

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 22, 1977

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

ART GALLERY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA—  
UPGRADING

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the Art Gallery of South Australia—Upgrading.

Ordered that report be printed.

## PETITION: CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. **BLACKER** presented a petition signed by 69 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce, without delay, stringent laws with appropriate penalties which would protect children from abuse by pornographers, and take action to prohibit the sale of all pornographic films, books and other material which include children.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

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

## ELECTION CANDIDATES

Dr. **EASTICK** (on notice):

1. How many candidates in the recent State election resigned from State Government employment for the purpose of becoming candidates, who were they and from what departments and positions did they resign?

2. How many of these persons who were not successful candidates have sought re-employment and who are they?

3. On what date was an application for re-employment received from each such person and on what date was, or is it intended that, any such person be re-employed?

4. Have any such persons who have been re-employed lost any seniority or job advancement opportunity as a result of their candidature or have any of them been re-employed either in a different position or lesser position and, if so, what are the details?

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: The replies are as follows:

1. Eleven.

Name	Department	Position
Crafter, G. J.	Legal Services	Articled clerk
Thomas, R. J. W.	Highways	Asst. traffic inspector
Weise, B. J.	Public Buildings	Electorate Secretary (Peake)
Bannon, J. C.	Labour and Industry	Asst. Director
Pooley, E.	Education	Office assistant
Lee, M. B. H.	Further Education	Education officer
Cruickshank, V.	Education	Assistant
Allen, A.	Education	Assistant
Gerrie, D. H.	Education	Assistant
Klunder, J. H. C.	Education	Deputy principal.
Sachsse, M. F. H.	Further Education	Principal

Note—The following three employees of the Government did not resign—

Winn, K. J.	Further Education	Registrar
Moulds, R. H.	Agriculture and Fisheries	Technical officer
Krieg, T.	Education	Special senior master

2. All unsuccessful applicants have been re-employed.

3. Name	Date of application for re-employment	Re-employment date
Crafter, G. J.	20/9/77	28/9/77
Thomas, R. J. W.	19/9/77	19/9/77
Weise, B. J.	19/9/77	19/9/77
Pooley, E.	27/9/77	7/10/77
Lee, M. B. H.	19/9/77	30/9/77
Cruickshank, V.	28/9/77	28/9/77
Allen, A.	19/9/77	19/9/77
Gerrie, D. H.	19/9/77	19/9/77
Sachsse, M. F. H.	19/9/77	19/9/77

4. No person who has been re-employed has suffered any loss of seniority or job advancement opportunity.

## FROZEN FOOD

Mr. **WILSON** (on notice):

1. What is the projected cost of construction of receiving facilities for frozen food at the—

- (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital;
- (b) Modbury Hospital; and
- (c) Flinders Medical Centre.

2. What are the estimated commencement dates of each of these projects?

3. What other institutions are to have these facilities?

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN**: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) \$530 000  
(b) \$45 000  
(c) \$23 000
2. (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital—March, 1977 (construction started)  
(b) Modbury Hospital—August, 1977 (construction started)  
(c) Flinders Medical Centre—July, 1978.
3. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Enfield Hospital, Hillcrest Hospital, Strathmont Training Centre, Glenside Hospital, Northfield Wards, Royal Adelaide Hospital, St. Anthony's Hospital, Osmond Terrace, Clinic, Mental Health Clinics, Windang Geriatric Accommodation, Para District Hospital, Ru Rua, Morris Hospital, Regency Park Crippled Childrens Association, Meals on Wheels Incorporated, and Wattle Park Teachers Centre Staff Cafeteria.

## PARA WIRRA FOREST

Mr. **GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): Does the Government intend to erect signs in the State forest near sections 404 and 374, hundred of Para Wirra, indicating where motor bikes may be ridden for recreational purposes, so that nuisance to nearby residents can be minimised?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The three entrances to section 374, hundred of Para Wirra, are sign-posted "No Entry Without Permit", and the words "No Bikes Allowed" will be added. Section 404 is not forest reserve and there are no plans to erect signs in this area. Permits to use section 374 are not issued to motor-cyclists, but it is known that illegal entries are made. However, trail bikes are extremely mobile and offenders difficult to apprehend.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STATUTES

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What are the arrangements between the Government and the Law Book Company concerning the publication of the consolidation of the South Australian Statutes?

2. Why is the price of each volume of the consolidation and of each annual volume \$45?

3. Was the price, up to the 1976 annual volume, for the annual volume \$12.50?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Briefly, the arrangements are that the Law Book Company edits and prepares the edition and notes of the consolidation, and compiles the index. This work is actually done for the company by Mr. E. R. Ludovici, who is also under contract to the Government to undertake the consolidation of the Statutes. Printing and binding of the consolidation is carried out by the Government Printer at the Government's expense. The company has sole rights to sell the consolidation, but the Government is entitled to retain a certain number of sets for its own use. The company is supplied with a certain number of sets initially without charge but is required to pay the Government 50 per cent of the selling price of additional sets sold. The retail selling price of each volume is fixed by agreement between the Government and the company.

2. The selling price of \$45 a volume is based on the cost of production.

3. The price up to the 1976 annual volume was \$12 a volume. The price of annual volumes up to 1975 had been kept low because they were part of a set that was shortly to become obsolete.

#### LETTER REPLY

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Is it proposed to answer my letter of July 11, 1977, to the Premier about Mr. M. W. Willis and Mr. A. T. Gun, S.M. and, if so, when?

2. Why has the letter not been answered before this?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. I fail to see the necessity to enter into protracted correspondence on a matter that has already been considered and answered previously. I have said I see no basis for the matter to be put before the Public Service Board.

#### VENUS BAY ROAD

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Will the Minister give urgent consideration to having the Flinders Highway to Venus Bay Road sealed, because of its poor condition?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The Venus Bay access road is under the care, control and management of the District Council of Elliston. Consideration would be given to Highways Department assistance for reconstruction and

sealing, if the council gives the road sufficient priority in its annual road grant applications.

#### BOAT RAMPS

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Are boat ramps at North Haven vested in the Minister or his department for control and maintenance?

2. Why is a \$2 launching fee charged for each boat a day?

3. Are pensioners given a concession and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The fee is consistent with the operation of similar facilities at Glenelg and interstate.

3. No. Cabinet has approved the implementation of an annual permit system of \$40 per permit which pensioners can take advantage of. Pensioners, among others, were considered in reaching this decision.

#### NETLEY TRAFFIC LIGHTS

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice): What is now the estimated date of installation of traffic lights with pedestrian activated lights at the junction of Galway Avenue and Marion Road, Netley?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Late March, 1978.

#### HENLEY BEACH ROAD

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What plans does the Highways Department have for the realignment of the "S" bend on Henley Beach Road, Fulham?

2. When will this work be commenced?

3. If no action is contemplated, why not?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Highways Department has no plans at present to realign the "S" bend on Henley Beach Road, Fulham.

2. See No. 1.

3. It is considered that the cost of the work involved (estimated at a minimum of \$200 000) would far outweigh the benefits to be gained. In contrast, the intended relocation of the median opening is estimated to cost less than \$10 000.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS

**Mr. TONKIN** (on notice): Because of the reported agreement at the recent Premier's Conference on detailed guidelines for the review of local government in line with the broad agreement reached at the April, 1977, Premiers' Conference in this regard, is the State Government no longer interested in proceeding with its plan to incorporate remote areas outside existing zones of local government?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The State Government remains interested in a form of incorporation for remote areas outside existing local government.

#### DR. BARRY HUGHES

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Is Dr. Barry Hughes attached to the Premier's Department, or alternatively any other Government

department and, if so, what are the complete details and terms of his appointment?

2. Does Dr. Hughes's appointment necessitate interstate travel and, if so, what interstate travel has Dr. Hughes had since July 1, 1977, and which department or departments have been responsible for his air travel, and what are the details?

3. Does Dr. Hughes have the right of private travel interstate during the course of a normal working week and, if so, has this right been exercised since July 1, 1977, and, if so, when and for what duration?

4. Has Dr. Hughes during the course of his employment been required to brief any Party in Opposition anywhere in Australia and, if so, what are the details?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Dr. Barry Hughes works as a member of my Ministerial staff as Executive Assistant (Economics). The terms of his appointment follow closely those pertaining to a Flinders University reader a position from which he is currently on leave. They were set out in answers to the members for Mitcham and Davenport on December 7 last and to the Leader on November 24 last. I see no reason to repeat them yet again.

2. Yes. The following interstate trips have been made by Dr. Hughes since July 1, 1977:

July 1—Premiers' Conference, Canberra;

August 5—All States Premiers' Conference, Melbourne;

August 22—Australian Graduate School of Management Economic Forum, Sydney;

October 14—Immigration Ministers' Conference, Canberra;

October 21—Premiers' Conference, Canberra;

November 3-5—Investigation of the implications of Statehood of the Northern Territory, Darwin;

November 7-8—Speech to Academy of Social Sciences, Canberra.

All travel paid for by the South Australian Government, except that for the journeys connected with the August 22 and November 7-8 speeches which were, or are about to be, paid for by the organisers of the conference concerned.

3. No. However, I have allowed Dr. Hughes to travel interstate to speak to economic conferences to which he has been invited in his professional capacity as an economist. He has been able to enlighten people in this country on the true state of the economy. Even the member seems to have gained a glimmering of economic understanding from these occasions. I remind the member that he cited approvingly part of one such speech by Dr. Hughes on August 16 last, the same day he complimented the South Australian Government for being "in touch with reality" on its commitment to full wage indexation.

4. No.

#### FULHAM INTERSECTION

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Has the West Torrens council approached the Road Traffic Board to have a turn-right phase included in the light cycle at the intersection of Henley Beach Road and Tapley Hill Road to aid traffic in making a right hand turn in all directions?

2. Has such a request been agreed to?

3. If no investigation has been requested, will the Road Traffic Board consider such an urgent request?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Yes.

#### ADOPTIONS

**Mr. EVANS** (on notice): When does the Minister intend to introduce modified regulations in relation to the adoption of children?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** As soon as amendments to the Adoption of Children Act have been passed. It is expected that a Bill to amend the Act will be introduced during the present session of Parliament in 1978.

#### REAL ESTATE AGENTS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Does the Attorney propose to answer the letter of June 15, 1977, to him from Mr. Ron Thonemann of Woodside concerning the practices of a number of Adelaide real estate agents and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. Why has no answer yet been given to the letter?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. My Secretary has recently written to Mr. Thonemann about his letter.

2. Not applicable.

#### IRRIGATION

In reply to **Mr. ARNOLD** (October 13).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The design for the rehabilitation of the Cobdogla Irrigation Area has been re-examined on the basis of an additional residual head at the irrigation block outlets of 14 metres head (20 psi). The additional cost of the heavier duty pipes required is \$2 600 000 to which must be added the costs (not estimated) of the heavier duty pumps and motors, switchgear, surge protection, etc. The additional power cost is estimated at \$95 000 per annum.

There is approximately 2 400 hectares of ratable land in the Cobdogla Irrigation Area so that the capital cost to pressurise would be well in excess of \$1 000 per hectare with an annual interest and power cost commitment in excess of \$140 per hectare. Of the 2 400 hectares, approximately 200 hectares is at present under spray with the remainder furrow irrigation. Whilst every practical encouragement should be given to converting from furrow to more efficient irrigation methods, it is doubtful, even with a fully pressurised system, whether an area such as Cobdogla would ever be 100 per cent converted from furrow. It would be a decade or more before even a 50 per cent conversion could be expected, and it is therefore obvious that pressurisation by means of individual installation on blocks is the more economic method of approach. Whilst only Cobdogla has been reassessed, the same order of costs per hectare would apply to the other irrigation areas listed for rehabilitation.

#### GOVERNMENT OFFICES

In reply to **Mr. KENEALLY** (October 13).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** It is not proposed at this stage to construct a Government office complex at Port Pirie. The Public Service Board has expressed an opinion that all existing and foreseeable office accommodation

problems in Port Pirie will be overcome with the move of the Motor Registration Division into the new office building which is about to be built by the State Government Insurance Commission in Florence Street and the completion of the community welfare centre towards the end of 1980.

#### GOVERNMENT OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (October 18).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The Government Office Accommodation Committee has the responsibility of recommending to the Government the long-term planning of office accommodation needs. The variable nature of these requirements, means that economies can best be achieved by leasing a significant proportion from the private sector.

The relative shortage of office accommodation in the Adelaide area necessitates, on occasions, that leases are secured prior to actual need resulting in additional delays as detailed design work cannot be undertaken until such time as the lease is secured. Depending upon the complexity of a client department's office space requirements, several months can elapse before the accommodation is finally ready for occupation. Unexpected difficulties in the provision of associated services such as telephone and telex facilities and the provision of furniture and equipment can also add to these delays.

#### WATER QUALITY

In reply to **Mr. KENEALLY** (October 20).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The flow in the Murray River is now below South Australia's entitlement, and water is being released from Lake Victoria to make up the entitlement. The flow in the Darling River has progressively reduced, and that river is now contributing only about 25 per cent of the water entering the State. The turbidity has improved, and will continue to improve, in the upper reaches within the State and progressively improve downstream over the next month or so.

#### RENOWN PARK GATEWAY

In reply to **Mr. ABBOTT** (October 26).

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** This has led to considerable correspondence between the Hindmarsh council, the Ombudsman, and the honourable member's constituent. The dispute arose from the council's action in agreeing to remove the tree at the part cost of the applicant, and the applicant's refusal to pay the cost. The estimates submitted by the council were made after consultation with the Botanic Garden. The council offered to share the cost of \$304 with Mr. Wood, contributing 50 per cent. Further negotiations continued after investigations by the Ombudsman's office, and these negotiations were not concluded at the time the tree was cut down.

I would point out that the application for a crossover which required the tree removal was for a second crossover. The property is served by an initial crossover in South Road. The costs applied by the council were as a result of consultation with an expert authority, namely, the Botanic Garden.

#### TRANSPORT RESEARCH

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

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The budget for the Transport Department (Planning Division) is provided primarily from Loan funds, because such planning activities as the department undertakes usually lead to major investment projects which are funded from Loan funds. Inevitably, however, some of the work undertaken by the department is not an appropriate charge against Loan funds, although it is not always possible to foretell precisely the projects or costs which should therefore be charged to revenue.

Accordingly, \$100 000 is provided by Treasury so that some projects undertaken by the Transport Department (Planning Division), can be charged to revenue at the end of the financial year. The payment of \$99 703 in 1976-77, was the amount allocated to the following projects which are not considered to be an appropriate charge against Loan funds:

	\$
Public transport maps . . . . .	20 068-73
Scholarships and fellowships . . . . .	19 377-03
S.T.A. management study . . . . .	
(1/5 of contribution) . . . . .	10 350-00
Statewide transport study . . . . .	7 640-20
Transport research forum . . . . .	7 198-20
Energy supply study . . . . .	24 509-60
3rd int. conference on behavioural travel modelling	10 559-63
	\$99 703-39

It is not likely that any of the NEAPTR expenses will be allocated to this Revenue Budget line.

#### PUBLIC PARKS FUND

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

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Applications for subsidies from the Public Parks Fund are received on a continuous basis and are considered by the Public Parks Advisory Committee, which makes recommendations to the Government on the schemes to be approved. When a subsidy has been approved, the council is advised and may immediately proceed with the land acquisition or development works. It is not possible, however, to determine precisely which councils will benefit from the allocation of \$300 000, because of time delays in arranging acquisition or carrying out works. Claims may not be received in the financial year in which the approval is granted and the present policy is to meet claims from funds in the year in which the claim is made. All approvals are made subject to funds being available at the time the claim is received. If funds are not immediately available, the claim is deferred to the next year. I am not personally aware of any embarrassment being caused to councils by this policy.

#### BATTERY RESEARCH

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

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Research into nickel-zinc, zinc-chlorine, lithium-sulphur and other types of batteries is

being actively pursued, but even optimistic forecasts place their introduction five to 10 years into the future, and efforts to date with fuel cells have failed to produce an economic cell of sufficient power density. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration fuel cells that the honourable member refers to are much more sophisticated than conventional lead-acid batteries but, because they are very expensive, heavy, fragile and need a lot of maintenance and care to work satisfactorily, are not suitable for use in electric vehicles. Nevertheless, fuel cell research is of the type which presents the possibility of an important break-through in the future, though, as with most possible break-throughs, it is rather difficult to predict exactly when in the future.

The Flinders University electric car differs from most electric vehicles in that it does not demand high currents from the batteries when starting. This means that, because the battery pack need only supply low or medium currents to the motor, it should be possible to modify the design of the batteries to make them more efficient in terms of storage per unit weight.

So far, the research work has been carried out by two researchers who were funded by post-doctoral fellowships from the Transport Department. Funds from the Transport Department total \$17 659.86.

#### SOUTH-WESTERN DRAINAGE

In reply to **Mr. TONKIN** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 26).

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Although works on the South Western Suburbs Drainage Scheme were completed in 1975-76, a sum of \$30 000 was provided on the 1977-78 Loan Estimates to meet expected payments arising from disputes connected with one contract, and acquisition of a land easement. It is understood that the contractor's claim may be withdrawn. The sum of \$37 436 represents reimbursements of expenditure due to be received from local government authorities. When these claims have been settled, the Auditor-General will be requested to certify the accounts as required by the Act.

#### STORMWATER PROJECTS

In reply to **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 26).

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** During the debate, the honourable member referred to the Eastern Parade—Finsbury drain, stage 2, section 1. I point out that it is the prerogative of the Torrens Road Drainage Authority to award the contracts for these works to be carried out. The drainage authority has approached the Highways Department concerning the 50 per cent Government stormwater drainage subsidy and has been advised that a subsidy based on the lowest acceptable tender received would be recommended for approval by the Minister of Local Government. At this stage, the drainage authority has not forwarded tenders to the Highways Department for examination.

#### SUCCESSION DUTIES

**Mr. TONKIN:** In view of the Prime Minister's commitment last evening to the abolition of Federal estate

and gift duties and the action taken by all other States during the last 12 months, will the Premier now adopt the Liberal Party's policy of abolishing succession and gift duties in South Australia? The Prime Minister's policy speech last evening committed the Federal Government to a two-stage abolition of Federal estate and gift duties aimed at encouraging the States to abolish their own similar duties. At the last State election Liberal Party policy was the complete abolition of succession and gift duties to be commenced during the life of this Parliament. In Queensland, death duties were abolished at the beginning of this year. In Tasmania, Premier Nielson (as he was then) announced the remission of death duties in respect of real property acquired in that State on or after September 1, 1977. In Western Australia, death duties are to be phased out by 1980, and an announcement today from New South Wales states that death duties will be abolished over a three-year period as from the next Budget. Obviously, South Australia is again the odd State out. Therefore will the Premier now act urgently to adopt the Liberal Party's policy on abolishing succession and gift duties so that the people of South Australia, who are already highly taxed, will not continue to be disadvantaged under the Labor Party's policies?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No, the Labor Party in South Australia does not intend to proceed further with remissions of succession duty than we have gone. South Australia led the States in Australia with certain remissions in this area. When we came to office originally we had to alter the incidence of succession duty, which in this State under Liberal Governments fell heavily on the poorer sections of the populace and comparatively lightly on the wealthy sections.

It is remarkable that the Prime Minister is now following the course adopted by previous Liberal Governments in this State because, by abolishing Federal estate duty, he is in fact affecting the top 2 per cent to 3 per cent of people in this country. There is absolutely nothing from that remission of taxation which would affect the average householder in this community.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** The Prime Minister himself would benefit tremendously.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No person in South Australia on an average income would get anything from that enormous handout proposed from the Federal Government to the wealthy in this country. I find it all the more remarkable because, at a Premiers' Conference not long ago, when Mr. Bjelke-Petersen announced that Queensland was proceeding to the abolition of death duties, the Prime Minister bitterly berated him for it within the conference. The Leader knows full well that this year we have provided to use up the reserves in South Australia, to maintain our services in the face of Federal Government pressure to reduce them, without affecting taxation within the State.

**Mr. Tonkin:** What about Mr. Wran?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** We have not altered taxation; we have tried to keep the taxation figures as they were. Indeed, we have absorbed several costs, such as transport costs, in order to try to keep the pressure of prices down within the community. However, unless there is a change in Federal Government policy, this State, in order to maintain its services next year, will have to increase taxation. We have made that clear, and I made clear again before the recent election that that would be so. If the Leader proposes that we give remissions in taxation amounting to between \$19 000 000 and

\$20 000 000, he had better get up and say which of the State's services he intends to cut and whom he proposes to sack.

#### STIRLING NORTH SCHOOL

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister of Education inform me when it is expected that a new primary school will be constructed at Stirling North? I understand that such a school is planned for Stirling North. At present 190 students from that town are transported by bus into Port Augusta for primary school education each day, the first bus leaving Stirling North at 7.45 a.m. and the last bus arriving back at 5 p.m. Stirling North is a fast-growing town in the North, and the parents there believe that if a junior primary school were constructed soon it could grow as the need requires.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** From memory, I believe that it is planned to build a school in the 1979-80 financial year. Whether it will be possible to do anything earlier than that depends on various matters, including some kind of estimate of probable enrolments at the school—how quickly they will build up, and so on. I will refer the honourable member's question to my departmental officers, who can give me the full picture, including a future demographic profile of the area, indicating what the enrolments are likely to be at the new school. Once I have that information, I will give it to the honourable member.

#### PAY-ROLL TAX

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** In view of the Premier's surprising about-face resulting in his enthusiastic support for the abolition of pay-roll tax, as outlined by his Federal Leader, Mr. Whitlam, will the Premier take action to phase out pay-roll tax in South Australia and, as a first step, adopt the policy outlined by the Liberal Party at the South Australian State election? We realise that the financial situation in South Australia is deteriorating, since the reserves built up by the sale of the country railways will, during the course of this year, be dissipated (or squandered, as my Leader has said). Nevertheless, in relation to other States, South Australia is overtaxed. Obviously, the Premier is keen to remove pay-roll tax, according to statements he has made supporting his Federal Leader and, in view of those statements, we could expect an increase in employment if such relief were given to industry in South Australia.

During the State election campaign, the Liberal Party proposed a policy of exemption up to \$72 000. The Premier described this policy as being fraudulent, disastrous, impossible, and so on. Subsequently and belatedly, the Premier announced that the exemption level would be lifted to \$60 000 in South Australia, and in New South Wales the Premier (Mr. Wran) has adopted the Liberal Party policy enunciated in South Australia. Will the Premier now review the levels of exemption in South Australia with a view to removing pay-roll tax, so that the benefits will result that he has recently claimed will accrue to the State and to the nation?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Judging by the honourable member's remarks in the past few days, I can only say that he should return to the school at which he taught and do a reading comprehension course. At the State election, the major part of the Liberal Party's policy in relation to pay-roll tax related to an incentive payment, which was alleged to promote employment, in remission of pay-roll tax for

extra employees engaged. I condemned that policy as being one which would not produce the result Liberal members forecast of it of some 50 000 extra jobs, which was the figure they mentioned, because the Government had already tried the policy in country areas in offering to companies which engaged five or more extra employees a complete pay-roll tax remission for the extra employees engaged, and few companies had actually taken advantage of that offer. In fact, for the marginal employee, the extra cost in pay-roll tax is irrelevant really to the question of engaging that additional employee. The amount of the total pay-roll tax remissions in South Australia which the Leader referred to and which would go to industry, if in fact it engaged anyone under such a marginal incentive scheme, would have been about \$20 000 000 a year at the outside. That is quite a different situation from saying to industry that we will abolish the whole of pay-roll tax on its whole pay-roll for existing employees.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Across the board.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes, across the board. That, in South Australia, would mean a boost to industry of about \$140 000 000.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** You claimed that the pay-roll tax—

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

**Mr. Dean Brown:** You've changed your story.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Davenport must cease interjecting. I called him to order, and he took no notice of the Chair.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Obviously, the State Government cannot afford to give remissions in pay-roll tax greater than those which have been given without its being paid out by a Federal Government for the amount remitted—without being reimbursed for that total amount of money. We cannot take from revenue further than has been done in Tasmania and Victoria by agreement with us in removing the remissions, in fact by indexing the nature of the remissions given to small companies with six or fewer employees.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be polite to you and to the Chair if the Premier were to address the House and not speak with his back to you.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Venning:** He's got his back to the Speaker all the time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order. I do not want to find it necessary to warn him.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** What has been offered by the Federal Labor Party at this election is that it will return to the situation that existed before the States were given pay-roll tax: that is, that the Federal Government would pay to us out of income tax the amount we are now collecting in pay-roll tax on condition that we abolished pay-roll tax. The State Budget would not be worse off: we would not be in a position that we were not able to afford the remission because we would be compensated for it. In those circumstances it is a real benefit to South Australian industry.

For instance, this morning I visited a factory of Wylie's which is a good concern in South Australia with excellent works and which, for the information of the member for Davenport, is now in the course of a \$2 500 000 expansion programme. The fact is that Wylie's is under great pressure at present because, whilst it has 83 per cent of the Australian market in shock absorbers, there has been a marked increase in the import of Japanese shock

absorbers, with Japanese manufacturers seeking to undercut the price of the South Australian company. If all of the pay-roll tax of this company was abolished that would be of significant assistance to it in its competition with the Japanese in relation to the price of its product. That is just one example of what could occur. It would have done nothing for the company to offer it a remission in pay-roll tax if it took on another 20 employees, because the 5 per cent or less of the cost of an extra employee in that matter does not induce the company to take on the whole extra cost of an employee and is not sufficient to discount the marginal extra cost of an employee in the present market situation. If honourable members cannot understand that, I suggest that they ponder it for a while.

### JET SKI MACHINE

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Can the Minister of Marine say whether it is intended to apply any control over the jet ski machine that has received publicity in the past few days? The machine has been advertised at a cost of \$2 200. It is suggested that it can reach 60 km/h, and that it has been used in the United States and other places generally for speedboating, water ski-ing and surfing. It would seem that there is a possibility that, if the machine is used especially in the surf, there could be a danger to swimmers. Has the Minister read reports about this machine, and can he say whether it should come under the ambit of legislation controlling boats?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I saw the article this morning referred to by the honourable member, and I have asked the Marine and Harbors Department to inquire into the matter. The information I have is that the operator must be licensed and the jet ski must be registered under the Boating Act. Regarding safety equipment, negotiations are now being undertaken between the department and the firm selling this machine, and, whilst no finality has been reached, I assure the honourable member that this aspect is being considered. When I obtain a report from the department, I will let the honourable member have a copy of it.

### SALINITY

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Can the Minister of Works say whether, because of the expected low flow now and that in the near future of the Murray River, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has prepared an estimate of salinity levels to be expected in South Australia this summer? As the Minister is well aware, the methods used for applying irrigation to land and various crops has a large bearing on the tolerance that the crop can stand. If forecasts are available, it may be of considerable benefit to some irrigators who are considering changing from old methods of irrigation to the new methods now available.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The department has provided me with a report, the details of which I cannot remember exactly, expressing its concern about the likely levels of salinity next year, and even late this year. The honourable member would be aware that in certain parts a high level of salinity has been reached. From memory I think that the report states that there was a slug of saline water near Merbein and that will, of course, eventually be in the system in South Australia. I do not know in what

way the honourable member refers to a forecast. A forecast of salinity levels from week to week or month to month has not, to my knowledge, been prepared. I will ask the department whether or not that is a feasible thing to do. I think the honourable member will appreciate the great difficulty, because of the various factors that come to bear on the situation, of doing that. Certainly, if it can be done, the expertise is within the department to do it. I will see whether that can be done and whether publicity can be given to it in order to allow, as the honourable member has suggested, growers to alter their method of application and so on in order to help minimise the effect of this highly saline water on their plantings.

### HOUSING TRUST

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Is the Minister of Mines and Energy, as Minister in charge of housing, satisfied with the operations, innovations and planning of the South Australian Housing Trust, and can he say whether South Australia would receive far more resources if houses were built privately?

I refer to a newspaper report which suggested that the Housing Trust, first, drew too heavily on financial resources in the form of subsidised long-term second mortgages when selling its homes; secondly, failed to call open and disclosable tenders for its houses often enough; thirdly, improperly prepared its plans and specifications when open tenders were called, placing too heavy a reliance on individual on-site judgments on build-up and extras; and fourthly, had been unremarkable for changes or improvements introduced to the housing industry.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** As the honourable member was good enough to let me know that he would ask this question, I will comment on it in some detail. I think the record of the Housing Trust, with regard to innovations in the housing industry, is second to none. The most innovative feature of Housing Trust work in recent times is seen with the examples of cluster housing to be found in trust estates. The trust leads the field in this State in medium density cluster-type housing and its scheme at West Lakes, where some 250 houses are built or under construction on the cluster principle, is an example of this. The total number of units to be built on the cluster principle at West Lakes will be 600.

Medium density is by no means confined to West Lakes. The Manitoba development in the inner Adelaide area is an example I mentioned last week. Other examples can be seen at Elizabeth, Elizabeth Vale, Seaton Gardens, Novar Gardens, Christie Downs, Hackney, Black Forest and in some country towns, such as Nuriootpa and Mannum. It is just 40 years ago when, on November 22, 1937, the trust completed its first houses at Rosewater. Since those double unit houses were built the trust has met many new challenges and has continued to progress. Perhaps one of the reasons for its success has been that it has constantly looked to the future and has adapted policies and approaches to meet changing circumstances.

The trust will continue to maintain a flexible, broadly based multi-type housing programme and incorporate in its estates a range of housing units to accommodate a wide range of the community approaching the public housing authority for assistance in housing. It has been said (and was quoted by the honourable member) that the Housing Trust has been unremarkable for changes or improvements introduced to the housing industry. Besides the move to medium density housing, the trust has made many

other changes and improvements over the years. Not long after its inception, the trust introduced brick on edge construction. This was much criticised at the time but it proved an economical and sound method of building on good soil.

Regrettably, Adelaide has much questionable soil, and a variety of methods has been used to combat this to a greater or lesser degree. As well as using the usual engineering methods, the trust has been the only major developer in Adelaide to build many hundreds of houses on soil which has been stabilised by the addition of lime. This has proved economical and satisfactory. On this subject, too, the trust was also the first major developer to turn to brick veneer housing, thus obviating the need for highly expensive footing systems. Regarding veneer it can also be said that the trust, after a considerable battle with all the lending institutions, including the State lending institutions, introduced *pinus radiata* timber both for roofing and stud work.

Other innovations, generally long before the private sector, introduced by the trust to its houses were: circuit breakers, kitchen exhaust fans, ceiling insulation, solar heating, poison cupboards, unified screen fencing and gates, truss roofs, and plastic cold water plumbing.

The trust was the first to design specific small groups of independent units for caring for the aged and, in recent times, its policy of purchasing and upgrading existing houses under its special rental housing programme has been most innovative. It has been said (as the honourable member stated) that the State would receive far more from resources when houses were built privately than by the trust. That reminds me of previous statements by Mr. McLeay, the Federal Minister for Construction (and he should know better), suggesting that because we built houses through the trust we were depriving private industry of work. In fact, Mr. McLeay, who must be one of the most ignorant Ministers for Construction the country has ever had, did not know that the trust has always engaged private building contractors to erect its houses. Any expansion in the trust's activities is an expansion in the activity of private builders.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Are the developments by private contractors or the trust?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The innovations that have been made have, in most cases, been the result of work inside the trust. The Leader should know that the trust, which was set up more than 40 years ago by a Liberal Government and which has been supported by both sides in this Parliament, has a fine record and is distinguished as being by far the leading public housing authority in the whole of Australia. Suddenly, members opposite are now associating themselves for the first time with attacks on the South Australian Housing Trust. It is about time that the Liberal Party, at least on this score, reverted to its traditional position.

The trust resents strongly the allegation that its plans and specifications are imperfectly prepared, and no suggestion of this nature has even been made to it from the building industry. Actually, the trust has been, on many occasions, highly commended on the manner in which it has provided tenderers with fully detailed plans and specifications.

**Mr. Evans:** Who has made the allegations?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** They were made and reported recently in the press by Mr. Hickinbotham. I am not sure whether he was reported correctly; I doubt whether he was, and that is why I did not mention his name until the honourable member questioned me. It is true that the trust does not call tenders on every occasion, because there are great advantages sometimes in enabling

a builder to have continuity of production, particularly in keeping costs down.

On the other hand, the trust does call regular and frequent tenders for all types of house and for each sector of the metropolitan area in order that it has comparable tender prices for any negotiations it may enter into. I see those tender prices. The trust does not publicise its tender prices, but since the trust provides many elements of the house the actual builder's figure frequently has little resemblance to the cost of a finished house. While it might be true for a few individual houses, generally on relatively remote sites in the country, for a builder to make his on-site judgment about build-up and extras, this is quite rare. For the great bulk of its tendering, particularly for medium density, the trust does ask for an on-site price. However, elaborate engineering drawings are provided so that on-site work and build-up can be accurately assessed.

Finally, the trust's policy of providing second mortgages mainly from semi-governmental funds commenced in 1952 and undoubtedly it has been the means of thousands of low-income families purchasing their own houses. One of the great problems of the present time is the high cost of second mortgage finance. Interest rates vary between 15 per cent and 17 per cent, and this is one of the main sources of the high weekly payments in purchasing a house. If the trust did not provide this second mortgage finance, the position of the average purchaser would be much worse overall and there would be adverse consequences for the building industry.

#### RIVER TORRENS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Mr. WILSON:** Can the Minister of Works say whether the second stage report of the River Torrens Development Committee has been completed? If it has, will he release it and, if not, why not? I take this opportunity of thanking the Minister for his courtesy in arranging for me to see the Chairman of the committee recently. However, since then I have received representations from individuals and organisations that are anxious to see the second stage report of the River Torrens Development Committee, particularly as it relates to the current NEAPTR proposals.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I have received the report and I intend to place it and submissions before Cabinet next Monday. Following that, I expect that the report will be released to all councils and interested parties.

#### WORK EXPERIENCE COURSES

**Mr. KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Education give an indication of the present status of work experience courses in secondary schools in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The programme has now been operating for about 12 months in a series of what one might call pilot schools, and it seems to be having a good deal of success. The results have to be judged against what is behind this scheme, what people were trying to achieve by having the scheme in the first place. The scheme does not guarantee that young people will be able to get jobs when they leave school. Only a drastic up-turn in the economy can ensure that enough jobs are available for many young people who otherwise will be unemployed.



The scheme seeks to give young people, as an integral part of a course at their high school, some acquaintance with the work place.

I can obtain for the honourable member details of the number of high schools involved in the scheme. There is much enthusiasm for it in country areas, and there has been a gratifying response from employers, particularly small employers, who are happy to have some of the year 11 students in their shop for some time. Government departments have assisted also. I am aware, for example, of some young people helping in various ways in a regional office of the Community Welfare Department. As long as we see the scheme as an attempt to acquaint young people with the nature of the work place and the sorts of demand that will be made upon them once they become employees and not as an absolute insurance that young people will be able to get a job, I think that we can say that there has already been a considerable amount of success on the part of the scheme.

### BUS SERVICES

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Can the Minister of Transport say what was the object of the Government's taking over Bowmans, Briscoes, and other private bus services in and about the metropolitan area and what has been achieved by that take-over, bearing in mind that, among other things, the Bus Service Planning Group's report of 1974 recommended co-ordination and integration of the bus services during the 1974-78 period, which does not appear to have been implemented? In order to explain my question and concern, I point out that, according to the Auditor-General's Report, it appears that, during the period adverted to (certainly for the past two years), there have been no fare increases but the actual number of passengers carried on the metropolitan bus services has decreased. In addition, the Auditor-General's Report for the same period indicates that the bus and tramway employee force has increased by more than 20 per cent (from 1 673 at the close of 1974-75 to 2 033 at the year ended June, 1977). The Minister will no doubt appreciate that my earlier question about access to the State Transport Authority's report was fruitless. Since then, the Chairman of the authority has explained that, despite attempts to do so, the authority has been unable to produce a report on its activities since it was established in the early 1970's. Accordingly, in the meantime a reply regarding my understanding of the objects of the take-over would be useful.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The purpose of assuming responsibility (I reject the term "take-over", because no take-over was involved)—

**Mr. Becker:** Not much!

**Mr. Tonkin:** Of course it was a take-over.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Of course it was.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister has the floor.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I will repeat what I have said (and these know-alls, who would know all about it, having had nothing to do with it, are somewhat irksome). We were requested by each of the organisations to which the honourable member has referred to assume responsibility for and ownership of their services: that is why we did it. What has been achieved is that the people in those areas now have a bus service at a reasonable fare level, which is something they did not have previously. It is as simple as that.

**Mr. Mathwin:** They used to walk—

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** When the member for Glenelg decides to keep quiet and learn a little about this matter, he might get on much better. The Minister of Education was continually receiving complaints about the paucity of services in the southern districts. The level of service was determined, understandably, by the profits of the Briscoe company. If the company was not to make a profit, the only recourse it had was to cut out services. So, it lost more profits, and the service deteriorated until eventually it reached the stage where it was impossible for the company to continue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** It is difficult to give an intelligent answer to the member for Alexandra whilst the member for Rocky River and the member for Glenelg are butting in all the time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are far too many interjections. Members complain that not enough questions can be asked, but interjections, I can assure honourable members, do not improve the situation.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I thank you for that, Mr. Speaker. I treat this question seriously. It is the second question the honourable member has asked on transport since the session began. As he is the shadow Minister, that is a great record for him, and he deserves full credit for it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable Minister will get back to answering the question.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I am attempting to do that. The situation simply is that it was a matter either of the services going out altogether, leaving people in those areas without any transport at all, or of the Government's assuming responsibility for their operation. The Government was not prepared to leave those people high and dry.

**Mr. Chapman:** Why don't—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has asked his question.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The situation is, as the honourable member would know, that a few months ago the Government was able to review the fare structure of the one last remaining private operator in that area, Premier Roadlines, together with its own service in the area, and the fare structure was reduced to be in line with that applicable to the rest of the metropolitan area. Those are the things that have been achieved. When we look at the decline in patronage that the honourable member has mentioned, we find that the decline as of recent times has steadied considerably if we consider the whole of the public transport system. What has happened in the southern areas, as the honourable member surely would know, is that, since the train service was extended to Christie Downs, many people who previously travelled by bus or by road have chosen to travel on the better and quicker service provided by rail. I do not think there has been any undue fluctuation in the tramways union award. Indeed, the award is bound by indexation guidelines, to which this Government has rigidly adhered, and there has been no—

**Mr. Chapman:** No, not the award, but the number of employees.

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

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Employees in those areas are working now in accordance with the award, and that is something that previously they were not doing. First, they were not bound by the tramways union award; secondly, under the old conditions that applied they had mixed functions, and that is a factor which is not acceptable in this day and age. The net result has been that, if decent conditions for workers and decent services are to be

provided, additional employees are necessary. That is the answer to the whole matter.

### REGENCY PARK

**Mr. BANNON:** Can the Minister for Planning inform the House of the stage of development and the future plans for the Regency Park recreation area? The area concerned is in the Ross Smith District, and is a project of the State Planning Authority which has been under construction for some considerable time and which has caused much interest in the district. Questions are being asked as to the state of development, when the project will be in use, and what will be its relationship to other developments in the area, such as the Parks Community Centre and the colleges of education around it.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The project involves the build-up and reclamation of a significant area of land that was originally part of the old sewerage farm. It has involved the construction of a nine-hole golf course. Honourable members will be surprised to know that it was initiated, before I became Minister for Planning, by a previous Minister. It involves the building of a restaurant and club house, provision of a picnic area, barbecue facilities, children's playground, and an oval area.

The project will provide an extremely important facility for a part of Adelaide which is not well provided with recreation facilities. The golf course will be officially opened next Sunday, when I will have the pleasure, hopefully, of hitting off the first ball. There will be an exhibition match in which three good golfers and I will be engaged. I hope to avoid making an exhibition of myself. The public will be able to play on Sunday, and the whole area will be officially opened on that day. Those honourable members who have not seen the area recently should visit it and examine what has occurred there, and they will be very pleased to see the extensive redevelopment that has been involved in this recreation area, and that it, together with the Crippled Children's Association development and the Regency Park College of Further Education, provides a substantial facility for the whole area.

I hope that, in the future use of the area, we will be able to reach an arrangement with the Enfield council or the Enfield and other councils to involve them in the administration of the recreation area, and that there will be some kind of liaison established between the Regency Park recreation area and The Parks Community Centre, which is also now being constructed. This project, together with The Parks Community Centre and the Regency Park College of Further Education, is one of the most pleasing set developments in the whole of the metropolitan area, because it provides facilities which have been needed for more than 100 years in this area of Adelaide but which have not been previously provided. These suburbs of Adelaide would previously have been classed as those most deprived of recreation areas.

### OPTICAL SERVICES

**Mr. ALLISON:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether negotiations have been concluded between the South Australian

Health Commission and the Federal Government for the optical testing of pensioners and the subsequent provision of subsidised optical services to selected regional centres, in particular Mount Gambier? I ask the question because I understand that tenders have been invited at Port Lincoln and Whyalla for the provision of such services, but I am not aware of any similar move in my district.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I understand that the position is as stated by the honourable member, but I will obtain a detailed report from my colleague.

### BARKER REACH

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Marine provide any information about the channel in Barker Reach? An article published on page 28 of last Saturday's *Advertiser* quoted a member of the Small Boat Club, which has its club and mooring facilities at the back of Torrens Island, as saying that the stranding of boats was occurring too often. The Small Boat Club is situated on Garden Island, at the back of Torrens Island, and uses a small channel in which is a dog leg that was dredged some time ago. I know that many owners that use keel boats are concerned because of their problems in getting up the channel, and any information from the Minister would be appreciated.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I noticed the article to which the honourable member has referred, and I must emphasise that this is not to be confused with the Angas Inlet, to which the member for Semaphore has referred several times concerning sanding up near where the Small Boat Club is established.

The channel was established about 1969-70 when it was dredged to provide 4ft. depth at low water and beacons were installed to mark its course. It was recognised at the time that the channel was narrow, tortuous and of limited depth but it served to provide a facility for the boats then in use in the area.

Subsequently, there has been a considerable increase in the number of boats using the area, contributed to by the increase in the number of vessels being accommodated in the Small Boat Club mooring area, and by reason of the enlarged public boat launching facilities provided on Garden Island. Also, there has been an increase in the size of boats and in the numbers of less skilled operators. The greater numbers must inevitably lead to congestion in an already narrow channel and, no doubt, some vessels may be forced out of the channel and, in some areas, could not then avoid running aground. Inquiries made of experienced departmental launch crew reveal that there is no evidence that the channel has narrowed or shallowed since its construction. I will have the matter examined to see whether it would be feasible either to widen or to deepen the channel. I think the honourable member would appreciate that it could be a costly exercise. I will certainly make that inquiry and let the honourable member know what is involved and whether or not the Government can do something about it.

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** My question is directed to the Premier, if I can get his attention.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I take it from that haughty—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will ask his question.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I was waiting for the Premier's attention; I seem to have it. Will the Premier give an explanation and, if so, what is that explanation as to why eight out of the 11 questions that I had on the Notice Paper for today have not been answered? As you, Mr. Speaker, and other honourable members are aware, until last session the rule in this Parliament, and certainly in this House, was that all questions on the Notice Paper were answered on the following Tuesday.

I have protested about the abandonment of that practice before, but I understand that today (because I have checked the figures) there were 79 questions on the Notice Paper of which 14 were answered, leaving 65 questions unanswered. When I have raised this matter before the Premier has defended the abandonment of the practice by saying that there are certain statistical questions requiring statistical information (particularly those put on the Notice Paper by the member for Hanson) which it is impossible to answer quickly. I do not accept that as an answer; it is only an excuse.

That is certainly not the case with the majority of the 65 questions not answered today and in my own case eight out of the 11 questions I have on the Notice Paper were not answered. Question No. 110 has been on the Notice Paper since November 3; it concerns the Premier's plans for a trip overseas. I put it on the Notice Paper deliberately because I was told that the Premier would not give information about his plans for an overseas trip next year and I thought that this was the best way of doing it. Other questions—and I am not going through them all, of course—

**Mr. Dean Brown:** What about the one about his trip to Malaysia?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is another of the 65 questions, presumably, that has not been answered. Other questions that I have on the Notice Paper are, I suspect, at the least politically difficult to answer and therefore have been left.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member does not continue commenting.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** No, Sir, I will not. I will simply mention them. One concerns the files kept by the Police Department. There is nothing statistical involved in that question. It is a current matter of controversy and all the Ministers must know the answer to that question. Another question concerns what I understand is a scandal in the Environment Department concerning the trapping of birds some years ago. There is nothing statistical about that, but I require information about that. The new Minister for the Environment knows what I am talking about and could have answered that question today.

Another question, which I addressed to the Minister of Mines and Energy, concerns licences for uranium exploration in this State. That Minister, who has been buzzing about like a bee in a bottle since the judgment of Mr. Justice Wells was handed down last Friday, could have replied to that question. It is obvious that these questions are not being replied to because they are politically difficult.

I ask the Premier for his explanation of why eight out of 11 of my questions and, if he likes, 65 out of a total of 79 questions on the Notice Paper have not been replied to, in the hope that when he gives that explanation he will also give an undertaking that the Government will return to the previous practice of replying to all questions on the Notice Paper on the following Tuesday.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In some cases the material was not to hand in time for the Cabinet meeting yesterday. In those circumstances, we would expect that that material would be available for the next Cabinet meeting and therefore that the questions would be answered next Tuesday. For several questions it is necessary to check, not only the text in Cabinet but also matter contained in the text of replies, with particular officers and departments. When questions come to hand on a Thursday or reach the department on a Friday, it is often difficult to get the replies for the Cabinet meeting on Monday afternoon.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** But some of them have been on the Notice Paper for weeks.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Like the one about your trip.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Several of the questions referred to me personally. I was not in Cabinet yesterday, and Cabinet deferred replies to those questions pending my return.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Maybe you weren't there last week, either.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has asked his question.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The reason I was not in Cabinet yesterday was that I was electioneering in Tasmania. I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition was electioneering in New South Wales yesterday, and I also noticed the signal absence of the honourable member from the House during much of last week. I rather presumed that he was about the same sort of thing.

#### MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

**Mrs. BYRNE:** As a new library resource centre and extra classroom accommodation is under construction at Modbury High School at an estimated cost of \$700 000, I ask the Minister of Education whether it is still expected that this project will be completed for the start of the 1978 school year.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The last time I inquired of my departmental officers about this project the reply was "Yes". However, I will get an up-to-date report on the position for the honourable member.

#### LONE FATHERS

**Mr. WOTTON:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what savings will be made by the State Government because of the Fraser Government's decision to pay pensions to lone fathers? On November 2 the Minister for Social Security, Senator Guilfoyle, announced that a benefit would be paid to lone fathers on the same basis as it is paid for supporting mothers. A sole father will be eligible for a benefit of \$49.30 a week, plus \$7.50 a week for each child, including a student child.

In addition, a guardian's allowance of \$6 a week will be payable where he had the care of the child under six years of age or an invalid child. As with supporting mothers, a sole father will not be eligible for the new benefit until six months after he became a sole father. South Australia and Western Australia, which now provide assistance to sole fathers, will accordingly be relieved of this responsibility after the assistance has been in force for six months.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I suppose that the direct reply to the honourable member's question is "No", because, as he pointed out, there will be no saving in the near future. As was pointed out in his question, the Commonwealth does not come to the party for six months. That applies not only to sole parent fathers but also to sole parent mothers. Continued negotiation with the Commonwealth Government and Senator Guilfoyle has failed to yield any softening in attitude. I am rather pleased that the honourable member has raised this matter, because it must be more than obvious to most people in the community that the reason the announcement has been made by the Federal Government could be based only on two factors: I would hope that shame has finally got through to the Commonwealth Government, because it argues continually that income maintenance is its area of responsibility, but it fails to do much about it, whether we are dealing with unemployed people struggling to get benefits or, as has already been outlined, sole parents in the community who have battled on almost unaided, except in South Australia and Western Australia, to maintain their children, particularly in the first six months, which is surely the critical time after a separation occurs.

It is after a separation occurs, certainly in the case of a parent mother, that most help is needed, but the Commonwealth Government says, "Bad luck; go and see the State." We get no return for that whatever. The same will apply, as announced by the Commonwealth Government, to sole parent fathers who make the choice, which everyone in the community would applaud, to stay at home to take care of their children and to provide the parental influence that is so vitally necessary in those circumstances.

In reply to the honourable member I would say "None at all for the immediate future." Certainly some leavening will occur of the cost to the State after the six-month period involved occurs in each case. If the honourable member is so interested in welfare support, I wish that he would take up with his Federal colleagues the question of hardship that has been inflicted callously on people who are now unemployed, and seek to obtain a new and better method of benefit payment.

I have been working for some time to get a sensible answer from the Commonwealth Government on that matter. I have now received a telex on this matter that causes me to have some hope of relief for the people concerned. I cannot say any more than that, because it seems that every time one receives a communication from Canberra on these matters one must seek further clarification before one can ascertain how much money the Commonwealth is willing to shell out.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1975. Read a first time.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The object of this Bill is to rectify an apparent anomaly in the principal Act that has recently become evident. Several people who applied to be registered as land salesmen under the old Land Agents Act were registered under the provisions of the present Act just after it came into operation in 1974. A question has been raised whether such people are "entitled to be registered" within the meaning of the principal Act as they do not have the qualifications now required of land salesmen. It is the Government's intention to make it quite clear that these people are, and always have been, entitled to be registered under the Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that this Bill shall be deemed to have come into operation on the day that the principal Act came into operation. Clause 3 provides that a person who was an applicant for registration under the repealed Act immediately before the commencement of the principal Act is entitled to be registered under this Act. The provision relating to the registration of an applicant for registration (as opposed to an applicant for renewal of registration) is put into this section. Clause 4 provides for the renewal of registration upon payment of the prescribed fee. An applicant for renewal is not obliged to establish again that he is entitled to be registered. Clause 5 repeals section 28 of the principal Act. The substance of this section is now contained in the two previous sections of the Act as amended by this Bill.

**Mr. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

- No. 1. Page 1 (clause 4—After line 18 insert "declared shop" means a shop that is, for the time being, a declared shop under section 4a of this Act".
- No. 2. Page 1, lines 20 and 21 (clause 4)—Leave out "of which the proprietor is a natural person and".
- No. 3. Page 1, line 21 (clause 4)—Leave out "two" and insert "three".
- No. 4. Page 2, lines 37 and 38 (clause 4)—Leave out "one hundred and eighty-six" and insert "four hundred".
- No. 5. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 40, insert "(da) a declared shop;".
- No. 6. Page 2, line 45 (clause 4)—After "goods" insert "of a kind used in the sport carried on in or about those premises".
- No. 7. Page 3, line 3 (clause 4)—Leave out this line.
- No. 8. Page 3, lines 9 to 12 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines.
- No. 9. Page 3, lines 35 to 37 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines.
- No. 10. Page 4—After clause 4, insert new clause 4a as follows:
  - 4a. (1) *Declared shops*—Where the Minister is satisfied that—

- (a) the business of a shop, being a business that is mainly or predominantly the retail sale of foodstuffs, was being carried on or before the commencement of this Act;
- (b) after the commencement of this Act the business of that shop continued to be the same as or substantially similar to the business of that shop before that commencement;

and

- (c) by reason of the operation of this Act, the number of hours in a week during which the business of that shop was carried on during the period of one month immediately before that commencement was more than the number of hours in a week during which the business of that shop may lawfully be carried on after that commencement,

the Minister may, by notice in writing served on the shopkeeper of that shop, declare that shop to be a declared shop for the purposes of this Act.

(2) A declaration under subsection (1) of this section may be expressed to have effect subject to such conditions, limitations or restrictions as are specified in the notice.

(3) Where the Minister is satisfied that a condition, limitation or restriction specified in a notice under subsection (1) of this section has not been complied with or has been contravened the Minister may by notice in writing served on the shopkeeper of the shop concerned revoke the declaration and upon that service the declaration shall have no further force or effect.

No. 11. Page 4, lines 13 to 15 (clause 5)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 12. Page 6, lines 20 and 21 (clause 11)—Leave out "supported by not less than two-thirds of the total number of members of the council".

No. 13. Page 6, line 33 (clause 11)—Leave out "three years" and insert "one year".

No. 14. Page 7, lines 1 to 4 (clause 12)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 15. Page 9, line 30 (clause 14)—After "goods" insert ", not being prescribed goods within the meaning of section 15 of this Act,".

No. 16. Page 9, line 45 (clause 15)—Leave out all words in this line.

*Amendment No. 1:*

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry):** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

This is the first of a series of amendments concerning convenience shops. Its effect is to permit the Minister to allow convenience shops to continue operating. All these amendments are in direct conflict with the findings of the Royal Commission that such shops are not in the best interests of the community. The Government has made clear its position on this matter, and I do not see what I can add to what I have already said about it.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I find the Minister's statement remarkable. This Bill has been the subject of intense debate, and considerable amendments to it have been moved and debated at length in another place. The propositions have been put forward, as always, with the best interests of the community in mind, and for the Minister simply to say that he can add nothing to what he has already said shows a peculiarly set and fixed attitude towards the whole business, an attitude that I find strange indeed.

Perhaps one can excuse it because of the Minister's natural concern that the legislation may not be passed in good time, and the Government may be unable to achieve what it said it would achieve, that is, late night shopping before Christmas. I understand perfectly well the difficulties that the Minister must be having and the reservations that he must have about the activities of Mr. Goldsworthy and the union involved. However, that is the Minister's problem, which he will have to solve. Surely, the Minister must have some influence on Mr. Goldsworthy, who seems at present to be in contempt on the Industrial Commission.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Mr. Goldsworthy's dealings have nothing to do with the amendment.

**Mr. TONKIN:** With respect, I will defer to your ruling. I am being charitable in saying that this could explain the Minister's perturbation over the entire matter and his unwillingness further to debate it. I find his attitude curious indeed. Three matters have been debated here: opening times, convenience shops, and red meat sales. Those matters have been debated thoroughly in this place previously and in the debate on the Bill that was introduced in another place. I can only support the amendments that have come from another place, and it is cavalier of the Minister to dismiss so briefly such a great deal of work and a detailed list of amendments.

**Mr. BECKER:** I support the amendments. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I express concern and disappointment that the Minister has not at any stage considered the representations made to him in this Chamber and in another place. Frankly, I was disgusted at the standard of debate that I heard in another place one evening last week, as well as at the sheer arrogance of Government members there who refused to accept any sort of argument whatsoever.

I should have thought that by now the department, the Minister and the Government would get the message on behalf of South Australia's consumers, and consider consumers in the metropolitan area and, more especially, those in my district. When one goes back through the history of late night shopping and looks at the start that was made some years ago in providing a list of exempt goods, one asks why legislation to create exempt goods was ever considered. Why did we ever try to dodge the issue of late night shopping after the 1970 referendum relating to shop trading in the metropolitan area was conducted?

This Parliament and the present Government created the whole issue of declared shops, and now the Government is going back on its word. This means that no business in South Australia will feel that it can trade legally, because its ability to trade could be jeopardised at any time by the whim of the Government. The Minister said that he and the Premier gave an undertaking that they would abide by the Royal Commission's findings. Last week, I asked the Minister a question on an entirely different subject, regarding which he set up a working party. Although that working party made a report and recommendations, the Minister has never published those recommendations because, he said, he did not call for them to be made. Yet the Minister says he will abide by the findings of the Royal Commission when the Royal Commissioner has made a recommendation that is completely outside his terms of reference. That is illogical, and I therefore appeal to the Minister because, if ever anything will be his undoing, it will be the double standards that he has adopted regarding the whole matter of convenience stores and declared shops in South

Australia. I urge the Minister to reconsider the whole matter.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 2:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

The original provision was included to enable small family shops to open during unrestricted trading hours. If this amendment was passed, the effect would be to allow large retailers to operate a chain of small shops through the appointment of managers. Such a move would be to the detriment of those businesses that the original provision was designed to protect. I do not know whether members of the Legislative Council knew what they were doing when they moved this amendment. However, I have examined the matter extremely closely, and it gets completely away from the recommendations made by the Royal Commission. In those circumstances, the Government will not accept it.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 3:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

This amendment seeks to increase from two to three the permissible number of staff engaged in small exempt shops. As such an increase is contrary to the Royal Commission's recommendations, I reject it.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I make the point at this stage that the ultimate policy and principle of the Liberal Party is that there should, as far as possible, be open trading, with the consent and agreement of all parties involved. By moving from two persons to three persons, as provided in this amendment, we are supporting that general principle, which will relate to a number of amendments that the Committee will consider. Although I do not intend to make that point each time, I want it clearly understood that that is our policy and the principle which we support. As three staff is therefore better than two, the Opposition supports the amendment.

**Mr. BECKER:** We do not believe that this Parliament ought to accept legislation by a Royal Commission. It is about time we did the job we were put here to do, that is represent the people. I support the increase in the number to three. If three employees can contribute to the efficient operation of a business and if the business can stand the employment of three persons, why not have three?

I was taught a long time ago that in industrial relations one should never place any employee at a disadvantage. No person who has to handle retail sales and money should ever be left unattended and open to attack or placed in a position of suspicion. Regardless of whether it is a supermarket, delicatessen, T.A.B. agency or bank, one should always consider the employees in this regard. If two people work in a shop and one wants to go to the bank or is called out of the building, the other person is left on his own and that is not fair. I know that there are many one-man businesses in the metropolitan area, but in the present situation I believe that any employer who leaves an employee unattended particularly after hours, would be an utter fool, showing total disregard for that person. It is plain common sense to increase the number of employees from two to three. I appeal to the Minister to reconsider his position on these grounds.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 4:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be disagreed to.

This amendment was passed by the other place to ensure that convenience stores can continue to operate. However, the amendment will have a wider repercussion. It would permit any food shop that does not exceed 186 square metres in floor area to have unrestricted trading hours. The result of such a provision would surely be that food retailers could establish chains of supermarkets which would have unrestricted trading hours. This would nullify the intention of the legislation and the recommendation of the Royal Commission that small food shops should have unrestricted trading hours but supermarkets should have to observe normal trading hours. If amendments Nos. 1, 5 and 10 are retained in the Bill, the Act will provide the necessary machinery by which existing convenience stores can continue to operate, providing that they continue in substantially the same manner as they are doing at present. There is no need for this amendment to be passed to enable convenience stores to continue operating.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I have listened to the Minister's explanation but I am not sure I have understood what it is all about. The effect of this amendment is, I take it, to allow convenience stores to continue, but the Minister says it goes wider than that. The Minister went on to say that, if amendments Nos. 1, 5 and 10 remained in the Bill, it would not be necessary to have amendment No. 4, because amendments Nos. 1, 5 and 10 between them would allow existing convenience stores to continue trading. Did the Minister accept amendment No. 1?

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** No. I was just saying that by way of explanation.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The explanation, so far as No. 4 is concerned, is useless, as I understand it, if the Minister has already rejected No. 1. Does the Minister intend to accept Nos. 5 and 10?

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** We have not got to them yet.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It is obvious the Minister does not intend to accept them, and that part of his explanation is quite specious. With respect to him and, I hope, my friendship with him, I could not accept that explanation at all. This was one of the strongly debated matters in this Chamber because of the utter unfairness to individuals of what the Government proposes. I therefore must say that I cannot support the motion. I support what the old people in the other place have suggested.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hoppood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

*Amendment No. 5:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be disagreed to.

It is merely consequential on amendment No. 1.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 6:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be disagreed to.

Such an amendment restricts the principal activities of exempt shops and sporting centres to the retail sale of sporting goods of a kind used in the sport carried on in those sporting centres. It appears to be unnecessary, and I reject it.

Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos. 7 and 8:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 7 and 8 be disagreed to.

These are the first in a series of amendments relating to trading hours of butcher shops. Their effect is to remove the special provisions concerning such shops and thus permit late night trading for the sale of meat in shopping districts. Such is contrary to the specific recommendation of the Royal Commission. I see no reason to say more than I said in the original debate.

**Mr. TONKIN:** The matter of the sale of meat was vigorously supported by the Opposition in this place, and obviously it has been supported by members in another place. I am of the opinion that, once again, we should work on the principle of the Bill, namely, that, if shopping hours are to be extended, they should be extended widely and should apply to all classes of foodstuff and other commodities. I support the amendments.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

*Amendment No. 9:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 9 be disagreed to.

This is simply consequential on amendment No. 2, and I reject it.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 10:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 10 be disagreed to.

This is consequential on amendment No. 1.

**Mr. BECKER:** I support the amendment, even though the consequential ones have been defeated by the Government. This is legislation by Royal Commission. The amendment really spells out what is a declared shop. I am surprised that a Minister of this Government is refusing an opportunity under a clause that would give him the whole power to control or supervise declared shops in South Australia. We are not particularly in favour of leaving total control to Ministers of the present Government but, in this case, we have made that compromise.

The attitude of the Minister's department and the Government has been made clear. Authority was given verbally in 1972 and was confirmed by letter in 1973. It was also confirmed that all declared shops or convenience stores were permitted to trade. It was further confirmed in 1975, and a press release was issued by the previous Minister. The position has been established clearly. There is a precedent for the retention of these convenience

stores. I refer now to the editorial in the *Advertiser* on Monday, November 7.

Whilst some members opposite may say that that newspaper is conservative and that it supports members on this side, I assure the Committee that it does not. I do not think the *Advertiser* has been all that helpful in the campaign that has been waging to retain convenience stores. It took that newspaper a long time to wake up that there was something in this legislation. In part, the editorial states:

While the Government's attitude throughout has been that the Bill should give effect to the Royal Commission's recommendations, the Opposition, while supporting the principle of late trading, has sought some major amendments. One for which there seems little support except from a section of retail traders that is wary about the whole business, was to cut out late Friday shopping and make Thursday the late night in the city as well as the suburbs. Another for which there may be rather more justification, although little prospect of success in the Council, was to remove the exclusion of fresh meat sales from late trading.

Here comes the crunch:

The Opposition's other proposed amendment, however, deserves some further consideration by the Government. One effect of the legislation, as it now stands, would be to remove the existing practice of seven days a week late trading in so-called convenience shops. The amendment seeks to preserve this privilege for such shops, mainly supermarkets in suburban and outer metropolitan areas.

The editorial should have been corrected, because they are not mainly supermarkets. The editorial continues:

There is clear evidence already that feeling on this issue is running high, not only among customers who have become used to enjoying such facilities but among owners and those who work in the supermarkets. If they enjoy some trading advantage over others, as the commission found, it does not necessarily follow that they should not continue to do so if they are providing a service for which there is a demonstrable demand.

There is a demand, and it was clearly proved that, of 11 000 constituents in one part of my district, about 7 000 signed the petition. About 4 500 signed it within the first 2½ days, during which people were manning the desk and asking for signatures, whereas for the remainder of the week it was left there for people to sign voluntarily. That, in itself, proves that the people in Henley South, Fulham and West Beach areas are concerned at losing the services of the West Beach Foodland. We had evidence that the increased costs of operating the store, which provides employment for 85 young people on a part-time basis, varied between 1 per cent and 1½ per cent, which was absorbed in the business's profits. The business is able to operate, because of its size of about 5 300 square feet. The reason why I did not speak earlier is that the store's selling area is 486.2 square metres. To accept 400 square metres would have been selling out this business.

A proprietor needs a certain floor area in order to operate his business. He must have sufficient area in order to be able to display a wide range of goods and to engage in discount selling. He must also have sufficient shelf space, various brands, and be able to generate volume sales. There would have been plenty of opportunity for the competitors who believed that they were being damaged by this operation to commence a similar kind of operation. The closest competitor has written to the Minister, saying that he was pleased because he was making a profit. We must consider the consumers, the wide range of members of the public, and shift workers.

A row of six blocks of flats near the supermarket is occupied mainly by young married couples who are trying



to save money by working overtime. The only time during which they can shop is after normal hours. There are many other flats throughout the West Beach and Henley South areas. The West Beach caravan park is the largest such park in South Australia. It was used by 90 000 caravans last year, involving about 360 000 people. If we are to attract tourists to South Australia, we want them to take sightseeing tours, not do their shopping, in the day time.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Wouldn't making Adelaide an international airport attract tourists?

**Mr. BECKER:** That would be done over my dead body.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You're speaking with two voices, aren't you?

**Mr. BECKER:** The honourable member has not been in the House for weeks.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The discussion between the honourable member for Mitcham and the honourable member for Hanson has little bearing on the motion before the Committee, and I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to desist from interjecting.

**Mr. BECKER:** The established convenience stores are for the benefit of the people the present Government claims it represents, but it wants to take away a privilege those people enjoy. If the member for Mitcham wants to remain a member, he also should represent the people instead of considering one or two of the privileged class who want to travel overseas occasionally. We should be thinking about the people and their environment. I will fight for my constituents at every opportunity I have. I believe that, as there is a convenience store at West Beach, it should remain there.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hoppood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker (teller), Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

*Amendment No. 11:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 11 be disagreed to.

This amendment is consequential on amendment No. 7, and I oppose it.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I support the amendment. One of the prime benefits of late night shopping should be to enable women in paid employment to do food shopping. What is the use of having additional time in which to shop for food if red meat is excluded from the available products? If the provision in the Bill is passed, we will see a distortion of eating habits in this State. We will see the consumption of red meat decline, and the diet of South Australians will be affected by this provision.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You're exaggerating.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** That is not an exaggeration. If people can shop at night and buy fish and poultry, but cannot buy the flesh of red meat, they will buy what is available, and the consumption of red meat will decline.

**Mr. Millhouse:** People do not shop only at night.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** True, many people will continue to shop during the day, but late night shopping will be available and many people will take advantage of it. However, they will be deprived of the full advantage

because butcher shops will not be open. This Bill is a farrago of bureaucratic nonsense, since it prevents people from doing what they want when they want in buying anything from food to sculptures, artefacts, or wood carvings. Had I been able to be present in the House when the vote was taken, I would have opposed the Bill.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 12:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 12 be disagreed to.

This amendment provides that an application to the Minister by district or municipal councils to vary a proclaimed shopping district must be supported by a simple majority of that council. The original requirement of a two-thirds majority of the council has existed in the Industrial Code since 1970 and has presented no difficulties in operation. Therefore, it is not desirable to change that procedure without evidence of practical problems concerning the implementation of that provision.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 13:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 13 be disagreed to.

This amendment allows a council to apply to the Minister for a variation of a proclaimed shopping district after one year has elapsed since a previous application was rejected. The original provision of three years was included in the Early Closing Act in 1926. That provision, which has a long history, has operated successfully.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 14:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 14 be disagreed to.

This amendment is consequential on amendment No. 7. Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 15:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 15 be agreed to.

I support this drafting amendment. It gives full and proper effect to clause 15, which restricts the after-hours sale of prescribed goods.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 16:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 16 be disagreed to.

This amendment is merely consequential on amendment No. 7.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 14 and 16 was adopted:

Because the amendments adversely affect the legislation.

*Later:*

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry)** moved:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Bannon, Becker, McRae, and Wright.



*Later:*

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 9.15 a.m. on Wednesday, November 23, 1977.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference on the Shop Trading Hours Bill to be held during the adjournment of the House and that the managers report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.  
Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from November 17. Page 905.)

**Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder):** When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was speaking of the water situation in the Virginia area.

**Dr. Eastick:** A very critical problem.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** It is a critical problem, as suggested by the member for Light, who would have an excellent understanding of the area and of the situation. I know that he has assisted in this matter in the past, and his assistance has been gratefully accepted. I should like to refer to a small booklet written by Mr. Ian Marks, who speaks about the use of the Adelaide Plains, saying that possibly there is not another area in South Australia with the climatic conditions of the Adelaide Plains and its closeness to the market for the production of vegetables, especially the Virginia area. The soil is of a pervious nature and drains well, and because of this the area does not experience the problems of salinity that occur in other parts of the State. However, the problem of the water and the basin persists.

In any business we must have progress. Business cannot stagnate; it must progress or decline. If the market gardeners of the area have any cutting back of their water supply, it will be a retrograde step. Either they must receive the quotas they are now receiving or receive an increased volume of water if they are to continue as efficient operators. The introduction of quotas sorted out a few problems and now, because of this, those who farm in this way in the Virginia area are mainly efficient and viable market gardeners.

A case was brought to my attention by a market gardener last Friday evening when I was visiting Virginia. The gardener concerned has an allocation of water which he quoted in gallons, and I think my conversion is probably correct. He has a quota of 306 000 000 litres a year, and he was not drawing water in the month of June, in the hope that rain would fall. On June 15, when the meter reader read the meter, the gardener asked him for details. He said, "Am I permitted to use water out of this year's quota to June 30, the date to which my allocation extends?" The meter reader replied that that day, June 15, was the final reading for the year and that any water used from that day until the end of the month would be deducted from the following year's quota if the gardener overused that quota.

The gardener had remaining in his quota 13 500 000 litres of water. No rain fell, and, before the end of June, he found it necessary, because of the planting of potatoes early in July, to use 11 250 000 litres of water, leaving in his previous allocation 2 250 000 litres. However, because that meter had been read on June 15, it was emphatically

pointed out to him that the water he used before the end of the month would be deducted from the following year's allocation.

This is a pertinent example of what I was endeavouring to explain earlier in my remarks. The growers consider that it would be far better and more just if they were given an allocation set over a period of years so that, according to weather conditions, they could allocate their quota from year to year, rather than being jeopardised, restricted and penalised, as has the grower in question this year. Apparently, he will get no redress. He was waiting for rain, trying to do the right thing, so that water would not be wasted; now he is penalised for taking a sane, just and correct action.

The farmers do not want to waste water; rather, they are endeavouring to conserve it by correct usage. I ask the Minister to consider this case. I have the name of the grower involved and I am willing to submit it to the Minister. Some consideration should be given to this case because, by June 30, the farmer had not used his full quota and the water he used in the period between the final meter reading on June 15 and June 30 will be lost if he finds it necessary to use his full quota for the current year. The production of the Virginia area and the Adelaide Plains, as outlined in statistics I quoted earlier in my remarks, amounts to more than \$15 000 000 a year in vegetables for use in South Australia and other States. As it is an industry we can ill afford to lose, efforts must continue to see that adequate water is produced.

I now refer to the use of Bolivar water. I have a letter written by Mr. W. R. Miller, who I believe is the manager of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association in Adelaide. The letter appeared in the morning paper earlier this month, and reads as follows:

Following your editorial "Sign of the dripping tap" (*Advertiser* 29/10/77) the hardpressed gardeners of the Virginia district are still wondering why their plan to use the useful Bolivar water (proved on the Munno Para experimental garden 1968 to 1975) to supplement their failing bores was fobbed off. This irrigation plan could have been financed with a Commonwealth water grant at no cost to the South Australian taxpayer (*Hansard* 15/10/70, 19/11/70 and 22/11/72). No satisfactory explanation was ever given with the official refusal to allow this scheme to get under way.

It is now evident that locally grown vegetables could be very scarce in the near future due to the severe restrictions on the use of bore water, and the drought conditions over South Australia. Useful Bolivar water, approximately 90 000 000 litres a day, has been flowing into the sea for 10 years. This is an appalling waste in view of South Australia's severe water shortage, coupled with the fact that South Australia is the driest State in Australia.

The *News* of November 3 contained a report, under the heading "Government studies report on effluent", as follows:

The State Government has received a report containing recommendations about the use of Bolivar effluent water for irrigation on the Adelaide Plains. But the Works Minister, Mr. Corcoran, is not giving any indication of the recommendations.

He said today the report, prepared by the South Australian Water Resources Council, would be carefully studied by the Government, and Parliament would be advised. Vegetable growers on the northern Adelaide Plains warned this week that the price of vegetables would be forced up in Adelaide because growers did not have enough water.

Mr. Corcoran said the Government was not going to be pressured into making premature decisions on such a vital matter. He said a scheme proposed last year was for effluent

to be piped to irrigation areas. It was estimated the scheme would cost more than \$20 000 000.

He had made it clear at the time the proposed scheme was unattractive economically and could not be financed from the resources of the State. He stressed the scheme would not receive favourable consideration from the Commonwealth Government.

The Minister of Works has said that the Government will not be pressured into making a premature decision, but I respectfully suggest to him that investigations have been going on for many years. Because of the urgency of the situation, because of its use to the State for the production of foodstuffs, and because of the effect on a multi-million dollar industry in this State, I ask the Minister and the Government to take urgent action to ensure that something can be done soon so that water at Bolivar can be used to help provide vegetables for the benefit not only of South Australia but also of other States.

At the outset of my speech I congratulated some people and wished others well, but I did not refer to you, Mr. Speaker. I congratulate you on your appointment to the high office of Speaker in this House, and wish you well and every success in the future.

I refer now to road grants to South Australia. As Opposition spokesman on local government, I believe that the matter of road grants overlaps the interests of transport but, because it has a vital bearing on local government, it is pertinent and appropriate that I should refer to this matter. Whenever road grants are referred to the Minister of Transport always states that there is insufficient money coming from Canberra and that Opposition members should co-operate with the Government in seeking more money from Canberra for this purpose.

**Mr. Venning:** This crowd doesn't know how to handle money.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** I will come to that point later. About the Minister's claim, I agree that this State could do with more money and that we should do our best to entice the Federal Government to make more money available, but sound reasons have been given for the money not being available, especially concerning road grants. I quote from an address, given by the Hon. Peter Nixon (Minister for Transport) on November 8 this year to the annual conference of the Australian Council of Local Government Associations, as follows:

For this financial year the Commonwealth has provided a total of \$475 000 000 which represents an increase of 8.8 per cent over the amount provided during 1976-77. I am well aware that some criticism has been forthcoming both from local government associations and State Governments that this allocation falls short of the Bureau of Roads recommendations.

As I have already suggested, however, the Government's primary objective has been to overcome the severe economic problems we faced at the end of 1975. Without being political I would suggest that the starting point the Government faced in December, 1975, was one of severe economic depression marked by an inflation rate of over 17 per cent, high unemployment which increased by 230 per cent between July, 1973, and July, 1975, and a net growth of less than 1 per cent between 1973 and the end of 1975.

While our increase of 8.8 per cent in road grants falls short of the Bureau of Roads recommendation, it is broadly in line with the overall increase in total Budget outlays and, I believe, demonstrates the importance we attach to the development and maintenance of an adequate road network for Australia. It must always be remembered that the Bureau of Roads advice was on the basis of examining the situation of road needs in Australia in isolation, and certainly did not

take into consideration the starting point of economic depression that the Government faced at the end of 1975 that I have just reminded you about.

That is the reason for the curtailment of moneys for road grants. Worrying about the lack of money we get is one thing, but what we are doing with the money we get is another thing. I have a scale of figures that indicates that for some years there has been in money terms an increase in the amounts received by South Australia for road grants. However, I admit that, because of inflation that has occurred, this money has not been as valuable in constructing roads as it has been in past years. Nevertheless, the Federal Government has increased in some categories the amount that has been supplied to this State. I am concerned that local governing bodies, particularly in rural areas, have not been receiving the amounts that they would like to have received. I am sure that the Federal Government intended that this money should reach councils. I refer to a news release by the Federal Minister for Transport, which the Minister has repeated exactly in his speech to the Australian Council of Local Government Associations this month. The release also states:

"I told my State counterparts that, unless and until I can be certain the Government's priorities for local government are met, it is the Commonwealth's intention to channel its funds in such a way, and to such an extent, there can be no credence to any claim that the Commonwealth is responsible for road-funding difficulties at the local government level."

In indicating the Government's priorities, Mr. Nixon said however that he was prepared to listen to views and suggestions from the States as to how the Government's concern in the area of funding of local government might be met. Mr. Nixon said, "The Government has directed funds to the local government sector mainly through savings in allocations to urban arterial freeways".

In the allocations and the categories the release distinctly states that there has been, after inflation has been taken into account, an 87.7 per cent increase for the category of rural arterial roads; an 11.9 per cent increase for rural local roads; a 46.5 per cent decrease for urban arterial roads; but an increase of 77 per cent for urban local roads. I am sure that the Minister does not believe in these categories.

To give an example of the Minister's attitude about categories of road funding, I quote from a speech that he delivered at the Local Government Conference at the Australian National University on May 24 this year, when he said:

Turning now to road categorisation, there is a view which is widely held in local government circles that money allocated to local roads automatically goes to local government. That is not so. In some cases, particularly in rural areas, many roads classed as local roads are under the care, control and management of the State road authorities. Conversely, there are instances where work on national highways is carried out by local government authorities.

Indeed, in South Australia, the national highway through the Adelaide Hills is being presently constructed by a sizable gang of Highways Department employees, by a sizable gang of private contractors, and by a very sizable gang of local government employees working under debit-order to the Highways Department. Before I leave the area of road grants, Mr. Chairman, I think I should state specifically that I totally reject the multiplicity of categories through which the spending of funds on the road network is governed at present.

I think that that is a pertinent statement, because that is exactly what is happening in South Australia. All road funding is being placed in the one fund. I have a letter

from the District Council of Mount Gambier objecting because "grant in aid" money is not being distributed to councils separately. This was an amount that could be used autonomously by the council, but now it does not know whether it will get that amount or whether it will go into general revenue and be used elsewhere. Early in the year the Commissioner of Highways (and I commend him for doing so) went to local government conferences, he even visited some councils.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Tell me, are you still shadow Minister (so-called) of Transport or Local Government?

**Mr. RUSSACK:** I have explained that.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I have been sitting here patiently, because I have to: I follow you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Goyder has the floor.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** In a speech he delivered, the Commissioner of Highways said, among other things (and I do not want to take this out of context, but I think these paragraphs are self-explanatory)—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Are you sure this isn't stuff you had left over from before the election when you were shadow Minister?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. RUSSACK:** It was my intention to complete my remarks as quickly as possible, to give time to other members, but the more the member for Mitcham interjects the longer I will be and the longer he will have to wait. The Commissioner of Highways said:

The present is an opportune time to explain in some detail the changes that have occurred in policy relating to the allocation and administration of grants generally.

So we have changes to grants generally in this State. The Commissioner continued:

The responsibilities of councils are, of course, subject to and modified by powers and duties conferred by other legislation such as the Highways Act. Under the latter Act, the Commissioner of Highways can take over specified powers of local government.

In one of the concluding paragraphs he says:

It must be emphasised that road needs in a particular area are not static, and that no individual council can expect to receive any given proportion of funds, or indeed any grants at all. Councils have no entitlement to any annual level of grants. Funds will be directed to areas of highest priority on a State basis, and it naturally follows that no council has an entitlement to a constant annual level of grants.

I took a sample of 10 district councils and found that they had all except one had a reduction in their road funding for this year, despite the fact that expenditure for the category of rural arterial roads was increased by 87.7 per cent and for the category of rural local roads by 11.9 per cent. Only one council that I approached had received an increase, and it had received an increase of one-third this year. In the main, councils have received less. I would think that this is the pattern throughout the State.

When I look at the document entitled "Schedule of proposed works financial year ending June 30, 1978", I find that there is a proposed expenditure for national highways of \$20 800 000, of which \$12 995 000 will be spent on either the South-Eastern Freeway or the Swanport diversion. In the category of national highways there has, admittedly, been a reduction from \$17 300 000 last year to \$15 000 000 this year, but that was because the Eyre Highway had been completed, yet not one cent has been appropriated to the Stuart Highway in South Australia. As I have said, a sum of \$12 995 000 will be spent on the South-Eastern Freeway, including the Swanport diversion.

It seems apparent that moneys for roadworks are being allocated in a lump sum to the Highways Department and then appropriated to the various roadworks that the Highways Department considers are essential and necessary. I realise that the metropolitan area and the roads that feed the metropolitan area, because of the population, must have priority and careful consideration, but not to the extent that councils, particularly in rural areas, are deprived of money that was intended for them.

May I quote from another press release from the Federal Minister on September 13 of this year:

The Minister for Transport, Mr. Peter Nixon, said today he was extremely concerned that total expenditure on rural local roads in South Australia will be 3.5 per cent less this year than last year. "The Commonwealth Government, because of its concern for the problems facing local government in the financing of their road programmes, increased grants to South Australia for urban local roads by 100 per cent and rural local roads by 26.4 per cent this year over 1976-77," Mr. Nixon said. "The reason for the drop in total funds for rural local roads is that the South Australian Government has reduced substantially its contribution to these roads. The Dunstan Government's failure represents the deliberate taking away by the State Government of all the benefit given to local government by the Commonwealth under the rural local road funding programme," he said. Mr. Nixon said the Commonwealth was clearly doing its part to assist local government and he hoped that, despite Mr. Virgo's failure to provide any State funds to local government under the local road programme recently submitted to the Commonwealth for approval, the State will rethink its position and make additional funds available to local government this year.

While I agree with the South Australian Minister that there should be, and we should all fight for, a greater proportion of funding, we should see that it is distributed in a right and proper manner. In his speech at the National University, the Minister said:

All State Ministers of Roads have at the last three conferences of the Australian Transport Advisory Council unanimously urged the Federal Minister to transfer the decision-making powers back to the States.

I am glad to hear that statement from a Minister of a Socialist Government. As a matter of fact, it is almost a statement in support of federalism, because that is exactly what federalism is (paying the money to the States) but, on the same principle, could not local government say the same thing to the State Government: "Give us an allocation of funds in the correct proportion and allow us to use it as we know it should be used"?

**Mr. Chapman:** So as to benefit from the local knowledge available at that time.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Exactly. As the State Government has the local knowledge, so does local government have the local knowledge. I bring forward one other point, on a question asked last week. I hope I am not encroaching on the domain of the member for Alexandra—

**Mr. Chapman:** You are welcome to do so at any time.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** —but I should like to bring forward a point about road funding, concerning the bridge at Cavan. Last week the Minister once again placed the blame in the court of the Commonwealth Government, but I have a schedule here of the 1977-78 national roads construction programme for South Australia, which includes the following job description: "continue two kilometres construction between Cross Keys and Salisbury Highway, including bridges over railway at Cavan, \$860 000." That money was allocated for that work by the Commonwealth; but we have not seen any evidence of that money being used. I know planning work is going on and that this costs

money, and that there is drafting, but my point is that money has been made available in this financial year for that overpass. I ask that that work be expedited as soon as possible.

**Mr. Chapman:** In the meantime, traffic continues to stack up and accidents, even deaths, continue to occur.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Yes. I understand that, because of the improved construction of that road, a lot of traffic is coming into the intersection at the Ajax motor garage, and also from the Salisbury Highway. Traffic is even coming from Elizabeth and exacerbating the situation. So, the sooner that is rectified, the better. Because of the time, I will conclude my remarks, but I bring those two major matters to the notice of the Government: (1) the seriousness of the water situation in the Virginia area and (2) local government concern about road funding, which local government views in a very serious light. It considers it is not receiving the funding that was intended for it from Canberra and which I have, no doubt, made known to honourable members this afternoon by the press releases and the statements of the Federal Minister. I support the motion.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** If it had not been for some remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in this debate last week, I probably would not have bothered to speak in it at all, because it has become quite hollow and meaningless. Now, we do not even have the Address-in-Reply debate at the beginning of the session, where it always has been on the formal motion to thank the Governor for the Speech with which he opened Parliament. He did make a speech, whatever we may like to think about it but, like so much that goes on in this place, it is really quite superfluous, and I have wondered several times today whether all that we do here is worthwhile.

I had to listen to the member for Goyder but, for a good part of his speech, I was the only member on this side of the Chamber, and I was here because I had to be. It costs, as Greg Kelton pointed out in his article yesterday, over \$6 000 000 a year to keep this place going, and sometimes one feels frustrated about it.

However, I did see a small mention on a back page of the *Advertiser* last week of something that the Leader of the Opposition had said in this debate so, because it pricked my interest, I looked it up in *Hansard*. It concerned the uranium issue, and also the question of police files. This is what the Leader said last Tuesday in this debate:

I now wish to refer to one or two matters that have arisen as a result of a newspaper report that appeared this morning. That was the Attorney-General's speech in Canberra, about which everybody is flapping. The Leader continued:

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.

He went on to try to excuse the fact that the Liberal Party, numerically the major Party on this side of the House, had changed its mind since he committed it, off the cuff I think, to support the motion introduced by the Premier on March 30 on uranium.

One could not have found a weaker explanation, excuse, for what the Liberal Party has done than that. The real reason that the Liberal Party is running away from the support which it gave to that motion on March 30 is simply that the Federal Government, which it follows slavishly through thick and thin, has made an arbitrary decision that

the mining and export of uranium from this country should go ahead and like a little puppy dog the Liberal Party in this State simply follows on. The Leader of the Opposition—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** What is this for, Sir, a message from the Legislative Council?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Oh, all right.

*Later:*

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I take it that while that was going on the little time clock was not ticking away my time. Can I have your assurance on that?

**The SPEAKER:** I think that was the case. I can assure the honourable member that he will have his time.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** As you have been generous enough to give me back my two minutes, I think I can assure the House that I will not need them. I am glad to have them, anyway. When I was interrupted I was dealing with the gutless hypocrisy of members of the Liberal Party over the uranium issue. I referred to what the Leader of the Opposition said last week in this debate and I was going on to quote from his policy speech which he mentioned because he said in the policy speech, "All was made clear on uranium." All I can find in the speech on mining of any minerals is:

The further development of our natural resources of copper, oil, coal and gas will be given high priority and we will proceed immediately to explore and define, and to initiate environmental impact studies on all proposed projects.

That does not mean much but it is harmless. The policy speech goes on:

When these studies are completed, we will be able to make decisions about the exploitation of our uranium reserves, too. Any development will be required to proceed within the strict guidelines I have already announced.

Goodness knows what those strict guidelines are! People talk about guidelines on this subject but they are never prepared to say just what they involve. That is all we had from the Liberal Party until the mention in the Address in Reply debate last week. I have said some fairly hard things about the Liberal Party. I think I referred to gutless hypocrisy. I may say that the Labor Party is not much better on this matter in my view and I myself—

**Mr. Venning:** What about you?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The member for Rocky River pays me the compliment of an interjection and asks what about me. To answer his interjection I propose to quote from my own policy speech of last September to show what I said about the mining of uranium. First of all, I quoted the resolution which was passed in this House on March 30 and pointed out that it was moved by the Premier and supported by the Leader of the Opposition, who added a second part by amendment, and I said that although I would have liked something stronger, I too, spoke in favour of it. I went on:

Now we find the Premier is encouraging the mining of copper and uranium at Roxby Downs saying that uranium can be stockpiled. His motion and what he now says less than six months later simply cannot be reconciled. It is expediency and hypocrisy.

I went on to deal with the Liberals and said they had changed their minds simply because their Party in Canberra had made the decision which is contrary to the decision they all supported in this House. In relation to this subject I want to set out unequivocally the position of the Australian Democrats on the question of uranium mining. This was one of the first matters of policy which

was balloted by the Party and upon which a firm and definite position has been reached. It is as follows:

**Uranium export:** That there be an indeterminate stay of uranium export and that it be accompanied not only by public debate but also by constructive action by Australia to stimulate, and itself initiate, a massive international programme of research and development of safe and inexhaustible supplies of energy, whatever their nature.

**Use of proceeds if or when any uranium is exported:** Members were strongly against all the profits remaining with the mining companies. They strongly supported a proposal to devote a proportion of profits to research and development of alternative energy sources, either through an export levy or nationalisation.

**Method of public decision:** That, following structured national (and, if possible, international) debate for at least one full term of Parliament, the issue be put to separate referendum at the same time as a subsequent election.

That is our policy. It is not equivocal; it is the policy we are putting to the people of this country at the coming Federal election. It is in contrast to both the other Parties. Despite the efforts of the Labor Party to capitalise on the uranium issue, your Party knows, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is divided; the Liberal Party does not give a damn about the future. All they are interested in is the short-term advantages which they see from the mining and exporting of uranium. If we look in today's *Advertiser* at the policy speech delivered last evening by Mr. Fraser, apparently all he said about uranium mining on behalf of the Liberal Party was:

And using our immense uranium deposits for peaceful purposes under the world's strictest safeguards.

God knows what they are! We are not allowed to know what Australia's safeguards for uranium mining are going to be. They are kept secret. No-one has heard what they are but we are told they are the strictest in the world.

**Mr. Max Brown:** How can you control other people?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is the whole point of the thing; it is impossible to do that. The Liberal Party says the strictest safeguards, but nobody in Australia except the Cabinet apparently, and a few public servants, are allowed to know what those safeguards are to enable us to make any decision for ourselves as to whether or not they are strict. That is all that we got from the Liberals in the policy speech. I do not know what the Country Party says about the matter. Probably, it says, "Dig the whole damn country up and give the uranium away." However, the member for Flinders supported that motion on March 20, like every other member of this House.

That is the position that we have now. It is not true to say as the Leader of the Opposition implied in this debate last week, namely, that, now that the second Fox report has come out, that has given the go-ahead to uranium mining. It did not do that. On page 9 of the report, in the section for which the marginal note is "The Commission's proposals", the report states:

After consideration of all factors, we propose a solution which, if a decision is made that uranium mining is to proceed, provides a reasonably satisfactory accommodation between competing interests and the conflicting uses to which land in the region can be put.

This report does not say that Australia should go ahead with uranium mining. Indeed, it refers back to the first report and the various findings made about the dangers and difficulties for us (for all mankind) of mining uranium. I will not go through them all: they are set out in the report at pages 185 and 186, under the heading, "Principal findings and recommendations." They have been ignored by the Federal Government.

During the recent State election campaign I mentioned publicly (and I have had no refutation of it) that there had come into my hands a copy of a document. It was one of the many thousands of documents circulated in South Australia and it was headed, "Uranium declaration, the people's right to decide." Whilst I have only a photostat copy of the document, Mr. Bob Giles, who gave it to me, has assured me that he has the original in his possession. That uranium declaration, the thrust of which was against uranium mining in Australia, was signed by the member for Bragg, the present Leader of the Opposition in this House.

**Mr. Chapman:** And a good one, too.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I will not comment on that. Perhaps the member for Alexandra carries loyalty too far when he makes that interjection. The document was signed by David Tonkin, a man named Bruce Harris (who, I understand, was to be a Liberal candidate in a north-eastern district), Joe Milne (a senior officer of the Liberal Party), a Mr. Taylor (who, I understand, is now Director of that Party), and his son. I have been told that that was what happened one day in May, on a Saturday morning, when the Leader of the Opposition was at Tea Tree Plaza, spruiking, coincidentally, on the shopping hours issue.

Mr. Giles presented the uranium declaration to him and, apparently, he was discomfited by the presence of several Young Liberals and did not like not to sign it. Those who were in his party followed suit and signed it.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** This was before Fraser cracked the whip.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I do not know about that. I point out, in all fairness, that the Leader crossed out the first of the three points, which was "Agree to a five-year moratorium on the mining and export of uranium". He explained to Mr. Giles (and I have questioned that person closely on this) that he did that not because he did not believe in a moratorium but because he thought a moratorium of a definite length was weak and that there should be an indefinite moratorium on the mining of uranium and its export from Australia. Any member who wishes to look at this document to check the Leader's signature on it, as I have done, is welcome to do so. This is what the Leader signed:

Uranium declaration, the people's right to decide. The final decision on the mining and export of uranium must rest with the Australian people, after a full public discussion.

What a laugh of a full public discussion we have had in Australia so far! There have been some farcical debates in the Federal Parliament. According to my colleague, Mr. Chipp, they have been gagged and they have been a waste of the time spent on them (and that time has not been much). The document continues:

The Fox report pointed out the many dangers, hazards and problems associated with nuclear power. These include:

1. The increased risk of nuclear war.
2. The real prospect of nuclear theft, sabotage and blackmail; and
3. The lack of any safe means for permanently disposing of high level radioactive wastes from nuclear power plants.

The Fox report also pointed out that uranium mining would create very few jobs and make very little contribution to national income. Moreover, in Australia uranium mining would have harmful effects on Aboriginal land culture and the natural environment. Because of these and other problems, we, the undersigned, call on the Australian Government to:

Then three points are listed. As I have said, the first has been crossed out. The document continues:

2. Promote full public discussion of all the questions raised by the mining and export of uranium, leading to a decision by all the Australian people; and
3. Develop a national energy policy which concentrates on energy conservation and the research and development of safer energy sources.

Having signed that in May, he went back on it because his Federal colleagues made a contrary decision, and he said what he did in his policy speech and what he said in the House last week. In my view, that is absolutely disgraceful.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** That does not contradict what you have just read out.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I know the member for Davenport personally favours the mining and export of uranium, and there his interjection is understandable, but his vote on March 30 in this House is not understandable, because of what we know of his personal views on the matter.

**Mr. Becker:** There was no division on the motion.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The member for Hanson says that there was no division.

**Mr. Becker:** You weren't even in the House.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I spoke in the debate.

**Mr. Becker:** That afternoon.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** What is the fellow talking about? Does anyone understand him? The member for Hanson knows as well as any other member (or almost as well: perhaps we have to be a little realistic) that any member could have called for a division on that motion if he wanted to, and the fact that no member on either side called for a division shows that every member favoured the motion!

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** No member called "No".

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is correct. Did members believe it then or did they not, because nothing has changed nationally or internationally, except the decision of their Party, which they must follow slavishly irrespective of what they think and irrespective of the damage, danger and destruction that that decision may bring to all mankind? That is the position with the Liberals. I must say that, in my view, the Labor Party is not doing much better. In the *National Times* last weekend there was a full-page advertisement, in which there was a photograph of the Premier. According to the report, the Premier stated:

On uranium, I am asking you to vote as the Liberals did in South Australia to play it safe.

That is signed "Don Dunstan, Premier, South Australia". The report continues:

No safeguards worthy of the name exist. Science simply does not know how to store nuclear waste, yet it stays deadly for 250 000 years.

There are no effective international agreements to police the way in which customer nations might use our uranium. For example, three years ago India exploded its first atomic device from uranium supplied by Canada for peaceful purposes.

So far so good. I agree entirely with those comments, and I challenge any member of the Liberal Party or the Country Party, either present in the Chamber now or outside, to deny the truth of that statement. Absolute silence. None of them can deny it. Not the member for Hanson, the member for Davenport, the member for Goyder, the member for Alexandra, the member for Rocky River, the member for Kavel or the member for Flinders can deny it.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** You know only too well that if we interject we would be ruled out of order.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** None of them denies it. Under the sub-heading "Accidents, Spillages and Deaths" the advertisement continues as follows:

When this, the full story on uranium, was placed before the South Australian House of Assembly, to their everlasting credit—

I believe that Dunstan is made to speak here with his tongue in his cheek—

every elected member—Liberal, National Country Party—everyone voted with the A.L.P. to play it safe.

The Australian Democrats' lone representative, poor little fellow, did not get a mention. However, there is method in that madness. I did not get a mention because of what comes next. The advertisement continues:

In this coming election—

he says, or is made to say in the advertisement—

I ask you, whatever your political persuasion, to please do the same.

He obviously did not write the advertisement itself because it contains a split infinitive. It continues:

I am aware that this can only mean to vote with the A.L.P.

Of course, that is wrong, because the Australian Democrats far more sincerely and strongly have espoused, as I read out in our policy, an indefinite moratorium on the mining and exporting of uranium. It would be damaging to the Labor Party even to acknowledge in a public advertisement the Australian Democrats exist, in the same way as the Liberals will not acknowledge in a public advertisement, that the Australian Democrats exist. About the only thing that the two Parties will agree on now is what a bad development in Australian politics is the Australian Democrats, because it is a threat to both the Labor and Liberal Parties, as the Minister for Community Welfare well knows. This was acknowledged to me by Professor Neal Blewett the other day at a seminar on the election.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** I know you're a bad development because you keep developing from one Party to another.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Minister is being unkind when he says that. I am referring, as he knows, to the Party. What I have quoted is what the Labor Party is saying in its advertisement, but, of course, it is not what is happening in this State. We now know that uranium exploration on quite an intense scale is occurring in South Australia with the consent, if not the encouragement, of the Government. What do we know about that?

Last Friday, Mr. Justice Wells handed down a judgment in the Supreme Court of South Australia. On Saturday morning the judgment got some publicity, as did some of my comments. As a result I received a telephone call over the weekend and was told that there are, to the knowledge of the person who spoke to me, two areas close to Adelaide in which exploration for uranium is now occurring. The first is in the Adelaide Hills. This man came from Gumeracha, as a matter of fact, which is in the Kavel District, and he told me that he was a landowner in the area and that he had been served with a notice of entry. He also said that about 200 landowners in an area roughly between Kersbrook and Gawler had been served with notices of entry. The company that has been given the licence to explore is one of the so-called multi-nationals that attract such contempt and derision from members of the Labor Party.

**Mr. Becker:** Are you going to name the company?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am. For the benefit of the member for Hanson, it is a German company—Uranerz.

**Mr. Nankivell:** East or West?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I think it is West German. It has its Australian office in the West but is of German origin. That company has been given by the Minister of Mines and Energy a licence to explore for uranium in the Adelaide Hills in the area that I have mentioned between Gawler and Kersbrook. For the benefit of the member for Alexandra, I mention another area about which he may know but about which he has been damned silent if he does know. That company has another exploration licence for an area south of—

**Mr. Chapman:** Myponga.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** —Willunga, on my instruction, which is Myponga, too, I suppose. Uranerz has also been granted an exploration licence down there. How that can be squared with the advertisement that features Don Dunstan, I do not know, but I should like to know. That is not all, of course. I referred to the judgment that was handed down last Friday. That was an action—

**Mr. Chapman:** As far as the Minister's department was concerned it condoned and explained the activities of that group at Myponga only last month.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** There you are, the member for Alexandra tells us that the matter has been explained and condoned. No doubt he supports it himself.

**Mr. Chapman:** Yes, I do.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** There you are. I hope the member for Alexandra, who was silent a few minutes ago when I challenged any member of the Liberal Party to explain his vote on March 30, will, when he speaks in this debate, explain his apparent change of heart. Now let me come to the other—

**Mr. Chapman:** I'll promise to do that if you'll promise to be around to listen.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is asking a lot.

**Mr. Max Brown:** Don't make too many rash promises.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** No, that would be a rash promise. I never cease to be amused by the Liberals: if I am here they seem to resent it and if I am not here they seem to miss me.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** If you're not here they are worrying about where you might be operating.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That might be so, too. On Friday Mr. Justice Wells gave his decision in an action that I believe was between two men called Schulz and Taylor and Esso Exploration and Production. North Flinders came into the action somewhere, too. I have not read the judgment, and I do not intend to canvass it. What I have here is the deed between Schulz and Taylor and Esso Exploration and Production Australia Incorporated, which, again, is part of a multi-national organisation. That deed provides for the transfer of a mineral claim from Schulz and Taylor to Esso Exploration and Production, and recites that Esso is the holder of exploration licence No. 263 and that Schulz and Taylor are the holders of a mineral claim. The effect of the deed is to transfer the mineral claim on certain conditions to Esso.

One of the minerals for which exploration is going on under licence is uranium. The Minister has personally consented to the transfer by endorsement on this deed dated June 15, 1977, because this agreement for the transfer of the mineral claim to Esso would under its terms have been void without the Minister's consent. However, the Minister has been willing to consent in writing to the transfer, and it is dated June 15. That meant further exploration for uranium in South Australia. It is common knowledge that the Minister personally is in favour of the mining and export of uranium from this State and this country but, surely to goodness, even though the Minister

is personally in favour of it, he should be abiding by his Party's express policy.

The Labor Party and the Government in this State cannot have it both ways: either they are against it, as they say in the advertisement and as they have said in their policy (in which case, they should not be encouraging exploration for uranium in this State) or they are not against it, in which case it is perfectly proper for this encouragement to be given. However, at present the Labor Party is trying to have it both ways. It is saying "We are against it," yet it is encouraging people (and I have given two examples of this) to go ahead and look for the stuff in South Australia. That is just as hypocritical as are the actions of the Liberal and Country Parties.

I am pleased to see that the Attorney-General has entered the Chamber. I hope we will (although I do not think we ever will) get a public explanation from him regarding where he stands on the question of the exploration for uranium in South Australia. That is all that I wanted to say on that issue. I believe that it should be one of the principal issues in this election campaign, both for its own sake and because it shows on the part of both the Liberal and Labor Parties the lack of honesty, lack of frankness, and the putting of loyalty to Party ahead of the interests of the community.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** How unkind!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Attorney knows that what I have said is accurate. He cannot deny that it is accurate.

**Mr. Venning:** What a lot of rubbish!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The fact that the honourable member chimes in with that comment shows the standard of mentality and the outlook of Liberals because, if there is any member in this House who personifies the outlook of the Liberal Party in this State, it is the member for Rocky River.

**Mr. Becker:** That is unfair.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Can any Liberal Party member say who better personifies the attitude of the Liberal Party than the member for Rocky River? I do not hear any nominations. Of course, there is none, because the member for Rocky River, country born and bred, is the personification of the Liberal Party in this place. He is proud of it, and why should he not be proud of it? I do not intend to say anything more on the uranium issue.

I should like now to refer to a matter which I raised in Question Time and which then made me very angry: the Government's failure to answer 65 out of 79 questions on today's Notice Paper, including eight out of 11 questions that I had thereon. It was perfectly obvious from the reply that the Premier gave me that he had no explanation for this lack of answers to questions. He talked for a while, and then threw in a bit of offensive material about me on the basis, no doubt, that the best form of defence is offence, and that, if one cannot meet an argument, one tries to distract attention from it by saying something else, or by taking the offensive on some other tack. That showed to me that what I knew, anyway, was correct: that the Government is now avoiding answering Questions on Notice that may be politically embarrassing to it. There is no other reason why at least some of those questions were not answered today.

Let me deal with just three of the Questions on Notice that I had on the Notice Paper, the first one of which, No. 168, deals with the inquiry that is to be undertaken by Mr. Acting Justice White on the police files that are apparently held on citizens who have not been convicted or even charged with any offence. I raised that matter, again by Question on Notice, and it took three weeks to get any sort of answer from the Chief Secretary. There was an immediate reaction of disquiet in the South Australian



community on it. The Government responded by saying, "We will have an inquiry". We do not know yet (and that was the purport of my question today) what the precise terms of reference for this inquiry are. We do not know what authority Mr. Acting Justice White may be given to carry it out. We do not know whether we will ever hear the result of it, or whether we will ever have the report, because we do not know that it will be made public.

The situation has not changed at all, and it is obvious that the Government is covering up what is, I believe, an embarrassment for it and a scandal in South Australia. I may be entirely wrong. I cannot make a judgment unless the facts for which I have asked in my questions are forthcoming. I did not get the answers today to the six questions that I had put on notice. Those answers could have been given today if the Government had chosen to give them. The only explanation is that the Government wanted to avoid the publicity that those answers would have received. That is a bad thing.

**Mr. Becker:** I got the impression that because the Premier was not there they did not answer any of the hard ones.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I do not know. That may have been the impression that the Premier was trying to give. Neither the Premier in his role nor Teddy Goldsworthy in his can avoid unpleasant consequences by staying away from any gathering at which he should be present.

The next question which I had on the Notice Paper and which may be politically difficult for the Government was question No. 171. Addressed to the newly-appointed Minister responsible for conservation matters, the question was as follows:

Is an officer of the Legal Services Department undertaking an inquiry into actions by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service regarding the trapping of birds or the sale of confiscated fauna, or either, or both of these matters and if so—

- (a) who is that officer;
- (b) what are his terms of reference; and
- (c) when is it expected that the inquiry will be completed?

I do not as a rule ask questions without some reason for asking them. I have been told (and this question was designed to test the reliability of this information) that there is a matter of some considerable scandal in the Environment Department that is being investigated by Mr. Meldrum, who was a Chief Superintendent of Police, in his present capacity as an officer of the Legal Services Department, and that this matter is the real reason for the dismissal of the previous Minister for the Environment and the permanent head of the department.

**Mr. Becker:** Did he know what was going on?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is what was put to me.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Well, it is mischievous and wrong. Let me make that clear now.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Perhaps the Minister—

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** The answer to your question was signed by me on Friday. I can't help that it didn't get to Cabinet.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Minister should be able to —

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** I don't take things to Cabinet; they're sent through the system. You ought to know that. You were a Minister yourself.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I would not have raised this matter in the House today if I had had an answer to the question. The questions I asked on this matter were designed either to confirm the information I had been given or to show that it was wrong. The Minister has no-one but himself or

his Cabinet colleagues or some of their servants to blame for my not getting the answer today. The system is that a question appearing on the Notice Paper for a Tuesday ought to be answered on the Tuesday, and those questions were always answered until about 12 months ago. If the Minister cannot organise himself or his staff sufficiently to get the answers to Cabinet so that they can be vetted by Cabinet and given here on the Tuesday, that is his responsibility, not mine.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** The question didn't involve the former Director, and you know it, yet you have the temerity to make a statement like that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am not ashamed of myself and I hope that, by what I have said now, the Minister will make a full statement on this matter before next Tuesday, because I can tell him that that is what is being said in the community, if he did not already know it—that the reason why his predecessor was sacked as the Minister for the Environment and the reason for the transfer of Dr. Inglis was this matter, whatever it may be. That is the position that has been put to me, and only the Government can clear it up. The Minister had an opportunity to clear it up, if he had wanted to, by giving the answer today to the question, and I was entitled to expect an answer to that question today.

I invite the Minister to say in the statement that he gives why his predecessor was sacked, because we have never had any explanation as to why he was replaced and given a complete sinecure, as though he were not there at all. That was the second question which was not answered today. The third question was No. 175, which dealt with the matter I have already canvassed this afternoon, namely, the question of licences for the exploration and mining of uranium. That was placed on the Notice Paper on Thursday, I think; certainly, it is on today's Notice Paper, and the Minister of Mines and Energy, if he had had any desire to answer the question, could have done so. The fact is that the Government wants to play down this matter, especially during the election campaign and in view of the kind of advertising being promoted by the Labor Party. I can think of no development in this Parliament that is more adverse to the functioning of the House and the rights of individual members than is the abandonment of the practice of answering Questions on Notice promptly. It has always been one of the boasts of this place that an honourable member could get some kind of answer on the following Tuesday, whereas now the Government takes as long as two, three, or four weeks to answer questions. The Clerks at the table have adopted the practice of numbering the questions, not week by week, but right through, and we now have some idea of how long a question has been on the Notice Paper.

The first one on the Notice Paper is No. 31, which the member for Light probably put there in the first week of the session. That question has still not been answered. This is a bad development, and I suggest that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, relay the suggestion to the Speaker that the absurd formula he uses every Tuesday afternoon in announcing the receipt of answers to Questions on Notice be changed. The Speaker always begins by saying, "All Questions on Notice, except," and then makes an exception. At one time, there were only a few exceptions but, today, I found on inquiry of the Clerks that 65 of the 79 questions were not answered. I suggest that it would be better to change the formula the Speaker uses and for him to announce more directly which questions are answered and how many remain unanswered. Perhaps the Clerk could devise some better form of wording for that so that we and the public know what the Government is doing.



**Mr. Dean Brown:** I've had some fundamental questions about the Premier's visit to Malaysia remain unanswered for five weeks.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The other Question on Notice I asked today concerned the Premier's plans for his, as I understand it, grand tour next year overseas. I put that on notice, because I was told by a journalist that the Premier and his staff steadfastly refused to give any information to anyone about it. I thought, "Well, we have one way of finding out; we'll put a question on notice," but the question has gone unanswered for about three weeks. What did we hear? The lamest of lame excuses from the Premier today. I also have a Question on Notice to elicit the information, which the Minister of Works could not give me the other day, about the Premier's visit to Singapore. We were told that he was to attend an extremely important conference, but the Minister did not know what it was.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** So it was.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I asked the Premier what it was, and I did not even receive an answer to that one. There is only one other matter I will canvass, and I do so really as much in the form of a warning to the Labor Party as for any other reason. It has been reported, I believe reliably, that Senator Steele Hall has resigned from the Senate and is contesting, with the full blessing of the Liberal Party, the seat of Hawker in the House of Representatives, and I understand that every member of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, including the Leader in the Upper House, is being drafted to work flat out in Hawker to ensure his election.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible conversation.

**Mr. Russack:** How do you think he'll go?

**Mr. Becker:** Where did you get that information?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Apparently, that is wrong, and there is a signal lack of enthusiasm by Liberals in this place to go into Hawker to help Senator Hall. I understand that the Liberal Party was doing in Hawker at the Federal Election what it did in Mitcham before the recent State election, namely, throwing everything it could possibly get into that electorate in an effort to win it. It failed in Mitcham at the State election, and I believe, in answer to some of the interjections just made, that it will fail in Hawker. However, that is not the point in referring to this matter. The fact is that we now have a vacancy in the Senate and, as I think is well known, although I have not raised the matter in the House, my own view is that that vacancy should be filled by a person who was a member of the Liberal Movement in 1975, and the most obvious candidates to fill the vacancy are other persons who were on the Liberal Movement's Senate ticket in 1975. Senator Hall was elected as a Liberal Movement candidate, and he was No. 1 on the list. No. 2 on the list at that time was Mr. Michael Wilson, who has since joined the Liberal Party and who is now the member for Torrens in the House.

**Mr. Venning:** So what!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The answer to the member for Rocky River is that, as a result of his membership of this House, I assume, although I do not know, that the member for Torrens does not want to be nominated for the Senate vacancy.

**Mr. Venning:** No, I don't.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I have spoken to Mr. Wilson about that matter, and he does not want the nomination. Third on the ticket at the 1975 election was Mrs. Janine Haines, who is available for nomination.

**Mr. Venning:** No, she's having a family

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The interjection of the member for Rocky River shows the standard of his mentality and the general standard of the Liberal Party. As I said a few moments ago (and I have no reason to change it), that typifies and personifies the outlook of the Liberal Party.

**Mr. Becker:** That's unfair.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** What is unfair about it? The member for Hanson cannot say, because there is no unfairness about it. The sort of thing that the member for Rocky River said is typical. Mrs. Haines is available for nomination, and I believe that she should be nominated to that vacancy. What I want to say to members on the other side is this: those who support the Australian Democrats and who are likely to vote for the Australian Democrats at the next election are watching very carefully to see how the Labor Party plays this one. We believe that we are entitled to make the nomination for the vacancy, for the reasons that have been given publicly. Our people are watching carefully to see whether the Labor Party will support us in that. They want to know the attitude of the Labor Party before the poll on December 10, because there are many of them who will decide, on the decision of the Labor Party on this matter, where their second preferences will go.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I did not expect other than some interjections of a disparaging nature for saying that. However, members on the other side know that in several districts, if not in the Senate in this State and in other States, the preferences of the Australian Democrats will be decisive. There is no dispute about that. There is no reason to dissemble about that. It has been said publicly. Neal Blewett said it at a seminar the other day: the Labor Party is looking carefully at this matter, not only in this State but in every State. This will be the test of sincerity of the Labor Party in its attitude towards the Australian Democrats. There is every reason, despite the sententious, condescending and pompous editorial written by Mr. Michael Cudmore in the *Advertiser* the other day, why the vacancy should be filled by the person whom I have named (Mrs. Haines), who was the third member of the Senate team in 1975 for the Liberal Movement, who is now a member of the Australian Democrats, and who would make a good Senator for South Australia.

Of course, it is up to the Labor Party. Whatever may happen, if the Liberal nominee is chosen by the South Australian Parliament (whatever may happen legally), there is no doubt that, if Mrs. Haines is nominated to that position, there can be no shadow of a legal challenge to her nomination. However, the same cannot be said if the Liberal nominee is appointed.

Those are the only things I wanted to say. I took the opportunity to say them because I had it, even though I believe that this debate is now really superfluous and is one of the debates that could well be discarded. It was an opportunity to raise those three points: the uranium issue, Questions on Notice, and the Senate vacancy.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the adoption of the Address in Reply, knowing well that it is a formal procedure and the right thing to do to respond to the first Opening Speech made by Mr. Keith Seaman. I add my congratulations to those offered by other honourable members to His Excellency on his appointment. In the brief dealings I have had with him when he made a formal visit to my district, I can say that he is well able to carry out the position of Governor. I know that he will do this to the best of his ability.

I should like to make only one comment about his Speech: I refer to its brevity, because it made a mockery of

the official opening of Parliament. Indeed, all members attended the official opening in the full expectation that they would have set out for them a legislative programme that could be used as a basis for future planning. I believe that all honourable members invited guests to attend that opening. Certainly, most country members invited their immediate family and friends, many of whom literally travelled thousands of kilometres in order to be present. True, that has no bearing on the Governor's Speech, but these people came to the opening only because they expected to hear the Government's official address being presented. That has some significance to the debate.

I take the opportunity of adding my congratulations to the six new Government members and the two new Opposition members. I make a comment about honourable members who have left this Chamber for various reasons, be it retirement or defeat at the recent election. I hope that I can claim all those members as friends, and I hope that they treat me similarly. I believe that they have all contributed most admirably to the proceedings of this House.

The Governor's Speech, worded by the Government, was of some concern to me, because it had an air of supremacy in it: it was virtually saying, "We have an open book to do what we please." In the four paragraphs comprising the Speech the Government was virtually saying, "We have a mandate to do what we like, how we like, and when we like." That attitude permeated the Speech, and it was an attitude that I do not believe the Government has the right to claim. Each district is contested on the merits of the presentation of individual candidates and, although Party politics comes into it, I do not believe that the Government has the right to pursue the matter in this way.

I should like to thank my constituents for their support, because I can claim to have the best figures of any member. I point out that in the District of Flinders the Labor vote has been reduced from 43 per cent some years ago to less than 25 per cent at the recent election. The records will show that this seat is probably the safest non-Labor seat in this State.

**Mr. Nankivell:** What about Mallee?

**Mr. BLACKER:** I will not argue with the honourable member about such a small percentage. The member for Mallee has a legitimate claim about the strength of his seat. In the District of Flinders there was a three-way contest, and I was especially pleased to win 41 of the 49 polling booths and to obtain an absolute majority of the vote.

The recent State election was the first election under the new equal-size electorate system. As a result of that system, we have seen a different ball game for both sides of Parliament. The election was contested in a manner different from that of any previous election. No longer is South Australia influenced to any great degree by the country areas. We are a metropolitan-dominated State. No Party can govern this State without having a metropolitan-dominated Party room. This is supported by the fact that, of the 27 members of the Government, 25 come from the metropolitan area. The member for Whyalla (representing an industrial town) and the member for Stuart, together representing the industrial triangle at the head of Spencer Gulf, make up the Government's ranks.

To me, this is a matter of great concern. Not one member on the Government benches has any real knowledge of or experience in non-urban affairs. I believe this has been shown even in relation to the shopping hours issue. The whole debate revolved around the influence of the metropolitan area, and country people did not get a

mention. The Bill was based purely on the recommendations of the Royal Commission, which in turn were based purely on the criteria set down by the Government: to report on the affairs of the metropolitan area.

I turn now to the figures for the whole of the State in the recent election. The figures have been referred to in this debate, especially by the member for Light, and I do not intend to repeat them, except to say that the Opposition must have an 8.1 per cent swing away from the Government if it is to win Government. That 8.1 per cent swing must take place in the four selected districts of Morphett, Mawson, Todd, and Brighton. Unless those four seats can be won, the Opposition is in dire straits, so to speak. The fact that those four are metropolitan seats emphasises again the necessity for the Opposition to give a metropolitan image in order to win metropolitan votes.

When we look at the percentage of votes in the various seats, taking the votes for the Australian Labor Party from the safest seats to the least safe, in order, we find that in 21 seats 60 per cent or more of the votes were cast for the A.L.P. With the exception of the two industrial triangle seats all are metropolitan. The Opposition gained on the A.L.P. vote in only four out of the 47 seats and gained on only one sitting member of the Government. In all other seats, the Labor Party strengthened its hand. These facts must be reckoned with by the Opposition if it is to get back into the field.

The situation is now developing in which any non-metropolitan group must be identified. We cannot say that we are South Australians and that we are all equal, because that is not so. We are represented in different ways, and there is different emphasis. All the pressure groups apply pressure in their own way, and immediately an individual stands up, be he country or metropolitan, saying that we are all South Australians, he is giving in to metropolitan dominance, be it of a political Party, of the Government, of organisations operating in the work force, or of anything else.

Therefore, we must be prepared to be identified as minority groups. It is much the same as referring to ethnic groups. No-one would deny them their right to be represented, to be talked about, and to be given special consideration, but this comes about because they are ethnic groups, prepared to identify themselves in that way. I say to members in country areas that they, too, must be prepared to battle it out on their own if they are to get any hearing or any real consideration within this Parliament.

I think the greatest news today for me and probably for most people in country areas was the *Advertiser* headline stating that the Prime Minister would abolish death and gift duties within the family. I think it is significant that the announcement was headlined on the front page of the newspaper.

**Mr. Tonkin:** What do you think of South Australia being the only State that is not going to do it?

**Mr. BLACKER:** I was going to mention that. It is a matter at which the State Government must look closely. The Premier has been lauding the attitude he has adopted and the concessions made in the past, telling us how good South Australia is, but we must face the fact that we are in the worst position of any State in the Commonwealth.

**Mr. Groom:** How are you going to replace lost revenue?

**Mr. BLACKER:** I understand that succession duties comprise 1.6 per cent of revenue received. I, for one, would be willing to have my taxes increased in other areas by 1.6 per cent or have Government spending decreased by 1.6 per cent. It sounds a simplistic way of putting it. How can the Government say it is going to hit an isolated group of people for the sake of 1.6 per cent of its income? These are facts which at last the Government has seen.

This has been a long battle, especially on the part of the Country Party. We have heard today that the various Parties are claiming credit for it, but the Country Party—

**Mr. Gunn:** Before you came into this place, I think.

**Mr. BLACKER:** —was pushing for it. The member for Eyre had better not raise the subject, because the Country Party has always been pushing for it and the Liberal Party amended its attitude on this matter as the result of Country Party pressures, particularly in the Flinders District, before the last State election. That is a statement of fact. Many members in this Chamber and in the other place were canvassing against me in the 1975 elections, saying that succession duties could not be abolished. This is definitely a case where the National Country Party has made the bullets, and in this case Mr. Fraser has been able to fire them, with the blessing of everyone.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Even the Labor members in this House.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Yes. I am sure that people who are conscious of their families, especially in rural areas, people who have had the initiative to develop their own business, will benefit by this. The gift duty issue has been mentioned by the Prime Minister, and I am sure every Opposition member would have been surprised when that came out, because it seemed to be a massive concession in one hit. With the abolition of probate duty, the need for gift duty abolition would not be quite so great. Nevertheless, how does a parent pass property to the immediate family if gift duty cannot come into it?

Another topic is fuel equalisation, a matter of great importance to the non-metropolitan area, and something for which we have been striving for many years. I appreciate that time is getting on, and I thank the House for its consideration. Although I wished to raise many other issues, regrettably time is against me. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

**Mr. VENNING (Rocky River):** I appreciate being able to take part in this debate this afternoon. I wish to comment on the attack made by the member for Mitcham on my Leader this afternoon. It is with some slight regret that I raise this matter because it involves a question of petty politicking and blatant misrepresentation by the member for Mitcham. Everyone is well aware of the obsession which has grasped him on a number of matters. Particularly is he obsessed with the subject of uranium and a deeply held hatred of the Liberal Party. He can be forgiven for holding strong views, but that does not give him any right to distort the truth in an attempt to strengthen his own case or to try to embarrass the Liberal Party by personal attacks to seek publicity or for any other reason.

The member for Mitcham has referred to a petition signed by the Leader and other members of the Liberal Party, but he carefully left until the end of that statement that the clause referring to a five-year moratorium was deleted. The reason for that deletion was that members of the Liberal Party believed that a fixed period of five years was unreasonable since adequate safeguards and other solutions to the acknowledged difficulties involving uranium could be found well before that time expired. To suggest, as the member for Mitcham has done, that the five-year moratorium provision was deleted because the moratorium should have been an indefinite one is a total distortion of the truth and unworthy of even him, and that is saying something. The Liberal Party believes that adequate safeguards now exist and that we have a moral responsibility to help provide for the energy requirements of the Third World. The member for Mitcham believes otherwise and has a deep hatred and resentment of the

Liberal Party, but that does not give him any right or justification for distorting the truth.

The Liberal Party despite his comments, treats the Address in Reply as an important part of our Parliament and believes that it is the responsibility of members of this Parliament to rise and speak on matters pertaining to their districts. To hear the member for Mitcham's comments this afternoon is to realise that they are nothing more than a sham. The all righteous member for Mitcham, Millhouse by name, is seldom in the House—he appears often only to have his name marked off the roll. There would not be an occasion, Mr. Speaker, when you would not have to caution, warn, or warn for the last time the said member. His performance in this place is most childlike, and I commend you, Sir, for the way you handle the member for Mitcham.

There are several matters about which I wish to speak in this debate. I refer first to the opening of Parliament by our new Governor, whom I congratulate on his appointment. It was a very shabby performance by the Labor Party to present to the Governor to read on the first occasion on which he opened Parliament a document which consisted of only about three paragraphs; it must have been an insult to a man of his capabilities. The member for Hanson correctly outlined the situation by saying that the policy was taken from the little red book, which outlines the policy of this Government.

I have heard various comments made by members opposite, particularly new members, about their socialist views. I saw the swearing in of members here and the various ways people accepted their responsibility, but I pledge to you, Sir, my loyalty to the Crown. I am proud to be a member of this Parliament, and proud to have lived in a country that has developed due to the sweat of the brow and not because of people who have come into being during a period when they can live on the hard work of people of earlier days. The socialistic attitude of members opposite is from people who have come into this society only because of the groundwork of people who have gone before.

I congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment and remind both you and the Chairman of Committees of how you made it. Notwithstanding that, I congratulate you both. It is interesting to note that I am now a near colleague of the member for Stuart. We have met on various occasions, and I noticed the other day that he made an announcement about some grants of Loan moneys to the District Councils of Laura and Georgetown, both in Rocky River. He also went into Eyre and made some announcements about Peterborough.

I believe that the electoral boundaries redistribution was a shocker, to say the least. The areas have been made so large that it concerns me that in my Party there are four country voices (and in this Parliament five) fewer, but this is the position in which we find ourselves today. The country voice is becoming something of the past, which makes it much more difficult for country members to put the case for people living in those areas. Unfortunately, the scene is now set and we must face the situation.

I mention now the campaign in my area, which was an interesting one indeed. The former Speaker of this House was my Australian Labor Party opponent. It could be said that he was probably the toughest A.L.P. opponent I have had since being in Parliament. I will have been here for 10 years on March 2 of next year, and during that period we have had five elections on three different sets of boundaries, but the former Speaker was probably the best candidate ever put forward by the A.L.P. He used his position as Speaker to the full and campaigned with the aid of his car and driver.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Rocky River.

**Mr. VENNING:** He had everything at his disposal and used it to the fullest effect. On voting day his Ministerial car was used to take people to Wandearah to hand out cards and that sort of thing. The whole campaign was interesting; in fact, it was quite jovial. The then Speaker started off with a card introducing himself in black and white, and then he switched to blue.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows Standing Orders.

**Mr. VENNING:** In the end he switched to green, which is the Country Party colour.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows that under Standing Orders he cannot exhibit in the House.

**Mr. VENNING:** Anyway, he finished up with a green card.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member will remember that he is not allowed to exhibit in the Chamber, and I hope that he does not do it again.

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

**Mr. VENNING:** I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m. if necessary.  
Motion carried.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from November 16. Page 834.)

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I say at the outset that the Opposition is not very happy about this Bill. It seems that the Government is to put perks ahead of jobs. I can think of no time less opportune than the present for added benefits of this nature to be given to a section of the work force in South Australia. I know that it was a Labor Party policy proposal, and the terms of the proposal were those that we are not unfamiliar with in South Australia, whereby the Labor Party undertook that in South Australia it would ensure that no conditions in the South Australian Public Service would be inferior to those in any other State. I think that promise was probably given in the first instance in 1973, and was certainly given in 1975 in the Labor Party's platform on that occasion, but the fact is, whether or not the Government likes it, South Australia is no longer a competitive or low-cost State.

South Australia has become a high-cost State, and it is legislation such as this that has eroded our competitive position in relation to the other States. There are plenty of examples that can be cited; we have been talking about what has happened to the cost of housing in South Australia. The Premier likes to twist his set of statistics to try to prove otherwise but the fact is that housing in South Australia is dearer than in other States.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will stick to the terms of the Bill. I see nothing about housing in the Bill.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The effect of this legislation will be further to disadvantage South Australia in its

competitive position in relation to the other States. It is all very well for the Government to come forward with these grandiose promises that it will make Public Service conditions in South Australia as good as those in any other State, but I can think of no less opportune time to be handing out perks to one section of the community which will put pressure on all other sections and will erode even further South Australia's position. This sort of legislation is being introduced at the cost of jobs. It is costing the jobs of people, and particularly school leavers as they come on to the labour market.

The Bill increases fairly significantly the benefits to people working under the Public Service Act in relation to long service leave. The major provision of the Bill as outlined in the Minister's second reading explanation, is as follows:

... The amendments provide 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.

At present, the provision is nine days, so the increase in entitlement will be from nine days a year to 15 days a year, after 15 years of effective service. There are other provisions, some of which are of a minor nature. The other major provision is that there is an absolute right to *pro rata* payment in lieu of long service leave after seven years of effective service. I think members who are familiar with the other long service leave Bills that have come before the House will remember the ramifications of the phrase "absolute right" as it applies to long service leave. That means, if an employee sets fire to a building and burns it down, he can well cost the taxpayers of the State \$2 000 000 but, when he is put off, he will still get his long service leave. Do not let us forget what is implied when it is provided that long service leave will be an absolute right.

This is the fourth long service leave Bill that has come before this Parliament in under two years. I recall the Bill to provide long service leave in the building industry that came into effect in April, 1977. There were two other Bills to delete wilful misconduct as a reason for not giving long service leave. That was in the long service leave legislation in relation to the building industry. Those amendments were defeated in the Upper House. I do not know what the fate of this Bill will be in the Upper House. It seems to me that the Government is in this Bill embarking on a particularly dangerous course when we see the fundamental lack of strength of the economy in South Australia. The Premier berates the Federal Government for its parsimony in relation to the finances of the States, but the situation in South Australia is that the funds that flow to South Australia, when we include the money that accrued to the State as a result of the railways deal—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is straying from the Bill. There is nothing about the railways in this Bill. It is only a short Bill; I hope he will stick to it.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Certainly. The Bill runs to several pages and my point is in relation to the impact it will have on the South Australian Revenue Budget. I do not think that one can deny that this Bill and similar measures will in the long term, maybe not in the immediate future, have a tremendous impact on the South Australian Budget. I am pointing out the economic climate in South Australia at a time when the Government will make this further encroachment on the funds of South Australia.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to point out to the House that it will, in the long term, have a disastrous effect on a deteriorating Budget situation in South Australia. We are the only State in Australia that has, in

effect, budgeted for this financial year for a large deficit; every other State has managed to produce some savings in its State Budget, and the South Australian Government has done likewise this year. This State, however, is the only one with a rapidly deteriorating Budget situation; we are facing a deficit in this financial year of \$18 400 000.

The Premier has said this afternoon that the Government expects to have to increase State taxes and charges at the end of this financial year, and this Bill will make those increases more certain. I repeat, because it is my major objection to the Bill, that the Government could not have chosen a less opportune time to discriminate against people who are seeking employment. The Bill will cost the jobs of people in South Australia.

**Mr. Chapman:** If the Government gets away with it.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** It will get away with it in this House, although I do not know what will happen elsewhere.

**Mr. Chapman:** After it has heard you and other speakers, it may give in.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** With due deference to the judgment of my learned colleague, I think that that is an unlikely eventuality in this place. I have found the Government less than amenable to reason when I have tried to persuade it of the error of its ways. However, I will not be distracted from pointing out the error of its ways and how the Bill gives the lie to the Premier's so-called concern about employment in South Australia, when it introduces a range of perks that will put the State way out in front of the other States, whereas at present the long service leave provisions for public servants here are about the average. I have figures on long service leave entitlements. It is difficult, in terms of legislation, to bring the figures to a common denominator to show what is meant, but I think the average long service leave in Australia is about nine days a year, after an initial qualifying period varying from seven years to 10 years. The only State that seems to have conditions similar to those proposed in this Bill (although they are not the same) is New South Wales. Despite that, the Premier of that State is making significant reductions in State taxation, and even today he has announced some further reductions in important areas.

The Opposition is not pleased about the Bill. I believe that it would be a less than responsible attitude to this legislation to say otherwise. The Government may be saddled with an election promise, but the bigger fool it was to make the promise. It has taken the Government a long time to introduce the measure. I guess the Government says that early in the life of this new Parliament is the right time to introduce a measure about which there is likely to be some reaction in the community. This legislation was promised by the Labor Party before the most recent State election, and I think it was promised in 1973, also. Certainly, it was promised during the 1975 election campaign.

I will recount to the House the conditions that obtain in the other States, although, at first glance, there is not uniformity, as I have pointed out. In the Commonwealth and in the Australian Capital Territory, three months long service leave is available after 10 years service. Then there is an annual accrual of three-tenths of a month for each year of service. I think that comes to about nine days a year, and that seems to be about the average. In Victoria, three months long service leave is available after 10 years service, and then one and a half months become available after each subsequent five years service. *Pro rata* leave is available on termination of service for any reason except summary dismissal, after four years service. That indicates that in Victoria absolute right to long service leave is

denied in the case of summary dismissal.

In Western Australia, which I would say is slightly above the Australian average, 13 weeks long service leave is available after 10 years service, 13 weeks after the second 10 years service, and then 13 weeks after each subsequent seven years service. *Pro rata* payments there are made, first, on completion of at least three years continuous service and upon employment ending for reasons other than misconduct or unsatisfactory service. No long service leave is available there if the person is dismissed for misconduct; no absolute right exists, as I understand the conditions in Western Australia. Secondly, in Western Australia a person not less than 60 years of age who resigns with at least 12 months continuous service and whose employment is ended by the employer on account of the employee's incapacity due to old age, ill-health, or an accident is entitled to *pro rata* leave. *Pro rata* payment is available for females resigning to be married after not less than three years continuous service. It is also available if the termination of service is due to pregnancy after not less than three years continuous service. *Pro rata* leave also is available on death with not less than 12 months continuous service, with the proviso of leaving one of the stipulated dependants.

In Tasmania, 90 days long service leave is available after 10 years service. The leave then accrues at the rate of nine days a year. The leave legally falls due each year, but the practice is to take it in 20-day batches. *Pro rata* leave in Tasmania is available after seven years service in certain circumstances, which were not disclosed during my inquiries.

As I have said, New South Wales probably leads Australia in long service leave benefits. After 10 years service, two months leave is available on full pay or four months on half pay. The leave then accrues at the rate of half a month on full pay or one month on half pay for each year of service. *Pro rata* provisions apply where an employee's service is terminated by the employer for any reason other than the employee's serious and wilful misconduct. In that State, there is a denial of long service leave if the employee is retrenched for misconduct. Further, if an employee terminates his service on account of illness, incapacity or domestic or other pressing necessity, or if the employee dies, *pro rata* leave is available on the basis of one month on full pay after service as an adult for five years, and for additional service after five years on the basis of three months full pay for 15 years service.

In Queensland, 13 weeks long service leave is available after 10 years service and thereafter there is a proportionate arrangement. In South Australia, 90 days leave is available after 10 years service and thereafter leave accrues at the rate of nine days a year. South Australia is at about the average level. The Government intends, in this legislation, to implement a pace-setting measure to put South Australia, with New South Wales, way out in front. It seems to me that this Bill is more generous than the legislation in the other States in relation to absolute right to *pro rata* payment after seven years service. As I have said, in Western Australia no long service leave is available if an employee is dismissed for misconduct. All kinds of industrial sabotage can arise. Here, a worker can burn down a factory, put the show out of business, be dismissed, and get his long service leave. That seems to me to be hardly a satisfactory arrangement.

People who can now receive *pro rata* leave after five years service will not be disadvantaged, but there is a move to phase that out. In other words, anyone who is entitled to *pro rata* leave now would get it after five years service, but the intention is that anyone else whose leave

subsequently falls due would not get it until after he had served seven years. However, it will be an absolute right so that no-one can be denied long service leave for any reason.

I do not object to the other provisions of the Bill. Provision is made regarding an employee who for some reason or other is given a job of lower status. He could be given that job for all sorts of reasons, including ill health. This Bill provides for him to be paid for long service leave when it becomes due at the rate when he earned it, and makes allowance for the diminishing value of money because of inflation. That is fair and reasonable, and I do not object to it; it is just plain justice.

Some States require their employees to take long service leave when it is due or within a reasonable period thereafter. In the past day or two we have heard a fair bit about tax dodges and what have you. By accumulating long service leave that could run into months and even years at retirement, a tremendous amount of taxation revenue is lost to this country. Taxation is levelled at the year in which this large lump sum falls due, and taxation is paid on only 5 per cent of that sum.

The effects of this Bill will not stop at the Public Service. We know perfectly well that when conditions put the Public Service out in front of the private sector pressure is immediately put on employers in the private sector to create conditions that approach or equal those in the Public Service. In this area, therefore, the Public Service is a pace-setter. At a time when the public sector, particularly in South Australia, is languishing and when employment opportunities do not exist, such pressure put on that sector as a result of this and other similar legislation is most undesirable.

It is time that people were willing to take a responsible attitude in Parliament to this sort of legislation. Perhaps the Opposition will not win any friends in the Public Service, but it is not trying to buy their support. We are not trying to follow the course of the Labor Party, which fronts up to elections to buy support. Some public servants are responsible enough to realise that the time for this measure is inopportune. We cannot blame association officials for putting these claims; they are paid to press the case of their members. I believe that scores, hundreds, and probably thousands of public servants would agree with the point of view I am putting forward. We need only consider the support for the wage-price freeze to show that responsible people believe that it is time to call a halt to exaggerated wage claims and to the handing out of perks, such as those contained in this Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Earlier in this debate I asked the honourable Deputy Leader not to stray from the measure. He began to stray a bit when he discussed the private sector; there is nothing in the Bill about the private sector. I hope that he will stick to the contents of the Bill.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, Sir. I believe that what I have said is relevant, and I appreciate your indulgence. I honestly believe that it is relevant to suggest that this Bill will have an impact on employees other than those referred to in this Bill. It will have a tremendous impact on the South Australian economy.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has made his point.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I believe there will be support even in the Public Service for what I am saying. I believe it is a responsible attitude to take at a time when this country still has a long way to go to get out of the economic situation in which it now finds itself.

A committee was established to consider in some detail improving the conditions in South Australia so that those public servants, especially in grades I to VI, were not

disadvantaged in relation to public servants in other States in Australia. The members of that committee were Mr. Graham Inns, then Chairman of the Public Service Board; Judge Olsson, Senior Judge in the Industrial Court; and the Hon. D. H. Laidlaw, a member of the Upper House. That committee examined and made recommendations in relation to conditions in the Public Service and took into account all matters pertaining to those conditions, including long service leave. The committee's determination was based on bringing conditions in South Australia to a position of equality with the other States. It seems to me that this Bill, coming on top of the findings of that committee, is ill-timed.

There is nothing further I need to say about the Bill. I am unwilling to support it, but I do not say that lightly or because I bear any grudge or malice towards the Public Service. The Opposition believes that public servants do a tremendous job for the public of South Australia—

**Mr. Keneally:** But!

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

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not agree with the sentiments of the Attorney-General in relation to the activities of the Public Service. He may wish to denigrate it, but I do not. I appeal to all thinking South Australians, including members of the Public Service, to realise that the time for the passage of this sort of legislation is most inopportune.

**Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder):** I support the remarks made by the Deputy Leader. As I have said before, I believe that the best possible conditions should exist for employees, whether they be in the public or private sector—

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** But!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Henley Beach is out of order.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** In the short term, there could be a benefit to all those who receive these improved conditions. In the long term I am sure that certain difficulties will arise. The best possible conditions should be available, but that can create a situation whereby some people would receive this benefit and others in the community would not receive it immediately. We have always understood that about 25 per cent of people are employed in the public sector and about 75 per cent are employed in the private sector. History shows that there is a flow-on of whatever is provided to one section of the community. A benefit for one section of the community creates dissatisfaction in other sections unless the same benefit flows to all. I am sure that that is the problem in this case.

I should like to refer to taxation and profit. The increased money that will be needed to pay for additional long service leave payments could be acquired by additional taxation. However, the Government will not have a bar of the word "profit", which is absolutely essential in the private sector to enable those concerned to pay the additional benefit to their employees who have served them for a specified period. I am sure that people in the private sector would be only too pleased to meet this commitment if conditions were not as bad as they are at present.

I should like also to refer to the difference that exists between large enterprises and small businesses. I understand that, out of 9 835 retail outlets in the city and metropolitan area, 7 927 employ four or fewer persons, including the manager. These are the people who will be placed in a difficult situation when the flow-on comes, as indeed it will come. Because of the circumstances that obtain at present, it is undesirable that this should happen.

Also, country towns are girded up by small businesses, and these people are at present experiencing much difficulty in relation to the employment of their staff. I am sure that many more people would be employed if conditions applied more equitably throughout the business world and the Public Service.

One of the key words in all considerations is "balance", and today we must consider whether it is good balance for such an increased benefit to be granted now when it is, I am sure, accepted that the State can ill afford it. Secondly, if this benefit was given, there would have to be a flow-on to the private sector.

I therefore support what the member for Kavel has said. Pressure will be applied in other sectors if this Bill passes. The issue is not that paying for the extra few days of long service leave to each employee will be difficult but that during that time the employee must be replaced by someone else. If casual labour is employed for this purpose, the rate paid will have to be increased to an extent commensurate with the benefits being given to the permanent employees.

Because unemployment is so high at present, the Federal Government and the State Governments want to do their best to ensure that it is reduced. This is, therefore, an inopportune time to grant this extra benefit. I am sure that everyone will do his best to see that unemployment is reduced. I emphasise, having been an employer, that I like my employees to enjoy conditions that are as good as those experienced by anyone else. However, if this Bill passes and public servants receive this extra benefit, why should not those in the private sector also be able to enjoy it? There is discrimination if all cannot have it. That is the danger that I see regarding the Bill. Also, it is an inopportune time to introduce such a benefit for public servants.

I wonder what is the comparison between the rates paid to public servants in South Australia and those paid to their counterparts in other States. I have reason to believe that in many respects they would not bear comparison. I should prefer to see incomes stabilised before additional long service leave is awarded. Indeed, I believe that public servants would rather receive a higher salary, thereby putting their salaries more in line with those paid in other States, than receive an extra benefit such as that provided for in this Bill. For those reasons, I do not support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Definitions applicable to this Division."

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Opposition does not object to this clause, which relates to the substitution of "effective service" for "continuous service" so that, if an officer is absent for good reason for a certain time, the board can compute the time of his effective, rather than his continuous, service. That seems to be a reasonable proposition. Because I did not make this point in the second reading debate, I do so now.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Long service leave."

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** New paragraph (c) of section 90 (1) (b) is the provision to which the Opposition, in the present economic climate, takes major objection. This is, I believe, the major change that is being made, that is, to provide 15 days long service leave on full pay after 15 years service. There is some argument whether this provision is better than that which applies in New South Wales, where a slightly different situation obtains. However, it certainly puts South Australia way out in front of the Australian States' average and, in the present economic climate, the

Opposition believes this to be most undesirable.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Regressed Officers."

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** This is one of the better clauses in the Bill. As I have indicated, the idea of not disadvantaging people who for some reason or other have had to take a cut in salary is a reasonable one. Although we object overall to the Bill, we do not object to this clause.

**Dr. EASTICK:** New section 97a, which is to be inserted in the Act by this clause, breaks new ground: it creates, as I understand the matter, a new area of involvement, and obviously the Government has certain circumstances in mind. It may involve the railways or other Government services. Can the Minister say why it has been found necessary to make this provision and which departments it may involve?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport):** I do not think that I can off the top of my head list the departments, but the Bill caters for the inevitable situation where officers experience a regression from time to time, as they have in the past. That has never been acknowledged from a long service leave point of view, although provisions exist with regard to the health disability scheme, and this provision is simply a continuation of that general principle. It could well apply to a wide range of departments, including the railways.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 and 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 633.)

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I oppose the Bill. The Minister's second reading explanation states that the Bill makes a number of disparate amendments to the Prices Act. In my judgment and that of the Opposition, most of the amendments are undesirable. Price control has been with us for a long time in South Australia, and one of the features of the legislation is that it should come before Parliament for annual review. However, the Bill seeks to remove that necessity, and, if passed, it will make price control in South Australia permanent. To my mind, that is undesirable. The level of price control would appear to be reasonably moderate in South Australia but, if the Bill is passed, and if the legislation does not have to come before Parliament for annual renewal, I believe that all kinds of things could be done administratively in relation to price control, without Parliament having the opportunity to debate them. I certainly oppose the first of the amendments, referred to in the Minister's second reading explanation, to make the price control legislation permanent, and I will take appropriate action in Committee to alter that situation.

The next provision in the Bill expands the definition of "consumer" to include land purchases. The Bill refers to the purchase of a home as the major transaction entered into by most consumers, and it is intended that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs will be able to investigate these areas. It seems to me that we are surrounding this whole area by a mass of legislation. We have the Builders Licensing Act, which was passed to protect the rights of house builders and to seek to redress faults that became evident in the building of a house, and machinery has been set up to police it. We have the Land



and Business Agents Act, which provides, I would have thought, a complete code for the regulation of this kind of activity. Now, the Government is seeking to provide a third arm of government to control this area. It seems to me that that is a completely unnecessary inclusion in an area which is already closely regulated.

The next amendment is the only one that appeals in any way to the Opposition. The Bill inserts a provision in the principal Act stating that it shall be an offence to personate an authorised officer. That seems to be reasonable. If people go into business premises and tell the proprietor that they have something to do with consumer affairs and want to examine his books and affairs, I believe that that provision is most desirable.

**Mr. Keneally:** Did the Liberals think you'd be counter-productive—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I secured the adjournment on these Bills, and thought that I should be here to debate them.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You have your priorities right.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has the floor.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know that the Minister is making any great contribution to the affairs of the House with that interjection. The Bill also extends the Commissioner's power to assume the conduct of legal proceedings by or against a consumer by providing that he may do so after the proceedings have been commenced. That provision seems to me to be highly undesirable: the consumer could seek legal advice, proceedings could be instituted, the Commissioner could examine these things and, if he thought that the case was going all right, he could step in and take over. That provision could be most oppressive to a supplier. We receive frequent complaints, particularly from small business people whom the Government says it wants to keep in business, about the amount of work they have to do to comply with Government rules and regulations.

When canvassing prior to the recent State election, this was a bitter complaint from a small business man in the Adelaide Hills who had been in business for many years, but the increasing amount of work he had to do in completing Government returns, amounting to harassment by the Government, provoked him to the stage where he thought he would give the game away. If he gives up and retires, it will mean the end of employment for several people in that small country township. Little thought is given to the amount of harassment a Government instrumentality like the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and his officers can inflict on a small business.

If a consumer has sought legal assistance and the matter is being prosecuted, it is unrealistic to believe that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs can step in and take over the case. The Minister states:

It—

the Bill—

removes the present restriction in the principal Act to the effect that before the Commissioner may investigate any unlawful practice he must first have received a complaint from a consumer. This restriction has tied the hands of the Commissioner to a certain extent, in that he has not been able to investigate practices or prosecute offences that have come to his attention indirectly from the complaint of a consumer or by other means.

How far are we to carry the Big Brother philosophy into the affairs of this State? How far are we to take such protection? The philosophy behind the work of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is that, if people want

to complain to him, he will investigate their complaints to see whether they are justified. This Bill will turn the Commissioner into a super snoop. Even if no-one complains he can fish around and institute investigations and proceedings of his own volition. That is a most undesirable provision to introduce into the operation of the department. My criticisms are not basically aimed at the activities of the department as it now operates. I have no objection to its operations in fixing grape prices for instance, but I do strongly object to three of the four amendments to which I have referred.

The powers of investigation are being so widened as to be almost unlimited if one examines the clauses of the Bill. For the reasons I have made abundantly clear, the Opposition is unwilling to support this Bill, because we believe it most undesirable that such legislation should not come before Parliament for annual review, as is the present position. The Bill gives the Commissioner powers of investigation, and power to step in and take over legal procedures, the court having no jurisdiction in the matter it seems to me; the Commissioner can say that he will take a case over and, even if the magistrate or judge hearing the case is not happy about it, he will have no opportunity to turn the Commissioner away. As the Bill extends the operations of the department in a most undesirable manner, I oppose it.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** In days gone by I annually opposed the Bill to extend the Prices Act, and often I was the only one in this House who did so. The brave words we heard from the Deputy Leader so-called tonight were always absent in those days—

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Regrettably so!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes. When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier I used to stand out on this matter, and he was always supported by the Labor Party, and, if not by all, then by an overwhelming number of his own supporters. When we moved into Opposition I did not get much more support for that.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Would you like your former speech inserted in *Hansard* tonight to save you from—

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** No. I am going on to say that in latter years I have not opposed the Bill because I have approved of the functions of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs which have been of an investigatory nature. That is his real role, which has grown in importance and has generally been beneficial. However, this is certainly the sort of legislation which can be oppressive and which should be reviewed annually by Parliament. Therefore, I certainly do not support the provision to cut out the annual review by Parliament by making this measure the same as other Acts, that is, permanent on the Statute Book. I refer to one provision (dealt with by the member for Kavel, although he did not go into it in much depth) to which I object. That provision allows the Commissioner to investigate on his own initiative any matter that he likes. I intend at the appropriate time to cut that provision out, even if we do not succeed in having the second reading defeated. Of course, we will not succeed in that—

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** We'll try to cut it out.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Deputy Leader suggests that we will try to cut it out; that is right. However, I say to him for transmission to his colleagues in another place that I hope that this time they have a bit of backbone and that they stand up to the Government on this Bill and do what he suggested in his speech should be done. I oppose the second reading and at the appropriate time, because it will be passed, I shall oppose vigorously (and give my reasons in more detail for opposing) the provision which would



allow the Commissioner to investigate, on his own initiative, any matter that he likes.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** In opposing the Bill, I indicate that I am not opposed to the principle of the Prices Act at all. Indeed, in some respects it has been beneficial to the people of this State as consumers. However, I find this Bill obnoxious, and I endorse the remarks of the member for Kavel. The time has not come, and it never will come, when we can give the Government an open order regarding the Prices Act. Therefore, an expiry date should be inserted in this legislation.

I am most concerned about the Minister's scant explanation which at page 633 of *Hansard* of November 2 states:

The Bill expands the definition of "consumer" so that it includes a purchaser or a prospective purchaser of land otherwise than for the purpose of resale or letting or for the purpose of trading or carrying on a business. Purchase of a home is the major transaction entered into by most consumers and expansion of the definition of "consumer" to include such purchasers will enable the advisory and investigatory functions of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to apply to such transactions.

Then, in describing the clauses of the Bill, the Minister states:

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act by inserting evidentiary provisions relating to appointment of authorised officers and delegation by the Minister.

The Minister then refers to clause 3, and so on. He skipped over what I call the interpretation of "consumer", and I should like to know why he did so. Clause 2 states:

"consumer" means any person in his capacity as—

- (a) a purchaser or hirer, or a prospective purchaser or hirer, of goods otherwise than for the purpose of resale or letting on hire or for the purpose of, or in the course of, trading or carrying on a business;
- (b) a purchaser, or a prospective purchaser, of land otherwise than for the purpose of resale or letting or for the purpose of, or in the course of, trading or carrying on a business;
- (c) a user, or prospective user, otherwise than for the purpose of, or in the course of, trading or carrying on a business, of any service rendered for fee or reward;

I assume that this covers the situation of Mr. and Mrs. John Citizen who purchase a block of land or a house property. However, the crunch follows in subclause (d), as follows:

or

- (d) a borrower, or a prospective borrower, of money otherwise than for the purpose of, or in the course of, trading or carrying on a business.

That is a most sweeping provision. The consumer is a borrower or prospective borrower of money otherwise than for the purpose of or in the course of carrying on a business; in other words, a business person. Therefore, the consumer is a borrower of any amount of money for any kind of purpose. This means that the Bill will widen the Act to cover every financial transaction in the State, whether it be a hire-purchase agreement or a personal loan from a bank, a finance company, or from any other person. It is wide open, and the Minister has said nothing about it. If he is trying to get the Bill to cover certain housing transactions that occurred recently, in which it was found that the financial arrangements were misleading (the situation has been given much publicity), the Minister should have said so. To try to slip in a clause in a Bill without explaining it is, I think, misleading. I think the

Minister has committed a breach in the Parliament by not spelling out the matter in terms that can be understood by members in this place and by the general public.

Everyone should be made aware of what the Minister is up to, but there is no doubt that, given half a chance, he will seize as much control as possible over every type of financial transaction in the State. I believe that is going beyond the terms of the Prices Act, and certainly the arrangements of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. The department, I believe, has been held in high regard, as I have said previously. I come back to the idiotic statement by the Minister on October 25 (*Hansard*, page 411). It was a totally misleading and mischievous statement. The Minister took some statements I had made on July 27 (not July 20, as he said) in relation to a complaint from a constituent. It was taken out of context to create a mischievous and misleading situation within the department. I have had dealings with officers of the department, and, to my knowledge, we have got on well. Officers have sought my advice in solving certain problems, and we have co-operated in that way. My experience in banking has been of benefit to an officer in one section. I become suspicious of the actions of the Attorney-General in any type of legislation he handles which gives him complete power and controls that go unchallenged. This is not in the interests of consumers. For the reasons I have outlined, I think the clause needs far more detailed explanation than we have been given.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I do not want to canvass again the areas that have been covered, although I agree with the points of view put forward. The provision in this Bill is similar to some of the new provisions inserted in Bill No. 8, to which I cannot refer, in relation to real estate. A situation is created whereby a person (in the case of the real estate legislation, a tribunal; in the case of this Bill, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs) may continue an action which has been stopped or withdrawn by the person who initiated it. In the Bill dealing with real estate, clause 9 (11) clearly indicates that a person does not have to be a tenant but may be a prospective tenant and can start an action. I do not want to say more about that at this juncture.

A situation where a third person can continue or initiate an action, more particularly where the Commissioner can carry on an action, is against the best interests of natural justice and of the business community. My experience as a member has been that many people who complain to the Commissioner have misunderstood the situation in which they have become involved. They have misunderstood or misplaced a document which has been given to them. On the spur of the moment, because someone comments about the value of their product compared to another product purchased from another store, a person gets his tail in a knot and seeks to extricate himself from a transaction on what, to him, soon becomes recognised as a misunderstanding of the consequences.

Where a person accepts the situation and seeks to withdraw the action, not through any force or pressure but purely and simply because of a better understanding of the situation after there has been an opportunity to cool down and to look at the matter constructively, I believe the matter should be left to lie. Under the provisions of the Bill, it will be whipped along, or it is possible for it to be carried along, by a third party who does not understand or is not involved in any degree in the background of the whole affair. To my way of thinking, both in this legislation and in the real estate issue in the other legislation to which I have referred, we are creating a Dracula which, I believe, will be very much against the

public interest.

I go one step further (and what I am saying is by no means an attempt to denigrate the work of this department) and say that this department has for a long time been starved of funds (in the sense of support staff). I think I could count on the fingers of one hand the number of letters I have received from the Public and Consumer Affairs Department or Prices Branch in the 7½ years that I have been a member of this Parliament, but the number of occasions on which I have directed to its attention particular matters far exceeds 10 times the number of fingers on both hands. Members of Parliament, and indeed many people in the community, are not informed of the ultimate outcome of a consideration by the department. When inquiries have been made of the Ministers (and I stress "Ministers" rather than the present Minister) it has been indicated that, if the department were to answer all the queries received and all the directions that were given to it by members, it would be able to carry out less investigatory activities than it currently undertakes. That, in itself, is entirely wrong.

I believe that there should be a documentation, confirmation, and acknowledgment of the receipt of a complaint by the department. More particularly, we will find ourselves in the position of a third party and, if there is no documentation in the hands of the initiator of the inquiry, he will be in an invidious position in any subsequent action, misunderstanding, or inquiry that takes place. I can speak from the other side of the coin, because as a person in professional activity over a period of years I received queries from time to time from a member of the staff of the Prices Commissioner asking the circumstances of a particular transaction between myself and a client, and asking for detail, or suggesting on occasion that I should consider reducing the fee, or give some special consideration in relation to the fee for the professional service, for the drugs supplied, or for the mileage traversed.

There was never a request in writing from the Commissioner's office and never an opportunity as a person under investigation (if I can use the word "investigation" in its broadest sense), for me to write back to tie my comments to a particular inquiry from the Prices Commissioner. I believe that is a very unsatisfactory situation. I should rapidly say that neither the activities of myself as a professional person nor, I believe, the activities of the member for Mitcham in his professional activities could, under the previous legislation, be investigated by the Prices Commissioner, because there are other means whereby, through the registration body of the professions, the activities and the prices charged could be investigated by the registration body. However, the Prices Commissioner, or his officer, would ring and seek to barter or seek to obtain a consideration: they would seek to suggest an alternative course of action to that undertaken by the professional person. As this was all done by telephone, it was not possible for the matter to be carried further, for it to be referred to a Parliamentary representative, or for a person involved in such an investigation to write back to the Commissioner seeking to put the other point of view or to point up to the other side of the coin. I shall certainly be voting against this measure because, as has been indicated, there are many aspects of it that are definitely against the best interests of the community.

**Mr. Keneally:** And veterinary surgeons.

**Dr. EASTICK:** Let us forget about trying to score cheap points about what my profession happens to be. No matter whether I was a bootmaker, an engineer, a member of the law or medical professions, or a veterinary surgeon, as I am, the principle is exactly the same; it is wrong that a

telephone inquiry is used rather than a communication in writing which can be referred to and which can be the basis of further argument if the situation arises.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You always could have hung up.

**Dr. EASTICK:** I was sorely tempted to do so, but, being of a kindly disposition and wanting in all circumstances at least to appear to be interested in the inquiry, I never got around to that action. I must admit to the member for Mitcham that on odd occasions (and it did not occur frequently) I was sorely tempted. I certainly drew to the attention of the inquirer the responsibility that I had as a professional person to my professional body and to the registration board in this State.

**Mr. Millhouse:** If you had hung up that probably would have brought forth a letter.

**Dr. EASTICK:** That is a possibility, but it might have also brought forth some other form of action or inquiry that I was not interested in obtaining. I want to make clear that, if the Government pursues the course of action contained in this Bill and the measure to which we are addressing ourselves at the moment becomes law, I believe it is incumbent upon the Government to make certain that additional funds are available for the correct back-up staff to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs so that all actions can be initiated in a correct, business-like manner.

It may well be adequate to initiate the inquiry by making a telephone call and saying, "I will confirm these remarks or these questions in writing," but it is entirely wrong, I suggest, and against the best interests of all who become involved in such an action if the verbal reply to a telephone inquiry from a person who does not always want to identify himself is the basis of action in the future. I recognise that there are several amendments to this measure to be considered. I will support the measure to the second reading stage so that that consideration can be undertaken, but, like my colleagues, I indicate that I will have no pleasure in supporting the third reading unless many of these unfavourable features are removed.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I wish, also, to express my objections to the Bill as drafted. Because of the type of legislation to which we are drifting in this State, I believe there is a tendency in business circles to forget about ethics that may have existed in the past and to judge the actions that a businessman or organisation might take by the legislation that exists in the States and to say, "Well, if it is not unlawful, it is not unethical, so let us move into that area."

**Mr. Millhouse:** That sounds a bit like Phil Lynch.

**Mr. EVANS:** The member for Mitcham can play in that field if he likes, and he might like to look at some of his actions at the time when he was in a key position. I will not take it any further than that. There are many people who might want to point the bone, including people on the other side of the political fence to myself, who hold key positions in the Federal field.

Be that as it may, I make the point that we as a society—not only businessmen and people in the business world but individuals in the community—are drifting into that sort of approach. It is happening even between neighbour and neighbour or to people in the same village or community. There is an attitude of saying, "Well, this is what the law says. I can do anything else and it does not matter until a Government of the colour of the one we have at the moment brings in another law to try to cover that angle." I ask honourable members to think about it seriously: we shall find we are more selfish and gradually becoming less principled because of this attitude developing in our society.

**Mr. Slater:** That's the philosophy of the Liberal Party.

**Mr. EVANS:** The member for Gilles would be in no position either to talk in that tone if he wanted to go on with it, because that is a problem that exists in his own circle in this House. This type of legislation, in which we are trying to cover every form of consumer from every likely aspect of misjudgment by him or her or from some fine print in a contract they have not bothered to read, is creating a problem that we shall not be able to legislate to cover in the long term; I hope that will be remembered.

The power of the Commissioner or of one of his officers to move without a complaint coming from a consumer may sound reasonable when we first look at it, but if consumer organisations start making representations to the Commissioner not on behalf of any consumer but perhaps against some business venture, will the Attorney-General with his philosophy also bring in legislation or give greater opportunity for legal representation, at no cost other than to the taxpayer, to those consumer organisations to go to the Commissioner and ask for an investigation and maybe even go further than that and allow for legal representation in a court of challenge, that legal representation to be paid for by the taxpayer instead of the consumer organisation itself?

That, too, is a real possibility. It may be even a union that will be asking the Commissioner to carry out an investigation in a certain area. Is that what the Attorney-General is looking at in that provision: allowing the Commissioner to move without any specific complaint from a consumer? That is really one of his jobs and one of the purposes of this piece of legislation. I do not think he has owned up to that in his second reading explanation. He has merely said that the Commissioner can move at any time without any particular complaint.

Also, I am concerned, as all members who have spoken have been, about trying to make the Act a permanent Act, in the sense that only Parliament can move to have it repealed or amended, in which case it would be repealed or amended as any other Act might be, whereas this Act and its operation have been able to be discussed annually. I do not think there is any doubt that that has been one of the governing factors why this department has acted reasonably, because it is more answerable to Parliament, being on an annual basis, than it would if it was permanent, with perhaps a report coming annually before Parliament.

I openly admit that as a member of Parliament I make use of the officers of this department, who have been helpful in many cases, but at the same time I have had complaints from people who believe that they have been unfairly treated by the department in business operations, and that as a business organisation, if a dispute involves only a few dollars, it is better off to own up and pay up even though it feels it has not acted unfairly, unethically or unlawfully; it would sooner pay up than front up to the communication, interrogation and loss of time that take place with perhaps the principals of the organisation or their staff that may have acted in the disputed sale. So I oppose that provision; I hope we can just renew the Act annually, as in the past, and not go in for the sorts of permanent amendments the Attorney-General is seeking to include now.

Trying to include land in the provisions amazes me. The Attorney-General has not told us why he wants to put in that provision. His Government brought in urban land price control as regards allotments of land. For the life of me I cannot see any other area that he wants to move into. If he wants to move into the area of looking at the prices of all houses that are sold or built for sale as spec houses, let him say so. He has not told us that that was the intent of

the amendment. I understand why, and I accept that; there is no reflection on him. I should like the Attorney-General to tell us whether that is the reason, that in the long term he would like to see all land, houses and buildings, commercial, industrial, private, or residential, come under this provision. Is that his intention? If we are moving into that field, we are moving into a dangerous field.

The other matter that perhaps the Attorney-General is looking at is trying to include transactions that may take place between businessmen themselves; he may be trying to assess that a consumer can be a business organisation operating in a small way and his department may be able to cut it off at a particular point and say to the small operator, "We will consider complaints between one business and another business of a small nature," and the person may appear to be disadvantaged because of lack of monetary resources or lack of expert advice within his office staff.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Will you answer me one question?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is not Question Time.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why are we filibustering?

**Mr. EVANS:** I am not as a matter of fact; I decided that just for once I would slow down. The last time I did that last week, he also had his little dig. It is nice of him to be here and recognise by his presence at least once in the House sittings in the last three or four weeks that I am speaking. Quite a few small businessmen have complained about transactions that they believe, and have been told, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs could investigate. In fact, I needed to contact the department on one point recently, and I understand the problem. If that is the intention, I ask the Attorney-General to explain to the House how far he wishes to move in this direction or how far he believes the power of the Commissioner will go under this provision if it is allowed to become effective through both Houses of Parliament.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Are you waiting for Tonkin to come back?

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** There's nothing about small businessmen in this Bill.

**Mr. Millhouse:** He's just wandering on and on, saying nothing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. The honourable member for Fisher has the floor.

**Mr. EVANS:** I thank the Attorney for the comment, and I ask him whether he intends here to go that far. I agree that there is no specific mention of small businessmen, but a Government member stated earlier this year that the Government intended to cover that provision.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** It was the Premier.

**Mr. EVANS:** I ask the Attorney whether, by some back-door method, that will be covered in the Bill. If the legal mind of the member for Mitcham is such that he knows it is not the case, I thank him for that advice and I hope that the Attorney substantiates it later.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I haven't given you any advice.

**Mr. EVANS:** If he did, I am sure the member for Mitcham would charge me a significant amount for that advice, and I will not seek it. I oppose the Bill in its present form and ask the House to do likewise if the Attorney does not accept the Opposition's amendment.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan (teller), Dunstan, Eastick, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells,

and Whitten.

Noes (11)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Millhouse, Russack, Venning, and Wilson.

Majority of 14 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Paragraph (c) is an extremely wide definition of "consumer". It has been put to me that that could cover almost any transaction, such as the payment of an insurance premium. Will the Attorney say whether the Commissioner could go into even that sort of area?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs):** As I understand the position, that would permit the Commissioner to investigate unsatisfactory aspects of insurance transactions. That does not, of course, directly involve price control of any such things. It does not extend to that extent, as I understand the provision; it merely enables the Commissioner to investigate such matters.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I point out how wide that placitum and the one before it are. The Commissioner will have power to inquire into, say, the charging for the giving of legal advice, but only if someone seeks advice on a personal matter. If the same person asks for advice on a matter connected with his business, that cannot be touched. That shows the absurdity of the thing and I guess that, if we applied it to other professions or callings, we would find the same absurdity.

Placitum (b) is far worse because it means that any housing transaction between two private individuals can be inquired into by the Commissioner, unless I have misunderstood the wording. "Land" includes a house, because a house is built on land. If a person sells a house to someone who decides that he may have been overcharged, even though a bargain has been arrived at, the Commissioner can ask questions of the vendor of the house.

Again, it is a wide power and quite a novel departure. It is only one aspect of this clause that is really, when coupled with the powers that the Commissioner has in the principal Act, quite undesirable.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** For the benefit of members opposite, I would point out that there seems to be some confusion about price fixing under the Act, as against the general powers of the Commissioner to investigate complaints from consumers.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I don't think anyone has made a mistake about that.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Certainly the member for Mitcham was not making that mistake. It may be that members of the Liberal Party were making that mistake, and I would just point out to them that sections 19 and 21 of the Act contain wide powers relating to the fixing of prices. That matter is not affected directly by the provisions of clause 2 of the Bill.

**Mr. BECKER:** I agree with the sentiments expressed by the previous two speakers on this clause. When it comes to paragraph (d) I would go even further because the provisions of (d) relate to any financial transaction and widen the powers of the Commissioner to cover a tremendous field. I am at a bit of a loss to understand why the Minister did not spell out in more detail this matter in his second reading explanation, but if the clause is passed can he say how many additional staff members will be required to service complaints under paragraph (d)?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The demands on the

Commissioner's services are great now. The new definition of "consumer", whilst widening the definition somewhat, is in some respects a restatement of the situation. The definition of "consumer" in the principal Act states:

A person who buys or takes on hire or lease, or is a potential buyer or hirer or lessee of, or borrows money for the purpose of purchasing, goods otherwise than for resale or letting on hire or leasing . . . or is a potential user of otherwise than for the purpose of trading or carrying on a business of, any service rendered for fee or reward:

It relates to any service at all. The member for Mitcham is not pointing out any provision in the clause that is in addition to the powers to investigate the activities of people providing services for fee or reward, as that is already a provision of the Act.

**Mr. Becker:** On the purchase of goods that is fair enough, but there are such things as personal loans for the average person to carry-on.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It depends what the personal loan is for.

**Mr. Becker:** Sometimes they say "X,Y,Z", but often it is just a carry-on for an individual.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am not saying that it does not extend the definition; I am saying that many of the powers are already contained in the Act.

**Mr. Becker:** It will certainly make more work.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If it makes more work we will need additional staff, but I do not expect that it will be a dramatic addition. It will depend on the conduct of the business community.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Functions and powers of the Commissioner."

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I move:

Page 2, lines 18 to 21—Leave out all words in these lines.

This is the matter to which I referred briefly in the second reading debate. This provision means that in future the Commissioner can initiate an inquiry; he does not need to wait until he receives a complaint. He could read something in the paper or in some other way decide that he will make an investigation and inquiry. The member for Kavel used an inelegant phrase when he spoke, but it was descriptive since it means that the Commissioner can act as a "super snooper" if he wishes, because he can investigate anything he likes. He has, already, under the Act, enormously wide powers to obtain information. Section 8 provides:

(1) For the purposes of this Act, an authorised officer may require any person—

(a) to furnish him with any information which he requires;

or

(b) to answer any question put to that person;

or

(c) to produce at a time and place indicated by the authorised officer any books, papers and documents (including balance-sheets and accounts).

(2) The authorised officer may require any such information to be furnished, or any such question to be answered—

(a) orally or in writing;

(b) at a time and place specified by the authorised officer;

(c) on oath or affirmation.

(3) A person shall not—

(a) refuse or fail to comply with any reasonable requirement made under this section;

(b) give any information or make any answer which is false in any particular.

(4) A person shall not be obliged to comply with any requirement made under this section unless he has first been informed by the authorised officer that he is obliged to comply with the requirement by virtue of this Act.

Literally that means that if this power is bestowed and then used the Commissioner or an authorised officer can say, "I am going to make an inquiry into this" and can oblige people to give the information that is set out in section 8. The Commissioner will have much greater powers than the police have in the appropriate situation. One could argue that it must be a reasonable requirement under the section, but "reasonable" will give little protection to anything that the Commissioner may wish to ask about a business transaction. The principal Act provides a protection that there must have been a complaint to the Commissioner before he can initiate an inquiry but, under this measure, a complaint is not necessary and he can institute it of his own volition. Of all the widening of powers in this Bill, this is the most objectionable.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I support the amendment. That is to be understood from the remarks I made in the second reading debate. The member for Mitcham, despite his complaint that I had not gone into this matter in much detail in the second reading debate, had precious little to say about it during the debate himself. His argument was thin, but he has now put forward a more convincing case. The member for Mitcham repeated the phrase I used—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member should not continue to refer to the second reading debate whilst we are in Committee.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Mitcham made reference to it, and it is relevant to say that the major Opposition Party in this Chamber has made the situation abundantly clear. The reasons are obvious. The reasonable operation of the Consumer Affairs Branch should be able to protect consumers who consider that they have been dealt with harshly in some way and who have seen fit to complain to it. It seems to be completely unreasonable to suggest that the Commissioner should take it on himself to investigate matters when no complaint has been received from a consumer. That seems to be widening his powers dramatically and unnecessarily.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I can merely refer honourable members to section 18a(1)(a), which provides:

The functions of the Commissioner shall include the investigation of and conduct of research into aspects of and matters relating to or affecting the interests of consumers generally or any particular consumer or consumers;

**Mr. Millhouse:** That's not it at all; that's research.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It does not relate to research only. It refers to "the investigation of and conduct of research".

**Mr. Millhouse:** Well, go on after "research": it says "aspects".

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It refers to "aspects of and matters relating to or affecting the interests of consumers generally". I am merely saying that the Commissioner already conducts investigations from his own knowledge when he sees, for instance, advertisements in newspapers, or when he believes that things are being done by business people that are not in the best interests of consumers. So, this is not the great variation to the existing law that members opposite claim it is.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Well, why do you want a variation at all?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Because it clarifies the position.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** That explanation from the

Minister is in strange conflict with what he said in the second reading explanation, in which, regarding this clause, he said:

It removes the present restriction in the principal Act to the effect that before the Commissioner may investigate any unlawful practice he must first have received a complaint from a consumer. This restriction has tied the hands of the Commissioner to a certain extent, in that he has not been able to investigate practices or prosecute offences that have come to his attention indirectly from the complaint of a consumer or by other means.

That is at complete variance with what the Minister has sought to peddle to the Committee this evening.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You're quite right.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is indeed high praise. It is abundantly clear, in light of what I have just quoted, that the Minister is trying to pull the wool over the Committee's eyes. He is seeking a considerable extension of the Commissioner's powers, and what he has told the Committee will not wash. I support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wilson.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan (teller), Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 6—"Repeal of s. 53 of principal Act."

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out to the Committee that the member for Kavel has on file an amendment that seeks to strike out the present clause 6 and insert another clause in its place. The question is that the present clause stand as printed. If that motion is defeated, the honourable member will be in order in moving to insert the new clause. I think it would be appropriate for the honourable member to canvass his proposed amendment when discussing the clause.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is abundantly clear that we object to the clause, and it would appear from your explanation, Mr. Chairman, that the firm likelihood is that the amendment, as such, will not be put. I take it from your explanation that, if the clause is passed, it will be the end of the argument.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member is allowed to canvass the new clause.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** We believe it essential that the Prices Act should come before Parliament for annual review. However, this clause, which would delete section 53 from the principal Act, would mean that the Act would be permanent and that it would not be necessary for the legislation to come before Parliament annually for ratification. Many articles could be brought under price control without the matter coming before Parliament for regular review. At present, the Prices Act seems to be administered in a moderate fashion, and the number of items under price control is minimal. Although few could complain about the operation of the Act at present, no-one can see into the future. If the Government decided in a rash of activity to bring a whole range of commodities under price control, Parliament would have no say in the matter. In our view, it is essential that section 53 be not repealed. What I am seeking to do is insert in clause 6 the kind of provision which has appeared in Bills for many years now and which would seek to strike out from the Act "1977" and insert in lieu thereof "1978", thus meaning

that the Act would continue until the end of next year. I cannot conceive of a position where we would say to the Commissioner, "The Act is permanent. You go ahead and do what you like to the prices of commodities in South Australia." For that reason, we are opposed to the clause as it stands.

The member for Mitcham indicated that he supported this clause, but unfortunately he is not present now. The official Opposition supported his amendment, whereas the thanks we have received for this is that he has left the Chamber, and is probably on his way home. Without his support, we will press on regardless, and the only way in which we can move towards amending the clause is, in the first instance, by voting against clause 6.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan (teller), Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 834.)

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** We support the Bill and, when one looks at it, one will realise that we have little option to do other than support it. The Government proposes to continue indefinitely the principle of wage indexation. In his second reading explanation, the Minister reminded the House that, when the legislation was first introduced, he expressed concern about the future of wage indexation, particularly in view of the Fraser Government's continual opposition before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to the basic purpose of indexation, which is the preservation of the real purchasing power of wages in times of inflation. The Minister, after referring to an awful period in the history of Australia, went on to state:

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.

That is an interesting statement, because in 1974 wages increased by 28 per cent in money terms, yet in real terms there was only about a 12 per cent increase, with inflation running at between 16 per cent and 17 per cent. In normal and stable circumstances, it is fair to assume there would be a growth in productivity of between 2 per cent and 3 per cent, and wages would match that. However, since the introduction of wage indexation it is interesting to note how wage earners in South Australia have been affected.

Through this legislation any decisions handed down by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission are automatically transmitted through our State Industrial Commission to wage earners under State awards. The following figures indicate the position which has applied in Australia and South Australia in regard to consumer price index percentage increases, as well as the date and size of wage flow-ons:

	Consumer Price Index (Percentage Increase)		Wage flow-on:
	Australia	Australia South	
March, 1976	3.2	3	May 15, 1976, 3 per cent or \$3.80
June, 1976	3	2.5	August 15, 1976, \$2.50 up to \$166 or 1.5 per cent
September, 1976	2.5	2.2	November 22, 1976, 2.2 per cent
December, 1976	7.1	6 (discounting for Medibank 3.2)	March 31, 1977, \$5.70
March, 1977	2.1	2.3	May 24, 1977, 1.9 per cent up to \$3.80
June, 1977	2.4	2.4	August 22, 1977, 2 per cent
September, 1977	2.5	2	—

The wage flow-on for September, 1977, has not yet been brought down, but we will probably get it in the first or second week in December, as that case is now being argued before the commission. The Minister referred to the 1974 wage-bargaining situation, where wage earners received about three or four times normal wage increases in percentage terms. This was when unemployment started and when the real problem started in industry. Profits dropped to a third, and the recession started in earnest. No-one ever again wants to see that happen in Australia. At the same time, I would not like to see wage earners in this State disadvantaged as they have been over the years.

South Australia has always been known as the low-cost State. Unfortunately, its workers were known as the lowest paid workers, but I do not see why South Australia should be any different from the rest of Australia. When one goes back over the past 12 months—

**Mr. Bannon:** The member for Davenport doesn't agree with that.

**Mr. BECKER:** Many honourable members on this side may not agree, but on some issues I have had personal experience, and it is about time that members on this side saw the plain facts of life concerning those issues. Several unions are presently arguing that wage indexation does not give the worker what he is entitled to in real terms. At present, the wage earner in South Australia is about 1.4 per cent out of pocket. He has lost under wage indexation, but that is a decision of the Federal Government and this State Government, believing that, if we are to curb inflation and bring costs down, this is the way to achieve it. I do not know whether that is the complete answer, because I do not see why it should be at the expense of the wage earner.

**Mr. Allison:** The rate of inflation—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing about inflation in this Bill, which deals with wage indexation.

**Mr. BECKER:** Wage indexation is basically tied to it, and is trying to combat inflation. I am concerned about the benefits accruing to workers in this State. This Bill deals with that matter and simplifies the process. Although I will in the Committee stage deal with a technicality, the legislation deserves our continued support, and for that reason I commend the Bill to honourable members.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** I support the Bill and the principles of wage indexation, but I believe that one amendment should be made to the Bill to ensure a termination period for wage indexation, which would continue a previous principle laid down in this House. In debating this Bill it is pertinent to examine the need for wage indexation and the Minister's attitude towards it. I am disappointed that the Minister of Labour and Industry has not shown the courtesy to this Chamber of being present this evening to hear the debate on the Bill. I believe that the Government, if it had any respect for Parliament, would adjourn the Bill until the Minister is present.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing about the Minister in the Bill.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The Minister introduced the Bill, and his views are pertinent. In his second reading explanation the Minister talked about the principles of wage indexation and how he supported them, yet we had an incredible example only last week where, in a report by Rex Jory in the *News* of November 16, the Minister indicated his willingness to go outside the guidelines of wage indexation. On that occasion the Minister indicated, concerning the 37½-hour week—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will adhere to the Bill. There is only one clause, and it concerns indexation. There is nothing about 37½ hours in the Bill.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is, I think, a most pertinent point in the Bill as to whether or not this House continues to support wage indexation. I am pointing out that, if someone is prepared to offer 37½ hours outside of the Arbitration Commission—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order and I will not allow him to continue. He will stick to indexation. There is only one point in the Bill: whether we have indexation or not. There is nothing in the Bill about 37½ hours. The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the eight guidelines for wage indexation is that any reduction in working hours within the working week must be presented to the Industrial Commission for approval, to ensure that they are within the guidelines.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member persists in this manner I will have to withdraw his leave. The Bill before the House deals only with indexation.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is no question but that the Bill deals with indexation and the continuation of it in this State. Indexation is very much a matter of all the conditions which come before the Industrial Commission. Among those conditions which affect indexation is the matter of hours. This is quite clearly recognised in Federal legislation, in this State's legislation, and in the amending legislation. I could quote from various authorities. I could quote Dr. Barry Hughes, and if you wish I could quote his words in an interview in which he makes it quite clear—

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is not addressing himself to a point of order relevant to the Bill. The Bill simply extends to the date of proclamation the application of the present legislation, which, at the moment, has a termination date. That is all that is in the legislation.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not absolutely *au fait* with this point of order, but I cannot see that the Minister can take a point of order whilst I am taking a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I shall uphold the Leader of the Opposition. We will deal with points of order one at a time.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I had almost finished, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your help. Dr. Barry Hughes, the Premier's financial adviser, in an interview in July, 1976, was asked the following question:

What would it do to the economy if more people worked a shorter working week?

**Dr. Hughes replied:**

I think it would complicate the hell out of the inflation problem and I really don't see how we could solve the problem at least into the 1980's with a general 35-hour week.

The indexation system which our institute—that is the Institute of Labour Studies at Flinders University, which the member for Ross Smith knows well—

has been advocating for a long time now is very much under attack . . .

The whole question of indexation and its continuance in this State depends very much on the attitude that this Government takes to working hours.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. I stick to the ruling of the Chair. The Bill concerns the continuance or otherwise of indexation, and I ask the member for Davenport to continue in that vein.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I intend to do so. I intend to look at what the Minister of Labour and Industry said last week, which indicated that he is not prepared to go along with wage indexation. The whole purpose of raising this issue of 37½ hours—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is continuing in this vein. If he does, I shall have to take action.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The point I was making was that last week the Minister of Labour and Industry clearly indicated in an article in the *News* that he was prepared to go outside of wage indexation. I shall read to the House the pertinent part of the article in which he said that, as follows:

Mr. Wright said, "It may be at some stage if the S.E.C. is going to continue to deliberately hold that position up that we are going to have to act unilaterally as a Government and to do something about it."

The Minister indicated that he was prepared to act unilaterally—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** —and therefore to go outside of the Arbitration Commission.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Order! The honourable member has been here long enough to know that, when the Speaker is on his feet, the honourable member must resume his seat. I shall warn the honourable member for Davenport. He is getting away from wage indexation, and that is the only thing in the Bill before the House.

**Mr. TONKIN:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member was talking—

**Mr. Dean Brown:** You can't—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport for the second time. That is his final warning. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. TONKIN:** The point of order is this: the honourable member, in deference to your ruling, and rightly so, did not mention the question of hours. He was simply talking about the Government's attitude to the arbitration and conciliation system which at present supports the very indexation principles that we are talking about extending by means of this Bill. That is all he did. I submit that there is no case for him to be pulled up on that score, because it is vitally important. We are considering whether or not to continue to support the principles of wage indexation. That is what this Bill is about.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Of course it is. Anyone with any—



**Mr. TONKIN:** For that reason—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is the last time I shall warn the honourable member and not name him. I warn him for the last time.

**Mr. TONKIN:** This is my point of order: we are discussing indexation, and therefore it is most pertinent that we discuss the attitude of this Government towards the arbitration and conciliation legislation and system.

**Mr. Chapman:** Which is the basis of indexation.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is out of order. I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Davenport was talking about an S.E.C. ruling, if I remember rightly. He must keep within the confines of indexation, yes or no.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was not talking about an S.E.C. ruling but about the Minister's having indicated publicly that he was prepared to go outside arbitration, and that is—

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You didn't.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I did.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I read to the House the article quoting that the Minister had indicated that he was prepared to take unilateral action, which would be outside of arbitration. If it is outside of arbitration, it is outside the eight guidelines laid down for wage indexation.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the honourable member's point of order. I am simply saying that he must stick to the Bill before the House. The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Obviously, I am not allowed to debate any specific case in relation to wage indexation. I find it difficult to debate the continuation of wage indexation in this State on a perpetual basis at the discretion of the Minister when I am not allowed to debate specific cases as to whether or not the Government has supported or opposed wage indexation. I find that almost unbelievable.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I am reflecting on the Government, because I believe that the Government should make a clear and obvious statement of its attitude on wage indexation. I know that the Leader of the Opposition last week tried to get a statement from the Minister on his attitude to wage indexation, and whether in all circumstances he supported it. I understand on that occasion that, when the Leader of the Opposition asked that question of the Minister, some evidence was presented to the House that the Government may not have been supporting wage indexation in all circumstances. I also point out to the House what I believe is the important need for wage indexation in the light of several logs of claims recently submitted to employers. I should like to cite two cases. One is a recent log of claims lodged in the past three or four days by the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union of Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will be able to link this with wage indexation. He has not done so as yet. He is now talking of logs of claims, and there is nothing about them in the Bill.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** My linking of this wage indexation is that I wish to point out what could happen if wage indexation was not continued. As the Act stands, wage indexation is due to finish at the end of this year. I am pointing out, if wage indexation does not continue, what sorts of claim could be faced. This particular claim as presented to me indicates that the union is requesting from the employers \$485 for a 28-hour week. I believe that is

quite ridiculous.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is right away from the Bill before the House. He can be for or against the provision, but at the moment he is moving right away from it.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I indicated when I first got to my feet that I was supporting the principle of wage indexation, and that I was supporting it to the second reading stage only. I believe it should be amended during the Committee stage, but I do not believe I can talk in detail about that amendment because I would be outside the Standing Orders. I am pointing out to the House the need to maintain wage indexation in all circumstances, including cases that come before the Minister that the Minister does not particularly like, because it has been clear to the House in the past seven days that the Minister is prepared to throw aside wage indexation when it does not suit him.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Nonsense.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** That is certainly what the Minister has said. An article that appeared in the *News* on Wednesday of last week states clearly that the Minister was prepared to take unilateral action and go outside the guidelines of wage indexation.

**Mr. Bannon:** In which paper last week?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** If the member for Ross Smith disagrees with that, may I read it to him?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Ross Smith is out of order. I have already ruled on that matter.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I refer the attention of the House to that article, which appeared in the *News* and which clearly indicates that the Minister is prepared to go outside of wage indexation. There can be no doubt about that whatsoever. I believe that if (and I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker) we cannot debate individual cases there is little point in my continuing this speech. Unfortunately, I cannot present to the House what I think is important evidence that needs to be presented, first, ensuring that there is a termination of wage indexation and, secondly, supporting the case that wage indexation should continue but continue in all cases including any case that may not run the Minister's way. I believe that the State Government must be prepared to discipline itself and its employees to the conditions of wage indexation. I am gravely disappointed that I cannot debate those outside cases. I believe they are vitally important in considering this Bill, but unfortunately, apparently they cannot be considered, so there is little point in my continuing my remarks—

**Mr. Chapman:** You've done a good job.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I am disappointed I am not able to debate what I think are most important issues in this Bill; it is most unfortunate. They are pertinent arguments and I have done much work on this Bill. I believe we should be able to examine in detail whether the Minister of Labour and Industry has been prepared to abide by the standard that he is now saying everyone else in the State should abide by. I think there is pertinent evidence in a particular case that I cannot mention on working hours that would show the Minister has not been prepared to support the principles of wage indexation.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I heartily support the remarks of the member for Davenport and I say again, as I have said on a number of occasions in this House, that it is extremely difficult to discuss a hole in the ground without being able to discuss the dirt around it;



and that is the position we are in.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Or what came out of it.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Yes, or what formed it in the first place. That is a ruling that has been made from time to time in this House and I defer to your ruling, Sir.

**Mr. Keneally:** You always like to discuss things.

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

**Mr. TONKIN:** In this instance, the matter at issue is whether or not the Minister of Labour and Industry is prepared to stand by the legislation which he has brought into this House and which we are debating tonight; that is, whether or not we will maintain wage indexation in this State for another limited (and I believe it should be limited) period. If we pass this legislation and continue it for another 12 months (or, as the Government would like, indefinitely), we want to know that the Minister of Labour and Industry will guarantee that he will, in fact, himself abide by this legislation and that the Government will do so, too.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Which Minister is in charge of this Bill?

**Mr. TONKIN:** I do not know which Minister is in charge of this Bill; certainly, the Minister at the table at the moment is not in charge of it. I would like, before this whole matter is finalised and put through the Committee stage, to see this whole business of whether or not the Government will abide by wage indexation clearly spelled out, by any Minister. I will even accept the word of the Minister of Transport, sitting at the table now. That is vitally important.

The member for Davenport has referred to a particular instance, which I do not intend to canvass because it would be contrary to your ruling, Mr. Speaker; in any case, I think everyone in this House and in the community knows to which case he is referring. I confess to being gravely disturbed by the Minister's and the Government's attitude to this whole business. The conciliation and arbitration system is very much concerned with this matter of wage indexation. Wage indexation, it has been generally agreed, has been one of the major weapons in controlling inflation and bringing it down under two figures.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing about inflation in this Bill.

**Mr. TONKIN:** For that reason I think it ought to be supported by everyone in this House. That is why we are supporting the Bill. We believe that there should be an improvement made to it, but I do not believe that we can afford to go outside those guidelines. I do not think we can afford, in any way, to reject the guidelines of indexation. That is why I am gravely disturbed at the attitude demonstrated by the Minister in the past few days. This must reflect the attitude of the Government. If (and I speak hypothetically) the Government were to take unilateral action outside the guidelines to which it is currently subscribing by the introduction of this Bill, it would be a cynical action of the gravest portent.

**Mr. Chapman:** Typical.

**Mr. TONKIN:** As my colleague says, it would be typical. When things go the Government's way it goes along with legislation, but, when things do not suit it, it does not go along with legislation and bends the rules. That is the very reason why we are speaking tonight, because I am very suspicious that the Government intends to break the rules that it is trying to impose on other people.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TONKIN:** That is all right, I am used to it; it is a propensity Labor has for raking muck.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Get out of the gutter.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I would like to hear a Minister, any one of them, or even one of the back-benchers, give some sort of undertaking that the Government intends to honour the spirit of the legislation it is seeking to impose on other people; that is all we ask, Sir. If it expects other people to live up to that legislation, it should do so, too. We have seen other examples, but I am not going to quote them tonight. Let me remind members about the misleading advertising and one or two other matters that I am certain will come to mind without my raising them. Mr. Speaker, you are in a difficult position with such narrow legislation, too, and we have done the best we can to ventilate our grave concern about this matter without going outside the limits you have set. I hope, Sir, that you will appreciate that we have done our best and will realise that we are gravely concerned. We would not have taken this action otherwise.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You've been brainwashed by Fraser, and what a bloody liar he is, as well as you.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I ask the Minister to withdraw that remark. It is quite unparliamentary. He called Mr. Fraser a bloody liar.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the Minister to withdraw his reference to the Prime Minister.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport):** I will withdraw it, in deference to you, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Expiry of Act."

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I ask the Minister who is posturing for the Minister of Labour and Industry this evening to give an undertaking to this Committee as to whether or not the Government will support the principles of wage indexation while this Act is in operation on all occasions, not on just a few select occasions when it suits it.

**Mr. BECKER:** In view of the request made by the member for Davenport, I would be grateful if the Minister could indicate to the Committee the Government's undertaking in this regard, because it could assist the Opposition in its attitude to the future of this clause.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** It is quite obvious that the Government would not have brought the Bill forward if it was not intended. This is a silly question and deserves almost a silly answer.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** The Minister may consider it a silly question. He has given a silly answer, but that is not good enough for me or the Opposition. I regard this as being a most important matter. This clause provides that the Act shall expire on a date to be fixed by proclamation instead of being renewable. If that is to go in and if we are not to proceed with other action we can take on this clause, I want to know exactly where the Government stands and whether it will honour its commitments, because its record in this respect is far from satisfactory.

It is also far from satisfactory that the Minister in charge of the Bill is not here or, failing that, that the Premier or the Deputy Premier is not here to give an assurance. If the Minister of Transport is unable to give the assurance we seek and is prepared only to treat the matter as one of levity or being silly, I assure him we do not. Let us wait until we get a Minister in here who can do something. I move that progress be reported until such time as we can get that assurance.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Whitten.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**Mr. BECKER:** I move:

Page 1, line 11—Leave out “a day to be fixed by proclamation” and insert “the thirty-first day of December, 1978”.

I believe that, whilst the Bill provides that the Act shall expire on a date to be fixed by proclamation, a fixed date should be stated. The Government can repeal the Act at any time it wants to do so, but I would still like to have the assurance that, if wage indexation is with us in the next calendar year, we shall then have the opportunity to review the situation. I do not think there is any way in which the consumer price index figures can be brought down to 2 per cent or 3 per cent in the next 12 months; I should like to think they could be but I doubt whether they can. In view of the uncertainty and the pressure (I explained earlier that some unions are, quite understandably, concerned that wage indexation is not the complete answer for their members; I can see their point of view), we must be firm in the present situation and be consistent in putting in a termination date. I commend the amendment.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The Government is not prepared to accept the amendment. The point that the honourable member has made is correct. The Government is able to repeal the legislation again at any stage that it wishes to do so, but the important point is that, if it is not possible to initiate further legislation before or near December 31, 1978 (in other words, if we do not have a repeat performance of this evening in 12 months time), the legislation will automatically go out of existence.

The Government has, despite some wild allegations that have been made this evening, abided carefully by the indexation guidelines, and it proposes to continue to do so. We believe that the guidelines and the whole scheme of indexation have served the community well. I do not

intend to comment on the attitude of other Governments and the effect of that, but I simply indicate that the Government's desire in introducing this Bill is to ensure that the indexation provisions that have served us quite well will continue. They have not served us completely, and I accept the honourable member's point that there are deficiencies that ought to have been overcome. I hope that they will be overcome, but that will not be done simply by putting in a termination date. I have enough confidence to believe that indexation will continue well beyond December 31, 1978. For that reason, the Government has brought in the amending legislation so that the legislation will have continuing effect for the community.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Although the Minister's statement was put in his usual roundabout way so that he would not lose face, I accept the statement as an assurance, but I wish he had made it earlier. He has stated categorically that the Government will, on all occasions, abide by the guidelines of wage indexation, and I infer from that that it will not act unilaterally to go outside the indexation system. I am pleased with that assurance. The Minister nods his head.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** I did not nod anything.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Until I hear otherwise, I accept the Minister's statement as a guarantee and I thank him for it. However, I support the amendment moved by the member for Hanson, because I believe that it is wise.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker (teller), Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Whitten.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 23, at 2 p.m.