating that the question is too hard to answer?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the reply is ready, we will have it available in the House, but it will take some time. It is useless the honourable member's pointing to the 51 questions when many of them contain about 10 questions themselves.

Mr. Millhouse: Neither of the two unanswered questions did in my case: There's no reason why they couldn't have been replied to straight off.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry that the replies to them were not to hand at Cabinet. Cabinet goes through these matters, in order to prepare the replies for Parliament, at the beginning of the Cabinet meeting every Monday.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: As the Liberals did.

Mr. Millhouse: And we never avoided replying to a question; nor did you until four weeks before the end of last session.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At no time during the history of the Liberal Government were there 51 questions on the Notice Paper.

Mr. Millhouse: So what!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are trying to see to it that questions are replied to, but I do not give any undertaking that all questions in all circumstances placed on the Notice Paper for any particular Tuesday will necessarily be replied to on that Tuesday.

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain a report on the stage reached in constructing a community welfare centre at Modbury? The Minister would be aware that in reply to a question on August 10 last year he told me that purchase of the site of the community welfare centre had been completed and that planning for the development had commenced. At that time the building of the centre was to commence during 1977-78, but was subject to the availability of funds. I point out that when built the centre will replace the existing Modbury office of the Community Welfare Department, which is housed in leased premises at Ridgehaven,

and which before that was located in a house that was purchased by the Highways Department when the North-East Road was widened. As this is one of the fastest growing areas in South Australia, the population served by this office has increased dramatically, causing an increase in the number of inquiries and of the staff to cope with them. Some local organisations have shown interest in using this building. For these reasons I consider that the construction of this centre should have a high priority.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member is well known for her concern in such matters affecting her constituents, and I will try to obtain a report for her soon.

GOVERNMENT FACILITIES

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier now issue a directive prohibiting the use of Government department facilities for the dissemination of Party propaganda to Australian Labor Party candidates? All members are aware of the recent abuse of department teleprinter services in Ceduna earlier this week, and the breaching of the principles of responsible government involved. The Premier has cited the case of his officers being responsible for this. To avoid any further possibility of such abuse of Government department facilities, will the Premier now issue a directive prohibiting the practice?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already made a statement about the directions that I have given. I am not aware of any case that requires me to give any further direction. If the honourable member's contention is that no Government facilities are to be used for the dissemination of Party propaganda, I can only reflect upon the loss of facilities to members of this House that the honourable member's question implies. I hope that his question is not implying that. I have tried to provide additional facilities for members of this House to do their job, which I appreciate at times involves political activity: it would be strange to be a politician if it did not. Members have the best facilities they have ever had in this House; they have never had such good facilities.

Mr. Millhouse: They're getting new furniture, too, at taxpayers' expense.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True. I imagine that the Minister of Works will be open to applications—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am expecting applications from every member of the Liberal Party in both Houses not to have new furniture.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And you'll accept them.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes, but I will wait for them to put them in.

Mr. Millhouse: You've already had mine. I wrote to you straight away.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In those circumstances I would imagine that, in the premises asked for by the Leader, there will not be any new furniture if the premises are provided.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We'll save that one up for later.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will see what members opposite actually come up with in specifics.

ADOPTIONS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Community Welfare tell me how many children are becoming available for adoption in this State? A recent newspaper report stated that in New South Wales the

number of adoptions had fallen dramatically. I assume that that is the same situation throughout Australia. As many people who are waiting to adopt children are interested in the position in South Australia, can the Minister provide any figures on this matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many private conversations going on.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I read the report in, I think, the *News* a couple of days ago and expected that at least members on this side of the House might be interested in matters affecting the welfare of citizens of this State, so I obtained information.

Mr. Millhouse: In other words, it's a Dorothy Dixier.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Not quite. In common with New South Wales, the South Australian figures have shown a reduction in the number of children placed for adoption in the past financial year. The Community Welfare Department placed 176 children for adoption, and private adoption agencies placed another 10 children, making a total of 186 children for the year. This number compares with 239 placements in the previous year, a reduction of 53 children. I am sure that members would be aware of some of the reasons that would perhaps have caused this reduction, amongst them being the change in community attitudes that encourages single mothers to retain their children, whereas they were not so encouraged before and often placed them for adoption. At the end of June this year, 594 couples had been approved as adoptive parents in this State and applications from another 289 couples were being considered. The honourable member was right when he said that people were interested in these figures. I therefore thank him for giving me the opportunity of making the figures available, Dorothy Dixier or not.

BURRA LIBRARY

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education say whether any progress has been made in relation to establishing a community school library in Burra? The Minister will recall that I have approached him several times about this matter. I received the last letter from him on May 18 stating that he was considering the matter. The difficulty arose when the Hallett District Council was reluctant to contribute towards the community school library. This is understandable because people living in the northern section of that council area commute to Peterborough, those in the western section commute to James-town, and those in the southern section commute to Burra. My request to the Minister was that a community school library be established at Burra without the support of the Hallett council. I believe it is imperative that this school be equipped with the library because this is the first community school in South Australia. Has any decision been made on this matter?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Significant agreement having been reached between the parties in this matter, my signature on the document is now merely a formality. The answer to the question is in the affirmative: the community school library will proceed. Of course, it will be one of the jewels in the crown of the community school, which I understand, although I have not visited Burra recently, is proceeding extremely well.

ECONOMIC SUBMISSIONS

Mr. SLATER: Can the Premier say whether it is proposed to establish a special State Government committee to make submissions to Federal Government inquiries on

tariffs and import quotas in cases when decisions on these matters could affect industries in this State? I note that the Premier of New South Wales, Mr. Wran, has announced that his Government will set up a special committee that will make submissions to the Industries Assistance Commission and other federally established bodies of inquiry when decisions could have an effect on industries in New South Wales. I am aware that the South Australian Government has made approaches and submissions on matters affecting industry in this State to the Industries Assistance Commission, and that these submissions were prepared by officers of the Premier's Department, the Economic Development Department and the Treasury. They have assisted industries in South Australia. Does the Premier consider that the present arrangement in South Australia is adequate for representation to be made, or does he think it is necessary to establish a body similar to that which will be established in New South Wales?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that New South Wales is in fact following our example. Up to this time we have been the only State which has made detailed submissions to the Industries Assistance Commission on behalf of industry, and the I.A.C. has commented uniformly favourably on the quality of submissions made by the State of South Australia. I believe the officers of the Economic Development Department and the Economic Intelligence Unit, which has been responsible for this preparation, are some of the best officers in Australia and they have done a tremendous job, which has been appreciated by industry and by Federal officers. I think that the success we had in relation to our submission on the car industry is an indication of the kind of thing that can be achieved for South Australia, when we get overthrown the recommendations of the original I.A.C. report on the car industry that would have spelt disaster for South Australia. I am satisfied with the quality of work being done presently.

The Director-General of the Economic Development Department, Mr. Bakewell, is a former senior officer of the Department of Customs and Excise. He is well aware of the operations of Federal Government departments in relation to customs, quotas, tariffs, and the like. He was an assistant to Sir John McEwen, and consequently we have expert guidance as to the operations of the Commonwealth departments, as well as expert preparation of material within our own State.

PLANNING REGULATIONS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister for Planning say what action, if any, he or the Government has taken to withhold further changes to regulations relating to the Planning and Development Act, pending the result of the present review? Many people in local government who are involved in interim development control still have some difficulty in recognising the full ramifications of the requirements of the various regulations, and with fairly constant change (and one can mention 70 (a), which is the subject of a disallowance motion before this Chamber as such an example), the officers responsible have suggested that constant change or frequent change can only cause further difficulty to the public in the proper administration of development controls, whereas if there was a stay of proceedings until the alterations that it has been acknowledged are necessary are made, there will be a reduction in the degree of confusion that can occur between now and when the identified alterations are effected.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I presume that the honourable member is not suggesting that I should hold up a change in a council zoning regulation where the correct procedures under the Planning and Development Act have been carried out and where there is a recommendation from both the council and the State Planning Authority to the Government that the regulation should be promulgated and where the Government supports the regulation. If we are dealing with a particular council area, and if that is all that is affected by the change in zoning regulations, and if it is a proper change, then surely it should be allowed to take place. There is the question of changes in the model planning regulations. These are subject to review, but they are not subject to frequent change. I did delay one set of regulations because of the view I took that the car parking requirements in those regulations with respect to churches were grossly excessive. The car parking requirement was for one parking space for every three seats in the church. That would seem to be a totally unnecessary requirement.

Many councils are not aware of the provisions of the model planning regulations, which enable the council to give consent to the adoption of lower standards. I have taken up with the State Planning Authority questions arising from that situation, where maximum standards in the model planning regulations, because of the attitudes of councils in not using their consent rights, tend to become minimum standards as well. So far as the general situation is concerned, it is normally the case that we are receiving complaints from councils that regulations that are wanted are not being promulgated quickly enough and that there are difficulties over the negotiations that have to take place between the council and the State Planning Authority before everyone can be satisfied that the regulations can go ahead. I have not had any suggestion from anyone that regulations should be delayed.

If the honourable member has a proposition about the delaying of certain regulations I shall be interested to hear it, but I know of no approach that has been made. If someone has approached the honourable member I would like to know. Certainly, the District Council of Barossa, as I think the honourable member would appreciate, is concerned that before it puts in its zoning regulations it is quite sure how they are going to work so that it is sure they will work effectively and be understood and properly administered. Where the District Council of Barossa takes that attitude, we will certainly go along with it and do everything we can, in conjunction with that district council, to make sure that sufficient time is taken to ensure that the right decisions are made. I assume it is the District Council of Barossa to which the honourable member is referring.

Dr. Eastick: That is one.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Wherever we get a situation like that, and where there is a possibility that certain councils may want to come together for planning purposes, we will work with those councils and co-operate with them to the best of our ability, I assure the honourable member of that.

COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE

Mr. OLSON: Can the Attorney-General advise whether car dealers can compel their clients to take out comprehensive insurance coverage with a specific firm of insurers?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I very much regret that for the second time in three days this week the honourable member is asking for a legal opinion on a matter.

Mr. Olson: I'm not asking for a legal opinion at all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is asking the Attorney-General to advise him whether a dealer can oblige a customer to take out a policy of insurance with a specific insurer. If that is not a legal matter, I do not know what is.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you suggesting he should go to one of your colleagues and obtain advice?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If he wants to get it privately, that is another matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must uphold the point of order, because the honourable member is asking for an opinion. I cannot allow a Minister to express an opinion, whether legal or otherwise, on some hypothetical case. If the honourable member asks the Minister about a specific case, that becomes an admissible question.

Mr. OLSON: In the light of your ruling, Sir, I will rephrase my question and ask whether the Minister will investigate.

The SPEAKER: Whether the Minister will investigate what?

Mr. OLSON: Investigate the practice.

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable member follow on from that point, please?

Mr. OLSON: Investigate the practice that compels clients to take out comprehensive insurance coverage with a specific firm.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be pleased to investigate this practice and, in doing so—

Mr. Millhouse: It's contrary to the Trade Practices Act; you know that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In answering this question, I must say how irritating it is to have my junior at the bar take this pedantic attitude in these matters. It seems to me to be a ridiculous situation that we have had over the past few days in which every honourable member who asks a question of a Minister that involves the slightest legal point brings the honourable member to his feet to take issue over the question. It seems to me to be pedantry in the extreme. I believe that this practice is illegal under the Trade Practices Act but, if the honourable member will bring to my notice privately the details of the case that has been brought to his attention, I will have the matter investigated and, if necessary, refer it to the Trade Practices Commission to have it properly dealt with.

STATE INDUSTRY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: When the Premier announced last Sunday the expansion of a steel company in South Australia, why did he give the false impression that his Government had granted specific incentives and assistance to this company? In addition, so that the Premier does not deceive the public, will he give equal emphasis to an even larger potential investment moving out of South Australia? On Sunday last the Premier, with a great deal of trumpeting, announced that a steel company was moving part of its New South Wales production line to South Australia, at a total cost of \$250 000. In his announcement, the Premier stated:

Through the Department of Economic Development, the Government actively seeks to bring new industry to our State through a range of incentives and assistance. On behalf of the Government I am glad to welcome Aquila FME's expansion in our State.

That statement obviously gives the impression that this production line has moved to Adelaide as a direct result of the hard lobbying of the South Australian Government and especially because of specific Government incentives and assistance. However, the true situation is that the company has not received any incentives or assistance from the South Australian Government and the line has not moved here through Government lobbying. In fact, the company has had no correspondence whatever with the Government on its move. The Premier has failed to mention that another company is closing down its manufacturing facilities in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating and getting on to another issue.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, Mr. Speaker, I am—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is doing that, and I remind him that he is.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pointing out that another manufacturing facility is moving out of this State. It is a fact, and I believe that I can state it as a fact because it is occurring. That manufacturing facility moving out of the State is Peters Ice Cream, a division of Petersville Limited, as it does not intend to rebuild its factory—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot see what that has got to do with the original question. That must be the subject of another question, surely.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: May I repeat my question to you?

The SPEAKER: How many questions?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: There is the one question. I shall repeat my question, if I may. I asked why the Premier did not give equal emphasis to an even larger potential investment moving out of South Australia, and I am simply outlining what that potential investment was. When the factory was burnt down, the choice was there for Peters Ice Cream either to rebuild in this State or to move elsewhere, and that new establishment would have meant an investment of about \$1 000 000, not \$250 000, as in the previous case I quoted. He has given no publicity—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member previously. If honourable members were to read *Hansard* tomorrow, I think they would find that more than one question had been asked. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is nothing wrong with the statement which I made in relation to the relocation into South Australia of the steel company concerned. My statement was perfectly accurate. The honourable member, of course, will read his own gloss into anything, and the gloss that he constantly tries to put on facts in relation to South Australia is that he desperately desires to see industries moving out of the State in order to try to attack the Government on it. If ever there was a constant knocker of industry in South Australia it is the honourable member, and I hope that, in relation to tomorrow's announcement, which will be one of very considerable size and importance to this State, we will not see from the honourable member the kind of attitude that he has constantly displayed in running down industry in this State. Peters Ice Cream suffered a very considerable loss in its trading position.

Mr. Venning: Sure—so what?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It suffered a very considerable setback through the fire, in which it was not completely covered. That, of course, has affected the

total liquidity of its operation. To blame that upon the South Australian Government means that the honourable member apparently is blaming us for every fire that takes place in this State. When he finds, as he will find, that icecream manufacturing in South Australia is expanding with further investment by an interstate company (and he will find that next week), I hope he will get up and eat his words and his hat in this House.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER LEGISLATION

Mr. BOUNDY: In the temporary absence of the Minister for the Environment, can the Premier say whether the Government will withdraw the beverage container legislation until certain anomalies are resolved? Because of the new legislation, Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds, owners of the Saveway store at Two Wells, will be stopped from selling cans of soft drink because their store is more than 20 kilometres from the nearest buy-back centres, at Smithfield and Willaston. They rightly claim that the legislation is an invasion of their right to earn a living. During summer they sell 1 400 cans a week and employ up to five part-time employees. They consider this legislation to be ill-conceived, because the Government should have made certain that buy-back centres were operating before now. There are further facts that concern every citizen in the State concerning this legislation. I have been told that the estimated cost of collection depots under the new legislation will be \$50 000 for the South Australian Brewing Company; \$150 000 for Coca-Cola; and \$150 000 for Schweppes. For sales tax on the deposits the South Australian Brewing Company will pay \$100 000; Schweppes will pay \$150 000; and Coca-Cola will pay \$300 000, and then the 33½ per cent retail mark-up on the 5c deposit is estimated to be about \$1 500 000. This is a total of \$2 400 000 which will have to be met by soft drink consumers, and this figure does not include the 5c deposit. I am also informed that vending machine sales in factories and other work places will be impossible, despite assurances from the Minister to the contrary. I have also been told that the new recommended retail price of soft drinks will rise from the present 29c to 38c as a result of the 5c deposit, and this will give South Australia the dubious distinction of having the most expensive canned soft drinks in Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply is "No". We do not intend to withdraw this important legislation, which is vital to the conservation of this State.

Mr. Millhouse: And which the honourable member supported in this House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I find it strange, because the "anomalies" to which the honourable member has referred were matters debated in this House when he voted for the legislation. The honourable member has produced some of the last-ditch stands of the can users in South Australia. Whether they were the people who got together the case for his constituents, I do not know, but the extraordinary thing is that, in relation to can operators, the people putting their cool drinks and beer in cans are always producing arguments of this kind, but apparently, they have not told the honourable member why this outlet has not applied for and obtained an arrangement with suppliers to be a collection depot. It is perfectly easy: where is the difficulty for them?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They don't want to apply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, there is a simple way out of the difficulty, and I must confess my heart does not bleed for them in these circumstances.

Mr. Millhouse: He's already made a note of this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member can obtain application forms from the department, if he wants to, and I suggest that he gets on his charger and gets up there before his competitor.

PORT LINCOLN WHARF

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Marine explain to the House the present situation in relation to discussions between the Waterside Workers Federation and the Government about the future operations of the Port Lincoln wharf? Can he also explain the success or otherwise of the trial shipment that took place in May? Members will be aware that this matter has been raised several times in previous sessions. However, since the last session a considerable advance has been made in the construction work, and preliminary trials have occurred. Cereal growers on Eyre Peninsula are anxious to know whether their harvest will be shipped should future rains enable such harvests to occur.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to be able to say that the trial shipment went quite well. Obviously the plant needs some adjustment, but that can be done. It does not seem that any serious defects have occurred that cannot readily be overcome. It was quite a satisfactory trial. Regarding the problem about which the honourable member and some other members are fully aware, I have four times, I think, met with Federal representatives of the Waterside Workers Federation. The Director of Marine and Harbors has met with representatives of the Barley Board, the Wheat Board and the Australian Association of Employees Labour. I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that I think the solution to this problem is close at hand. This follows a meeting I had the week before last with Mr. Lelane, who is Federal organiser of the Waterside Workers Federation of Australia. He has put proposals to me that I believe will solve the matter. It is intended that Mr. Griffith, the Director of Marine and Harbors, will go to Sydney next week to see Mr. Craig, who is the Chief Executive Officer of the A.W.L. The Director has also had discussions with representatives from the Wheat Board and the Barley Board about the matter. The Director will also visit Brisbane next week to discuss the matter with port authorities from other States, because it is important that South Australia does not create a situation in solving the problem that could have ramifications elsewhere. As I have said, the solving of the problem is close at hand: it is a fairly simple solution. Although I do not wish to give details of the solution now I will, as soon as the matter is resolved, inform the honourable member. I agree with him that not only will I be pleased when it is solved and we can use this fine facility to the fullest extent but also, I am certain, his constituents and other people who will be served by this facility on the West Coast will be pleased.

NARROW GAUGE COMMITTEE

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Transport or any of his officers given evidence to the committee established by Mr. Nixon, the Federal Minister for Transport, concerning the return of the northern narrow gauge railway lines of the State? I would be interested to know whether the Minister or his officers have given evidence to the committee and, if they have, what has

been the nature of that evidence. When the committee was set up the Minister said that he considered the committee to be loaded against South Australia. Mr. Keal, who is Project Officer for the Transport Department in this State, is a member of that committee, so I believe that South Australia is represented on the committee. I therefore ask the Minister whether he or his officers have given any evidence, what has been the nature of that evidence, and how the committee is proceeding.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Either the honourable member has a short memory or he is trying deliberately to turn this matter to the advantage of his own political Party.

Mr. Gunn: That's your tack.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member would remember, even though I would not expect the member for Eyre to remember—he is not interested—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He's gone very quiet in the past few days.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He was done on Monday. The honourable member would recall that the committee was established at my request; in fact, I suggested to the Federal Minister that there ought to be a committee consisting of two members from South Australia and a Federal representative. The Federal Minister agreed with the logic of my suggestion but then proceeded to establish a committee loaded against South Australia by appointing two Federal officers and one South Australian officer, he being Mr. Keal, who is an extremely competent officer of my department in whom I have full confidence. I still stress to the honourable member that two Federal officers are on a committee of three and, if the honourable member does not call that loaded, all I can say is that he had better go and get loaded himself.

At 3.6 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS AND JUSTICES) BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934-1977, and the Justices Act, 1921-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move;

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill is designed to rectify a problem that has arisen in the administration of the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act following a recent decision of the Supreme Court. In 1972, an amendment to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act introduced a provision under which all offences under that Act were to be dealt with as if they were minor indictable offences under the Justices Act. Subsection (2) of section 129 of the Justices Act provides:

Except where justices or a special magistrate have or has independently of this Act power to punish by longer imprisonment or higher fine . . . the court shall not inflict any punishment exceeding in the case of imprisonment, imprisonment for two years, or in the case of a fine, two hundred dollars.

It had previously been assumed that the provision for a higher fine in the special Act (in this case the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act) would constitute an independent power to punish by longer imprisonment or higher fine within the meaning of this provision. Indeed, that appears to be the view taken by Mr. A. J. Hannan, in his book entitled *Summary Procedure of Justices*, in his commentary on section 129. However, the recent decision of the Supreme Court is contrary to that view, and consequently it is now necessary to ensure that the penalties prescribed by Parliament in the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act are not to be read subject to the limitations prescribed by the Justices Act.

Accepting the correctness of the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 129, one might perhaps have thought that section 122 of the Justices Act answers the problems of sentencing raised by section 129. Section 122 provides that if "it appears to the court that the offence, by reason of its seriousness . . . ought to be tried on indictment, it shall not proceed to convict the defendant but may commit him for trial upon indictment". Be that as it may, the Government has decided to deal directly with the problem by amendment to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act and the Justices Act.

The present Bill accordingly divides the offences under the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act into two categories. The more serious offences, which now may carry penalties as high as \$100 000 or imprisonment for 25 years, are designated indictable offences. The less serious offences are designated minor indictable offences. The salient difference between the two categories of offences will be that the indictable offences will, as a matter of course, be disposed of upon indictment before a judge and jury, while in the case of a minor indictable offence the defendant will have the option of being dealt with by a court of summary jurisdiction or, if he so elects, by a judge and jury. The provision providing for penalty in the case of minor indictable offences is re-drafted so as to ensure that the penalties prescribed by the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act will prevail over the limitations in section 129 of the Justices Act.

In his judgment the honourable Chief Justice drew attention to the fact that the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act is a somewhat antiquated document that has been the subject of a great many amendments in recent years. The Government has had in view for some considerable time the need to make a general revision of the law relating to narcotic and psychotropic drugs. With this end in view it has established the Royal Commission into Non-medical Use of Drugs. It would of course be premature at this stage, before the report of the Royal Commission is to hand, to embark upon a full-scale revision of the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act. However, the Government can assure members that as soon as the report of the Royal Commission is available, it will deal with the revision of the drug laws as a matter of urgency.

Clause 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act. The effect of the amendment is to provide that a person who knowingly has in his possession any drug to which the Act applies, who smokes, consumes or administers to himself any

drug to which the Act applies, or who has in his possession any appliance for use in connection with the preparation, smoking or administration of any drug to which the Act applies shall be guilty of a minor indictable offence. The graver offences under subsection (2) of section 5 which relate to producing or trafficking drugs to which the Act applies will under the terms of the Bill be indictable offences and thus in every case will be dealt with by judge and jury.

Clause 5 removes sections 6 and 6a of the principal Act. These provisions are now obsolete. Clause 6 amends section 8 of the principal Act which relates to offences against the regulations. The offences under this provision are to be minor indictable offences. Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act. The provision to which the amendment relates deals with obtaining by false representation prescriptions for drugs to which the Act applies. This offence is to be a minor indictable offence. Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act. This offence is similar to the offence under section 9 (2), and relates to a person obtaining from a pharmaceutical chemist, wholesale chemist, or manufacturer, any drugs to which the Act applies. The offence is designated as a minor indictable offence by the amendment.

Clause 9 amends section 13 of the principal Act which relates to delaying or obstructing inspectors who are acting in pursuance of the principal Act. The offence is to be a minor indictable offence. Clause 10 amends section 14 of the principal Act. The amendment prescribes a maximum penalty for a person who is guilty of a minor indictable offence against the Act of \$2 000, or imprisonment for two years, or both. The provision states that these penalties are to apply notwithstanding the provisions of section 129 of the Justices Act. The amendment also provides that if any person attempts to commit an offence against the Act, or solicits or incites some other person to commit the offence, he will be guilty of a minor indictable offence. The amendment also removes subsection (8) of section 14 which is no longer necessary in view of the earlier provisions of the Bill.

Clause 11 provides that the offence of promoting by advertisement the use of drugs to which the Act applies is to be a minor indictable offence. Clause 12 corrects an error of numbering in the principal Act. Clause 13 is formal. Clause 14 amends section 120 of the Justices Act to provide that offences declared to be, or designated as minor indictable offences in other Acts, are to be cognisable by a court of summary jurisdiction constituted of a special magistrate.

Mr. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 27. Page 220.)

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion. I commend the Lieutenant-Governor on the presentation of his Speech and, particularly, on the manner with which he is carrying out his duty as the Lieutenant-Governor of this State. It is fair to say that never would anyone have believed, had they been appointed Lieutenant-Governor, they would have been expected to fill the role as he has done. I believe that Mr. Walter Crocker has carried out the position with distinction.

I regret sincerely the inability of Sir Douglas Nicholls to continue in his appointed role as Governor of South Australia. I have much admiration for Sir Douglas and

his stature in the community. He has demonstrated his willingness to serve all groups in the community with distinction. South Australia has suffered a loss because of his inability to continue in that office.

Reference was made by His Excellency to the passing of four former members of this House: Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. T. C. Stott, Mr. G. T. Clarke and Mr. H. Shannon. These were long serving members and, collectively, served 104 years in Parliament. I should like to add a few remarks to those I made in a previous sitting about Sir Glen Pearson, who was a neighbour of mine. I grew up with his family, and went to school with his daughter Edna, and Jeff and Ian are close friends of mine and of my family. I have nothing but the highest respect for the Pearson family. For 19 years Sir Glen served the district I represent, and during that time he held several Ministerial portfolios, including that of Treasurer. He posed for me an almost formidable standard to follow. Sir Glen Pearson was a man of conviction. He knew that some of the measures he had to take in this House would not be favourable in his district, and I believe that at times they did reflect on it. As a man of such conviction, he was not afraid to take a blow on the chin. He accepted his responsibilities as Treasurer and carried them out in a manner for which he should be commended. He believed in responsible budgeting and his example will be recorded for all time.

I also add my condolences to the families of the other deceased members. I knew the late Mr. Stott during some of his 37 years as a member. I believe it is wrong of me to comment on the activities of former members of this House, but if anyone was entitled to recognition and perhaps a knighthood for his services to this Parliament for 37 years (during which for some time he was Speaker) Tom Stott was.

In his Speech, the Lieutenant-Governor referred to the agricultural scene. I believe it is only fair to say that the northern parts of the district I represent are in the grip of a severe drought. Last Friday, I travelled between Port Lincoln and Cleve and all the way from Tumby Bay to Cleve I had to have my lights on because of the dust; twice I was unable to see the third dash in the white line ahead of me. I think that is indicative of the conditions which the South Australian rural areas are suffering. While I was at Cleve, rain fell and on the way back the sand drifted across the road causing corrugations about 4in. or 5in. deep. That is not an isolated situation; it is happening in many of the drier parts of Eyre Peninsula and South Australia. I was amazed on Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning to hear announcements on the A.B.C. regarding the incomes of the primary producer. I doubt whether these reports were published in the South Australian press, but the *Australian* gave it headlines. In the issue of July 27, the following appeared:

Farmers head for crisis year. Real incomes likely to fall 14 per cent.

Whilst it is right and proper that the real incomes be reported to the public, I was incensed by the following comment above those statements:

Families face higher food bills.

How is it possible that the income of farmers is dropping, yet food prices are rising?

Mr. Max Brown: Because of the middle man.

Mr. BLACKER: The member for Whyalla has said what I was going to point out—it is because of the middle man. The report continues:

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

That indicates the rip-off taking place. The report refers to a 14 per cent reduction in farmers' incomes, and then immediately states that the nation will reap record returns from agriculture this financial year. I think this report underlines the basic problems concerning our society. It continues:

Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures released last night show that real income per farm will drop by 14 per cent if inflation holds at 10 per cent.

As inflation will probably be greater than 10 per cent, the drop will be 14 per cent, plus. The article continues:

The bureau's estimates come as a crushing blow to an industry plagued by rising production costs and high capital investment for minimal returns. They stress Australia's growing reliance on minerals diplomacy and the need for a massive overhaul in rural production and marketing. The weekly national farm income—which excludes production costs—is estimated at \$199 a week, a fall of \$13 on last year's figure, putting the average farmer near the breadline. The average male wage is \$190.

The bureau's estimates for this financial year also carry a warning for the nation's housewives—most goods produced on the farm will be dearer. While the estimates at first glance look good for farmers, they show that in real terms—because of rises and falls in demand and production—the man on the land is in for a grim time. The bureau predicts that increased returns from most crops, meat and dairy products will be partly offset by lower returns for wool and sugar.

Wool production will be nearly 5 per cent below last season, the smallest clip for 20 years. The number of sheep shorn is expected to drop because of an 8 per cent decline in national sheep numbers.

Wheat production will remain at last year's figure of about \$1 125 000 000 gross. Total Australian wheat production is expected to be 10 per cent higher than last year, the highest in a decade, but an expected world wheat glut will cut the return to farmers by about 9 per cent.

Beef prices paid to farmers are expected to rise after drastic cuts in the size of the national cattle herd. But once again, farmers will not get the full benefit of a forecast 25 per cent rise in overall prices for beef and veal. This is because prices last year were at their lowest for more than 10 years and even a 25 per cent rise will not bring them back into line with prices paid on the farm from 1970 to 1973.

So the report goes on, outlining categorically the plight of the rural people in this State. An accompanying report, headed, "Bitter harvest on the land," states:

The gloomy farm forecast by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics means that the farmer will earn only \$9 a week more than the man in the street. This is despite the farmer's capital investment of at least \$100 000 in his land, livestock and machinery. If he invested his capital in 10 per cent interest bonds he would be better off than working an 80-hour week for this season's estimated average income of \$10 352.

Yesterday's bureau projection for 1977-78 puts the weekly farm income at \$199. Even allowing for eating his home-grown food the farmer is worse off than the average Australian male earning \$190. The fall in farmers' earnings is in line with an 8 per cent drop in net farm income of \$1 766 000 000.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Have you read the article by Chatterton and his wife regarding rural problems?

Mr. BLACKER: I will not comment on that article, because I believe other facets of the report in the *Australian* should be told to members.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If you ever want to read a lot of hogwash, you should read the article by our Minister of Agriculture and his wife.

Mr. BLACKER: I would like to go into that at another stage. The people of Australia are enjoying an economy they have never had before. Of the disposal income of the average citizen of this State, only 20 per cent is spent on food. These figures were taken out in the past two days by my using the facilities of this

House. They prove quite convincingly that the average Adelaide householder spends \$29.38 on food out of a total amount of \$146.45. This means that only 20 per cent of his income is spent on food. If this is compared with the position in other nations, we find that, after tax, people in Japan and England spend about 25 per cent, in Russia 53 per cent and in Asia 82 per cent. If we were spending between 50 per cent and 80 per cent of our income after taxes on food, there would not be much left over. In Australia, where we spend about 20 per cent on food we have enough left over to buy a colour television set, a second car, a better house, and be able to take a better vacation. These are the things the people of this State, and of Australia, have grown to accept as part of their way of life.

The people of this State ought to be told that they can have those things because of the price of food and not in spite of it. The big companies ought to be told that one of the reasons why the Australian people can afford to buy the products those companies sell is the low price of food. This has been a progressive step; the actual amount that the consumer spends on food is declining all the time, so he has a greater ability to service the manufacturing and other industries on which this State depends so much.

We should go a step further and ask just how much the primary producer contributes towards the cost of living. If we take as an example a box of cornflakes, which I understand costs about 67c, the cost of the raw product to make that box of cornflakes is about 9 per cent of total cost, so only 6 cents is returned to the primary producer. That 6 cents is not even the cost of the packet or the trinket inside the box, so if the primary producer actually gave the commodity to the manufacturer it would reduce the price by only 9 per cent.

Let us look at meat prices. I looked at the last market report and found that prime yearling beef was bringing 60 cents a kilogram. One looks elsewhere in the same paper and finds that T-bone steak is \$1.99 a kilogram and sirloin steak is even more expensive, so the cost of the raw product is only 25 per cent of the market value. Therefore, if the primary producer gave his commodity to the consumer he would reduce the cost of living to the consumers of this State, and of the nation, by only 4 or 5 per cent. These are the cold, hard facts that we, as representatives of country areas, are presenting.

I did another exercise: I took the gross national return of farm income of \$1 766 000 000 and divided that by 14 000 000 people in Australia. I then divided that figure by the number of days in the year and found that it is costing the average citizen of this nation 35 cents a day for the raw and primary products of this nation. The point of this exercise is that, if the primary producer did not charge anything for his labour or interest on his capital and just gave his commodity to the people of this nation, he would assist the economy by only 4 per cent to 4½ per cent. This concerns me very much.

It concerns me even more that the article I read out did not gain recognition in the local press. The South Australian community is so urban-orientated that it did not recognise this article's significance. I was unable to find it reported in the *Advertiser* or the *News*, although it might have appeared somewhere in small print in the back of one of those papers. This also concerns the rural producers upon whom this community rely.

Mention was made in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech of the farmer training scheme that is proposed for the Eyre Peninsula. The Speech states:

The need is also recognised for the provision of programmes for Eyre Peninsula farmers who wish to keep abreast of present developments in agricultural technology. I have been involved in this scheme because I am a member of the Eyre Peninsula Community College, formerly the Eyre Peninsula College of Further Education. That council, in consultation with the education committee of the United Farmers and Graziers organisation, has been formulating a farmer training scheme. The scheme was originated by the U.F. and G. The Chairman of the U.F. and G. committee was Mr. Garth Polkinghorne, who should be commended on the enormous amount of work that he has put into this scheme. The scheme, in principle, is designed to equip farmers and potential farmers with the appropriate level of knowledge and skill to enable them to farm efficiently and profitably. It is designed for practising and intending farmers and farm youth, and it is hoped that at the end of the course a certificate in farm practice will be awarded. It is expected that the course will be conducted over a two-year period. The course is a private course only and cannot be interpreted as being the farmer training scheme of the State. A number of developments have led up to this stage, I think the principal one being that there was an indication that a section of the community on Eyre Peninsula was prepared to get together and give some backing to such a project.

It is fair to say that those who initially enrolled in this course are farmers' sons, with one exception. I bring that to the notice of the House so that it will be known that the course is available not only to farmers' sons and so that it will be recognised by those persons concerned (and they are the ones committing themselves to the establishment of such a course) that the structure of the course is one of a balance between theory and practice. On the theory side, there are two block release periods each of three weeks in each of the two years. These block release periods will include lectures, demonstrations, and appropriate visits to recognised agricultural institutions and perhaps to machinery manufacturing firms and the like. The on-farm practice consists of project work, the preparation of enterprise budgets, alternative farm plans, stockyards and the like. The supervised practice involves the log book of activities, field days and group activities. For theory, there will be a progressive assessment as the two years pass, and there will be terminal examinations. For practical, there will be project marking and a log book of performance.

Associated with this scheme will be the need for master farmers and, in most cases, this will involve the parents of the lads who have enrolled for the course, whether master farmers for their own sons or for someone else's sons has yet to be determined. The master farmers will be obliged to undertake a training course of short duration, but the idea is to establish whether the master farmers are suitably equipped to be able to pass on the agricultural knowledge and the farm management schemes that would be necessary in the promotion of such a scheme. It is envisaged that initially there will be a two-day programme to bring these master farmers up to date and enable them to act effectively as tutors for the students.

The course has been developed as a result of close association between the Further Education Department and the United Farmers and Graziers education committee. I have already mentioned that Mr. Garth Polkinghorne has been the Chairman of that committee. He is a resident at Lock, and he has been the brainchild behind this project and the one who has tried to get the scheme off the ground. The United Farmers and Graziers

officer (Mr. Dennis Slee) has also contributed much of his own time and his organisational time to the scheme, as have the council and officers of the Further Education Department.

The scheme will be based initially at Cummins, and the farmers there who have indicated their intention of becoming involved come from within a radius of about 80 km. They have certainly indicated their willingness to proceed with the scheme. I can only commend this practice as being of some importance, and I believe that it will lead to further development later. I envisage that such a course could easily be expanded to enable non-farmer sons to undertake a farm training scheme. I think it reasonable to expect that the students could be promoted or sponsored by producer organisations. The U.F. and G., the Stockowners Association, or even the Agricultural Bureau could be responsible for sponsoring students. This, to me, is significant, because it gives an opening to boys and girls outside a rural environment to be able to become involved if they so wish. One of the greatest problems of the farming community today is to know who will continue farming in the future. Unless one is born into farming, one has no hope in the wide world of getting there. The genuine potential farmer who could be existing in the metropolitan area could not, unless there was a scheme of this nature, get into a farming scene.

Many previous speakers in the debate have referred to the unemployment situation. The other day I came across a lengthy newspaper report which, I believe, contains considerable merit. It appears in the *Advertiser* of July 20, under the heading "What has happened to all the jobs"? I will read it because it outlines some of the problems. It states:

A visitor from another planet might have trouble reconciling that at the latest count there were 332 792 Australians or 5.4 per cent of the work force registered as unemployed at a time when so many jobs in the community need to be done. Why is that so? The major reason is that in the private sector—and that accounts for three-quarters of the jobs available—no business which wants to stay in business can employ a person unless the earnings generated by the employee are greater than the cost of employment. The cost of employing a person is not simply his or her wages but also such things as workmen's compensation, pay-roll tax, long-service leave and so on. The South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry has estimated that to employ a person in the building trade involves wages plus 59 per cent, in the manufacturing industry, wages plus 45 per cent, and in retailing, wages plus 33 per cent.

An inevitable move by employers has been to replace labour with machines wherever possible. The employer argues that although the machine may be expensive, at least he knows what his present and future commitments for repairs and running costs will be. But it would be a brave man who would try to calculate what an employee's wages and associated costs will be in five years time. This trend has been encouraged by the Federal Government's taxation concessions for new plant. That is why the unemployment trend appears likely to get worse. There are relatively high stocks of goods available now, there is unused capacity in many factories and ample scope for increased overtime should demand warrant higher production. Unfortunately, much of this unused capacity lies in plant which has been outmoded by new technology.

Another reason for unemployment is that many of the jobs that have to be done need skills the unemployed do not have. Training and retraining of unemployed people might be some way of getting over this problem. Unions and their members also must overcome their fears and obstruction to technological change on which progress depends. The inertia evident among workers and management must be overcome. As it stands, management often can resist pressure to become more efficient by applying to the Prices Justification Tribunal for higher prices or threatening to dismiss workers and gain greater tariff

protection. It does appear the "lucky country" philosophy and earnings from mineral exports have blunted the need for industry to remain competitive and for people to retrain or develop skills. Are there other reasons why unemployment is so high? One is that Australian wages relating to what we produce are out of line with wages in countries with which we trade.

Figures issued in June by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (O.E.C.D.) highlight Australia's dilemma in world trade. They show that real wages in Australia rose faster between 1972 and 1975 than in any of 15 other O.E.C.D. members. That would not have been so bad if the output by each worker had risen by roughly the same percentage. However, Australia's increase in productivity was virtually nil—a fate shared with many other countries including the United States, Switzerland and Sweden. In a real sense, Australia's wage surge meant productivity could not be expected to rise. Wages rose at the expense of profits and with heavily reduced profits, companies could not or would not invest in new plant and techniques on which productivity gains are mainly based. In this merry-go-round situation, it became virtually inevitable the Australian dollar would lose its value against the currency of other countries whose productivity gains were more in line with gains in real wages. In trade terms, it meant Australian consumers found imported goods were better value than goods made here. Hence the rush on imported motor vehicles and a host of other goods. Ultimately, of course, that severely drained our foreign reserves and forced a devaluation of the Australian dollar. It also meant Australians lost their jobs as demand for local goods dried up in the face of cheaper imports. While the devaluation has helped restore the position, our competitors will continue to reap the benefits of greater spending on new plant and so on. The need for local companies to make greater investment in plant is therefore quite urgent. And therein lies the classic dilemma: to be able to compete internationally, Australia must invest in modern technology which, inevitably, will mean fewer jobs. But if there is no investment, production costs will remain high and the local market will be increasingly vulnerable to imports.

Who are the unemployed? They mainly are single people who are unskilled, young, migrants or women. The problem for many of the young is the frustrating round of "no experience, no job; no job, no experience." And if that is not bad enough, many employers say that the young people now leaving school are not equipped by the type of education they have received to fit easily into industry and commerce. It also appears many young people have left school with unrealistic ideas of their own abilities and their future role in the work force. When they have discovered what is expected of them, many have resigned. That appears to explain why 42 per cent of young people unemployed left their last job voluntarily. All of this would seem to suggest the nation's secondary school teachers have not been giving their pupils an adequate idea of what life in the outside world is all about. That is not surprising since most teachers have spent all their lives in teaching institutions. Teachers may argue with justification that their job is to teach, not to fit their pupils for the peculiar demands of the world outside. But to build an image for the young of a world far removed from reality must be to sow the seeds of disappointment and resentment. There would seem to be a good case for greater vocational guidance for students, more class visits to offices and factories and even a system to allow secondary teachers to spend a few weeks every year or so working outside schools.

So much for the basic problem and some of the reasons for it. What, if anything, can be done about it? A popular suggestion is for the Federal Government to create jobs for people. In theory that sounds fine but in practice it doesn't seem to work because the ultimate price may be more inflation. Britain, which has employed this approach more than almost any other country, seems disenchanted with it. The British Prime Minister (Mr. Callaghan) recently said:

"We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boosting government spending. I tell you in all candor that that option no longer exists and that insofar as it ever did exist, it worked by injecting inflation into the economy."

I bring that quotation to the attention of the House, because they were the words of a Labor Prime Minister. They indicate the position we are facing today. The article continues:

A theoretical solution would be for employers to pay an unemployed person any wage rate which was mutually acceptable. To do that, however, would mean the suspension or abolition of minimum wages and it is difficult, to say the least, to see Australia's unions accepting that proposition. Even unions whose members have a high degree of skill have a vested interest in ensuring the minimum wage levels are high since this secures their margin for skill in difficult times and provides a spring-board for higher margins in more buoyant times.

While the minimum wage appears to safeguard the standard of living of the unskilled, it actually prices him out of the market and on to the dole. That way every person loses—the nation's production, employed taxpayers through having to support the unemployed, and most importantly the unemployed person, both in material terms and in self-respect. Given that scenario, it should be possible for the Federal Government, employers and unions to come to an arrangement under which the \$500 000 000 or so a year being paid in unemployment benefits could be used to bridge the gap—or some of it—between the "economic worth" of the person to be employed and the minimum wage. As the economy recovered, competition for unskilled labour would ensure wages would rise and cut out the subsidy. The alternative is that the inexperienced and the unskilled will remain out of work until the general wage level of skilled employees rises to the point where unskilled labour has an "economic worth." And that could take a very long time.

That was a long article, but I believe that it needed repeating. It outlines some of the basic problems confronting the community.

The article mentioned the education system. I have some reservations about the campaign that has been going on. Only recently I, like other members in this House, received notification from some members of school staffs that they were dissatisfied with the cuts in education spending. I support education expenditure, provided that the money involved is put to good use. Many cries of "Don't cut education spending" come at a time when the education people themselves have not been taking a responsible attitude. We have heard letters read in this House from some responsible teachers who have complained about the wastage within the education system. We have had instances of equipment having been delivered to schools when it has not been asked for. We know of cases where grants have been asked for and much larger sums have been provided. In one case, \$1 500 was asked for and \$30 000 came along. We had the case of a \$200 grant being asked for and a \$2 000 grant being received, when the school council did not know what to do with it.

This is not responsible budgeting. If the education system gave an approach which created a sense of responsibility within the community, it would have the full support of the community. We have almost reached the stage where a person who advocates a cut in education will get popular support. This can be the fault only of those involved in education who are not taking a responsible attitude. I am sure all members in this House would support every teacher and every member of the education system in their request for additional funds if every dollar spent was spent wisely and the end product was a good solid education for our children.

As a result of letters I received from a number of schools (more from schools outside my district than from those within it), I wrote to the Federal Minister for Education asking for an explanation of this situation.

I should like to quote from his reply, because I think it puts back at the feet of the community the need for responsibility. The letter states:

As you will know, I announced in the Senate on June 3 the guidelines for the education commissions for the 1978-80 rolling triennium. I explained that, in arriving at its decisions, the Government has had to reconcile its aspirations at all levels of education with its policy of containing inflation which necessarily involves restraint in public expenditure, and reducing the level of deficit in the Federal Budget. Only by substantially reducing inflation and expanding productivity can our nation produce the additional funds necessary for future expansion in education as in everything else.

The guidelines indicate that for schools the level of funds allocated for 1978 will be at the same level in real terms as for 1977. In these terms, 1978 should be regarded as a year of consolidation rather than growth. Decisions on the allocation of these funds between programs and States will be made after the Government has received and considered the Schools Commission's report for 1978.

You may not have realised that the Fraser Government inherited a severe education financial cutback from the Whitlam regime. In its 1975 Budget, the Whitlam Government for the 1976 calendar year cut back all four Education Commissions by \$105 000 000 compared with 1975. The Schools Commission was cut back by \$43 000 000 (8 per cent). In the current year, 1977, we have been able to significantly increase education expenditure in real money terms. These gains will be projected forward into 1978.

I should add that the Government expects that States will continue to discharge their own financial responsibilities to Government and non-government schools, and in this regard it is important to recognise the significantly improved capacity of the States under the revised Commonwealth-State financial arrangements to contribute to these activities.

These comments are compatible with today's education scene, and if those involved in education took a responsible attitude in cutting excessive expenditure in some areas and made appropriate application in others, that action would be fully supported by every member.

I was pleased to be able to ask a question today, the first I have asked this session, relating to the bulk loading wharf at Port Lincoln. This wharf should be the pride and joy of this State, as when completed it will have the ability to load at the rate of 4 000 tonnes an hour. Without doubt it has the capacity to match any equipment we are likely to see on overseas shipping, and will be a quick turn-round point for grain despatches from this State. Unfortunate circumstances have led to a dispute regarding the completion of this work, but I am pleased to hear from the Minister of Marine that negotiations are continuing for a satisfactory conclusion. It is somewhat ironical that a wharf of this magnitude with the commensurate State expenditure should be placed in jeopardy and have to result in negotiations between the Waterside Workers Federation and the responsible Government authority.

What seems hard to understand and appreciate is the fact that never at any stage did anyone raise this question during the initial investigations of this port. It was only when the port was almost completed that the dispute arose. We had a situation in which an \$11 000 000 project was being held over a barrel because of an issue that should have been discussed in 1969 when the first inquiries were made, but was never discussed. I am pleased that the Minister was able to report that negotiations could reach a satisfactory conclusion.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech had no reference to the fishing industry, and this concerns me.

Mr. Becker: Too hard to handle.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes, perhaps it was. I can appreciate that because it would be a difficult portfolio. These days an article on fishing seems to appear in every daily newspaper. It is an industry plagued with differences within each of its sections, whether it be abalone, lobster, shark, or prawn. In addition, there are differences between the industries themselves, and between the industry associations and departmental instrumentalities, and everywhere along the line we find that people cannot agree. We are now getting differences between the State and Federal Governments. I regret that this situation has arisen, because the industry and therefore the State will suffer from it.

Despite all that, one problem that has not been solved relates to the facilities for the fishing community at Port Lincoln and Cowell and, to a lesser degree, in other parts of this State. In 1966, the Public Works Committee tabled a report on the Port Lincoln tuna berth, and that report contended that a berth should be built to handle the tuna catch alone. Regarding the need for improved facilities, the report stated:

Mr. Moyses advised the committee that the growing need for more wharf space for the unloading of tuna boats had been recognised for some time. One solution, as requested by the local fishermen, was to build a jetty for this purpose just southwards of their slipway in Porter Bay. A scheme for such a facility, together with outline plans and estimates, had been prepared and submitted.

The report also referred to the need for some relief of the difficulties of loading tuna and meat for export in overseas refrigerated vessels, and stated:

Serious delays to vessels were experienced because tuna and frozen meat could not be loaded from the shipping pier at the same time as dusty commodities, phosphate rock, sulphur and coal, were being unloaded. It was anticipated that these difficulties would rapidly multiply with the expected increase in both the exported tuna and the imported phosphate rock and sulphur tonnages.

This has resulted in a health problem with the loading and unloading of fish together with the unloading of rock phosphate and sulphur at the same wharf. This problem was recognised in the committee's report as far back as 1966, but we are further away from that berth now than we have ever been, a fact that has caused the displeasure of the industry for some years. I have also raised this matter several times in the House. Recently, the State General Manager of Safcol at the opening of a new freezer complex at Port Lincoln, at which the Premier was present, stated:

Port Lincoln and Cowell both have totally inadequate waterfront facilities for fishermen. Port Lincoln is Australia's largest fishing port and Cowell is rapidly becoming an important port for fishermen to land their prawn catches.

Mr. Fowler then referred to the Public Works Committee report, and stated:

Nothing has been done about this—and fishing boats still don't have a place to land their catch when the general cargo wharf is in use. Similarly, Cowell needs better facilities if it is to become perhaps Australia's leading prawn port. This request, for the Government to develop these facilities, is not intended to lessen our gratitude or recognition of what has been done by the Government.

Obviously, this has become an urgent need of the industry. I remind members that the Franklin Harbour at Cowell is silting up, and many prawn boats cannot get into the harbour because of the sand drift. Most of the larger vessels, especially those in the 80ft. category, have to wait for high tide in order to get in and many are stranded and have to wait for the tide for six hours before they can get out. This situation has caused much concern in the fishing community. It means that facilities at Cowell, and more importantly the people at Cowell

who depend on the business that the prawn industry brings into the area, could be placed in jeopardy if the harbor cannot be used in future.

There is a growing need to construct a marina at Port Lincoln for pleasure craft. This may seem to be a luxury in time of economic restraint, but there are 150 craft at the Port Lincoln Yacht Club, and numerous yachtsmen from other States visit this port. There is an entry of 62 yachts in the Outer Harbor to Port Lincoln yacht race, and it is being acknowledged that Port Lincoln is the sailing harbor for southern Australia. Without doubt the facilities do not encourage people from other States to spend their time there. If marinas were made available, I am sure that many Adelaide yachtsmen would leave their vessels in the security of the marina at Port Lincoln and fly backwards and forwards to Port Lincoln for their yachting experiences.

Another issue relates to the formation of the Pest Plant Control Board being set up under the Pest Plants Commission. A dispute arose in my district when the commission advised councils in the area that they must amalgamate to form their own pest plant board. I am concerned about the issue because councils have rejected the advice believing it to be a slur on their own integrity and believing that the services that such a board would offer could be nothing but a disadvantage to them. Before the enabling legislation was passed by this House an officer of the Agriculture Department visited the Eastern Eyre Peninsula Weeds Board. That board comprised the District Council of Tumby Bay, which had a weeds adviser of its own; the District Council of Lincoln, which had a weeds adviser in its own right; the District Council of Cleve which, in turn, had a weeds adviser; and the District Councils of Franklin Harbor and Kimba, which jointly employed a weeds officer. The Pest Plants Commission has proposed that those district councils, especially the District Council of Lincoln and the District Council of Tumby Bay, should amalgamate. It is believed that this would do nothing but detract from the effectiveness of the present system.

I am concerned that those councils have virtually been told they must comply. I was present at Cleve for a meeting of the Eastern Eyre Peninsula Weeds Board at which Mr. Max O'Neil was also present. He quite openly stated that those districts councils could operate boards of their own because they qualified under the criteria for that purpose. He stated at that time that those councils had demonstrated that they were carrying out effectively what was expected of them. That the Pest Plants Commission now says that those councils must amalgamate is nothing but a slur on their past activities and can only detract from the effectiveness of the Pest Plant Control Board itself. It is a step backwards to reduce the number of weeds officers from four to two.

Mr. Vandeeper: Don't tell me the department's going back on its word?

Mr. BLACKER: It certainly looks that way; the councils certainly believe that that is the case. Other aspects that need to be stated are in relation to pest plant boards having been established in other areas, especially in the Mid-North where there are councils comprising collectively 3 700 sq. km with a population of 5 000 people. Another area covers 4 294 sq. km and has a population of 4 400 with a rate revenue of about \$250 000 to \$300 000. Those areas can be compared with individual councils, for example, the District Council of Cleve, which has an area of 5 000 sq. km, and is far greater, collectively, than those other areas. The population in the Cleve District

Council area is less, but rate revenue is comparable. The District Council of Lincoln covers an area of 4 690 sq. km, a population of 4 000 and a rate revenue of about \$330 000. It cannot be said that these areas do not qualify, or that they have not complied with the requirements laid down by the Pest Plants Commission. It is a grave turn-around by officers of the department, who previously stated unequivocally that those councils as they were operating as the Eastern Eyre Peninsula Weeds Board could continue, because they met ideally the criteria being considered by the Pest Plants Commission. The district councils involved have rejected any involvement and will fight to the bitter end the compulsory amalgamation of the councils to set up a pest plant advisory board.

People at Coffin Bay have been trying to obtain land for a golf course. The saga commenced back in May, 1974, when letters were written to the Director of Lands. At the time negotiations were proceeding with the department for the acquisition of an area for the Coffin Bay Peninsular national park. The Coffin Bay Progress Association, acting through the District Council of Lincoln, wanted only 40 hectares of land on which to build a golf course. The association wanted to build its fairways through scrub. Its request was legitimate, because virtually hundreds of thousands of hectares of land was available there. The explanation for refusing the request was to the effect that the golf course would be incompatible with the formation of a national park. The explanation was so irrelevant that it was laughable. This is a growing recreational area that would gladly operate a golf course to attract tourists to the area. Another reason given by the department for rejecting the request was that Coffin Bay was served adequately by golf courses at Port Lincoln, Tumby Bay and Port Niell. How people could stay at Coffin Bay and travel to Port Niell to play golf I do not know.

Mr. Becker: How far away would that be?

Mr. BLACKER: It is a 2½ hour drive. How anyone could be expected to drive 160 km to play golf, I do not know. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the motion. I was sad that Sir Douglas Nicholls could not continue as Governor of this State. I am sure that he was most disappointed, as was Lady Nicholls, about it. I congratulate Mr. Crocker, the Lieutenant-Governor, for carrying out his duties assiduously.

I pay my condolences to relatives of former members. I knew Mr. Shannon and Sir Glen Pearson quite well. I attended Sir Glen's funeral a few months ago as the representative of my Party. I assure members that Sir Glen was held in high esteem in his district. Naturally, these former members were stalwarts of the Liberal Party.

During the course of this debate members have had many opportunities to express different ideas. I can assure members that I have vastly different ideas from the Leader of the Opposition. In the earlier part of this session he made a statement that this is a very tired Government. If any Opposition member cares to look at the Statute Books and also at the *Hansard* volumes that have accumulated during the regime of this Government he would see that that is not so. I could assure members opposite that the Government has made many notable changes, and that this Government, which has already been returned several times to office, will be returned again.

Mr. Gunn: You can't—

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not know where the member for Eyre has been because if he has been reading public opinion polls and travelling through various districts recently he would know the high regard in which the Dunstan Government is held. I think the member for Eyre is getting frightened. He was even more frightened when the district boundaries were being considered. The honourable member even bought a house alongside the house of the member for Flinders. I am certain the member for Flinders would have won the election if he and the present member for Eyre had stood against each other.

I believe we will retain office. The member for Glenelg was not a member of this House when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier. I got along well with Sir Thomas and still do. The Leader said that we were a tired Government, but at the time of the Playford Government we were sitting for only four months of the year and we had eight months off. Members always knew with certainty that they would be able to attend the Melbourne Cup. We now sit many more months in a year. There is no need to worry in any way at all about the number of hours we have been sitting in this House during the Labor regime, which will continue.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We're over-governed.

Mr. LANGLEY: I will have more to say about that because I have a transcript of what the Leader of the Opposition said recently when he was on talk-back radio and that will surprise members opposite. If the Deputy Leader wants to go even further back, if ever there was government by the Executive in this State it was during the Liberal regime under Sir Thomas Playford. The district represented by the Leader of the Opposition borders my district, and I wonder whether he has any idea of public opinion on important matters of the day. I saw a television programme last night and the *Advertiser* report this morning was totally different. I do not know whether or not the press is a puppet of his Party, but I was most surprised recently when I heard a member of the Opposition congratulating a member of the press for one of his articles. One day you are praised and the next day you are dumped. Members opposite have stated that during the term of the Whitlam Government they did not do any knocking.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Who said that?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sure you did. You and other members were knocking the Whitlam Government.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Unley has used the word "youse". We all realise that he cannot use the word "you"—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —but that is a gross misuse of the English language.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the second time I have had to warn the honourable member for Davenport today and I shall not warn him again if he continues to speak while I am calling order. If the honourable member for Unley has used the word "youse" it is an unparliamentary term. At the same time, I remind all honourable members to be cautious.

Mr. LANGLEY: I will try to do my best and, if it upsets the member for Davenport, that will not upset me greatly. I will respect your ruling. There is no doubt that during the term of the Whitlam regime members opposite took all available opportunities to slate that

Government, although they did not have many opportunities to do so. For members opposite to say they spoke nicely about the Whitlam Government is getting away from the truth. They now have the gall to complain when we have a word to say against the present Federal Government. I can assure members opposite that if the Federal Government went to the polls today it would be in a lot of trouble. What is good for one is not good for the other, and members opposite have had a great turnabout on this matter. I can recall when the Prime Minister promised he would fix unemployment in two years. There is no doubt that he has fixed it all right—it has been increased. I know there has been—

Mr. Mathwin: Mr. Cameron said he would resign at 250 000.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Glenelg can have his side of the argument, but they are the words the Prime Minister used. The Prime Minister said that he would fix it. Has the Prime Minister fixed it? Things have got worse and they will possibly be even worse next year. This Government has put much money into helping the unemployed in this State, but the irony of it is that the Federal Government takes money from the people helped by way of taxes, and does not return that money to the State, although we may get some money back in various ways. If this taxation revenue were reimbursed, there would be the opportunity to employ more people. The member for Hanson is not happy about it. He sent out a pamphlet in his district mentioning a sum of \$27 000 000. He was a bit premature because it was not the end of the year and the figures had not been shown. I have his pamphlet here; there are a few Labor supporters in his area.

Mr. BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Unley, in referring to a pamphlet I put out in my district, is completely misrepresenting the facts.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. I point out to the honourable member that many so-called facts are stated in this House. Whether they are correct or incorrect is not a point of order.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order: I seek your clarification please. Is it correct for a member to stand up in this House and deliberately mislead the House by misrepresenting the facts?

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member feels that he has been misrepresented, he has an opportunity to ask leave of the House to make a personal explanation, and I have never known that to be refused.

Mr. LANGLEY: I will soon have an opportunity to state what was in the pamphlet; whether the member for Hanson likes it or not is not my worry. The honourable member is allowed to have his opinion and I can have mine.

Mr. Becker: Don't call me a liar!

Mr. LANGLEY: I did not say that at any stage. The help being given to people in my district, where we have a considerable number of young people and other people out of work, has been greatly appreciated. These people worked on projects in the district, and I am sure some work has been done in the Hanson District, such as tidying up playgrounds and giving other places a facelift. This work would normally not have been carried out. This is surely a feather in the Government's cap. I commend the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Premier for enabling us to help these people, who are in dire need of help. It is a fact of life that many young people are unable to get jobs and much is happening that would

not normally happen in this State. It is well known that, in many cases, a person aged over 50 who goes to get a job is told that he is too old. It is very hard for such people to gain employment. Like everybody else, I hope that it will not be long before we have full employment in this country. I am not sure that the Federal Government is keen about that, but that does not alter the fact that it is a necessity.

Another matter that I think was on everyone's mind many months ago was the referendum about freezing wages and prices. Everyone in the community was saying it was the right thing to do to stop unemployment and to provide more jobs. Most people said, in conversation, that they thought that was the answer, and that they saw no other answer. When the referendum was held, the proposal was defeated easily.

Mr. Russack: Mr. Hawke had a different opinion than the Labor Party.

Mr. LANGLEY: I had a different opinion than Mr. Hawke; I voted "Yes" and "Yes". I thought about the matter and thought that that was the best idea. The proposal was defeated, but I am sure that, considering what has happened since, people in this country wish that they had voted for a wages and prices freeze. It was what many people had asked for. I am not sure that the Opposition Party did not ask their followers to vote "No" and "No". I think members opposite would now like the answer to have been "Yes" to both questions, and I think the Prime Minister would have liked that to happen. That is one way the unemployment and the down-turn in industry would most likely have been avoided. One of the reasons why the proposal was defeated was that businesses said that they would all freeze prices. My wife would go to the grocery store and say, "I thought prices were frozen, but so and so is up 2c this week", despite advertisements saying "Our prices are frozen". Firms that said the prices on all articles were frozen were just saying that as a gimmick, and it just did not happen. When the price freeze ceased prices increased on some articles by 8c or 9c and those articles are going up from week to week.

Mr. Slater: One firm has made \$31 000 000 profit.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and some of the little firms were told what price they would have to sell their goods for to that firm, otherwise people were out of work. I was in favour of a wage and price freeze when the referendum was held and I stick to that. I am not a Bachelor of Economics or anything like it, but I am sure, and I thought at that time, if that wage and price freeze had been voted for it would have been successful.

I noted in the Leader's speech that he spoke of broken promises. He was very wary about mentioning things that had been done by the Labor Party, things that people had wanted for years but were denied by the Playford Government. If I was able to get every member on my side of the House to go through every broken promise of the Playford regime it would take a long time and yet the Opposition talks of the Prime Minister's broken promises and says, "Don't worry about them." It might have been awkward for Sir Thomas Playford, as he did not sit for very long because there was very little before the House.

Mr. Whitten: Was he known as Sir Promise Playford?

Mr. LANGLEY: I cannot say that because I held him in quite high esteem. I did not believe in his policies and most likely we had a few differences of opinion in this House. The Leader missed one of the greatest things done by this Party that has helped this Party in this State—

pensioner concessions. The Liberal Party had an opportunity to introduce those concessions over a period of 25 years, but never made a move to do so in any way. Then, the concessions were increased from 50 per cent to 60 per cent, and what a winner that was with these old people! However, under the new taxation laws it is being taken away from them and many pensioners are paying taxes; that is shocking.

Mr. Russack: Who introduced that? The Whitlam Government did.

Mr. LANGLEY: I can assure the honourable member of one thing: this year's taxation papers are totally different from last year's.

Mr. Russack: Hayden did that when he was Treasurer.

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member will have an opportunity to make his point, but I say that there have been more pensioners taxed this year than in any other year of which I know. I can assure honourable members this has hit pensioners hard. People have come into my office who have never filled out a taxation form until this year, and I am sure that they are honest.

Mr. Allen: You're two years behind.

Mr. LANGLEY: Maybe I am, but I say that the taxation papers this year are different from last year's and have different concessions on them. I can perhaps be proved wrong, but I say that there are more pensioners who had to fill in taxation forms this year and who will have to pay tax than there has been in any other year. I have never had so many pensioners come to my office and ask why they must fill in a taxation return.

Mr. Whitten: Because of Fraser.

Mr. LANGLEY: Probably so, because his Party is in Government, but that may not last much longer. Raffles were conducted illegally during Sir Thomas Playford's term in office, and every so often someone was fined so that it would look good. Later, when Frank Walsh became Premier, a referendum was held on the running of lotteries. I think that the entire Opposition must have collapsed with fright, because about 70 per cent of the voters favoured lotteries. The Opposition is behind the post in all such matters. Our hospitals, which are as good as those in any other Australian State, are still improving as a result of totalisator, raffle and lottery profits. Very few sporting clubs would exist were it not for raffles and club licences.

Mr. Allen: You've not introduced poker machines yet.

Mr. LANGLEY: No. Many questions have been asked by the Opposition, but the Premier has been most astute. The poker machine question could be embarrassing if put to the House. Would Opposition members have a free vote on the matter? The Premier has said that the machines will never be allowed in this State under his Administration. Although I am sure that New South Wales would be pleased to get rid of its poker machines, the revenue they earn is very handy. I am not in favour of them, because many who play them lose money they can ill afford. I am sure that South Australians would not condone the use of poker machines in this State.

The Minister of Transport seems to be one of the Opposition's major targets. Recently, I was in Queensland and travelled over some of its roads, which must be the worst I have ever traversed in Australia. The whole set-up in Queensland is a dictatorship. We now have good and efficient clearways, which have been applauded by the motoring public. We have also had an increase in the number of traffic lights, which have been made uniform and which have prevented many

accidents. I believe that the "turn left with care" signs were introduced by the present Minister, and these are essential in solving our traffic problems. He has also provided cycle tracks. The Minister is doing an excellent job with the funds available to him.

Mr. Tonkin: What do you want out at Unley? What are you trying to buy?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am pleased with what has been done in the Unley District. It has been a stable electorate for some time, although each election it has been said that I would be defeated. I assure the Leader that my district needs more, and I am making requests of the Ministers. I am not going to say (as did the member for Mount Gambier), "They're spending too much in my district."

Mr. Russack: He didn't say that.

Mr. LANGLEY: I can show the honourable member a report of it in the press.

Mr. Russack: I reckon it's because of the member for Mount Gambier that you've spent so much money there.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not so sure that the member for Mount Gambier will be back, but that will be decided by the people there, who will judge this Government compared to the Opposition. They were the words of the member for Mount Gambier, and I could not believe my eyes when I read them. I quote now from a report, under the heading "Now Hear This!", appearing in the *Sunday Mail* of July 10. There has been much comment about this matter. When anything appears in the paper that is against their Party, members opposite say that the Premier has donated the money to get it in the paper, but that is not true. The matters in that article are true. They came from a Mr. Neighbour, who is a member of a group of professionals and businessmen who have launched a campaign to back South Australia against "knockers". The article states:

The campaign, by the recently formed Committee for Good Government, began yesterday with a series of advertisements on commercial radio stations throughout the State. The 60-second commercials make four main points.

I am sure that Mr. Neighbour would be pleased to hear the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition concerning this matter. I would not mind sending Mr. Neighbour a copy of what the Leader said. Members opposite say that this scheme was sponsored by the Premier, but that is not so. We have been trying to convince the Opposition of these four main points for some time. The article continues:

Education standards and facilities are high compared with other States. Building costs for houses are lower in Adelaide than in any other capital, except Perth.

I recall the Opposition's stating the other day that the cost of building a house in South Australia is more expensive than the cost anywhere else in Australia. I think that the Premier quoted Savings Bank figures, whereas the Opposition quoted figures from Jennings the builder. However, the Opposition did not refer to the cost of the land on which the house was built. The land cost and the building cost must be combined.

Mr. Russack: What about the cost of the services?

Mr. LANGLEY: That is included in the cost of the land here, but that is often not the case in other States. The cost of a house, land, and facilities in South Australia is the lowest in Australia. The price of a home must include the cost of the land as well as the cost of the building. The cost of the building depends on the type of construction. It may be brick, brick veneer, or weatherboard.

Mr. Whitten: Like those in New South Wales or Queensland.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. They are suited to the climate. I consider that South Australian houses are well built and a credit to us. There are some poor tradesmen, but generally our tradesmen are good.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: And the electrical work is second to none.

Mr. LANGLEY: It is always good, because we have the Electricity Trust and we have licensed electricians. It took the Labor Government to legislate for licensing, and it has been most successful. I believe that the law should be tightened further. The third point was that State taxes are lower in South Australia than in any other State except Tasmania. That was explained by the Premier, not to the delight of the Opposition. The fourth point is that South Australia has the lowest number of working days lost through strikes. The member for Davenport is supposedly an expert on unions.

Mr. Slater: Union bashing.

Mr. LANGLEY: I may have time later to talk about that. The figures I have mentioned are compiled by people with no political axe to grind and, as far as I know, with no political allegiance. I do not want to go through the whole of the article. It is from an outside source, and in my opinion the contents are truthful. I had an opportunity on Thursday, July 21, to hear the Leader of the Opposition on a radio show. I should like to read a couple of sections of the transcript, as follows:

Lady caller: A few years ago, we as a family were heavily taxed on copper dumps we won in the North. At that stage, it was out of the ground, but stockpiled, which means it's a long way from being used. Now, while we were battling in the courts to reduce this tax, which was, I might add, astronomical, it practically flattened the lot of us, but while we were battling in the courts to reduce this tax, Parliament was not in session, and my son said, "There's something very strange about this whole situation, dad; this solicitor of ours is not asking the right questions." And he went down to Parliament House to find out if anything had happened in the interim and found that Parliament was not in session but 12 Bills were going through, and that they were being signed by the Governor at the time, because of Parliament being not in session.

Mr. Tonkin: Well, they would have been passed through Parliament, because His Excellency would not have been able to sign them unless they'd been passed.

Lady caller: Well they had gone through apparently because the time lapse or the time pressure of—

Mr. Tonkin: It might have been regulations, you see, because regulations can be changed at any time, and they can't be challenged until Parliament sits.

Lady caller: No, that's right, well, one of the Bills related to this area, so—

Mr. Tonkin: Yes, I think I can see what you are getting at. In other words, the Government can, in fact, take action, in Parliament or by regulation to really get the advantages over the private citizen, and that to me is absolutely abhorrent. I think it's totally wrong. There have been a number of cases like that in the past, and I don't like it.

In future—although probably not for a very long time—the Opposition, if in Government, will not use regulations, because the Leader of the Opposition does not like them; they are abhorrent. That was a most enlightening statement. Sir Thomas Playford had the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which deals with regulations, short-circuiting the Parliament. The opportunity is still there, as the Leader of the Opposition says, but he will not use it. I should like to know whether that is Opposition policy. I turn now to one of the hot-potato questions, uranium. I do not know who asked the question, but the transcript of the programme reads as follows:

J. C.: Where do you stand on uranium?

Mr. Tonkin: Uranium is something that I believe may have to be mined and may have to be used. We believe that, until safeguards are found, we shouldn't make any immediate decision on it. Those safeguards, to me, seem to be coming closer and closer. I, at the present time, am very concerned about the fast-breeder reactor. I'm concerned about a plutonium economy, and I think that what President Carter said makes a lot of sense. In other words, that if it means that we can avoid fast breeder reactors, by having more uranium available, then we probably have a moral obligation to export uranium. I would go further than that and say that if we do I would prefer to see us process our own uranium and keep control over the whole business, and export only the rods, the energised rods and so on, so that we've got a total control over the whole operation. But, we haven't yet come to a firm decision but I can see more and more that there's a great deal to be said for exporting some form of uranium energy.

That is a total turnaround. Even in this case, the Leader of the Opposition is fast changing his views and he is reaching the stage, like the Prime Minister, when he will say that uranium will be mined in this country. Little has been said about the Australian Labor Party conference in Perth. I have it on good authority that the motion on uranium adopted by that conference was identical with the one moved in this House, contrary to what was in the newspapers. People have mentioned this to me, and I want to clear it up once and for all.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: In this case the Opposition is supporting A.I.P. policy.

Mr. LANGLEY: There is no doubt about that. We will be finding out before long what is to happen. At present we receive no Federal funding for sport. The present system was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Broomhill, when he was the Minister concerned with sport, and it has been carried on by the present Minister, the Hon. Mr. Casey. After attending many meetings and functions I know that we have some excellent people in the department, and I praise them for their wonderful work in helping people in the realm of sport. The Whitlam Government made tremendous strides towards helping sport. Because of a change in Government there was a change of face. I put on record the wonderful work that has been done, and commend the spirit of people in sporting activities who attend coaching classes and receive certificates.

Recently, the Sports Council decided to have one type of emblem and tracksuit for people who represent this State, and that decision received wholehearted support. This is something to be proud of, and those who participate in future will be proud of the uniform. It took some time to decide on the best design, but we now have one State colour. Many coaching schools are being conducted, but sporting activities in this State could expand, and I hope they will, especially if the Commonwealth Government soon sees sense and realises that there should be Commonwealth funding. The State Minister has helped to fund fares for State players, but it is awkward for the Government to fund overseas tours. However, this is money well spent, and was long overdue. The member for Hanson has raised this matter, and when I was in Opposition every attempt was made to obtain such funds. Recreation and sport in this State is improving, and all members will realise that whatever the complexion of the Government this support must be continued.

I do not know to what union the member for Davenport belonged: he may have belonged to the Public Service Association, but I should think that most of us are members of some organisation. I shall not list them, but I am sure that most Opposition members pay into

some sort of organisation, for one reason or another, and I hope they do. Those on the land, schoolteachers, and others in private business have the chance to join some sort of association to which they can belong. I suppose some belong to the Liberal Party organisation, too, and I am a member of the Labor Party and proud of it. In some of the largest companies in this State, before a person can start work he must become a union member.

We have referred to this matter many times, but I cannot obtain a reply from the member for Davenport to the question: "Do you believe that, if a person is in a union and his union fights for him and he receives an extra \$3 a week, the people who are not members of that union should receive that money?" I feel strongly about this matter, because I believe that if a person is not a member of a union he should not receive the advantages, because he is not paying anything into the funds of the union. Every time the member for Davenport speaks he knocks the worker, especially regarding workmen's compensation. However, when the chance arose to amend that legislation he missed out, and then next day Opposition members wanted to reconsider the legislation. The Leader of the Opposition has said that unions are required (and I agree with that), but he wanted to control them.

Mr. Evans: Do you believe in subcontracting or piece work?

Mr. LANGLEY: I was a contractor and a subcontractor as a member of the Electrical Contractors Association, and paid my dues. It was my right, and I did it. Concerning piece work, the first thing that happens when a workman becomes proficient and lays 800 or 900 bricks a day while someone else lays 1 000 (it does not happen these days) is that the employer increases his darg and that man has to step up to 1 000 bricks for the same amount of wages. Those who do the most work push up the other chap's quota, although he is not so good. Piece work is wrong, because in the end the employer or large contractor makes the money. They push the worker into doing this, and I do not favour it.

In my opinion and in the opinion of most South Australians, there is no doubt that when the elections are held we will be back on the front bench, contrary to what is being said by Opposition members and those people who are trying to help them. I support the motion.

Mr. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I refer to a statement made by the member for Unley in the Address in Reply debate about what he said I included in a newsletter that I publish in my district every couple of months. The honourable member implied that I was suggesting that the State Government had a surplus of \$27 000 000 in the Treasury. For his benefit I quote the newsletter, as follows:

State taxation has increased dramatically in the past seven years. Frequently, the present State Labor Government has tried to lay the blame on the Federal Government, but, when the Premier can boast of a \$27 000 000 surplus in the Reserve Account this financial year, that particular argument can hardly be taken seriously.

What I said in that newsletter was that the State Treasury started off the financial year with a surplus of \$27 000 000 in the Reserve Account. A statement on page 11 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year that ended on June 30, 1976, shows a surplus in the Consolidated Revenue Account at June 30, 1975, of \$22 782 009. After the transactions for that financial year and for 1975-76, plus completion grant, etc., the surplus in Consolidated Revenue Account at June 30, 1976, was \$27 568 682, so I was being a little conservative when I said \$27 000 000. That is the surplus in the Reserve Account with which the Government started off the 1976-77 financial year. As at the financial year ended June 30, 1977, we have been told that a slight deficit of about \$83 000 exists. That sum must be deducted from the \$27 568 000. I did not imply in my newsletter that we would end up with a \$27 000 000 surplus on Revenue Account. My newsletter quite clearly states: "Reserve Account". That proves that we in South Australia can argue that we have been severely hit by State taxes, and that has been borne out many times. The State Government has been able to reduce some taxes. Rural land tax has been abolished. Concessions have now been granted in stamp and succession duties, and concessions have been granted in the stamp duties area where people are buying their first house. A Government that can reduce taxes in the past 12 months can feel reasonably confident of its efforts. At the same time taxpayers have a right to complain that they have been overtaxed. I was grateful to see on page 22 of this evening's *News* the headline "Dunstan challenges value of home". The report states:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, is challenging the official Government valuation of his Norwood home . . . If people think valuations on their properties are incorrect they should contact the Valuer-General's Department . . . A temporary office of the department had been set up in the Norwood Town Hall and would be open tonight and tomorrow—including tomorrow night. Mr. Dunstan said time for appeal against valuations would expire on August 2 . . . The Assistant Valuer-General, Mr. J. Darley, said unimproved land values in the Norwood area had risen by about 300 per cent since 1970.

Mr. Gunn: Did you know that the department had been instructed by the Government not to give information to the public?

Mr. BECKER: No, I am not aware of that. What surprises me, of course, is the stand now being taken by the Premier in relation not only to his own home but also to properties in the Norwood council area. I remember a few years ago when the member for Glenelg and I held a public meeting at the Glenelg Town Hall that was extremely well attended. It was one of the best organised public meetings held by two members of Parliament. We obtained hundreds of signatures on petitions objecting to valuations in the area. I received about 180 letters from constituents asking me to write to the Minister in charge of the Valuation Department objecting to their valuations. Last year the West Torrens council area was hit savagely by revaluations. An error occurred in the whole of Novar Gardens and the valuations had to be redone at the instigation of a person who was then the Mayor of West Torrens. I will not go into further detail on that matter.

I am surprised that, when the member for Glenelg and I started the campaign against high valuations in our own districts, we were accused of being over emotional and were also accused of doing what some Government backbenchers are doing today—knocking the State. We were not knocking the State at all. We are saying that when we objected to the valuation increases and warned the people of South Australia about it, we were classed as knockers

and as being over-emotional, yet the Premier can defend his own district by saying that a temporary office of the department has been set up in the Norwood Town Hall and will be open tonight and tomorrow, including tomorrow night. I wonder whether that indicates that South Australia is to have retail trading at night? Why is the Valuation Department suddenly establishing offices during the evening—because it is convenient to the public. Who will pay the overtime bill for the public service? I hope those public servants will not be working for nothing.

When valuations increase in the Premier's district we get this sort of action, but when it happens in a Liberal member's district he is accused of being over-emotional, knocking the State, slamming taxes and this and that. This Government has two sets of values. I have no doubt the statements being made by the Opposition are suddenly frightening the Government. After all, it has enjoyed seven years of luxurious living. The Attorney-General would not like to lose the position he has; he has never earned so much money; he has never had it so good or so easy.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What do you think will happen after the election—30 Labor members?

Mr. BECKER: Nothing like that will happen.

Dr. Eastick: That is an indication of how crooked the redistribution is.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many private interjections and private conversations.

Mr. BECKER: The valid point made by the member for Light is that the Government was extremely confident about the redistribution of boundaries because it knew the problems that would exist for the Liberal Party. One cannot just carve up the State and chop out four country districts and expect four country members of the Liberal Party to give up without some sort of fight. It is fair and reasonable to understand that problems would arise. A calculated risk was taken by the Government, and it has carefully and cunningly played on the whole issue. The Liberal Party has been treated severely under the redistribution of boundaries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: The Liberal Party has been attacked throughout the present session for giving individual members the right to stand for Parliament. It is a pity that the public has not been given the opportunity to appreciate that when a person is a member of the Liberal Party he has the right to stand for Parliament without any overriding dictatorial force that would deny him that right. I hope that the citizens of this State will be free to choose what they want to do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): Last week we heard the member for Glenelg, more commonly known as "the Great Survivor of the Liberal Party", in his usual grandstanding fashion criticise and lace the Furnishing Trade Union for various claims and conditions asked for in that organisation's ambit log of claims.

Mr. Mathwin: That was only the first instalment. The second one is still to come.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ABBOTT: It is obvious that the member for Glenelg still does not understand an ambit claim, no matter how many times it is explained to him. Perhaps he does not wish to understand. Perhaps he is a union

basher. The best description of an ambit claim was described recently by a newspaper reporter when he said that an ambit claim is a legal device to enable a party to a Federal award room to manoeuvre in a changing industrial and financial situation. I hope the honourable member read that description. If he does not understand the description he should take a course on union education through the adult education association or through the Workers Education Association. I can recall when the late Sam Lawn (the former member for Adelaide), as Federal Secretary and court advocate of the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation of Australia, in 1948 serving a log of claims on the Vehicle Manufacturers Association of Australia. It took almost five years for that case to be finalised. However before it was concluded the cost of living had risen so rapidly that they were out of ambit, and Mr. Lawn had to serve a new log of claims as instructed by the court.

Mr. Whitten: At cost to the union?

Mr. ABBOTT: At great cost to the union. The case started in 1948 and finished in 1953, with more than 12 000 pages of transcript. The Federal Vehicle Industry Award contained in those days more than 200 classifications and there was only 5c differential in the rates of pay for many of the classifications. It was quite a deliberate exercise by the employer advocates to waste time and drag that case out. How they could say that a body builder was worth 5c a week more than a motor mechanic, or a motor mechanic was worth 5c a week less than a fitter and turner, or a fitter and turner was worth 5c more a week than a die setter, I will never know but they were the tactics used in those days deliberately to waste time. That award was known as the 1953 Federal Vehicle Industry Award and it remained that until 1972 when a new ambit claim was served on the employers. As I understand it, that award is still known as the 1972 Federal Vehicle Industry Award.

From time to time the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia is criticised as being a dictatorial body. Its actions and decisions are often condemned by people who know nothing about Trades and Labor Council procedures or how dispute situations are settled or handled. Government Ministers are also condemned at times for not sticking their noses into trade union disputes and affairs. I will not (and I never will) accept that the Trades and Labor Council is a dictatorial body. It operates under a democratic set of rules, which have been operating for many years. The rules have rarely been altered since its inception. If an affiliated union seeks the support or assistance of the Trades and Labor Council on any matter it has every right to do so, provided that the matter it intends to put forward has been approved and endorsed by the affiliated union; that is the only prerequisite.

This puts the matter officially before the Trades and Labor Council. It is then dealt with by the executive committee of that body and, whatever recommendation is decided by the majority of the executive, that is the recommendation that is put before the full Trades and Labor Council meeting. Whatever recommendation is put to the full council is only a recommendation: it is not a direction to the council. The full Trades and Labor Council is made up of several hundred delegates from every affiliated union, and more than 70 unions are affiliated with the council, representing 120 000 unionists.

Every executive recommendation is read and put before the full delegation of council; details of the particular issue are given; and reports and all information in respect

of every matter is fully explained to the delegates. Occasionally an executive recommendation is accepted without debate, but on most occasions a full debate takes place. Individual delegates have every right to speak and enter the debate on any matter that is before the council. They can support, oppose or amend any item until a decision is arrived at. The important point is that all recommendations are put to a vote and the majority decides. That decision then becomes the official decision of the Trades and Labor Council.

How anyone can say that the Trades and Labor Council is dictatorial when it follows procedures I have just mentioned is beyond me and I am completely bewildered by it. I think it is complete ignorance by those who say otherwise, because the council is completely democratic and I believe what I have just outlined proves that beyond any doubt. The council does not interfere with, nor has it ever restricted the right, of any union democratically to decide to work according to an award. However, I do support the democratic right of an affiliated union that complies with a majority decision to protest against another union affiliate that does not comply with the majority decision. Unions affiliated with the Trades and Labor Council act in accordance with the rules of that organisation and not the rules of any other organisation. I think the same position would apply to the Liberal Party. I can imagine what would happen to a member of that Party should one of its members choose not to comply with its rules. He or she would be dealt with severely, if the Liberal Party has any rules, perhaps it has Rafferty's rules. It would certainly be hostile to anyone who stepped out of line. We only have to cast our minds back a few years when we saw the great split with the Liberal Movement, now the new L.M., and next it will be the Liberal Democrats, or something.

I am not saying that I agree or disagree with all decisions arrived at by the Trades and Labor Council; that is not the point. I am saying that if a union becomes an affiliated body it should abide by the majority decision. There is also a lot of unwarranted criticism levelled at the Government and Minister for failing to interfere and rectify various industrial disputes. No members of this Government interfere with the legitimate business of trade unions, any more than they interfere with the legitimate business of the Employers Federation, the Chamber of Commerce, the A.C.T.U., or for that matter any legitimate organisation. What is more, the trade union movement does not attempt to tell this Government how to run its business.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I want to refer to the hypocrisy of the Labor Government in relation to uranium mining.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad to hear the hard left wing Attorney-General, the young Peter Duncan, Attorney-General some of the time but private citizen when broadcasting to Fretilin. I am not sure what cap he has on at the moment. The stance of the Labor Party on this matter is completely hypocritical. Resolutions of the Perth conference of the Australian Labor Party are binding on all members of that Party. By a majority vote at the Perth conference, it was resolved that there is an indefinite moratorium on the mining of uranium and it will be reviewed in two years when they have their next corroboree.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It was unanimous—not a majority view.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Okay. I would have been interested to hear the contribution of the Minister of Mines and Energy. I would have liked to hear his honest sentiments in relation to this matter. I want to point out a few facts of life that I hope are known to members opposite, who have quite cheerfully accepted this indefinite moratorium. I point out as I did in the House a few days ago, what Mr. Hawke said when he was speaking to a group of students (that is recorded in *Hansard*). In effect, he said he could not understand the argument of people who are against mining uranium because nothing we do can alter the fact that we are in the atomic age. He said that by withholding our uranium supplies all we will do is to increase the price of world supplies because people who have nuclear reactors will get supplies from somewhere. He said that Australia has 20 per cent of the reserves and that if in fact we do not mine them all we will do is put up the world price of uranium to developing nations and further inhibit the development of the undeveloped nations.

Dr. Eastick: The Federal Parliamentary Leader said something similar.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: No, he didn't.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I cannot be sure of that, but if the member for Light says that that is the case, I would think that would be the case. Mr. Hawke further said that if we carried this argument to a logical conclusion we would have to look at the mining of coal or iron ore, because we turn steel into guns and guns are used for warfare; therefore we should not be mining iron ore. That is what their Federal President said within a week, I think, of presiding over the deliberations of the Labor Party in Western Australia that put an indefinite moratorium on the mining of uranium.

Mr. Whitten: It was for two years.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It would be reviewed, but the effect is that there is an indefinite ban on mining. Mr. Hawke also said that the people who argue against the mining of uranium get a warm moral glow from having done something that escapes him, except that they have added to the world's difficulties by increasing the price of uranium.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What about the resolution here three or four months ago?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The terms of that resolution were that we would approve of the mining of uranium when we were satisfied that there were satisfactory safeguards and methods of disposing of wastes. When the Premier went on television that night he elaborated far beyond the bounds of that resolution, and he had to be pressed by the interviewer who asked, "Does that mean an indefinite ban on the mining of uranium" and the Premier said, "Well, Yes".

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Will you support that resolution in the same terms now?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We made our position clear in the terms of that resolution, and the interpretation being sought to be put on that resolution by the Government and

the Premier is quite different from the terms of the amended resolution passed in this House.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Tell us whether you support that resolution?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can I claim the protection of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, so that I can use my time to some advantage?

The SPEAKER: I admit that there are interjections, but I must remind the Deputy Leader that he is one honourable member who uses this period to interject, so it must be even on both sides. I have only called the House to attention when the interjections become a little unbearable.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They have managed to waste a minute of my time, so I will press on. The facts are that oil and gas global reserves will disappear before the turn of the century. They are probably the cleanest fuels, and they will be used up by then even if we only maintain our present rate of consumption. The alternatives open to the Labor Party, if we are not to develop nuclear fuel, will be the further use of coal and any other fossil fuels that may turn up.

Mr. Whitten: What about solar energy?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Work is being done in relation to solar energy at the present time, and it can be used for achieving temperatures approaching the boiling point of water, but there is much work to be done (and I am not for a minute decrying research into solar energy; that certainly must be done). According to the present prognostication for the use of solar energy in, say, transport or the generation of electric power is a long way off.

Dr. Eastick: Its greatest proponents suggest 20 to 25 years.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it is a long way off. I point out the options that are open to the human race at present. Evidence has come to light in the past few weeks (and it has come to our attention in Australia in the last week), that there is tremendous danger for the human race from the build-up of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. If there is exclusive use of fossil fuels, particularly coal, the danger to the human race will be far greater than any danger from the development of thermal reactors using uranium. If one studies the build-up of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere during the past 10 years and translates that graph onwards into the next century with an increased use of fossil fuel, the result for the human race will be quite disastrous in about the middle of the next century. I have some information I will quote to the House at some time in the future showing what the effect will be from the burning of coal and the use of fossil fuels. The further use of fossil fuel will certainly be far more dangerous than the further development of the thermal reactor. There are 400 thermal nuclear reactors currently operating in the world.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You read that fact wrongly.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General is out of order.

Motion carried.

At 5.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 2, at 2 p.m.