HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 23, 1977

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

SHOP TRADING HOURS BILL

At 2.2 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendments Nos. 1, 2 and 3:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendments and the House of Assembly do not further disagree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 4:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two". And that the House of Assembly agree to the amendment as so amended.

As to Amendments Nos. 5 and 6:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendments and the House of Assembly do not further disagree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 7:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to Amendment No. 8:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but makes the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 3, line 10 (clause 4)—After "cooked meat," insert "frozen meat,"

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 9:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendment and the House of Assembly do not further disagree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 10:

That the Legislative Council amends its amendment by striking out the word "Where", first occurring, and insert in lieu thereof the passage "Subject to this section, where" and by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:

(4) A declaration under this section shall not have any force or effect on and from the 31st day of March, 1979.

As to Amendment No. 11:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to Amendments Nos. 12 and 13:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendments and the House of Assembly do not further disagree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos. 14 and 16:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

Although there were 15 amendments, the conference dealt with six major categories, as follows: supply of fresh meat; the increase in the size of food shops from 186 square metres to 400 square metres; small shop sections; convenience stores; sporting goods; and changes in shopping districts.

The explanation, which I hope is now before honourable members, can be followed quite simply. Agreement has been reached that only frozen meat will be covered by the legislation, and that is consistent with what is in the existing legislation but was omitted in the legislation now before us. As a consequence, the situation will be that the present requirements regarding frozen meat will be allowed to continue and that it can be sold accordingly.

The Legislative Council did not insist on its amendment to increase the area of food shops from 186 square metres to 400 square metres, and a compromise situation was reached. The size of such shops now will be 200 square metres. The Government conceded that there were fairly good points in the amendments regarding small shops, and they were accepted accordingly.

Two thoughts were expressed on the matter of convenience stores. The first was to allow the convenience stores to continue to trade. After a great deal of time on this subject (and I believe the managers were taking a humanitarian view in this regard), it was decided that owners of some of these stores could have been placed in a somewhat difficult position, particularly owners of convenience stores who had purchased them recently. On the other hand, I make the point that numerous shopkeepers in this category would not have been placed in any difficult financial position, in my view, because of the advantage they have had over the years in trading to the detriment of other traders.

Finally, it was decided that an extension of 15 months would be granted to convenience stores so that, on March 31, 1979, the stores now known as convenience stores will cease to operate in South Australia. No others will be allowed to open in the meantime. I believe that decision gives some relief, particularly to those storekeepers who could have found themselves in a difficult financial position. I do not think any member on either side in this Chamber would want to see such a situation develop. Protection has been afforded in the legislation to anyone falling into that category.

Amendment No. 4, in regard to sporting goods, was accepted by the conference in terms identical with the amendment by the Legislative Council. The amendments regarding shopping districts also have been accepted in terms identical with those of the amendments forwarded to this place by the Legislative Council.

I think I have given the Committee a summary of the conference. I am pleased that the managers were able to reach agreement after 3½ hours or four hours in conference. I should like to place on record my appreciation of the assistance given to me by the managers from this House. I thought for one fleeting moment that I was going to lose the support of the member for Coles, but she soon dispelled that thought and made it clear that she was defending the position of this place.

I am confident that the way has been made clear for late night shopping to commence in South Australia, as promised by the Government, on December 1. I know some difficulties have occurred in the Industrial Court, but they are the concern of the court, not of this Committee. I understand that some action is taking place there now which may overcome the award situation. The Government has completely carried out its obligation to the public of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER: I thank this Committee for the opportunity to be present at the conference. It was difficult at times to sit there and have to bite my nails, but the outcome was basically what the Government wanted. I am still a little disappointed that we in West Beach will lose the benefit of the convenience store to which we have become accustomed. Under the proposals before the Committee, the store will have 16 months in which to trade out of the situation, but I am concerned about the possibility of the loss of 85 part-time jobs for young people. They will have an opportunity to seek other

employment, if necessary; I hope that it will not be necessary, and that there is some chance of their retaining their employment.

I think the conclusion reached about frozen meat was probably the only solution that could have been reached by the conference. It was felt (and I do not know whether the Minister got this impression) that the Bill could have been in jeopardy. The availability of frozen meat will provide a benefit to the consumer, but it depends how it will be prepacked and presented to the public. It looks ghastly, but at least no-one will have an excuse for being unable to obtain steak or chops for a barbecue.

A small concession was made in increasing the size of convenience stores to 200 square metres. This will cover a large percentage of the existing convenience stores or exempt shops, but it places a restriction on those that are slightly bigger. There are two or three of them.

The situation at West Beach should be looked at in isolation. The period of 16 months will give us an opportunity to reassess the situation, and perhaps all is not lost. There may be an opportunity for that business to be retained.

It was an experience and a pleasure to represent this Chamber at the conference, and I think the value of the conference system has been proved. At least, if a Minister is prepared to listen and to accept the debate, and if he looks at the matter from a humanitarian as well as from a legislative point of view, it is always possible to reach some compromise.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that I cannot take part in the mutual congratulation that we have heard from the Minister and the member for Hanson, who apparently is the spokesman on this topic for the Liberal Party. I could not help noticing, during the time when the Minister was speaking and when he himself was speaking, the artificiality of the whole thing. Apparently, the member for Hanson sat there and, to use his own expression, bit his nails, whilst the member for Coles, who wanted to follow her inclination which, on what she said last night, was against any of this legislation, was muzzled. That shows the complete artificiality of the system for resolving deadlocks between the Houses.

I do not propose to say any more about that except that I do not believe that there is the cause for congratulation that we so often hear in this place when a compromise is reached. Usually, it is found afterwards, when the legislation is examined at leisure, that there has been a botch of one description or another. Most of the compromises we reach turn out to be legislatively absurd. Whether or not that will happen in this case, I do not know.

If, as I understand it, convenience shops are to be closed after 15 months, I do not think much of that as a compromise. Obviously, they have been used extensively and are wanted by the public, and I cannot imagine why they should be cut out at any time, and that apart from any unfairness that may be done to those who operate them and depend on them for their livelihood.

What we have seen in the debate merely confirms my view that this legislation is unnecessary, will cause injustice, and will be a clog on the community. It should not be on the Statute Book in its present compromise form or in any form, and I hope that sooner or later (and I hope sooner) it will go. Whilst I say nothing about accepting or rejecting the compromise (that will be accepted), I have no enthusiasm for it, and the sooner this Act is repealed the better.

Mr. RODDA: I am disappointed that the provisions concerning red meat have not been altered, and that any alterations will be the province of the Royal Commission. People in South Australia will have to adjust but, obviously, red meat producers will be disadvantaged by this legislation. I believe that the Minister, in essence, is fair, and I hope that from what he said during the second reading debate his word will be his bond, and that he will reconsider this matter next year after the legislation has had a trial. Undoubtedly, people in South Australia will express their wishes one way or another, but there is a strong feeling among producers of red meat about butcher shops being closed at a specific time. I am sure that butchers could have adjusted to meet any change that would have been necessary if my amendment with respect to this matter had been included. There must have been some granity discussions at the conference, and a hard line must have been taken by someone to enable the Bill to come out in its present form, as it will deny to red meat producers their best market, or at least diminish it. I hope that we will be able to sell our surplus meat on the export market.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I support the comments of the member for Victoria. Regarding amendment No. 8 on which a compromise has been reached, I am disappointed that the description of red meat has not been preserved. The term "frozen meat" will cause a problem in policing. Unless it is clearly spelt out in the regulations, one may ask at what point is it necessary that the meat be frozen: must it be frozen at the time of sale, or must it have been frozen, or could it be on the thaw at any stage? Frozen, chilled, cooled, or preserved meat by refrigeration is a delicate area, and it will be virtually impossible to police this provision.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It worked in the previous Act.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Whether it did or not, we were not then referring to irregular shopping hours on irregular days in irregular districts in the community. Shopping hours were somewhat regular, whether that was desirable or not. If we are to change the climate it will be necessary to change the coat we wear. This whole exercise has been rather hastily botched, and, in some respects, I tend to support what the member for Mitcham has said. Members will realise that it is seldom that I go as far as to say that I support that honourable member in any regard.

I am disappointed at the tone of the compromise on this clause. As Opposition members, it is our job to support red meat producers in this State, because this is the only place in Parliament from which they receive genuine and positive support. From other legislation introduced, it is obvious that the Government has little or no regard for primary producers, and especially red meat producers. On their behalf I place on record my disappointment that any sort of restriction has been placed on the retail sale of their product.

The provision regarding frozen meat, if taken to the extreme, will favour retail outlets that are equipped to display and sell frozen products. Those who normally display fresh red meat will be at a disadvantage, because this definition will favour the large retail stores, the commercial supermarkets and the like, and this is denying another sector of the community from being able to market a product which, at present, is running out of our ears. We do not know what to do with our meat, because our export markets have been steadily eroded, and even within the country we are faced with sufficient restrictions.

The set-up at Gepps Cross, owned and maintained by the Government, controls and monopolises the sale of meat within the whole of the metropolitan area and its environs and, if anyone located outside the metropolitan area seeks to market within it, he must bow to the terms controlled by the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible for the operation of the monstrosity on the

northern side of the city. Those who have been seeking and will continue to seek part of the market are denied open and free access to this area. Also, there is some confusion about the percentage of their output that may come into the metropolitan area. With the present restrictions prevailing on the marketing of meat in South Australia, any further restrictions or lessening of the opportunity to market our red meat products must cause concern and that concern will be expressed from this side on behalf of producers.

Mr. BECKER: I feel that I should answer the remark made by the member for Mitcham about the artificiality of my expression regarding my interpretation of the conference. I want to make very clear that there is nothing artificial in what I have to say or the attitude that I have in relation to the convenience store at West Beach, those who are employed there, or the effects this Bill may have in the long term on their employment. The member for Mitcham is being mischievous; he is trying to create a misleading impression. He was not present at the conference, and nobody who was present at that conference will disclose what went on in the discussion and debate. Had the member for Mitcham been in this House continuously at the beginning of this session and at the beginning of debate on this issue he would have known that nobody has fought harder, nobody has tried harder, and nobody could have done more than I have done towards preserving the *status quo* in relation to the West Beach Foodland Store and the convenience that it provides for the people in my electorate and surrounding districts.

The members from another place who took the side of retaining the convenience stores did all they could as hard as they could, and as solidly as they could, to try to preserve that situation. No-one could state that my remarks were artificial. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I challenge that person to make that allegation outside this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have spoken again except for what has just been said by the member for Hanson. I did not say that his comments in this place this afternoon were artificial. I said that the whole system of settling disagreements between the Houses was artificial. I am glad I have cleared up that misunderstanding, but it is quite obvious from what the member for Hanson has just said that the attitude he took at the conference was the attitude of the Government and not the attitude that he had taken on behalf of the convenience stores, particularly that one at West Beach, so the people at West Beach will now know that, while publicly he may have championed them, at the conference he did not.

Mr. BECKER: I must clear up this situation once and for all. The Minister, the member for Coles, the member for Ross Smith and the member for Playford were all present at the conference. Managers do not disclose what takes place at a conference; I have never heard of disclosures being made before in this Chamber, and I do not see why we should. I do not see why the member for Mitcham has any right to assume anything one way or the other. He is trying to come in on the tail end of an issue. If he thinks he will embarrass me on this issue he will fail, because the proof is there that all along the line I have fought for the people in my electorate and I will continue to fight for them, as he jolly well knows. I am disappointed at the decision reached, but there it is. The decision has been made, but all is not lost, from what I understand of the situation. However, there is some considerable time to go before the store is cut out. The member for Mitcham is totally incorrect in what he assumes.

Mr. Millhouse: I bet I'm not.

Mr. BECKER: I bet you are.

Mrs. ADAMSON: As one of the managers at the conference, I express my appreciation to the Minister for his chairmanship and his friendly reminder to me of my responsibilities as a representative of the House of Assembly at that conference.

Mr. Millhouse: You're just saying the very thing that I was saying about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. ADAMSON: If the honourable member will allow me to finish; I am now back in this Chamber and a member of the Opposition. As such, I feel free to repeat what I have already said, that I believe that the Bill is a farrago of bureaucratic nonsense. I also believe that it is time members of this Parliament, particularly those on the Government benches, got out of Trades Hall and in behind the counters of shops to get the consumers' point of view and to learn what it is like to have one product denied and another substituted in rock-like frozen form, because that is what will happen to the housewives of South Australia.

As a manager at that conference, and someone new to the experience, it was a demonstration of the benefits of compromise. I know that the member for Mitcham is not aware of that; the fact that he is sitting on the cross benches is evidence of that. The fact of the matter is that the Government has the numbers in this House and the Opposition does not. We were able, at least, to salvage something that will enable consumers to get some benefits, if not all the benefits, that members on this side would have liked.

Motion carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MINING LICENCES

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certain reports have appeared in the press and on radio and television as a consequence of remarks made by the member for Mitcham yesterday in relation to exploration licences held by a company called Uranerz.

Mr. Millhouse: You should have answered the questions yesterday.

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It does not relate to the question, because the company concerned holds only an exploration licence and not a licence to mine. It does not hold a claim or a mineral lease.

Mr. Millhouse: It must have expectations, though.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. I hope he will cease interjecting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The facts, even if the member for Mitcham is not really interested in them, are as follows. Uranerz currently holds two exploration licences, one covering the Gawler-Kersbrook area and the other in the Mount Effie area, 10 km south-east of Willunga. The licences were granted after detailed investigations by officers of the Mines and Environment Departments, and as a result of those investigations strict additional conditions were attached to the licences. These are the special conditions which apply beyond the normal conditions that apply to an exploration licence. First, the licensee shall not construct new tracks, upgrade existing tracks, or use declared equipment without the prior approval of the Director of Mines. Secondly, the licensee shall take due care to preserve all Aboriginal and historic

relics sites and shall notify the Adelaide Museum of any localities discovered in the course of exploration. Thirdly, the licensee shall notify the Director of Mines, at the planning stage of any airborne survey, of details of the type of survey, of the area to be surveyed and of flight line spacing and flight height. Fourthly, all exploration boreholes shall be completely backfilled to the surface. If pressure water is encountered during drilling the complete depth of hole must be cemented off to ensure no upward leakage. If any hole is to be left open, it must be completed to departmental specifications. Fifthly, the licensee shall furnish a complete technical report in respect of any land comprised in the licence which may be surrendered. This report shall be separate from any other report required under the licence.

These special conditions are in addition to the normal conditions that apply when an exploration licence is issued. Those normal conditions, for example, cover such matters as rights of compensation to people whose property may have been damaged as a consequence of exploration. The licence relating to the Gawler-Kersbrook area includes portions of the Kersbrook and Crawford forest reserves and also part of the South Para reserve in the metropolitan watershed zones. With respect to the forest areas, the applicant obtained prior to the issue of a licence a Cesser of Exemption from the Woods and Forests Department permitting exploration with in forest areas.

The applicant has also agreed to conditions imposed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department with respect to the watershed areas. Part of these conditions require that no exploration is permitted in the reservoir reserve itself. In the watershed areas generally exploration is permitted. The exploration proposal in each case in relation to the two licences was gazetted on July 14, 1977. That gazettal allows a period for public objections. No objections were received within 28 days of gazettal of the proposal to issue these two licences. The same procedure occurred with respect to both licences; both were gazetted on July 14, and no objections were received in relation to either one.

Non-compliance by the company concerned with any of the special conditions or any of the other normal conditions applying to a licence, including compensation provisions for any damage, would be sufficient grounds for cancellation of the licence. Where an explorer requires entry into any property, under the Mining Act he serves a notice of entry on the landholder. If the landholder has objections to that entry, he has 21 days to object, and any objections are then considered by the Warden's Court.

It is worth noting that some minimal exploration in the 1950's showed up minor occurrences of uranium in portions of the Hills area. I might add in that connection that a resident at Myponga received a reward from the Federal Government in the 1950's for the discovery of uranium at Myponga. It is considered by my officers that it is not very likely that significant uranium will be found. However, it is important that we know what the resource is, particularly in the circumstances that there may be leaching of uranium into the watershed areas and into Adelaide's water supply.

Honourable members will be aware that regular checks are maintained on radioactivity levels in the various reservoirs, and in the past significant increases in those levels of radioactivity have been found, following rains subsequent to a nuclear test in the atmosphere, particularly the French nuclear tests. There is, however, a normal level of background radioactivity, and there is little doubt that, because of the incidence of some radioactive substances in the watershed areas, there is some potential leaching of those substances into the water supply. No doubt that has been going on for a long time. The Government's position on uranium mining has been made quite clear in absolutely unequivocal terms.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't encourage people to explore for it and then say you are against mining it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know the member for Mitcham wants to make political capital on behalf of his rump Party, the Australian Democrats, on this question, and that is the only reason why he has been raising the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the Minister will get back to the Ministerial statement.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All right, but he keeps on interjecting without listening.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He never listens. I make it quite clear that the Government's position is, first, that we need to know what resources we have and, secondly, that in the current circumstances in relation to the decision made with respect to uranium mining there is no reason to stop exploration for uranium and other metals. At any rate, if exploration takes place for other minerals, in some cases uranium will be found. The exploration that occurred at Roxby Downs was not for uranium but for copper, and the discovery of uranium occurred as a consequence of the discovery of copper. Whether anyone likes it or not, there is no sure-fire method, even if one wanted to, to stop exploration for uranium (the honourable member for Mitcham should be aware of that), simply because the exploration for other minerals, which presumably no-one wants to stop, inevitably will uncover some uranium. However, I think every exploration company in South Australia has had made abundantly clear to it the Government's position, and indeed this Parliament's position, on the mining of uranium. At this stage, the Government's position, which I repeat, is that the mining of uranium will not be approved until such time as it has been demonstrated that it is safe to mine and export uranium to a customer country.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you will have to have that advertisement—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member wants to ask another question, presumably he is capable of doing that.

QUESTIONS

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

PENSIONER HOUSING

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The trust endeavours to provide the form of accommodation most appropriate to the needs of the persons who apply for housing. The majority of applications for trust cottage flat accommodation are from single, aged women. However, the trust has included a few two-person units in most cottage flat developments. Flexible housing designs are presently being developed to allow single or couple occupancies of the units in a flat development. The current demand for accommodation by aged persons is beyond the trust's financial capacity and the introduction of designs with additional bedrooms would reduce the number of units

that it could build. This would further delay the provision of accommodation for applicants who have already waited more than five years for such accommodation.

STAMP DUTY

In reply to **Mr. EVANS** (November 17).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In response to the question concerning the difficulty facing people in qualifying for the Government's stamp duty concession, where they have purchased a new home and settlement will not take place until after December 23, 1977, the Government has decided to make the following arrangements. The Commissioner of Stamps will accept applications for the concession provided the transfer, contract and other relevant information is lodged with him on or before December 23, 1977, and settlement takes place on or before March 31, 1978. The Commissioner will inform agents of the procedures to be adopted in this regard.

BULK BUYING

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

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The creation of the Services and Supply Department has had no discernible effect on the principle of the bulk buying of goods, nor was such intended. There are, of course, many initiatives being taken consequent upon the amalgamation of the four organisations, namely, Chemistry, State Supply and Government Printing Departments and the A.D.P. Centre, to form the Services and Supply Department; but the specific task of the bulk buying of goods and materials for the Public Service is still carried out by the Supply and Tender Board and its executive arm, the State Supply Division, pursuant to the Public Supply and Tender Act. The annual report of the board is tabled in Parliament, and continues to illustrate the benefits which accrue to the Government as a result of bulk buying.

URANIUM

Mr. TONKIN: If not for the purpose of examining the feasibility of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, can the Premier say why representatives of the United Kingdom uranium enrichment company, Urenco, visited Whyalla and Woomera and had detailed discussions with senior Government officials during their visit to this State last month? During their visit in October, arrangements for which were made by the South Australian Government, I understand Urenco representatives met with the Premier; had detailed discussions with senior Government officials; visited Whyalla and Woomera, flying over Redcliff and Roxby Downs; and examined industrial conditions in South Australia.

The original proposals for a uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff, which were supported by the Government before the Labor Party's switch-around in policy, were based on the centrifuge process, involving the use of special steel and industrial skills, and the visit arranged last month indicates that these proposals are still being actively pursued by the Premier and the Government, in spite of their publicly stated support for the Labor Party's total ban on uranium.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the honourable member has forgotten what has already been said in this House on this topic. I have said repeatedly that the Government intends to keep up with the present technology in relation to uranium treatment.

Mr. Tonkin: That sounds a bit thin.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is that we have to know what the uranium technology is, and we intend to keep studies on uranium technology up to date. The Urenco people, who have been involved in the original investigation in this area and who were involved in Europe in the gas centrifuge system, came to Australia to discuss with the Federal Government (and indeed with several State Governments) the activities that might be undertaken in the future in relation to uranium in this country. They sought to see me so that I could explain to them specifically what the Government's policy was on this matter. I made clear what the resolution of this House was: that it was the Government's policy that, until such time as either safe technologies were developed and in use and, in addition, that there were international agreements that would enforce the use of such technologies to the satisfaction of this House, there would be no mining or treatment of uranium in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did they go to Whyalla, then?

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are aware that studies in relation to uranium enrichment undertakings in South Australia have continued so that we can keep up, as I have said, with existing technologies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know specifically why they were in Whyalla, but I can imagine, for instance, why they went to Woomera.

Mr. Millhouse: They must have been encouraged by someone.

The SPEAKER: Order! I intend to warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They'll go for—

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position that the Government has taken on this matter is quite clear. We intend to establish what out resources are; we intend to keep up with current technologies. Until such time, if ever, that technologies for the safe disposal of atomic waste and adequate international arrangements are made, we will not support or allow the mining or treatment of uranium in South Australia.

Mr. Tonkin: But you'll be ready to go when you change your mind?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If safe technologies are developed, the vitrification process is shown to be safe (it is not in use yet anywhere, so no-one can say that it is) and international arrangements are made that can guarantee the safe disposal of atomic waste by customer countries, proper monitoring, and so on, in those circumstances the situation may well change and, if it does, South Australia will be in a position to take advantage of that fact. We are certainly not changed in any way from the position that was put before this House when the motion was moved earlier this year. We are quite unlike the Opposition, which seems to have done a series of somersaults continually on this matter.

SHOPLIFTING

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Attorney-General advise the House of the rights customers and shopkeepers hold in cases where suspected shoplifting is involved? The self-

service concept of modern-day retailing aims at many things, among which are a more convenient service to the public, impulse buying and reduction in staff. All those aims, however, result in temptation to those people who would not normally shoplift and encouragement to those who would. Shoplifting is reaching major proportions and shopkeepers are rightfully concerned about it. So that the rights of all people are protected, clear guidelines need to be enunciated.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member probably knows that there has been a long-standing tradition in this House that Attorneys (and, for that matter, any other lawyers in the House) do not give legal opinions here on matters such as this. I am sure a former Attorney-General, the member for Mitcham, would be familiar with that tradition. I made my position perfectly clear on this point when I first became Attorney-General. However, as this is a matter of considerable public concern, I think it is desirable that some statement should be made setting out guidelines (to use the honourable member's word) as to just what is the position to ensure that breaches of the law do not occur inadvertently in these situations. I will obtain a report for the honourable member, and I will ensure that some general guidelines are included in that report so that people generally in the community and those more particularly involved in the retail sector will be able to have some appreciation of just what is their position in relation to this matter.

MINING ACT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy consider amending the Mining Act to give greater protection to landowners who object to prospectors coming on to their properties for mineral exploration purposes? The Minister today in a Ministerial statement referred to the appeal to the Warden's Court that is open to landholders. From that explanation it transpires that in relation to the exploration by one company the Engineering and Water Supply Department was not allowing this company to come into reservoir reserves. Indeed other stipulations in those conditions apply particularly to Government departments.

I am receiving complaints from landholders who object to the fact that people can come on to their properties, and then the burden is on the landholders to go to the Warden's Court and prove hardship. I will summarise briefly one letter I have received. The landholder involved has had three instances of entry on to his property this year. In the first instance he was served with notices by two South Australian parties that said that they intended to come on to his property. When he took the matter to the Warden's Court, those people subsequently withdrew. More recently he has been served with a notice and he has now to go through the whole business again. He says, among other things:

> I honestly and genuinely believe that the procedure for gaining a right of entry to properties privately owned should be substantially altered so that we should at least be consulted before such rights are handed out willy-nilly. The owner in my opinion should be given the right to object to the department prior to these rights being given and, if such objections can be seen on inspection of the property concerned to be valid and just, then entry by all and sundry should be denied.

He goes on to complain that landowners have to seek permission to sink bores or push out dams and that they cannot alter land use—he refers generally to restrictions on landholders.

From the Minister's explanation, it appears that Government departments have looked after their own interests in the special conditions written into the current permit. To expect landholders to study the *Government Gazette* in the first instance is, I think, a little unrealistic. I am receiving complaints from constituents who are concerned in general at the way in which the Mining Act is operating in their locality.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member should explain that the provisions of the Mining Act, for which he voted, arise basically from the fundamental fact that, while the ownership of surface land may reside in a particular landholder, ownership of the minerals, if any, below the land does not reside in the landholder, unless he has a private mine, but resides in the Crown—in other words, in the community as a whole. That situation gives rise to the procedures that exist under the Mining Act at present. The Crown, as the owner of the minerals, is not prepared to say to the landholder, "Well, you shall not enjoy the ownership of that land, because you may interfere with our rights, as a community, to exploit those minerals that may lie beneath the land." There must, however, be a *quid pro quo,* which, in the initial stages, relates to the right of the Crown to give exploration rights to people to explore for minerals that are owned by the Crown in cases where the surface of the land, if you like, is owned by a private landholder.

If the honourable member cares to think about this matter, he will appreciate that there is no way in which the law can move in order to resolve the rights of the two owners—the rights of the Crown to the ownership of the minerals and the rights of the landholder to the surface land—without there being some occasional conflict. That is inevitably part of the nature of the beast. The licences issued do not, as the honourable member has tried to suggest, just protect the rights of Government departments: they contain specific conditions that relate to the rights of individuals as well as to the rights of landholders. If there was ever any complaint about the way in which an exploration company had behaved, and the complaint was taken up with the department, I assure the honourable member (and I hope that he will assure his constituents of this) that it would be taken up most vigorously with the exploration company or the licence holder.

I know of no instance in my experience as Minister of Mines and Energy where, when such disputes have arisen, we have not been able to secure a satisfactory resolution of them. However, as the Crown, or the community at large, owns the minerals, I , as Minister, must defend the right of the community at large to determine what those minerals are that lie beneath the surface of the land, because the ownership of them does not reside in the landholder unless that landholder has a private mine.

BRAEVIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department intends to purchase additional land for the Braeview Primary School?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This school was in what was previously my district, so I am not unfamiliar with its situation. I believe it has a total area of about eight acres, whereas we would regard a 10-acre area as being more ideal for a primary school. Some of the land near the school is undeveloped, but I am by no means certain that it is still in the broad-acre stage; a form A approval for subdivision over some of the area could have been granted

and that, of course, has a rather drastic bearing on the cost of any acquisition.

My officers are considering the situation to ascertain whether it is possible to get a bit more land for the school, which is likely to experience considerable growth in the next few years. As the honourable member is aware, the school will be getting some new buildings early in the new year to cope with an influx of enrolments: this is the so-called stage 2 development of the school. Further growth will occur until the Reynella East Primary School and the new Happy Valley Primary School are built in about 1980. The department is keen to increase the area of the school. Although I cannot now give any guarantees that that will be possible, we are examining the situation.

WEBB REPORT

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say when it can be expected that legislation will be introduced to give effect to the recommendations that were made by the Webb committee, which inquired into the dairy industry? In addition, can he say whether, when the legislation is prepared, producer organisations and other relevant interested parties will be consulted on the drawing up of the legislation? The Webb report is a comprehensive document that deals with the basic prosperity of an important industry in South Australia. Some of the recommendations break new ground in the industry. Regarding what can be expected in the legislation, the report will have an effect on those high rainfall areas of the Adelaide Hills, the South-East and the Murray Swamps.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague and to obtain a report for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

LIGHTBURN LAND

Mr. GROOM: Can the Minister for Planning say what is the position regarding the possible purchase by the South Australian Housing Trust of about 22 acres of vacant land known as Lightburn Estate situated on Morphett Road, Novar Gardens, for residential purposes, and what are the problems associated with such purchase? The land to which I refer now abuts the Novar Gardens residential area. In 1965, the entire Novar Gardens residential area was zoned "general industry". Housing Trust development took place to the north of this land in 1965 and by a private developer, I think Mr. Stokes, on land to the west in 1966.

After the residential area had been developed, the council proceeded to zone the area "residential". In 1974, the land was owned by Pilkington A.C.I. Proprietary Limited. A developer applied to the West Torrens council to divide the 22 acres into industrial allotments. An active residents' committee was formed to fight this proposal and petitions were circulated requesting that it be re-zoned "residential 1". The outcome was that encumbrances were then place on the title to provide some protection for residents.

Pilkingtons then sold the land in 1976 to Lightburns, and Lightburns have now placed the land on the market for sale for industrial purposes. If industry is allowed to develop on the estate, property values will fall. Therefore, the issue is of great interest to residents in the area.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We are interested in the possibility of obtaining this land for housing development. However, certain difficulties lie in the way of a satisfactory resolution of the matter. First, the price that would apply to this land would not be such as to permit the land to be purchased and developed as a single unit housing project with allotments of the normal size. The price of each allotment would be quite excessive in those circumstances. There is a possibility that the land can be developed for medium density housing projects. This would require the agreement of the residents in the area, and the support of the West Torrens council for the appropriate rezoning of the area. These matters are being investigated at present.

HORWOOD BAGSHAW LIMITED

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Works say what is or are the name or names of the professional consultant or consultants who has or have worked in conjunction with the State Government and a representative of Horwood Bagshaw Limited during the past few weeks to advise on the adoption of a scheme for employees and possibly other parties to purchase up to half of the shares in Horwood Bagshaw Limited or a subsidiary company, and why has the Minister of Works denied that such investigations have been carried out in recent weeks?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should think that over the past few weeks the member for Davenport might have had enough of this subject. He has not yet had the decency to recognise that he has been spreading false and malicious information about this matter throughout the community and in this House. He has not yet had the decency to face up to the fact that he is wrong and apologise to the House and indeed to the company which has criticised the honourable member so trenchantly.

Unfortunately the honourable member was not in the House when I read my statement the other day, although he has no doubt looked at it. I said then that it is unusual for a company to criticise a Liberal member of Parliament, but the criticism made of the member for Davenport was of a type that I have never heard before in this House, and he ought to be ashamed of himself, but he is not. What the honourable member has now raised is probably just another fairy tale, just another figment of the honourable member's vicious and poisonous imagination but we will check it. If there is any semblance of fact in it, we will have a look at it.

Mr. Dean Brown: You'll apologise?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Dean Brown: You'll apologise, will you?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport.

HAHNDORF BUILDINGS

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Semaphore.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. I cannot hear the member for Semaphore.

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister for Planning say what action the Government can take to protect the historic buildings at Hahndorf? Recently, publicity has been given to the restoration of several buildings at Hahndorf. This particularly applies to structures incorporating early German architecture, which is of significant historic value in this State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am grateful for the

interest shown by the member for Semaphore. I am glad at least one member of this House is concerned enough about the problems at Hahndorf to ask a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable Minister will answer the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am. I am grateful for the question and therefore I am about to answer it. Under current law, limited powers can be applied either by local government or by the State Planning Office or Authority with regard to any proposals that involve the destruction of historic buildings and their replacement by others.

I think it is necessary to point out that it will be vital for this House to consider amendments to legislation or even new legislation that no doubt will be introduced by the Minister for the Environment. However, I point out two basic facts: the first is that the preservation of historic buildings is not a factor, as I understand it, that would allow the local council of the area or the State Planning Authority to take action to prevent demolition of any buildings in Hahndorf. We have endeavoured to get discussions to take place between the developer, the department, and the local council to see whether or not some sort of compromise could be reached.

Mr. Wotton: You know that that's not—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I said we had endeavoured to see—

Mr. Wotton: What has happened?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Allow me to say that it has happened. If the honourable member is so sensitive about not asking the question, he should at least allow me to give an answer. The position is that discussions have taken place, but the developer also has rights in the matter, and it is not possible legally, I understand, for either the council or my department to review the development.

Mr. Wotton: Why weren't you able to be there at that meeting?

Dr. Eastick: That's too hard.

Mr. Wotton: Come on, answer.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When was the meeting?

Mr. Wotton: You know.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know that the meeting took place, but I cannot give the precise date.

Mr. Wotton: You were informed that you were supposed to be there, but you just didn't turn up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Opposition members have often complained that they are unable to ask enough questions during Question Time, but once again they are interjecting and the questions are becoming longer. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At no stage, to my knowledge, have I been requested to go to a meeting. Certainly, I would be willing to attend such a meeting, but at no stage has it appeared in my diary or has a request been made to me, either verbally or in writing, to attend. The member for Murray can make what he likes of that answer, because I am telling the truth on that matter.

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am getting back to the question. Regarding the position of Hahndorf, I believe that we need legislation which enables certain historic buildings, not just in Hahndorf but in other parts of the State (Port Adelaide is one area, Burra is another, and there are other places in the Hills area particularly, and also the Barossa Valley), to be declared as not subject to demolition and where it is also possible, because of that declaration, to obtain a lower valuation of the building and lower rates and taxes. If the owner of a building cannot alter its use and cannot pull it down and replace it with another building, the value of the property has been reduced as a consequence, and that lower value has to be reflected in lower rates and taxes. I think it is necessary to have such powers.

I would also say, however, that there is a tendency within our community to say that every old building is worth preservation, of necessity, and that that is not necessarily the case at all. We need a system of declaration of old buildings that is acceptable broadly to the community as a whole. We cannot, I believe, live with a situation where indiscriminately, whenever a proposition to change some old building or to pull it down comes along, some support is given to the retention of that old building. We need an organised system that identifies clearly those buildings that are worthy of retention, and we need legislation, in an area such as Hahndorf, that ensures that new developments taking place within the area are fully consistent with what is already there and with what is being preserved.

These are two basic features which we need to have in our law but which we do not have at present. I hope partly as a result of the proposals with respect to Hahndorf, that the pressure for such legislation and the support for it will build up considerably in the community.

POPULATION FIGURES

Mrs. ADAMSON: Because of the Minister for Planning's statement on Wednesday, November 16, about the Government's record on urban renewal, can the Minister explain the declining population in the inner metropolitan area? I quote statistics from the 1971 and 1976 census showing the population decline as follows: Adelaide, 15·6 per cent; Thebarton, 12·8 per cent; Kensington and Norwood, 12·9 per cent; St. Peters, 12·8 per cent; Prospect, 6·5 per cent; and Hindmarsh, 15·7 per cent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pleased that the research assistant who wrote the speech that the Leader of the Opposition delivered in the Address in Reply debate has also seen fit to prepare the question asked of me by the member for Coles. May I say that the decline in population of Adelaide proper and the inner surburban areas of Adelaide has been a phenomenon of our metropolitan development for more than 30 years. It has been partly a consequence of the industrial and commercial development of the central areas which have forced out residential usage and which have converted previous residential buildings to other uses, either through a straight renovation of the interior of old houses, or, alternatively, through their demolition. There has been much of that activity and anyone who has been observing Adelaide and the inner suburbs would know the extent of it.

I think one of the best examples can be seen along East Terrace, Adelaide, where most of the old buildings have been retained but have been converted to non-residential use. Greenhill Road especially has been commercialised by the gradual pulling down of old houses that were originally located there. Once some commercial development occurs in a residential area, values of the properties increase and rates and taxes rise dramatically. Pressure is put on the previous owners of the residences to change the use, or to move out. Anyone who still owns a residence on Greenhill Road, for example, would be paying very high rates and taxes and would be under great pressure to sell to a commercial interest.

The first point is that, if we wish to preserve residential

areas, we must have effective laws that enable us to declare areas as residential and to ensure that, if an area is declared residential, the appropriate rates and taxes will apply. No effective zoning powers resided in the Government or in councils in South Australia until the 1967 Planning and Development Act was passed, when the now Premier, then the Attorney-General, was responsible for that Act. The first zoning regulations that followed that Act came into force some years afterwards. A large part of the honourable member's baby (or that of the research assistant) in this respect went out with the bath water years ago. The second point to be made is that progressively since the Second World War younger families have moved to the fringes of Adelaide. Any younger family who wants its own house—

Mr. Gunn: And your obsession with Monarto has exploited that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member for Eyre—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want the Minister to answer that interjection.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will not reply to the interjection, Mr. Speaker. It was a foolish one, anyway. The methods that have applied for financing cheaper houses that are bought by low income people, particularly those with young families, invariably have a tremendous bias in favour of the purchase of new houses. New houses are available only on the fringes, and this has been the situation in Adelaide ever since the Second World War. The young people with young families can get finance only for purchasing a new house, because those are the cheapest houses which are available and for which they can get finance. Those houses are on the fringes, so, progressively, the young families have been forced to go to the fringes. This has meant that the average size of the family unit in the inner suburbs has decreased. This has happened over the 30 years since the Second World War and in most of those years there has been a Liberal Government in office. While there has been a reduction in the number of residences in Adelaide and in the inner suburbs, there has also been a reduction in the average number of members in each family. It is those two factors (the switch to commercial and industrial uses and the reduction in the number of members in each family in the inner suburbs) that have been responsible for the figures which the research assistant to the Leader originally prepared for the Leader's speech in the Address in Reply and was now prepared for the honourable member.

WHYALLA FURTHER EDUCATION COLLEGE

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Education inform me (and if he cannot do so at this stage will he obtain this information) whether the extensions to the further education college in the process of being built in Whyalla will be completed in time for occupation at the beginning of the school term in 1978, and also whether the school's proposed intake of students in 1978 will be affected in any way by the current lack of employment opportunities in Whyalla?

I think the Minister would be aware that the Federal Government under Malcolm Fraser refused to come to the party in the financing of this project and that the State Government is finding the $6 000 000 required. With the present unemployment figures in Whyalla increasing almost daily because of the policy of the Fraser regime, I am concerned, particularly in respect of the probable student intake level in 1978, that the probable intake of apprentices in Whyalla will decline, and that the much talked about retraining scheme of the Federal Government for redundant skilled workers is just not working.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: My understanding is that this facility will be ready at the beginning of next year, but I had better obtain an up-to-date report from the officers of the Further Education Department which I will make available to the honourable member. Much discussion has occurred between the department and employers in the Whyalla area about the probable enrolment picture in Whyalla next year. We still do not have a final picture, but some sort of picture is emerging, and I will also get that information.

McNALLY ESCAPEES

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether it is a fact that two of the three inmates who were involved in a recent break-out from the g.g.i. Grenfell unit at McNally Training Centre on Sunday night were due to appear in the High Court on charges of attempted rape? It appears that the escapees had records of violence, rape and attempted rape, yet they were housed as 17-year-olds in the Grenfell unit. I ask the Minister whether this was correct.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member has asked whether persons were to appear in the High Court. The answer is "No".

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Local Government consider encouraging local government bodies to make more use of Part 21, sections 424 and 435, of the Local Government Act, to enable local citizens and organisations to invest in their own local government area through the purchase of bonds? A number of my constituents who have come from the United Kingdom and Europe have queried why it is not common practice in South Australia for local government bodies to issue bonds as a means of borrowing money to carry out special works or undertakings.

Mr. Mathwin: You'll get the full story now.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I thought you wanted—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEMMINGS: This practice is used extensively in the United Kingdom. The interest terms could be made extremely attractive, without exceeding the rate fixed by the Australian Loan Council at the time of issue of such debentures.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have my officers examine the points the honourable member has raised. While the cross-fire was going on, I am afraid that I missed a deal of the question, but I am sure that *Hansard* will have reported it accurately.

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you sit down?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry that the member for Glenelg is so upset today.

"ANLABY"

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether, as a matter of policy, the Government has considered acquiring the property known as "Anlaby", in the Kapunda area? It has been publicly announced that "Anlaby" is to be placed on the market. The property, to all intents and purposes, would not sell readily for

residential purposes, because of its size. It is strategically placed as regards agricultural facilities such as Roseworthy Agricultural College, the wine industry, and other areas, and it could well be a very real acquisition for accommodation for persons involved in agriculture at the level which originally was the charge of Roseworthy College. I am thinking of something of the Glenormiston type of undertaking that is available to agricultural students, more particularly to those who want to go back to the farming community in Victoria, and other examples exist elsewhere in Australia. Being at Kapunda, "Anlaby" would be able to make use of some of the expertise available from the Roseworthy College. Being in the centre of most forms of agricultural undertaking, it would suggest itself as a distinct proposition, by the very nature of the property. "Anlaby" is involved with this State's Parliamentary scene, because it was the home of a former Premier, and the property may suggest itself to the Government as being a worthwhile project.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the honourable member for that suggestion and for his question. The question of the future of "Anlaby" has exercised the Government's mind since we knew that it was to be sold. It is, as the honourable member has said, a most historic property in South Australia. As it is a significant part of our history and is a remarkable old building, I have asked my officers to examine the building to see whether there is some use the Government would have for it and whether it is appropriate for us to take some action that would seek to preserve it for some specific purpose. The Government has not reached any conclusion on that score at present, but I know that Mr. Bachmann will be seeing Mr. Dutton about the sale of "Anlaby" soon and will inspect the property.

CAPITAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME

Mr. SLATER: Will the Chief Secretary obtain information from the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport on the number of projects approved and the total sum involved under the capital assistance programme administered by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport for 1977-78, and on the extent to which the projects approved exceeded the number of applications received?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member from my colleague.

RED CROSS SOCIETY

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier consider the situation of the Red Cross Society in Adelaide having to pay council rates for its headquarters? I believe that a legal opinion has just been given to the Adelaide City Council that it cannot exempt the society from paying rates on its city property. The amount of rates involved is about $7 000 a year. The council would be in an embarrassing situation if it made a donation back to the society because other groups that could be in similar circumstances could ask for donations. It is only recently that this problem has come to light. To my knowledge, it has not been resolved, and that means that either the Treasury must come to light with funds to help out or an amendment to the Local Government Act must be introduced so that organisations such as the Red Cross Society are not rated. I therefore ask the Premier whether he could have the matter investigated and thus resolved so that Red Cross is not debited each year to the extent I have mentioned.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's suggestion that the Treasury should find these funds does not enthuse me. As the honourable member has pointed out, Red Cross is not the only organisation that would demand such treatment. We are not in a position to extend remissions to charities further than the very considerable remissions and assistance we have already given. I would have thought that the council could make an *ex gratia* payment that would not have got it into grave trouble with other organisations. However, I will take up the matter with the Minister of Local Government.

BUILDING INSPECTORS

Mr. ALLISON: Does the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs intend to appoint inspectors of the Builders Licensing Board to Public and Consumer Affairs Department branches in country areas? I recall that many months ago, when the Mount Gambier branch was being opened, the Minister implied that such appointments would be made in due course. I am quite sure that ample scope exists at least in Mount Gambier for such inspectors to engage in this work for the board and also to act as advisers for the Public and Consumer Affairs Department.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not know that I have ever said that we would be appointing inspectors of the Builders Licensing Board to regional offices. What I said at that time and what is proceeding within the department is that there is a policy of ensuring that, as the various branches of the department are gradually merged, and particularly as the inspectorate aspects of the department's activities are brought more and more together, we could have inspectors in rural areas taking on a multiplicity of tasks, including the inspection of building work.

A person who is capable of taking on that sort of activity could undertake various other types of inspection within the ambit of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department's operations. The intention generally is that we should ensure to the greatest possible degree that there is no overlapping in the activities of inspectors. Another example that comes readily to mind is that we are phasing out visits by Standards Branch inspectors to licensed premises. Previously they checked drink spirit measures and the like, but this type of inspection will be handed over to the licensing inspectors who visit licensed premises periodically.

This type of rationalisation is proceeding within the department. I do not expect that it will reach an advanced stage for several years, because we intend to have specialised training courses for inspectors and, after that initial training, to conduct in-service training to ensure that each inspector within the department gains a full appreciation of the work done by other specialist inspectors in the department so that it will be possible for departmental inspectors on visiting premises to undertake a range of inspections within their expertise.

I hope that by this means the department will be able to operate much more efficiently and provide a better service to the public of South Australia. Also, by this means we hope that we can at regional branches provide inspections similar to those that now occur in the metropolitan area of buildings and the like for people who make complaints. I presume that the honourable member's concern relates to Mount Gambier. I understand that soon additional officers will be appointed to the Mount Gambier branch to deal with the developing demands of people within the South-East for the services of the Public and Consumer

Affairs Department.

It is interesting that the honourable member should raise this matter today, following the attitude of some Opposition members last evening in opposing certain aspects of the Prices Act that would have ensured that the department—

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Quite so, Sir. Anyway, it would have ensured that the department could more effectively look after consumers in South Australia.

MINISTERIAL PRESS RELEASES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether it is Government policy for Ministers to make press releases before replying to members' questions in this House? A reply I received yesterday is to some degree reported in the *West-Side* newspaper, which came out this morning, as though the matter was initiated by the Minister. I understand that this is not the first time that this has happened to many members on this side. At times over the past 7½ years I have been subject to the same sort of treatment, but that practice ceased some time ago. When I was first elected to the House I was told of a gentlemen's agreement that if a member asked a question he was given the reply and that he could do with it as he saw fit. I am alarmed that that gentlemen's agreement, if it did exist, has now been broken.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of a gentlemen's agreement. If ever there was such an agreement I can only say that the Playford Government was extremely ungentlemanly.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you know of any gentlemen?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I am not aware that there is any restriction on a Minister making a press release at any time he sees appropriate.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The member for Hanson makes them often enough.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He never consults with us.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister for Mines and Energy is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From time to time I have noted members opposite making statements concerning the activities of the Government that impute the responsibility therefor to themselves. That is fairly common on Opposition benches. I really do not think the honourable member has anything about which to complain.

SCHOOL ZONING

Mr. WILSON: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is the policy of his department to allow parents the choice of two or more high schools to which to send their children? I understand that there is a possibility that parents in certain suburbs of my district who previously had a choice of high schools may have no choice in 1978.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall be happy to look at any specific situation that the honourable member likes to refer to me. The Government's policy on this subject, which was announced by the Premier in his policy speech before the last election, is that the current zoning system will be phased out over a three-year period. Next year we will attempt to increase the options available to parents, although that will only be a modest extension of the present situation. In the following year, we will use a system of cluster zoning (to pinch a term from a different area) whereby the parent and the student will have, hopefully, about half a dozen high schools from which to choose. In the following year zoning will be phased out completely.

At present while some areas are zoned tightly, in other areas we are able to provide a much greater range of options, because there may be a series of high schools with declining enrolments so that no pressure is placed on a school by erasing the previous zoning boundaries. There is to be some modest extension of that next year in line with the first stage of the three-year policy outlined by the Premier. That policy goes further in some areas than it does in others, depending on the availability of places at a school. What it really boils down to is the specific problem the honourable member has in mind and, if he refers the details to me, I will get a report for him.

DIESEL TRAINS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether tenders have closed for the supply of the new diesel trains promised by him during the election campaign and, if they have, how many tenders were received and when a decision will be made on the successful tenderer? On September 8, 1977, the Minister announced that a new fleet of air-conditioned trains would be built at a cost of more than $10 000 000. He also said:

> The new railcar fleet was approved by State Cabinet this week and tenders will be called within the next few days.

The Minister went on to say that the trains would be in service within 15 to 18 months, and that they could be converted to electric power easily and economically.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: To the best of my knowledge, tenders have closed. They do not come to me immediately. As far as I know, the officers are presently examining them. I understand that there was a significant number of tenders and alternative tenders received. I hope the officers will be making a recommendation to me soon, but obviously they cannot do that until they have assessed the tenders and are able to make a recommendation.

Mr. Mathwin: Will they do it at Islington?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not even know whether Islington tendered. I hope it did, but I fear it may not have done so, under direction from the Federal Minister, who would not permit Islington to be used to build the 13 cars we wanted. Because of his attitude, we had to call these other tenders.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member indicate what the subject matter is?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir, my attendance in the House.

Mr. Chapman: That will be short because his attendances aren't too long.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What the member for Alexandra just said lends point to the explanation I now offer to the House. Yesterday, in finishing an answer to me about the failure of the Government to give replies to most of the questions on the Notice Paper, the Premier said:

> 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.

The innuendo in that passage obviously is that I have been away from the House and engaging in electioneering.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You only turn up to get your—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy must cease interjecting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the remainder of the sitting yesterday, the Liberals, as they often do when the Premier attacks me, took up the same theme, suggesting repeatedly that I am not in the House much. Indeed, this is something which the Liberals in particular have often said, quite inaccurately, about me. It was one of the stories peddled by them in my district during the 1975 election campaign.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member does not intend to comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir. In view of what the Premier has said, I have checked the records of the House relating to my attendance in this place—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That would take—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to have to warn the honourable Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and have found that I am recorded as being present every day of the present session and the earlier session this year. I hope that in view of this explanation the calumnies about me on this subject anyway from both sides of the House will cease.

At 3.18 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 632.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am disappointed that other matters were not dealt with before this Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: Get on with it.

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

Mr. EVANS: He had a bad night, Mr. Speaker. Of the business listed for the week this Bill in particular could have been disposed of, together with other matters, including the Address in Reply debate and some private members' business, in the time allotted. To come back to the Bill—

The SPEAKER: I hope so.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Who can you trust over there? The Whip gets let down.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is out of order.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You can't trust him. He looks basically honest, but he gets undercut.

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

Mr. EVANS: First, I appreciate that the Government has agreed. The agreement is also appreciated by many people who wish to give evidence, so we can perhaps have a Select Committee consider this Bill. I think that that is a proper action, and for that reason I will attempt to be brief about the points that the Opposition sees as needing consideration to make this Bill a better Act, if ever it becomes an Act. People who read the debate may be able to consider the points raised, and I include people in the Attorney-General's Department.

First, the Bill sets out in the main to protect the consumer (the tenant), but it also gives a limited protection in some areas to the landlord. The Attorney-General went to some trouble (more than he normally would) to point out that he was trying to help the landlord, in an attempt, I should say, to give more emphasis to that than perhaps the Bill really gives in application.

We in this State lack rental accommodation for many of the under-privileged in our society. I do not believe that there would be a member present who has not had many inquiries from people seeking Housing Trust accommodation, or accommodation at a low rental, because they are in a financial position that does not permit them to pay the normal rent prevailing in the private sector or the higher rents that may apply in the Housing Trust, which is the only other major letting agency in the State.

The Highways Department and one or two other Government departments own some houses that they let while deciding whether they will be developed or improved. Figures I have indicate that 10 000 applicants are waiting for Housing Trust houses. Who is responsible for supplying the accommodation at a sum the prospective tenant can afford? I believe that it is the State's responsibility, if the property is to be made available at a rent below an economic rent. If the rent is to be set at a sum at which the landlord cannot make a reasonable profit the State should accept the responsibility. That is the first point that needs to be made.

We should not expect a minority of people in society who happen to be landlords to carry the bill for subsidising rents; I do not think that anyone can argue against that. If we do expect them to carry the bill, there will not be landlords in the field who are willing or able to operate in the long term. Although other countries have tried to make them subsidise rents, they have found that the private sector has moved out, and the State has had to bear the entire burden. There is one exception, namely, Greece, where there is no public housing; rental housing is in the private sector, or individuals have undertaken to purchase their own house.

Another example of wanting to protect tenants to the extreme may be found in Edinburgh, where the authorities have tried an experiment with no eviction for non-payment of rent. The Edinburgh city council housing administration found that rental arrears more than doubled in six months, once it introduced the policy that a tenant could not be evicted for non-payment of rent. The policy in Edinburgh was a failure in that respect. In Italy, 32 per cent of the people who occupy public or semi-public housing, as some of it is defined, do not pay rent. This practice has become such a hot political issue there that the authorities are reluctant to enforce the payment of rent, because they would lose votes, either at local council level or at central government level.

I emphasise the point that I believe that it is the State's responsibility to cater for that area of need. With the voucher scheme, which has been suggested and which has been experimented with in Canberra, there is an opportunity for the State Government or Commonwealth Government to subsidise the individual, by means of a voucher given to him to help pay the rent for the house in which he chooses to live. The voucher is worked out on the basis of what the authority believes a tenant can afford to pay from his income, compared to the amount necessary

for the landlord to maintain the property and be able to show a reasonable return on his capital investment. In that field, the State has an opportunity to support the Federal Government's experimental voucher scheme, as other States are doing, and at least to give it a try to see whether it will remove some of the stigma placed on people who are forced to live in sometimes congested Housing Trust areas. However, there will still be a need for Housing Trust areas as we know them. Many of the people in those areas have made them beautiful, their homes attractive, and have maintained them at the standard at which the trust itself maintains them.

I believe that the trust, during the 40 years of its operation (after being established by a Liberal Government), has carried out its duties responsibly, considering the political pressures that have been placed on it as regards rent increases for those who could afford to pay more, the sums available to it over the years, and the burden it has had to carry in the form of the many almost penniless migrants who have been brought to the country. In many cases they have had to start from scratch, perhaps with a reasonable background in trade training, but with no material assets. The trust has acted responsibly in this area.

I hope that we as a Parliament, through a Select Committee's taking evidence, will bear in mind that a minority should not have to pick up the tab on behalf of the majority. If it is a State responsibility to subsidise rents for the disadvantaged, the State should pick up the tab for it. In New South Wales, moves have been made to introduce legislation along somewhat similar lines to the Bill, although the legislation varies considerably in many aspects. I will not go into that matter today, because it would be unnecessary, seeing that the Bill is to be referred to a Select Committee which can examine the New South Wales legislation. In Victoria, I believe that there will be a move to withdraw some of the legislation that has been introduced dealing with rents and rent price-fixing, because it has begun to disadvantage those who need rental accommodation by creating a shortage of accommodation. Landlords there are unwilling to invest their money in a venture from which they might not obtain a reasonable return, the kind of return available to others who invest in Commonwealth bonds, in building societies, or in some other area from which they would obtain a 10 per cent or 12 per cent return.

We need to be conscious of the fact that there must be a return to the landlord of at least somewhere near the level of what is the bank overdraft rate in the community. If a person has borrowed money in order to establish a tenantable property, he would not make a profit if he were allowed to make a profit only on the capital investment, as such, because he must face many other charges.

I will now go through the Bill and refer to the different clauses that concern me to some degree. Clause 5 sets out the definitions. The term "residential tenancy agreement" means any agreement, whether express or implied, under which any person for valuable consideration grants to any other person a right to occupy, whether exclusively or otherwise, any residential premises for the purpose of residence. I am not sure whether "whether exclusively or otherwise" is necessary, and I hope that that is one area to which the Attorney-General will direct his attention when replying to the second reading debate or will clarify for the Select Committee.

Clause 6 provides that the Act will apply to any residential tenancy agreement entered into, renewed, assigned or otherwise transferred after the commencement of the Act. Subclause (3) thereof provides:

> This Act does not apply to or in relation to—
>
> *(a)* any part of a hotel or motel;
>
> *(b)* any premises ordinarily used for holiday purposes.

Those members who represent major tourist centres near the metropolitan beaches such as Glenelg, Somerton, West Beach, Henley Beach, and Grange, might ask how we decide which properties are used for holiday purposes if a property is leased for short-term tenancies for eight months of the year and for holiday purposes during the four-month holiday period. Does the definition cover that situation? Does it exclude such properties from the operation of the Bill? This matter is indeed of concern to the members representing the districts to which I have referred.

Clause 9 provides that the Commissioner shall have certain functions for the purposes of this legislation, and it then sets out five functions, referred to in paragraphs *(a)* to *(e)*. In all cases, it relates to a tenant or tenants. Paragraph *(a)* provides as follows:

> The investigation of and conduct of research into aspects of and matters relating to or affecting the interests of tenants generally or any particular tenant or tenants;

If the Attorney-General was genuine in his approach when he referred in his second reading explanation to landlords, why did he not also protect landlords by including them in the clause? Why does it refer to tenants only? One would think that there might be times when the Commissioner should conduct investigations on behalf of landlords. However, there is no reference at all to them. Paragraph *(d)* provides:

> The investigation, upon the complaint of a tenant or otherwise . . .

Again, we are giving the Commissioner power to investigate without any specific complaint being made by a tenant or tenants. Why? Are we deliberately appointing an inquiry agent, such as the Commissioner, to seek out areas that he should investigate, or are we appointing the Commissioner to enable tenants to make complaints to him and have them investigated? I cannot see why we have included "or otherwise" in this provision. I hope that this matter can be dealt with later.

The same thing applies to clause 9 (2), which refers to what the Commissioner may do. On being satisfied that there is a cause of action and that it is in the public interest, the Commissioner can, without a complaint having been made, make investigations and take certain actions. I cannot see why the Commissioner should have that right. I hope that the Attorney-General can explain why that provision has been included. Subclause (4) provides:

> The Commissioner shall not institute, defend or assume the conduct of any proceedings pursuant to subsection (2) or (3) of this section without first—

At this point, the Commissioner, having decided to carry out an inquiry, must seek the written consent of the tenant, which, once given, shall be irrevocable, except with the Commissioner's consent. Surely, if a complainant makes a complaint in writing and then suddenly wishes to revoke the authority to investigate on his behalf, he should be able to do so. After, all, the Commissioner is acting on the advice and at the request of the complainant to investigate, yet the Bill provides that at no time can the complainant revoke that request. That is unreasonable and unacceptable, and I hope that that situation, too, can be improved. Clause 9 (5) *(b)* provides:

> The Commissioner may, without consulting or seeking the consent of the tenant, conduct the proceedings in such manner as the Commissioner thinks appropriate and proper.

The complainant should be consulted regarding the way in which the matter is to be handled, because he does not want to be placed in an embarrassing situation. I hope that

this matter is also covered.

Clause 10 relates to the immunity of the Commissioner and his delegates. They will not be liable for any action that they may take or any omissions they may make in good faith and in the exercise, or purported exercise, of the powers or functions of the Commissioner, or in the discharge, or purported discharge, of the Commissioner's duties under the Bill. Even if a private solicitor was acting, difficult though it might be to pin him for improper action or neglect in carrying out his duties, he would be liable. In any event, he would be answerable. Yet we are saying to the Commissioner and to those people to whom he delegates powers that they shall not be liable. I think that they should be liable, and, indeed, that they should act in such a way that they do not get into this situation. If they do get into such a situation, they should be answerable in the same way as anyone else would be.

Part III relates to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, which is given much power and which can be constituted by only one person. Clause 18 (1) provides:

> The tribunal shall in respect of any proceedings be constituted by one member of the tribunal.

So, one person will sit in judgment. Later, one sees that there is no right of appeal whatsoever. Subclause (2) of clause 20, which relates to the powers of the tribunal, provides:

> The tribunal may make an order under subsection (1) of this section notwithstanding that it provides a remedy that is not otherwise available at law or in equity.

We are really providing that a group of people acting individually (there may be eight or nine of them in the State; the Attorney has not said how many tribunals there will be) can bring about decisions that in any other area of the State would be considered unlawful. I hardly think that that is a satisfactory situation and, indeed, I cannot accept it.

Part III sets up the tribunal, whose members may not need to be qualified. It need not observe the rules of evidence and from it there is no right of appeal. It can make decisions which gravely affect individuals both financially and in the fundamental personal requirement to have a roof over one's head. That such a tribunal should be able to adjudicate between citizens is fundamentally opposed to the basic concept in the Westminster system of the rule of law. The principles of the rule of law are as Lord Hewart said in his book, *The New Despotism:*

> . . . a second nature. They are part of the bracing air we breathe.

On page 24 he says that the rule of law comprehends two principles. The second is as follows:

> Everyone, whatever his position, Minister of State or Government official, soldier or policeman is governed by the ordinary law of the land and personally liable for anything done by him contrary to that law, and is subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of justice, civil and criminal.

Mr. Millhouse: You realise that was written 50 years ago.

Mr. EVANS: That is right, but I think the principle applies today as much as it did then. The important aspect of the principle is that in determining rights between citizens the ordinary courts should be used, and not special tribunals with no provision for qualified members where the rules of evidence do not apply, where there is no appeal, and where even the prerogative writs, the last protection for the citizen who has not had justice, are expressly excluded.

A. V. Dicey in his classic exposition of the rule of law, *The Law of the Constitution,* contrasts the rule of law with the system of administrative law *Droit Administratiff* operating in continental countries, notably France. Lord Hewart points out that, while the English system of the rule of law is preferable to a separate administrative law, the *droit administratiff* is at least law: representations may be made, the rules of evidence are observed, reasons for judgment are given and there is a right of appeal.

Lord Hewart complains about what he calls "administrative lawlessness" which he says has crept into our law. He was actually complaining about decisions which are left to Ministers but which are in fact exercised by some subordinate official. However, the same criticism applies in regard to the residential tenancies tribunal. It is not one of the ordinary courts of the land. Its members need have no qualifications. It is not bound by the rules of evidence. There is no appeal or even any redress in the case of a complete miscarriage of justice. This Part of the Bill is an important evasion of the rule of law, one of the main protections of our civil liberties.

The setting up of tribunals cannot be accepted. The Attorney-General must accept a right of appeal at least to a local court. To say there is no right of appeal at all and that one person shall make the first and final decision is wrong. There should be an area of appeal for people who believe they have been treated unjustly. In his second reading explanation the Attorney-General referred to the report "Poverty and the Residential Landlord-Tenant Relationship" by A. J. Bradbrook, M.A., LL.M. While Mr. Bradbrook advocated that all the tribunal members should be legal practitioners, the Attorney-General has suggested that they should not be lawyers. A tribunal member could therefore be a person with no expertise in the field of landlord-tenant relationships, and he may know nothing about legal processes. As much as I have attacked at times some aspects of our legal system in the past and reflected on some lawyers, I believe this is one area where possibly lawyers should be considered to be the best people to act as members of the tribunal. I would fight for that point unless there is a better suggestion of how to choose people who are qualified and a guarantee that they have the necessary qualifications to carry out their duties.

Recently, the Attorney-General chose for appointment to the Builders Licensing Board a woman who worked at a television station. When she was asked why she was on that board she answered, "I would not have a clue; I do not know anything about builders' licensing or the building industry. I have been asked to go on the board and I will."

Dr. Eastick: That is reminiscent of the President and Secretary of the Labor Party at Virginia being appointed a member of the Water Resources Council.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, but I will not go into that. Here was a person admitting she did not have the necessary expertise to go on the Builders' Licensing Board. This is too critical a situation to leave it open-ended. We all know that Party political affiliations have affected the appointment of some people to decision-making positions. The matter is too serious for us to allow that to happen.

Clause 20 (2) ought to be deleted because it allows the tribunal to make its own laws, regardless of other laws. In relation to clause 22 (1) *(b)*, surely a person should only have to produce the books and documents that are likely to be relevant to a situation. To ask for any books or other documents is going a bit wide of the mark, and I would suggest it should be restricted in practice to books or documents that are likely to help the inquiry. I do not believe that these tribunals should have such wide powers, powers that are wider than some courts have at the present time.

Clause 22 (3) requires a person to answer questions, even if the questions are likely to incriminate him in some other area. I do not believe that is right. We know that in

any other court a person does not have to answer a question that is likely to incriminate him. He is protected to that degree. The fact that an answer may not be used in evidence is no protection at all when the prosecution knows exactly where to get the evidence for any other action which may need to be taken or which they may desire to take, as prosecutors.

I argue that, if a person believes that in answering a question he is likely to be incriminated, he should be entitled to refuse to answer. Clause 23 (2) provides that an agent is not allowed to act for fee or reward. This provision is unacceptable. A lawyer, a real estate agent, or sometimes a stock firm collects rents. People act for other individuals. The property owner may be in hospital or he may be aged and not able to look after the business or to appear before a tribunal. The owner could be overseas, perhaps on a study tour, or he could have been transferred in employment to another State. He cannot appear before the tribunal, and his agent cannot appear for fee or reward. The agent is not likely to appear without such fee or reward. If he is a real estate agent or a lawyer, he expects a fee. The clause should be amended so that people who appear for clients may charge a fee. It may be necessary to fix the fee by regulation. The Attorney-General has, within the Bill, the power of regulation.

I have mentioned clause 27, which provides that there shall be no right of appeal. I believe a right of appeal should be allowed. The provisions of clause 31 fall within the Liberal Party's philosophy; we believe bonds should be held either in a Government fund or in some accredited trust fund. We would not say necessarily that it had to be a Government fund, but we believe the interest should go to the tenant, not necessarily ending up in some Government department. If the Government set up an inspectorial service, as we stated in our policy, and if a pre-tenancy or post-tenancy inspection of the property was made, whether by the tenant or by the landlord or both, the interest on the bond could be put into a fund to help pay for that inspectorial service. The service could be requested voluntarily. It would not be compulsory for every property to be inspected, but the tenant or the landlord could ask for the inspection or it could be asked for by them jointly. If an inspectorial service is not set up, I do not believe that the money should be put into the Government's coffers, but should be passed back to the tenant.

The need for bonds is obvious. We have heard of people exploiting the situation. A few landlords have acted irresponsibly and have brought discredit on other landlords. It is unfortunate, but it happens in all walks of life, political and otherwise. We are aware of this area of concern.

Clause 34 lists all the matters that may be considered by the tribunal in setting the rent payable in respect of the premises and in deciding whether rents are excessive. Paragraph *(f)* provides that "any other relevant matter" may be considered. The capital value of the property has been omitted. Surely, in assessing the rent, the value of the property is significant. If the legislation is offering some protection to the landlord, as is stated in the second reading explanation, surely the capital value of the property should be included, and there is also some argument that we should include a provision for interest at the Commonwealth Bank overdraft rate.

Clause 44 provides that, where the property may have fallen into disrepair, causing a health hazard or some other dangerous situation, the tenant can have the work done without notice and without informing the landlord. That is unacceptable. The tenant could get someone to do the work and send the bill to the landlord. To me, the clause means that the tenant does not have to notify the landlord, but can get the work done by his own mate in the trade, for instance.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Where it is dangerous.

Mr. EVANS: There is a need to provide that the landlord should be given a reasonable time, say 24 hours, in which to have the work commenced. If that is not done, then the tenant may be in a position to take action to have the work carried out. The landlord owns the property, and should be given some right to decide what work will be carried out and what tradesmen will be used, and an effort should be made to get the best possible job at the lowest price for the parties involved—the tradesmen, the tenant, and the landlord.

There is some argument for the total deletion of clause 50. Putting the onus of proof on the landlord is making the situation as difficult as possible for him and as easy as possible for the tenant. The provisions of clause 53 may be difficult to carry out where a landlord may be overseas. The tenant is in the property, but it could be difficult to get documents signed in the 21 days suggested if the landlord is overseas and has not given a power of attorney to someone. Some people are reluctant to do that, and it is their right to take such an attitude. Some may say that it is not a good practice, but if no power of attorney is given an escape clause should be provided giving an opportunity to show proof that the landlord is overseas, so that the period of time could be extended.

Clause 55 is controversial. There is a need to protect people with families, and every effort should be made to avoid discriminating against people simply because they have children. However, we must consider the need for the landlord to ask the prospective tenant how many children are in the family, their ages, and how many are likely to live in the house. The Housing Trust does that, and if it is right and proper for the trust to do it then the private landlord should be able to seek the same answers. There could be stairs, with no lifts provided. It would be a protection for the family and the children to be informed of that situation. The Attorney-General has had complaints, as has the Minister of Community Welfare, of cases in which people have not considered the children involved.

Some parents moving into accommodation that might not be in the best condition in which to raise a family could thereby risk injury to their children. The landlord should not have to take all of the responsibility if he believes that the accommodation he is providing is unsuitable in that case. If we are not careful we could take out of the rental accommodation field accommodation that may be available through the private sector to a family, and the Housing Trust would then have to pick up the tab. Many bachelor flats are available where families could not be accommodated. The landlord should be able to ask prospective tenants whether they have children, so that his other tenants are not disadvantaged, because they have rights, too. If people are living happily in a community and do not want other people to disturb them, the landlord, the tribunal and the State should consider the lifestyle of those people also.

We need to consider this matter carefully but, at the same time, we must do all we can to protect the right of the family with young children to obtain shelter. If they cannot afford to buy a house or enter into an agreement, and the Housing Trust cannot provide them with a house (because we are four years behind in that waiting list), let us not force people in the private sector out of this field and thus create a greater shortage of accommodation. The risk of that happening exists. I hope that we as Parliamentarians will do all we can to protect the family, particularly a

family with young children.

Part V relates to the termination of residential tenancy agreements, the period varying by up to 120 days. I will not attack that provision, although 120 days is a long period. At this stage I do not believe it is necessarily too long if the landlord does not have another specific use for his property. In other words, if the tenant is paying his rent and is not damaging the property, if the landlord and his immediate family do not wish to move into the property, or if the landlord does not have to sell it for financial reasons, it is not unreasonable that he should give reasonable notice.

Perhaps 120 days is a little too long but, as long as the person concerned has the right to have his rent increased by the tribunal which, acting properly, will protect his financial interests, I see nothing wrong with that. Perhaps we will hear more about that in the Select Committee that will change my mind. I imagine that those views would come from landlords. Clause 70 (3), referring to the tribunal provides:

> *(a)* except in the prescribed circumstances, suspend the operation of orders made under that subsection for a period not exceeding ninety days, if it is satisfied that it is desirable to do so having regard to the relative hardship that would be caused—

What is meant by "except in the prescribed circumstances"? Obviously, that provision has been included to benefit the landlord, but it does not say so. The Minister could include a reference to landlords in the Bill because, to leave to regulation what is to be prescribed, is unsatisfactory. We do not know what the regulations will provide before they come before Parliament. If we had the numbers to object (which is unlikely) we could move to have them disallowed, but we would have to move for all the regulations in question to be disallowed. If the Bill defined more explicitly that situation, we could at least talk about it and try to convince the Minister otherwise, if we did not agree with him. Clause 83 provides:

> Any income derived from the investment of the fund under this Act may be applied—
> . . .
> *(c)* in such other manner as the Minister may approve.

That is very wide: the Minister could approve it for any other function within the State or within his department. It could have nothing to do with the landlord and tenant relationship. I hope that the Minister can tell us what he has in mind when he says "in such other manner as the Minister may approve".

I appreciate the Minister's indicating his agreement, contingently on the Bill being read a second time, to having it referred to a Select Committee. It is an ideal Bill for that purpose, because many people, including the Law Society, landlord and tenant organisations, and others would like to see this happen. I suppose it is fair to say that that suggestion was first made to me some time ago, when this legislation was mooted during the recent State election campaign, by a member of the Real Estate Institute (not an executive member) because of all the evidence that would be available to a Select Committee. I am pleased that we have reached that point. Although I support the second reading, I have many reservations about the Bill in its present form.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am indeed pleased that this Bill is to go to a Select Committee. I cannot for the life of me understand why the member for Fisher, well knowing that the Bill is to go to a Select Committee on which he will serve (as I am now told), and having given contingent notice that it should go to a Select Committee, has spoken for about an hour on the Bill for absolutely no reason. No-one has been listening to him, and it has been a complete and utter waste of time. I do not know why the Liberals do what they do. No doubt it was a Party plan that he should waste the time of the House in this way. I certainly lodge my protest about that.

It was obvious from the beginning that this was the sort of Bill that should go to a Select Committee. I did not know until last evening that it was to go to a Select Committee, and I had already given instructions to the Parliamentary Counsel to draft more than 30 amendments to the Bill, following closely the recommendations of the Law Society, which has spent much time considering the measure. However, that would not have been a satisfactory way to remedy the obvious defects in the legislation. The only proper way to deal with the Bill is through a Select Committee. I hope that several of the matters on which I intended to move amendments will be altered as a result of the recommendations of the Select Committee. Therefore, I look forward to seeing the report of that committee in due course.

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): Because I hope that this Bill will go to a Select Committee—

Mr. Millhouse: There is no doubt at all about its going to a Select Committee.

Mr. WILSON: I thank the member for Mitcham for that information. I support the second reading in the hope that the Bill will go to a Select Committee, as has been foreshadowed by the member for Fisher's contingent notice of motion. If the Bill should go to a Select Committee, ample opportunity will be available to debate the report of that committee and to deal in detail with the Bill. However, some general matters of principle in connection with this legislation require comment.

First, some landlords, by their actions, have penalised tenants. Similarly, some tenants have penalised landlords. However, it seems to me that this Bill is an over-kill. Because of the actions of a minority of landlords and tenants, we intend to make the majority suffer. At present a surplus of rental accommodation is available. In fact, I believe that there is a buyer's market. However, the danger in this legislation, if it is passed unchanged, is that it will provide so many constraints that it will lead to a reduction in the amount of rental accommodation available, with a consequent general increase in rents.

I do not intend to canvass any more than one provision in the Bill, and that refers to the proposed tribunal. It seems that the tribunal, as proposed, will comprise one member, sitting as the tribunal for a proclaimed district. The Bill does not lay down any qualifications for members of the tribunal, yet in many cases they will give judgment in situations as serious as those that come before our Local Court. Even Bradbrook, on whose report, I presume, much of this Bill is based, states that members of the tribunal should be legal practitioners. It is unthinkable that we should have for this tribunal any lesser qualifications than for those who preside over Local Courts.

In addition to this, the decisions of Local Courts are subject to appeal, but the tribunal formed under this Bill is subject to no such constraint. This is the second Bill that has been introduced during my short time here in which it has been sought to restrict the right of appeal. The Bill proposes to give exceptionally wide powers to the tribunal, and the member for Fisher has dealt with some of them at length. I refer to clauses 20 (2), 20 (5), 22 (1) *(b)* and 22 (3). However, I will not go through all those provisions in detail. I am most concerned about clause 28, which seeks to remove or limit the supervision by courts. It provides:

> No judgment or order in the nature of prohibition,

> certiorari or other prerogative writ or declaratory judgment or order shall be given or made in respect of any proceedings taken or to be taken by or before the tribunal or in respect of any order of the tribunal unless the court before which the judgment or order is sought is satisfied that the tribunal has or had no jurisdiction to take the proceedings or that natural justice has been denied to any party to the proceeding.

I believe that the system of prerogative writs is one of the bases of our society, and I believe that it is extremely dangerous to enter into any situation where the removal of prerogative writs becomes the norm. In conclusion, I will quote from Hood Phillips' *Constitutional and Administrative Law* the following short sentence:

> "By Magna Carta", said Bowen L. J., "the Crown is bound neither to deny justice to anybody nor to delay anybody in obtaining justice. If, therefore, there is no other means of obtaining justice, the writ of mandamus is granted to enable justice to be done."

For the word "mandamus" we could substitute the names of the other prerogative writs.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I support the second reading but, unless there are massive changes as a result of the deliberations of the Select Committee, I will not support the third reading. Security of accommodation and legal rights regarding accommodation are basic to the security of home and family life. Anything that can be done to enhance the quality and security of home and family life should be done, but I do not believe that some aspects of the Bill may have that effect. In fact, they may have the reverse effect. Several provisions will necessarily lead to higher rents, which is not in the interests of tenants.

I wish to comment briefly on two aspects, hoping that the Select Committee will give attention to them. One is in relation to the legislation as it affects migrant families, particularly the families of Greek and Italian origin, who are extremely keen to give security to their family life by providing accommodation to second and even third generations. Those families will find this legislation unduly restrictive, confusing and legalistic, and those people who have tried to build houses to let to other people and to make available later to their own families who may migrate to Australia or to make available to other generations will find that their ability to do so is no longer worth while for them.

The other aspect on which I wish to comment is in relation to homes for the aged, which will be directly and adversely affected by several clauses unless these homes are declared exempt from the Act, under clause 6. At June, 1976, there were 6 550 independent self-contained living units in South Australia that would come under this legislation unless they were exempted, as are hotels, motels, and the like. The landlords of homes registered under the Commonwealth Aged Persons Homes Act are non-profit-making church or benevolent organisations. They are in the business of caring for the aged, not for the purpose of making money but because they care for the aged. They understand the special requirements of aged tenants and know how to cater for those special requirements, but, unfortunately, the Bill shows no understanding and no sensitivity in regard to aged tenants, be they in homes for the aged or the tenants of private landlords.

I refer particularly to clause 29, which would exclude the donation system for aged persons homes that is permitted by the Commonwealth Act. Most organisations that care for aged persons rely heavily on this system to provide incentive for expansion and, if clause 29 applied to those homes, that incentive would be removed. That clause would stop any form of development that required the aged person to contribute a donation or a loan.

In addition, I will comment briefly on clause 144. Subclause (1) *(a)* and (1) *(b)* are perfectly sound and reasonable, but subclause (1) *(c)* could open up a Pandora's box for the landlord in the form of unbalanced eccentric, elderly, or psycho-geriatric tenants who would seek compensation for any reasonable expenses incurred by them in repairing the premises where the state of disrepair arose otherwise than as a result of a breach of the agreement by the tenant and was likely to cause injury to person or property if not immediately repaired, whether or not the tenant first gave the landlord notice of the state of disrepair. There could be a situation where a tenant might not be happy about the state of the footpath leading to his unit. He could have it repaired and, under this Bill if it became law, the landlord would be required to pay compensation, possibly amounting to many thousands of dollars.

Further, clause 50 would have a profound effect on homes for the aged, in so far as it provides that a tenant may assign his interest under an agreement or may sublet. Again, this clause provides the opportunity for abuse and for rackets in private tenancy agreements. It is in contradiction to the Aged Persons Homes Act, and it also contravenes zoning regulations of local government whereby some homes for the aged have been built under zoning regulations that permit high density, provided the residents are aged or disabled.

Clause 55 (1) provides:

> A person shall not refuse, or cause any person to refuse, to grant a tenancy to any person on the ground that it is intended that a child should live on the premises.

Discrimination against children should be opposed wherever it occurs, but this attempt to eliminate such discrimination is grossly irresponsible. Some premises are simply not suitable for children, and some parents are not sufficiently aware of their responsibilities to realise this. Therefore, the responsibility falls back on the landlord and, unless he fulfils it, children could be at risk through being accommodated in premises that are completely unsuitable.

Additionally, it could put a landlord in an impossible position, and I refer to a letter I have received from a landlord, as follows:

> I have just furnished flats in North Adelaide. The flats are occupied by nurses and other persons on shift work. If I put in a family with young children, the above tenants will not get any peace and quiet because we know the children will run up and down the stairs. In the end I will lose these good tenants by putting children in my flats. I have asked my tenants if they mind having children in the flats, but they all reject the idea. So it is not I, the landlord, who discriminates but the individual tenants who express a preference.

In the case of homes for the aged, if tenants were to allow children to be accommodated on the premises, it would not necessarily be in the interests (indeed, it could be against the interests) of aged and frail tenants.

Clause 58 deals with the termination of a residential tenancy agreement as it would apply to homes for the aged if they were not exempted from this legislation. Clauses 61 and 62 give no recognition of the care programmes and the assessment of frailty (either mental or physical) of aged persons which may require a landlord to move a tenant, but not necessarily with the tenant's agreement as the tenant might not be in a physical state to give such agreement.

We could have the ridiculous situation of the State Government's Eastern Domiciliary Care geriatric team recommending to a landlord that a tenant be transferred to other care, yet the landlord would first have to go to the

tribunal for permission. Under clause 62 (2) the tribunal might require the landlord to wait 120 days. True, it is a highly unlikely situation, although legally it could develop, and waiting for 120 days could mean the death or severe disability of that tenant.

I have given these examples to show that much work has to be done by a Select Committee, and I hope that there will be an opportunity for all interested persons to give evidence and for there to be a thorough debate on what seems to be a Bill which, far from having the effect of increasing the security of tenants, could lead to a decline in rental accommodation, thus creating insecurity among tenants.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): On many occasions over the period in which I have been a member of this House I have called for some action in this respect. No other honourable member has more flats in his district than I have or would have had as many problems on this matter referred to him as I have received. I am pleased that at least this legislation is put before Parliament and that it is now going to a Select Committee so that both sides will be given an opportunity to put their case once and for all.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Evans, Goldsworthy, and Groom; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on February 21, 1978.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 833.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): It is my understanding that the Government is willing for this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee in line with the motion I moved yesterday and, if that is the case, I thank the Government. It is extremely important that it be so referred, and I should like to outline briefly some of the facts that have come to my attention in examining this Bill. When the House hears some of these pertinent facts and realises the complexity of this problem it will accept the need for this Bill's being referred to a committee.

First, the committee should investigate the impact of such a clothing corporation on Whyalla, where I understand the clothing factory will be established. Whyalla has an employment problem: I understand about 1 600 people are unemployed in that town, and about 400 of those people are unemployed women. The establishment of a clothing factory in addition to the existing factory would have a major effect on unemployment in that town.

Secondly, the Select Committee needs to assess carefully what labour skills would be required to establish such a factory, and whether those skills are available in Whyalla. This would depend partly on the type of garment or uniform that such a factory would produce, but I understand the production of such uniforms will require skilled machinists, that it will be expensive to train such people, and difficult to start from scratch unless there is available a pool of trained machinists. I understand that such a pool is unlikely to be found in Whyalla, but I believe the Select Committee should make its own assessment of that problem.

Thirdly, the Select Committee needs to investigate the impact of setting up such a corporation on existing garment manufacturers, especially those who have existing contracts with the State Government. Earlier this year I had referred to me an example of a garment manufacturer who had been forced out of business because of difficulties over a Government contract. It is not the sort of contract that would come into the suggested clothing factory, but in examining the contract I believe that it was unreasonable and unfair. A Select Committee could also consider that aspect. Also, it is important that the Select Committee examines what damage would be done to existing garment manufacturers. There is little point in creating 60 new jobs, which I understand the new factory would create at Whyalla, if it is likely to put 60 people out of jobs in Adelaide, especially as there is a surplus of machinists and skilled labour in the garment manufacturing industry.

Apparently, in my investigations I discovered that the number that could be put out of work in Adelaide could exceed 60. It would not be a direct replacement, because an existing company that manufactures, under contract, garments for the Government would be put in the position in which, if these contracts were removed, terminated, or not renewed, the entire operation would be no longer viable and the company would have to close. Several companies with 30 or 40 employees that have between 30 per cent and 50 per cent of the work from the Government would be forced into economic difficulties if the contracts were cancelled, and the entire staff would have to be put off. I was told not by one but by several garment manufacturers who could see an increase in unemployment in the Adelaide area as being more than 100 people. The Select Committee needs to assess the impact on existing companies and the number of persons who would lose jobs in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The next point to be assessed by the Select Committee is the cost to the taxpayer of setting up such a corporation and factory. I understand that the Premier has given a preliminary cost of, I think, about $1 000 000, and that information was given to Whyalla newspapers during the recent election campaign. I hope that information will be available to the Select Committee.

In addition, I believe that the Select Committee should consider the present tendering method that exists for the supply of State Government garments. It is fair to say (and I discovered this in my investigations) that troubles have been experienced by Government instrumentalities in obtaining Government uniforms quickly. Because of this, considerable delays of up to three months have been caused to manufacturers in obtaining uniforms and in many cases they have had to go to interstate suppliers to obtain them. If this is the case and if such a clothing factory is likely to replace the work being done in other States, one could not object strongly to its being established.

As I understand the position, one of the reasons is that the present tendering method in South Australia is not as good as that used by the Commonwealth Government, and many companies who could do the work are not tendering. An example brought to my attention was that companies that are looking for work are not tendering for work offered by the Government, although one of these companies is only working at 40 per cent capacity and another is working at only 60 per cent capacity. That example illustrates that there is a large unused capacity already in the Adelaide metropolitan area, and perhaps the Government, in order to overcome this supply problem, should alter the tendering method. The recommendation by several people was that the State Government should adopt the same system as is used by the Commonwealth Government.

The next point that needs to be considered concerns the advertisement in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, November

19, for a General Manager for the Government Clothing Factory. The Bill to set up the corporation has not been debated by the Opposition in this House and has not been passed by both Houses yet, before we have the chance to debate the issue, the Government has had the gall to place an advertisement in last Saturday's *Advertiser* asking for a General Manager for the Government Clothing Factory. That shows sheer arrogance on the part of the Government, and is a breach of the principles of Parliamentary democracy. It indicates the attitude that the State Government has adopted since winning the recent State election, an attitude of being prepared to over-ride the traditions of this House and the traditions and precedents of Standing Orders. It is ensuring that this Parliament becomes as redundant as possible, so that it can go ahead and do what it likes. Several of my colleagues have referred to this change in the Government's attitude since it gained an increased majority at the recent State election. The advertisement clearly outlines some of the details, as follows:

GOVERNMENT CLOTHING FACTORY
GENERAL MANAGER

The S.A. Government intends to establish a clothing factory at Whyalla. The factory will initially employ about 60 people.

Duties

The General Manager will be responsible to a board of management for all aspects of the design, construction, commissioning and operation of the factory. Initially the appointee will be located in Adelaide, but he will be required to move to Whyalla when the factory is constructed.

Qualifications and Experience

Applicants should have experience at senior management level preferably in some area of clothing manufacturing or allied industry.

The advertisement then refers to conditions, and a salary of about $16 000 a year will be negotiated. Inquiries should be directed to Mr. Lees, Chairman, Clothing Factory Steering Committee, of Unley. It is interesting that applicants do not have to apply to the Public Service Board, but to Mr. Lees.

One other point that needs to be considered is that the Government commissioned its own study into the need to establish a clothing factory. On April 5 this year I asked the Premier to make available to the House a copy of the report of that working committee. Also, I asked him who were the members of that committee. In his reply he said that the Chairman was Mr. Haslam, and the members were Mr. Collins, Secretary, Clothing Trades Union, and Mr. Palmer, Assistant Director, Services and Supply Department. In his reply to me the Premier did not make available a copy of the report, but stated:

> When the Government receives the working party report of detailed financial considerations and when it has considered its policy to the total questions, it will also consider the question of releasing all the information relevant to the Government's decision.

Obviously, the Government has received that working committee report but, to my knowledge, it has not been released publicly and it has not been released to me. Perhaps the Government has dodged the issue of making that decision, or it has decided that it will not make the report available. I believe that the Select Committee will have the opportunity to examine the report, and that is a further reason for the appointment of such a committee.

I have presented to the House many reasons for the appointment of a Select Committee, and I hope that I have outlined some aspects that the Select Committee should investigate in order to obtain the necessary information to enable this Parliament to make a full and accurate assessment of the need for such a clothing factory. Finally, I have pointed out that the arrogance with which the Government is now operating—

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I look forward to the motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee being carried.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the remarks of the member for Davenport. This whole Bill is breaking relatively new ground in South Australia, and it is entirely appropriate that we should support it to the second reading stage, so that it can be referred to a Select Committee. The whole principle of this Bill, which has wide ramifications, should be examined very carefully. It is one thing to establish a Government-sponsored clothing factory to provide employment but it is an entirely different thing to put forward a proposal to establish such a factory if it will put other people out of employment as a result.

There is no question in my mind, following the many representations that have been made and the extreme concern conveyed to me by many people in the industry, that the possibility of other people being put out of employment is very real. Firms may well go out of existence because the Government goes into competition in this way. If that is likely to happen to even the slightest extent, I am certain that the Government will have no part of it. The Government's concern, as it has often publicly stated, is for creative employment, and I am certain it would not want to create some jobs at the expense of many other jobs lost. I support the Bill to the second reading stage, and I will support the motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Dean Brown, Max Brown, Dunstan, Nankivell, and Slater; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on December 6.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 627.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): We support the Bill. In doing so , my only regret is that it does not go as far as the Opposition would like it to go. That regret is more than made up for by the fact that the Government is introducing this Bill and therefore confidently expecting that pay-roll tax will still apply after December 10. That is a very real measure of the Government's confidence in its Federal colleagues' chances of success in December, and that confidence is pretty low.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Government knows that Gough doesn't have a hope in the world.

Mr. TONKIN: I agree. That is why this Bill is before us now. This Bill provides for the maximum exemption level from pay-roll tax to be raised by 25 per cent, and the minimum by 12½ per cent. This will bring the limit up to $60 000. Members will recall that during the election campaign the Liberal Party had a three-point policy on pay-roll tax. It was largely as a result of the extreme pressure under which the Government found itself in connection with pay-roll tax that the Government rather reluctantly agreed to raise the exemption to $60 000. I am

pleased that the Government is honouring its election promise in this regard, but I am disappointed that we are not seeing the level of exemption raised to $72 000, as was proposed. Further, I am disappointed that we are not seeing a remission for 12 months of pay-roll tax, on an indexed basis, for all additional employees taken on, and I am sorry that we are not seeing a rebate of pay-roll tax for all apprentices. This would have been a worthwhile addition to the Bill.

The position in other States has been clearly outlined. All States have raised the level of exemption to at least $60 000, and in Queensland it will be $100 000. Indeed, in Queensland from the beginning of the next financial year it will go up to $125 000. The Queensland Government's general attitude to pay-roll tax is very worth while, and it will help considerably in restoring confidence, helping small businesses, and creating jobs. We must think about that very seriously. Of course, one of the paradoxes associated with this question has been the Premier's ambivalent attitude to pay-roll tax concessions. He accused the Opposition of engaging in lies and hypocrisy in connection with proposals for pay-roll tax exemptions that we put forward during the election campaign. He retreated from that position somewhat by saying that he would put the exemption up to $60 000. Now that the Federal Labor Party has put forward a most remarkable plan for abolishing pay-roll tax, the Premier has suddenly and completely changed his attitude: he now finds that an excellent idea.

From being the only Premier out of step on pay-roll tax (because all the other Premiers believed that pay-roll tax incentives were worth while in job creation) he has suddenly become completely committed to the proposals put forward by the Federal Leader of the Opposition. It is not unknown for the Premier to do a complete somersault on such a matter. The basic situation is that pay-roll tax, as originally designed, provided for exemptions in respect of firms employing 10 people or fewer than 10 people. The flat level proposed of $72 000 would have gone somewhere toward restoring that situation. As it is, the level of $60 000 is unlikely to go toward restoring that situation. It is a shame that we have not kept pace with the original spirit of the proposal.

This Bill is relatively complicated in relation to the formulae in it. The Bill will benefit industry and small businesses in this State. We therefore support it, but I repeat that it does not go nearly as far as the Opposition would like it to go.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, s. 13a."

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): While many of the formulae here are basic, I would appreciate some explanation from the Premier as to how this formula was arrived at, what it means and whether it does equate. I would particularly like him to explain the reason for the alternatives given in subclause (2) *(a)* and *(b)*.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The formulae, of course, are mathematical formulae. I do not know whether the Leader is able to make head or tail of them; I must confess I am not.

Mr. Tonkin: I cannot understand them; that's why I asked you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest the Leader have a consultation with the draftsman. I am assured by the draftsman that the effects of the formulae reflect the principles set out in the explanation.

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier make the Public Actuary available to explain this to me?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly make arrangements for the Public Actuary to explain this to the Leader, if he so requests. The Parliamentary Counsel says that he is perfectly capable of explaining them, and will be happy to do so.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 17. Page 889.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill, which gives the South Australian Barley Board the opportunity to market the oat crop of South Australia. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, indicated to the House that the Government intended to repeal a previous measure that never operated. That measure, even though it passed through this House and most members on this side supported it, caused much concern to certain constituents who were previously in the Rocky River District and who are now in the Light District. I hope that the problems that those people brought forward during and after that piece of legislation was passed have been solved.

I believe that it is sensible to allow the South Australian Barley Board to market the oats grown in South Australia. It is well known that the Australian Barley Board has been successful for many years in marketing the barley crops of South Australia and Victoria. It is interesting, if one looks at the latest annual report of the Australian Barley Board, to see the breakdown of each dollar spent. One sees that 91·07 per cent of each dollar collected is returned to the producer. Unfortunately, it is not returned in the year that the crop is harvested, but over two or three years the grower receives approximately 91 per cent of every dollar collected by the board. I hope that that result is obtained for oats. The *South Australian Year Book,* (at page 433), in dealing with oats, states:

> The milling qualities of most oats grown in South Australia do not meet the requirements of overseas markets and only a small proportion of the harvest is exported; most of the crop is used as animal fodder. As is the case with barley, some of the area sown for grain and hay is grazed until June or July then closed to sheep to allow re-growth to a crop. Part of the area sown for forage is left to stand until it is used as dry grazing in autumn, when other fodder is not plentiful. In 1973-74, 81 per cent of the total area of oats was sown in four varieties—Swan, 115 000 hectares; Avon, 43 000 hectares; Irwin, 31 000 hectares; and Kherson, 17 000 hectares.

I have in front of me a table drawn up by the bureau, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Oats, South Australia

Season	Area Sown for			Total	Production	
	Grain	Hay	Forage	Area	Grain	Hay
	'000 hectares				'000 tonnes	
1969-70 ..	151	41	84	275	121	156
1970-71 ..	195	52	88	335	153	180
1971-72 ..	169	53	56	278	166	204
1972-73 ..	142	53	60	254	74	120
1973-74 ..	152	56	44	252	142	192

Mr. GUNN: We are fortunate to have in this State the

Chairman of the Australian Barley Board, Mr. Walker, who is well known to many members of the House and who has performed his duties most satisfactorily. Until September 17, Mr. Pearce, who is also a member of the Australian Barley Board, was resident in my electorate.

I have discussed this measure with the Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated and other members of that organisation who are themselves growers. They support the measure because they believe it will be in the best interests of the growers concerned. I am pleased to note in the legislation that trading among growers, or trading by growers who wish to sell to racehorse trainers or the like, will still be permitted. I believe this is essential as oats is a different commodity from barley to deal with. Most barley is exported, but only a small proportion of oats is exported.

Secondly, as facilities have now been provided by Bulk Handling Co-operative for the bulk handling of oats, considerable quantities of oats have been exported from Thevenard, which is in my district. Another piece of legislation with which we will deal soon is complementary to this Bill and will ensure that the export of oats will continue in the future.

Having read the Bill, I could comment on clause 11, which amends section 14 of the principal Act, relating to the sale and delivery of oats, but I believe that I would only be taking up the time of the House if I were to go into that matter in detail. I hope that this clause will solve the problems that have existed. The Liberal Party will examine the manner in which the legislation is administered. Although we support it, if in the future it needs amending, we will support its being amended, because we believe it essential that the legislation should operate in the grower's interest, not only the grower who wishes to sell for export, but also the grower who has built up over the years a grower-to-grower trade or a trade with race-horse trainers or like people. Many people engaged in agriculture grow only a few hectares of oats each year. As they do not want to go to the trouble of sowing a few acres of oats, they buy oats from a neighbouring oat-grower. I am pleased to see that an appropriate provision has been included in the Bill.

I support the Bill, which has been requested for many years by the United Farmers and Graziers. Having discussed the Bill with the Secretary and members of the grain committee, together with other growers in my district and in the Flinders District who have knowledge of the legislation, I point out that they do not object to it, they see nothing wrong with it, and I hope that it has a speedy passage through the House.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I, too, support the legislation, which permits the Australian Barley Board to market oats. The name of the board is something of a misnomer, because one might think that all States were represented on the board, whereas only Victoria and South Australia, which have marketed successfully on behalf of their growers, are represented on the board. No doubt Australian growers look forward to the day when we will have an all-States Australian Barley Marketing Board, the same as we have for wheat. Being on the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation before entering Parliament, I point out that a move was afoot in those days for an all-Australian coarse grains board but, because they were looking for stabilisation of barley marketing, the same as for wheat marketing, a delay occurred in bringing this about, because of the lack of stabilisation in the barley industry.

The Bill permits the Australian Barley Marketing Board to handle oats. For some time, growers and grower organisations in this State have tried to have this type of legislation introduced in the South Australian Parliament. There has been considerable controversy in the past over oats, which is a Cinderella crop to South Australia's primary producers: this year, it is very much a Cinderella crop, because of the drought. Only a small quantity, if any, of oats will be grown and exported, particularly from South Australia. The Bill permits growers themselves to deal in oats if they require them for feeding their own stock. It also permits a manufacturer to buy his oats wherever he wishes, so long as he uses the oats in manufacturing. The Bill is lenient to the manufacturer in that provision. I support this move, and I know that the growers and the grower organisations will be pleased to know that this legislation has been introduced. I do not foresee any problems with it, either here or in another place. Although we had similar legislation previously, it was never proclaimed, but this Bill endeavours to reinstate the provisions of the earlier legislation. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I, too, support the Bill, which enables the Australian Barley Board widely to expand its activities into the oats field and into other grains, but more particularly oats. Members would be aware that producer organisations have been lobbying for an orderly marketing scheme of oats for some time, and I think that the Bill is the first real step as a result of their lobbying. An important provision in the Bill is that producers who are actually specialising in the growing of oats will be able to receive better returns for their commodity, knowing that it will be marketed in the best possible manner and that the quality will be maintained, thus creating buyer confidence in a quality product. It is the old story, namely, if one has a good product to sell, one can demand a price for it and expect to be adequately rewarded for it. If, as has been happening in the past, oats are marketed without much classification, we will get a buyer reluctance to accept the grain in question. Probably the aspect which has been queried the most is the exchange or sale between farmers where grain is sold for seed. That aspect is adequately covered by clause 11, which states in new section 14aa:

> (2) Nothing in this section shall apply to—
>
> *(f)* oats sold to a person where those oats are not resold by that person otherwise than in a manufactured or processed form including, without limiting the generality thereof, the processed form of chopped, crushed or milled oats.

The new section refers also to permits granted by the board, and this provision will overcome the reluctance of many producers to accept the original legislation. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, which I expect will bring about better returns to those producers who specialise in the oat-marketing field.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I, too, support the Bill. I remember that in about 1967 or 1968 the first oat marketing Bill was introduced. That Bill was allowed to lapse in the House at that time, because its provisions were more restrictive than are those contained in the current legislation. They were so restrictive that it was not possible for growers actually to trade between themselves in the buying or selling of oats for feed.

This is an excellent Bill, or so it appears to me, in that it has reached a compromise in all areas of dispute. For instance, the South-Eastern growers, if they wish to, will still be able to sell to the Victorian Oatgrowers Co-operative, which has been marketing South-Eastern oats for many years. In fact, it has been marketing most oats

for export in South Australia for a number of years. As has been pointed out, the Australain Barley Board is technically a two-State board, although it has the name Australian Barley Board but, so far as its activities with oats are concerned, they will be restricted entirely to the marketing of oats in South Australia. What we have done here (and we have done it wisely) is that not only have we permitted the Australian Barley Board to become the marketing board for oats but also we have defined "proclaimed produce" as meaning "grain or seed of a class or kind for the time being declared by proclamation to be proclaimed produce for the purposes of this Act". In other words, we have actually widened the powers of this board to enable it to market all grains or seeds that may be proclaimed. So, with the exception of wheat, which will continue to be marketed by the Australian Wheat Board, the Australian Barley Board will become the marketing authority for all small grains, seeds or any other proclaimed produce, including oats and barley in South Australia.

The points covered in this Bill, which will be different, as I pointed out initially, from the initial Bills that came in, are these. In new section 14aa (2) *(f)* power is provided for me, if I wish, to negotiate with my neighbour for him to provide me with so many thousand bushels of oats delivered into my silo for feed purposes. This enables me to undertake that arrangement without having to go through the board and, subject to my not reselling those oats other than in a processed form, it is a perfectly proper action. That was one area of concern. The other area of concern in my electoral district is the possibility of growers not being able to continue to sell to the Victorian Oatgrowers Co-operative when they wish to. That has been provided for in this legislation.

I think this is a first-class Bill and the principle of setting up the Australian Barley Board as the marketing authority in South Australia for all grains and seeds other than wheat is excellent. Knowing the personnel of the board, I am satisfied that the people who are growing oats to be marketed by the Australian Barley Board will receive the same sort of service as the barley growers in South Australia. It has been a service of considerable benefit to them and it has returned them a very good price and a ready sale of their grain on the overseas markets. The Barley Board, with its international connections, will be able to obtain the same thing in the export field for the oatgrowers of South Australia. I support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I certainly support the Bill. It is interesting to go back to the recent past and recognise the difficulties that the legislation has had. I say "difficulties" because one of the early Acts with which I was involved, the Oat Marketing Act of 1972, which is to be repealed by this Bill, had a fairly chequered career in the debate in this House and in another place. In great measure, the difficulties had arisen because of the attitude of the then Minister of Agriculture, who was not prepared to discuss the various facets of the industry with the people in the industry, and who had determined over a dinner one night with a gentleman from Victoria that, in the situation that would apply in South Australia, it would be in line with the activity that that gentleman, Mr. Cooper, had been involved in in Victoria.

There were many difficulties. I explained this in the debate in the House on March 28, 1972, the report of which appears at pages 4356 to 4358 of *Hansard,* that there was a distinct conflict of interest by the involvement of Mr. Cooper in the activities that had been initiated by the then Minister, Mr. Casey. Whilst I do not want in any way to reflect upon the character or integrity of Mr. Cooper, there were major difficulties because of his heavy involvement in the Victorian oat marketing scheme. At that time I had taken a deputation to the Minister from people involved in the industry, and particularly a group that called itself the coarse grains marketing group in Adelaide. There was some background information. I was particularly involved and interested because there are several large operators in this field in my own electoral district: Johnson Brothers at Kapunda, Vater at Saddleworth, and in the recent redistribution I have laid claim to a Mr. Sanders of Clare.

All these people have been tremendously involved for a long time. They are knowledgeable about the activities of oat marketing, and I believe from some of the information that has been made available to me recently that the final measure we are now considering will accommodate the expertise that those people have to offer in the overall marketing of oats in this State. It is not only an issue that involves marketing on the local or Australian market; several of these people to whom I have referred have an extensive overseas market for oats, and this is a measure that will assist dramatically the export opportunities for South Australia and will greatly enhance the activities of the container shipping berth at Outer Harbor.

One of the problems that the Johnson Brothers of Kapunda have had over a period of time in fulfilling their marketing to Hong Kong, Japan, the Philippines, Singapore, and Kuala Lumpur has been the inability to obtain sufficient shipping from the Outer Harbor area. The new container terminal has improved the situation and there is a distinct likelihood of an increased shipping outlet from that source which will allow these people to fulfil their commitments on time, and at a price that is competitive with oat prices from other parts of the world. With a commonsense approach and with the consultation that has already taken place in the relatively immediate past, this is a measure that will help all sectors of the community in South Australia. I give it my support.

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

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 22. Page 924.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. It gives an opportunity to those people who were authorised to be qualified agents before the new Act came into operation in 1974 to continue as agents. I believe that one person's livelihood is affected and that this Bill will clarify that situation.

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

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 17. Page 889.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill. The principal Act was assented to on July 7, 1955, so the provisions of the Act have applied for almost 22 years. As one who has more or less inspected bulk handling facilities throughout the world, I can say that in South Australia, although we were late to introduce bulk handling facilities,

we have a system in this State of which the growers can be proud. The system here was built up by using grower tolls that were interest free as compared with the Eastern States where bulk handling facilities were provided by the taxpayers of those States.

At the outset of bulk handling the South Australian Government of the day gave the bulk handling company a Government guarantee as far as the bank was concerned. The company had not been operating for long before it discharged that obligation. Whilst we were under an obligation to the Government of this State the bulk handling company board had on it two Government nominees just to watch things from the viewpoint of the taxpayers of this State.

About four or five years ago the services of those nominees were dispensed with and the company no longer relies on the Government guarantee as far as the bank is concerned regarding the construction of silos. The company pushed ahead with silo construction as rapidly as possible to provide storage as quickly as possible for the growers. We are now in a position to repay to the growers the tolls that they have been paying for several years.

Earlier today we passed the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill, to which this Bill is complementary. The company has handled oats for growers for some years. Oat growers have provided finance for the bulk handling company to build storages for growers in certain areas of the State, such as the South-East, where oat production is considerable, and on Eyre Peninsula. In the Northern parts of the State the company has been able to store the growers' oat deliveries by using existing barley and wheat storages, and an adjustment of the figures of the marketing firms was made to allow oat growers to contribute something towards the silos.

This Bill gives a complete charter to the bulk handling company to be the sole receiver of oats in this State. We have the sole right to receive wheat and barley and now, with this legislation, oats. For the information of the House, we receive lupins, too, from growers in the South-East who use our existing storage facilities and pay us on a daily basis for the time they use those facilities.

I support the Bill for many reasons. I was pleased to hear the tenor of the debate on the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill and how suitable its provision are to growers. Oat marketing has been a contentious business. Oats is a Cinderella grain and dealing with it was complicated. Growers will be pleased that the bulk handling company can proceed to handle, store and take oats in from the grower under the provisions of this legislation. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the measure and make only two brief comments about it. I am not sure whether the member for Rocky River wishes me to congratulate the directors on their role in the development of co-operative bulk handling, but I would make the point—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You'll have noticed that he used the word "we" when he was talking about the board of the company.

Mr. BLACKER: Co-operative bulk handling is an industry sponsored, developed and maintained by growers.

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

Mr. BLACKER: Before the dinner adjournment I was speaking in support of the Bill, particularly is relation to the fact that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is industry sponsored, having been developed and maintained by the producers. That needs to be emphasised. The co-operative was financed by a Government-guaranteed loan through the Commonwealth Trading Bank, the initial funds raised having amounted to $1 000 000. This was repaid with funds raised through the toll system. The producers undertook to pay 6 pence a bushel toll to be used by the co-operative for a period of 12 years. This effectively meant that the producers gave to the co-operative an interest-free loan for that period. I think many people in South Australia overlook this. All the concrete cells and silos around our State have been put there and financed by the grain industry for the use of the grain industry: they are not there at the taxpayers' expense.

I support the Bill because I believe that it enables more use to be made of these facilities by allowing a wider range of grain to be handled in this way. If our grain-handling authorities can handle grain in an orderly way through an orderly marketing system, all can benefit, and the market, the consumer, gets a better product, the producer being compensated adequately for the quality of grain that produces.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from November 22. Page 940.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Before the dinner adjournment last evening I was referring to the recent State election campaign in the District of Rocky River. The Australian Labor Party candidate was the former Speaker of this House, and an Independent and a member of the Country Party also were candidates. I was referring to how the A.L.P. candidate issues cards in three different colours. He started with a black and white card, then changed to a blue card, and finished with a green card, which is the Country Party colour. A pamphlet issued stated, "A country man for a country electorate." There was no mention of the A.L.P. in that pamphlet.

Dr. Eastick: He must have been on that bridge to nowhere.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. That man's political history in regard to how he came here in the first place was interesting. The newspaper cuttings are still interesting. In the recent election campaign, he worked extremely hard. I do not know whether the Labor Party put him into Rocky River with the idea of getting rid of him or whether that Party thought that he could win it.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: We thought we could get rid of you.

Mr. VENNING: I intend to be here for some time, putting the case for the rural areas and the man on the land.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: More significantly than most of you think.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, and I appreciate the support given to me by the Deputy Premier. Although I am not permitted to display it to the House, I have a pamphlet. I think it is a shame that literature, whether in the form of pamphlets or letters, distributed to the people of the State cannot be shown in Parliament. We are allowed to read them, but we must be careful not to raise them so that the Speaker can see them.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was out of order last evening, if I remember correctly.

Mr. VENNING: That is right. I am not displaying the pamphlet: I am only reading it. Thousands of copies of a letter were sent throughout the District of Rocky River. I think they were delivered by the taxpayers of the State, in a Parliamentary envelope with an 18c stamp on it. The letter that I have comes from Mr. Connelly, Speaker, House of Assembly, Member for Pirie, 5 Norman Street, Port Pirie.

Mr. Harrison: Is that the black and white one, or the green one?

Mr. VENNING: No. This is the letter. The colour of the letter did not vary. This is addressed "Dear Mr. Smart". There are many people named Smart in the area, so no-one will know which one received this. It states:

> As the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for the seat of Rocky River I wish to inform you that I shall be visiting your area in the immediate future and trust that I shall have the opportunity to meet and talk with you. If however I can assist you in any way please contact me at the above address.
>
> In the meantime, I take this opportunity to inform you that on Friday, August 12, and Saturday, August 13, I shall be visiting the towns of Yacka, Gulnare, Georgetown, Red Hill, Koolunga and Port Broughton accompanied by our Premier, Don Dunstan. If you or any organisation with whom you are associated would like to meet our Premier personally or as a group, I would be happy to make the necessary arrangements.

That was in connection with the visit in August. The second letter deals with the visit by the Premier and Mr. Connelly on March 1 and 2, 1977. On neither of those two occasions did the Premier inform the local member that he was coming into his area to meet the people and determine their demands in Rocky River.

The Premier came and met committees, district councils, football clubs and other groups while he was there, and these people told him of their needs. So far, although nine months has now elapsed since that visit when the Premier first came to the district, these people are still waiting the hear from the Premier. I refer to the Jamestown Football Club, the Jamestown corporation and the grower organisation, all of which are still waiting to hear how the Premier will assist them.

At the time the Premier was in my district a report appeared in the newspaper headed "Dunstan Tour Attacked", and the report states:

> The acting Opposition Leader, Mr. Goldsworthy, today accused the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, of ignoring the Liberal member for Rocky River, Mr. Venning, during a tour of South Australia's Mid North. He said the tour was a piece of blatant electioneering.
>
> "The whole purpose of the visit is to try to drum up support for Mr. Connelly, the Labor Party candidate for Rocky River," Mr. Goldsworthy said. "It is customary for the Premier or Ministers, when they are going into a member's district, to contact the elected member and to be accompanied by him when visiting public institutions in the district. In this case the Premier is visiting the district of Mr. Howard Venning, the Liberal member for Rocky River, but is being accompanied by the A.L.P. candidate."

Why did he not accompany the local member? The report continues:

> Mr. Dunstan was not available for comment on Mr. Goldsworthy's attack today. However, it is understood Mr. Dunstan had dinner with Mr. Venning at his Crystal Brook home last night.

Mr. Rodda: Didn't Mr. Connelly have dinner with you, too?

Mr. VENNING: He may have. The uninvited guest! The report continues:

> Mr. Dunstan said today: "Mr. Goldsworthy, in his petty little way, is criticising my visits to the country centres.
>
> Apparently he wants to deprive me of the ability to go throughout our State to meet local people in local communities and discuss problems affecting their communities.

It is now nine months since the Premier visited the area, yet all these people and organisations are waiting for the Premier to say how he will assist them. The Premier also states:

> Apparently he also wants to deprive me of the ability to expedite Government decisions relating to these problems. As for this trip being political, last night I met members of the District Council of Crystal Brook and the council of the Institute of Crystal Brook at the arrangement and request of the Liberal member for Rocky River, Mr. Howard Venning.

The Crystal Brook District Council and the institute committee are still waiting to hear from the Premier nine months after he saw them how he can assist them. I now indicate how rough the Labor Party plays things. I know that politics is politics, but an announcement in my district appeared long before the recent election was even planned. On December 1, 1976, about 11 months ago, the following statement was broadcast on radio and appeared in the newspaper:

> Laura gets child centre. The Mid North township of Laura will have a new building provided for its kindergarten and pre-school activities. This was announced recently by the member for Pirie, Mr. Connelly. He said about $36 000 would be spent on the project. Mr. Connelly said he had been advised by the Education Minister, Dr. Hopgood, that the Laura and District Council had donated a site opposite the primary school for the new building.

I am not concerned about the remainder of the report, but I am concerned about the Minister of Education making the announcement through Mr. Connelly, the then Speaker, who eventually became the Australian Labor Party's candidate for that district in the recent election.

That was not the only time the A.L.P. has played it rough. The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport announced through Mr. Connelly a project involving a caravan park in my home town. An announcement was made that funds would be provided for that park. Naturally, I appreciate anything done in my district, but I take a dim view of the manner in which the Government has gone about things.

Further, during the campaign, the candidate took into the area the Minister of Agriculture. He probably thought he would whip up a bit of support from the farmers in the area who were going through a dry period.

Dr. Eastick: That would be a forlorn hope.

Mr. VENNING: That is for sure. The candidate and the Minister travelled from Crystal Brook to Jamestown. I believe few growers met the Minister and the then Speaker, but they did not talk much about seasonal conditions: they expressed their concern at the effects of succession duties on the rural community. On June 14, 1977, a report appeared in the *Advertiser* about the A.L.P. conference, headed "End gift duty bid defeated". That item was evidently put on the agenda of the conference by the Port Lincoln A.L.P. sub-branch, and the report states:

> The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) told the convention that to abolish gift duty between spouses would open up "an enormous area of tax evasion for people who were not in a matrimonial relationship".

I cannot see how that would be tax evasion if it became a law. If that was the law, people would be complying with it. The report continues:

> He was speaking against a motion from the Port Lincoln A.L.P. sub-branch which called on the South Australian Government to consider total abolition of gift duty between

spouses.

Mr. Dunstan said there had been substantial reductions in South Australian taxation in the past two years. He opposed the motion because there could not continue to be "constant assaults upon Government revenue." The motion was lost on the voices.

Now Mr. Wran has taken steps to do just what was sought by the Port Lincoln sub-branch of the Labor Party. We know what has happened in Queensland and Western Australia, but South Australia is becoming the sick State of the Commonwealth. I know that we have natural problems in South Australia: it is the driest State in the driest continent in the world, and we cannot afford to have a Labor Government. We need a Government that will assist the people and not drag them down.

The result of the recent election is well known in the State. I tried hard to get the result in my district printed in the *Advertiser,* and I rang the *Advertiser* after the allocation of preferences, some time after the election. I telephoned twice and was told they would ring me back: they did, but they did not print the final result. Many people throughout the State watched the contest in Rocky River with much interest because the Speaker of the House was involved, as was the member for Rocky River. I will now give to the House final figures so that they will be included in *Hansard* and many people will know what the figures were: the result was, Venning, 9 188; Connelly, 6 596.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But I heard you weren't very popular up there.

Mr. VENNING: I will deal with that interjection soon. I have a slot in my speech to say something about it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I don't believe it, of course.

Mr. VENNING: I know that the Minister does not. I believe that the Minister is dinkum, too. However, I will deal with Mr. Greg Kelton later. I watched with much interest the fate of my friend Mr. Connelly. A recent article in the newspaper states:

> Connelly to boost jobs in the bush. The former House of Assembly Speaker, Mr. Ted Connelly, has been given a Government post to create job opportunities in South Australia's outback.

I do not know what he is going to do for the member for Eyre, and whether he will take over Eyre or campaign for the next election, but I assure the ex-Speaker (and he will know from his experience of the member for Eyre) that he will be in for a rough time if he thinks that he will do that in this new position. The article continues:

> Mr. Connelly was defeated as the Labor candidate for Rocky River at the September State election. Mr. Connelly is tipped to win the job of Chairman of the new Northern Areas Development Trust when it begins operating, probably next year. He is now working full-time in the local government office in Adelaide as a research officer involved in the planning of the trust.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you think he'll win the job?

Mr. VENNING: I do not know, but I should hate his job working for the Minister of Local Government. I do not know which would be worse: he is not getting much of a choice. The article continues:

> His house in Port Pirie is on the market. Establishment of the trust was one of a series of "job creation" measures outlined by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, during the election campaign. The trust will have the power to borrow up to $1 000 000 a year.

goodness gracious me—

> It will also be entitled to apply for unemployment relief scheme funds. Legislation to establish the trust is now being considered by the planning team. The type of projects which would be carried out by the trust would include the upgrading of the main street of Marree and general improvement of amenities in outback areas.

That seems to be the future of the previous Speaker. We have been trying to find out what his salary will be in this job, and we have heard many figures.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is $13 000.

Mr. VENNING: It seems to have been cut back, but no doubt it will cost taxpayers about $25 000 to $30 000 by the time a car and accommodation is provided. If I had been beaten in this contest, I wonder whether the Government would have given me a job like this.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No worries: we'd have put you on the bulk handling, anyway.

Mr. VENNING: I cannot help thinking that I won the war but he won the peace.

Mr. Arnold: You wouldn't have the qualifications.

Mr. VENNING: I could have got them in a couple of days. I now refer to the *Advertiser* and our press, and give full marks for the integrity of our country press. However, some of the stuff we read in our city newspapers (and I use the word "stuff" as an appropriate word for some of the literature that is published), especially in the *Advertiser* under the banner of Greg Kelton, leaves much to be desired. I am surprised that a newspaper like the *Advertiser* would allow such rubbish to be printed. Greg Kelton is the political writer for the *Advertiser,* and the stuff he publishes from time to time is mischievous and is far from being truthful. I have a fair idea whence he gets this information. If this rubbish does not cease, and whilst they are using the privilege of the press in publishing stuff about people, I believe a member has the right to seek Parliamentary privilege in order to defend himself.

I refer to his comments made about my colleague and friend, Keith Russack. An article in the *Advertiser* before the recent election stated that Keith Russack was sacked from the Liberal Party. At the time, I had been door-knocking in Kadina (to good effect) up to the Friday evening, but in Saturday's *Advertiser* Greg Kelton's article said that Keith Russack had been sacked from the Liberal Party. That made my task more difficult, as I had to convince people that what had been published in the article was not the truth. I could not return to all the people that I had seen to tell them of this. That was the start.

Later, another of his articles stated that Mr. Russack would not be welcomed back in the Liberal Party room. What rubbish: he did not leave the Party, but stood, according to the constitution of our Party, as a candidate in the election, and he was successful. It is about time that this mischievous rubbish written by Greg Kelton and published in the *Advertiser* should stop. He had another go on Saturday last when he attacked the member for Rocky River. I am now busy travelling throughout my district to ascertain in what area I am unpopular.

Mr. Whitten: What about the Wallaroo jetty?

Mr. VENNING: I took a deputation from Wallaroo people to the Deputy Premier today, and I commend the Minister on the way he received that deputation and treated the problem of the mishap at Wallaroo. At the time he was acting Premier, and was under much pressure. I called him the Premier several times, because I believe that he should be the Premier.

Following the deputation that the Minister received today, the people went away very much assured. I am referring to the damage done at Wallaroo on October 24 at 7.20 a.m. Thank goodness it was not 8.20 a.m. because, if it had been, quite a few lives might have been lost. Despite the damage done at Wallaroo, no lives were lost and no-one was injured. The people went back to Wallaroo today

feeling much happier following the assurances given by the Minister of Marine to Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, the Wheat Board, the Barley Board, and the Waterside Workers Federation. These people were all concerned about the loss of employment. They received assurances from the Minister today that they could expect a reasonable Christmas. I hope that in future Mr. Kelton can get some information from somewhere (I do not care where it comes from) that is worth publishing in the *Advertiser* concerning the political situation in this State.

The rural areas are experiencing a very difficult period, because this is almost a record dry season. My area has had about seven inches of rainfall, whereas our average rainfall is 15 inches. The crops are probably the poorest I have seen on Montrose. Because the soil is loose, it will need careful tending between now and the opening of the next season. Many growers will have to buy their seed wheat. It is a critical state of affairs when a grower, having prepared his soil, sprayed, and sown his crop, cannot reap sufficient grain to resow his fields next year. I hope growers will receive the assistance from the Government that they deserve. Costs are rising daily, and some areas are going through their third successive drought year.

I hate to think about the plight of rural people who have to rely on the sale of rural products. Machinery firms depend on the success of the man on the land. Many agents in the North are concerned as to how they will be able to keep their staffs employed next February, next March, or this time next year. The Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Sinclair, has made announcements about cattle. I hope that the State Government will spend its $1 500 000 quickly, so that Commonwealth funding can come into operation. Unfortunately, even at this time, with regard to the previous year, the Government has not yet spent its $1 500 000 of State money. It is not until this money is spent that the Commonwealth Government will take up the tab. So, it is essential that the Minister should become aware of the current problems that the man on the land is facing.

Last Monday evening, when our Federal Leader gave the Liberal Party's policy speech in Melbourne, he talked about abolishing Federal gift duties and death duties. He also said that he would equalise petrol prices to the extent that country areas would not pay more than 1c a litre above the metropolitan price. What was the position a few years ago when we had a Liberal Government? It considered people in the outback in connection with stabilising petrol prices, but who took this concession away from people in the outback? It was a Federal Labor Government! Now, we must rely on a Federal Liberal Government to give it back to the country people. The confidence of the people on December 10 will be such that they will return the Fraser Government, which will abolish death duties and gift duties. When I came into Parliament in 1968 I said that, if I achieved nothing other than the abolition of death duties and gift duties, I would be happy with my time in Parliament.

The Queensland Government has abolished these duties. Further, the Federal Government, the New South Wales Government, and the Western Australian Government are going to abolish them. So, South Australia is the only State keeping these duties. I will have to prevail on the Premier to do what the Port Lincoln branch of the Labor Party wants him to do. If the Premier does not comply, I will have to move to another State to achieve what I set out to do when I came into Parliament about 10 years ago. I will have to twist the Premier's arm to achieve my aim. The following press release was issued on November 2:

> The Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Ian Sinclair, said tonight (November 1) that a significant step forward for primary producers had been taken with the introduction of legislation in Parliament today to establish a national rural bank. Mr Sinclair said that the new bank would be called the Australian Rural Bank and it would be the first financial institute of its kind to ever be set up under Commonwealth legislation for the sole and specific purpose of facilitating the provision of finance to primary producers.
>
> The Government had been concerned for some time in devising a way of enabling long-term credit to be made available to farmers. Primary producers, said Mr. Sinclair, will be able to ask their banks to extend the period of their existing or new loans through the refinancing facilities that will become available through the Australian Rural Bank. The Government will be participating in the new bank so as to enable repayment periods to be extended to between 10 and 30 years at concessional interest rates, initially at around the rates applicable to short-term loans of a similar amount and risk.

High interest rates are killing the man on the land today. I know that members opposite do not realise that the land is the means by which the man on the land earns his income. The means by which he earns his income is taxed, because he pays such things as water rates, and, when he dies, succession duties and probate duties have to be paid. But if misfortune took one of the members opposite away, what would happen? No succession duties would be payable on that member's job. This is the point I make about the man on the land.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has the floor.

Mr. VENNING: The land is the means by which he earns his living and at the same time feeds the multitudes not only of Australia but of the world. The press release continued:

> The Australian Rural Bank will operate as a refinance institution, able to lend funds to existing financial institutions so that long-term moneys are available to farmers. The Commonwealth Development Bank will be able to also refinance its loans through the Australian Rural Bank.
>
> The Commonwealth Government will appoint an independent chairman and there will be Government and rural producer representatives on the board of the bank. Mr. Sinclair said that the establishment of the Australian Rural Bank to enable loans to primary producers to be made on terms more favourable than would otherwise be practical was a major step in helping to alleviate the cost burdens that had escalated when Labor came into office.

I stress those final words: when Labor came into office. If we want to retain things as they are we have to see that Labor does not get back into office and push this country back to where it was three or four years ago.

I listened with much interest to the member for Newland, who had much to say about education. He was reported in the *Teachers Journal* as follows:

> I started teaching in South Australia in 1963, and my first school had a staff of 18 and 350 students, which gave a student-teacher ratio of about 19·5 to 1. The staff consisted of a head-master, three senior masters, and 14 staff members, many of whom had not been trained as teachers. Apart from the two cleaning ladies, that was the entire staff; we had no deputy headmaster, no librarian, no bursar, no teacher aide, no printer, no laboratory assistant, no library aides, no groundsman, no handyman, and no office staff.

I point out to the member for Newland that I can remember when I started farming and we had horses. We took the grain out of the paddocks on a horse and dray, so there had to be some progress during that period. The following newspaper report appeared the other day

relating to the Minister of Education:

> More than 1 000 teachers will not get State school jobs next year, South Australia's Education Minister, Mr. Hopgood, said today. "On present indications the best we will be able to do is offer jobs to half the people applying to us," he said.
>
> Mr. Hopgood was commenting on the "grim situation" facing teachers. He will speak on it in the Assembly this afternoon. More than 2 000 student teachers, contract teachers and people seeking to return to teaching have applied for State school jobs.

That was an interesting report to read, having read what the member for Newland had to say in connection with education in this State. Something must have gone wrong with the planning. I turn to a press release of an address by the Rt. Hon. Ian Sinclair to the 48th ANZAAS Congress in Melbourne on Thursday September 1, 1977, as follows:

> Concern for the relevance of education to man's need is not a modern concept. It is a serious question which has occupied the minds of every generation.

Mr. Tonkin: It has been liberal philosophy since the eighteenth century.

Mr. VENNING: That is right. The release continues:

> Over 2 000 years ago the Greek Euripides made this plea to his people: "No frills in education, please; only what the nation needs." To decide what the nation needs remains the important question. For what purpose are education facilities required and provided? Is education intended simply to gain academic qualification; to pass the time; to gain personal satisfaction; or is it intended to assist students in their present or future occupations?
>
> There are people, many of them within the teaching profession, who contend that if only Government would provide more funds for education our national problems would be resolved. Wise allocation of available money and manpower resources is more to the point in today's circumstances. Education is an important community responsibility. It is important that the time and talent of students is not wasted in the acquisition of skills for which there may be no reasonable need in the future. It is important that the taxpayer is convinced the public funds he provides are not wasted in futile endeavour.
>
> The Commonwealth, in co-operation with the States, does have a responsibility to provide adequate funds. But educational institutions themselves have the heaviest responsibility; first, to mount relevant and worthwhile study courses; and secondly, to give honest information to students about employment demand for those qualifying in particular courses. Encouraging students to enter courses merely to increase a faculty's "body count" and so attract Government funding is no basis by which recruitment to educational institutions should proceed.
>
> The Commonwealth has given the lead in this field by combining three commissions previously responsible for recommending on the funding of universities, colleges of advanced education, and for technical and further education. The Tertiary Education Commission will monitor the supply of and demand for people of particular skills and recommend resource allocation changes to the Government.

That is an interesting report and there is a wealth of information in it that I hope members opposite, when they get their *Hansard* pulls, will read and learn from.

I congratulate the Governor again on his appointment. An excellent Governor with a high reputation has been appointed to our State. Sir Mark Oliphant was most outspoken on many subjects. I know that the people of the State appreciated his outspokenness, and I hope that the present Governor will be equally outspoken. One matter on which I hope the new Governor will speak up is the play *East*. I hope that the Governor will comment to the people of South Australia and continue to express himself along lines similar to those along which Sir Mark spoke. I support the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I, too, support the motion. Although there is little in the Governor's Speech to which one could reply, the Government's instruction was obviously intended to convey a message of intent to proceed with its earlier programme of legislation, otherwise the official opening ceremony would have been a farce. I could not help but note the expressions on some of the visitors' faces in the Legislative Council gallery on opening day. It was indeed a disappointment to some people who had travelled long distances to witness, in some cases, I understand, their first opening ceremony; within a few minutes, it was all over, as no doubt members will recall. The opening, in my view, was an example of formality and tradition in the fullest sense. In saying that, I do not reflect on the Governor or his predecessor. I extend respect, in particular, to Mr. Walter Crocker in his role and application to the job during the changeover period leading to the Crown appointment of Mr. Seaman.

My congratulations are extended to all members who were re-elected to their respective districts, as awkward as we know some of them are.

Mr. Whitten: Or they were.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is a case of "If the cap fits". I have never been one to extend bouquets and, accordingly, find congratulations on this occasion somewhat difficult to extend. However, to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the newly-elected Chairman of Committees, I agree that in both cases there appears to be a semblance of ability, and I think that, as the job creates them, there have already been occasions of test. On those occasions, Mr. Speaker, fairness generally appears to have come through. However, the real test will come as the Government's threatened legislative programme unfolds before members.

To the new members for Newland, Ross Smith, Morphett, and Mawson, I extend good luck. Those members on the Government side will need it, because, poised in their position between the two extreme wings of the Australian Labor Party, they must be anything but comfortable. The Premier and his righteous crew there on his near right are desperately trying to sail a middle course and present some public credibility, whereas on the other side the extreme leftists are pulling away toward compulsory unionism and industrial disruption and breakdown. I will return to the subject of unionism, South Australian style, later.

The new members for Coles and Torrens are a credit to the Parliament and, although we are in Opposition without the numbers to govern, it cannot be denied that our newly acquired members have added considerable quality to the Opposition. The ex-members for Torrens, Frome, Millicent, and Murray are a sad loss to the Opposition and, I believe, to the Parliament as a whole. I believe that they have been, during their service to this place, and will continue to be, friends of all members within the Parliament.

The ex-member for Torrens (John Coumbe) was always available, particularly to new members. I owe to him personally my thanks for the assistance he extended on a number of occasions, certainly when I first came into this place. At any time one chose to go to him, he was always ready to offer a helping hand. Indeed, he was always ready to extend praise to his colleagues when that praise was due. He was widely experienced politically, industrially, and personally, and I wish him well now with his new and charming wife in his well-deserved honourable retirement.

Claude, Murray and Ivon were, and will remain, friends of all, too. I had the pleasure to feel free to refer to those members by their Christian names, and I feel free to do so on this occasion.

Unionism in the work force, as in any other sector of the community, is an ideal. It is designed to provide unity and entitled privileges, but no rights on demand. In my view, no-one has a God-given right other than to life itself. There should be fair return for effort. Appropriate living and working conditions are paramount in a healthy, industrious and developing community, but automatic rights by socialistic or any other demand I cannot accept. My support for the principle of unionism is indeed fading, through no fault of the employees, in most cases, but simply because of the system of dictatorship which prevails and which is becoming exposed in the leadership of far too many militant trade union outfits.

Unfortunately, many of this State's genuine workers are either unwillingly locked into the system or cannot obtain employment without being a party to the closed-shop union policy that so many of our industries, such as the motor vehicle industry, retail combines, and commercial enterprises, are forced to adopt. At local government level, and in trade, commerce, industry, social welfare, even in some of the charitable organisations (indeed, in some of the apprentice training levels), right throughout the land we have the pressures of compulsory union membership creeping in. In recent years, I was elected to a national training committee, which was set up to train young people who had indicated their wish to enter the wool industry. Reaction from the Australian Workers Union was anticipated. In order to exclude no interested party, the then State Secretary of the A.W.U. was invited by the State sponsoring authority to attend those meetings.

Not only did he refuse to attend but, in most cases, he also declined to reply to the invitation. However, the message filtered through from that organisation that the trainees either had to join the A.W.U. or undertake to do so at the end of the school, or the union would boycott the scheme. The strong opposition to the training of young men was forthcoming from that union. It was claimed, without adequate survey or study, that, as there were enough men in the sheep shearing industry in South Australia, there was no need for recruits or the orderly training of apprentices.

In fact, right from the outset in this State it was our aim to improve the skills of those already involved from those nominated apprentices who had already demonstrated their desire and accepted the smell and nature of the job itself. The erosion, unfounded criticism, and reluctance to co-operate, and domination by the A.W.U. had to be experienced to be believed. Anyway, this year my committee has had a little more luck with the successor of the earlier-mentioned union secretary and, hopefully, common sense will prevail and future trainees will not be subjected to standover demands. I think most of the members would be aware of the union secretaries of the A.W.U. in this State, and I see no point in becoming personal. I am criticising the principle of dictatorship and demand by unions, and in particular by the A.W.U. (South Australian Division).

Union membership should be gained by desire of the individual and salesmanship of the union representative, and in all cases where an organiser fails to sell his product that should be the end of the subject. Indeed when convenient or at any reasonable time a union representative should be welcome to enter the site of industry, whether or not he has reason to believe that members are on the site or not and, upon identifying himself, every reasonable courtesy should be extended. But at no time should compulsion, blackmail, or threat of black ban be tolerated. There is no law requiring compulsory unionism in Australia, nor hopefully will there ever be. I am afraid too many employers are ignorant of the real position and bow to the threats mentioned above and again and again militant and standover union organisations bluff their way over the innocent. Only the other day a constituent of my colleague, the member for Victoria, received a threat of black ban on his product if his employees refused to join the A.W.U.

I do not propose to deal with the details of that case, for obvious reasons, but at the same time, as my colleague has brought that matter to my notice, let me say that there appeared in the *Naracoorte Herald* of November 17, 1977, a report on the tactics and activities of the A.W.U. organisers in the South-East, who attended a meeting of a large number of shearers. The heading of the report is "Threat of wool ban". The article states:

> South-East pastoral workers in the Australian Workers Union are threatening not to handle wool shorn by non-unionists.

The Stockowners Association representative, Mr. Dean Kelly, on that occasion came out firmly advising the growers of their rights or the opportunities they had to withdraw from responsibility or involvement in that union issue. The union organiser says they had struggled to get an award in 1902 and did not intend to see non-unionists break down the conditions. Mr. Dunnery, for the union, said the meeting had also referred the matter to the union's Federal executive because it could be a matter of national concern. The article states:

> "We'll be taking the attitude now that if we strike any shed now that is using non-union labour, we'll attempt to have the wool stopped," he said.

There are other references in that article that I will not pursue at this stage, but clearly there, reported in that South-Eastern newspaper, is the very type of threat and blackmail tactics to which I have been referring earlier in my remarks. The practice is to be deplored and, whilst supporting the principles of unionism where they can be fairly presented and sold, never will I tolerate compulsion, force or threat, nor should any other employer in the State do so, in the interests of healthy industry and freedom of speech, and the choice of the individual all of which are basic principles on which this Party firmly rests, principles which we on this side of the House proudly stand for, I repeat, but unfortunately members opposite dare not, as even their preselection would be in jeopardy, if they did so.

Max Harris in the *Sunday Mail* the other day barely touched the sides, although he pointed out the effects of how we are travelling a disaster course wih Great Britain. On the bones of their backsides they are still screaming for more money for less work—sick and weak, and the innocent work force progressively pricing itself out of a job in the process, simply under the dictation of the shortsighted and irresponsible.

Finally on this matter I plead with the grower organisations, industry and commerce, in fact all employers, to abide by the relevant awards, the arbitration and industrial court decisions and continue to upgrade the conditions and facilities for their employees, pay well those who work but ban the closed shop union policy at all levels before this nation like Great Britain is brought to its knees; and above all support Fraser's industrial relations Minister, Tony Street; a fairer man and more competent Minister in this portfolio we could never expect to meet.

However, while on the note of fairness, I should like to

place on record a short personal explanation. During a grievance debate on November 15, 1977, at page 778 of *Hansard*, I criticised the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries for his performance at the opening of a fishing industry annual meeting and generally for his poor Ministerial administration, lack of appropriate industry policy, and so on, with plenty of grounds for doing so. Amongst other things, I told this House that his Director, Mr. Kirkegaard, had agreed to send me a copy of the Minister's delivered speech. It was not forthcoming at the time I rose on November 17 and I mentioned that fact. Last week, a lady staff member of Mr. Kirkegaard's office after reading the *Hansard* pull telephoned me and explained that she had received instructions from her director to arrange for dispatch of the document. Mr. Chatterton's Ministerial secretary also telephoned and apologised and admitted that the matter had been overlooked at his office level.

We all make slip-ups from time to time; they happen to all of us. I wish to record in particular that I fully accept the situation explained by the staff surrounding the awaited document and with no reflection on those responsible. In fact, I thank those who had the guts to stand up and defend their director and Minister in the manner they did. There are a number of other matters I would like to refer to in the fishing industry. The first is a brief reference to that Ministerial speech. The Minister in his address to the general meeting of the Australian Fishing Industry Council (South Australian Branch) on October 21, 1977, said, among other things:

> The essential administrative activities associated with licence renewal and other matters of correspondence have been speeded up and we are putting a more human face on the administration of the licensing area by replacing curt letters of refusal with opportunities to explain reasons and problems in person to local fisheries inspectors.

It was a bold remark and it was a very welcome breath of fresh air, I am sure, not so much for those already in the industry but for those who are interested and may have been working in the industry but are unable to become licensed participants.

Indeed, it was an indication that the whole licensing system may have been restored from a low level within the department. I heard him make those remarks and was anxious to get the document. I could not believe that we had received press releases directly from the department about the freezing of A and B class licences in South Australia and then, within a few days, hear the Minister addressing the industrial participants and telling them that the processes associated with licence renewal and other matters of correspondence within the department would be speeded up. There was a direct conflict between the press release and the Minister's remarks at that time. However, he went on to say:

> We have cleared up many of the anomalies that existed in fisheries management policies and are discussing the remaining "grey" areas with the fisheries industry and amateur organisations. Legislation passed in the last session of Parliament now enables us to establish management for the scale fisheries and to improve enforcement procedures.

Theoretically, grand words! I hope that the department will now hurry itself into demonstrating that it has put those remarks into practice because a freezing has occurred of A and B class licences to genuine and sincere applicants who are seeking to be part of the industry. They are continually being refused those licences and are being sent off to appeal, in the main, with absolutely no success at that level.

At the same time in South Australia we are witnessing the consistent refusal to license these genuine young people who are seeking to enter the industry. We have an incredible number of recreational fishermen pushing off to sea and catching loads of fish from our natural resources around nearby coastal areas, and we have little control over their activities. The *West Coast Sentinel* of Wednesday, October 26, 1977, states that the number of boats registered as at July 1, 1976, was 37 000 and that licences have been issued to 48 000 operators. I understand that about 1 400 licensed fishermen exist in South Australia.

To demonstrate just how ridiculous the situation is, it would be fair for me to draw members' attention to the remarks made by the member for Victoria only a few days ago when he set out to demonstrate the difficulties the industry is having with the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and the difficulties our young people are having in trying to enter the industry. He referred, too, to the apparent lack of attention for the protection of apprentices and the encouragement of those who are genuinely interested in this industry and who should be given a cue rather than boat owners continually being licensed and registered so that they can push out to sea to catch fish, some of which recently have been sold on the commercial market.

Without pursuing that matter in further depth, I would sum up by drawing attention to the Raptis issue. On November 22, 1977, a report relating to the Raptis family was issued. Mr. George Raptis said that his company had no option but to move to an area where the company could develop and expand. As far as I am aware that subject has not been raised in the House, but I believe that it is extremely serious that this family, or any member of it or any part of the fish-processing business in which it is involved, should be leaving South Australia.

I was even more concerned about that issue when I read that report and ascertained that Mr. George Raptis said that the family had been let down badly by the State Government. The other day I spoke to George Raptis to try to become a little better informed about what the family had in mind for its company's processing activities. Mr. Raptis told me that he had obtained about $2 000 000 with a view to proceeding with a processing works in the Karumba district near Normanton in the south-east corner of the Gulf of Carpentaria. He was reluctant to further criticise the State Government other than to utter the remarks to which I have referred, but he did say, "We have no alternative but to get out of South Australia in order to expand our activities. There is no longer any incentive here. We have repeatedly been refused licences."

Mr. Whitten: Why don't you tell us the truth?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I can understand the reaction of members opposite. Understandably, the Government is offside with the Raptis family. The Government took Raptis to court in South Australia and to the High Court and lost.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: Only four members of the Government are in the House, and every one of them has reacted to reference to the Raptis issue because the Government has a shockingly guilty conscience. Those members know that for generations the Raptis family has been well recognised and has worked extremely hard to develop the fishing industry in South Australia by putting in an incredible effort to build up their enterprise. They have put boats to sea successfully, have done well and have employed many people, not only at sea but also on shore at Bowden and other places, such as Port MacDonnell at their lobster factory.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: Irrespective of the jealousy and of the reaction of members opposite, because this is obviously hurting them—I can hardly hear myself speaking for the reaction of the member for Whyalla, the member for Price, and the Attorney-General, who are all chipping in because this is a sore point with them. The Government was done, do not worry about that. It is a disgrace that a long-term South Australian family, irrespective of its origin, name, colour, or whatever (a hard-working family that has applied itself extremely well), has virtually been driven out of South Australia. It will be interesting to see whether the Minister of Mines and Energy, who has just entered the Chamber, will join the reaction of other members opposite.

Mr. Becker: Where do they get the bulk of their catch?

Mr. CHAPMAN: They catch fish where they can find them and have put in an incredible amount of time researching the areas in which they can find prawns. The family found hundreds of acre feet of prawns, caught them, brought them ashore and had them confiscated. You would know the story from there on, Mr. Speaker, because they were taken to court, and they won! The proof is in the pudding; they not only won their point of developing an industry but also, when challenged by the Government, they won. I believe the Government should bow out and suffer the embarrassment of that case like men and not react in the way members opposite have reacted this evening. I do not know much about processing—

Mr. Max Brown: We can see that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: —the enterprise at Bowden, nor have I ever been to Karumba in Queensland. However, all those points aside, I wish the Raptis family well in its enterprise in Queensland, whether or not it exercises its opportunity to continue to bring prawns to South Australia by sea, rail, road, or whatever, or whether it is later required to land them ashore in the Gulf country.

I hope that they succeed in their interprise and that, for as long as possible and for as long as they see convenient, we will enjoy their products back here in South Australia. I understand that for the time being the Bowden works will be retained, and hopefully sufficient licences will be issued to those interested in directing their catches to Raptis, or sufficient licences will be issued to those associated with the company directly so that the Bowden processing works belonging to the family will continue to be successful.

I refer now to transport. In doing so, I do not boast to know a great deal about that matter, but it has been interesting to learn what I have picked up so far. Since becoming the Opposition spokesman in this place on transport, the Minister has given Parliament the impression that he will co-operate in providing information, and privately he has pursued that attitude. However, questions I have asked the Minister during Question Time so far in this session have been fairly abortive. It seems that he will do and say anything in reply to questions other than give straight answers.

However, from my research and from sources outside, interesting observations have come to hand regarding the functions and financing of our State Transport Authority, particularly the bus and tram division. The House will recall the question I asked yesterday about the bus services, when I asked the Minister what was the object of the Government's takeover of Bowmans, Briscoes, and other private bus services in and about the metropolitan area since April, 1974, and I also asked what had been achieved by that takeover.

In explaining that question, I claimed, amongst other things, that the number of passengers carried on the metropolitan bus services had decreased since the takeover of the private bus operations. I also stated, after referring to the Auditor-General's report for the year ended June 30, 1977, that during the interim period the bus and tram work force had increased by more than 20 per cent, from 1 673 at the close of 1974-75 to 2 033 for the year ended June, 1977. In reply to my question, the Minister commenced by objecting to my reference to the takeover. He said that the private bus owners had each requested the Government to assume responsibility and ownership of their services, and that there have been improved services in the Southern Metropolitan Area and reflected the paucity and economic-based decision of the Briscoe operation. The Minister then claimed that the decline in the number of passengers had halted and he said:

> Since the train service was extended to Christie Downs many people who previously travelled by bus or road have chosen to travel on the better and quicker service provided by rail.

The accuracy of the Minister's answer about the bus services will require some time and research to establish. However, on my claim that the number of passengers travelling on these State Transport Authority services has deteriorated, figures I will give the House positively give the lie to the Minister's reply. The numbers of passengers carried on the Municipal Tramways Trust services and by licensed bus operators before the take-over in 1974 and afterwards until 1977 are as follows:

Year	Number of passengers
1969-70	58 500 000
1970-71	56 000 000
1971-72	56 100 000
1972-73	58 300 000
1973-74	58 800 000
1974-75	58 300 000
1975-76	58 300 000
1976-77	58 100 000

The figures for the period subsequent to the take-over are those from 1974-75. The figures in that table were taken from the respective reports of the Auditor-General and they clearly reflect the deterioration in patronage both before and since the take-over action by the Government in 1974. In regard to the claim that some bus passengers had transferred to train, the suburban journeys were as follows:

Year	No. of Journeys
1972-73	12 800 000
1973-74	12 900 000
1974-75	12 000 000
1975-76	12 000 000
1976-77	12 200 000

Therefore, the Minister's claim that bus passengers had transferred to train travel is also quite hollow, for since 1972-73, when the number of passengers travelled was 12 800 000, those loadings have also deteriorated by 600 000 during the period to 1976-77, again as reflected in the official Auditor-General's Report. It is interesting to note that in 1973-74, prior to the private bus operation take-over, the train patronage had lifted to 12 900 000, and for the subsequent years, 1974-75 and 1975-76, it sharply deteriorated by 900 000 passengers each year. The Minister's reply to my reference to the substantially increased number of personnel publicly employed in that division during the abovementioned period was simply another backhander to private enterprise, wherein he implied that the private operators were not working in accordance with the award, in that the employees were performing mixed functions.

This specific matter again reflects the expense we are

unnecessarily incurring for union demands and indeed reinforces my whole argument that, since the takeover and during the period 1974-77, our bus services in the metropolitan area have neither been integrated nor co-ordinated as officially recommended. The services have not improved in accordance with the public claims by the Minister and the patronage has deteriorated. At the same time the personnel employed and the direct financial burden on the taxpayers have skyrocketed from the State's contribution of $2 500 000 to the M.T.T. in 1973-74 to a $12 000 000 deficit in 1976-77. I will mention that matter in more detail later.

In transport, as in any other form of public service, certain ingredients are paramount. The first is adequate service and the second is adequate service at a reasonable rate which the public can afford and which will attract maximum patronage. The final matter is value for the public money so expended and provision for the annual balance of accounts of that expenditure to be clearly and publicly available, under the banner of each departmental division and clearly reflecting the State's true financial position at any time, or at least as immediately after June 30 each year as this can be arranged. This information should be available in this place so that, when the financial affairs for the forthcoming year are being debated, we will have had time to collate that detail.

My interest has been drawn to the Auditor-General's Report of 1976-77, for several reasons. I refer to the many points under the headings of "Transport" in that document, which I found extremely interesting and useful. It is the only document to which I have really had access and which reflects the recent position of the State Transport Authority's activities. I place much importance on the report, and I congratulate the Auditor-General and his staff on it.

In June, 1976, the State Government decided to salt away part of its excess revenue raised through taxation and other Government charges. The sum of $20 000 000 was salted away with the State Transport Authority. At page 493 of his 1977 report, the Auditor-General reveals that $2 880 000 was included in the receipts of the Bus and Tram Division, being interest on moneys invested in fixed deposits. This method of accounting is misleading to the public in that the true financial position of the State is not disclosed and, in this case, the division is credited with income not actually earned by it as part of its operations. Additionaly, when the $20 000 000 is eventually spent on new buses or whatever, the authority is not required to pay interest or depreciation on the funds invested. The real costs of operating the division will therefore not be known, nor will the benefits to the taxpayer be known, either.

A few days ago I asked the Minister what had been achieved since the authority became operative in 1974, absorbing the Metropolitan Tramways Trust and private bus operators. My information is comprised of details extracted fom the Auditor-General's Report, and those details have been checked and rechecked. I invite the Minister or his officers to study my comments, and I would welcome their reply or reaction to them. The State contributed $5 900 000 to the division's annual deficit in 1974-75, $8 800 000 in 1975-76, and $12 000 000 in 1976-77. The State's contribution to the M.T.T. in 1973-74 was $2 250 000. Therefore, over a relatively short period the cost of management of the authority has increased the deficit to this State by about 30 per cent annually.

Members do not have to do many calculations to realise that within a short period, if that undertaking alone pursues this type of management and has the type of losses it is now experiencing, the State will be facing losses of hundreds of millions of dollars in the authority's area alone. Eventually we will get back to a situation where the Government will try to unload that transport service just as it sold the country rail services of this State a few years ago. It will be interesting to see how the authority, when these new buses or contracts are provided, will pay the bills involved, because the funds at hand will not go far.

Taking the Auditor-General's Report a little further, I find that the acquisition costs of the 16 private bus operators taken over to June, 1977, were $4 700 000, and that the Commonwealth Government had made non-repayable grants to the division in this State of $10 000 000 since 1974-75 in addition to a grant of $20 000 000 made by the State Government in June, 1976. The division had cash reserves of $28 400 000 as at June 30, 1977, from these grants to pay for new buses on order. Therefore, in the three years to June 1977, the sum of $56 700 000 has been allocated from taxpayers' funds that the division will not have to repay.

The division also received $10 400 000 of Loan funds, and goodness knows how it qualified to borrow, exercise and enjoy Loan funds to any degree, let alone to that extent, with that sort of nest-egg in hand. True, it is recognised that during that time it will have to repay that particular Loan money referred to, as any normal business undertaking has to do.

In reply to my question yesterday the Minister suggested that I had not been very active in questioning him: he said that I asked him only two questions. If my genuine intent to obtain information on this subject has not previously been demonstrated on this subject, I hope that the Minister and his officers read this speech and realise that I am interested in it. I should now like to refer to several other matters concerning my district.

Mr. Gunn: It's a well represented district.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I thought that was taken for granted. It is taken for granted within my district, and I had hoped it was taken for granted throughout the State. Recently, I presented to Parliament a petition on behalf of the Yankalilla District Council, signed by 1 417 people who support the private retention of section 57, hundred of Waitpinga, in the name of its present occupiers, Q. T. and J. R. Wollaston, seeking that that land not be acquired by the South Australian Government as an extension of the Deep Creek Conservation Park, thereby allowing the property to remain in its present use. This is a matter of public interest. Indeed, the South Australian media have canvassed the merits of private retention and explained the case both for and against the Government's acquisition in recent weeks. I am sure that the publicity was most welcome by all parties concerned, because this young couple, who are established on this property with their family, have done much work on this site and it seems fair that they be left to continue. To draw the attention of honourable members to the specific details regarding this land, I point out that the petition contained the following information:

1. That the parcel of land described in register book volume 4027, folio 360 being lot A of portion of section 57, hundred of Waitpinga, owned by Messrs. Q. T. & J. R. Wollaston and used for the conduct of the Raywood Nursery, be not acquired by the South Australian Government as an addition to the already extensive Deep Creek Conservation Park.

2. The conduct of the nursery in its situation of virgin bushland is unique, and can have no adverse or detrimental effect on the environment of the surrounding area.

3. The nursery which is well managed, provides a ready outlet for the trees and shrubs which it produces for the needs of the district and metropolitan area.

4. It is not the intention of the owners to clear or disturb

any further land for the conduct of their activities.

5. The nursery and its surrounding park land is open seven days a week for the conduct of trade and for the enjoyment of all environmentally conscious people.

6. The owners are conservation minded, and in the planning of their activities on the land have had due regard to the placement of their service facilities in order that these will blend with the natural landscape.

I commend the district council and the ratepayers in the council area for their sincere support of the Wollaston family in its present plight, and with the benefit of that petition and of other correspondence and appeals that have been made to the appropriate Ministers in this place and in their respective Ministerial offices, I hope that the Government ultimately will leave that young couple alone, will lay off the acquisition pressure that has been indicated in correspondence from the Environment Department, and will refrain from pressuring these young people into either an unacceptable leaseback arrangement or acquisition as previously threatened.

While on the subject of national parks and wildlife, I draw to the attention of the House a situation that has concerned me, and I refer to what is apparently becoming the policy of Ministers and indeed, in this instance, it seems to be the policy of the Minister's staff. The subject of political leap-frogging as referred to by the member for Hanson today in Question Time is a serious one, and whether or not there has been a gentleman's agreement in this place in the past, I think, in fairness to members seeking to represent their districts, that when correspondence is directed to a Minister, a Director, or other departmental officers, that correspondence should be replied to direct to the member concerned, so that he may provide the appropriate reply, either with or without the departmental correspondence, to his inquiring constituent.

I wrote to the Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service, on October 25, enclosing correspondence received from a Cape Jervis constituent. I asked the Director whether his department considered that it was a requirement to make a formal application in order to retain the wallabies referred to in my constituent's correspondence, and I also asked him whether he would forward the appropriate application forms and, on their receipt and return whether he would give this family favourable consideration, or alternatively, if no official application was necessary, whether he would inform me as soon as possible. I signed that letter as I do in the usual way. I wrote to the constituent the next day acknowledging receipt of his letter, and explaining what I had done on his behalf with respect to my correspondence to the Director. I did not hear anything until this week, when I received a letter from the Director, Mr. Bob Lyons. The letter, dated November 2, states:

> I refer to your letter of October 25, 1977, on behalf of your constituent of Cape Jervis. A letter authorising your constituent to retain the two agile wallabies was forwarded on October 28, 1977, a copy of which is attached hereto for your information.

When I turned to the copy which was dated a week before (on October 28), that letter from the Director to my constituent states:

> I advise that this division has sanctioned the keeping of the two agile wallabies in your possession. In future however, it will be necessary to obtain approval from this division prior to accepting any animals which are not held by current permit holders. The above animals may not be disposed of without the approval of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife Service.

There was absolutely no reference to my having raised the subject on behalf of the constituent; no return to me, as one would expect, of the details so that I could forward them to the constituent in the normal way. I was completely ignored by the Director, and I believe that that practice is happening too often and should be stopped forthwith. I could bring to the attention of the House several similar actions, not so much the actions of Directors but by the actions of Government Ministers in recent times in practising this political leap-frogging in the way to which the member for Hanson has referred. He has instances of their going to the press and releasing the reply that is being sought before it is dispatched to the member who sought the information in the first instance.

Mr. Mathwin: They tell them to do it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am not sure what is happening, but I am aware of the result at departmental level, and this is the most recent example of it occurring to me. In this instance I am not impressed by the Director's action, whether he has been directed from the top or otherwise. It may be that he is in a state of confusion. Recently, he has witnessed the sacking of his Minister (the member for Peake) and of a senior and wellknown officer in the Environment Department (Dr. Inglis), and no doubt he is now extremely uncomfortable about the publicity about the hawking, sale, or disposal of native birds and the subsequent involvement of officers of his department in the witchhunt or search that is going on. I can understand that recently Mr. Bob Lyons may have had a fair bit on his plate. It seems that he has been associated with a department that is in great trouble.

I do not have any evidence to support or otherwise the reports that have been made recently, nor have I any evidence to back up the recent statements made by the member for Mitcham on this matter. Clearly, I am not raising these matters with the idea of demonstrating that I know more about them than I have read in the newspaper, because I do not; I am doing it simply to convey that I recognise that the Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service in South Australia, Mr. Bob Lyons, has been in a very sticky climate for a long time.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I did not intend to refer to the matter to which I will now refer until I had been rebuffed by the Minister of Community Welfare during Question Time today. The Minister was afraid to answer my question—

Mr. Slater: You answered it yourself.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is not for me to answer it, but for the Minister to answer it. The question was as follows:

> Is it a fact that two of the three inmates involved in a recent break-out from the g.g.i. Grenfell unit at McNally Training Centre on Sunday night are due to appear in the—

I made a slip of the tongue and said "High" Court, which is used in the United Kingdom, when I should have said "Supreme", and the Minister refused, and dashed into his foxhole to hide himself so that he did not have to face the question—

> on charges of attempted rape? It appears that the escapees had records of violence, rape and attempted rape, yet were housed in the Grenfell unit.

Following a technical error on my part, the Minister scurried away as fast as he could go into his foxhole, because I said "High Court" instead of "Supreme Court".

In connection with the abscondings from McNally Training Centre last Sunday evening, my concern is not particularly with the Minister but with the situation that caused these abscondings. I have so often drawn the Minister's attention to the staffing at McNally that one would have thought that the Minister would examine what is going on there. I shall be interested in the Minister's reply to a question that will be placed on notice in this connection. I understand that two of the absconders were on a charge of oral rape of one of the inmates recently in that institution, and they are to appear before the Supreme Court very soon. The problem is that the Minister allows the situation that this type of criminal is housed in this unit. Time and time again the Minister has had brought before him by me particularly the question of this type of inmate being placed not in the high-security unit. It is obvious to me and, I am sure, all other members that a criminal of this type ought to be housed in the high-security unit at McNally Training Centre.

In addition, I would have thought that, after my question of last week about staffing, particularly in connection with residential care workers, the Minister would check on the situation, particularly at McNally Training Centre. The reply to that question stated that in McNally Training Centre there is a total staff of 111 for 51 inmates: a ratio of about 2:1. At that institution there are 79 residential care workers for 51 inmates: a ratio of about 1½:1, and that is far too low for that type of institution. At Vaughan House there is a total staff of 40 for six inmates: a ratio of about 7:1. At that institution there are 28 residential care workers to six inmates: a ratio of about 5:1. Yet at McNally Training Centre the ratio in connection with residential care workers is only 1½:1. I would have thought that the Minister, if he was doing his job properly, would transfer some staff members from Vaughan House to McNally Training Centre. Of course, the position goes more deeply than that. At McNally Training Centre, as at other institutions of this type, there are some female residential care workers, and I understand from information I have gleaned that in some cases, including cases in the high-security areas at McNally Training Centre, the staff back-up is one male residential care worker to two female residential care workers.

I understand that last Sunday evening there were only two on duty in the unit—one female and one male. I also understand that one of those residential care workers was not in the unit at the time that the other person was assaulted and locked in a cupboard. I blame the Minister for this, because he is failing in his duty to this House, to his department, and to the public of this State.

Mr. McRae: How many more workers do you want out there?

Mr. MATHWIN: There are too many, as the honourable member would know better than anybody. I certainly put much store on his intelligence, particularly about this matter. He knows full well that the situation and the imbalance at these institutions is shocking. The fact that the Minister is doing nothing about it is an absolute disgrace. If he was an honest Minister he would resign on the issue. It is all right for the Minister or other members to say that it is a difficult situation and we have to deinstitutionalise these places, but even in the latest report (which of course up until its release last week was a secret report for some months, because it was brought down in July, 1977) on page 15 it states:

> . . . we recommend that the three Centres, Vaughan House, Brookway Park and McNally be closed down as soon as possible. The only possible exception would be a separate small maximum security setting for the hard-core cases, which should be separated from all other youths at an early stage in assessment.

Mr. McRae: Would you support that?

Mr. MATHWIN: One would hope that the Minister would agree with the report, yet he allows this type of hard-core youth in McNally to be mixed with less serious offenders and allows them to be out of a security situation. The Minister is to blame entirely for what happened last Sunday night, and for what could have happened to the public when we have these rapists, attempted rapists and oral rapists at large in the community. What type of description did the Minister allow to be given to warn the public? What sort of description were the police and media allowed to give of these offenders? It was that three youths who had escaped from McNally were in T-shirts, two were wearing jeans, and another was wearing brown pants. Those descriptions could fit any teenager in South Australia.

How is the public to be alerted to keep its eye open for three youths when it has a description like that, a description released by the Minister who ran into his foxhole today because I asked him a difficult question? He knew he was behind the eight-ball and seized on a technicality as a means of avoiding the question. I believe that the Minister is failing in his duty; he has now become arrogant and shows little concern for the law-abiding public of this State.

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

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): For quite some time we have been lambasted in the Address in Reply. I have listened intently to discover whether there has been any thought whatever by members opposite about unemployment in Australia and in particular in South Australia, and I have heard no member express any concern whatsoever, not even from the member for Rocky River. I have heard much about the poor man on the land and the superphosphate subsidy, and so on. The final speaker in the Address in Reply, the member for Alexandra, never expressed any concern whatever about unemployment. All he talked about was the A.W.U. What he said was complete union-bashing: he talked about dictatorship in the A.W.U., one of the most democratic unions in Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: The grass roots of democracy.

Mr. WHITTEN: Yes, it was one of the first unions ever formed in Australia and one of the first unions to be affiliated with the Australian Labor Party. He then talked very untruthfully about Raptis and Sons and the reason that company is leaving South Australia. He refused to say that Raptis was compelled to go up to the Gulf of Carpentaria to treat its prawns, because Bjelke-Petersen had made an edict that prawns caught in the gulf must be processed in the northern areas. So much for the member for Alexandra.

What I really want to grieve about is unemployment in Australia and the way in which this callous Fraser came to Government on a promise that he would reduce unemployment—jobs for all, was what he said, and that was only one of his many broken promises. At present, 367 000 people are unemployed in Australia and, in another six months, there will be at least another 100 000. About 200 000 young people will soon be leaving school, with little or no prospects of getting work, all because of the callous and deliberate policies of the rotten Fraser Government.

Mr. Mathwin: It was a happy country till Whitlam got his hands on it.

Mr. Venning: He got—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for

Glenelg and the honourable member for Rocky River are out of order.

Mr. WHITTEN: I predict that, within another six months, there will be at least 450 000 unemployed people in Australia.

Mr. Allison: You must think Whitlam is getting back.

Mr. WHITTEN: I expect him to get back; the paper in front of me carries the headline, "Gains to Labor in new poll". I can understand why the Opposition is so worried. The Morgan poll indicates that Labor leads the coalition by 47 per cent to 40 per cent, with the Australian Democrats scoring 8 per cent. One has only to do simple arithmetic to realise that, on the basis of the past two elections, without doubt the Labor Party will be in Government after December 10.

Mr. Venning: Where?

Mr. WHITTEN: In Canberra, that is where. What a mess we will have to clean up! Returning to the question of unemployment, I point out that the Commonwealth Employment Office, located at Port Adelaide, had 2 346 registered unemployed last month. This month, there are 2 440, or an increase of 94 in the past month. Let us have a look at a break-up of the figures and the concern that should be shown by the Opposition.

A total of 1 188 adult males and 295 adult females were unemployed. Of the young unemployed, 549 were males and 408 were females. For the 1 188 adult males, only 30 job vacancies existed. For the 295 adult females, there were only two registered job vacancies. For the 549 young males, there were eight job vacancies and for the 408 young females there were only six job vacancies. For the total of 2 440 people registered unemployed in Port Adelaide there was a total of 46 job vacancies

This is the pattern in the industrial areas in which the ordinary people live: they do not live in Burnside. In Port Adelaide, for every job vacancy, there were 58 unemployed people—58 people are chasing every job vacancy in Port Adelaide. In Salisbury, the same pattern exists, namely, 44 out of work for every available job. It is unfortunate that South Australia does not line up very well as far as the number of unemployed to job vacancies, but I relate that to the treatment South Australia has had from the Fraser Government, because it is patently clear that there is a reaction by the Liberals against the Labor-governed States.

To bear this out, the Australian average number of unemployed to every vacancy is only 17, but in South Australia it is 19—that is, there are 19 persons chasing every job. In Port Adelaide, which is an industrial suburb, the average is 58 unemployed to every vacancy. Whilst South Australia has a smaller percentage of unemployed compared with other States, here there is a greater number of people chasing every job vacancy. The industrial areas are more affected by recessions, and this recession has been deliberately created by Fraser in his endeavour, so he says, to curb the inflation rate; but the inflation rate has not been curbed one iota, unless we call one-tenth of 1 per cent in 12 months a reduction, because the inflation rate was 13·2 per cent to September, 1976, and now it is still 13·1 per cent. If it is said that one-tenth of 1 per cent represents a curbing of the inflation rate, I cannot agree with that contention.

As far as unemployment is concerned, I mention what has happened to the young unemployed and what may happen to them. In South Australia at Flinders University, Professor Rosemary Sarri, an American social scientist, has foreshadowed an upsurge in juvenile delinquency in Australia. With unemployment expected to be 480 000 by next year, she predicts a tragic toll of young people as a result of their not being able to get jobs. She says:

> The fact is, when you are a young adult, you have a tremendous amount of mental, emotional and physical energy and that energy must be expressed. Now, if we don't create legitimate opportunities—such as jobs—for them to provide an outlet for this energy, then they will inevitably seek other ways to achieve this end; illegitimate ways.
>
> There is a notion that if you give these kids the dole, that will somehow solve the problem,they'll sit down and be docile. But it is simply not in the nature of the adolescent to sit down and be docile.

Soon, we shall reap the backlash of what Fraser has put on to the young people of Australia. He will not give them any jobs; he puts them on the dole and the young people will react so as to become a little more unruly and will not obey the law as they should. This has been brought about by this awful Fraser Government, and I am pleased that on December 10 we shall get rid of it and have a Labor Government.

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

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): Before getting on with the matter that I wish to discuss, I wish to comment on the Address in Reply and debate the unfortunate circumstances that arose for me. I got the call at about 5.40 p.m. yesterday, but at that time the indication was that the Address in Reply debate was to finish at 6 o'clock. I spoke for 10 minutes and then, following a request in a note passed to me, I sat down to let another member have at least a few words in the debate. Unfortunately, unbeknown to me, the debate was extended to the next day. The Address in Reply debate continued and other members had their opportunity to speak for the full amount of time allowed.

As a result, I had only 10 minutes, but I hope I can catch that up as the session proceeds. I have an undertaking from the Liberal Party that it will try to give me that sort of consideration at the appropriate time. I am not criticising anyone: it is just unfortunate.

I now take up the challenge issued to me yesterday by the member for Mitcham in the Address in Reply debate in relation to the uranium issue. I have not spoken in this House before on that issue, but I should like to make my position clear. It has been reported in the Labor Party's advertisement for the coming Federal election that the National Country Party voted wholeheartedly for a motion that was before the House of Assembly on March 30. I accept unequivocally that I supported the motion that the House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and, unless and until it is so demonstrated, no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

On March 30 no-one objected to that motion in this Chamber. I fully supported it and still do. What annoyed me was that on March 30 the Premier on television stated that that motion was, in effect, a ban on the mining of uranium for a long time. He was questioned about what he considered would be needed to be demonstrated adequately for the mining of uranium to be considered safe. He said that it may never be adequately demonstrated. The questioner then asked whether that, in effect, was placing a total ban on uranium mining, to which the Premier replied, "It could be interpreted in that way". That is where I and the resolution of the House part company.

I do not believe that anyone could interpret that as being a resolution of this Parliament that it should abandon for all time the mining of uranium. I believe that it has been demonstrated adequately since it was suggested

by the Premier that uranium should be stockpiled at Roxby Downs. I appreciate that difficulties exist in separating the ores, but it has been demonstrated that uranium mining can be tolerated to that extent.

In that context, the Government has already violated the motion that it moved and was passed on March 30. Therefore, we should ask ourselves why the uranium issue is an issue at all. It is simply that the world is facing an energy crisis: it must have energy. It seems that the nuclear age is the only way now of catering for that energy crisis. Soon I will refer to all the possible alternative energy resources that exist. No matter what South Australia or Australia does, we are in a nuclear age.

I understand that about 180 nuclear reactors are operating throughout the world and that they will operate totally independently of whatever Australia does. The same waste problems, handling problems, the same threats of sabotage and blackmail will still exist. All the problems that have been mentioned about mining uranium in South Australia now exist, regardless of what South Australia does.

I understand that there are about 600 nuclear power plants in various stages of development throughout the world. By the time the nuclear power stations that are on the drawing board and in various stages of construction are operating, about 800 nuclear power stations will be operating throughout the world. What South Australia does will not matter one iota in relation to the problems associated with the nuclear industry.

I think it is Indonesia that has a nuclear reactor almost completed. To my knowledge that country at this stage has not signed a contract for the supply of uranium for that reactor. At least, until a few weeks ago it had not done so. We have a neighbour with a nuclear reactor wanting fuel for it. That country knows that its neighbour has fuel for it but the neighbour at present is unwilling to supply the fuel because the conditions set down are such that it is not a proposition. That country may say, "If you cannot let us have some uranium, are we going to buy all your other commodities and be interested in your other produce?"

It gets back to international resource diplomacy as to whether we should share something if we have it. The real problem is not so much in the nuclear reactor, but what happens after that. Already, there have been threats of the development of the fast breeder reactor. That reactor can use the waste from present nuclear reactor for the production of power. The world problem is that, if the fast breeder reactor is developed, the waste from that is one of the most dangerous things known, namely, the plutonium. I understand that this is akin to the nuclear bomb, so the world must do everything it can to retard development of that reactor. If Australia, by farming out its uranium resources in a careful and controlled way, can stave off for a decade (hopefully for two decades) development of the fast breeder reactor, it will be playing a valuable part in the energy crisis in this world.

Hopefully, by that time, other energy sources can be devleoped to the extend of being able to be used successfully. I understand that at one stage Brazil was negotiating to purchase a fast breeder reactor, but I think it was Canada or the United States, one of the supplier countries, that stepped in and said, "We will supply the uranium if you will use a nuclear reactor rather than a fast breeder reactor." I could mention the other energy sources available to us, the fossil fuels. All right, use them too.

I think solar energy is the most hopeful one that we could expect. I do not think the wind resource can be developed to the stage of being an efficient unit. Most of us recall the old Windlite, the Dunlite and Freelite lights that were operating with the 32 volt system. We could not have that in the metropolitan area. Every house would need five windmills to keep the power supply going, and that is ridiculous. We could think of tidal power. These have possibilities, but the real problem—

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

Motion carried.

At 9.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 24, at 2 p.m.