

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 16, 1977

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: MAIN ROAD 321

Mr. BLACKER presented a petition signed by 332 residents of Lower Eyre Peninsula, praying that the House would support the upgrading and sealing of Main Road 321 between Lipson and Ungarra.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: URBAN RENEWAL

The **Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. HUGH HUDSON**: I wish to correct certain misleading conclusions drawn by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech last week. Over the past few years the South Australian Government, through the South Australian Housing Trust, has had a very considerable involvement in urban renewal within the city of Adelaide area and the surrounding inner suburbs. The Government has accepted for some time that, through the trust, it should do all it can to meet housing needs within the city, because large numbers of rental applications are received from people who work there, and certain disadvantaged and older groups of inhabitants need the social and welfare support that the inner city area can provide.

The South Australian Housing Trust has approached its task in two ways: by buying and renovating old houses, and by obtaining suitable land on which to provide new housing. Since the renovation programme of old houses commenced only a few years ago, 156 houses and cottages within the city, and 10 at North Adelaide, have been purchased and upgraded. In addition, the South Australian Housing Trust has purchased two rooming houses in the city. These are located in Carrington Street and are leased on the condition that they remain as rooming houses. Each provides accommodation for about 85 people. Furthermore, the trust purchased the Afton Hotel in May of this year. This is a private hotel which was up for sale and which was likely to be converted to another use. It has now been leased to the former management for continued operation as a private hotel. It is licensed to accommodate about 100 persons, about two-thirds of whom are long-term tenants. The trust has also been involved in the establishment of "Nidlandi" in Mocatta Place (off Morphett Square). This is now a boys' hostel comprising five units and involved the trust in the complete upgrading of an old terrace building.

The special rental housing scheme has many advantages. First, only houses which are vacant, or are about to become vacant, are purchased. Secondly, as the houses all require renovation, the Government programme assists in

the rehabilitation of the area in which the houses are located, thereby encouraging private initiatives as well, and a number of private initiatives have followed the action of the Housing Trust. Thirdly, it has enabled the Government to increase its rental stock and as a consequence many good houses have been retained for rent by low income earners. Fourthly, the programme provides work for building trades in an area which is very labour-intensive. Fifthly, greater scope is given to the trust in assisting applicants with specialised requirements, for example, those with physical handicaps. Sixthly, many of the houses purchased are frequently well placed (particularly those in the city) close to various welfare support facilities. Seventhly, many of the houses and cottages, and again particularly those in the city, feature small front and rear yards and are suitable for families who would have difficulty for various reasons in maintaining large garden areas.

The total number of houses purchased by the South Australian Housing Trust under its special rental housing programme now stands at 972 (as I indicated previously, 156 in the city and 10 in North Adelaide), the vast majority of these, outside of the central city area, being in the inner suburbs. So far as new construction within the city is concerned, the Government, through the Housing Trust, has been very active over the last few years, 41 units on the "Manitoba" site in Carrington Street having been completed; they were available for rental right at the end of 1975. This development provides six one-bedroom, 10 two-bedroom, 21 three-bedroom and four four-bedroom dwellings, together with a community room for the residents. Only recently, the trust has completed 11 two-bedroom town houses in Vinrace Street in the south-west corner of the city.

Work is currently in progress on a residential development comprising 18 three-storey walk-up flats, 16 two-storey cottage flats, 15 two-storey maisonettes and 11 two-storey town houses on land surrounding the Box Factory Community building in Regent Street. Detailed planning is now under way for the construction of 29 dwellings comprising 15 two-storey two and three-bedroom town houses and 14 one-storey and two-storey one-bedroom cottages on land in Margaret Street, North Adelaide. Tenders for this project are scheduled to be called in mid-February, 1978.

The above facts demonstrate quite clearly the Government's involvement in the residential redevelopment of the city area. This has been undertaken with the close co-operation of the Adelaide City Council. It was the same co-operation between the Government and council which resulted in the City of Adelaide Development Control Act being passed by this Parliament at the end of last year. The Government's policy is concerned with progressive urban renewal and rehabilitation in the central areas of Adelaide as rapidly as possible. However, it should be clear from experience both here in Adelaide and elsewhere that such renewal and rehabilitation can proceed only through effective planning policies and close co-operation between State and local government.

Wholesale clearance and rehousing programmes are rarely effective, because of excessive costs and the difficulties associated with relocating people whose properties are purchased. It would be beneficial if the Leader of the Opposition were to be specific about the particular policies advocated in the rehabilitation of inner areas. Is he advocating rezoning of R1 and R2 areas so that wholesale medium density housing can be promoted? Is he advocating slum clearance programmes and, if so, what level of capital subsidy is being suggested? The process of declining population in inner Adelaide and in

the surrounding inner suburbs has gone on for over 30 years.

Fortunately, it now seems that so far as the inner city area is concerned the process has now been halted, largely as a consequence of the very effective co-operation of the Government and the Housing Trust, on the one hand, and the city council, on the other. It is not good enough for the Leader of the Opposition to make wild charges that misrepresent the facts of the situation and involve no associated specific policy or policy suggestions that are capable of implementation. There is not a word of a specific policy and not a statement made by the Leader on what he would advocate being done.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this goes far beyond the realms of a Ministerial statement, and is now entering the realms of debate.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order, as the Minister is responsible for his statement.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have almost finished. The approach that has been adopted by the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party is purely irresponsible, destructive and illustrative of the complete lack of thought and understanding that is involved in the Liberal Party policy statement on this matter.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

HANDYMAN HELP

In reply to **Mr. ABBOTT** (November 2).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have ascertained that there are no other councils doing anything quite like the Hindmarsh council's plan to provide a free handyman service for pensioners.

HENLEY BEACH BUS SERVICES

In reply to the **Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** (October 20).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The State Transport Authority plans to extend the Fulham Gardens bus service to Henley Beach in two routes: one via Marlborough Street, and the other via Cheadle Street, early in 1978. It is also proposed to operate a new service along Lexington Road, Henley Beach South (from the Henley Beach Road), but the introduction of this service will be subject to the availability of a suitable turning loop.

LADYWOOD ROAD

In reply to **Mr. KLUNDER** (October 27).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The only work proposed by the Highways Department in this vicinity is a long-term proposal to construct an arterial road linking McIntyre and Quarry Roads with the Ladywood Road-Montague Road intersection. The timing of this work is largely dependent on the rate of development of land in the Modbury-Golden Grove area and the availability of road funds. On present indications, development of this road is unlikely within the next 10 years. Ladywood Road, Montague Road and Milne Road are under the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully, and that council may be able to supply the honourable member with further information.

STATE SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr. ALLISON** (November 3).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: A regional supply facility is being established at Mount Gambier by the State Supply Division to service the South-East region of the State and should be operating for the commencement of the 1978 school year. Approval in principle has also been given to establish a regional supply facility at a centre yet to be chosen to service the northern and western regions of the State.

These facilities are being established to improve the efficiency of the supply function to Government departments in these areas and, in particular, the service to schools and Government health and welfare facilities. Feasibility studies are to be undertaken into the requirements for similar facilities in other country regions. The regional supply facility will provide the same range of goods presently supplied to Government departments and schools throughout the State from the central store, Seaton, and, in addition, will provide a specialised purchasing facility within the region.

MARION ROADS

In reply to **Mr. GROOM** (November 2).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Available funds for urban local roads in the current financial year are fully committed. It is anticipated that the Highways Department will again recommend some assistance to urban councils in 1978-79 for roads which are wholly the responsibility of local government. However, funds available to the department will be limited, and it is anticipated that it will not be possible to meet all needs. You may be assured that sympathetic consideration will be given to the needs of the Corporation of the City of Marion in conjunction with those in other areas.

STAFF COLLEGE

In reply to **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: If the attendance of a member at the Australian Administrative Staff College at Mount Eliza is approved, funds can be made available. The amount provided represents an overall estimate and no funds have been specifically provided for this purpose.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

In reply to **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (Appropriation Bill, October 20).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The prime cause of accidents on the corner just below Eagle on the Hill appears to be excessive speed. The Highways Department has recently installed additional advisory and warning signs and guard railing to further improve delineation of the curve. In addition, some modifications have been made to the road shoulder on the outside of the curve. The situation will be kept under review.

ROAD SAFETY CENTRES

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (Appropriation Bill, October 20).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The sum of \$14 was charged by the Public Buildings Department for an officer's time to

visit the road safety centre at Oaklands Park and report on additions requested. This year's allocation of \$22 000 is to provide for an additional storeroom for lesson material, stationery, etc. at the road safety centre at Oaklands Park and also the provision of a new lecture room at the road safety centre, Millicent.

LITTER CONTROL COUNCIL

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (Appropriation Bill, October 20).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reasons for the reduction in the Estimates of Expenditure for the Litter Control Council are that the on-the-spot litter fines have been introduced and consequently the Litter Control Council has this year adopted a changed emphasis on its efforts to combat the litter problem. Three intense State-wide anti-litter campaigns were conducted last year, but this year the Litter Control Council with the very valuable assistance of Kesab is extending the community litter campaign to pinpoint problem litter areas throughout the State. The Litter Control Council and Kesab have established very good working relationships and the fact that there is not an apparent continual public campaign is in line with the strategy determined by these organisations.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (Appropriation Bill, October 20).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is anticipated that four additional branch offices will be opened in 1977-78, at Mitcham (December, 1977), Lockleys (April, 1978), Port Adelaide (April, 1978), and Nuriootpa (January, 1978). The staffing requirement for each metropolitan branch is seven and for country branches four. An additional 10 driver testing officers will be appointed during 1977-78.

POLICE PENSIONS

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The time it has taken to complete the investigation as at July 1, 1974, is a reflection of the substantial arrears of work which built up in recent years in the Public Actuary's Department. The report should be available shortly. When any benefit under the Police Pensions Act becomes payable, the Government makes a contribution to the fund, representing the major part of the amount which the fund then has to pay. For example, in the year ended June 30, 1977, the Government contribution represented 77.8 per cent of the total benefits paid by the fund. The future proportion will vary, depending on the rate of inflation, but will always be more than 72 per cent.

The balance of the benefits is provided out of the fund's own resources which are built up from members' contributions. These contributions are thus intended to cover future liabilities and bear no particular relationship to the Government's current contributions. For example, in 1975-76 members' contributions were 1.41 times the Government's contribution, whereas in 1976-77 the multiple had fallen to 1.04. In future years the Government's contributions may be expected to become larger than members' contributions. The experience of the fund in no way supports the hypothesis that many senior members are retiring early (or resigning).

POLICE FORCE

In reply to **Dr. EASTICK** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The following requirements relate to candidates for entry to the South Australian Police Force:

Educational:

To be eligible for consideration, candidates must have satisfactorily completed a minimum of four years secondary schooling. They undergo a number of written tests designed to measure intelligence and reasoning ability, and to demonstrate standards achieved in English expression, spelling, word knowledge, arithmetic and listening comprehension. Students of matriculation standard are not prevented from applying; in fact, they are encouraged and many have been successful. Approximately 43 per cent of cadets currently in training have completed year 12 secondary schooling and many of them have actually matriculated.

Physical and medical:

Successful candidates must be both physically and medically fit with normal hearing, eyesight and speech. A minimum height requirement is 175 cm (5'9") although cadet applicants are permitted some latitude provided they are expected to grow. It is necessary for candidates to pass a medical examination and chest X-ray.

Personal qualities:

Candidates must be of excellent character. Only those considered to be honest, dependable, emotionally stable, tolerant and understanding, with a concern about the welfare of the community, are accepted. Three references are required. Age: the Police Department requirements are for cadets between the ages of 16 years and six months and 17 years and three months at their time of joining. A limited number of cadets can be accepted up to 18 years of age but only to fill vacancies caused by separations within existing courses. When there is a need to supplement the number of cadets graduating from the cadet training courses, adult applicants between the ages of 20 and 29 years are accepted for adult training courses. From June 1979, when the first group of cadets will graduate at 19 years, adults will also be eligible for induction at 19 years of age.

Interviews and selection:

Finally, candidates attend for interviews following which selections are made on a competitive basis, preference being given to those candidates with the best all round qualifications and potential. Over recent years there have been far greater numbers of candidates than vacancies available; thus the competition for selection is extremely high.

ELECTRICITY WORKERS

Mr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry considered the consequences of any unilateral action the Government might take to pre-empt the findings of the Arbitration Commission on the proposed 37½ hour week for electricity workers, in breaking with the accepted principles both of arbitration and conciliation and of wage indexation and also in the serious effects which could result to industry generally, and to the economy, and will he assure the House that no such action will be taken?

The Minister raised the possibility of Government action to by-pass the Arbitration Commission in this case, when he said that, if the delays in the hearing continued, the Government might instruct the Electricity Trust to apply the 37½ hour week without waiting for the commission's findings. It is recognised that the basis for

wage determination and for the setting of industrial conditions generally depends on support for the Arbitration Commission and the Minister has always strongly upheld the present system of arbitration.

It is also accepted that conditions applied to workers in Government departments and instrumentalities almost inevitably flow on to associated industries, and have a direct effect on the economy and that these factors are taken into account by the Arbitration Commission. It is for this reason that I ask for the Minister's assurance that the Government does not intend to repudiate the whole system of arbitration by the action he has been reported as contemplating.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would be delighted to allow arbitration to work, if it was able to do so. The whole matter of this settlement, on the reduction of hours, between the Electricity Trust and the unions involved was based on productivity. That productivity agreement is a much better agreement than that obtained by Telecom; there is irrefutable proof of that. What has happened is that the Victorian Government, through the S.E.C., has kept interfering in this quite legitimate case for some 18 months. I do not consider that the Government can stand idly by and accept the situation.

Something needs to be done to put the Government in a position where it can determine its own affairs. Because this is a Federal award it allows the S.E.C. or other interested parties to intervene, and they have done that continually and are doing it right now with a writ to the High Court. I believe that the Government has a responsibility to carry out the agreement. An agreement was reached through the good offices of the trust and the Trades and Labour Council here, and the Government cannot stand idly by and allow some outside body, some other State, to hold up those proceedings. If the Government did do that I would think that it was not honouring its obligations.

TEACHING POSITIONS

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Education outline the present position relating to the employment of teachers for those people who have applied for teaching positions with the South Australian Education Department in 1978?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation across the Chamber, and I cannot hear the honourable member for Spence.

Mr. ABBOTT: With many trainee teachers coming out of colleges of advanced education, I am interested to know how many of them can be placed in the Education Department and how many will need to look for alternative employment.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not exaggerating when I say that the position facing people coming to the Education Department for employment in 1978 is pretty grim. The exact figures will not be known for a little while, but at this stage I can certainly give round figures. The honourable member referred to exit students from the colleges of advanced education. They, of course, are not the only ones involved. The Adelaide and Flinders Universities also produce diplomates and graduates who typically come to us for employment. In addition, there are contract teachers in the schools who are employed on contracts which expire at the end of the year and who will in most cases be applying for permanency or renewal of their contracts. Finally, there are those people in the community who are registered as teachers and who have no doubt taught at some stage in the past. They have not

been teaching for a while, but, wishing to re-enter the teaching profession, they are applying for jobs. There may also be people who seek a transfer from the private sector to the Education Department.

In round terms, we will be able to employ one in every two of these people, and that is a fairly grim situation considering the past expectation people have had about their ability to get a job in the teaching profession. It seems to me that two factors are operating: first, the no 2 per cent in real terms chickens are coming home to roost. For those members who have short memories, I should perhaps translate that jargon into English. The States had been led to believe by Senator Carrick that, through the Schools Commission, the money flowing from the Commonwealth to the States would amount to 2 per cent growth in real terms. In fact, the Labor Senators were taunted in the Senate more than 12 months ago by Senator Carrick when they had predicted that this commitment would not be honoured for that financial year was honoured, but it has certainly been dishonoured in this financial year.

The position is that we are getting indexation only through the Schools Commission for salary costs, but we are not getting indexation for capital costs or for non-capital recurrent costs. Earlier on, as I recall, I imparted this information to the House (certainly when I wrote my much publicised letter to Senator Carrick), indicating that the effect of these decisions would be to cost this Government about \$4 000 000. Although not all of that money, had it been available, would have gone into salaries, nonetheless I invite members to do their own arithmetic as to the impact of that decision on our ability to employ more teachers. As I have said, the effects of that decision are now really biting. The people who are suffering are those who are coming to us for jobs and, indeed, the children in the schools who would benefit by some further inroads in teacher-pupil ratios.

The second factor operating is that, in 1974 (to pluck a particular year out of the air), the wastage rate for primary teachers was 12.5 per cent, and for secondary teachers it was 10.5 per cent. By wastage rate, I mean departures from the department for whatever reasons—usually resignation, some in case of death, pregnancy, and so on. Those wastage rates were marginally down on what, for example, they had been for the year before. The estimates for the end of 1977 are 6 per cent in primary schools and 4 per cent in secondary schools, and that has been the downward trend over the past few years. I suppose that may suggest some greater stability in the teaching force, but what it mainly suggests is that jobs are not available outside. The current state of the economy means that the sorts of job previously available to teachers who wanted to move on from the teaching profession simply are not there. When we realise that a change of 2 per cent in the wastage rate from, say, 6 per cent down to 4 per cent, means 300 jobs, we begin to get some idea of one of the two factors which has led very much to the present unhappy situation and which can very much be laid at the door of the economic mismanagement of the Federal Government.

BUILDING COSTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Government is aware of the deteriorating position in relation to costs in the construction industry in South Australia and, if it is, will he say what is proposed to reverse these trends? An examination of the September issue of the *Journal of the Australian Institute of Quantity*

Surveyors reveals that costs in the construction industry in South Australia are the highest of all mainland States surveyed. South Australia has the highest cost in 444 items out of a total 863. The previous June issue of the publication indicated that we had the highest cost in 419 of the 844 items listed. The figures indicate that not only are we the highest State, but that our position is deteriorating, since even a greater percentage (over 50) of the total items in South Australia have a higher cost than is the case in all of the other mainland States.

I shall quote briefly one or two examples to illustrate the position. Regarding external works on the construction site, in 12 items out of 18 the costs are higher in South Australia than in other States. For concrete work, 28 items out of 47 cost more in South Australia. In external works, for instance, for 100 mm thick unreinforced concrete paving, including form work and lightly brushed surface, the cost in New South Wales is \$10 a square metre, in Queensland it is \$9, in Victoria \$7.50, in Western Australia \$9.30, and in South Australia \$10.50. In regard to concrete work, one item of a number in which we lead the field, the cost a square metre for construction of beams is \$63.10 in New South Wales, \$56 in Queensland, \$61.80 in Victoria, \$69.30 in Western Australia and \$75.20 in South Australia. And so it goes on. We could analyse the figures in more detail if we had time. However, costs in South Australia are higher and the position is deteriorating.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not quite certain why the honourable member addresses a question of this kind to the Government. Concrete in South Australia is the cheapest of any State in Australia; we have by far the most efficient concrete industry. If the honourable member looks at the prices of the raw materials for concrete, he will find that South Australia is able to undersell every other State. The prices charged for work of this kind are prices charged to contractors by subcontractors. I do not know whether the honourable member suggests that the Government should follow the policy of the Federal Government of reducing construction expenditure and thereby reducing the kind of quotes made by subcontractors in the industry.

Mr. Mathwin: It is the labour cost, is it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the honourable member that, in a great deal of the contracting industry today, there is no day labour cost. It is by subcontractors, as the honourable member knows.

Mr. Mathwin: It is the labour cost, then?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary. If the honourable member looks at our award rates he will not find that the labour cost here is higher than the cost elsewhere. If he knows anything about the building industry, the honourable member knows that the tendering climate depends on the amount of work available. In South Australia I am happy to say that the South Australian Government, by channelling money out into the community, has managed to keep a high level of employment in the construction industry, and that is not the case in other States. If the honourable member wants us to reduce the amounts paid to people in the building industry by increasing unemployment, in accordance with the policy of his Federal colleagues, he had better get up and say so specifically.

COURT SITTINGS

Mr. SLATER: Will the Attorney-General say whether consideration has been given to hearing cases in the lower courts in Adelaide at hours outside the normally accepted

court hearing hours? I understand that, over the past six months, experiments with night courts have taken place in Whyalla. Is it likely that this practice will be extended to the courts in Adelaide, in an endeavour to assist persons who might wish to attend court outside normal working hours? Alternatively, I note in the press that discussions have taken place between the Attorney-General and the courts regarding a proposal for an early opening of the courts at 8.30 a.m. Can the Attorney provide any information on the matter?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Shortly after I was appointed as Attorney-General, I arranged for an experiment to be undertaken at the Whyalla Court of Summary Jurisdiction that involved the setting down of certain cases to be heard at night by justices of the peace. This scheme was designed especially to assist people who worked at the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited during normal daily working hours to have matters heard outside working hours so that they would not lose wages as a result of having to attend court. That experiment has been continuing now for a little more than 12 months. A couple of months ago we extended the system to operate until the end of this year. When the results are in, I will be able to make further public statements about the Government's intention of extending that scheme to other parts of the State.

My intention now is that we should certainly continue the scheme at Whyalla, possibly with increased flexibility, to ensure that people who are working on various shifts can attend court outside their normal working hours. An interesting aspect of the experiment is that we have tried introducing flexible arrangements by means of annexing to the summons a notice suggesting that if people cannot get to court during normal court hours they should contact the court by telephone and arrange an alternative time for a night court, for the afternoon, or something of that sort.

The Whyalla experiment has proved quite successful regarding its flexibility. Regrettably, the reports I have received are that there has not been an extensive demand for night court sittings in Whyalla. However, the court sittings that have been arranged have been attended. A significant and important factor is that people who have contacted the court to have matters dealt with after hours have, in the vast majority of cases, attended the court; there has been no difficulty with people failing to attend. I hope that that programme will be extended next year to the metropolitan area and to other parts of the State where there is a demand for it.

Regarding the discussion I had with Mr. Matison, Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, on Friday last about alternative sitting times for courts, the suggestions that I made to him (which were based on a system that, I think, operates in Washington, United States of America) were designed to relieve another problem of having cases, which it was thought would be contested, collapse on the day of the hearing thus leaving a magistrate without work on that day. It is always a difficulty in the administration of the courts when two parties believe that their matter is to be tried before a magistrate on a particular day and, for one reason or another, the matter settles on that day and, accordingly, the magistrate's work is taken away.

It is proposed that we introduce a scheme whereby contested matters would be listed before magistrates at an earlier hour. At present the courts sit at 10 a.m. or 10.30 a.m., which is a long-standing tradition. I have suggested to Mr. Matison that magistrates to hear contested matters would sit at 8.45 a.m. or 9 a.m. and that it could soon be ascertained which matters were to proceed and take up a magistrate's time for that day and which matters would be settled.

By this means by 10 a.m. or 10.30 a.m. when the uncontested matters would be listed in the Adelaide Magistrates Court or the Adelaide Local Court, the courts would have had an hour or so to call in retired magistrates or special justices, as the need dictated, to ensure that the courts were properly staffed. We should thus be able to save magistrates considerable time. I have suggested that as one alternative to Mr. Matison. He will discuss it with the magistrates.

Mr. Gunn: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre is out of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: He will discuss it with the other magistrates, and I imagine that we will then consider the magistrates' point of view on those suggestions and decide whether or not to implement a scheme of that nature.

RICE STRAW

Mr. RODDA: Has the Premier used public funds to have a feasibility study carried out into the rice straw feed proposal in Malaysia? Will officers within the Agriculture Department be involved in this study, and what is the expected cost of the study? Farmers in this State generally know that stubbles or dry residue from cereal crops, if treated with urea, can be converted into feed that will support ruminating animals. A large quantity of stubble in this country could be so treated. The Premier's announcement has raised some eyebrows among primary producers that we could import this residue from Malaysia for stock purposes. A detailed statement by the Premier about these proposals will be welcomed by farmers in the livestock raising industry in this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government was asked by the Prime Minister of Malaysia to undertake some studies of assistance to three northern North Malaysian States which are in the major poverty area of Malaysia. They contain many rice farmers whose only income is from rice farming and whose income is small. The States concerned were keen to improve their industrial output and employment and find some additional means of assistance to poor people. We agreed to study two projects. One was the expansion of the cement industry in Malaysia. The development corporations of the three States (each of the States of Malaysia has a specific development corporation) had pointed out that they had considerable limestone deposits that would be suitable for development in the cement industry, and in Perlis, the smallest of the States, a major cement plant is being commissioned currently. As a result of that approach, the Government of South Australia arranged with Mr. Schroeder of Adelaide Brighton Cement Limited to make a visit to Malaysia and to study the potentiality of developments in the cement industry.

His report was that the existing capacity of the cement industry in Malaysia, once the new plants presently being built are commissioned, was such that it was inadvisable to invest further in equipment in the cement industry, that their capacity would be sufficient to supply their needs and probable markets for some time to come, and that no major down-the-line industry should be started in addition. Some small projects were recommended but that would not involve any South Australian input of any kind. Monier and Humes are both already established in Malaysia, as also is Hardies.

The second area they asked us to look at was another unused resource in the area, paddy straw, of which some 500 000 tonnes a year is burned. As a result we provided for the commissioning of a study which would point to

conceivable uses for this straw. Other studies had been undertaken elsewhere in the world in relation to making building bricks, rice paper and other things of this kind, none of which so far has proved successful.

There were two modes of study: one was by a team sent from South Australia to examine the feasibilities of the development of rice straw, and that was a team of experts, including one from Amdel. The recommendation in that report was that there was a very considerable possibility and a very good prospect of converting the paddy straw for stock feed, the immediate aim being to provide for the growing cattle industry in Malaysia and Sumatra, but the possibility was also foreseen that this might provide some stock feed to South Australia, should that prove viable. As a result of that study, which I believe was a good one, presentation was made to the States concerned and to the Malaysian Government, and the study recommended that a final feasibility study be made after consultations had been held with the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank. The World Bank has asked for an observer to sit on the feasibility study.

Those preliminary studies were financed by the South Australian Government, which indicated however that it did not believe that it should put further money into the final feasibility study, that it had done what we thought was a fairly generous thing concerning the Malaysian Government and the Governments of the States, and that the final feasibility study should be financed from elsewhere. I had discussions about the financing of the final feasibility study, which would cost Malaysia \$95 000, with the Prime Minister of Malaysia, the Menteri Besars of the three States concerned, and Dr. Lim Chong Eu. As a result of the discussions, I am confident that the money for this study will be found within Malaysia, and I expect that the final arrangements will be made by Mr. Bakewell, who has been at the Commonwealth Development Secretariat meeting in London and who expects to complete these arrangements in Malaysia after he has come back from the Commonwealth Development Secretariat meeting, at which this undertaking was discussed. The final feasibility study would then show the possibilities of this project, and what would be the in-put for South Australia. The study could benefit South Australia markedly in that we would have the rights, as a result of the study, to design and provide the machinery involved in the process. The study should also show whether there is a means of our obtaining back-loading through this source to South Australian exports. That is something that we have considered, because it could be of great importance to this State. At present the Malaysian and Indonesian cement industries are using imported artificial gypsum from Japan and Taiwan.

Mr. Gunn: There is pretty good gypsum at Thevenard.

The Hon. D.A. DUNSTAN: I am coming to talk about that, as it is part of the discussions that have been going on. The imported gypsum from those sources is artificial gypsum; it is unstable in quality and, because it is in powder form, it absorbs moisture readily and it is difficult for the cement industry to use. However, it is at a price f.o.b. of about \$1 a tonne less than gypsum out of Thevenard. On the other hand, gypsum out of Thevenard is 97 per cent pure, which is much purer than the gypsum from Japan. Also, it is stable and consistent in quality, and it does not absorb moisture in the way that the Taiwanese and Japanese gypsum does.

Mr. Chapman: What about seeking leave to continue and taking this up in the Address in Reply debate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am answering—

The SPEAKER: Order! There should be one question at a time. The honourable Premier is answering a question

asked by the member for Victoria. Members complain at not having the opportunity to ask questions but, by constant interjecting, I am afraid that the number of questions is reduced.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The problem for us in the supply of gypsum is that shipping from South Australia to the area is much less regular than the shipping between Taiwan, Japan and Malaysia, and also that, because they have back-loading, their freight rates are lower. As a result we cannot, until we get back-loading from Malaysia, land our gypsum at a price that will be competitive even though its quality is much better. Therefore, we have been looking for some possibility of getting imports in sufficient bulk to enable a back-loading to South Australia and to allow the export of the gypsum, which could be very valuable to South Australia.

This is one of the projects being looked at on that score. Of course, the final decision about that matter will depend on the final feasibility study. When that is made it will be very much clearer whether this is a resource that can be used for South Australia. In any event, if conversion of paddy straw to stock feed goes ahead in Malaysia, South Australia will have the first opportunity to provide the necessary agricultural machinery and the design of the collection systems and the like, which again could be quite valuable to industry in this State.

TERMITES

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether I can be provided with any information that may have been obtained from research into a new type of termite that was recently found in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about the termite they find at West Beach?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: They are borers more than termites.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In June of this year in the District of Henley Beach there was a significant find of a new type of termite that had the C.S.I.R.O. baffled at the time. The concern about this termite was that it was not, as is normally the case, a slow-moving termite, but one that could fly. There was doubt about whether or not it was a native or some introduced species, but apparently the damage it can do is quite substantial. Whilst I am pleased to have received no additional reports of damage caused by this pest, I am aware that samples of the termite and the damaged timber were taken to Canberra for research. I have heard of no results of that research, and I would appreciate any information that could be supplied to me.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague whether he has any information on this fast-moving, flying, boring termite.

RICE STRAW

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question is subsequent to that asked by the member for Victoria about high protein stock feed from Malaysia. Will the Premier reassess on technical, health and economic grounds his dream of ever importing so-called high protein treated paddy straw into South Australia as stock feed? In addition, will the Premier table in Parliament the initial feasibility study that he said had been carried out into this venture? With your

permission, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House, I seek leave to explain my question.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He will now proceed to comment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Just listen! The Minister and the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN:—won't like it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The honourable member for Davenport has asked leave of the House to explain his question briefly. I hope he will stick to that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In the past 48 hours I have made a number of inquiries of agricultural experts in this State and they have put forward five pertinent facts in relation to this project. First, on cost grounds, they say it would not be economically viable to introduce such material into South Australia and that high protein lucerne hay at a cost of \$2.50 a bale is available in South Australia. That hay has a protein content of between 15 and 25 per cent and a digestibility of between 65 and 75 per cent.

The cost at Port Adelaide of loading or unloading one single bale of hay (and this would include the treated paddy straw) is \$3 a bale, which is far more than just the cost of equivalent lucerne hay of far higher quality in South Australia. Secondly (and this fact they also put forward on technical grounds), they believe that the scheme is impracticable. They point out that paddy straw has a protein content of 5.5 per cent, and there is no way in the world, without adding other chemicals, that one can increase the protein content of it, irrespective of the treatment applied to it. When talking of a high-protein feed, one is talking of a feed of at least 20 per cent and, in most cases, of up to 50 per cent protein, and there is no way in which that can be got from 5 per cent or 5.5 per cent paddy straw. They also point out that the most likely treatment about which the Premier was talking (and he has been extremely vague on the treatment that could be applied)—

The SPEAKER: Order! Having listened to the honourable member, I thought that he was going along very well until he said the last sentence. I hope that he will not continue to comment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: They point out that the most likely treatment is to treat the paddy straw with some kind of alkali, particularly sodium hydroxide, which would break down the link between the cellulose and the lignum and increase the digestibility. In the circumstances, the digestibility of the paddy straw is increased from 45 per cent to about 60 per cent digestibility, which on their estimate is still a moderately low digestibility, and which compares poorly with lucerne hay.

The third point is the extreme danger of the introduction of exotic diseases from any material coming into South Australia and the grave risk that foot-and-mouth disease, blue tongue, and other diseases, which are already endogenous in South-East Asian countries, would be brought into Australia. They pointed out the consequences of what appears to be a blue tongue outbreak in the Northern Territory, which could result in the loss of meat export markets and the mass slaughter of the infected animals.

The fourth fact they brought forward is that South Australia is already an exporter of high-protein animal feed, and that lucerne pellets are already being exported which have a guaranteed minimum protein level of about 22 per cent, which is far higher than the 5.5 per cent to be found in paddy straw.

The fifth point was that large quantities of wheat, oats, barley and rice straw are already available in Australia,

and that these straws have a similar quality to and chemical composition of any straw available in Malaysia. They said that, if any such feed was to be produced for South Australian markets, it should be produced in South Australia, but that at this stage it was uneconomic for us to adopt such a process, and we were far from being capable of doing so.

On reading *Hansard* of the other place, I was interested to read that the Minister of Agriculture, whom one would expect to be the technical expert in this area, had said that the feed would be used not for cattle, as the Premier indicated in his earlier reply, but only for pigs and poultry. Having checked with agricultural experts in this area whether such paddy straw could be fed to pigs and poultry, I was told that the recommendation is that no straw should be included in those diets, although in exceptional circumstances up to 5 per cent or 10 per cent high-quality lucerne hay could be included in the diet of breeding pigs, but that was generally not recommended. They concluded that the entire scheme posed by the Premier regarding importing any such feed into South Australia was a wild dream.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member gets himself into all sorts of pother from time to time. No doubt he has done so again on this occasion. The Government has had a study, which I shall obtain for the honourable member. I point out to him, however, that there are a number of aspects of this scheme with which he has not bothered to deal, and I suggest that, before he whips himself into his usual rather hysterical lather in order to try to impress other people, he should wait until the feasibility study itself is produced. I noticed that he made some quite disparaging remarks about the input from South Australian industry towards this project. I know that he is always delighted if he can suggest that something unfortunate is happening to South Australian industry and does not like it to get terribly much work.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will you tell us what machinery—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has asked his question. The honourable Premier.

Mr. Chapman: It's a—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member should wait for the feasibility study before he tries to knock the whole project before we know exactly the terms of the project itself.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't be too—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, I point out to the honourable member that the feasibility study is so far recommended that the experts of the World Bank have sought it and the Malaysian Government itself has said it will support it. In those circumstances, I suggest that we wait until the feasibility study comes along to see what is available from it.

REAL ESTATE FIRM

Mr. KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs consider the possibility of introducing legislation to cope with the situation where a number of real estate companies misrepresent or fail to disclose full details of financial commitments to prospective home buyers, resulting in those home buyers ending up in an untenable financial situation? I shall give one example involving a particular company. I have eight more examples involving that same company, and I have been informed that similar situations exist with other companies.

The company to which I refer is Preston Real Estate Pty. Ltd., of 286 Glen Osmond Road, Fullarton, and the buyers in this case are Mr. and Mrs. McNicol, of 20B Roger Pitt Street, Modbury Heights. Mr. and Mrs. McNicol responded to an advertisement by Preston Real Estate, indicating that a home unit could be bought for \$200 deposit and \$58 weekly repayments for the first 12 months. They were told by the salesman that the total amount in transaction fees would be of the order of \$200, and that this would be due a month after they moved in. In other cases, people were told that fees would be added to the second mortgage.

The salesman told them that a State Bank loan would be available within 18 months, and promised that a subsidy on loan repayments would be made by the company to cover the difference between the \$58 a week they would have to pay and the full amount repayable weekly for the first 12 months after occupation. My constituent's earnings at the time were \$140 a week, and the salesman suggested that, since my constituent had the use of a company vehicle, his statement of earnings should be increased by \$50 a week.

They were then directed to a broker, and that broker did not explain that they were buying a strata title, nor the nature of a strata title. The documents that they signed were not properly explained to them, nor did they sign in the presence of a justice of the peace. They occupied the premises in December, 1976. In March, 1977, they were presented with a bill for the various fees and charges relating to the purchase (as were people who had been promised that it would be added to the second mortgage). In this case, the amount came to \$1 043. When my constituents indicated an inability to pay, their subsidies were stopped. In all, two weekly subsidies were paid by Preston Real Estate, and my constituents face a weekly repayment bill of \$98 out of a total weekly income of \$140 (in another case, the repayment is \$98 out of a total of \$118), with a minimum waiting time of two years from now before they have any hope of a State Bank loan.

In none of the nine cases that have come to my attention has Preston Real Estate Pty. Ltd. kept to the promises it has made. In each case, it has traded on people's trust to put those people in untenable financial positions, with the salesmen and the company in each case knowing full well that it would place those people in those untenable financial situations. I ask the Minister to investigate.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Several companies are now involved in rather complicated schemes in the house finance area. This matter has been raised in the House before and is of considerable concern to the Government. The common thread running through all these schemes is that consumers are persuaded to commit themselves to transactions that they cannot possibly afford. In some cases this persuasion is by positive misrepresentation (which is often difficult to prove in court if the matter is taken to law), and in some cases, by over-emphasis of the short-term situation and little or no mention of the long-term commitment.

In some cases the cost of the house is inflated, and so far exceeds the market value that, when consumers borrow more than the market value of their house, they ascertain, if there is a mortgagee sale or something of that sort, a large deficit is involved.

I have asked the Consumer Legislation Advisory Committee, which was set up by the Government about 12 months ago to consider several problems in the consumer legislation area, to consider the matter and recommend appropriate measures to enable legislation to be passed to require appropriate disclosures of the financial details of real estate transactions. I hope to receive a report from

that committee soon. Recently, the Minister for Planning foreshadowed that it could be necessary for the Government to pass legislation in this area. As soon as the Consumer Legislation Advisory Committee report is to hand I will have more to say about that matter.

The Government has also established a Home Finance Advisory Service to assist prospective house buyers with information about sources of finance, waiting periods, interest rates and the like. I strongly urge anyone who is about to buy a house in the next few months or so to seek advice from that service, which has been supplied by the Government to try to assist people and to ensure that they do not become embroiled in financial arrangements that they cannot afford. The service also provides assistance and advice about documents involved in the transaction and can provide that advice before the documents are signed. I emphasise that point, because it is imperative that the documents be checked before the purchase occurs.

The company to which the honourable member has referred, Preston Real Estate Proprietary Limited, has been the subject for some time of complaints to and inquiries by the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch and the Land and Business Agents Licensing Board. The Business Agents Squad is now investigating certain matters relating to the operations of that company. If the honourable member will give me full details of the matters about which he is concerned on behalf of his constituents, I shall be pleased to consider the matter further and let him have a report or a detailed reply on those matters.

MOUNT BARKER TANNERY

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Premier say whether officers of his department or the Economic Development Division have prepared an internal report on the economic viability and future prospects of the Mount Barker tannery and, if they have, what were the recommendations of the report and did it recommend that the tannery should not be supported financially? The following report headed "Challenges Government to save Johnson" appeared in this afternoon's *News*:

The Chairman of Industrial Equity Ltd., Mr. Ron Brierley, today claimed the South Australian Government was fully aware a receiver would be appointed to the Johnson Leather Company if no practical solution could be found to the Mount Barker tannery's problems.

Mr. Brierley said there had been full consultation with the Government "on every step," but he was "not too sure" what had happened in the last few days. He was commenting on a statement by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, that the action had been taken without consultation with the Government and was "drastic and heartless". Mr. Brierley said the Government had offered every assistance, except financial. The company had simply run out of money, he said.

"We are prepared to meet the Government on the terms of any reasonable solution," he added. He considered it unfair that his associates had been "made a scapegoat" when nobody else could offer any alternative action.

I am concerned about the announcement that the Mount Barker tannery has been put into receivership. The tannery is of major significance in relation to employment in Mount Barker, it being the town's major industry. I understand that a major problem relating to the tannery is the cost of untreated hides. It is ludicrous when the economics of salting and freighting hides from outlying areas of South Australia to metropolitan tanneries, including Mount Barker, is extremely marginal for

growers, if at all profitable. I understand that few, if any, hides skinned by local slaughtermen on Kangaroo Island, for example, ever find their way to tanneries or processors and, accordingly, are wasted and so denied any further use.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Mount Barker tannery of Johnson Leather Company applied to the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation for \$500 000. The curious feature of the application was that Industrial Equity Limited has considerable financial resources itself: it is not lacking those resources. If the honourable member chose to investigate the resources of Industrial Equity Limited he would ascertain that they are extremely high. However, the application was made to the corporation. It is strange that it happened under threats that, if the Government did not find \$500 000 for the tannery immediately, something would happen to the tannery, and that this came after announcements by the tannery's own management of "good business and expansion".

The South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation proceeded to examine the matter and, whilst the matter was before the corporation, and without notice to it, the board of the company put in a receiver. That is the situation that faced us. I do not believe that Industrial Equity Limited, which has shown itself to be remarkably ruthless in other business dealings, has any reason now to complain about the South Australian Government, but the people of South Australia have every reason to complain about Industrial Equity Limited.

Because of our concern for the tannery and employment in the area, the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation is working with the receiver to ascertain what can be done about the enterprise from our point of view. Clearly, Industrial Equity Limited is considering this matter purely from the viewpoint of its own monetary benefit; no other consideration seems to work with that company. It is quite extraordinary that we should be blamed by a company that had within its own power the resources to finance any temporary liquidity difficulty with which the existing finances of the tannery at Mount Barker were faced.

I do not believe that it is the duty of the people of South Australia simply to finance anyone who comes along to the Government and, despite the fact that the company has money itself with which to cope with immediate liquidity difficulties through one of its subsidiaries, says, "All right, the taxpayers will put in that money." That is what was demanded of us. I believe that the course that has been followed by the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation is right; it has been responsible and proper, and I have every faith in the board of that corporation. I believe the corporation has acted with propriety and that it will continue to do so in an endeavour to assist the honourable member's constituents.

ENRICHMENT COURSES

Mr. BANNON: Can the Minister of Education say what is the position in South Australia regarding funds for technical and further education? I was concerned and somewhat surprised towards the end of last week to read newspaper reports referring to a threat to technical and further education courses at a certain college and suggesting that this was also a general situation. The courses of special concern are those that equip people with skills for certain trades and other technical skills that might be required if there is an upturn in the economy. I was

surprised because I thought that the Federal Government had been trying to make some sort of virtue out of the priority it had afforded to technical and further education. What was reported as happening seemed at odds with that position.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This matter has arisen largely as a result of publicity given to the possible non-continuation of enrichment personal development courses at the Marlestone College of Further Education. Marlestone is by no means in a unique position in this respect, and in terms of permanent staff has been rather more generously treated than most of the colleges. For example, at the beginning of this year an additional 22 full-time lecturers were made available to Marlestone college. All of those people were in the trade training area.

I want to make perfectly clear to the House that in fact there has been a considerable expansion in enrolments at the colleges of further education in the apprenticeship area. In the building trades area, which is the area with which Marlestone is particularly concerned, enrolments this year are up by about 20 per cent, and in some of the building trade areas (not all of them) enrolments have increased by nearly 50 per cent. It is necessary that the department give priority to enrolments in these areas over the enrichment areas. Given the fact that there is not sufficient money to be able to do all we would like to do in these areas, it has been necessary for there to be some squeezing of the number of people who are enrolled in the enrichment area.

Only a month or so ago the State Government made available to the colleges of further education about \$250 000 to enable the continuation of some of the enrichment courses where sufficient enrolments are available. In some cases, where few enrolments occurred, it is difficult to sustain those courses on that ground, even if the finance were available. It is not simply a matter of finding an additional \$50 000 (which I think was the figure quoted by Mr. Gee, the Principal of Marlestone College of Further Education); that sort of money would have to be found for many other institutions around the State in order to ensure equity of treatment.

The honourable member referred to the position of the Commonwealth in this matter. I agree with him that the Commonwealth has made noises from time to time about an upgrading of its priority towards technical and further education. In addition, last week the member for Davenport made play in the press with certain figures (I am not sure whence he got them), suggesting he has some expertise in this field. I checked the figures closely. The best way of understanding this matter is to note the percentage of the total expenditure by the Further Education Department from State funds and from Federal funds. These figures have been made available to me from our State Treasury. They have been checked closely, and the estimated split up of the source of funds for technical and further education in this State this financial year is 18.6 per cent from the Commonwealth Government and 81.4 per cent from the State Government. It is intending to go back two financial years, before the so-called upgrading of priority from Commonwealth sources to this area. The split-up in the financial year 1975-76 was, from State funding—

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the principal Act, the Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929, as amended, to provide a degree of clarification of the power of the bank to accept as customers "commercial" bodies. At present, the principal Act, at section 31a, prohibits the bank from lending money to "commercial" bodies. This limitation is contained in subsection (1) in the expression "not being a body referred to in section 46 of this Act".

Clause 2 of the Bill proposes the removal of this limitation in its present form with a view to inserting it in what is felt to be a more appropriate place, that is, section 46 itself. Section 46 of the principal Act is proposed to be amended by clause 3 of the Bill. In substance the amendments proposed by this clause are as follows. First, since section 46 imposes a conditional limitation on the powers of the bank to accept as customers "commercial enterprises", there has been included in that conditional limitation the power of such an enterprise to borrow from the bank. Secondly, the conditions of the limitation which were contained in subsection (2) of section 46 have been varied. In its present form subsection (2) provides that the limitation does not apply to the opening and operating of credit cheque accounts by commercial bodies if there has been appropriate consultation with the State Bank.

It is now proposed that the whole limitation imposed by subsection (1) will not apply to "commercial" bodies where the trustees are satisfied that the provision of the facilities is necessary to "protect or extend" the interests of the bank or to provide facilities not readily available from other sources. It is suggested that the expression of the conditional limitation in the form proposed will deal with the situation in which from time to time the bank finds itself where one of its "commercial" customers, being a natural person, either forms a partnership or a company, and as a result cannot continue to be a customer of the bank. If the amendment proposed is accepted it will permit business partnerships and small commercial companies to be customers of the bank.

Finally the attention of members is drawn particularly to the fact that in no conceivable way does the removal of the present limitations on the powers of the trustees affect the security of depositors' funds. The limitation on amounts that may be lent and the security required for loans remain exactly the same, as also does the bank's general powers of investment.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish the State Clothing Corporation; to prescribe its powers and functions; and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the establishment of a statutory corporation to be known as the State Clothing Corporation. The functions of the corporation are to be the manufacture supply and delivery of clothing, linen and

other textile goods required by Government departments or agencies and to carry out repairs of textile goods and other sewing work for Government departments and agencies. The Government proposes that the corporation's operations will be conducted at a new factory to be established at Whyalla, providing a considerable number of jobs in an area suffering from relatively high unemployment.

State Government departments and agencies currently purchase clothing, hospital linen and other textile goods valued at over \$2 500 000 from suppliers in South Australia and interstate each year. It is expected that establishment of the corporation will reduce costs to the Government in this area and reduce reliance on supplies from outside the State. It is also anticipated that the corporation will provide the means whereby the public sector's requirements for textile goods and services are met in a more responsive manner and the quality of such goods and services is more effectively controlled. The Government intends that the corporation with a new up-to-date factory will combine modern management and production techniques with a progressive approach to industrial relations and organisation. As the remainder of the explanation deals with the clauses of the Bill, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 is the definition section. Clause 5 provides for the establishment of the corporation. Clause 6 provides that the corporation is to be constituted of five members appointed by the Governor, one of whom is to be chairman.

Clause 7 regulates the terms and conditions of office as a member of the corporation. Clause 8 provides for remuneration of the members of the corporation. Clause 9 regulates the conduct of meetings of the corporation. Clause 10 ensures the validity of acts of the corporation notwithstanding any defect in the appointment of a member and protects any member from personal liability for any act in good faith in the course of his duties as a member.

Clause 11 requires members of the corporation to disclose any conflict of interest and refrain from taking part in any decisions relating to any matter affected by such conflict. Clause 12 provides for the execution of documents by the corporation. Clause 13 sets out the powers and functions of the corporation. The functions of the corporation are, as has been stated above, to manufacture, supply and deliver textile goods and to provide sewing services to Government departments and agencies. The corporation is also empowered to perform these functions for other persons or bodies of persons approved by the Minister.

Clause 14 provides that the corporation is to be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. Clause 15 provides for delegation by the corporation to particular members or employees of the corporation. Clause 16 provides that the corporation may appoint employees and that its employees are not to be subject to the Public Service Act. Clause 17 provides that the corporation may enter into arrangements under section 11 of the Superannuation Act, 1974-1976, with the Superannuation Board with respect to superannuation for any employee or class of employees.

Clause 18 provides that the corporation may make use of the services of public servants and officers of

Government agencies. Clause 19 requires the corporation to conduct its business in accordance with the usual methods of financial management and to attempt to break even or secure a trading surplus. Clause 20 requires the corporation to adopt annual estimates of its income and expenditure and to expend moneys only in accordance with estimates approved by the Minister. Clause 21 empowers the corporation to borrow money.

Clause 22 provides that the corporation may establish banking accounts. Clause 23 provides that the corporation may invest any temporary surplus. Clause 24 requires the corporation to pay to the Treasurer the equivalent of any tax from which it is exempt. Clause 25 requires the corporation to keep proper accounts and provides for their audit. Clause 26 requires the corporation to prepare an annual report to the Minister on its activities and provides for its tabling before Parliament. Clause 27 provides for summary proceedings for any offence. Clause 28 provides for the making of regulations.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1967-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 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 amends the principal Act, the Public Service Act, 1967, as amended, in the general area of long service leave entitlements. In summary the amendments provide—

(a) for an entitlement of 15 days per year for every year of effective service, after 15 years of effective service, where that year occurs after July 1, 1975; and

(b) for an absolute right to *pro rata* payment in lieu of long service leave after 7 years of effective service,

and, in addition, the Bill proposes other minor and consequential amendments.

To consider the Bill in some detail, clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts a definition in section 81 of the principal Act of "effective service", and is the first of a series of amendments to clarify the conditions upon which officers will qualify for long service leave. This clarification accords with the manner in which the present provisions are administered by the Public Service Board.

In general, all of an officer's service counts towards the grant of long service leave other than certain periods of leave without pay in excess of one month and certain other leave which does not count as part of the officer's service for long service leave. However, in the case of officers who are transferred from the Commonwealth, other States or Government instrumentalities, their service with those bodies will in certain circumstances count for an entitlement to long service leave. This "entitlement service" is now grouped under the heading of "effective service".

Clause 4 amends section 90 of the principal Act and is commended to honourable members' particular attention. The amendments effected by this clause are—

- (a) to provide for a clarification of service entitlement;
- (b) to grant the 15 days' leave for the sixteenth or subsequent year of effective service occurring after July 1, 1975;
- (c) to provide an adjustment in entitlements where the relevant year of service "straddles" July 1, 1975; and
- (d) to provide that all calculations of payment in lieu of long service leave entitlements will be based on years and months of effective service.

Clause 5 amends section 91 of the principal Act which is the present provision relating to payment in respect of *pro rata* leave after the completion of five years' effective service. Section 91 in its present form provides for *pro rata* leave in certain restricted circumstances, and by this clause the restrictions have been somewhat relaxed (as to which see the amendments proposed by paragraph (b) of this clause). However, the application of this section has been now limited to officers who joined the service before the commencement of the amending Act presaged by this Bill.

Clause 6 re-enacts section 92 of the principal Act, making no fundamental changes of principle. It also—

- (a) enacts a new section 92a of the principal Act which provides *pro rata* payment in respect of leave after seven years' effective service unconditionally; and
- (b) enacts new section 92b of the principal Act which provides for a similar payment on the death of an officer who had seven or more years' effective service.

Clauses 7, 8 and 9 are consequential amendments. Clause 10 grants a concession to officers, who in the course of their service were "regressed", that is, who for no fault of their own were reduced in salary by reason of ill-health or by reason of the fact that work in the classification in which they were employed was no longer available. Although proposed new section 97a looks complicated on the face of it, in substance, the principle is quite simple. It will ensure that where any payment is to be made in relation to leave accumulated while the officer was on the higher salary, he will be paid for that leave at that higher salary or its present day equivalent.

Clause 11 amends section 99 of the principal Act to ensure amongst other things that in the case of officers joining the service from the Commonwealth, other States or certain Government instrumentalities a break in service of less than three months will not affect their prospects of having their prior service regarded as effective service for amongst other things the purposes of long service leave entitlements. I point out that this service is only so regarded where the officer has not had a grant of leave in respect of it. Clause 12 amends section 126 of the principal Act and is a consequential amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will recall the unanimous support given to a Bill I introduced last year extending the period of operation of the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act for a further 12 months,

terminable by proclamation earlier if necessary. At the time I expressed my concern about the future of wage indexation, particularly in view of the Fraser Government's continued opposition before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to the basic purpose of indexation, which is the preservative of the real purchasing power of wages in a time of inflation.

However, the system is still in operation. A major review of the indexation guidelines is at present being undertaken by the Australian Commission and the principal parties in the national wage cases, and this gives some confidence that the system will continue at least in the foreseeable future. The alternative could be a return to the 1974 wage-bargaining situation, which would not be in the interests of wage earners, employers, or the economy as a whole.

On behalf of the Government, I restate our belief that the system of wage indexation and its guidelines will survive only if the principal parties retain confidence in it. In particular, wage earners must be assured that indexation is not a device to lower the real value of their wages and depress their standard of living, but is a system which enables their wages to be adjusted in an orderly manner to keep pace with inflation. Unfortunately, not all parties before the commission are prepared to adopt this view.

The current Act, which makes it possible for the State Industrial Commission to apply the Federal decisions to workers employed under State awards, expires at the end of this year. The Government believes it will be necessary as long as the wage indexation system survives, and it is therefore appropriate to extend the life of the Act indefinitely. However, it must still be regarded, as its title indicates, as a temporary provision, because it can be terminated by proclamation at any time when the situation demands it.

I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* without my reading it the report of the Parliamentary Counsel.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Parliamentary Counsel

Honourable members will recall that the principal Act, the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975-1976, was enacted so as to ensure that the various industrial tribunals in this State would have jurisdiction to give effect to "indexation decisions" of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. In the ordinary course of events this Act would expire on the thirty-first day of December, 1977, and the effect of this measure is to continue the principal Act in operation until a day fixed by proclamation.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from November 15. Page 776.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Last evening I was referring to the operation of the Fisheries Department and especially to the attitude of the Minister. I believe that it is ridiculous that the Fisheries Department should be attached to the Agriculture Department. I have discussed this matter with interested groups in the community that believe, like I do, that this department should be attached to the Marine and Harbors Department. Also, I was explaining my concern at the present administration of the managed fisheries programme. I make clear that I support the policy of a

managed fishery, but I am disturbed at the way in which it is being administered.

After making a thorough examination of this matter one must realise that the South Australian Minister and the Fisheries Department have a policy of closing the industry completely. It is obvious that they have given away commercial fishermen, have sold them out, and are not interested in them. For several years we have had a series of Government reports, for example, one from Professor Copes, and later I will quote what one large organisation had to say about his report. I understand that an officer of the department is to prepare a history of the Fisheries Department. That is a good idea, because the way in which the department is now being administered means that scale fisheries will be only history. Because of the way it is being administered there will be no scale fishermen left in a few years. Most of the fishermen are elderly and no new fishermen are coming in. The Government should move quickly, otherwise no-one will be left in this industry.

By courtesy of the South Australian Fishing Industry Council I received its newsletter, which I found interesting, and paragraph 2 states, "A national fishing industry training committee was established." That is a good idea, because I believe it is essential that we train young people to enter the industry and that we provide them with incentives and the knowledge to earn a livelihood in this industry. However, if the present policy is continued there will be no industry left for them to enter, because no licences are being issued and there will be no purpose in training these young people.

In the past 12 months the New South Wales Government has transferred its Fisheries Department to the control of a separate Minister, and that is a situation long overdue in this State. To emphasise what one large organisation, namely, Safcol, thinks about the present administration of the department, I quote from a resolution of the board of directors, as follows:

This board is seriously concerned at the policy of the Fisheries Department in respect to the restriction on fishing licences for the scale fishery. It is the opinion of this board that it is a denial of natural justice that fishermen who have been operating in managed fisheries should be prevented from fishing for other species when they relinquish their particular permit; particularly as there is no evidence available to the industry that such prevention will in any way alleviate the excessive fishing effort on various species.

Continuation of the present policy will severely reduce the intake of West Coast branches to the extent they will be no longer viable, and the plants will have to be closed. The ramifications of the restrictive practices of the Fisheries Department go considerably beyond the restriction of licences on scale fish and, unless corrected, will strangle the present industry and prevent future development.

The Premier is aware of this information but I do not know whether he has considered it seriously. I believe that he should, because these operations are undertaken in my district. If the present policy continues, it is obvious that these factories will be phased out or greatly restricted in their operations, with a consequent loss of employment.

Also, the report of a comment made by the Minister of Fisheries during the election campaign appeared in *Review Times*, as follows:

Establishing a separate Fisheries Department would add almost \$250 000 to the State Budget, according to South Australia's Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Chatterton. Mr. Chatterton was commenting on the Liberal Party's policy announcement that they would establish separate departments of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Mr. Mathwin: Would he know?

Mr. GUNN: I do not think he would know. It is the first time I have been aware that this Government is concerned about saving money. It is obvious that the Minister does not know the feeling of the industry, because wherever one goes and discusses this matter with people who have knowledge of it they are all of the same opinion as the Liberal Party, that is, that the department should be separated.

I have a copy of a document prepared by Safcol in relation to the findings in Professor Copes' report. Some of us who met Professor Copes during his brief visit to South Australia were amazed that he could come up with a report after being here for only a few weeks. It is interesting to note what Safcol had to say in relation to that report. The whole basis of the report was not to assist fishermen to get into the industry but to try to get them out of it. It was an endeavour, in my opinion, to put more controls on fishermen that are not necessary. There are enough controls already, but the Government does not seem to have the courage to enforce those controls, particularly where they will affect so-called amateur fishermen. I will quote from an analysis of the section of Professor Copes' report dealing with abalone which states:

South Australia has had a valuable abalone industry with one of the major stabilising factors being the ability of Safcol to process and market the abalone in either frozen or canned form—whichever would give the best return. The cost of installing and maintaining canning facilities to export standards is high. Decreasing volume of catches are destroying the economics of abalone canning. Catches are decreasing because of: (a) less individual effort by the divers left in the industry. (b) non replacement of divers leaving the industry. The resource is not being overfished—it is being under exploited.

Scale Fish: An equally disturbing situation is developing in several of the scale fisheries. Many of the older fishermen are reaching retirement and withdrawing, but—they are not being replaced.

This is basically because of the restriction of part-time licences. It is from the young part-time—almost semi-amateur fishermen—that the recruitment of full-time professional scale fishermen is drawn. Diminishing volumes mean increasing costs to processors and, eventually, to a completely uneconomic situation with an accelerating running down.

Professor Copes says that part-time fishermen may be phased out of commercial fishing without any effect on the scale fisheries. That is not correct. I could quote what Professor Copes had to say about sharing the rent. That suggestion is a lift out of the socialist philosophy of the Labor Party. Any fair or reasonable person who read Professor Copes's report could describe it only as a socialist document. I am aware that the Agriculture and Fisheries Department has a dossier on me. Obviously this speech will be placed in that file, but I hope they take some time to go through it and see what I have said.

Mr. Keneally: Ha, ha!

Mr. GUNN: I have been informed by members of that department that they have a file on me and I told them to keep it handy because they would have plenty more to put in it in the future.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: We probably have one on you, too.

Mr. GUNN: You probably have. I turn now to the rural industry, an industry that is very important to the people of this State.

Mr. Keneally: You're going to talk about ship building?

Mr. GUNN: No, I said the rural industry. I represent an electorate that has many marginal agricultural areas in it. I had some interesting figures taken out by the library

research section. I ask the question: "How many farming properties are therein what can be classed as marginal areas?" By that I mean the 14 inch (or 355.6 mm) rainfall area. About 7 666 rural holdings are in the 14 inch or below rainfall areas of South Australia. They comprise some 27 per cent of the total rural holdings in South Australia. In 1974-75 there were about 28 185 rural holdings in South Australia. Unfortunately, over the past three seasons many of these farmers have had, virtually, three droughts and they are facing a very severe economic situation.

The South Australian Government has stated that it will make funds available through its various agencies. Yesterday I received a complaint from an accountant in the Ceduna area that people have made application but have had no reply. He is concerned because these people want to be in a position to make arrangements to buy seed. Unfortunately, some will have to buy seed (some for the second year in succession), and they do not know how much money they will receive.

During the election campaign some interesting documents were circulated by the Labor Party. Some had the Premier's photograph on them. One was put out by a gentleman called Mr. Krieg, who stood for the seat of Flinders. He had quite a notorious campaign. During the early part of that campaign he visited Darke Peak, which is in my old electorate, and I understand that during a visit to the school he handed out Labor Party material to all the school children. That is a passing comment that I am sure will interest members. Fortunately, the people were a wake-up to the Labor Party policies, and I understand that he received one vote at that booth.

Mr. Keneally: At Darke Peak the Bible is a socialist document.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the honourable member made that comment, as I have many friends there who will be interested in it.

Mr. Keneally: They thought you were in the League of Rights.

Mr. GUNN: That is a quite ridiculous comment for the honourable member to make. This document states:

Why should you support me and this Government?

He is talking about rural people. It continues:

Here are some examples from Labor's excellent record which concern us—1. Reforms to rural land tax and succession duties . . .

Ever since I have been in this place the Liberal Party has had a policy of abolishing rural land tax. All the Labor Party did was pick the eyes out of the Liberal Party's policy, as it did with the succession duties policy, but it did not go far enough. I believe that we have reached the point where we should abolish succession duties in this State; it is long overdue. The Queensland Government has abolished succession duties, they are being phased out in Western Australia, and I recently read a report in the *Sunday Mail* which stated that Mr. Wran has said that he will abolish death duties in New South Wales. I wish this Government would follow its colleagues in this matter, because it is a step that is long overdue.

Mr. Keneally: Joh Bjelke-Petersen is trying to abolish death!

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member can criticise Joh Bjelke-Petersen if he likes, but he cannot deny that he runs a good State where there are far less taxes than we have in this State. Let us look at what this document says. The Labor Party could not help having a shot at the Liberal Party in the final few paragraphs, where it stated:

What are the alternatives?

We know what the Labor Party alternative is—socialism. The member for Ross Smith told us about the sort of

society in which he would like to live—a controlled society. The document stated:

A Liberal Party which passively agrees with any statement from Canberra, however harmful it may be to our State, a Party which chooses to concentrate on emotional issues like the recent claims on lack of law and order—issues unsupported by fact—

we know what nonsense that is—

or an even more conservative Country Party which has little or no effect in the governing of the State. Flinders deserves a voice, not just in Parliament but in Government. I can give you that voice in the Dunstan Government.

The member for Ross Smith certainly told us what sort of voice members of the Labor Party have. They are only puppets on a string, a voting machine. That is the kind of voice a Labor Party member is given.

Mr. Rodda: He's the golden boy.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, the golden boy, and he let the cat out of the bag. He said that the Labor Party, to educate the people, must continue to push them. We are all aware of the massive publicity machine the Labor Party has set up in this State at taxpayers' expense to educate the people along its narrow socialist path so that they will not be their own masters in a few years time.

Mr. Keneally: You've only five minutes left, so say something sensible.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member never says anything sensible. In conclusion, I will refer to State taxation. Every time the Premier gets up in the House (and he did it again during Question Time today), he attacks the Federal Government or says how well off we are in South Australia, but he has never told us whence the Commonwealth Government should obtain any extra money. The closest he went to doing so was during the last session, when I asked whence the Commonwealth Government would get the extra money, and the Premier replied that it would get it from its normal taxing arrangements. He was obviously advocating an increase in taxation, whereas we have heard him on other occasions advocate that the Commonwealth Government should reduce income tax. We have heard no praise from him as a result of the Commonwealth Government's reducing interest rates and income tax. He said that the extra money should come from general revenue. He obviously believes that some of the Commonwealth Government's programmes should be abolished, but which ones?

Does he want the income equalisation deposit scheme abolished, which would greatly assist people in marginal areas? The scheme was recommended in 1973, I think, by the Industries Assistance Commission, and was described by Mr. Whitlam as "perks for Pitt Street farmers". During the recent election campaign, the heading "A.L.P. aims at stabilising farm incomes" appeared in local papers, over a report, part of which stated:

Mr. Chatterton was a leading member of the national committee that drafted the policy . . .

What policy could he draft? He talks about stabilising incomes, but the Commonwealth Government has taken the most positive step for many years in this field, although "gorgeous Gough" has described it as a hand-out to Pitt Street farmers. There is no doubt in my mind that, after the forthcoming Federal election, Clyde Cameron will deal with Whitlam. Mr. Cameron is waiting a few more weeks so that he can get even with Whitlam.

I had intended to say something about the uranium issue but, as I have only two minutes remaining, I thought I would conclude my remarks by telling the House about what I thought was a very good argument that appeared in the *News of Thursday*, October 27, under the heading "Government earns his grade", dealing with Dr. Gramm,

from the United States of America. I will quote the article, because I think it will interest Government members; it states:

The Federal Government would get a good grade for its economic management, a top American economist, Dr. Philip Gramm, said in Adelaide today. "Clearly, the halving of the inflation rate over the last two years has been produced by the action of the Federal Government," he said. Dr. Gramm, a professor of economics in Texas and an authority on inflation and energy, is in Adelaide to speak at a seminar organised by a group of free enterprise supporters called Enterprise Australia. He rejected the suggestion that the Government had cut inflation at the expense of people's jobs and said he thought unemployment had been produced by inflation. Dr. Gramm, who is also an authority on energy, said people who opposed the sale of uranium acted as if they are going to prevent the nuclear age if they succeeded. "The real question is whether you are going to create jobs here to produce uranium or is someone else going to do so," he said.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion, because that is the only thing one can do in the circumstances. I believe that the opening of Parliament this year was something of a farce, as was borne out by the Speech given to the Governor to deliver at the opening. To put into the hands of the newly-elected Governor a Speech of about half a page—

Mr. Mathwin: Three paragraphs.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think, from memory, that that is correct. The Speech congratulated the Lieutenant-Governor for his work, and that was fair enough. I was sorry that Sir Douglas Nicholls had been sick and had had to retire. The Speech merely indicated that the Government intended to introduce its policy, and that was all. It made a farce of the proceedings, because we are to reply to the Speech. What can a member say in reply?

Mr. Keneally: Well, sit down!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Some Government members have had plenty to say. The member for Newland took the opportunity of waxing eloquent and reading his speech, which has been reproduced almost word for word in this month's *Teachers Journal*: obviously, he made a political point or two, and I shall do the same thing. The Governor's Speech made a whole farce of traditionally outlining the Parliamentary programme. I am pleased to support the sentiments expressed in the Speech. I think that the new Governor has done a first-class job. I expressed reservations when Sir Douglas Nicholls was appointed and I was asked to comment, in the Leader's absence. I said that the only reservation I had was in relation to his health and, unfortunately, that reservation has proved to be only too well founded. Sir Douglas did not remain in office long before his health forced him to retire, and I was sorry that he was forced to leave the job. I think that the Lieutenant-Governor has done his job extremely well and I think that Sir Mark Oliphant's public comments before him, together with the Lieutenant-Governor's public comments, have done much to waken public interest on important issues to the community.

Recently, Mr. Crocker made pertinent comments on the University of Adelaide. I was pleased and proud to serve on the university's council between 1970 and 1973 (Mr. Crocker joined the council at the same time), and to see the situation developing that the council was becoming larger, unmanageable, and stratified; in other words, it was composed of many pressure groups with an axe to grind. In those circumstances, one does not get expeditious and wise decisions made by people, many of

whom have better things to do with their time than to listen to people with an axe to grind. I was delighted to read the Lieutenant-Governor's comments on the university, because I shared some of those same experiences.

I pay a tribute to the retiring Governor-General, because in the Address in Reply we refer to the Queen's representatives. The present Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, is due to retire within a week or two. In my view, Australia has been served extremely well by Sir John.

Mr. Groom: Why is he stepping down?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Why should he not step down? The Labor Party has been trying to hound him out of office since he showed courage enough to sack the incompetents who were running the affairs of the country and when a complete deadlock had been reached in this nation's affairs. When Supply had not been granted, and the Whitlam Government refused to resign, although it had no other choice open to it, he showed the necessary courage for which he will, in the course of history, be given due credit.

I think that the former Governor of South Australia, Sir Mark Oliphant, summed up the situation admirably when he said that this was democracy in action. I reinforce and support the comments made yesterday by the Governor of New South Wales, Sir Roden Cutler. Without direct reference to the Labor Party, he said he hoped that the powers of the Governor-General and of Governors would not be circumscribed, an obviously oblique reference to the proposals of the Labor Party to turn the Governors and the Governor-General into figureheads, with no position at all in relation to the Constitution of Australia. I hope that those underhand proposals of the Labor Party are thwarted, for the very sound and sensible reasons enunciated recently by Sir Roden Cutler.

I turn now to some comments about your predecessor, Sir, and I make no apology for doing so. He has retired from this place.

Dr. Eastick: The pastures might be greener.

Mr. Gunn: He's got a good job.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He is getting a good job, and I shall refer to that in a moment. I congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment. I believe you have a basic reserve of fairness which, in my judgment (and I say this sincerely), is the first essential quality for any Speaker who is going to do the job well. When I came into this House in 1970, over half the members here were new members. We have served under a succession of Speakers, each with his strengths and weaknesses. The one fatal weakness in any Speaker is that he is not basically fair. I do not think anyone can level such an accusation against you, Sir, from the experience we have had in the past or since you have occupied the Chair. I wish you well, and I trust that nothing will happen to change the quality you show.

Your predecessor has departed from this Chamber in what for him were unfortunate circumstances. He came into it in unfortunate circumstances, having lost preselection for the former seat of Pirie. He was not happy with the preselection procedures of the Labor Party, which, of course, are not based on any concept of one vote one value. It is the Labor Party delegate who shows up at the preselection corroboree or conference with the most votes in his pocket who is likely to win the day.

Dr. Eastick: He waves his card.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I remember the time when the very moderate member for Playford was under attack from the left wing. He got some of the heavies with a few thousand votes in their pockets on side, and he managed to survive the challenge. The concept of one vote one value has no place in the preselection procedures of

the Labor Party. The image of the former member for Pirie, a highly respected local figure at the time, was somewhat tarnished with the passing of time. He was unfortunate in not gaining preselection; that went to a man named Phelan. The Premier waxed loud in condemnation of Mr. Connelly's standing as an Independent against the endorsed Labor candidate. The Labor Party procedures are somewhat less democratic than are those of the Liberal Party. The Labor Party went through the business of kicking him out of the Party, and he was expelled. The Liberal Party is much more democratic in conducting its affairs.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Labor Party thinks it knows more than we do. In the words of the Premier, Mr. Connelly was on an ego trip. However, he was successful, and the Premier had to eat humble pie shortly afterwards.

Mr. Rodda: He had to suck up to him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let us put it as charitably as we can. The Premier had to enter into delicate negotiations within a matter of hours of the conclusion of the election. The Premier had a change of heart, as did Mr. Connelly, and not many hours had elapsed before the then member for Pirie emerged as Speaker in this House. Any measure of independence which he might have thought he had when he was elected by the people in the Pirie District evaporated completely, and he became a true blue Labor man, as he said he had always been.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's a contradiction in terms.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am saying how the then member for Pirie explained his situation. He ran for election as an Independent, and was successful. To justify that he was back in the fold, he said he had always been a Labor man, but apparently he had had a slight divergence. I am reminded of the song in H.M.S. *Pinafore*, staged recently at the Festival Theatre. The character being described was Porter, First Lord of the Admiralty. The words are to the effect that he had always voted at his Party's call, never thinking for himself at all. The ditty concludes as follows:

He thought so little they rewarded he

By making him the ruler of the Queen's navee.

The Labor Party is not unmindful of its friends. A former Labor opponent of mine in a previous election was the son of one of my constituents in the Barossa Valley. He decided to hitch his wagon to the Dunstan star. After the election, at which he was unsuccessful, he found that life was not quite as it had been previously, but before long the Labor Party teed up a fairly secure job for him in one of the Government departments.

It was no surprise to me, of course, to find that the former member for Pirie is now Research Assistant in the office of the Minister of Local Government. I understand that bigger, brighter, and better things are on the horizon for him. He is to carry out a job connected with the operations in the northern part of the State. I hope that, in his new task, he will be above politicking for the Labor Party. I have made the point that the Labor Party looks after its own. It could not make him the ruler of the Queen's navee, but it could give him a job in the northern part of the State. I know that will not be the history of your tenure of office as Speaker, Sir. You came to office in more propitious circumstances, and I am sure you will leave office in circumstances more propitious than those attending the departure of your predecessor.

Yesterday, I wanted to raise several matters during the no-confidence motion relating to the Attorney-General, but Standing Orders precluded a discussion at length of those matters. I wish to refer to them during this debate

because they impinge on the business of the House. They relate to the Attorney's attitude to uranium mining. The history of the Attorney's public statements have caused his colleagues considerable embarrassment over the years. Yesterday, I said that the Attorney was bemoaning the fact that the uranium demonstrations would be infiltrated by violent right-wingers, whereas previously he had complained that universities had become silent because right-wingers had taken over.

The Attorney's attitude to the monarchy is completely inexcusable. No-one can argue about his wishing to be known as an agnostic and not wishing to take an oath. The Premier, along with the member for Ross Smith, and one or two other of the Attorney's colleagues, were in that category recently.

Mr. Venning: He's deteriorating.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is their business. If they are agnostics and have no faith in any being superior to them, that is their affair. If they refuse to take an oath on the Bible that is their affair. I raise this matter for reasons enunciated by the Attorney when he stated publicly that he owed no allegiance to the Queen. That is a disgraceful stance for a Minister of the Crown to take. Whether or not he likes it, this is a monarchy. He has said that he is not religious—that is his affair. I will quote the Attorney's exact words. In 1973, when the Attorney refused to take the oath of allegiance, it was reported:

Explaining his stand, Mr. Duncan said outside the House, "I am an agnostic. I think religion is quite irrelevant to anything. I would prefer to swear my allegiance to Australia and not to the Queen. I do not hold any allegiance to the Queen."

Mr. Slater: Isn't that his own personal business?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not believe that it is.

Mr. Slater: It's his own personal view.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He is a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. Arnold: He's the Queen's chief law enforcement officer of the State.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I agree. If the Attorney holds no allegiance to the Crown, he should not hold office. He also stated:

I do not hold any allegiance to the Queen, but you have just got to say that. There is no other choice.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You speak sometimes of civil liberties. Are you saying that republicans cannot run for public office.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He can express what views he likes as private citizen Peter Duncan, but he runs for cover when it suits him. When he talks to his friends up in Timor and to Fretelin by radio from Darwin and sends them messages of support and sympathy, he says that he is John Citizen and is not the Attorney-General. That he can duck in and out of that situation to me is ludicrous. That is the way he excuses his public action.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I still want to know whether you think republicans can run for public office.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In my judgment a man should not accept the office of a Minister of the Crown if he does not hold allegiance to the Crown. The Minister can disagree with that view if he wishes.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about his view?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Am I not allowed the civil liberty of holding my own opinion? Are not members opposite saying that theirs is the only view?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney has the job. If that is his attitude he should not hold the job. The Attorney-General's thinking on uranium must obviously now be the thinking of the majority of Labor Party members because, frankly, they have done a back flip on

this matter, as they believe they can gain cheap political mileage from trying to gather votes from those who are concerned about the uranium issue. The Whitlam Government negotiated contracts for the export of uranium, but now fellows like Uren, the Deputy Leader on the Federal scene, are saying, "We will repudiate contracts for the supply of uranium." The Labor Party itself negotiated contracts for the supply of uranium when it was in office federally. The Federal Party has done a back flip, as have members of the State Labor Party. The Minister of Mines and Energy, underneath all this, is most disturbed about the effect this attitude will have on mining in South Australia. Underneath he knows that this is political garbage and that the Party is trying to get cheap political mileage at the expense of Australia and, indeed, oversea nations.

Mr. Groom: What's your opinion?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am about to give it to you. In the tripe that the Attorney fed to the media in his speech on Monday night, he said he believes that uranium producers are afraid of public debate, afraid of inquiry. The more I have inquired into the question, the more I am convinced that Australia has no option but to mine and export its uranium deposits. That is not to say that I have not entertained doubts about the problem of waste disposal. I was greatly concerned about that. It is unfortunate that weapons of war of the most devastating kind can be manufactured from the products of nuclear reactors. However, man has never been backward in devising means of mass extermination, especially in the past few years, so Australia could not halt warfare simply by not mining its uranium.

Bob Hawke summed up that argument fairly well. As I said, I was concerned about the disposal of nuclear waste, but all the reading I have done since then and all the lectures I have attended (and I have attended one or two) indicate that that situation is well in hand. Sir Mark Oliphant, who was a great opponent of uranium mining, has recently acknowledged that fact. Sir Mark, however, is still opposed to uranium mining on the ground that it increases the likelihood of weapons of mass destruction being produced, but he no longer opposes uranium mining on the only ground that really disturbed me—the handling of waste from nuclear reactors. Sir Mark has said that that situation can now be contained.

The fact of life is that we live in the nuclear age. There are about 300 reactors operating or soon to be operating. About 30 countries are involved in producing nuclear power, some of which I referred to yesterday. Great Britain has been in this field for many years. West Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Italy and Sweden also produce nuclear power. Last night I read an article about nuclear power in Switzerland, where about a quarter of all power comes from nuclear reactors. The article indicated that Switzerland depends on that source of power and monitors the environment closely.

Whether or not we like it, we live in a nuclear age, and the effect of Australia's refusing to mine uranium, as Bob Hawke said recently to a group of university students in Melbourne, will be to increase the cost of energy in the developed world and slow down the development of the underdeveloped world.

Bob Hawke made several points in that speech. I must confess on reading through the speech I found it well reasoned and the only logical and moral stand one can take in relation to the mining of uranium. He said:

Now, coming from that point, let me say why at this stage my view is that we should mine and export it . . . But unfortunately no-one, and I repeat no-one, has yet shown that by keeping Australian uranium in the ground we in fact

do anything about those dangers, and in fact all that has been shown so far is that if we, in fact, with what represents about, according to what dollar equivalent to use, but the general agreement would be you could say our reserves represent about 20 per cent of world reserves.

If we keep ours in the ground, all that happens is that alternative suppliers fill the requirements of those countries which not into the future are going to make the decisions but which are already fundamentally committed to this as a source of power. Other suppliers fill the contracts and then what happens only as a result of keeping ours in the ground is that the cost of energy is increased in those rich countries, which are now using this as a source of power and to the extent that their energy is costing more by not only making an impact upon them but immediately it also makes an impact upon the underdeveloped world in terms of increasing the cost structure of the rest of the world.

That is the point I just made. Bob Hawke continued:

Now, that is the fact which as they say no-one has yet disputed. Now, if therefore, you believe that all in answer to that, you do is to say well, we can have a lower moral satisfaction in saying, all right, well we haven't done anything about the problems in the rest of the world, but they are still there, the only thing we have gone and done is to make the world more expensive, but we are not in fact going to have contributed to those dangers if you believe that that is a reason, then I'm sorry I can't follow, because if that is the case do we close down our iron ore mines, do we close down our coal mines because some of the things that are going to be done without iron ore which is converted into steel, some of the things which are going to be done without are going to involve the creation of armaments which are going to be used in wars to kill people, do we close them down because we don't want to have anything to do with that sort of thing? I just can't understand where you draw the line in terms of an issue like this, where there is nothing that you can do about the issue involved.

My respect for Bob Hawke increased on reading that because he was flying in the face of the policy—

Mr. Slater: I'm sure that would not be reciprocated.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That does not matter, although occasionally I say something in this place which strikes a respondent chord in at least one or two members opposite. I would not be unduly disturbed if it never did that but I hope occasionally I say something that strikes a respondent chord. No doubt if I had frequent contact with Bob Hawke he might agree now and again with something I said.

Dr. Eastick: At least he had the courage of his convictions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and he flew in the face of the ill-founded policy of the Labor Party. That sums up the situation to my mind. I refute entirely the statement of the Attorney-General that people on the mining side of the argument are frightened of discussion. What they want is rational discussion, and the people on the Attorney-General's side of the argument are deliberately confusing the issues and will not look at scientific facts and the facts of life. One just cannot bury one's head in the sand like an ostrich and believe that in some way or another we will reverse the move towards the use of atomic energy in the world, by denying oversea countries access to our uranium. We will not. This was pointed out by a Labour Minister from Great Britain, who said that England was dependent on uranium. If Australia does not supply it, that country will have to get it somewhere else.

I believe we have had enough of this emotional nonsense from the Attorney-General and other left-wingers in the Labor Party, but unfortunately this attitude seems to be in the ascendancy, as it does in relation to

other things I could mention in the political arena. I want to say a word or two about the federalism policy of the Liberal Country Party coalition in Canberra because I believe—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I will listen to you with a great deal of interest because I have been waiting for some clarification on this issue for some time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister must be a lot denser than I gave him credit for if he cannot grasp the basic tenets of the federalism policy, and see the way it has worked so successfully in the past couple of years. If he cannot see the tremendous advantages that have accrued to the States from that federalism policy he is adopting a political stance.

Mr. Slater: Why are you laughing?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am laughing at the members opposite because they are trying to cry wolf in relation to this matter, because it is obvious to the meanest intellect that the federalism policy has been a tremendous bonanza to the States and local government in Australia. I will quote some figures that will support that point of view.

Mr. Slater: Who wrote this?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will make the document available to the honourable member if he wishes. The States now receive a guaranteed share of personal income taxes. The share increased general revenue in 1976-77 by 19.6 per cent and it will rise another 18 per cent in 1977-78. Local government receives a fixed percentage of 1.552 per cent. The States have been able to balance their Budgets. In 1976-77, the State Budget results in relation to revenue account were as follows: New South Wales had a deficit of \$500 000 (which, considering the size of its Budget, is near enough to a balanced Budget); Victoria had a surplus of \$9 100 000; Queensland had a deficit of \$100 000, after putting aside about \$5 000 000 to carry over into this year's Budget; South Australia had a deficit of \$100 000, which is near enough to the balanced Budget for which the Government budgeted; Western Australia had a surplus of \$3 400 000; and Tasmania had a surplus of \$1 600 000.

The Labor spokesmen and propagandists opposite plead that the Commonwealth Government ought to spend more money. The Commonwealth is looking at a deficit of billions, and every State Government of Australia managed to produce a balanced Budget last year. What is more, all States have been able to effect fairly significant tax cuts. We know that South Australia has been dragging its heels a bit in relation to this matter, as we would expect a Labor Government to do.

This has happened during the life of the Fraser Administration as a result of increased funds granted to the States because of a fixed share of income tax revenue. There was an initial argument as to how it would be paid, and the States wanted it on the current year's tax, but they have now agreed (and this was the original suggestion of the Commonwealth Government) that it should be computed on the previous year's tax collection, because that would be a firm figure.

Dr. Eastick: It shows the Commonwealth Government's willingness to talk.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, and it will try to guide, too, but the States made an error. All we had from the Premier was criticism. What are proposed for State Budgets this year compared to the Federal Budget? For 1977-78, New South Wales is budgeting for a small deficit of \$400 000; Victoria is budgeting for a small deficit of \$500 000; Queensland for a surplus of \$400 000; and the position for South Australia highlights the fact that we are going downhill fast compared to other States because the estimated deficit is \$18 400 000. The Premier states that it is to be a balanced Budget, but he will get rid of all the

State's reserves to do it. Western Australia is going for a balanced Budget, and Tasmania is going for a deficit of \$2 900 000, and has accumulated reserves to cover this.

All the States have their finances well in hand, and we should compare this to the Federal situation. The Federal Government has been able to accommodate the States through its federalism policy so that each State can introduce these Budgets, with the exception of South Australia whose resources are being run down by \$18 400 000, so that the day of reckoning will come at the end of this financial year. We can only applaud the generosity of the Federal Government in the terms of its federalism policy.

Let us now consider tax relief that has been afforded at State levels because there has been significant tax relief in some States, especially in Queensland and probably in Western Australia. The Federal Government is battling to reduce taxation, although the States want taxation to be reduced and expenditure increased. Labor propagandists are saying this, but that is nonsense. The federalism policy has worked well for the States. New South Wales has given relief in pay-roll tax, probate and stamp duty at a cost of \$36 000 000 to its Budget in 1976-77. No figures are available for pay-roll tax, so that the total could be about \$50 000 000. In Victoria, there has been relief of pay-roll tax, probate, and land tax; no figures are available for two of these concessions, but probate concessions will reduce the State's income by \$12 000 000. In Queensland, relief has been given in pay-roll tax, probate, gift duty, and land tax, and the concessions costed will affect the Budget by \$42 500 000, although no land tax figures are available. In that case the total could be about \$50 000 000. This is at a time when the Federal Government is struggling with a deficit of about \$3 000 000 000.

South Australia, never the leader in tax reform, has given some relief in pay-roll tax, probate, land tax, and stamp duty at an estimated cost of about \$15 000 000. In Western Australia, concessions have been made in pay-roll tax, stamp duty, and death duties at a cost of about \$8 000 000. In Tasmania, relief has been given for probate, land tax, and pay-roll tax at a cost of about \$2 500 000, with no figures available for pay-roll tax. Who could complain about the federalism policy of the Federal Government and say that it is starving the States of funds?

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You are ignoring half of what comes to the States—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I can get the figures.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about special purpose grants?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They are included in figures that I have. In considering special purpose grants, the total increase in funds, whether special purpose grants or revenue funds—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: And Loan?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In 1975-76, special purpose grants for current purposes of about \$2 300 000 000 were paid to the States; in 1976-77, it was about \$2 400 000 000, an increase of 4 per cent; and in 1977-78, it was about \$2 880 000 000, an increase of 19.6 per cent.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You're wrong: I have the figures.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The figures I have are from the Federal Treasury. If I add the total funds to the States of a revenue nature, which is revenue returned from taxation plus grants which are non-repayable, the figure in 1975-76 was about \$5 400 000 000; in 1976-77, it was about \$6 100 000 000, an increase of 12.6 per cent; and in 1977-78, it is estimated it will be about \$7 200 000 000, which is an increase of 18.5 per cent. I will give the Minister this

document and if he can find any mistakes that will be well and good.

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: Tony Messner has had several letters from me on this matter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not get them from him: these figures came from the Federal Treasury. The other area of Government that has benefited under the federalism policy is local government because a fixed percentage of revenue has flowed to it. I do not think that any genuine spokesman for local government will complain about the thrust of the federalism policy. People who are not making cheap political points will welcome the increased independence afforded to local government as a result of the federalism policy. In 1975-76, local government in New South Wales received \$29 300 000; in 1976-77, it received \$51 300 000; and in 1977-78, it will receive \$60 300 000. That figure represents from the first year of the federalism policy an increase of 75.3 per cent in funds flowing from the Federal Government to local government. This year the increase will be 17.7 per cent, which is way ahead of inflation. The position of local

government is improving dramatically under the federalism policy.

I will not quote all the figures, but that is the pattern of this table. However, I will quote South Australian figures: in 1975-76, the amount of \$6 800 000 flowed to local government; in 1976-77, it was \$11 900 000, an increase of 75.7 per cent; and in 1977-78, it is estimated it will be \$14 200 000, a further increase of 19.2 per cent. The total figure was \$79 900 000 in 1975-76 for all States; in 1976-77, the total was \$140 000 000; and in 1977-78, it will be \$165 300 000, which gives an increase of 75 per cent under the first year of the federalism policy or a further average increase of 18.1 per cent. I seek leave to have table No. 6 of this document inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Whitten): Can the honourable member assure me that this is wholly statistical material?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it is figures showing increases in all States.

Leave granted.

TABLE 6

State	1975-76 (\$m)	1976-77 (\$m)	1977-78 (\$m)	%	%
				Increase (1975-76 to 1976-77)	Increase (1976-77 to 1977-78)
New South Wales	29.3	51.3	60.3	75.3	17.7
Victoria	20.2	35.4	42.1	74.9	18.9
Queensland	13.8	24.2	27.9	75.4	15.1
South Australia	6.8	11.9	14.2	75.7	19.2
Western Australia	7.5	13.2	15.5	75.0	17.9
Tasmania	2.3	4.0	5.3	74.7	32.1
Total	79.9	140.0	165.3	75.0	18.1

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is simply an extension of the figures for the other States. I have quoted New South Wales and South Australia. It ill behoves the Labor Party, and particularly the Premier, to belabour the Federal Government in relation to its federalism policy. The only people who would criticise this policy are those who are not prepared to accept the responsibility for making decisions in relation to spending money sent to them. We know that under the Whitlam centralist Administration there was a higher and higher percentage of money flowing to the States that had an earmark or tag on it. They were specific purpose grants, moneys that were being made available to the States that the States were being told how to spend.

If members of the Labor Party are happy for that situation to continue and happy to return to those dark days, they have less sense of responsibility and less responsibility to the electors of South Australia than they should have. We on this side of Parliament welcome the dramatic moves away from the centralism of the Whitlam years to the giving back of the rightful powers of decision making, autonomy and flexibility to States and local government. I repeat that the two important features of the federalism policy are autonomy and flexibility. Any Government that is not prepared to exercise some decision making, autonomy and flexibility is not fit to govern.

I turn now to a matter I have canvassed previously relating to what is called, in popular jargon, the private sector, the relative strength of the private sector and the Government enterprise in South Australia. I received a list

of building projects, most of which are school projects, from an interested party whose name I do not intend to mention, because the letter is not addressed to me, but the facts are irrefutable. On this list of Government building projects we find that the Public Buildings Department is the constructing authority. These are not small projects: they are projects running into millions of dollars in total.

There seems to be an increasing trend for the Public Buildings Department not only to be the supervising authority but also to be the constructing authority. I have no evidence (I admit freely) as to the efficiency of the Public Buildings Department in construction activities, but I believe that all experiences in the past have indicated (particularly in the present climate, which is highly competitive), that the taxpayers of South Australia are likely to get best value for money when contracts are let after competitive tendering. The Public Buildings Department is the major constructing authority in this whole list of projects, which runs into 20 or 30 at least (and in total runs into millions of dollars, most of them costing hundreds of thousands of dollars), many of which are school extensions.

Mr. Arnold: Perhaps Government departments should tender for capital projects in open competition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is an excellent point. Nobody really knows, in relation to these activities (and nobody seems to check), whether in fact the final cost is the cost estimated by the Government constructing department. I doubt whether a final check is run or anyone gets particularly worried if they find that the building costs

more than was estimated. That cannot be the case with a private contractor. If he has won a contract as a result of competitive tendering, he has to make a go of it, or bad luck. There is no way in the world he can say it has cost more unless he has an escalation clause that covers that situation, but the pressure is on the contractor from the word "go" to do the job.

The pressure is on the contractor from the time he tenders because (particularly in the present climate) he knows that he is in competition with other constructors in South Australia for the job and, if his price is not right, he will not get the job. That is not the case with the projects shown on this list. The Government seems to be obsessed with the idea that somehow or other it is providing stable employment no matter what it costs. In the long term we will get more for the taxpayer's dollar if we spend that money wisely and get the best value for the money.

The people who have contacted us are concerned at this trend, and I express that concern now. I am concerned, as I pointed out during Question Time today, at the increase in construction costs generally in South Australia. I pointed out that the Journal of the Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors has indicated quite clearly that South Australia now leads the field in construction costs. It is all very well for the Premier to get up and answer some other question, but he did not really answer the question I asked, which was, "What is the Government going to do about this?" It has no plan whatsoever.

The Government introduced a Bill today (which I have not yet studied) to increase amenities and long service leave, I think, for Government workers. The Government intends to give further benefits to people in the Public Service. These benefits will flow on to these people in the Public Buildings Department who are working for the Government, and no doubt they will flow throughout industry. It is this sort of move that has led to a deterioration of our situation when compared to other States. Nobody wants to deny people in South Australia a good way of life simply for the sake of denying them these benefits, but the facts of life are that we are in competition with the other States of Australia and Australia as a nation is in competition with other nations, and on all counts they leave us for dead.

When one looks at the productivity of the Australian worker and compares it with other countries, one sees that we are not in the race. I remember the study leave report of the member for Florey when he came back from overseas a year or two ago. In particular, he studied conditions on the waterfront in Germany and England. He was highly critical of the conditions in Germany, and the basis of that criticism was that the overtime payments were not anything like as generous as they are in Australia and that they shifted too much cargo.

Figures were quoted in that study leave report of how much went over the wharf per wharf labourer in West Germany. Compared with the Australian turnover, it was about five or six times greater. He was bemoaning that fact, that was his comment in relation to West Germany. The fact that the workers there were quite content with their lot did not affect his view that it was sweated labour. Also, the fact that the workers were quite happy to accept the same rate regardless of the time of the day a ship was in port was, he believed, exploiting them. The fact that they were content was something he did not like at all.

He went to England and found conditions much more to his liking. That country had the most generous severance conditions and could not sack an employee: if they did, the severance conditions were by far the world leaders. I wonder whether the honourable member has had a look at what is happening to the British economy and what is

happening in Germany at the present time. If he had a look at the end result of all this I do not think he would be quite so enthusiastic in his praise of conditions in England.

The whole thrust of the report was about getting more and more benefits for more and more pay and more and more loadings for working different shifts; more and more benefits and less and less productivity. We know where Britain is, and Australia, on that score, compares very poorly with every oversea country. South Australia, in relation to other Australian States, fares poorly. If we have a look at the end result of the situation, we find that South Australia is now a high-cost State.

Mr. Max Brown: And we won the last election.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that we have a redistribution here which the Labor Party has managed to get through and that people can live in a fool's paradise for just so long, but when things go bad they go really bad. We know what happened on the Federal scene as a result of a Labor Government's policies. It will be an interesting situation at the end of this financial year when the State's reserves have run down. The State Government, in contradistinction to every other State in Australia, is running a deficit of \$8 400 000, and when we find our reserves are gone and unemployment is climbing faster here than in any other State, the day of reckoning may not be far away. In all areas of construction costs we are now the pace-setter.

Mr. Max Brown: That's your opinion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is statistically factual. I know that the member for Whyalla is a nice, good-hearted sort of Australian. The information appears in the September, 1977 (the most recent), report of the *Building Economist*, a publication of the Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors, which sets out that 444 single items out of about 800 cost more in South Australia than elsewhere in Australia. If the member for Whyalla wants to dispute that, he will have to take it up with the institute. That is a sign of the times in South Australia.

Even simple jobs, such as laying a concrete path, are dearer here than elsewhere in Australia. The Premier, when replying, said that we had the cheapest concrete, but something must have gone wrong somewhere along the line. If we have the cheapest concrete, and we are said to have cheap stone, because it comes from near the city (and some environmentalists want to change that), how can we have the dearest laid concrete paths and cost of erecting concrete columns and building concrete steps?

Dr. Eastick: Do you think it has something to do with the human component?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member has hit the nail on the head. This harks back to the philosophy espoused by the member for Florey, who was complaining because the West Germans were working too hard, whereas we give more and more benefits for less and less work. Although we may be living in a paradise, it is a fool's paradise.

Mr. Venning: They call it pace-setting.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but we are running down the State's reserves. We have squandered the money we received from the railways deal. At the end of the year we will have a \$18 400 000 deficit, increasing unemployment, and hope that something will turn up.

Dr. Eastick: Which paddock will they sell next?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a good question. I have another lengthy report written by Paul Johnson, a former Labor spokesman who saw the light in Britain. He writes interesting reports, and the one I have is on union domination, but time will preclude me from quoting from it.

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

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): In supporting the motion, I endorse the many remarks made by previous speakers in congratulating His Excellency the Governor on his recent appointment to that high office. South Australians are extremely fortunate in having such a person in that position, because he has shown in the past that he is a humanitarian and a man of the people, and I am sure that all members will agree that, during his term of office, he will bring credit to it.

I also congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, formally, on your election as Speaker. At all times since you have been in the Chair you have demonstrated fairness to all members, and I am sure that, during the life of this Parliament, you will continue to do so. I also congratulate the new Government members, namely, the members for Ross Smith, Newland, Morphet, and Mawson, together with the Opposition new members for Coles and Torrens.

Mr. Arnold: What about yourself?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I never sing my own praises. I also thank the member for Torrens for his interest in transport matters in my district. I appreciate his constructive concern, but it is a pity that the interest of the Leader of the Opposition in my district is not constructive but is, in his usual fashion, destructive.

In the traditional way, I will confine my remarks purely to my district, although I realise there are many areas in which I could perhaps condemn the Fraser Government for the situation it has caused in Australia. My district has enjoyed from the outset the benefits of orderly planning that have occurred going back as far as the 1950's, through the efforts of the Housing Trust and, latterly, the efforts of the Housing and Urban Affairs Department through the Land Commission. I pay a tribute to the commission for the work it has carried out not only in my district but also in the adjoining district of Elizabeth. Country members should visit Elizabeth and Napier and see the orderly planning that is a credit to this Government and to the commission, and perhaps they would not laugh if they could see what the people in those areas are being given. I am sure that the member for Light would agree with me.

Dr. Eastick: Tom Playford started it.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I gave praise to the trust, through Tom Playford. I refer now to the development of Craigmore, in relation to which the Land Commission, in conjunction with the Housing Trust, with private developers, and with local government bodies in that area, produced what is aptly described as a "community with a difference", and that is exactly what it is. Craigmore is not merely a collection of home sites but a planned community that will provide every facility for the home builder of today and tomorrow. The sites have been carefully developed to preserve the natural beauty of the area, with the unspoilt backdrop of the hills face zone. The prices of

blocks there are extremely low, and represent excellent value to people building their first house. The trust has already commenced building in that area and, from my information, there is no shortage of purchasers. In fact, the demand has exceeded the trust's expectations and has resulted in a reverse of the situation in previous years in which the demand for houses in the northern area had exceeded the demand for houses in the southern area.

The price of the blocks of land being made available to the public in phase 1 of the development is extremely low. For the 229 blocks offered, prices range from \$6 950 to \$8 200. Some of these residential allotments are being offered to the public at extremely generous terms through the State Government Insurance Commission. These terms include 10 per cent deposit with repayments over periods of five years to seven years at an interest rate of only 12 per cent, adjustable monthly. The commission's policy, on which I congratulate it, is that finance for land purchase should not carry the high rates of interest that normally apply to a buy-now pay-later basis.

Included in the price of the blocks are water, underground power, sewerage, bituminised roads, and kerbing. To sum up, Craigmore has been an exercise in planning, imaginative thinking, and active co-operation between Government departments, private enterprise, local government, and statutory bodies. I am sure we will all agree that this is absolutely necessary if this State, especially in the outer metropolitan area, is to avoid the problems of the early days caused by *ad hoc* development.

I turn to the other major development in my district, Munno Para, involving, apart from residential homes and industry, a large scale district centre which will provide the focal point for retail shopping, community facilities, and a local government centre. I should like to refer to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition in this House on November 3, when he said that this was not really wanted by local government bodies in the area. At page 698 of *Hansard*, the Leader made the following comment:

One accepts that there must be some development of that area, and the local government bodies in the area have accepted that, but not of the magnitude proposed by the Government.

I intend to inform members that that is completely untrue. The Munno Para District Council has endorsed completely the concept of full-scale development in the area. I shall quote from the Munno Para inspection day brochure. With the member for Light, I attended the inspection day. I am sure that he will back me up when I say that the members of the Munno Para District Council were giving full support for the South Australian Land Commission, the South Australian Housing Trust, and the State Government in their concept of the development north of Smithfield. They were completely enthusiastic about it. I quote from the brochure, under the heading "Munno Para District Centre" at page 7, as follows:

Following a co-operative study between the council, State Planning Authority, the South Australian Land Commission and the South Australian Housing Trust, the council has chosen a 55-hectare site abutting the Adelaide to Gawler railway line just north of Smithfield for the district centre for Munno Para.

A general and detailed location plan is included with these papers. The centre will cater for a new town of 100 000 people; is near the geographical centre of the catchment area; will be built in stages to cater for the rapid residential development; will provide a full range of community welfare,

civic and recreation facilities in addition to shopping, to meet the requirements of the population; is on land in State Government ownership; is near the railway line which, together with bus feeder services, will provide an important transport network; will give Munno Para a focal point with which the people of the district can identify; and will eventually contain a new district council office, central library, hall, recreation and community facilities.

This area of 55 hectares is north of Smithfield, and at the moment is rural land. When the district council picked this site it was fully aware that there would be full-scale development from Smithfield to Evanston Gardens. Apart from the Housing Trust and the Land Commission, private enterprise is building in the area. At no time was the Munno Para District Council against this. It was prepared to plan and it has spent more than \$16 000 on two documents—a study of the proposed site and the benefits obtainable in future from the district centre and the development. At all times, the district council was aware that there would be full-scale development, and it gave its full support to the State Government bodies. The remark of the Leader of the Opposition that local government bodies in the area were not in favour of the magnitude of the scheme is a complete untruth.

Mr. Max Brown: Perhaps the member for Light and the Leader of the Opposition could get together.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. The view of the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth, my own council, is that at no time has it had any misgivings about the proposed development north of its own local government body area. We have received full co-operation in consultation with the Munno Para District Council. We have supported its consultation with State Government bodies, and we have been asked to give our views on the proposed site. The Corporation of the City of Elizabeth gives its full backing. Again at page 698 of *Hansard*, where he spent a great deal of time talking about Munno Para, the Leader of the Opposition made the following comment:

It is a development that will compound the problems of isolation already generated by the urban sprawl. The planned city could well be too close to the existing areas of Elizabeth and Salisbury. It would compete with and detract from those centres; otherwise it will have its own possibility of development of commercial growth absolutely stymied by the close proximity of those already developed centres.

Bluntly, that is a load of hogwash. Either the Leader's research officers have not told him where the new district centre will be, or he is romancing. The site of the new district centre is well away from the Elizabeth City Centre and miles from the Salisbury District Centre. It will only enhance the facilities available for that area north from Gawler down to Salisbury and Para Hills. It is a natural extension of the Gawler corridor, a concept that, even when the member of Light was mayor of Gawler, was accepted. Development along the Main North Road up to the hills face zone was an accepted concept.

Dr. Eastick: With the exception of a green belt.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I am coming to that. Again, at page 698 the Leader talked about a green belt. He talked of a population of 100 000. No-one is denying that eventually, in another 15 years to 20 years, if the need arises there will be a population of 100 000 people. The Leader says that there can be only 33 000 dwellings. Apparently he has decided that, taking the population of 100 000 and dividing it by three, 33 000 dwellings will be needed, and

that that is a fact of life. We know that that is not right. The area of Munno Para now has a population of 25 000 people with slightly more than 4 000 homes. I think the Leader is trying to tell the House that the situation will change, purely because it enhances his argument. He states:

There would be plenty of land available as long as the existing green belts and industrial belts were ignored. Some land was zoned rural "A" in 1962 . . .

I shall read now from the location study of the Munno Para District Centre, which deals strictly with the district centre. It deals with the zoning of the complete area to be developed, as follows:

On September 12, 1974, the District Council of Munno Para gazetted zoning regulations under the Planning and Development Act. The zones defined under these regulations are shown on map 4.

On map 4 we see a typical zoning area, which takes in residential 1, residential 2, district, business, local shopping, recreation reserves—a normal zoning regulation.

Had these zoning regulations been designed to eliminate a green belt or an industrial belt they would never have been approved by the State Planning Authority. As we all know, zoning regulations are purely and simply based on model zoning regulations. For that reason, the remark made by the Leader that the only way we could get 100 000 people in the area would be to reduce the existing green belt or industrial land was a fabrication. The Munno Para District Council, like the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth, places great importance on the green belt and on planned and orderly zoning of the area. I would extend an invitation to country members to come to my district to see what green belt provision is made. Our green belt allocation to the people is only short of that of the city of Adelaide. It is something of which the Munno Para District Council and the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth are justly proud.

As reported at page 699 of *Hansard*, the Leader referred to the development of Munno Para. The remark he made there was an insult to the people of my district and to the people of Munno Para in particular. I will take much pleasure in informing the people in my district exactly what the Leader thinks of them and of the area in which they live. I was not asleep, and I could swear the Leader said, "Who wants to live in Munno Para?", but when I read *Hansard* I saw that the remark had been corrected slightly. The passage in which the remark was made is as follows:

Clearly, the Government should answer many questions, not the least of which is whether it intends to divert possibly billions of dollars of community resources to a city where, from experience, few people will prefer to live.

That is a great indictment on the present citizens of Munno Para, and on those people who have applied to live there in the future. The Leader is saying that the people of Munno Para, the people of the District of Napier, are, in effect, second-class citizens. They do not live in fancy houses close to the hills; they do not own a boat or a caravan; they are just working people. I can assure the House they are good people. I would invite the Leader to live in Munno Para or in the Napier District.

Mr. Max Brown: They'd chuck him out.

Mr. HEMMINGS: They might, but perhaps he would find that they were ordinary, decent people. As far as I am concerned, his remark in *Hansard* is an insult to the

people of my district. Come the next election I am sure that I will not need to bother about issuing a pamphlet; instead, I will just run off a few thousand copies of *Hansard* to show people in the area what the Leader thinks of them.

Mr. Max Brown: You'd better exclude the member for Light, otherwise he might get into trouble.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Had the member for Light been in the Chamber when that remark was made by the Leader he would have squirmed, as I did. I do not believe that the member for Light thinks in that way about the citizens of Munno Para. Regarding the Leader's condemnation of the development of Munno Para, I will quote from the *Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler and Munno Para News-Review* of Wednesday, September 28, 1977.

Mr. Max Brown: The worker's paper.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Not really. A report in that paper relates to the Munno Para District Council's selecting a 55-hectare site. A paragraph of that report deals with the Leader's claim before the recent election that development at Munno Para was a \$2 000 000 000 bungle. He then changed that to a \$1 000 000 000 bungle and, in *Hansard*, he came down to a \$334 000 000 bungle. We are not sure what kind of bungle it is or about what price tag we should put on it. I am sure that over the next few months he will continually change the price tag, but to him it will always be a bungle. Under the subheading "Claims dismissed", Councillor Kane (who is Chairman of the Munno Para District Council) is reported to have dismissed recent claims by the Leader of the Opposition that the plan for regional community facilities in Munno Para was a \$2 000 000 000 bungle.

On Thursday, November 3, I was fortunate to attend a reception with members of the Munno Para District Council. Understandably, I was upset by the remarks the Leader had made about my district. I mentioned them to the people present and promised that I would supply copies of *Hansard* so that they could see exactly what had been said. One gentleman on the Munno Para District Council, who I can assure the House in no way supports the Australian Labor Party but is a vocal supporter of the Liberal Party, when referring to the statement that local councils did not want this development and the remark "Who wants to live in Munno Para?" said that Mr. Tonkin must have lost his marbles. That is a statement from a person sympathetic to the Leader.

Whether the Leader has lost his marbles or whether he has any marbles at all, I do not know, but that is the view of the community, the view of people who have been involved from an early stage in trying to extend the council area of Munno Para. These people have worked completely and actively in co-operation with the Lands Commission and the Housing Trust. They know what this matter is all about and what is wanted in the area. They and I resent the fact that the development of Munno Para is being used by the Leader in an attempt to attack the Government and the Minister for Planning. As far as people in my district are concerned, that is just not on. We should try to conclude why the Leader is continually slating the development of Munno Para.

Mr. Max Brown: He's a knocker.

Mr. HEMMINGS: We could say that, because he knocks everything that the Government tries to do in

South Australia. However, let us consider more closely why the Leader is knocking this development north of Smithfield and up to Evanston Gardens. That is the key to why the Leader is knocking the Government, trying to embarrass the Minister, and trying to get publicity that the development will cost a massive sum to build homes, infrastructure and businesses. I believe that the Leader said we should forget about that development and concentrate on the inner metropolitan areas. That is the key.

We should consider the next redistribution because that will show exactly what will happen. The population of my district has almost reached its quota and it could be that, with the development of Craigmore, the population will be increased to above that quota. It is fairly obvious from the rate at which the trust is building in Munno Para West and in Munno Para and from the rate at which the M.L.C. insurance group is building in South Gawler that by the time of the next redistribution my district will have to be altered. The Leader sees the danger. He sees that there will be a change of boundaries in my district after the next redistribution, and possibly a change in the boundaries of the District of Light. It is probable that a new seat in the northern metropolitan area will be created, and, according to present voting trends, the people in that district will probably elect a Labor member. It is quite possible that we might even see the exit of the member for Light.

I think the Leader of the Opposition is politicking on this matter. He is not in the least bit interested in the people of Munno Para. He sees that, because of the building taking place in the area, a new seat will be created at the next redistribution and the incumbent of that seat will be sitting on this side of the House. That is what this business is all about; I think the Leader should be completely ashamed of himself.

After the Leader has read *Hansard* (and I assure him that I will not correct any parts of my speech), perhaps he might write an open letter to the people of Munno Para saying exactly what he meant. He, like some members of the Opposition, say things and then try to excuse themselves by saying that they did not really mean what they said, but meant something else. I ask the Leader to explain at a later date what he meant in the paragraph in which he said that few people would want to live in Munno Para.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion. I believe it is a disgrace to Her Majesty's representative to have put such a puerile statement in his hands. In the 7½ years it has been my pleasure to be in this House, I have never seen such a puerile document put forward as a Governor's Speech. I hope I will never see such a Speech in future. The Speech is supportable in one or two main areas only. I certainly restate my appreciation of the work undertaken on behalf of the State of South Australia by Mr. Walter Crocker. During the previous Address in Reply debate seven or eight weeks ago, I lauded the work he had undertaken, and I repeat those sentiments. The appreciation of the work done by Mr. Crocker for the benefit of South Australia has been recorded many times during debate in this place during the past few years. I certainly wish the new Governor and his lady a joyous term of office. I trust their health will be maintained and that they will not suffer the problems suffered by other persons who have held that office recently. It is an important office. I look forward to receiving the benefits of the present Governor's genuine interest in the welfare of the people of this State.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to your present office. I look forward to the impartiality which has so far been evident continuing during the period you occupy your office. Many changes have taken place in the membership of this House since we last met. It is a change which I find frustrating, a change which I regret in many ways. It is obvious to those of us of the class of '70 that we are back in the same position we occupied then: we are sitting on this side of the House with a membership of 20, looking at a sea of 27 faces. To have deteriorated to that degree in that period of time is most unfortunate, but it is a fact of life and some stark realities are associated with the results of the recent election to which I will refer a little later.

In making that point I regret the fact that many old faces are no longer present, some by design and some certainly not by design. I refer first to the former member for Burra and subsequently of Frome, Mr. Claude Allen. He was regarded highly by all of us who had the good fortune to know him. He was intimately involved in the large district he represented. He paved the way for my colleague, the member for Eyre, to follow. I had the pleasure of attending many public meetings at which Mr. Allen was also present. The spontaneous comment from many towns people (not necessarily those politically aligned with him) about the work undertaken by Mr. Allen and his wife has had to be experienced to be appreciated. I know they were genuine remarks on the part of those who made them.

I look forward to a long association with that gentleman, who now joins the august body of past members of this place who are now resident in my district. I refer to Senator Laucke (previously a member for Barossa), Mr. Bob Nicholson (formerly a member for Light) who, although living in Adelaide, spends much of his time at Eudunda, and Mr. J. S. Clark (the former member for Gawler and subsequently member for Elizabeth). Messrs. Dawkins and Creedon of another place also reside in the area. There is therefore a fairly large population of past, present and no doubt future members of Parliament living in my district.

I also refer to Mr. John Coumbe, who served this State well for a long time. His efforts have been lauded by the new member for Torrens. He was a Minister, a Deputy Leader of the Opposition, a member of many committees of this House and a person well versed in industrial affairs. He was regarded highly by union organisations, as is attested by the many union representatives who had the pleasure of working with him while he was Minister of Labour and Industry.

I refer to the former member for Murray, Mr. Ivon Wardle. The facts of life of the redistribution meant that several of our members did not return. I laud the work that Mr. Wardle did in turning the then seat of Murray, which was once a Labor stronghold, into a Liberal stronghold at the end of his occupancy, and in no way do I denigrate the fact that his place has been taken by another colleague, the now member for Murray. The respect with which Mr. Wardle is held in the seat of Murray, as the present member will know, is high, and I am glad for Mr. Wardle and his wife that he has been able to move into another sphere of interest in which he will serve the old folk of this State for a long time as a deputy administrator of the Resthaven organisation in South Australia.

Mr. Vandeppeer, the former member for Millicent, was with us for a short time only, but he made his presence felt. He was close to the people he represented and was highly respected throughout the District of Millicent. He,

like other of our members, was unable to return because of the reduction of the number of country seats available. He will continue to share the interests of those still here, and will look after and seek to promote the best interests of the people throughout the State, in his case more particularly those in the country.

Mr. Boundy, the former member for Goyder, came into this place, as members will recall, in a peculiar way. He was interested in the people of the Goyder District, he represented them, and he was able for the first time in the history of Parliamentary representation to justly say that he represented or lived with the bottom end. The people of Yorke Peninsula, from the time it was the seat of Yorke Peninsula and subsequently as part of Goyder, have consistently considered that representation from the lower end was needed. I have no doubt that the present new member for Goyder will, as he has been for several months, be spending a considerable time in the bottom end and representing that area equally as well as he seeks to represent others in that district.

We have heard from the new member for Ross Smith of his appreciation of the work undertaken for many years by the former member for that district. Without a doubt, when the former member for Ross Smith retired, the House lost one of its characters. The present member for Ross Smith indicated that ill health had caused the former member perhaps not to become so involved in recent times as he was earlier. Those who have been here since 1970 will recall the times on which the contribution of the then member for Ross Smith clearly indicated his perceptiveness, his interest in a good joke, even at his own expense if necessary, and some of the by-play he would get up to. I refer members to page 907 of *Hansard*, August 20, 1970. This incident followed the debate on the shopping hours issue on the previous evening; it may well have been in the early hours of the morning when we had kept going for a long time. The then member for Alexandra, who was quite incensed about certain aspects of the Government's legislation, referred to the matter as a blatant blue duck.

During Question Time the next day the then member for Ross Smith asked a question, and regrettably *Hansard* really corrected the proof so well that the "orno-orno-ornological oddity" came out only as "ornithological oddity". He asked members, and particularly the member for Alexandra, whether it was a fact that, following his introduction of the term "a blatant blue duck" last evening, that member had been to the library to research the matter. The member for Alexandra who was always, as members will recall, in on a joke, said that it was a fact that he had been to the library, had a good look around and had not found very much information about the ornithological oddity but he did find that, like the A.L.P., wherever it existed it was a pest. This was the tone of by-play that often involved the former member for Ross Smith. His comments from behind closed eyes or from behind a newspaper will be recalled by many members, and I wish him well in his retirement.

Comment has been made about the former member for Pirie. It is regrettable for him that he has been put into the position of being seen publicly as accepting a "job for the boys". Whenever former members of Parliament go out in the circumstances in which the former honourable member left this place, and accept the type of occupation that he is about to accept, they will have to bear the brunt of the criticism.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you say that about Forbes, Story, and so on?

Dr. EASTICK: I say it about any person in the type of position now being put up, in the sense of a person who takes a paid position of that nature. Concerning the Forbes and Storys and the former member for Gawler and Elizabeth, the Hon. J. S. Clark, and the former members for Chaffey, for Murray, and for Spence—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about the former member for Gumeracha?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, but I believe they are entirely different situations to the one I am describing in respect to the former member for Pirie, in that it is a full-time appointment of a policy-making nature. I believe that, when former members are able to use their expertise on boards, it is wise for the Government of the day to consider the matter. It has not always been a Liberal Government that appointed a former Liberal member, as the Labor Party has been responsible for appointing some former Liberal members and vice versa, and I do not criticise that in the sense of involvement on boards. I believe that the appointment of a former member of this House who held the distinguished position of Speaker and putting this mantle on him has caused a slur on his service.

I very sincerely offer to members on both sides who have entered this place for the first time my congratulations on their appointment. I do not necessarily congratulate those Government members for having won against candidates of my Party, but they will understand that this is a reciprocal understanding. I believe that in the visionary stakes associated with new members Opposition members have come out on top with the election of the new member for Coles, and I welcome the new member for Torrens.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In that order?

Dr. EASTICK: I cannot have them both winning the visionary stakes. If the competition was between the member for Coles and the Minister of Mines and Energy the member for Coles would win hands down. My colleague in this House who most recently resumed his seat, the member for Napier, is my immediate neighbour; we enjoy a common boundary. The only difficulty is that at the moment the roll does not recognise whose constituents are whose. There is an area between the District of Light and the District of Napier where what one might call roll cleansing is needed. It is also necessary in many other areas; indeed, it was referred to in debate three or four weeks ago during the debate on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. Gunn: The member for Light should take a dim view of it all.

Dr. EASTICK: There are some areas and pockets I would be happy to give to him. I point out to the member for Napier a fact to which he did not allude; that is, that the member for Light has consistently improved the vote in the area to which he refers and which was, on earlier occasions, always very pro-Labor. I must admit that it is the only one box in the original Light that I have never won, but I reduced the deficit of about 490 votes to a mere 17 in 1973 and about the same in 1975. If it is my good fortune in due course to collect a number of people in the development area that he is talking about, I will look forward to having the same degree of assistance and support from those people.

The member for Napier is certainly going into a district which is a far better one than it might have been if the

member for Light had not got behind and assisted the then member for Elizabeth in the removal of Mount Smithfield and in the killing of the then promoted corridor housing scheme, where houses were to be built on the basis of seven and a half to the acre in the area immediately west of Smithfield. It was one of those rare occasions when I found that a member of the Labor Party, the member for Elizabeth, and I were able to achieve something together. The area is the better for it, and I hope that the comments he makes about the orderly development of the whole of the Elizabeth and Smithfield area continue. It is, in the main, with the exception perhaps of some of the duplex places (which are one of the unfortunate aspects of the dual housing arrangements wherever it exists), a delightful spot, and it has been made so by the farsightedness of the planners who put in large numbers of trees and created some quite dramatic playing fields (dramatic in their size and frequency). Like the member for Napier, I look forward to an area becoming a green belt area and being so designated soon so that there will be no further fear in the minds of people in the areas of Napier and Light that it may suddenly disappear.

I was heartened by comments that the Minister for Planning has made on earlier occasions when, in describing future planning arrangements for South Australia, he conceded that the original 1962 metropolitan planning area might be contracted in some places. I trust that the contraction will at least be in that northern area, and undoubtedly there are spots in the south near the Minister for Education's electorate where he would want to see some contraction. I suggest that we cannot accept the situation where, because something was in a plan drawn in 1962, it necessarily has to be totally built to those original thoughts of 1962. I think that the Minister will appreciate, because of questions asked over a period, that I accepted the urgent need for work currently being undertaken by Mr. Hart and others in the Housing and Urban Affairs Department. I believe that there is an urgency in the need to make clear to the many people in both of those areas (Napier and Light) precisely what is to take place in that future development.

Earlier I mentioned the election results, and I want to say a little about them in relation to figures originally introduced into the other place by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall on October 18, 1977, under the heading "Voting details, September, 1977, Two-Party preferred A.L.P. Vote". Mr. Cornwall indicated the descending A.L.P. vote against the electorates. The Electoral Department has updated some of those figures. It has not, of course, altered the situation where the results were declared at 27 seats for the Government and 20 for the Opposition, but individual figures do need some updating. Attached to those figures I have noted, by the use of a couple of simple lines, the fact that, the break even point obviously being at 50 per cent, if we were to shift 2.5 per cent either side (that is, a 2.5 per cent loss by Labor or a 2.5 per cent loss by the Opposition), the Labor Party would lose only one seat whereas the Opposition would lose three seats. If we were to increase that to 6 per cent, there would be no difference for the Labor Party, but there would be an additional loss of a further two Opposition seats. In other words, it would become one to five. If we were to take it to 10 per cent we would find there would be a bank of 21 Labor seats where the result was in excess of 60 per cent for Labor. The same 10 per cent in the reverse direction shows that there is a bank of only 12 Opposition seats. These details are purely statistical, and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Voting Details September, 1977

District	Two-Party preferred Percentage	A.L.P. Vote
Spence	77.32	
Stuart	73.92	
Whyalla	73.20	
Elizabeth	72.35	
Semaphore	72.19	
Ross Smith	72.16	21
Napier	70.95	
Salisbury	69.50	
Price	69.39	
Peake	67.42	
Playford	67.03	
Florey	67.03	
Baudin	66.70	
Adelaide	66.21	
Albert Park	64.12	
Gilles	62.80	
Ascot Park	62.50	
Mitchell	61.40	
Hartley	60.44	
Norwood	60.23	
Unley	60.06	
Newland	59.81	
Henley Beach	59.34	
Brighton	58.07	(6)
Todd	56.51	
Mawson	56.47	
Morphett	50.35	
Coles	48.61	(1)
Mount Gambier	48.57	+ or - 2.5%
Torrens	47.50	(3)
Hanson	44.59	(1)
Eyre	44.07	+ or - 6.0%
Rocky River	41.78	(5)
Glenelg	40.54	
Chaffey	40.36	
Murray	39.97	
Fisher	39.57	
Light	39.34	
Mitcham	35.82	
Bragg	34.72	
Victoria	34.66	
Kavel	31.25	
Alexandra	31.05	
Goyder	27.29	12
Malley	27.15	
Davenport	25.82	
Flinders	25.76	

Dr. EASTICK: I mention these figures not to get into any discussion with the Minister or other members but purely and simply so that the stark reality of the situation may be seen.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If the Democrats gave out a two-sided how-to-vote card and gave their preferences to the Liberal Party, as the Liberal Movement did previously, percentages in two marginal seats (Brighton and Mawson) would alter substantially.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: It is interesting to have that comment from the Minister. We will come back to it on another occasion. I make the point that on the two party preferred vote, as they were cast and appear in the record the figures I have introduced show some rather stark realities that people in the community could well address themselves to.

I recall that, on the occasion on which we last debated the Address in Reply only a few months ago, I referred to the fact that, although we were approaching an election (we did not know then, although 24 hours later we did know) the issue which had taken us to the people in 1975, was still and still has not been satisfactorily resolved so far as the human element is concerned. Regrettably, unless the Minister for Planning or the Minister for Transport can inform the House without delay, the situation is still precisely the same, namely, those involved in the railway

system, the human resources, still do not know what will be the end result of their relative future employment and opportunities for promotion. Although they may have a general idea, they do not know what the situation will be in relation to their superannuation or how much they can commute or how much they cannot commute.

They do not know many things which are not only important to them as individuals but are extremely important to the members of their families. I once again draw the House's attention to the fact that, regardless of what the Government may have been doing in the background relative to these people, they have been shabbily treated, and it does this Government no credit for having left them in limbo for so long. I trust that the Minister has not tried to load the blame on to another Government, as his colleague did only yesterday in reply to a Question on Notice, in which he said that the problem of whether the Railways Institute would be relocated in the old railways building in premises recently vacated by the Motor Registration Division was a matter for the Australian National Railways. Notwithstanding the dozens of letters of assurance that the Premier and the Minister have given to the railway employees over a period, they have now carefully duckshoved the matter and sought to throw the responsibility for the decision on to the Australian National Railways.

Some members have addressed themselves to various aspects of what might be called the continuing uranium debate, and great play has been made from time to time by Government members on the decisions taken in this place last March. Comment has since been made of changing circumstances and attitudes and the belief held by Liberal Party members. On that occasion, I indicated my belief that we were not able to stand in the way of progress any more than anyone else had been able to do in the past. I recognise the importance of taking every step possible to safeguard the community at large, individually and collectively, and I indicated that it was my genuine belief that the undertakings, which would be forthcoming in a period of time, paralleled back to all of the other major advances through the centuries, would eventually give us an answer.

I am interested to take the matter further, and simply refer anyone who is interested in the whole matter to a contribution I made to this debate on March 30, 1977, appearing at pages 3052 to 3055 of *Hansard*. On that occasion I referred to the *Gazette and Letter to Graduates* from the University of Sydney, volume 3, No. 4, of February, 1977, a great part of which was given over to the nuclear debate. As a perusal of *Hansard* will show, one of the reports indicated the attitudes which might be expected in respect of four different classes of people who were identified as optimists, pessimists, fatalists, and idealists. In the most recent gazette, namely, volume 3, No. 5, of September, 1977, appears a letter over the name of Wilmer C. Marffy, which states:

With reference to the article in your current issue entitled "The Nuclear Debate" I wish to make the following comment. To the views of the optimist, pessimist, fatalist and idealist there is at least one other to be added, that of the scientist. An attempt to stop the development of a proven scientific advance has never succeeded. By forgoing its benefits you get the worst of both worlds; the threat remains but life will be harder, first for the poor and then for us. Problems must be faced and solved not sidestepped. The greatest risk of all is to abandon the field to those who are not interested in the risks involved at all.

Other letters also appear in the same issue of the gazette, one by the Professor of Electrical Engineering, H. K. Messerle, of the university. The letter, which makes interesting reading, is longer than the other letter but, in the totality of the debate on this issue, it bears putting into the record. It states:

Much of the present nuclear debate is emotional and lacks factual background. The prime purpose of nuclear fuel is to heat the boilers in electric power stations and generate electrical energy. The problem is then that electricity has become an essential part of our life and we can hardly be without it. The attractiveness of electricity is in its end use, it is a clean energy, versatile and environmentally attractive. Many applications of electricity are unique like radio communications, modern medical instrumentation, etc. It is even helping to stem the population explosion in underdeveloped countries by providing light and offering people alternative activities at night.

I am sure that that would suit the Minister for Planning. The letter continues:

As oil and natural gas is running out we find that electrical energy demand will grow and it is expected that by the year 2000 about 20 per cent of energy used will be consumed in electrical form. Because of losses in producing electricity this means that about one half of all primary fuels used by 2000 will be used to generate electricity. Australia has plenty of coal for its small population to cope with this problem well into the next century. The only real practical alternative fuel for many other countries is, however, nuclear and some

countries either have no indigenous fossil fuels or are already running out of reliable fuel supplies. The amount of electricity generated in the world using nuclear fuel is already many times the total power generated in Australia. Solar energy or wind power is not just uneconomical, it is definitely not a practical technological answer at this time. To stop the development of nuclear power would place hardship on major population centres in the world.

It is therefore easy to be an armchair martyr and forgo nuclear power in Australia and let others suffer for our ease of mind. There is then the question of the risk involved in developing nuclear fuels. As an engineer one confronts this type of question continuously and the Granville train disaster indicates some of the consequence.

Even walking on the footpath along a street involves taking a risk. One has to keep one's perspective right in this context and the effects of conversion to nuclear power on average life expectancy may be compared with that of a farmer spending just a few days of his life in an industrial centre which is heavily polluted.

Nuclear technology is still in its infancy and the utilization of nuclear fuel is still unbelievably inefficient. It is therefore advisable not to rush into nuclear power. The way around this dilemma is to induce man to reduce his hunger for energy. This can only be achieved by a conscious and serious effort at conservation of energy and even more effectively by reducing the world population.

The real problem goes much deeper than the question of nuclear power. It has been with us ever since man has applied his mind to adjust the environment in order to improve his living standards. We cannot stop scientific development and to single out nuclear energy and ignore for example the most lethal gadget man has ever developed—the motor car—is probably an over-reaction. But we certainly should face up to the problem of coping with advancing technology.

Again, I make no apology for having read the whole of that letter, because I believe that it is an excellent one written by a person vitally involved and vitally concerned. There are several other such people in our community, and one of them would be well known to members. Certainly, he is highly regarded throughout the world. I cannot say for certain that he is the only Australian to have won the Nobel prize for his work in Australia, and almost entirely in Australia. I refer to Sir MacFarlane Burnet, who has recently been "looking forward and looking back". That is the heading on the report in the November-December issue of *Airways* for this year. It is a publication by Qantas. Amongst many other questions relative to mankind and his interest in humanity, Sir Macfarlane Burnet was asked several questions. The report states:

On the other great debate, nuclear power, he is less sure. This statement follows comments about the concern he has expressed about organisms (bacteria and viruses) that have been acted upon by a series of controlled experiments to create, possibly, immunising agents or other types of material. He has expressed concern that they may escape and cause much trouble. The report continues:

It's a pity that there's such a thing as nuclear power but there's no escaping it. It can't just be wiped out immediately. It must be regarded as an interim solution before renewable resources come into play. I feel frankly that Australia should mine and sell its uranium, make as much profit as it can but make an absolute commitment that any profits coming to us are given to research on solar power.

That is not an unreasonable recommendation. Certainly, it is not an unreasonable commitment for a Government to make. I would be prepared to make such a commitment, because I believe that we recognise, as shown in many documents, that there is an urgent need for find the

alternative, and that alternative probably comes into the area of solar or wind, more likely solar. The report of what Sir Macfarlane says continues:

I've told people on both sides of the debate that we should mine and sell uranium, with all the precautions we can get, because it's the only source of capital with which we could undertake the really big job of getting solar energy harnessed in all its forms The sums show that radiation such as that from the French nuclear bomb tests could not have caused cancer in Australia. The idea that they were responsible for 60 cases of thyroid cancer here is silly. Radiation from nuclear power stations would be so inconspicuous and so incalculable that you couldn't say there would be more than about two extra cases of leukemia, and out of a normal incidence of 200 000 cases, you'd never spot them.

He was asked:

Accepting that nuclear power is needed as a bridge for some countries before alternative sources are developed, what if the funds Sir Macfarlane wants invested in solar power are not forthcoming? What would the prospects be like?

His reply was:

I think they'd be grim. I don't think Australia should touch nuclear power itself. We have enough coal to bridge us. There has never been a real suggestion that Australia would touch nuclear power, so he is completely in line with reality and the thinking of people of all political persuasions. The report continues:

But I think it's terribly important that somebody, and Carter is the only man who can, say what Kennedy said about putting a man on the Moon within the decade: that in 10 years we must be able to produce electricity from solar on a really big scale, 1 000-megawatt installations, and active work to make all other utilisations of solar energy viable. One of the enormous advantages of solar power is that you can decentralise it, particularly for low grade heating. And we could get almost all our energy from the sun. It could be done.

Other comments in that document add to the debate on this issue. I have a high regard for the comment of a person of the calibre and quality of Sir Macfarlane Burnet, and no-one can doubt his genuine interest in humanity, the people of Australia and, indeed, people throughout the world.

Another report which has recently been brought to my attention also advances the debate on this issue. It is entitled "Problems of storing nuclear waste are minor" and it is in *Church Scene* of October 20, 1977. The report was prepared by Mr. N. R. Evans, of Deakin University, Victoria, and it has been referred to me by a Church of England clergyman. The report states:

The Rev. G. W. Christopher may well be pleased at having "got on record how we, (the South Australian Diocese of the Murray), feel about uranium and its terrifying possibilities" but informed readers of *Church Scene* (8.9.77) can only groan with embarrassment at realising how little the synod there actually knows about uranium.

The overwhelming consensus amongst those engineers and scientists who are concerned with present day power systems and with the planning of the power systems of the next few decades is that unless the breeder reactor programs now under way in Britain, Western Europe, and Japan are steadily implemented, there will, by the end of the century, be acute energy shortages throughout the whole of the non-communist world. The social consequences of this can only be compared to those of wholesale and widespread famine of earlier times. Our civilisation today is as dependent on cheap and abundant energy supplies as the societies of previous centuries were dependent on successful harvests.

Whatever minor problems of storage of nuclear waste arise, (and they have been magnified and distorted by people who have not the slightest competence in the area), these problems pale into insignificance besides the social and political problems that will arise when the domestic lights go out and the factories become silent, because of lack of fuel to keep the power systems going.

The Rev. Christopher is quoted as saying "uranium would pollute the earth with the most toxic substance ever known".

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Dr. EASTICK: The letter from Mr. N. R. Evans continues as follows:

Presumably he is not talking about uranium itself—as this element is already present in the earth in substantial amounts—there is almost as much uranium in the earth's crust as there is lead. If he is talking about plutonium, which is the fuel produced by the breeder reactors, he may be comforted to know that he would have to swallow a good tablespoonful of plutonium before being sure of a quick death. I would be surprised if the Rev. Christopher hasn't got some garden sprays in his tool-shed which are just as toxic, perhaps even more so, than that. Furthermore, it is worth pointing out in this context, that, as a result of the testing of nuclear weapons, about 10 000 lb. of plutonium in the form of finely divided dust has fallen on the earth's surface since 1945 and it has been determined that the lung burden from fallout of plutonium in the USA amounts to 0.2 picocurie. Since many water supply systems have radiation levels greater than 5 picocuries per litre due to the presence of radium 226, we can form a judgment of the significance of the effect of this existing plutonium dispersal.

This story of a resolution passed at a diocesan synod in South Australia is, I suppose, a foretaste of things to come; and at synods great and small throughout the nation in the months ahead, people will be urged to take a so-called "Christian" stand on the mining of uranium.

It is to be hoped that the warm feelings that are generated through the passing of noble sounding resolutions will not be regarded as a satisfactory substitute for the homework that is required if the facts of the case are to be understood. And if synods are to consider resolutions of this kind, there is, I think, an obligation to acquire a greater mastery of the facts than that displayed by the South Australian Diocese of the Murray.

One is at liberty to accept that concerned people will have a view without their being attacked on their beliefs or their Christianity. I believe that is the point Mr. Evans makes: it is necessary to be informed on these matters and not to become emotionally involved without doing at least some homework. I hope that the comments which I have added to this debate will be seen in that most important light.

In discussing this matter, I said, first and foremost, that I do not believe we can stand in the face of progress. Changing tack on subject matter, but equally believing that we cannot stand in the face of progress, I refer now to the situation besetting the quarter-horse fraternity in South Australia. Representations have been made to the principal racing club and other racing clubs in South Australia, pointing out that the quarter-horse is a fact of life, that it is here to stay, that it provides enormous entertainment, and that its integration into racing programmes for the recognised thoroughbred meetings would enhance the meetings and assist in winning people back to the racing industry.

I do not suggest that the racing industry is not a big one. I have said so in this House. However, like many other

sporting organisations, it is finding difficulty in maintaining its public image and in retaining public participation. I sincerely recommend to those responsible for the thoroughbred racing industry that they should recognise that quarter-horse racing is being accepted in other States and in other places. Most of the quarter-horses and the part quarter-horses in this State have been developed from the thoroughbred. It is not a quarter-horse race as such. The members of the fraternity are looking for the conduct of short distance sprint races of four furlongs to five furlongs. I believe that it has been proved around the world as a means of attracting interest to the racing industry, and I hope that the people who are vitally concerned will receive better assistance than they have been receiving until now.

During the grievance debate last night, (*Hansard*, pages 776-7) I referred to the stray dog problem in South Australia. I referred members to comments associated with the report from Sydney. I want to come back to one or two aspects of the matter, and I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it, as a matter of statistical detail, a brief table appearing in the Australian Veterinary Association Newsletter of October 27, 1977, relating to the number of dogs and cats in proportion to the human population in various countries of the world.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member guarantee that the information is purely statistical?

Dr. EASTICK: That is so.
Leave granted.

Proportion of Dogs and Cats to Human Population

	USA	Australia	United Kingdom	Canada	West Germany	South Africa	Holland	New Zealand
Dogs/People	1:6.2	1:8.9	1:9.4	—	1:25.2	—	1:15.1	—
Cats/People	1:6.2	1:10.8	1:12.4	—	1:26.5	—	1:15.1	—

Dr. EASTICK: The table indicates that in the U.S.A. there is one dog for each 6.2 persons; the same proportion applies for cats. In Australia, the figure is one dog for every 8.9 persons and one cat for every 10.8 persons. The figures give a clear indication of the magnitude of the problem. I referred to the number of dogs being destroyed in New South Wales, and I refer briefly to the annual report for 1976-77 of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, South Australian Branch. That publication contains statistical detail of the number of calls in which the organisation was involved during the 1976-77 year. The information is statistical, and I seek leave to

have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.
Leave granted.

Reports and Inspections

Received and actioned by the headquarters of the society, 3 918. This total does not include reports received and actioned by the society's honorary inspectors and branches. Each case of alleged ill-treatment investigated may concern more than one animal. Revisits to owners of neglected animals are not detailed but, of necessity, are made in approximately 27 per cent of the cases reported.

	Dogs	Cats	Horses	Sheep	Cattle	Birds	Native and Various	TOTAL
Destroyed sick and injured	206	461	14	475	34	102	53	1 345
Veterinary attention arranged	86	12	12	6	2	71	14	203
Rescued and Released/Returned to owners/New homes found	479	71	4	19	1	80	23	677
Cases of alleged ill-treatment investigated	784	126	146	84	99	61	91	1 391
Dead on arrival/Gone on arrival	149	76	3	5	3	49	17	302

Dr. EASTICK: The report emphasises the tremendous number of stray dogs and cats put down each year because of the failure of the owners to fulfil their responsibility to the animals. It is a matter which we must look at, and one to which the Government has been giving attention. Working parties have been established. I understand that people who are vitally involved with the problem have been in touch with the Government. I can report, although I do not do so with any favour, that the Mitcham Dogs

Home, at Lynton, will close for the receipt of stray dogs from South Australian councils on December 31. On February 15 next it will close for the receipt of those dogs which have been booked in for boarding commitments. On February 28 next it will cease to be in the possession of the people who conduct the Dogs Rescue Home, and it will no longer be available for the assistance it has given to councils and other organisations in the control of stray dogs.

It is absolutely essential that another facility of this nature be provided with a minimum of delay. because I hazard a guess that without such a facility many dogs and cats will have to be destroyed on the spot because a central facility will not be available to control them. Although the number of reclaimed animals is small, at least in many cases (often reported in the newspaper) a dog or cat which has strayed and which has been the companion to a child or a person confined to his home is reunited with its owner; that is, a genuinely lost pet as opposed to the abandoned pet (an action that occurs especially at holiday and registration times) a hold-off period is required between the picking up of the animal and the possible reclamation of it before the death penalty becomes mandatory.

The Government has a responsibility to act quickly in this matter, having regard to the importance of animals to many members of the community. It must recognise that, although some people in the community will abandon responsibility, others will benefit from the companionship of animals.

Last evening I referred to a report in the *Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler and Munno Para News-Review* of October 28 that dealt with a problem associated with dogs. Under the heading "It makes your blood boil!" in the same paper the following report appears:

Last week while walking in one of Salisbury's beautiful parks I came across the mutilated bodies of a hare and a possum. There is only one conclusion to be drawn and that is hunting dogs have been "blooded" there. I know that dog-racing authorities take a dim view of such practices, but the "bleeding" boys get up pretty early in the morning, and are hard to catch.

That real possibility was expressed when an inquiry in relation to dog-racing was instigated. Members from both sides and people in the industry indicated clearly that they would not tolerate the situation referred to. Regrettably from time to time evidence has arisen of people who lack responsibility and become involved in such activities.

That practice occurs not only in South Australia. At the most recent Queensland election both the Liberal party and the Labor party made clear that they recognised that this activity was a problem in Queensland, and both Party Leaders committed their members to solving the problem. Again I refer to the article which appears in *Comment*, volume 7, No. 6, of October, 1977, and which is produced by the Uncle Ben organisation. That article indicates that Queensland plans action on animal abuse. It states:

More effective ways to catch animal abusers and increased penalties for offenders have been called for by Queensland Treasurer and Racing Minister, Mr. W. E. Knox, and Opposition Leader, Mr. Tom Burns.

Other details are given in the article. Regrettably people of this type of low intelligence and lack of humanity exist in the community. The comment in the *News-Review* indicates that they are also in South Australia.

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

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I take this opportunity of wishing our new Governor, Mr. Keith Seaman, well in his new post and trust that both His Excellency and Mrs. Seaman gain much satisfaction and pleasure as they carry out their duties on behalf of Queen Elizabeth II for her subjects in South Australia. I express those wishes on behalf of the people of my district.

I join with His Excellency in expressing appreciation for the way the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Crocker, carried out his duties as Head of State in the period intervening

between the forced retirement of Sir Douglas Nicholls and the appointment of our new Governor.

The brevity of the Speech (about three paragraphs I believe it was) by His Excellency in opening Parliament somewhat surprised me. The people of South Australia deserve to be told what a new Government intends to do with their destiny during its term in office.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment as Speaker. I know that you will treat this, the highest position in the House, with dignity and that you will carry out your duties in a fair-minded manner and with respect for members on both sides of the House.

I also congratulate new members on both sides of the House for the contribution they have made already, especially in this debate. In particular, it is pleasing to have a member of the fairer sex on this side again. I wish her, as I wish the member for Torrens, well in the commencement of their political careers.

In being elected the new member for Murray I know that I will follow in the footsteps of a Parliamentarian who served his constituents well during his time in this place. In the period of almost 10 years that he served the people of Murray, Mr. Wardle won their respect, and his dedication has been appreciated, as was reflected in the ballot boxes during that time. Having won the seat from the Labor Party, he gradually increased his majority as he worked for and personally assisted so many people in his district. I wish both Ivon and Dorothy well in the years ahead.

That two colleagues were forced to become rivals during the recent election was most unfortunate: it was a direct result of the boundaries redistribution and, more particularly, the terms of reference set down by the Government for the redistribution. The propaganda surrounding one vote one value at the time of the introduction of that legislation was successful in confusing the people of this State and was yet another example of the political opportunism on the part of the Government. To most people who did not stop to think, one vote one value was promoted as being the epitome of equal representation. It is only now and in the future that people will have the opportunity to ascertain for themselves just how misleading is this concept, and country constituents in particular cannot be represented as well as their counterparts in the metropolitan area.

In drawing attention to my own district I am very much aware that Murray is easier to represent than some of the districts served by my colleagues on this side of the House. However, the increase in the area of the new seat of Murray has brought with it real problems when one wants to represent equally all the people in that district. The Government has seen fit to limit each district, whatever its size, to one electorate office for each member. Naturally, in my own district, the obvious population concentration demands that my electorate office be in Murray Bridge. I enjoy working in that town and will continue to do so.

Unfortunately, however, there is no way I can expect the people of Mount Barker, Hahndorf, Woodside, or anywhere else throughout the Hills area to drive to Murray Bridge to visit their local member. Therefore, there is an immediate breakdown in communication, and I believe communication to be important for proper representation. The new District of Murray is an area that before the redistribution was served by two electorate offices. I have always encouraged people to make use of my office so that good communication could be achieved between the people and their Parliamentary representative. I have always encouraged people to come to my office or to see me not only with problems but also with suggestions that may improve the situation in the district

or the State, or for the people of South Australia generally. Now the situation is almost impossible to promote, not because of the boundaries drawn by the Royal Commission (which was an independent tribunal), but because of the terms of reference set down by the Labor Government.

We have a situation in which country members are restricted in the way they represent their district because of the vast distances to be travelled, and many inconveniences result from that excessive travelling, whilst people in the metropolitan area are served by members who, I suggest, could serve the district by push-bike, if they so desired. Once again country people have suffered as a result of the actions of the Dunstan Government which sees its survival, limited though it may be, dependent on the metropolitan area where at present the votes are.

While on the subject of redistribution, I refer again to the removal of the name "Heysen" from the electoral system in this State. I have referred to this matter previously, but I say again how disappointed I am, as are many thousands of people in South Australia, that the Commission was not able to retain the name "Heysen", especially in this year that we in South Australia are celebrating the centenary of the birth of that great artist and great Australian. I hope that, when it becomes necessary for a new seat to be introduced into the system, those responsible will consider seriously acknowledging the work of Sir Hans Heysen by recognising his contribution to the State by naming a district after him. For this to take place in the Adelaide Hills, in what I would refer to as real Heysen country, would be a fitting memorial in that beautiful part of South Australia. I look forward to becoming more involved in my new electorate of Murray.

At present, this State is in the grip of a very severe drought and its consequences, and I suggest that this situation is much more serious than is recognised by the State Government. I am particularly concerned about what was referred to by the President of the Stockowners Association as staggering mismanagement by the South Australian Government, which has denied drought-affected farmers access to at least \$700 000 in interest-free Federal Government loans. The Budget document states:

As a practical token of our concern, we—
and I refer to the State Government—
have included in the Budget almost \$12 000 000 for a drought relief programme.

I suggest that this is a misleading statement, and I point out that \$10 000 000 of that \$12 000 000 came from the Federal Government. This is yet another example of the misleading statements that are handed out by the Government at present. The situation now is extremely serious, and many people in my district are facing their third bad year in succession. It concerns me particularly that a number of young farmers are being forced to walk off their properties at this time. It is interesting to note that, in Australia generally during the past five years, the average real income for each farm has fallen by 40 per cent. As a result rural holdings in Australia have fallen from 252 000 in 1969-70, to fewer than 240 000 today.

One of the major concerns is that, at present, many people on the land cannot afford to put back what should be put back into the ground in the way of elements. Many people are living from day to day in regard to their properties, and this situation will have its effect in time to come. I was interested to read as part of the state of the State, a series of articles published by the *Advertiser* recently, an article "Rural backlash hits home" by the *Advertiser* rural affairs editor, Jim McCarter. A section of that article states:

There's an old saying in Australia that when things are "crook" down on the farm, they're not likely to be good anywhere else. The truth of that saying is being brought home to South Australia's urban community today as the stranglehold of drought, high prices and falling or low returns intensifies the squeeze on our hard-pressed farm community. That it's not simply a rural problem is highlighted by the mass staff lay-offs by city-based farm machinery manufacturers Horwood Bagshaw Limited., and John Shearer Limited.

The message will be driven home much more forcibly in coming months when consumers have to pay appreciably higher prices for many basic foods, especially meat, because of the drought. About 85 per cent of the State is affected by the drought, which is having a devastating effect on livestock industries. Already, on-farm fodder reserves are approaching bankruptcy having been estimated in mid-September at only 1 100 tonnes of wheat, 8 000 tonnes of feed barley and 110 000 tonnes of hay.

Normal on-farm reserves in January—still two months away—are 30 000 tonnes of wheat, 40 000 to 50 000 tonnes of barley and 706 000 tonnes of hay. As a result graziers are quitting all but a basic breeding nucleus in most districts. Predictions are that the State sheep flock will be down to about 14 000 000 head by March 31 next year—the lowest level in 21 years . . .

High costs and uncertainty about the future are also maintaining the overall decline in the South Australian dairy industry . . . The State's lucerne growers appear to have a tremendous unsatisfied demand for their seed production (there is reported to be hardly any seed of conventional varieties left unsold in Australia) but at the same time they are under grave threat from new pest aphids detected here for the first time earlier this year.

The parts of the article that I have read emphasise the situation that we find on the land at present. Only in the past week I have had glaring examples from cattle producers and fruitgrowers who are finding their returns, or the money they receive for their produce, is less than the money they pay out in costs and charges. For the sale of cattle, several instances show that the money received is less than the cost they have to pay for commission, cattle duty, yard fees, cartage, transport insurance, etc. The same conditions apply to many people on the river, especially fruitgrowers in that area, because so often the costs are more than they hope to receive for the fruit.

Drought conditions have prevailed for some considerable time, and as the reserves of the farming community diminish so a greater demand will arise for State and Commonwealth assistance. The seriousness of this situation and the drop in demand for manufactured commodities, due on the one hand to the present financial straits of the primary producer and, on the other, to higher wage demands, is spotlighted by the unemployment crisis which has arisen in a number of areas. I particularly mention the situation in Mannum, in my electorate, as an example. The situation in that town (and I repeat that it is only one of a number of towns affected in the same way) is extremely grave.

I now move away from that subject to general matters. In my Address in Reply speech a few weeks ago I referred to the encroachment of Government on what I referred to as our personal and business lives. We wonder whether, in fact, self-reliance will still be a virtue or whether our future generations will be caught up in the web of Government dependency and perhaps cradle to the grave security. We also wonder whether our future will be one of sound guidance and leadership from those who would learn from us, from a people with character and integrity, or whether we will find ourselves morally bankrupt. It would only be those who see life through rose-coloured glasses who cannot see and appreciate the many problems and

concerns that face us at this time in this country and in this State—the energy problem and our fumbling and counter-productive attempts to deal with it, the uncontrolled power of unions and the abuse of that power, the intrusion into our personal and business lives by Governments, and the conflict at the present time between social goals and individual freedoms.

My main concern at the present time, however, is the attitude that so many people have come to adopt in our society today, an attitude which begins with condoning moral degeneration and fiscal irresponsibility, which in turn pervades our actions and many of our policies. It is, I believe, this attitude and its effects that put us in more danger today than any possible nuclear war; in other words, self destruction. Surely we are most immediately threatened by our endless demands, the indulgence of every desire and every demand, without care, without regard, without responsibility and without concern for costs or consequences, endless demands and endless excesses.

Recently, Sir Mark Oliphant, who of course is well known to all people in this State, gave the stocktaking of the environment and stressed the continuing need for conservation, at a luncheon address in Melbourne prior to retiring as the President of the A.C.F. I will quote from a section of the address that he gave on that occasion. He concluded that address by saying:

The abrasive, devastating influence of human greed expressed as extreme materialism, and our inability to do away with war as a means of settling international disputes, is our greatest enemy.

I believe that the increased load on the productivity base is directly attributable to the enormous growth in both Federal and State Governments, and their growth is in turn the result of a change in thought and attitude in our concept of the role of Government and our expectations. An article written recently by B. A. Santamaria in relation to problems facing Australia as a country, and the people of Australia, under the heading "social spending", stated:

The proportion of Federal budgetary expenditure devoted to education, health, social security and welfare has risen from 25.3 per cent in 1967-68 to 46.7 per cent in 1977-78. It has had little or no effect on the incidence of poverty. The increase has, however, accompanied a rise in the percentage of married women in the workforce from 27.4 per cent in 1966 to 41 per cent today.

There is a relationship between the two sets of figures—the withdrawal of the mother from the home throwing the cost of her irreplaceable functions on to consolidated revenue; just as there is a relationship between the proportion of married women in the workforce and youth unemployment.

There are methods of handling the problem: but it must first of all be recognised as a problem.

The article concluded:

In my view the next three years will quite conceivably be the last available to us to get Australia on to the rails once again. Time does run out.

We have reached the stage today where vast sums of money are being devoted to the single purpose of welfare, both Federally and in this State. As an Australian, I feel an urgent sense of responsibility for other citizens who are ill, handicapped, too old or too infirm to work, and I accept a real responsibility for those who genuinely cannot find work, particularly young people seeking a satisfactory vocation which will enable them to prove themselves, as young people must, and to take a proper stand in society today.

However, with welfare generally I wonder what the outcome would be if we could obtain an honest accounting of the need for, and benefits of, our expanding protections

against the cost of protection itself; the direct costs and indirect costs in terms of prices and inflation, for example. But in accepting this responsibility for others who need genuine assistance, I do believe, unfortunately, that today there are far too many people riding in the waggon who are capable of pulling it.

I see in welfare today that much more emphasis needs to be placed on the alternative that puts the welfare recipient and the money to work—a situation in which, under a structured and closely supervised setting, those on benefits are able to gain the experience, training and confidence they need to get out of the welfare system and into the mainstream of our economy. Of course, in the process they would be doing valuable work.

Statistics and surveys show that for many people non-participation as productive members of our economy is not temporary, nor is it explainable by physical handicap or disability, on-the-job injury, old age or plain laziness. These non-participants include ex-offenders, out-of-school teenagers, present and former drug addicts or alcoholics, the mentally ill, the partially disabled, single parents with young children, and others lacking skill, training, experience or opportunity who can be classified as unemployed. Because their situations are only slightly affected by changes in the economy, they have little hope of finding lasting employment. They have come to be part of a permanent welfare population. Welfare payments maintain these people but do not move them towards self-sufficiency. In the past money spent on welfare has been used in a way that has few long-range returns.

In the past, money spent on welfare has been used in a way that has few long-range returns. It has been like a man who has an oil leak in his car and who keeps buying oil instead of paying a mechanic to fix the leak. Today, we need to be looking at welfare payments as being not just sustenance grants but as a means to provide support work for people obviously considered unemployable.

Some of the elderly and some now classified as totally disabled, including some who are retarded, are still able and willing to do useful work. The goal need not be to remove them from the welfare rolls, but it should be to enable them to supplement their welfare payments while doing work which satisfies them and which is useful to society. Welfare subsidies could be diverted to maintain these people in productive employment in sheltered workshops, and we have some examples of this in this State at present, and it is working extremely well. I believe however, that much more could be done in this field.

I suggest that it might be possible to train and employ welfare people as practical nurses, transportation escorts, or to assist with shopping and other services for people who would otherwise be in nursing homes. I believe that much of the money provided in assisting nursing homes could be diverted to home care and day care, which from both a human and cost-benefit standpoint are more desirable than, shall we say, storing the elderly and disabled in institutions. In other words, I believe that we need to move away from the traditional or old approach to welfare that we have known for so long under a guaranteed annual income from Government, both Federal and State, towards a system that would prepare them voluntarily to move off welfare and into the labour force. In other words, welfare subsidies could become an investment for the future rather than a grudging payment for failure.

I also believe that more support and development needs to be given to involvement in the voluntary sector within the community. I believe that there is a real place and, indeed, a real need for a non-Government welfare sector in social development activities and, at this point, I commend the work and research that have been carried

out into the field of voluntary assistance by the South Australian Council of Social Service, and quote from the council's Thirtieth Annual Report, 1976-77, under the heading "Voluntary sector support and development", as follows:

This involvement has focused on support to voluntary organisations, both in the development of skills and in the evaluation of their services. The unit directors have been very aware of the limited resources available to voluntary organisations and the many demands upon them, and continue to view a project of this nature as vital, to assist in the maintenance of a strong non-Government role in welfare in South Australia. The unit has brought voluntary organisations together to examine areas of common concern, and formed task forces to look at issues like children of handicapped parents, emergency relief for youth, and adoptions.

In other areas, work has been undertaken with Government (particularly the Department for Community Welfare) to look co-operatively at common concerns, including youth homes and funding of non-recreationally oriented youth-work programmes. Throughout the year, SACOSS has consulted with various voluntary agencies and offered technical assistance, in areas like information provision and policy development. Through activities like the combined charities Christmas card and gift shop, the council has provided opportunities for voluntary organisations to raise funds.

The council's concern about the place of the non-Government welfare sector in social development activities, and its future viability, will remain a priority in the new financial year.

As I said earlier, I commend SACOSS for its contribution in assisting the development and operation of statutory and voluntary organisations engaged in social welfare activities.

I also take this opportunity to discuss briefly matters relating to the treatment of juvenile offenders in South Australia, and to express a particular concern relating to the treatment of them, particularly as regards the numbers of offenders being returned to institutions for the second, third, and successive times. Two matters, in particular, relate to punishment and restitution. I believe a real need exists for treatment to include emphasis on behavioural change based on reasonable and generally accepted community standards. Young people who offend should be educated, in some cases directed to make restitution; in other words, damage caused should be paid for. Loss or suffering by the offended should be acknowledged and appropriate restitution ordered and, whenever possible, supervised, because I believe that one way in which we should change the behaviour of young offenders today is through persistent recourse to worthwhile alternatives based on standards generally accepted in our community.

This could also be achieved through consistent relationships with staff and volunteers who are not only seem to be talking about such standards but who actually attempt to live out such standards themselves before the young people as an example. I believe that Governments today need to take more responsible action for the curbing of influences in the community that are leading juveniles into permissive and deviant behaviour. I believe that television has a major responsibility in shaping the behaviour of our community. I believe there is a real relationship to the incidence of sexual crime and the promotion of R classification movies that fantasise abnormal sexual behaviour or portray abnormal behaviour as normal to be desired and, indeed, followed.

The extended hours of hotel trading and entertainments attracting young people, now permitted with the lower

age, makes, I suggest, under-age drinking more difficult to detect, thus tending to aggravate social problems. The relationship of crime to alcohol is well known, and experience has shown that it is much higher than we, as a society, dare to realise. Alcohol is regarded as something of a sacred cow, but the day is fast approaching when the average citizen may realise the social problems being caused. There are readily available statistics for anyone to peruse. I realise the difficulty that we, as politicians, face in daring to want to reverse permissive trends in our society, but these are the areas where, I believe, the rot has really set in. Any effective work in regaining a wholesome society must really start in these unpopular areas.

I refer now to another concern which I have and which, I believe, is shared by many South Australians and, in fact, by many Australians. That relates to the union movement and the vast unbridled power it possesses which is, in fact, a real threat to the freedom of all Australians. I am well aware that the union movement has made a significant contribution to the growth of this country, the improvement of working conditions, and the balancing of labour-management relationships. Unions, combined with a free enterprise system, and business both small and large, have created a vast middle class of Australians who tend to make up the backbone of our country as we know it today.

I believe it is now time however, to curb the power of union leadership and return the control of unions to the union members. The average member in unions today no longer has a voice. He is the forgotten man in the union movement. Today, union leaders hold the power to bring our country to its knees at any given time. They have the power to shut down any industry and all industry, disrupt any transportation and all transportation, or bankrupt any major company or companies. We have reached the stage where even elected representatives in this House are unable, or afraid, to act without the sanction of union leadership. I am of the opinion that such men have Ministerial responsibilities in this Government. I believe that no group should have such power in what we would hope is still a free Australia.

In this State today (in fact, in Australia generally) we have two fundamental political philosophies. One believes in decentralisation of political power: the other in centralised power. One believes in maximum freedom for the individual: the other in maximum control by bureaucracy. Freedom symbolises the character and the way of life of the average Australian. Our earlier settlers came to Australia in search of freedom, and perhaps some of the later settlers did too.

"Give a mate a fair go" is an expression which has grown up with this country and its people. Mateship, a fair go, co-operation, and team spirit feature prominently throughout Australian history. It is a very important part of the Australian way of life today. To me, Liberalism is an approach to life and, as a Liberal, I believe that my individual liberty is my most precious possession. I believe in a society which is a free association of individuals who believe that everyone has the right to develop his own personality and choose his own way of life, subject to the rights of others, freedom of speech, freedom of association, equality before the law, with all people being given equal opportunities. Socialism, on the other hand, of course, attempts to make all people equal by building up and pulling down to the same level.

I do not believe in blackmail through compulsory unionism. Liberalism aims to create an environment in which economic freedom can flourish. It recognises that free enterprise is the key factor in achieving general

economic progress. For economic freedom to exist, we believe in freedom of enterprise, freedom of contact, and we believe that the profit motive is an important means of rewarding and sustaining individual effort. I believe that the first step towards success in any job one does is to be interested in that job and have the incentive to do a good day's work for a good day's pay. Economic and social freedoms naturally hinge on freedom of the individual. It has been said that freedom of choice on the part of the individual is so basic to our society that, whatever controls and restrictions are introduced, freedom will be of the greatest importance in the year 2000.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the motion, and am conscious of the fact that this is the 43rd Parliament of South Australia. I think it is 13 years since I came here, and I have taken part, successfully, in six elections. I do not know the recipe for that, but I am sure that it is not through making long speeches in this place. If I was in the illustrious position that the Government is in, with the numbers it has, I might be growled at more than the Deputy Premier is from time to time. However, that is part of the business of government.

We are in a changed ball game, in regard to the rural people. In the South-East, the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Allison) and I are doing the work that hitherto has been done by three members. The distances are long and the calls are many. We find that the one vote one value system, in practice, is a different ball game. I was interested this afternoon to hear the member for the new District of Napier tapping the sounding board and suggesting that, under the Electoral Act as we now have it, the piece of country that is now his hallowed ground, will have another member covering part of the area, and he still expects to hold his district. That will happen at the expense of country people.

I hope the Government will see the need to increase the number of members here, because, if the situation we have had in the past few weeks continues, we will be looking for more members in the country areas. There are always people to take the place of others, but they will find out that 24 hours in the day are not enough.

The District of Eyre comprises about 80 per cent of the State, and the District of Mallee reaches from south of Millicent to within 25 miles of the General Post Office in Adelaide, and it extends up to near the Murray River, well on the way to Mildura. The next big electorate is the District of Flinders. Those three districts take in most of the State, and sandwiched in are seven or eight country districts that we are privileged and proud to serve.

However, the task is big and difficult, and it is difficult to attend engagements in both the north and south of the district. I have made arrangements to attend functions in the north and the south of the district on the same day during the next couple of weeks and that will involve my driving about 400 miles. I am sure the member for Napier does not intend that. The one vote one value system is affecting the service that country members can give their electors.

My colleagues have mentioned that the Speech of His Excellency the Governor was the shortest opening speech on record. If the Governor had butterflies, he did not have them for long. I suppose that is one way to cut one's teeth in making a maiden speech, this one being of only four paragraphs. Therefore, it is not easy for me to make a speech on the Governor's Speech. Bill Quirke, a former member of this place, came into the Chamber without notes and was asked to speak. He took up the Governor's Speech and went through the entire address. This was on a Thursday afternoon, and he kept the House until the bells rang, and then we came back after dinner and he made a

long speech, exceeded, I think, only by the former member for Wallaroo, who spoke for four hours.

I extend my congratulations to His Excellency on his appointment. His Excellency Keith Douglas Seaman, O.B.E., B.A., LL.B., is a man of letters, a man who has well served his church and his community. In this high office, he seems to be the odd man out. We know the attitude of the Government to knighthoods, and I do not suppose His Excellency will receive a knighthood, but I place on record that it would be fitting to see him as Sir Keith Seaman. I think the member for Gilles agrees with me, but we know the attitude of the Government to what it calls an anachronism. However, if a man is good enough to be appointed to the office he should be good enough to be knighted.

Walter Crocker has served with distinction for a long period as Lieutenant-Governor following the unfortunate illness of Sir Douglas Nicholls, whom we acknowledge as a great Australian. Sir Mark Oliphant, who retired from office not long ago, left us with fond memories.

Mr. Max Brown: I didn't think he was a friend—

Mr. RODDA: He was a great friend of South Australia.

Mr. Max Brown: I didn't think he was a friend of your people when he marched—

Mr. RODDA: We hear much talk of civil liberties, and I would not stop people from doing what they wanted to do as long as they did not interfere with someone else. That is my approach to the matter mentioned by the member for Whyalla.

I join with my colleagues in welcoming new members. On this side, we have the member for Coles and the member for Torrens. On the Government benches, we have the member for Ross Smith, the member for Mawson, the member for Morphett, the member for Napier, and the member for Newland. To those new members I extend a welcome and the hand of friendship. Although they may find this place a little unfriendly, before the forty-third Parliament has run its course there will be social occasions on which people can get to know one another. I am sure you will agree, Sir, that throughout the South Australian Parliament there is a great mutual regard for people as persons. South Australia has been renowned for that attitude; long may it continue.

I endorse the remarks of those who have paid a tribute to former members. I was the Whip when Mr. Allen and Mr. Wardle came into this place in 1968. Both were men of great attainment in their professions. They have served the Parliament and South Australia well, and they will continue to do so. Mr. Boundy and Mr. Vandeppeer came on the scene a little later, and it is unfortunate that the redistribution of which I spoke is responsible for their no longer being here. I hope that, in due time, they will again be present in this Parliament. John Coumbe came to Parliament in 1956. He is a dedicated South Australian who can look with pride on the service he has given to the State. Mr. Connelly, our former Speaker, won for himself a place in history. On the first occasion on which he saw Parliament in session he was presiding over it. That is probably a case for the *Guinness Book of Records*. He, too, became a victim of the redistribution of boundaries.

My interest in the Opposition shadow Cabinet concerns agriculture. As the member for Murray has said, South Australia generally is in the grip of a severe drought, although some areas have had rain at the right time and excellent crops have resulted. This is a paradox in a dry season, but it shows the great fertility of South Australia and points the way to the better days which we hope will follow. However, it seems that we are in a dry cycle, and we must prepare for the worst.

I was interested in the comments of Sir Norman Young

yesterday in giving his report as Chairman of Elder Smith-Goldsbrough Mort Ltd. Speaking of the season and the way in which it was unfolding, he said that most parts of South Australia had had insufficient rain and that the northern part of Eyre Peninsula and the Murray Mallee were particularly dry. The poor season was reflected in the latest estimate of the wheat harvest of 520 000 tonnes, which was down by 26 per cent on the official estimate only a few weeks ago. That estimate could be optimistic. In the upper portion of the lower South-East, crops have deteriorated, and much of the cereal crop has been cut for hay. The grain forming in the head is pinched and has gone off, and so the vigilant farmer has cut it for hay whilst it is in the milky stage to take advantage of the pre-grain condition of the growth of the plant, thus making the best of a poor deal. Sir Norman pointed out that wool and livestock had been a welcome improvement for his company's income. The average price of wool was \$271 a bale, an increase of 28 per cent, while the average price of sheep was \$8.77, an increase of 55 per cent. Cattle prices also had shown an increase.

Aggravating the cattle industry are the drought conditions, which are forcing many stock to the market. Farmers at some of the big sales in South-Eastern areas are getting prices today—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. RODDA: The bright spot on the rural scene is the wool clip. A great tribute must be paid to the South Australian wool producers for that. The advent of broad spectrum ventures is enabling the wool animal to make full and proper use of the meagre feed that is available to him, and some excellent wool clips will occur notwithstanding the bad drought conditions that exist. Great credit can be given to researchers in the research and development departments for what they have discovered recently in this important branch of animal husbandry.

Fodder conservation is the front line of next season's rural production. Whilst we will be looking for an early opening to the 1978 season we are mindful and painfully aware of the need for sound management and animal husbandry on the highest plane. These two factors combined will be required to get stock through an extremely dry cycle in the weather pattern that is now plaguing Australia.

The rural industry still forms the major part of the earning capacity of the States. The Agriculture Department has a particular role to play in the dire straits in which South Australian farmers now find themselves. Drought assistance is uppermost in rural considerations.

The natural disasters legislation at the Federal level is welcome. Concern has been expressed at delays that have occurred in this regard, but I am pleased that the Minister of Works last week reported that steps are in hand to assist producers who have many thousands of cattle that must be destroyed on site. The sum of \$11 000 000 was voted in the State Budget as part and parcel of the natural disaster plan. That sum will be a boon in keeping people solvent when they undergo an extremely tight period that has arisen as a result of the drought.

The transfer of the Rural Industry Assistance Branch to the Agriculture Department was looked on with mixed feelings. In practice it seems to be working satisfactorily. Simplifying the administration level and getting rid of the 21 pages of data that were required in applications from farmers for rural assistance has certainly streamlined those applications. I hope that any farmer who needs assistance will get it speedily, quickly, and effectively.

The beef industry is suffering the rigours of drought,

poor prices and over-productivity. A real need exists for beef loans to be made to people who are wholly and solely breeding cattle. The wholesale slaughter of female cattle has occurred and will lower productivity in the next couple of years. Therefore, it is more than likely that there will be diminished cattle numbers in South Australia. Of course, with the drought in the north it could follow that cattle will be at a premium a couple of seasons hence.

The dairy industry has undergone many changes recently. All of us associated with agricultural production look forward to putting into effect the recommendations of the Webb report. On Friday the member for Mount Gambier and I will meet with dairy farmers in the South-East to discuss that report. The uppermost thing in the dairy farmers' thoughts is that they should share the equalisation of the price that is paid for city milk. That activity contains difficulties, but dollars and cents make the world go around. An American sailor once said, "Almighty God might rule the ocean but the almighty dollar is fairly important in the pockets of the producer".

The wine and food industries play their part in the agricultural team and also have their problems. The drought is setting back our newest industry, the seed and pasture industry. Although some co-operatives and enterprising private entrepreneurs have enjoyed fairly satisfactory sales overseas, some setbacks have occurred because of the poor season and because of pests such as the lucerne aphid, which is plaguing this country. I express my regard for the way in which the Agriculture Department has got cracking on the question of taking action to control this pest.

Capital taxation concerns people on the land. The member for Eyre referred to this subject. The Liberal Party policy announced by the Leader at the recent State election was that, had we been successful in winning Government, we would have set in motion legislation to abolish death duties. According to the State Budget, this tax brings in about \$20 000 000 for the State. I am sure that every member has in his district people who have suffered because they have had to find money to meet this iniquitous tax. Portions of some properties in my district have had to be sold for this purpose. Those properties have got out of phase and families that hitherto conducted highly productive properties have had to sell up their properties to pay this tax.

The end result is that the State suffers. This money has to be put aside in order to pay State taxation, when it should be invested to increase production. Today we heard some derisive comments about the Premier of Queensland, but he has abolished this tax. I know that he receives royalties that we do not receive in this State, but some South Australians have migrated to Queensland with money to invest. About \$1 600 000 will be received by the State Treasury in gift duties, and this is the other component that militates against people arranging their affairs in a proper way. I draw the Government's attention to this iniquitous tax. Queensland has abolished it and Victoria is phasing it out.

I know of an estate in which an unfortunate death occurred last October. A small part of it is in South Australia but most of it is located in Victoria, and I understand the Victorian Premier is back-dating his legislation abolishing this tax in order to help this family. The death occurred on October 5 last year, and the legislation will operate as from October 1.

It is interesting to compare estates of this size in South Australia with similar estates in Victoria, but obviously there is no comparison because the Victorian people can satisfactorily arrange their affairs, although they are situated in an area plagued by the present drought

conditions. I understand Western Australia will phase out succession duties in legislation to be introduced in the present Parliament. Mr. Wran is Premier of New South Wales, and the Treasurer is a former Premier, Mr. Renshaw, who has firm ideas about this matter. I believe he has raised the rebate to \$300 000 and that further inroads into this iniquitous tax are being considered. This matter should be considered closely by the Government, because this Government seems to be the only one out of step among the mainland States regarding this form of regressive taxation.

I am pleased that the Naracoorte meatworks, after a rugged start, has opened again and is now employing 267 people, and Naracoorte is grateful for the Government's input. William Angliss with its expertise has joined South-East Meat and, with the rebuilding and restructuring of a larger freezing unit, the increased size of the hide shed, and general upgrading of the initial works we can see something that will make a real contribution to the killing of stock. Cattle available in that area would do justice to any table in Australia or overseas.

One other matter concerning country people, and even those in the city, is the slow-down of spending, especially in South-East towns. The opening of the meatworks at Naracoorte does not seem to have had any effects on the local economy, and businessmen are extremely worried about the situation. No doubt the principal reason for it is the drought that is plaguing the earning capacity of the man on the land. Most of the 267 people who have started work at the meatworks have come from the rural scene, and they are using the money to tide themselves over this period and clear up debts that they have accumulated.

This situation highlights the parlous position of the rural community, but we have the Naracoorte meatworks, the forests, and the vineyards in which family members can be employed in order to obtain a cash flow that will help them. There seems to be a reluctance by farmers or business men to employ that extra pair of hands. Whilst I do not oppose workmen's compensation and a fair deal, I believe that the 17½ per cent loading and the other high charges are causing much concern to people who employ staff and who should be employing more. I am sure that the Minister of Labour and Industry will again consider this matter, and ascertain whether a proper adjustment could be made that would rebuild confidence into the economy. I think the situation is holding back South Australia at present, and an amendment to this legislation would be helpful. The Minister could make a contribution that would return South Australia to the top flight that it used to enjoy in the golden heydays.

I have much pleasure in supporting the motion that will reply to His Excellency's brief speech given to us when he opened Parliament. We look forward to an energetic and interesting First Session of this forty-third Parliament.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): First, in congratulating Mr. Keith Seaman on his appointment, I wish him a long, healthy, and successful term as Governor of this State. I welcome the new members to this Chamber, especially the members for Coles and Torrens on this side. I pay my respects to former members: John Coumbe, Ivon Wardle, Murray Vandeeper, David Boundy, Jack Jennings, and Claude Allen. I believe that all of them in their different ways served South Australia well and made a significant and beneficial contribution to this Parliament. I wish all of them a happy, long, and pleasant retirement. I also congratulate you, Mr. Acting Speaker, on your appointment.

Mr. Tonkin: It's a pleasure to see him.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is. I always believe I can get a

fair deal from the Acting Speaker, and I appreciate that. I also congratulate the Speaker on his appointment. I wish to speak first about the procedure of Parliament and some changes I believe need to be made. Recent world events, especially in developing countries, have revealed how difficult it can be to maintain a Parliamentary democracy. Although most Australians are very cynical about Parliament and its members, few would want to see the basic principles of our parliamentary system change. However, unless that Parliamentary system is relevant to the problems and aspirations confronting our society, the threat of less democratic forms of government will increase. It is time that the procedures of State Parliament were reviewed with the intention of improving its image, performance, and effectiveness. Such a review should be given high priority in this House. I now wish to deal with certain of these procedures, although I will not cover some points this evening and will have to deal with them on another occasion.

The behaviour of members of Parliament within the Chamber receives constant adverse comment from the public, and much of it is valid comment. Even the members realise that. A story is told that a visitor to Parliament recently commented to a member about the daily prayers to open Parliament. The visitor asked, "when you pray, do you look at the tragic condition of the State and then pray that the Almighty will give members the wisdom to find solutions?" The honourable member aptly replied, "No, I do not, I look at the members and pray for the State." The main reason for such deplorable behaviour is not so much the people but the system. Parliament is largely an adversary system. The news media highlight and encourage such confrontation.

The Government exploits the situation by using its voting strength and the Standing Orders to suppress the Opposition whenever possible. The Opposition, quite naturally, fights back. To pass delicate judgment on the whole procedure we appoint a Speaker from the Government benches. An analysis of most confrontations in our Parliament shows that invariably the rulings or decisions of the Speaker become the central issue in any such dispute. Speakers have a responsibility to be truly independent and to protect the rights of the minority in Parliament. In addition, the Speaker has the more difficult task to curb and the privileges of the majority, which is of course the Government.

Speakers are just as prone to human error as any other member of parliament, especially when they hold marginal seats. Embarrassment of the Government may threaten their own seats just as much as any other member of Parliament. On numerous occasions, when the pressure has been applied to the Government, the Premier, or a Minister, has indicated to the Speaker to use Standing Orders to reduce the effectiveness of the Opposition's attack. Interjections from Government members have often seemed to be acceptable but if an Opposition member interjects he is silenced immediately. Personal comment, especially against the Fraser Government, is usually acceptable in questions by Government members. On the other hand, I have been ruled out of order for pointing out the fact that South Australia has had the highest increase in unemployment during the last 12 months compared to the other States, a fact, I point out, rather than a personal comment.

It is time an independent Speaker was appointed to preside over the conduct of Parliament. A judge, or another suitable person, could be appointed for a three-year term with the consent of both the Leader of the Government (the Premier), and the Leader of the Opposition. Such a Speaker would not have a vote and

tied votes would mean defeat for the resolution. This should not prove a practical problem provided there was an uneven number of members of the Parliament at all times. Such a Speaker would not be open to the same political pressure from Ministers. I believe an independent Speaker would also be more consistent in the interpretation of the Standing Orders of Parliament. The Speaker is also responsible for administering the use of facilities at Parliament House. Again, the judgment of an independent person would minimise ill-feeling arising from apparent politically biased decisions made in that area.

The second vital area for Parliamentary reform is the availability of information about the Government. The Premier promotes industrial democracy for companies and the Attorney-General demands the availability of credit ratings on customers by the Government, but the Government itself has withdrawn behind a cloak of secrecy. Public disclosure is a powerful force in maintaining honest and efficient government. Recently, public disclosure has been threatened by the refusal of Government Ministers, and especially the Premier, to answer accurately and fully questions asked with notice in Parliament. I stress that these are Questions on Notice which the Government has at least a week to consider and, in most cases now, several weeks which I understand are always formally approved by Cabinet before being tabled in this House.

The public has a right to know what the Government is doing on their behalf and how their taxes are spent. The Premier has consistently refused to reveal the extent of Government financial loans and guarantees to individual companies. He uses the excuse of confidentiality, but if public funds are put at risk to aid an individual company, that company must be prepared to reveal the extent of that public risk.

The purchase price paid by the Government for private assets has also been concealed. The price paid by the Land Commission for developed land sold by R. D. C. at Reynella to the group was withheld by the Premier. Likewise, he would not reveal the purchase price paid by the South Australian Government for the Birdwood Mill Museum. These are but a few of the many examples I could quote to the House. On other occasions the written answers given in Parliament have deliberately distorted the facts of the original answer prepared by the Public Service. Obviously to reveal examples would be to reveal my sources, but such practices tear at the very fabric of our Parliamentary democracy. This distortion has been so great on occasions that public servants have said the answer is no longer true; that is, the answer finally presented to this Chamber.

I support the introduction of a Freedom of Information Act which would allow people the right of access to Government information. If such information was refused, the person could seek a court order to demand the release of information. Only under specific conditions could such information be refused. The United States of America has witnessed some horrifying revelations about its public administration through the right of access to Government information. Although the experience has been traumatic, I believe the long-term viability of Parliamentary democracy has been strengthened as a consequence of that in the United States. It is for that reason that I support the introduction of a Freedom of Information Act in our own State. I congratulate the Federal Government for going to the trouble of having an inter-departmental committee prepare a paper on such a Freedom of Information Act and, I understand, to draft a preliminary Act to be presented to Parliament shortly.

The second subject on which I wish to speak is the series

of events relating to two companies; O'Neill Wet Suits Pty Ltd and, subsequently, Golden Breed Pty Ltd. There have been other occasions when details have been given to this Chamber about some of the involvement and about amounts of money involved, especially in relation to this Government. I do not wish to go back over all of those figures; I believe they are clearly documented in *Hansard*. The Government took some pride in this company, which was originally set up as a South Australian company. It very successfully marketed its products, particularly T-shirts and windcheaters, through the whole of Australia. The Government took such pride that it saw fit to use its reporting staff or press secretaries to obtain space in the *Advertiser* to boast of its achievements. On January 10, 1976, a feature article appeared in the *Advertiser*, headed "Taking care of business", and it stated:

The South Australian Government has a behind the scenes success story.

The Government went to great lengths to point out what it had done for this company, O'Neill Wet Suits.

I now briefly summarise the following events. Late in 1976 the company started to face liquidity problems. It sought help and financial assistance from the Government, as well as from outside bodies. I point out to the House that I understand that the liquidity problems were not that urgent, because, at the point of closure, the company was able to continue and to obtain finance on the best terms on which it could be obtained. Eventually, finance was obtained through, I understand, the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. Without going into the exact dates, I understand that, eventually, there was a guarantee of about \$300 000 and a loan from the Industries Assistance Corporation of about \$700 000.

Overall, I understand that the Government gave financial assistance to the company of about \$1 000 000, and that went through either late in 1976 or early in 1977. Those details are documented in *Hansard* as a result of various questions that I asked the Premier. I was disturbed, at the time when I first raised the issue, that the South Australian Government, more particularly the Premier, was not prepared to reveal the extent of those loans and guarantees to that company. I believe that the public has a right to know the facts and that the Premier has an obligation to give them. If he placed public funds at risk to aid an individual company, the Parliament and the public have a right to know about it. At that time, I criticised the Premier for failing to give such information.

At the same time, the company had a series of confrontations, I understand, with an American company that had taken over the trademark under which it was trading in Australia. There was some confrontation with Golden Breed Incorporated, an American company which had the American rights to the trademark being used and to the motto, and a great deal of legal advice was obtained. This is the point at which the pertinent facts arise, and I shall go through them briefly.

There was, I understand, a dispute between O'Neill Wet Suits and Golden Breed Incorporated as to whether a previous agreement signed some time earlier was still valid and, if it was still valid, how much money was owing by O'Neill Wet Suits to the American company Golden Breed as royalties on the use of its trademark. To cut a long story short (and I have copies of legal opinions obtained), I think that the pertinent summary is outlined in a letter signed by Mr. H. K. Schulze, of Collison and Company, patent and trademark attorneys. The letter, sent to O'Neill Wet Suits (Australia) Pty. Ltd. on December 22, 1976, states:

We enclose herewith the opinion received from Mr. C. C. A. Binks of Baker, McEwin & Co. whom we believe to have

considerable expertise in the matter of the Trade Practices Act. This opinion, which suggests that the agreements are unenforceable if not illegal, will also bear strongly on the opinion received from Mr. A. C. King—

who I understand is a Queen's Counsel—

and would I think confirm my opinion given to you previously on the ownership of the trademark.

I have the legal opinion from Baker McEwin and also comments from Mr. King, Q.C., on this matter. I think the pertinent point is that it appears that the previous agreement was unenforceable and, quite likely, illegal; that is the first pertinent fact. The next point is that a new agreement was being drawn up, to be signed between Golden Breed Incorporated (the American company) and O'Neill Wet Suits. This is significant, because, when that agreement was signed on February 25, 1977, I understand that it was signed by the company very much on the South Australian Government's instruction. I think I need to explain here that the South Australian Government at this stage had become a significant operator in O'Neill Wet Suits. The Government had given it a financial guarantee and loans amounting to \$1 000 000, a condition being that the Government, through the Industries Assistance Corporation, was entitled to appoint three of the six, I think, directors of the company.

Therefore, the Government was able, if you like, to exert tremendous influence on O'Neill Wet Suits to force it to sign any agreement, particularly any trade-user agreement. What I shall refer to as the first document I have is the trade-user agreement signed on February 25, 1977, which states:

This agreement made this twenty-fifth day of February, 1977, between: Golden Breed, Inc. a corporation organised and existing under the laws of the State of California, United States of America and having its principal office and place of business at 211 West Emporia Street, Ontario, California (hereinafter referred to as the "licensor") and O'Neill Wet Suits (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., a company incorporated under the laws of the State of South Australia (hereinafter referred to as the "licensee");

It is a very lengthy agreement, and I do not intend to read all of it, because it is 23 pages long. However, I think it appropriate to quote two relevant sections of it—first, pages 4, 5, and 6, which deal with the royalties. Pursuant to the agreement, a royalty basically of 5 per cent of the selling price of the garments in Australia was to be paid to the American company Golden Breed Incorporated. However certain conditions were imposed. It was a complex agreement. That 5 per cent was to apply to the first \$2 000 000 sales, 4½ per cent was to apply on sales from \$2 000 000 to \$3 000 000, 4 per cent was to apply on sales in excess of \$3 000 000, and there were other complications. Basically, it was a royalty of between 4 per cent and 5 per cent, depending on the actual level of sales, and various other conditions were laid down under the agreement.

Conditions were laid down, as outlined on page 9, on the trademark use and offensive litigation; on page 11 was a section on quality control; on page 13, a section on advertising and promotion; on page 14, best efforts and penalties; on page 15, term renewal and review of royalties; on page 16, termination; and page 17, the conditions which exist in the case of the company going bankrupt. I deal with these matters, because I think it is the first pertinent part that I will deal with later in my argument. On page 17, under the section on bankruptcy, the agreement states:

If licensee shall go into liquidation, or enter into a scheme of arrangement with its creditors, or shall be unable to pay its debts within the meaning of section 222 (2) of the Companies

Act, 1962 (as amended) of the State of South Australia or shall permit or suffer any warrant of execution to be levied against its goods or permit any person, company or body holding a bill of sale or other security over its goods to repossess the same for non-payment of any sum or sums of money due thereon then and in any or either of such cases licensor shall have the right to terminate this agreement on five (5) days written notice sent by licensor to licensee at the last known address of licensee.

That was a significant clause and I understand that later it was to be exercised by Golden Breed Incorporated. Within five days of failure to meet its debts or to have a warrant executed against it for goods or against any person, the American company virtually could exercise its powers under this agreement on five days notice. Those powers were considerable. In effect, they allowed the American company to take control of all stock bearing the trade mark, to take complete control of the future use of the trade mark, and in effect to take complete control of the assets of the company, because all those assets were tied up on the trade mark and the insignia on the clothing. That is very pertinent.

Although I cannot table that document, I wish it to be known to the House that I certainly have a complete copy of it. As I have said, it was signed on February 25, 1977. I understand that late in February or early in March the company was placed into receivership, and I think it was early in March that the power under the section to which I have referred concerning bankruptcy and other areas was exercised by Golden Breed Incorporated, the American company, against O'Neill Wet Suits (Australia) Proprietary Limited.

When that occurred, it froze the entire operation of O'Neill Wet Suits and already a receiver had been appointed. He was Mr. Allert of Peat Marwick. The pertinent point so far was that apparently the South Australian Government, which had the deciding say in this, forced O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited, through the board, to sign a trade user agreement, which seemed to me to be over-generous in the payment to the American company and, secondly, over-generous in the powers it gave the American company in default of any payment.

I point this out in relation to the 4 per cent or 5 per cent being extremely high, because the American company had not contributed anything to the original development of this trade mark. Without going into details, I mention that the American company acquired this trade mark by acquiring another company. It did not supply any expertise to the Australian company. It merely allowed the use of the trade mark in Australia, so I think 4 per cent or 5 per cent of the selling price of the goods was excessively high, and I think it was against the interests of the South Australian company that that agreement was signed and that apparently the South Australian Government saw fit to put pressure on O'Neill Wet Suits to sign that agreement.

We have the company in receivership, we have the American company basically freezing its assets and using the power under the agreement to which I have referred. The next thing that occurred was the signing of the new agreement, the agreement to form the new company, Golden Breed Pty. Ltd. I shall read a large part of the agreement, because it is pertinent. The agreement was between the following parties:

Richard Hugh Allert, Receiver and Manager of O'Neill Wet Suits (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., ("Receiver"). O'Neill Wet Suits (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. ("O'Neill"). The Industries Assistance Corporation ("Government"). Heller Factors Pty. Limited ("Heller"). Mirror Pty. Ltd. ("Mirror"), Coro (Canada)

Ltd., ("Coro"), and Golden Breed Incorporated ("Golden Breed, U.S.A.").

The agreement was to set up a new company called Golden Breed Pty. Ltd. Before dealing with that, I should point out the most important part. Heller Factors was a secured creditor with, I understand, \$1 200 000 owing to it. The South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation also was a secured creditor, with \$1 000 000 owing as Government guarantee or as loan. The Bank of New South Wales was a secured creditor, with an overdraft of \$200 000. Group pay-roll tax, which was secured, was owed to the State and Federal Governments, and totalled \$400 000. Bennett, a Sydney-based company, was a secured creditor and was owed \$450 000.

Then there was an important group, the unsecured creditors. They were local creditors in Australia and they were owed about \$800 000. Other company loans, mainly family loans or from other companies, totalled \$350 000 and oversea unsecured creditors were owed \$800 000. I also point out that, again, on very rough estimates made when the company went into receivership (and I think the House will appreciate that any such assets vary in value, depending on the marketability of the product) the value was about \$6 000 000.

Debtors owed the company about \$2 000 000. Cash on hand was about \$400 000, mainly in fixed deposits. Stock, raw material yet to be made up into garments (in other words, fabric) was valued at about \$1 200 000. Completed garments were valued at about \$2 500 000. That adds up to just over \$6 000 000, plus a limited amount of plant. Most of the plant was on hire and the factory at Lonsdale was being leased from the South Australian Housing Trust. That gives a fairly accurate break-down. Mirror Pty. Ltd. was the manufacturer of Golden Breed Products in New Zealand. Coro was the Canadian manufacturer and retailer of Golden Breed Products, and Golden Breed Incorporated was the American company that held the trade mark. I will read parts of this agreement, which we will call the agreement to set up Golden Breed Pty. Ltd. and to transfer the assets from O'Neill Wet Suits Pty. Ltd. Regarding the new company, Golden Breed Pty. Ltd., the agreement states:

2. (a) Government hereby subscribes to 50 per cent of corporation's common stock for a consideration of \$250 000.

(b) Coro hereby subscribes to 30 per cent of corporation's common stock for a consideration of \$150 000.

(c) Mirror hereby subscribes to 20 per cent of corporation's common stock for a consideration of \$100 000.

(d) Corporation will not issue any stock in addition to that so subscribed for unless agreed to by the subscribers just above specified and, if required by law corporation Memorandum & Articles of Association will include appropriate implementing provisions.

In summary, the South Australian Government held 50 per cent of the assets at a cost of \$250 000 in the new company and Golden Breed, through Coro and Mirror, owned the other 50 per cent. They also had an equity capital value of \$250 000. I refer to another part of the agreement which states:

(e) Government and Heller will be jointly and severally obligated, for a period of two years commencing on the closing date (namely, the later of May 18, 1977, or the day after the date when all approvals required under paragraph 10 below are received). To provide corporation with a bank line of credit in the amount of \$1 000 000, to be drawn down in such amounts and at such times during such period as corporation shall decide; such bank loans will be on a first secured basis and will bear interest at the prime rate in effect with respect to such loans on the day made or 12 per cent per annum whichever is the lower.

The pertinent point is that the Government and Heller Factors jointly had to guarantee \$1 000 000 to this new company in the way of bank credit.

So the South Australian Government has put in \$500 000 as equity capital, and now \$500 000 as bank credit to the new company. The document continues:

(f) Coro will provide corporation with a line of credit in the amount of \$250 000 for a period of two years commencing on the closing date, to be drawn down in such amounts and at such times during such period as corporation shall decide; such loans will be on a second secured basis and will bear interest at the rate of 12 per cent per annum.

In other words, Coro would put in a credit amount of \$250 000 to the new operating company. So already the South Australian Government is very heavily financially committed to this new operation.

I now wish to deal with certain aspects of the agreement and, in going through it, I wish to prove to the House that the agreement signed by those various parties was unfair and unjust, to say the least. It is an agreement which favours extremely heavily the new company, Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, at the expense of the old company, O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited and, because that company is in receivership, therefore especially at the expense of unsecured creditors within South Australia and overseas. I read from the agreement, as follows:

Receiver and O'Neill (with the full approval of Government and Heller) to induce corporation to assist (and to induce Coro and Golden Breed, U.S.A., to participate as herein provided) in an orderly disposal of the Golden Breed licensed goods of O'Neill, agree as follows:

We are now going through the basis on which O'Neill Wet Suits had to give its assets, such as fabric, finished garments, and any leased plant, to the new company, knowing that nothing whatever was paid to O'Neill Wet Suits for this transfer except as outlined here. I ask the House to look at the basis of payment that was decided on. The agreement states:

(a) O'Neill's business and goodwill (excluding stock and debtors) in the Golden Breed licensed goods shall be transferred and assigned to corporation and O'Neill and/or the receiver shall turn over or make freely available all records and things which will enable corporation to carry on the said business in an uninterrupted and continuous fashion, including but not limited to customers' lists, sales records, sources of supply, designs, fashions, data, patterns, drawings and samples of its line of merchandise, advertising and promotional material, factory and production records and information in respect to marketing and merchandising programmes and practices.

(b) The lease of the Lonsdale factory shall be assigned to corporation and receiver and O'Neill will do all things required to effect the said assignment.

(c) Receiver will use his best endeavours to arrange with the landlords of other premises occupied by O'Neill a lease of all or such part of such premises as corporation may specify and shall for a period of 14 days after the closing date refrain from rejecting the existing leases covering such premises.

(d) Plant and equipment used by O'Neill is owned or leased by it. For a period of 14 days after the closing date Receiver shall refrain from rejecting the leases covering leased plant and equipment, and will use his best endeavours to arrange a new lease between corporation and lessors covering the plant and equipment corporation may specify. The owned plant and equipment selected by corporation shall be leased to it for a period of two years on commercial terms with the right at the expiration of such period to purchase the same at its then market value; and corporation

will notify receiver by the fourteenth day after the closing date the plant and equipment which it selects.

(e) In respect to employees corporation decides to continue in its employ, receiver will indemnify and save corporation harmless in respect of any existing obligations imposed under section 196 of the Companies Act or other law as such act or laws are in effect on the closing date.

(f) Corporation will advise within 90 days after closing date which raw materials it requires—

I think this is very important—

and receiver will sell such raw materials to the corporation. After such 90 days, receiver shall be at liberty to sell any raw materials which corporation has not required. Receiver will sell to corporation for a period of 18 months from the closing date any raw materials in its inventory which corporation may desire to purchase. The terms of purchase shall be the lower of the cost or market value and payment shall be 12 months from the date such raw materials are purchased. Receiver shall consign to corporation any finished goods in its inventory selected by corporation and corporation will sell such inventory on a commission agent basis for a commission of 33½ per cent of the prices (which shall be determined by corporation in its sole judgment) at which corporation shall sell the said consigned goods. Corporation will use its best efforts to sell the consigned finished goods and the goods which it shall finish using the raw materials purchased by it on terms, in a manner, to such purchasers, and at prices which, but in its sole judgment, are to the best advantage of the receiver. Title and ownership of the consigned goods will continue in O'Neill but corporation will warehouse, market, deliver, take appropriate steps to collect payment therefor from purchasers thereof and will pay royalties thereon. Corporation shall remit the amount invoiced for such goods less a commission of 33½ per cent of such amount 12 months after the consigned goods are shipped to the purchasers.

All raw materials purchased by corporation and finished goods sold by corporation as consignment agent as herein provided shall be free and clear of any security interest provided for herein and any document reflecting such security interest required by law shall so provide.

In the event corporation has failed to sell any consigned finished goods by the end of the eighteenth month from the closing date, such goods shall be returned to the receiver and corporation shall have no further liability or responsibility therefor; and Golden Breed, U.S.A., hereby agrees and consents that the receiver shall have the right to use the trademark "Golden Breed" on such returned goods until same is liquidated and sold, provided however that the receiver shall do no act or thing in respect to the use of such trademark which will prejudice or adversely affect Golden Breed, U.S.A.'s various rights in and associated with the trademarks and Golden Breed's goodwill in relation to the use thereof save that it is acknowledged that receiver shall have the right to sell such goods for whatever price he is able to gain therefor. In respect of any such finished goods the arrangements above specified concerning labelling shall apply.

I will go through the agreement and briefly relate to the House what that means. In effect, it means that the business and goodwill of O'Neill Wet Suits is to be transferred to Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, plus all manufacturing data and any other information the company had. Secondly, the premises of O'Neill Wet Suits would be leased to Golden Breed Proprietary Limited. Thirdly, all plant and equipment leased by O'Neill Wet Suits would be available for hire by Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, it had 14 days in which to decide to take it, and it could hire on commercial terms for up to two years. In other words, the same lease agreement would apply also to the new company, except that the new

company was able to pick and choose whatever it wanted to lease and had 14 days to do so.

Within 90 days of the agreement being signed the new company had a right to say which raw material (cloth or fabric) it wished to buy. After 90 days any unused or raw material the new company did not want had to go back to the old company. In other words, the new company could pick and choose whatever it wanted of the fabric of the old company. The receiver of the old company would sell to the new company for a period of 18 months any raw material. The terms of purchase were to be the lower of cost or market value. In other words, the new company had 18 months in which to use the fabric. It was to be sold to that company at the lowest possible price it could get anywhere at either purchase or market value not the highest price, as one would normally expect when selling up the assets of a company.

In addition, we have these important finished garments valued, as I said, at March at about \$2 500 000. The garments were on consignment to the corporation, and the corporation could sell them at whatever price it chose. The company could undercut the entire market. That would be the price the new company paid to the old company and, having sold the garments at that price, the new company could take a third of that price as its selling commission. That is totally unrealistic. Several accountants have considered the agreement and they agree that such terms were totally unrealistic.

Moreover, the new company had another 12 months after that period in which to pay for the consigned goods. In other words, the new company had 2½ years before it actually had to pay for the finished garments. That was the maximum period available to the new company but the period was at least 12 months during which no interest was paid. In other words, the new company could pick whatever assets it wanted from the old company and sell them off at whatever price it wished, take a third of that price and 12 months later pay the money over to the old company. That is totally unjust and is the sort of contract that should never be entered into, let alone by a Government, which is the main point I make.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope at some stage that the honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows better.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I do not intend to go through the rest of the agreement in detail. It is more than 20 pages in length, and I believe that I have covered the pertinent points. Certain rights would allow the South Australian Government, if it wished, to opt out of its share. The Government would be required to sell either to Coro or Mirror. The contract contains conditions for the employment of the manager of this company, Mr. Casey Bernard Josse. I do not believe that I should divulge publicly his conditions of employment.

The conclusions I draw from the facts I have presented are, first, that the South Australian Government seems to have acted hastily and unwisely in forcing the signing of the trademark user agreement. That agreement seemed to give Golden Breed Incorporated an extremely generous monetary return for the simple use of a trademark. The agreement also gave sweeping powers and rights to Golden Breed Incorporated, an overseas company, especially if default occurred in the payment of royalties. The agreement also gave unfair advantages to Golden Breed Incorporated over the products of O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited once the latter company had defaulted in payment and was placed in the hands of a receiver.

Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, the South Australian Government failed grossly to protect the overall interests of South Australians involved in O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited as either unsecured creditors or employees. The agreement signed between the receiver and manager of O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited, O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited, the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation, Mirror Proprietary Limited, Coro Limited and Golden Breed Incorporated for the transfer of stock and fabrics from O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited to the new company, Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, should not have been signed by the South Australian Government because it failed in the best interests of the majority of South Australians involved in O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited.

Outside accountants who have examined the agreement consider it to be too generous to the new company. The interests of unsecured creditors and employees could probably have been better served by a less generous agreement but an agreement that still protected the position of the secured creditors. I do not criticise other signatories to the agreement as they acted on behalf of sectional interests and were entrusted to do so. It seems that the South Australian Government zealously signed the agreement to obtain a half share in the equity capital of a large garment manufacturer in this State. I believe that that contract was grossly unfair and unjust: it should never have been signed by any Government, especially because of some of the comments made recently by the Attorney-General of this State about other contracts.

I raised one other point regarding this rather sordid affair: it relates to the way in which the new company (in which the Government holds half the shares with the company's employees) has dealt with employees, because the Government, especially the Minister of Labour and Industry has criticised several times companies that have laid off employees willy nilly. It is interesting to note the original statement made by the Premier when he said that the Government was intervening to save 500 to 800 jobs at the factory. Finally, only 184 people were employed by the new company.

Mr. Mathwin: They lost them on the way.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: A large number, yes. On top of that, subsequently the company dismissed employees without notice and paid them one week's pay in lieu of notice. During the election campaign I revealed that Golden Breed Proprietary Limited had dismissed 18 workers in a fortnight. The workers were given instant notice and one week's pay. Of these employees 15 were former employees of O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited and the other three were casual employees.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already spoken to the honourable member about not addressing the Chair. He has not done so now for more than five minutes. I hope he will address the Chair in future.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I apologise, Mr. Speaker. The dismissals were extremely surprising in the light of the obviously misleading Ministerial statement made by the Premier at the end of the last session. In that statement the Premier claimed that the Government was confident that the work force would be increased above the initial level.

It is blatant hypocrisy for the Premier to say that employment will increase when, at the same time, he is hiding the fact that 18 employees have been dismissed. I understand that since then the sittings before the recent election a further number of people have been dismissed and that the employment of the company was recently well below the original 184 people. In addition, I have a copy of a letter to the Treasurer of South Australia (and that is the

Premier) written on June 21, 1977, by Mr. H. J. Antill who I understand was Financial Manager for O'Neill Wet Suits, who has stated that he was guaranteed a position in the new company, Golden Breed Pty. Ltd. and who was writing to the Premier because that promise made to him had been breached. Although he had worked for a short time with the new company, he had been dismissed by it.

Mr. Harrison: What's the date of that letter?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It was dated June 21, 1977. I do not have time to go through it in detail, but the writer refers to what he did for the company and states:

The board of directors of O'Neill Wet Suits Pty. Ltd. appointed me as Financial Controller for O'Neill Wet Suits Pty. Ltd. in late December, 1976, and I commenced duty on February 1, 1977.

He then refers to what he did and then to the take-over and about dealings with board members. He states:

We were also informed that Mr. Casey Joosee would be appointed General Manager and that I would be appointed Company Secretary and Finance Controller of the new company, Golden Breed Pty. Ltd. As you are aware the proposed New Zealand contributors withdrew, but finally re-entered the venture on a slightly changed contribution when the total equity was halved, the other change being the inclusion of Mr. Casey Joosee as Managing Director and not as General Manager.

To cut a long story short, the employment of this person with the new company has been terminated, and it seems that the promise given to him was breached, as were those given to other employees.

The other significant aspect is to raise the point whether the company O'Neill Wet Suits, once it had been placed in receivership, could have been successfully sold to Australian interests which could have meant that all financial resources were kept within Australia. I understand that at least three or four companies were interested in purchasing the assets of the new company, but the time allowed for that was brief. Golden Breed Incorporated (the American company) had frozen the assets, and it seems that the negotiations for the purchase of the assets of O'Neill Wet Suits were prematurely halted by the setting up of the company half-owned by overseas interests and half-owned by the South Australian Government. I believe that is also against the best interests of South Australians. If possible, the assets should have been kept in Australia, especially by a Labor Government that makes so much of the point of foreign ownership of companies within Australia.

The facts I have presented to the House are not all of the facts in relation to this dealing between O'Neill Wet Suits and Golden Breed. I have a massive file with copies of many letters and agreements signed, and I believe that the overall evidence presented this evening plus the other material I have clearly indicate that, first, the South Australian Government needs to disclose publicly what loans and guarantees it gives to companies; secondly, it needs to improve the assessment of companies before giving that money; thirdly, the South Australian Government applied undue pressure for the signing of the trademark agreement; fourthly, the South Australian Government, through the S.A.I.A.C., did not allow adequate opportunity for any local or Australian company to buy the assets or assist the old company O'Neill Wet Suits Pty Ltd; fifthly, the South Australian Government went ahead and signed what I believe was an unfair and unjust contract and that the South Australian Government, which has been given the responsibility of looking after South Australian interests, failed to do so, especially those interests of both employees and unsecured creditors. As a result, many people in South Australia

have been financially hurt, or hurt because they no longer have employment in this industry.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): I refer to the inconsistencies of the Opposition in relation to the uranium question. I am moved to do this because, after listening to the speeches yesterday of the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I came to the conclusion that clearly they had changed their attitude on this question since March of this year because of pressures from the Commonwealth Government. What really has made me speak this evening is the speech by the member for Light this afternoon who, I believe, was sincere in putting a point of view about this matter. Regrettably, whilst he genuinely seems to believe that the views he has expressed are correct, I consider that his arguments were poor. I hope that I can provide some advice to him that I give honestly and hope that he will be prepared to listen to it.

First, we know what happened in March of this year when the Opposition somewhat reluctantly (and I think that was clear to all on this side) supported the Government in a move to establish a policy in this Parliament for the protection of South Australia in respect of uranium and our attitude towards it. However, I noticed some slight alteration in the Opposition's attitude after I read in the *Australian* of September 15, at the time of the recent State election, criticisms being made by the Leader of the Australian Democrats about the Liberal Party's attitude. After Mr. Millhouse had been reported, apparently the newspaper contacted Mr. Tonkin concerning the attitude of the State Liberal Party, and he was quoted as follows:

Mr. Tonkin said: "The State Liberal Party's position on uranium has been made quite clear on several occasions, and it includes further reviews following environmental impact studies. It does not put any specific time limit on any proposals."

Frankly, I was at a complete loss to understand what was meant by the Leader of the Opposition. I concluded that he did not want to say that State Liberals had decided that the mining and export of uranium should be encouraged, because he considered that such a statement might have a considerable impact on South Australians reading it at the time of the recent State election. What has been said in the past couple of days has made the position of the Liberals clear. Yesterday, the Deputy Leader stated:

I have listened with much attention to the debates on uranium mining, particularly in relation to the handling of its waste material, and I, along with the former Governor, have concluded that this material can be handled safely.

In reply to an earlier interjection the Deputy Leader had not been prepared to state clearly what the Liberal Party policy was on this matter but, nevertheless, he said that he had concluded that the disposal of waste materials could be safely handled.

Later, in the Address in Reply, I suppose because of the embarrassment that had been caused by having no clear outline from members of the Opposition, the Leader went to some trouble to explain the attitude of the Opposition. He said:

I now wish to refer to one or two matters that have arisen as a result of a newspaper report that appeared this morning. Comments on that report have suggested that the Opposition

has not in any way changed its stance on uranium mining since the House passed a motion on March 30 this year stating that some concern was expressed that it was not yet safe to provide uranium to a customer country. Government members who believe that that is so have no justification or basis for making that assumption. As members would know, that motion was amended by the Opposition to include "research into alternative energy resources". That amendment was accepted by the Government. The Government's use of that motion since indicates clearly, first, that it has been deliberately doing so for political reasons and that the motion was moved in the House for political, not humanitarian reasons; and secondly, that the Government is clearly behind the times because it has failed to account for the policy statements that were enunciated clearly by the Opposition during the election campaign.

I will read one of the statements made by the Opposition during the election campaign that certainly left some doubt in my mind about exactly what was the Opposition policy. It stated:

The position was made quite clear in our policy speech and in the statement on uranium. All I can say is that the Government is way behind the times if it still believes that the Opposition supports that politically-motivated motion that was passed in this House on March 30.

I think that the whole Opposition is twisting on this matter, and that is quite regrettable. We saw on March 30 the Opposition speaking and voting in accordance with a philosophy that agreed with the general point of view that, until safeguards had been firmly established by any user country, the export of uranium should not take place. Suddenly, the Opposition is following the line of the Federal Government, which blandly says it has examined the situation and has now come to the conclusion that there are no means of treating wastes and that it can therefore now safely export uranium.

I refer honourable members who may still have an open mind (and I particularly refer to the member for Light, because I think he is in that category) to what was said on a *Four Corners* television programme last Saturday evening that in my view clearly established the correct approach to this question. The people associated with the programme had sent a reporter to the United States who had questioned a number of people involved with uranium about this matter. The person who was of particular interest was Mr. Leo Ryan, who was Chairman of a Congressional nuclear energy inquiry, who was questioned and answered some leading questions posed by the Australian interviewer. He was asked, "Is the nuclear industry facing up to waste disposal problems", and he said, "No, absolutely no". He was then asked, "If Australia's decision to export was contingent on assurances that the ability existed to dispose of waste safely, could a decision be made by Australia to export", and his answer was, "No". He said that such a decision could certainly not be made by Australia and that it could not be made for the next 10 years.

On the same programme the interviewer asked questions of the Council for the Environment of the United States, and its concern relating to the committee of inquiry to which I referred was supported, because it was so concerned about the lack of ability of American industry to dispose of waste that it had made a recommendation to President Carter that, if the industry had not measured up within two years and established some evidence that it could properly dispose of waste, all development in the United States should be halted. So here we had two authoritative American groups that have made a close study of the whole question of nuclear waste disposal, and their answers are that there is no known way

in the United States to dispose of these wastes. If the Opposition is basing its support of the export of uranium on the fact that there is known technology to take care of the industrial waste, I think that it ought to have another think about this matter and be genuine in its attitude towards it.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): It was not my intention to talk about uranium but, seeing that the member for Henley Beach has raised it, I wish to say that it is abundantly clear where the Liberal Party stands on the issue of uranium. It is abundantly clear, also, that the Labor Party is wandering around in the wilderness on the issue. At the time of the State election it did not wish to have the matter discussed at all because it was a hot potato between the Attorney-General and the Minister of Mines and Energy. There was a conflict of opinion between those two people and the present Chief Secretary (who was not the Chief Secretary at that time) as well. They were the people who were causing or leading the mainstream of thinking in the Labor Party; they could not come to a common agreement, so they decided to sit on the fence and attempt to play it up coming into a Federal election.

The Premier is now going around saying that it should not be a political issue, but he uses it for political purposes in an advertisement. Let us be honest; the member for Henley Beach was talking with tongue in cheek trying to justify his Party's position, knowing full well that what he was saying was not a bit accurate.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You are speaking with—

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

Mr. EVANS: He was trying to protect what little credibility there is left in his Party on this issue.

Mr. Kenally: Do you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart is out of order.

Mr. EVANS: I will go back to the matter I wished to raise.

Mr. Whitten: You didn't tell us where you stand.

Mr. EVANS: I am standing in my position under your protection, Mr. Speaker, in this House.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You're twisting on you—

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

Mr. EVANS: The Electricity Trust of South Australia has a special tariff it now charges, K tariff, if one has solar heating, for which one pays 1.63c per kilowatt hour, which is the same as the normal J tariff charge for heating purposes during off-peak hours. The J tariff operates for a certain number of hours during the night: the K tariff continues for an extra number of hours during the night, seven hours, which is two hours longer than the J tariff. The K tariff users (those persons with solar energy plants) are forced to pay \$4.50 a quarter or \$18 a year, which is a self-erasing charge. In other words, as they use power the amount of power at 1.63 per kilowatt hour is taken off the minimum charge of \$18. I believe that is a practice the Electricity Trust should stop.

The Minister of Mines and Energy should make sure that that is stopped. We should not set out to penalise the people who have solar energy plants; we should encourage them. We have been talking about uranium and the need for some alternative sort of power in the foreseeable future and we should, by example and in particular through statutory authorities like the Electricity Trust, show that we are concerned about the lack of energy for the future and charge those persons who have solar energy plants only for the amount of power they use at the J tariff rate. There should not be a penalty because a person

installs a solar energy plant. If it was merely a meter charge of, say, \$1.50 or \$2 a quarter for servicing a meter, there may be some justification for it.

However, that is not what we are doing. We are imposing a minimum charge of \$4.50, which I think is too high for people who are genuinely spending large sums on installing solar energy plants.

Another issue I raise relates to a piece of land in Coromandel Valley, and I hope that Government back-benchers will take this matter back to the respective Ministers and ask them to investigate the situation. The Minister of Education would know that, when he attended the centenary celebrations at the Coromandel Valley Primary School, they were held, in the main, on a limited school area, more particularly, on a piece of land on the other side of the main Coromandel Valley Road between the road and a creek. That piece of land consists of about 4 ha, and has recently been approved for subdivision in the name of Mr. J. L. Laurie, under State Planning Authority docket No. 377/77. It is cut into, I believe, .8 ha allotments. There is a need for a cycle track, and the authority and the council have ensured that an extra 2.4 metres be retained along the road for a cycle track in future to connect Coromandel Valley with Hawthorndene for the public and for schoolchildren's use in particular. There is a real need for the whole area to be acquired and for the Government to retain at least the piece necessary for public use, and to dispose of the balance. If the total area were retained, it could be used for education purposes, for a cycle track, for horse-riding, and for general recreation use by the Coromandel Valley community. However, the area between the creek and the road is vital to the school. This matter was not brought to my attention until yesterday.

A group in the community is meeting, hoping to make an approach to the Government, and there is an opportunity to buy the total area, even though subdivisional approval has been given. If the Government does not wish to retain the part necessary for educational use and for the cycle track, the balance could be sold. I ask the Minister of Education, the Minister for the Environment, and the Minister for Planning to examine the proposal urgently because, once one of the five blocks is sold, the land will be lost for all time to the community, particularly to the Coromandel Valley Primary School. I think we all know how important it is to retain open-space playing areas for primary schools.

Another matter I raise briefly is my disappointment and that of people living in the Blackwood-Belair area in particular, with the fact that in planning the widening of the main road between Blackwood and Belair, no provision has been made for a bridge over the railway line at the Glenalta crossing near the Belair Hotel. When the road is upgraded, it is expected that there will still be a level crossing at that point. The quantity of fuel lost through stopping and starting, the amount of lost time to the people concerned, the extra costs placed on goods transported, and the general inconvenience, let alone the dangers existing for children who traverse that flat crossing, mean that the costs are so considerable as to warrant providing a bridge there for the community's benefit. It is not a difficult point at which to build a bridge, because the railway line is slightly recessed below road level and, on both the northern and southern sides, one approaches the junction downhill. It would be an ideal spot to construct a bridge, even though it may not be 100 per cent aesthetic, but the cost and safety factor is important, and the Minister of Transport should for these reasons reassess this crossing and construct for the community a bridge at that point.

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): A matter referred to me by a constituent last week has caused me to reflect somewhat on the role and activities of life assurance companies in our society, particularly those companies known as mutual and co-operative societies. Life assurance, as we all know, is big business indeed. The sum paid in premiums, the amount of interest earned on these premiums, the amount of fixed assets, and the investments owned by such companies represent a very large portion of our Australian and South Australian economy. For instance, for South Australia alone the annual rate of premiums paid, on the latest figures, is precisely \$124 473 000. The sum insured that that represents in South Australia (not in Australia as a whole) is \$7 325 000 000. The number of policies written and currently operating in South Australia in ordinary business (and those figures I have quoted do not include superannuation or industrial life assurance superannuation which, as we all know, is big and booming business—I am talking now about ordinary life assurance policies) is over 1 000 000.

Those South Australian figures, extrapolated into Australia as a whole, represent an extremely important economic force in our community, and one can see that when we look at the way in which that money is invested. Looking at the figures in Australia as a whole and the sort of breakdown of investment, we find that the largest proportion of those funds is in the fixed assets of the insurance companies, particularly buildings, properties, and other direct assets, but probably another 50 per cent is expended on housing and other types of loan, all of them secured by mortgages (rural loans loom large in that area). There are general policies, and there are investments made by the life assurance companies in Government securities (and these are substantial), also in local government, in debentures, and in the share market. So anyone can see that life assurance represents a substantial force in our economy.

Unfortunately, it is not subjected, I believe, to enough public debate and public scrutiny. That it is an extremely lucrative section of insurance can be demonstrated most easily, not by looking at the balance sheets of the companies concerned but simply by noting the reaction of the insurance industry to plans by the South Australian Government recently to allow the State Government Insurance Commission to enter into the life assurance field. Opposition to its entering such fields as third party accident policies was muted, and when the time came the private companies eagerly got out of the whole field because it was not profitable enough for them. As to the commission's entering the life assurance field, propaganda was put out through the media to try to prevent the Government from going ahead with its policy, and in this House the Opposition eagerly took up the fight on behalf of the life assurance companies to try to circumscribe the S.G.I.C. They were almost prepared to fight to the death. They drew back on the brink in another place and did not defeat the Bill. Another indication of the industry's fear in this sort of area can be seen in the reaction to the Australian Government insurance office proposal, which came up in the time of the Whitlam Government and resulted in street demonstrations sponsored and promoted by the insurance companies.

Therefore, obviously there is money in it and obviously they must feel that that share of the market must be protected, from Government instrumentalities in any case. That is on the higher policy level, but the matter that came to my notice was much smaller. However, I believe it was symptomatic of how the companies behave. Because of

their commanding strength in the economy, because of their size and dominance, they have put at the forefront the maximising of their profits on their own terms to such an extent that they are reducing service to policyholders, reducing employment opportunities in the industry, and, in the case of the mutual companies, their mutuality, so called, is diminishing, if it ever existed to any large extent, to such a minimal amount that the ordinary policyholder could be excused for believing that he was a cog in a mighty machine over which he had no control.

It is important to look at that mutuality, because when these companies come under scrutiny, particularly the big five of them (the A.M.P., the M.L.C., the T. & G., the C.M.L. and the N.M.L.), the ones that have annual premiums that top \$50 000 000, they are always quick to say that they act for their policyholders, that they are mutual and co-operative, and that they are not money-making concerns in the sense of a private industry business. Perhaps they conceive themselves as being so but, in their dealings with their policyholders, they fall far short of this.

For instance, these companies are tightly organised in terms of directorships. It is hard for policyholders to have any influence on who directs the companies and who makes the policies in which they are supposedly mutually involved. There is tight control and at any time policyholders as a body or as a group try to exercise influence on the company they are stopped sharply, because the importance of the investment funds of these major mutual companies is such that the captains of industry, so-called, want to keep their hands firmly on them and do not want anyone interfering with them.

The instance that drew my attention to this was that in recent years several companies have discontinued the practice of agency collections. Policyholders have been induced to enter into long-term policies that require them to pay on a regular monthly basis. One of the reasons why they responded to the policy was that the agent called monthly. Now they are told that the agents will not call. A typical example is the Colonial Mutual Association. The policyholder is notified by a computerised form that says, "You are accustomed to an agent calling to collect your premiums. With rising costs, it has clearly become too expensive and therefore the agent will not be calling. Please send your premium in monthly."; that is, "Make sure you get a cheque or a postal note, which will cost a few cents, buy a stamp, which will cost a few more cents, and put the letter in the post. That is how you will do it from now on."

In return, generously they give a discount if you pay a yearly instalment. On reading the small print, it turns out that payment for six months entitles a person to a discount, too. Many people cannot pay the lump sum. That would be a total inconvenience to them, and it was not the basis on which they entered into the policy, yet unilaterally they are told that there will be no more agents or collections. It means that the agents are no longer employed, that this service is no longer available to the policyholders, and that the policyholder is up for extra premium expense with absolutely nothing, except the so-called annual premium discount.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 17, at 2 p.m.