HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 24, 1977

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

PETITION: BUILDER'S LICENCE

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 25 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to grant a builder's licence to Mr. K. Cowey to enable building and renovation work to be carried out at Yunta.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOUNT GAMBIER EFFLUENT

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition signed by 1 072 residents of the South-East of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to give all consideration to providing secondary treatment of effluent from Mount Gambier so as to keep the ocean waters safe for bathing and to retain unrestricted access to beaches in the South-East.

Petition received.

MOUNT GAMBIER ROAD SAFETY INSTRUCTION CENTRE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the Mount Gambier Road Safety Instruction Centre.

Ordered that report be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

At 2.5 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.43 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House on November 23, to which His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:

> I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the first session of the Forty-third Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

BELAIR PRIMARY SCHOOL

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: On the basis of the anticipated opening enrolment of 671, it is proposed to appoint two additional teachers to Belair Primary School for the 1978 school year. The staff will comprise Principal, Deputy Principal, 26 teachers and librarian.

URANIUM

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say why the firm Urenco is currently considering and assessing Queensland and South Australia as two of the most favourable sites for the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in Australia, if in fact the Premier accurately conveyed the South Australian Government's position on uranium (that is, as strictly following the Labor Party line) when he spoke to company officials in Adelaide last month? The Premier said yesterday that he told the company that the Government's policy would stand until such time, if ever, as technologies for the safe disposal of atomic waste could be found and adequate international standards to the satisfaction of this House could be enforced. The Minister of Mines and Energy admitted last evening on commercial television that this really meant that it was not the House but the Labor Party that had to be satisfied. The fact remains that a major overseas company is still apparently of the opinion that South Australia should be considered as a possibility for uranium enrichment, even in the face of what the Premier reported yesterday that he said to the company representatives last month.

It is patent that the company's understanding of the Premier's position on uranium is that he considers himself currently bound by the rules of his Party, but that he hopes and expects these to change, quite possibly soon after the election. The Premier's current stance on uranium is now drawing national criticism and condemnation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now commenting.

Mr. TONKIN: —as being misleading, fraudulent and hypocritical.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The account I gave to the House of my remarks to Urenco was perfectly accurate.

Mr. Millhouse: They don't seem to have acted on it.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the honourable member that the officers of Urenco believe, according to what they put to me, that international arrangements and safe technologies will be developed in the time span which is not a short one—

Mr. Millhouse: What is it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —which could be conceivably considered in relation to the development of a uranium enrichment plant.

Mr. Tonkin: If ever, in your opinion?

Mr. Millhouse: What—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has asked his question, and the honourable member for Mitcham is out of order once again, and I hope that he will cease interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am talking not about my opinion but that of officers of Urenco. The Leader has quoted those officers, and they have stated that they believed that evidence concerning safe technologies and international arrangements would develop. My answer to that was that at this stage the Government of South

Australia has no evidence that would give us any confidence in that fact. That is the position stated to officers of Urenco. I said that, if they had evidence, they should supply it to us. We do not have evidence, and we have sought evidence as to current technologies and, indeed, we have sought it not only from the Atomic Energy Commission but also from the Federal Government.

Mr. Tonkin: You did say you expected—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has asked his question, and is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not expect that there is, in the foreseeable future, the possibility of the development that Urenco is talking about, not on the evidence that we now have.

Mr. Millhouse: What is its time span?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It did not give a specific time span but, at this stage, the gas centrifuge system of uranium enrichment has not been finally proved as viable, anyway. It is not a question of being able to say that a final feasibility can be developed on a uranium enrichment plant using the gas centrifuge system. We are up with the technology at present in knowledge, but we are not in a position to put a specific time span on it, except to say it could not be short. Again, several companies involved in exploration in South Australia look on the development of uranium over a considerable time span. This, I think, is what has induced some of them to proceed with some exploration activities, although I may say that others have ceased all activity in exploration.

Mr. Tonkin: You say you've given them no encouragement?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have given them no encouragement whatever. The position of the South Australian Government—

Mr. Millhouse: But they're going on—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham. I have asked him to stop interjecting, and the same thing happened yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position of the South Australian Government is perfectly clear. It will not allow the mining or treatment of uranium for sale to a customer country in this State.

Mr. Tonkin: At this time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, at this time certainly and in the foreseeable future. The condition for any change in that policy was the condition contained in the resolution of this House. I had thought that the Leader was of the same opinion. I do not know when he changed that opinion, because I have this document here, entitled "Uranium declaration: the People's Right to Decide", which states:

> The final decision on the mining and export of uranium must rest with the Australian people, after a full public discussion. The Fox report pointed out the many dangers, hazards and problems associated with nuclear power. Those include:
>
> 1. the increased risk of nuclear war;
> 2. the real prospect of nuclear theft, sabotage and blackmail; and
> 3. the lack of any safe means for permanently disposing of high level radioactive wastes from nuclear power plants.
>
> The Fox report also pointed out that uranium mining would create very few jobs and make very little contribution to national income. Moreover, in Australia uranium mining would have harmful effects on Aboriginal land culture and the natural environment. Because of these and other problems, we the undersigned call on the Australian Government to:

The first paragraph is crossed out.

Mr. Tonkin: Yes, exactly.

The SPEAKER: I do not want to have to warn the Leader, but he has asked a question, and then asked more questions. I hope he will cease interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The document—

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Leader. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The document continues:

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

Then the document is signed. The first signature is "David Tonkin", then some Taylors, one of whom is Brian Taylor, and other signatures. That document was signed in May of this year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And there hasn't been a decision—

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

Mr. Chapman: Of course he is.

The SPEAKER: So is the member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is quite clear what the Leader is about at the moment. Recently, there have been some rather embarrassing disclosures federally to the Liberal Party, including the fact that the Federal Treasurer has involved himself in activity which would be illegal in South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: What about you digging your garden?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order, also.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The attention of the Federal Government has been directed to me to try something of a diversionary tactic, and the result has been what is an outright lie by the Prime Minister. I have here a press statement released by the Prime Minister.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this State has referred to the Prime Minister as having expressed an outright lie. That is, I think, unparliamentary language. I think that the Premier has been a member of this House long enough to know that one does not refer to members in this House or any other Parliament in these terms.

The SPEAKER: I assure the Leader that the Speaker will ask the Premier to withdraw the word "lie", but I must say that many honourable members have used that word. This occasion will be a precedent for the future, so I hope honourable members will not use that word.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I withdraw the term and say that the Prime Minister has issued a statement which is a deliberate and known untruth. The Prime Minister's press release states:

> The advertising campaign against the Federal Government's uranium decision led by the South Australian Premier, Mr. Dunstan, has not prevented him from uranium development within his own State.

There has been no uranium development in South Australia since the motion that was passed in this House—none whatever, and the Opposition knows that perfectly well.

Mr. Becker: A few explorations, that's all!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not uranium development, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra, and I assure other honourable members that interjections will have to cease.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No-one possessing an exploration licence in South Australia can proceed to uranium development. There has been none of any kind, nor will any take place, and that kind of untruth is just the sort of thing we can expect from the present Federal Government.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

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

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

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

CHRISTMAS DAY

Mr. SLATER: As Christmas Day this year falls on a Sunday, can the Attorney-General say at what hours hotels and clubs will be permitted to trade on that day? I have received several inquiries from people relating to this matter. To my knowledge, hotels which normally open on a Sunday and which provide dining-room facilities will be permitted to trade as on a normal Sunday. I understand that clubs that hold a section 67 permit will be precluded from opening, as it is specificially provided in the permit that they are prohibited from trading on Good Friday and Christmas Day. I understand that clubs that hold a full licence (and this is an area of contention) are subject to the provisions contained in the club licence. I ask whether, if such clubs provide dining-room facilities to their members on a Sunday, they will be permitted to open on this Christmas Day. I want to clarify the position for the clubs, hotels, and the public generally as regards liquor trading on Christmas Day.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member ought to receive thanks from all members and from the public for raising this matter so that full clarification can take place and everyone in the community will be fully aware of what will be the licensing provisions for Christmas Day. As the matter involves not only hotel trading hours, which are relatively simple, but also the matters of fully licensed clubs and permit clubs, I think I ought to prepare a full report and bring it down next week so that all members may be fully advised about the exact situation that will occur as a result of Christmas Day falling on a Sunday this year.

URANIUM

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy envisage any more large-scale mining activities in the Adelaide Hills in future and, if not, why have licences been granted for exploration over a large area of the Hills? The current activity in the Hills area is causing considerable concern among landholders, and the Gumeracha council has been approached to allow exploration on the town oval and the adjoining parklands. The discovery of minerals in quantity could lead to pressure for their exploitation, and obviously the company is conducting the search on the basis of the likely exploitation of any discovery. The Hills residents and landholders are concerned to retain the natural beauty of the ranges, and indeed all Government planning and inquiry seem to be directed to this end; in fact, the Monarto commission is currently conducting an inquiry into desirable land use to preserve the character of the area. If then there is no liklihood of large-scale mining activity in the Hills, why were the licences issued?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I made clear right from the start, that, before any kind of mineral activity could take place in any part of the Hills, whether it be further quarrying, the extraction of copper or gold, or anything else, the Government would require the most stringent environmental conditions to make sure that there would be no environmental damage. I think that members should be aware that we have had enough problems as a consequence of the activities of Nairne Pyrites, where the community has been left to clean up the mess, to ensure that in future any kind of mining activity in the Hills will be subject to the most stringent conditions.

Regarding uranium, the legal position under the Mining Act is that, if people are prepared to meet the conditions that are reasonably laid down, the Minister is not able to refuse to gazette a proposal for the issuing of an exploration licence.

Mr. Dean Brown: That is—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is no distinction in the Mining Act between an exploration licence for uranium and an exploration licence for any other mineral.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will you amend the Act?

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member may be out of order, but the Government will be amending the Act to ensure that it has the legal power to prevent any kind of uranium development should it be considered by the Government that it is in the public interest so to do. That will be the kind of proposal that is put before this Parliament.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Not exploration?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Regarding exploration, it is not possible to say that an exploration licence can be granted for copper but not for uranium or thorium, or some other radioactive substance. What does an exploration company do if, like Western Mining Corporation, it is looking for copper and finds copper and uranium? Does it keep it quiet and pretend it is not there? Members know that that is nonsense, and obviously it is appropriate that the Government should allow exploration and the community should know what is there. We have a basic right to know what is there.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There's nothing unsafe about the knowledge.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If there is any possible future risk to our water supply in the watershed areas of Gawler and Kersbrook, we should know. We know from the exploration that took place in the 1950's that there are radioactive substances in the Hills.

Mr. Millhouse: That's pretty specious.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not specious at all. The member for Mitcham gets warned a lot, but that does not stop him—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Becker: You're a dobber, Hudson.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about warning in the question. The honourable Minister is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did not expect the member for Hanson to defend the member for Mitcham.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members should be aware that there are radioactive substances in the Hills. That has been proved previously. We do not know the extent of those substances, and we do not know the extent of them in the watershed areas. Quite apart from any other reason, we ought to give—

Mr. Dean Brown: Why did you give the licences?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I suggest that if a company is willing to spend the money in searching and is prepared to provide, as one of the conditions of an exploration licence, that any information it gets will be provided to the Government, members opposite would want to make sure that I spent the company's money rather than the taxpayers' money. Even the member for Davenport I am sure, in one of his sane moments, would agree with that proposition.

Mr. Dean Brown: I am sure that the company in a sane moment equally would at some stage expect—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is out of order. He will have a chance to ask a question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Let me make quite clear that every company that is exploring specifically for uranium in this State understands the Government's policy that no uranium development will be permitted until we are satisfied that it is safe to export uranium to a customer country. Any exploration is undertaken entirely at a company's own risk.

Mr. Dean Brown: But they'll—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has interjected four times during the honourable Minister's reply. I hope he will cease doing so.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Government's position is quite clear: it is completely consistent with any petitions that have been signed by members on this side of the House. It is not the case, however, that the position of members opposite on this matter is consistent with the petitions they have signed and the votes that they have recorded in this House. If there is any hypocrisy, humbug or double dealing it comes from the Leader and some of his colleagues; I exclude the member for Hanson.

RAILWAY CENTENARY

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether there is any plan to recognise the centenary of the Adelaide to Semaphore railway service? Reliable records indicate that on January 8, 1978, the railway service between Adelaide and Semaphore will have been operating for 100 years. Is it contemplated that a train pulled by a steam locomotive will be used to recognise this momentous occasion?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I understand that the Australian Railway Historical Society is trying to arrange a suitable function to commemorate the centenary. I do not have details of that now, but I will obtain what information I can for the honourable member.

CONVENTION CENTRE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier inform the House of the names and tender prices of the four groups that were interviewed by the steering committee examining the 27 proposals from various consortia groups to carry out a feasibility study for a major convention, trade, exhibition, sports and entertainment centre, and whether all the tenders were examined by the Auditor-General or whether only the four short-listed or the two finalists were examined?

Mr. Wells: Who wrote this for you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: It was not your man; it was one of mine. The four groups were referred to in a document released by the Premier with his press release on this subject on Sunday, August 7 last. The document listed two names and tender prices but did not give details in relation to the other two groups. Those listed were Cheesman Doley Neighbour and Raffen Proprietary Limited (a tender price of $55 000) and Llewellyn-Davies Kinhill Proprietary Limited (a tender price of $75 000). I understand that at least one of the four tenders was significantly lower than the accepted tender. No indication was given whether the Auditor-General sighted all 27 proposals, the four short-listed proposals or only the two proposals referred to in the document in which details were given. The tender of Cheesman Doley Neighbour and Raffen was recommended by the Government. The document, signed by the Premier, states:

> Subject to any comments you may wish to make, I propose to recommend the acceptance of the tender submitted by Cheesman Doley Neighbour and Raffen Proprietary Limited.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Without looking at the docket, I do not remember whether the four groups or only the last two went to the Auditor-General, but, so far as my memory serves me, only a short list went to the Auditor-General. The reason for this was that, when all the tenders had been examined, the other proposals were found to be unsatisfactory: some of them were quite hopelessly unsatisfactory.

Mr. Dean Brown: In what regard?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport must cease interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not just a matter of price: it was a question of what would be the nature of their investigation and report. That was looked at by a committee from my department which came up with a short list. After further examination it was decided that it was in fact between two tenderers—

Mr. Mathwin: And you recommended the final one.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of the final two tenderers between whom it was, there was a significant difference in price, but those were by far the two outstanding tenders as to mode and nature of investigation and report. Some tenders were received from interstate and some from South Australia which quite frankly dismayed me because of their inadequacy. I saw some of them, and really they were not very good. We would not have let a tender upon the basis of some of the submissions which were made. I do not know precisely what the honourable member is getting at here, but I suspect it is because one of the members of the firm concerned is a known supporter of mine publicly, but some of the members of that organisation are not. I point out that it is a highly reputable organisation which has received contracts awarded by a whole series of Governments of the honourable member's political complexion as well as mine.

Mr. Tonkin: It was not the lowest tender though, was it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not the lowest of all tenders: it was the lowest satisfactory tender.

Mr. Mathwin: You have to categorise it.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The recommendation by the committee was that finally it was between two tenders. The facts of the investigation were drawn to the attention of the Auditor-General with the file. The Auditor-General was then asked whether he raised any objection to the course which was proposed and which had been recommended to him, and he had no objection.

NON-URBAN RAILWAYS

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether agreement has been reached with the Federal Government regarding the date of the transfer of non-urban railways in South Australia to the Australian National Railways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Finality has not yet been reached, although there is more than a reasonably good chance that it may be reached next Thursday, when I am meeting the Federal Minister (Mr. Nixon) for the second time within a month.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Probably the last time.

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When we last met at the end of October we were able to identify the outstanding matters that required the attention of officers and the Ministers. The problems associated with those matters that could be resolved by the officers are proceeding at a fair rate, but three or four matters which require Ministerial decisions are still not finalised. I hope that those decisions can be determined by the Federal Minister next Thursday. If they are determined, we will then be able to set a declaration date in accordance with the legislation so that the transfer may be completed.

PENSIONER ACCOMMODATION

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister for Planning state the Government's policy on the provision of pensioner flats through the South Australian Housing Trust and what is the present situation in relation to rental grants homes, particularly in rural areas? This is a real issue in many country centres, and the position has been highlighted by a letter I have received recently from a constituent. This person, who is an invalid pensioner, applied to the Housing Trust, and in her letter to me she stated that she had been informed by the trust that the waiting time for a house was about two years. Yesterday, after an interview with a trust officer, she was told that the waiting time could be at least four years. I believe that this is a deteriorating situation in which the waiting period is increasing year by year, especially in relation to pensioner cottages and flats. Some people are not able, because of their incomes, to enter into a contract to purchase a rental-purchase house, and I believe that this is so serious a situation that I ask the Minister what is the Government's policy in relation to this matter and what can the Government do about overcoming the problem.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: For some years the South Australian Government, in conjunction with the Housing Trust, has provided funds for pensioner accommodation over and above any assistance we get from the Commonwealth Government. The level of support now is about $1 000 000 a year. Inevitably, there has to be a limit to this level of support, because the rentals that can be charged for pensioner accommodation, if borrowed money has to be used, mean that substantial losses are made. There has been a Commonwealth scheme of support for pensioner housing, but that scheme ended on June 30, 1977. It was a three year scheme, and under it we were involved in receiving a given amount each year. We pressed the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Minister for a new arrangement to apply as from July 1 this year, but that request was refused, and all that was provided for 1977-78 was the same amount as had been provided for 1976-77, the same amount that had provided for 1975-76, and the same amount that had been provided for 1974-75. We were told that the introduction of a new scheme would be deferred by one year.

The longest waiting lists in the metropolitan area for any form of accommodation are for pensioner housing. The wait used to be up to eight years but is now down to five years or six years in the metropolitan area. In country areas the time is less. I point out to members and to the general public that it is not reasonable to provide additional pensioner accommodation, even using the State funds provided to the Housing Trust, in country areas at the cost of extending still further the already longer waiting time in the metropolitan area. I think it is proper that waiting times in the metropolitan area should be a bit longer than those in country areas, because the alternative forms of accommodation are much less in country areas than they are in the metropolitan area.

However, I ask the member for Chaffey to get on to his Federal Liberal colleagues and demand of them that we receive a reasonable deal on finance for pensioner housing in future. What is Mr. Giles doing on this issue? What has he ever said or done about it? Will the member for Chaffey ask Mr. Giles to make this an issue and to go public on the matter, if necessary, if his Party colleagues refuse to perform? What will members opposite do with Mr. Fraser, Mr. Anthony and all those with family trusts? What will they do as part of the policy on pensioner housing?

Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for ordinary housing, the Fraser Government has the most rotten record of any Government in the history of Australia. During three years 1975-1977, with the worst inflation on record, it has kept the amount of money constant, and there has been an increase of 4 per cent for 1977-78. The biggest increase and the best scheme we have ever had was under the Whitlam Government, and when we have had a 50 per cent increase in building costs we have pleaded (and even the Liberal Ministers have pleaded) with Mr. Newman and the Federal Government—

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —and what have they got out of it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nothing! The worst record of any Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order. He knows that he must resume his seat when the Speaker is on his feet. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: The point of order that I take is that the immediate precedent in this House when a Minister has started a debate in a political manner is that you, Mr. Speaker, have called the Minister to order and asked him to answer the question in a reasonable manner. I ask you to continue that practice, if that is the precedent that you intend to continue in the House.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I hope the Minister will refrain from bringing politics into his answers to questions.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Every honourable member is disturbed as a consequence of the approaches that come from constituents about the waiting times that exist for public housing in this State. That matter is not peculiar to South Australia; it is repeated in every State in the Commonwealth, and it is a consequence (not just in the pensioner housing area where the waiting time is longer but in the ordinary housing area) of the overall attitude of the Fraser Government, which has maintained constant, in money terms, the amount of assistance given to the States under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and has refused to match the increase in the cost of building

homes by increasing funds available under that agreement. I must say this in conclusion; the worst offender in supporting the rotten policies of the Fraser Government—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —is the Leader of the Opposition.

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

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's true.

The SPEAKER: Order!

MATRICULATION EXAMINATIONS

Mr. KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Education try to ensure that students in the present matriculation examinations are not disadvantaged by errors made by the Public Examination Board? In one of the schools in the Tea Tree Gully area, mathematics students were given a sheet of mathematical information along with the examination paper. In many cases, that sheet was printed on both sides. In some cases it was printed on only one side. There was no indication, such as an instruction to turn over, which would indicate that there was more information, which these students did not get. The difficulty with these kinds of errors or misprints is that different students are differently affected, not only in terms of knowledge but in the differences in the ways in which they react under examination stress, and I ask the Minister to investigate.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for drawing this matter to my attention, and I will certainly take it up with the Chairman of the Public Examinations Board.

URANIUM PROSPECTING

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what undertakings or guarantees have been given to the company currently prospecting for uranium in the North-East of South Australia and in particular in the Crockers Well area? It has been brought to my attention that a large company is carrying out exploration work in the Olary area, and I understand that that exploration work is in the area where the South Australian Government conducted uranium mining some years ago.

I understand that 10 people are currently employed on this work. I want to know from the Minister what undertaking has been given, because obviously this company is spending a considerable sum of money on doing this field work. I believe that it would not conduct that kind of operation unless it had been given a firm undertaking that, if it found uranium, it would be permitted to mine it. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether this is not in conflict with the current policy stated by him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked the question twice.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I ask the honourable member to name the company.

Mr. Gunn: Esso.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I state unequivocally that no undertaking of any description has been given to Esso Exploration or to any other company in relation to this matter—none whatever to Uranerz, to Esso, to Western Mining Corporation, or to anyone else. To every company exploring for minerals or for uranium in South Australia, it has been made clear that, if they happen to discover uranium, they will not be permitted to exploit that discovery until such time as the Government is satisfied that the mining and export of uranium to a customer country will be safe. That has been repeated time and time again.

Mr. Gunn: You don't expect us to believe that?

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do expect legitimate, honest, and straight non-crooked members of the Opposition to believe it, but whether I expect the member for Eyre to believe it is another matter.

Mr. Gunn: Are you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am reflecting on you.

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

Mr. Gunn: That's a—

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

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. WHITTEN: My question, to the Minister for Planning, concerns the Port Adelaide redevelopment scheme. Can the Minister indicate what stage negotiations have reached with the Port Adelaide Joint Committee regarding amendments to the planning regulations that may be necessary for the redevelopment of Port Adelaide to proceed? The sum of $903 000 has been made available by the Government for the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. Many people in Port Adelaide are gravely concerned and are anxious to hear any further announcement that can be made regarding future plans.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As it is about two weeks since I have had any report on this matter, I think that I had better obtain detailed information and provide it to the honourable member as soon as possible rather than attempt an answer that may be inaccurate.

PORT LINCOLN FIRE

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Marine report to the House on the extent of the damage caused by a recent fire in the bulk-loading gantry at Port Lincoln and say whether such damage will unduly affect the completion and operation of those loading facilities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The fire certainly will not affect the final performance of the facility. As the honourable member would know, it has already been completed to the stage where it is possible to load at the rate of 2 000 tonnes an hour, and we are doubling that capacity to 4 000 tonnes a hour. However, some modification will be necessary to the silo complexes in order to keep up to the rate at which that facility can load grain ships. I believe that the fire resulted from a spark from a welding machine in an enclosed space. Although I have seen some details on the fire, I am not certain of the extent of the damage. However, I will obtain a detailed report and let the honourable member know exactly what is the situation and the extent and cost of the damage.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. BANNON: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House of the current position regarding Commonwealth funding of the upgrading of the Stuart Highway between Adelaide and Alice Springs, and say whether he

has had any communication from the Federal Minister for Transport regarding this? Hidden away on page 9 of today's *News* is an article headlined "No Stuart Highway cash, says Minister". The article goes on to explain that the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) told a meeting with tourism, trade, and local government officials in Alice Springs that the Federal Government would not provide extra money this year for upgrading the Stuart Highway between Adelaide and Alice Springs. He went on to say, according to the newspaper report, that in the preparation of the next Budget the Federal Government would look very carefully at making an allocation to South Australia and, most interestingly, that he would have talks with the State Transport Minister (Mr. Virgo) in the near future on the upgrading of the Stuart Highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know of no talks that are proposed. I would be happy, however, to have talks with Mr. Nixon on this, as long as he has some money and not too much gas.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The most important error in the whole report, if it is a factual report, is that Mr. Nixon said he would give consideration to providing money in the next Budget. I do not expect that Mr. Nixon will have anything to do with the preparation of the next Budget. I would hope that, after December 10, South Australia will again start to get a fair deal in relation to Federal funds.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Honourable members opposite know, and certainly the former shadow Minister knows only too well, that South Australia suffered this financial year a reduction in real terms of 10 per cent of funds from Canberra under the Nixon-Fraser-Lynch Administration. No matter which way it is looked at, that statement cannot be argued about. The situation simply is that, under the terms of the present legislation, we are suffering a reduction from $17 200 000 to $15 000 000 in this financial year for national highways. A road programme cannot be run in the same way as turning a tap on and off. The Government has had to put nearly $6 000 000 from State funds into the national highways programme—$6 000 000 that should have been spent on roads needed in the rural and metropolitan areas. That cannot go on. Quite frankly, unless and until Canberra provides South Australia with a fair allocation of funds, the prospect of building the Stuart Highway is, to say the least, bleak. Until we get a Federal Minister who is sympathetic to the States, I do not think there is any hope for any of the States. Mr. Nixon certainly is hostile to each and every State, including those with Liberal Party and Country Party Governments.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier, and he will be relieved to know that it is not on the uranium issue.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir; I am just reassuring the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Government propose to honour the promise in the A.L.P. policy speech at the recent State election, which was as follows:

> The Government will introduce legislation to require members of Parliament to disclose their pecuniary interests to the extent necessary to ensure that no conflict of interest occurs between their private activities and their public interests.

If the Government proposes to honour that promise, when will it do so? As I have said, I do not propose to deal with the uranium issue: having raised it—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must stick to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am happy to let the Labor Party and the Liberals tear each other to pieces.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will withdraw leave if the honourable member does not stick to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not say anything more about that. In the Australian Democrats policy speech I expressed support for that undertaking by the Premier and stated:

> We agree with that but we go further and advocate a register of payments in and out of the funds of all political Parties.

I hope that the Premier will also consider doing that as well as his Federal colleagues did when they were in office between 1972 and 1975.

The reason for my asking the question is that in the past few days, sadly, we have had much publicity and controversy about the activities of a former Liberal Minister in particular and now that has been broadened to include other Ministers as well. Therefore, the time is ripe, I suggest, for us in South Australia to ensure that the same sort of thing does not happen here. It rests, of course, with the honouring of that undertaking by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The policy will be honoured. I expect the Bill to be introduced into the House soon; in fact, a recommendation concerning it will be going to Cabinet on Monday.

Mr. Millhouse: Will it be introduced this session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be this session. I suggest to all honourable members that it will not be long before a requirement of full disclosure affects them. I can assure the honourable member that work has been proceeding, and had been proceeding for some time before the revelations concerning the Federal Treasurer and enormous speculative profits in land dealings hit the press. I believe it is proper that members of Parliament should disclose their interests, although I am not aware of and I do not believe there has been any improper activity by any member of this Parliament.

I believe that South Australian Parliaments and Governments of all political complexions have been markedly free from any sense of scandal or any suggestion that there has been peculation of any kind, or any improper activity, on the part of anyone. I believe that that is a South Australian tradition. However, I also believe that it is vital that that not only be the case but that it be seen to be the case, in the public interest.

The matter of political Parties' funds has also been under examination. As the honourable member would know from experiences in other countries, many problems are associated with that matter, and there needs to be an examination of the history in other countries of political campaign funds. Some other countries have found that the best solution to this problem is to prohibit private campaign funds entirely and to provide from the public purse a certain sum that is the limit that can be spent.

Whether we can achieve that in South Australia I cannot say; that aspect will be the subject of a subsequent investigation. We have been investigating it, but that investigation is not complete. Regarding the undertaking

that was given in the policy speech, the measure will be introduced into this House soon during this session.

At 3.40 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a joint committee to which all consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the joint committee being appointed the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions.

That Mrs. Adamson, the Attorney-General (the Hon. P. Duncan) and Mr. Groom be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I know that it is unusual for a member to speak on this motion, but I do want to say one or two words about it because, frankly, it annoys me to see it on the Notice Paper. It is now not only a formality but a complete dead letter. I have made inquiries and now understand that it is about 30 years since this committee actually met. When I was a new member I was put on this committee and thought that it was something pretty good. I think I was on it for 15 years, and it never met in my time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Well, that was good.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not quite sure how to take that interjection; perhaps the Minister will elucidate it if he takes part in the debate. As I say, the committee has not met for about 30 years, because the practice of having consolidation Bills has fallen into disuse; we just do not have them now. It seems, among all the clutter of procedure in this place and in another place, that we could dispense with that part of the procedure that is obviously superfluous. This is such a procedure. I know that the problem we have in that regard is that we have Joint Standing Order No. 18, which deals with consolidation Bills. Until that is repealed there is some obligation, I accept, that we should have a committee like this. Surely to goodness after all this time someone could take some initiative to get rid of at least this committee.

The only significance the committee ever has is that members' names sometimes appear on the back of the Notice Paper when there is nothing else to put there. That is an utterly absurd situation. Some people outside Parliament regard with some justificaiton our procedures as absurd. If we can do anything to bring the procedures up to date and to get rid of what is unecessary I suggest we should do it.

I do not oppose the motion. If what I have said is correct, we are under an obligation to appoint the silly committee, but I do ask that the necessary procedures be undertaken to repeal that Joint Standing Order (I believe it will mean a joint meeting of both Houses to do it) so that we will not have to go through this annual farce.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industries Development Act, 1941-1977. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes amendments to the principal Act, the Industries Development Act, 1941, as amended, in accordance with recommendations from the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation established under that Act. Briefly, the amendments—

(a) change the name of the corporation to a name that will cause less confusion with a Federal body of a similar name; and

(b) remove what are felt to be some unnecessary constraints on the activities of the corporation and the committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by enlarging the definition of "industry" to include "overseas industry", as defined, and by presaging the change of name of the corporation to the "South Australian Development Corporation". The specific need for enlarging the definition of "industry" has arisen in relation to consulting services from South Australia where in several developing countries Government involvement is required by the Government of the developing country. If we are to have joint undertakings of this kind (and it is important for South Australia to develop its consulting services in overseas areas) it is essential that this change be made.

Clause 4 amends section 10 of the principal Act by removing a constraint on the power of the Parliamentary committee, that is, the Industries Development Committee, to consider matters referred to it by the Treasurer. At the moment the committee may only examine applications for guarantees, grants or loans, and it is felt desirable that the committee should be empowered to report on any matter relating to assistance to industry, that is, any matter which is referred to it by the Treasury. The need for this obviously arises in such cases as the development of the Riverland Development Fund and the investigations into rationalisation of industry that have taken place there. It cannot be confined to matters of the examination for guarantees of grants or loans.

Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to the principal Act arising from the proposed change of name of the corporation. Clause 6 amends section 16a of the principal Act by formally changing the name of the corporation to the name adverted to above. Clause 7 amends section 16f of the principal Act, this being the provision of the principal Act that permits the corporation, with the approval of the Treasurer, to borrow moneys under a Treasury guarantee. At the moment, subsection (5) of this section provides that the maximum amount that may be borrowed by the corporation shall not exceed $5 000 000. Since each borrowing must be individually approved, an arbitrary maximum for the total borrowing seems quite inappropriate.

Clause 8 amends section 16g of the principal Act by slightly enlarging the powers of the corporation in two

areas, first, by the proposed insertion of paragraph (ba) in subsection (1). It is made clear that the corporation can purchase shares on the open market. At the moment a legal view has been taken that it can only purchase shares on the initial establishment of a company. That was not the original intention of the legislation. It was intended when the legislation was introduced that, if a company needed additional capital by way of the corporation's taking up share capital, it should be able to dispose of a certain part of its equity to the corporation. That was clearly forecast when the original Bill was introduced. However, the view of the Crown Solicitor has been that the wording of the Bill confines it only to the taking up of shares which have never been previously allotted or which are indeed only on the formation of a new entity.

Dr. Eastick: Or to be created?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; it would be a separate company. It would have to be newly issued shares and a new creation. That was not the original intention of the Act, and it has confined the activities of the corporation in an area where there was a sensible proposition about the acquisition of a certain area of equity at the behest of a particular company.

Secondly, the powers of the corporation to investigate and report have been enlarged to cover the same area as that proposed to be dealt with by the Parliamentary committee (as to which see clause 4). In addition, the limitation on the maximum amount of assistance that can be provided by the corporation to any person or company has been raised from $300 000 to $1 000 000. This is specifically necessary in relation to the Riverland area. The corporation has already lent to the limit of $300 000 in that area, and in the provisions which are being made for rationalisation in that area a significant extra sum will need to be provided. This limitation on the working of the corporation now is quite unreasonable and, with some larger concerns now coming to the corporation than was originally the case, it was obvious this limitation should be extended. It has been sought by the board of the corporation and the Government entirely agrees.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

REGIONAL CULTURAL CENTRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Cultural Centres Act, 1976. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It allows a trust established under the principal Act, the Regionl Cultural Centres Act, 1976, to deposit funds not immediately required by that trust with the Treasurer or to invest such funds in a manner approved by the Treasurer. Section 13 of the principal Act provides that a trust established in accordance with the Act may, with the consent of the Treasurer, borrow money. Unlike other Acts that establish statutory corporations and provide them with borrowing powers the Regional Cultural Centres Act does not provide an investment power. It should have done so. This Bill remedies that situation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enacts section 13a to provide for the deposit of any funds not immediately required by the trust with the Treasurer or the investment of those funds in a manner approved by the Treasurer.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act, 1959-1976, the Crown Rates and Taxes Recovery Act, 1945, and the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Early in 1977, the Minister of Lands (who then had the administration of this Act) established a committee of inquiry to investigate the problems that the ratepayers of the Eight Mile Creek apparently had. The ratepayers' main concern was with the drainage rates levied under the Act, which they considered placed them in a serious financial position. This Bill seeks to put into effect the various recommendations made by the committee, all of which are also eagerly sought by the ratepayers themselves. The rating provisions of the Act are to be brought into line with the South-Eastern Drainage Act provisions, in that assessments of unimproved land value made under the Valuation of Land Act will be adopted for the purposes of this Act. A maximum rate of seven-tenths of one cent in the dollar is provided for in the Bill. As the Act now stands, there is no specified maximum, whereas the South-Eastern Drainage Act provides for a maximum of three-tenths of one cent. This has long been a cause for dissatisfaction on the part of the Eight Mile Creek settlers.

I have given an undertaking to the Eight Mile Creek ratepayers that the Government will not at any time increase the proposed maximum rate to an extent that the difference between that maximum and the maximum specified in the South-Eastern Drainage Act would exceed the current differential of four-tenths of one cent. This undertaking also arises out of a recommendation made by the committee. The Bill also seeks to give the Eight Mile Creek ratepayers the right to vote at elections for members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, as it is this board which performs the functions of the Minister under the Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 deletes definitions that will now be redundant. A "rating year" is simply any year commencing on May 1 and ending on April 30 next. Section 882 of the hundred of MacDonnell is excluded from the operation of the principal Act, because in fact no drains service that particular area of land. "Unimproved value" means value as determined under the Valuation of Land Act. Clause 4 provides the Minister with a power of delegation.

Clause 5 provides a new, relatively simple, rating provision. A drainage rate must be declared each year on the unimproved value of the holdings. The rate declared must not exceed seven-tenths of one cent for every dollar of the unimproved value of those holdings. The rate declared each year is only to cover the cost of putting into effect the purposes of the Act. Each landholder is liable to pay his proportion of the rates within thirty days of receiving the rate notice. Clause 6 provides that 10 per cent interest (the current rate) will run on rates that are

overdue by more than thirty days. Clause 7 recasts section 14 so that it reads more concisely and clearly. Clause 8 repeals two sections. The provisions of section 15 will be covered by a simple amendment to the Crown Rates and Taxes Recovery Act. Section 16 is now redundant. Clause 9 provides that regulations may be made for the purpose of requiring landholders to remove obstructions from drains. The existing penalty of $100 for the breach of a regulation is increased to the more realistic level of $500.

Clause 10 amends the Crown Rates and Taxes Recovery Act. Rates under the Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act may be recovered under this Act. Clause 11 amends the South-Eastern Drainage Act. Eight Mile Creek ratepayers are given the entitlement to vote at elections for members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board. A reference to the Lands Department is deleted, as this Act in now administered by the Minister of Works. The board itself must now make the relevant plans available for public inspection.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It amends the principal Act, the Planning and Development Act, 1966, as amended. It is essentially an interim measure and is intended to deal with two matters necessary to maintain effective control of development during the period over which the Government is considering all aspects of control of private development. First, the Bill extends from 5 to 8 years the period during which interim development control may apply to land. There are some 20 local council areas, particularly in the metropolitan and Adelaide Hills area, in relation to which, in the normal course of events, interim development control would cease to apply in 1978 and many more in 1979. Thus, unless zoning regulations are prepared for those council areas so as to come into operation at the time their interim development control power expires, those councils would be bereft of development control powers.

Preparation of zoning regulations is a lengthy and costly process taking at least 12 months and frequently several years. It also requires the application of considerable resources by both the relevant council and the State Planning Authority. Accordingly, it is unlikely that all councils will be in a position to meet the present deadlines that arise from the expiration of interim development control in their respective areas. Moreover, in view of the current inquiry into the control of private development it would be most inappropriate to insist that councils prepare new detailed zoning regulations at this time given that the form of development control may change substantially as a result of the inquiry. A number of councils have expressed concern at the prospect of having to replace their present interim development control procedures with permanent detailed zoning regulations until the results of the inquiry are known.

Extension of interim development control will enable councils to continue their present means of development control for a further limited period until the results of the inquiry are known. This, however, will not inhibit any council which wishes to prepare zoning regulations if it wishes so to do. The second measure dealt with in this Bill is intended to ensure that land subdivision and resubdivision plans conform to the relevant authorised development plan and planning regulations for the area. Development plans are the major vehicle for stating policies for future development and they include policies for the division of land. However, at the present time only the State Planning Authority (and, on appeal, the Planning Appeal Board) are entitled to consider the provisions of development plans in the determination of subdivision applications.

The State Planning Authority is at present bound to consider whether land subdivision applications, in a limited number of metropolitan zones, conform to the metropolitan development plan and regulations. The Director of Planning must refuse approval if the authority considers that the subdivision application does not conform to the plan. No similar testing of applications against relevant development plans applies in respect of resubdivision applications or in relation to any division of land outside the metropolitan zones adverted to above. This amendment will deal with that position by providing that in all areas the Director of Planning will be required to assess subdivision and resubdivision applications in the light of the relevant development plan and planning regulations and he will be required to refuse non-conforming applications. Since the Director will make that assessment it will no longer be necessary for applications for subdivisions in prescribed metropolitan zones to be considered by the State Planning Authority. As a result some time-saving in the processing of those applications will occur.

Apart from this time saving, the benefits of the amendment will be—

(a) to ensure that future division of land conforms to the policies contained in development plans and planning regulations which have undergone the processes of public consultation and Government endorsement; and

(b) to ensure that the Director of Planning is entitled to test all land division applications against the development plan as indeed the Planning Appeal Board is at present entitled to do on appeal.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 41 of the principal Act by striking out the limitation on the period for which land may be declared to be under interim development control and substituting therefor a maximum period or periods aggregating eight years running from the first day of December, 1972, this being the earliest day on which interim development control could be imposed by regulation rather than by proclamation. In addition proposed new subclause (2b) validates any existing declarations relating to interim development control to the extent that they may be defective.

Clause 3 repeals section 45a of the principal Act. This section provided that where a plan of subdivision related to a "prescribed locality", as defined within the Metropolitan Planning Area, the Director of Planning was required to submit the plan to the State Planning Authority for an expression of its view as to the conformity of the plan with the purposes, aims and objectives of the Metropolitan Development Plan and the planning regulations made thereunder. If the authority came to the conclusion that the plan of subdivision did not so conform

the director was obliged to refuse his approval of the plan. It is proposed that for section 45a there will be substituted a new section 45a providing that this examination as to conformity with the relevant authorised development plan will be extended to cover all plans of subdivision and re-subdivision coming before the director and in the interests of prompt decision-making this examination will be undertaken by that officer, with the usual provisions applying in relation to notification of decision, reasons therefor and appeals.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 17. Page 888.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. There is no doubt that the first purpose of the Bill is to make it more difficult for people who operate what one might call sex shops in Adelaide, by restricting their activities concerning the exhibition of films to people they have claimed in the past to be prospective customers. In the past the police had great difficulty in proving whether or not they were genuine customers interested in buying the film or whether the sex shop was being used as a small theatre for what some people would consider to be pornographic films. There is no opposition to that, and there is support for increasing the penalty from a small $200 to $1 000. I think some people would argue that $1 000 is not substantial enough for those who go to extremes in this area.

The third point made by the Premier, and one of the most important, concerns a provision that was asked for in this House when the original Bill was introduced, and refers to having greater control over the type of film shown in drive-in theatres, especially where the drive-in theatre screen can be seen by people driving past or living in adjacent houses. Some films are offensive to some parents who would like control over what their children see, and they have had to keep the children inside the house with blinds drawn on the side of the house facing the screen if they wanted to try to stop the children seeing what was on the screen. Also some of these films would be offensive to adults. I give credit to the Government and to the Premier for this move. However, I am disappointed that, when this matter was referred to in the previous debate (and I think the Hon. Mr. King was then Attorney-General), it was strongly argued that this position should be covered so that greater protection could be given to that section of the community that did not wish to see, or have the family able to see, the more crude and what the Premier described as explicit matters of sex and sadism exhibited on the screen. This is a sensible and sane move, and for that reason the Opposition supports the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I bring to the attention of the House the important issue of industrial relations. I have no doubt that most, if not all, of the industrial laws and legislation and all the threats to deregister trade unions that have been introduced and advanced by the Fraser Government have brought about a marked deterioration in industrial relations in Australia. The concerted attacks on trade unions have reinforced my opinion that we are dealing with the most reactionary Federal Government that Australia has had since the Second World War. We need only examine the record.

On February 1, 1977, the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr. Street) announced a Cabinet decision to approve the establishment of the Industrial Relations Bureau, commonly known as the industrial police force. Then came the infamous Trade Practices Act. I say "infamous" as it attempted to throw the net over the general legitimate activities of all the Australian trade unions. This was followed by the Commonwealth Employees (Employment Provisions) Bill, which has never been proclaimed because of its doubtful constitutional validity. More importantly, it has not been proclaimed because the Federal Government knew that the legislation allowing the Government to stand down dismissed or suspended public servants was unworkable.

Then on Friday, October 21, 1977, the Federal Government pushed its controversial amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act through the Australian Senate. It is my understanding that no Government Minister spoke during the four-and-a-half hour debate on this Bill in the Senate. It was guillotined through the House of Representatives the previous day, and the debate in the Senate, which incidentally was a special sitting, ended when the Government applied the gag and forced the Bill through all stages without further debate. That, in my opinion, is a grave and crude way of handling a complex piece of legislation that is aimed at completely destroying the traditional role of the trade unions in Australia.

It is quite clear that the Commonwealth Government's approach in its tactics is to shift the blame for Australia's economic troubles from the Government and private enterprise on to the workers and to make them pay for fixing our economy and those of certain foreign countries. Much can be said about the profits of large companies such as Utah, the B.H.P. and many other giant corporations. However, it is not my intention to deal with that aspect now. The legisation and the industrial issues to which I have referred clearly show that the Fraser Government is hell bent on a continual stream of anti-trade union action. At the same time, it tries to convince and hoodwink the people into believing that it is really doing something about improving industrial relations in Australia. We need only look at what the Prime Minister said in his election campaign speech the other day, as follows:

> The Labor Party is trying to obstruct Australia's development. They are partners in obstruction with extremist union leaders. The extremist-led unions are all affiliated with the Labor Party. They all pay money to the Labor Party. They all help decide official Labor policy.
>
> We have shown that the public can be protected, that a fair and resolute stand can work. It worked in the air controllers' strike, in the postal workers' dispute. It worked against the A.C.T.U.'s uranium moratorium—they backed down. And in the Victorian power dispute, it was our move to deregister the unions involved that led to the strikers returning to work.
>
> We have been the first Government to pass laws protecting individual unionists and give responsible rank and file unionists the chance to make their voices heard.
>
> Secret postal ballots for union elections are now compulsory. We have set up the Industrial Relations Bureau to protect the public interest and also to act as an industrial ombudsman. Unions are now required to tell their members how union dues are spent. We are protecting individuals against being forced to join unions against their will.

> Responsible unionists have welcomed these laws. Only the extremists and the Labor Party have fought against them. These laws will not change things overnight. But over time they will have a major impact.

He went on to say much more. That statement is a load of trash and untruths. I think that the elections held recently in Greensborough and in Queensland clearly show that the people will not accept those antics and union bashing, and that the nation will express the same feeling in the ballot box on December 10.

I agreed wholeheartedly with the member for Davenport when he told the Liberal Party trade union discussion group, formed at a meeting at Liberal House on Greenhill Road on Monday, July 25 this year, that trade unions were an essential part of the overall system of industrial conciliation and arbitration within Australia, and that it was time that many Liberals reassessed their total opposition to all forms of trade unionism.

We continually hear from Opposition quarters about the necessity for and the importance of trade union training. The need to educate workers in trade union affairs, procedures, rules and the conduct of meetings is the cry. Repeatedly, we hear the trade union movement criticised for not paying enough attention to educating their members and for not advising members of their rights and privileges in accordance with the rules and, of course, when industrial disputes occur that criticism continues.

The matter of trade union training is yet another area that is being savagely attacked by the Fraser Government. On March 30 this year, the Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr. Tony Street, announced an inquiry into the future development of trade union training in Australia. That news release was as follows:

> Mr. Street said that the concept of trade union training and Commonwealth financial involvement had bipartisan support. However, there are a number of major issues on which Government decisions are required in relation to the future directions of development. He had raised a number of these issues when the trade union training legislation was before the Parliament in 1975. Since trade union training is currently being funded almost wholly by the Commonwealth, the Government understandably wishes to have the benefit of an independent examination before it is irrevocably committed to a particular approach.
>
> The inquiry will examine in particular: the desirability of integrating trade union training into industrial relations training generally and the closer integration of trade union training with the general education system; the role, membership and staffing of the statutory authority concerned with trade union training; and the cost and methods of financing trade union training. The full terms of reference are attached.
>
> The Government has asked the inquiry to report urgently so that its recommendations are available when the Government is considering the 1977-78 Budget estimates for trade union training.

I refer now to the Budget speech delivered by the former Federal Treasurer, Mr. Lynch, and particularly to that section thereof entitled "Labour and employment". It can be seen under the subheading "Trade union training" that in 1975-76 $3 000 000 was actually spent on that item. In 1976-77, $6 300 000 was actually spent, and it is estimated that in 1977-78 the sum of $2 900 000 will be spent on trade union training, which represents a decrease of $3 400 000. That shows how much importance the Federal Government places on trade union training in Australia.

The Australian Council of Trade Unions and the trade union training authority were, to say the least, surprised at this announcement. The Federal Government did not consult with the A.C.T.U. or with any of the constituent bodies of the council.

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

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): In the brief time that is available to me, I should like to talk about the business of this House, the way it is arranged, and particularly about private members' business. I draw attention to the fact that we are now debating the motion to adjourn, which was moved just before 4 p.m. this afternoon. We have already gone through all the business of the day, having dealt this week with far more than the business set down on our time table for the week. I protest in the strongest possible terms at the attitude that has been displayed by the Deputy Premier, as Leader of the House, and by the Government Whip. Most members will recognise that the Address in Reply debate is a most important part of the proceedings of this Parliament.

It is a traditional debate during which every single private member who wishes to speak should have (I will not say does have) the right to speak for up to an hour on matters affecting his own district and policies of the Government—policies in this case that were put forward at the recent election. Normally, the Address in Reply debate goes on for a minimum of two weeks or more. In past years, the average time has ranged between 20 and 25½ hours. The Address in Reply debate at the beginning of the last session of the Forty-second Parliament lasted, I think from memory, 25 hours. The situation then arose that an election was called before time, and we found that the Address in Reply debate was basically curtailed, much in line with the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened the first session of this Parliament.

It seems to me that there is no argument at all for curtailing the Address in Reply debate simply because one has already been held this year. That argument has been used by the Deputy Premier, but it will not stand up to examination. Not only is this a new session of Parliament but there has been an election. This is an entirely new Parliament, with new members and a new constitution. There have even been some Cabinet reshuffles. The Address in Reply has been spoken to by all of the Labor Party new members, and I understand by all members of the Labor Party who wished to speak, but it is most unfortunate that there has been so much difficulty in getting adequate time for Opposition members who wished to put a point of view on behalf of their constituents.

Mr. Wotton: The time just wasn't there.

Mr. TONKIN: The time just was not there. The member for Alexandra's excellent speech last evening concluded the Address in Reply debate. However, it was only after the most vigorous discussion and only because the Government had been proved to be totally out in its calculation of the time available that the Address in Reply debate was concluded at all. The two Whips agreed last Wednesday evening that we would be prepared to sit past the normal adjournment time of about 10 p.m. to allow more of the members who wished to have their say to speak. As a coincidence at the time, the Upper House sat until after 12.30 a.m. There was no reason whatever why that could not be done. Although the Whips agreed on the matter, the Deputy Premier said "No": he was going home at 10 o'clock, and that was the finish of it, regardless of the rights of freedom of speech in this House.

We found then that we were under extreme pressure, and the Deputy Premier, to do him credit, telephoned me and said that he would agree to the Address in Reply debate going on last Tuesday afternoon. The Address in Reply did go on, although the member for Flinders

curtailed his speaking time, as did other members. Every speaker wanted to say more than he said, but did not have the opportunity to do so, and the time available was curtailed. At 6 p.m. on Tuesday, we were told that that was the end of the matter: the Address in Reply would not go on and would not continue until the end of the session.

Then, on Wednesday, as you will well recall, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty arose that private members' business, which had been scheduled for that afternoon and which the Deputy Premier had said would be on that afternoon, was not on, because of the technical fact that it cannot be held until the Address in Reply has been dealt with. Rather than agree to the proposition that the Address in Reply debate should continue yesterday afternoon in what otherwise would have been private members' time, the Government insisted that we go on through not only the business that was on the time table that had been agreed to by the Whip, the Deputy Premier and Deputy Leader at the beginning of the week, but also that we should consider several other Bills that had not been scheduled.

We did deal with them; by and large, there was not much in them. Now we are in the ridiculous situation of having run out of Government business and having been able to finish the Address in Reply debate last evening, when, indeed, if we had been sensible and the Government had seen reason and had not been pig-headed and arrogant, we could have gone through the Address in Reply debate in a sensible and civilised fashion, got through all the business scheduled for the week and more (and we would have been happy to do it), and still had the opportunity to debate private members' business yesterday afternoon as we should have done.

That would have been fair, reasonable and proper, but the Government and particularly the Deputy Premier have been absolutely adamant, irrational and unreasonable in the approach to this whole business. Members opposite, particularly the Chief Secretary, are laughing about this, but the Government is showing, in its emerging arrogance, that it regards Parliament simply as an unnecessary impediment that must be put up with. It must go through the motions, but Parliament is regarded as not very important. This Government would rather govern without Parliament; it finds Parliament a nuisance. It finds the traditions that you, Mr. Speaker, and, I hope, all other members uphold so well in this House to be irksome, and it would like to see the end of them. I believe that the Parliamentary system of democracy that we have is a real safeguard that we must uphold at all times. We must uphold the traditions of freedom of speech and freedom of expression, and the privileges we enjoy in this place of being able to say freely what we believe to be the truth. The Address in Reply debate and private members' time, which are times not only for the Opposition but for all members to speak on behalf of their constituents, must not be curtailed.

I believe that you, Sir, know and understand that full well, and I appreciate your support for those traditions. In my mind, there is no question but that the Government is becoming arrogant. That arrogant attitude and the Government's contempt for Parliament will ultimately bring it down. I hope that the people of South Australia realise what is happening.

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

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): Last evening the member for Price, in the adjournment debate, spoke of the policies of the Fraser Government and their disastrous effects on the work opportunities of the Australian people, particularly young people. I want to substantiate those remarks and point out to the House and the people the effect that these policies have had on the Australian work force.

An examination of unemployment statistics since 1948, when the Commonwealth Employment Service (or the appropriate service at that time) first began publishing labour market figures, highlights the dramatic collapse in the employment situation in the past two years. From 1948 until August, 1974, Australia-wide unemployment rarely exceeded 2 per cent of the work force and often fell below 1 per cent. By May, 1976, 5·17 per cent of the work force was unemployed. In February, 1976, 62·2 per cent of the Australian population was in the work force, and a year later the figure had dropped to 61 per cent. Of the 193 000 persons attaining workable age (that is, over the age of 15 years) who entered the work force, 63 000 joined the work force and the rest were unemployed.

It is clear, therefore, that in the past two years there has been a steady decline in the employment situation. The depth of the Australian unemployment problem is perhaps best illustrated by this comparison. In May, 1974, one person was employed for every vacancy registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service. Today, the score is 16 unemployed for every vacancy. This proves that the economic policies pursued by the Fraser Federal Government have had a disastrous effect on the Australian worker. The figures available (although I believe there are more people unemployed than the figures show) reveal that the number registered for unemployment is a post-war record of about 350 000, which is 6 per cent of the total work force of Australia.

In September, 1974, when our friend Malcolm Fraser was shadow Minister for Labor, he said that the Government should pay the minimum wage to the unemployed if the number of people out of work reached 250 000. By that time it would be almost impossible for those people to get a job.

Dr. Eastick: He said that at about the same time as Mr. Cameron was going to resign when that happened.

Mr. SLATER: We all know the attitude of the member for Light. I understand that, when he read *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, he thought Simon Legree was the hero. The Federal Government in office has not followed the statement made by Malcolm Fraser in 1974; on the contrary, it has penalised one group of people in relation to unemployment benefits. I refer, of course, to school leavers. It has chosen to discriminate against those persons entering the work force for the first time by refusing benefits to them during the school vacation if they have registered for unemployment. This situation applies, of course, despite a court ruling which established the right of the school leaver to unemployment benefits if registered during that time. The words of Fraser have a very hollow ring to the people who have been affected by the policies his Government has established over the past two years.

According to the former Treasurer, Phillip Lynch, an over-generous dole is one of the reasons for unemployment. Let us look at some comparative figures in other countries for single adults where unemployment payments are made on a percentage of the average weekly earnings. I refer to an article published in the *National Times* of July, 1977, headed, "The dole—too high or not high enough?" The article contains the quotation from Phillip Lynch, to which I have referred, that an over-generous dole is one of the reasons that unemployment is so high. This view is not shared by the author of the article, who thinks unemployment benefits are not high enough and should be increased.

The following figures show the percentage of average

weekly earnings paid as unemployment benefits to single adults in other countries:

Country	Percentage of average weekly earnings
Denmark	65
France	56
Germany	66
Netherlands	80
Norway	38
Sweden	82
United Kingdom	38
U.S.A.	52

At the time the survey was undertaken to obtain these figures, the average unemployment benefit for an unmarried adult was 23 per cent of average weekly earnings. Therefore, the argument advanced by Lynch and others that the unemployment situation was created by people unwilling to work was purely hypothetical; they could not prove that that was the case. Further, it is generally accepted and well known that Australia's unemployment is not evenly spread, and some groups suffer more than others. Young people suffer disproportionately because of unemployment. Whilst the under-21's comprise about 15 per cent of the work force, they account for about 40 per cent of the unemployed. The prospects for young job seekers are profoundly depressing. Indeed, the prospects for school leavers next year are even worse than in previous years.

As I have already stated, the policies that have been pursued are not likely to improve the situation, especially if the Fraser Government is returned to office on December 10. The younger generation is likely to be affected for some time to come unless there is a reversal of the economic policies now being undertaken. A Gallup poll recently conducted showed that 72 per cent of the persons surveyed regarded unemployment as the most pressing national problem of concern to them. However, at the time the poll was undertaken the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle) initiated further measures relating to the payment of unemployment benefits in arrears. People who become unemployed and register for unemployment benefits for the first time must now wait at least three or four weeks before they receive a cheque. What are they supposed to do in the meantime?

In the short time remaining to me I should like to refer to the cost to the community of the high level of unemployment. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved directly in benefit payments, and similar amounts indirectly through lost productivity. I refer to the cost to the school system of potential school leavers who remain in the classroom. Further, I refer to the $100 000 000 cost to the Federal Government in 1976 to educate 5 500 graduates who are unlikely to find employment.

The experience of being unemployed is one of hardship, frustration and demoralisation. Indeed, I believe the policies that have been pursued by the Federal Liberal Government have grossly affected the Australian work force, and will have a continuing deteriorating effect on young people for many years to come. I refer to the social ills resulting from unemployment, and, although I do not have the opportunity to pursue them now because of the shortage of time, I am sure the opportunity will present itself if the Fraser Government is elected on December 10, something I very much doubt.

Motion carried.

At 4.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 29, at 2 p.m.