

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, March 9, 1978

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Licensing Act Amendment,
Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 2.3 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendment No. 1:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist upon its disagreement.

As to amendment No. 2:

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

Page 5, lines 16 to 21 (clause 18)—Leave out subsection (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(2) The Commission shall not give an approval under subsection (1) of this section, unless it is satisfied—

(a) that the relevant advisory trade committee for the trade in relation to which it is proposed that the approval shall be given has recommended that the approval be given; and

(b) that if the approval is given, the opportunities for persons, not being proposed mature age apprentices, to be apprenticed in the relevant trade will not be unduly restricted.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 3 to 9:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist upon its disagreement.

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. I would like briefly to explain the relevant amendments. By amendment No. 2, the Legislative Council insisted on the deletion of the clause in the Bill which obtained the unanimous approval of the trade committees. Included in the amendments is that the Apprenticeship Commission had the authority to judge the industrial situation with relation to adult training.

The conference was conducted in an amicable manner. Both Houses were keen to try to obtain some solution to this problem, because they were both on the one course in trying to give the opportunity to adults to retrain themselves. I have always thought that that is a proper thing. Amendment No. 2 simply means that, rather than having an absolute decision by all members of the trade advisory committee, it will now be necessary only for the committee to have a majority decision on which to

recommend something to the Apprenticeship Commission. Under the second provision, (b), approval is then placed in the hands of the Apprenticeship Commission and it is its job to ascertain that the normal junior apprentices will not be disadvantaged in any way and be prevented from being trained because of adults being brought into any industry. I am delighted with the results of the conference, and I have no hesitation in recommending new subsection (2) (a) and (b) to the Committee.

Amendments Nos. 3 to 9 related to penalties. The amendments recommended to the Committee for acceptance mean that the Government's amendments will be deleted and in their place will be the new amendments made by the Legislative Council in the first instance, which have been based upon the C.P.I. increases over the period since the previous time the penalties were increased. I found myself in a position where not to concur with that provision was difficult, because I am a total supporter of total wage indexation. I remind members that that is the policy of the Government and I hope that, in future circumstances, that procedure may be further discussed in any future matter before the House.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I, too, support the recommendations of the conference. Eight of the nine amendments put forward by the Government dealt with the penalties. They would have increased the penalties from \$100 to \$500, but it was agreed at the conference that the figure will now be increased from \$100 to \$250. I was delighted at the conference to see that the Minister was prepared to accept this. The Minister was a good chairman of the conference: he compromised and conciliated, and I have never seen him in such a congenial mood and prepared to give away as much as he was prepared to do on this occasion. I think the Minister conceded eight and a half amendments out of the nine that the conference considered.

I am pleased that the Minister has accepted the amendment on the maximum penalties. I found it strange when I was debating this matter in Committee previously that, when the amendments were moved, the Minister did not see fit to adopt the principle of a full flow on of C.P.I. as it relates to the penalties under this legislation. I am delighted to see that he has now changed his mind on that and is prepared to accept the recommendation of the Upper House. It is not often that we get the Minister to concede such points, but he has done so today.

The other and more important aspect of the Bill dealt with the permission that needs to be sought before a mature age apprenticeship can be given to any individual. The history of this matter is worth reiterating. The Bill as originally introduced by the Minister required all members of the Trade Advisory Committee to give their consent before there could be a mature age apprentice. It was amended by the Government after the Liberal Party had put forward its amendment. The Minister's first amendment was that it would be a unanimous decision of all those present at the meeting. The Liberal Party did not put any such restriction on it at all, but simply allowed mature age apprentices, and allowed approval by the Apprenticeship Commission of each individual case. The Upper House amended that just marginally. Its amendment was that there should be provision by the Apprenticeship Commission but that, in granting such approval, it must be ascertained that apprenticeships for juniors were in no way threatened by the introduction of mature age apprenticeships.

The Minister rejected that proposal, but finally he has conceded that he is prepared to accept that what we ask for is a democratic decision: in other words, simply a majority decision of the advisory committee. He turned

that down last time, but, to show the extent to which the Minister was prepared to compromise and conciliate this morning, he accepted that principle.

I can accept the final recommendations of the deadlock conference that there should be simply a majority decision of the Trade Advisory Committee and, if that is approved, then it needs to be approved by the Apprenticeship Commission to make sure again that apprenticeships for juniors are in no way threatened. In supporting the motion, I congratulate the Minister on one of the few occasions when he has been prepared to give so much and to compromise to such an extent.

Motion carried.

PETITIONS: MINORS BILL

Mr. WILSON presented a petition signed by 282 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that deprived parents of their rights and responsibilities in respect of the total health and welfare of their children.

Mrs. ADAMSON presented a similar petition signed by 206 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: PETROL RESELLERS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT presented a petition signed by 55 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that could cause petrol resellers to trade seven days a week until 9.30 p.m.

Mr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 96 electors of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

In reply to **Mr. ARNOLD** (February 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The high salinity levels in the water at present entering South Australia result from the accumulation of inflows of saline ground water in the reach of river between Wentworth and Merbein during the low flow period. Rains in the upstream irrigation areas during the week January 4-11 resulted in a drop in irrigation demands, and water which had previously been released upstream in anticipation of normal demands caused this saline water to move downstream. The anticipated peak salinities at the principal irrigation

offtakes will be of the same order as those experienced in December last, and irrigators, especially when using overhead sprays, should seek advice from officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. The peak is expected at Renmark in mid to late March, Loxton in late March, and Waikerie in early to mid April.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government has made any recent review of the disastrous rural situation caused by three successive years of drought in South Australia, and is the Government now planning to reduce interest rates for drought relief loans to help alleviate the situation that is adversely affecting the already serious economic position of the State? Over the past three years of drought it has been calculated that the South Australian economy has suffered a loss of farm revenue of more than \$250 000 000 in diminished returns from grain, meat, and wool alone: for example, the value of grain to the South Australian economy has dropped from \$190 000 000 in 1975-76 to \$72 000 000 in 1977-78. In fact the total sum is probably more than \$250 000 000, because of the other categories that have not been taken into account.

The loss of this money has had an adverse effect on secondary industry shown in reduced demand for machinery, motor vehicles, and white goods, and transport is also affected. Measures to relieve the economic difficulties of the primary sector not only support the welfare of drought stricken rural communities, but pay off significantly in helping to stimulate secondary industry, and, in particular, the private sector. At present the South Australian Government is charging 4 per cent interest for drought relief loans on money granted interest free by the Commonwealth Government. A rate of 2 per cent is considered quite sufficient to cover the State's administration costs. There is no reason for the State Government to make a profit out of the rural community's misfortunes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no way that the Government is making a profit from the misfortunes of the rural community. The assistance given in drought relief is constantly under review by the Government, and discussions are going on concurrently. However, I shall take up with the Minister of Agriculture the honourable member's suggestion in relation to the interest rate situation and let him have a specific reply next week. Also, I am interested to see that the honourable member is at last ascribing to some other cause than the Government's actions some of the difficulties that are facing the South Australian economy.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether he saw the report in today's *Advertiser* under the heading "S.A. attacked over highway"? If he has seen that report, does the Minister believe that Mr. Nixon may have been less than accurate in statements accredited to him? Yesterday, in Federal Parliament, the reply of the Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) to a question from that very popular and competent member for Grey (Mr. Laurie Wallis) was reported, as follows:

The South Australian Government had done nothing to upgrade the Stuart Highway, the Minister for Transport (Mr.

Nixon) said yesterday. The Federal Government was giving \$20 000 000 for national highway construction in South Australia this year, he said. But it suited the political purposes of the South Australian Government not to make funds available for the Stuart Highway because it did not think there were any votes for it in the Northern Territory. The statement is so obviously ludicrous that I wonder whether the Minister would answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I should mention to the honourable member that during his question he asked whether a newspaper report was inaccurate: that is not admissible. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did see the report in the paper this morning, and I wondered whether our pleas to Mr. Nixon had borne fruit, in that he had increased the allocation to South Australia from \$15 000 000 to \$20 000 000. I have not been able to get confirmation—

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have done so after considering the situation, because I understood you, Sir, had ruled the question out of order, and yet you have called the Minister to answer.

The SPEAKER: I did not rule the question out of order. I said a section of the question was out of order.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Like the question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask for clarification as to exactly which section of the question was out of order so that the Minister will be well aware of that section of that question that he is not entitled to answer.

The SPEAKER: I intend to let the Minister answer the question.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Deputy Leader to order for flouting the Chair.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When a question was asked of me on Tuesday on this subject, I said then that the State Government had been trying to get the Federal Minister for Primary Industry to honour the promise he made in a telex to the Mayor of Alice Springs (Mr. Smith) to provide additional funds to South Australia for the Stuart Highway. Mr. Wallis, the Federal member for Grey, apparently followed this same line when he questioned Mr. Nixon in the Federal Parliament. I have not had the opportunity to verify whether Mr. Nixon has provided us with an additional \$5 000 000 for this year.

Mr. Venning: He has.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Rocky River to order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not been able to verify whether the Federal Minister has now acknowledged the validity of our claim and has decided to provide South Australia with an additional \$5 000 000. I think the House has heard before, but I remind honourable members again, that South Australia this year will receive \$15 000 000 from the Commonwealth for national highways. However, we have budgeted to spend more than \$20 000 000, so in fact South Australia is, from its own resources, putting in \$5 000 000.

I do not know whether Mr. Nixon wants to take the credit for South Australia, from its own funds, spending money on national highways. Certainly, Mr. Nixon must approve the programme, and he approved, some months ago, the programme we submitted. It did not include any significant sum for reconstructing the Stuart Highway. However, our present programme provides that we will spend about \$250 000 in the next financial year and about \$1 500 000 in the following year upgrading the Stuart Highway. Of course, this is a long way off trying to do the whole job, because we are looking at a job costing (at 1976

prices) of well over \$50 000 000. This is the reason it is absolutely essential that there be a concerted effort on this road. Even the member for Rocky River would acknowledge that. This is the reason there have been efforts made by people in Adelaide and Alice Springs to induce the Commonwealth Government to provide the funds necessary.

Before the Federal election, a promise was given by Mr. Sinclair to the people of Alice Springs at a time when he thought the Country Party candidate was in danger of defeat. Now, people such as myself, Laurie Wallis (the member for the district), and the Mayor of Alice Springs, are demanding that Mr. Sinclair should face up to the undertakings and the promises that he made. That is what this matter is all about.

LAND COMMISSION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what action the Government intends to take to see that the unfair competition that exists between the Land Commission and the private sector is eliminated? The Government has known of this unfair competition for some time, as it has been raised many times by the Opposition in this House. A recent report by the senior lecturer in economics at the University of Adelaide, Dr. Bentick, which evaluates the relationship between the South Australian Land Commission and the private sector, states:

I would recommend that those elements of unfair competition which it [the Land Commission] enjoys should be removed, so that private sector participation is not discouraged and so that premature development does not occur. Financial concessions for the commission in the form of freedom from land tax, low interest rates and low council rates on properties undergoing development (as opposed to the holding of raw land), inappropriately reduce holding costs for the commission, thereby inducing premature development and impose a bigger burden on other property owners. The resource cost to the community as a whole arising from these financial concessions is in the region of \$500 000 per year while the revenue cost to other ratepayers is about twice that amount.

The Government has been aware of this situation, and urgent action should be taken to do something about it immediately.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government does not agree that there is unfair competition; it does not agree with Dr. Bentick's contentions on this occasion, just as it does not agree with them on numbers of other occasions. He was a member of the working party we originally set up in relation to the action that needed to be taken in respect of controlling the escalating prices of land in South Australia. At that time, he made a number of contentions with which we disagreed, and so we disagree with them at this time. In fact, some of the suggestions of Dr. Bentick would lead to a return to the very situation that the Land Commission was brought into being to affect.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I suggest you read the report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have read the report that was in the *Advertiser*, and I disagree with a number of Dr. Bentick's conclusions. He is welcome to his particular ideological point of view. It is not one with which the Government agrees.

Mr. Tonkin: Oh, I see, the Land Commission is an ideological concept.

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

NORTHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Works seriously consider having installed at the Northfield High School an air-conditioner suitable to service the staff dining-room? In company with the member who is now responsible for the area in which this school is located, I visited the school today to participate in a ceremony for the inauguration of school prefects. When we visited the dining-room, we were shocked at the heat emanating from the room. Apparently, there is no air-conditioning at all. We each considered that it was essential that some means be adopted to ease the position of the teachers at the school. Although the teachers made no complaint, we were so shocked at the conditions in which they were having their meals and recreation that we were determined to make an urgent approach to the Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's concern. I will certainly have an urgent inquiry made into the matter to see whether I can improve the position for those who use the facility.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say whether the State Government will, through the Community Welfare Department, pay benefits to farming families who can prove extreme financial hardship caused by the prolonged drought of the past three years? Many families throughout the State do not qualify for unemployment benefits. They have to maintain a property, and the meal money is just not there. As this is a question of extreme importance, I should be grateful if the Premier could examine this aspect, which is worrying certain people throughout the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report. The Minister informs me that the matter is being looked into currently.

MR. SAFFRON

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier support a motion to allow Mr. Abraham Saffron to come to the Bar of the House to answer the matters alleged against him in here last Tuesday? I should say, first, that I hold no brief whatever for Mr. Saffron.

The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General says that I will lay myself open to charges of that. That shows his prejudice and the way in which he is prepared to use this House for his own ends. I do not know Mr. Saffron, and my question implies no support for him or for his activities, but I advance two reasons why he should be given this opportunity.

Mr. Gunn: It'll only provide a forum for him to try to justify his actions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That, too, shows prejudice against a man who has been attacked in here. First, on Tuesday hard things were said in this place about Mr. Saffron by the Premier and the Attorney-General. Mr. Saffron has publicly denied the accuracy of what was said. Had it been said outside the House, it would clearly have been actionable, but it was said in here under privilege. Mr. Saffron has indicated publicly his wish to come to put his side of the matter, and I have confirmed that from Mr. Fairweather, his agent in South Australia, who has been in touch with me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must give the honourable member a chance to explain his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am surprised at the prejudice shown. I hope that members will realise (particularly the Premier, as a member of the legal profession, if not as a Parliamentarian) that anyone, whether he be in our view utterly pure or as wicked as sin, even the devil himself, if he is defamed in this place and wants to answer what outside would obviously be defamatory, should, as a matter of plain justice be given that opportunity. That is fundamental and, unless we do that, I believe that this House will simply become a vehicle for attacks on people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I further point out that there are sufficient of us in this place to cross-examine Mr. Saffron if he comes here. The member for Playford and I, if no-one else, would be able to hold our own. I am frankly surprised at the utter prejudice that is being shown by members on both sides of the House as I give this explanation. I think that it is quite wrong that a person should be defamed in here, want to come and give his side of the story, and then be denied that opportunity. That is why I have asked the question.

Mr. Becker: Check last night's news service.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have confirmed as late as lunch time today his desire to come here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not take this as a joke and I do not believe that anyone should be condemned unheard, whoever he is. I am surprised that the Attorney-General and other members should not accept that principle. That is what the interjections from both sides mean.

Mr. Chapman: From some members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The second reason that I advance for my question is that I have a suspicion, and I put it no higher than that, that there is much more to come out on this matter than was disclosed by the two Ministers in here last Tuesday. Frankly, I am puzzled by the whole exercise. If the Premier were to take the time of the House to answer all the rumours going around in the community about him and his Government, the House would have no time for any other business. I wonder why this matter was chosen for airing in here.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the latter matter, there is a simple answer, but, because of his attitude to the Government, the honourable member never takes what is the obvious answer to questions that arise. The Attorney-General had been asked not for the first time about the activities of this individual and those associated with him by a member in another place.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet he chose to give the answer in here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question. I hope he will remain silent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was proper that the Government should give those answers publicly. As there was a matter concerned with that which had been raised by innuendo, by newspaper headlines, concerning me and about which I had been attacked here by the Leader of the Opposition, I believed it proper for me to make a statement, too, on the two matters.

The honourable member talks about people being condemned without being heard, and then proceeds to make a series of charges by innuendo (he was not specific) in an endeavour to condemn the Government without

saying what it is that the Government is supposed to answer in this matter.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Let him—

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as Mr. Saffron is concerned, I note that the honourable member has been in touch with Mr. Fairweather. The honourable member says that people should not be condemned without being heard, but he must be aware that Mr. Fairweather has been found to be a person who is not suitable and not proper to be given any licence under the Licensing Act by the Licensing Court.

Mr. Millhouse: Should I have refused to speak to him when he rang me? Is that what you're saying?

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am suggesting to the honourable member that he is already well aware of the nature of the associations of Mr. Saffron, and he must be so aware. No purpose would be served by Mr. Saffron's coming in here, getting up at the Bar and going through the kind of exercise we saw on television the other night. What would that serve? I have no doubt that in this matter the honourable member is not as he normally does seeking to serve any other purpose than endeavouring to get a headline for himself.

Mr. Millhouse: The answer is "No", is it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

CITRUS MARKETING

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Deputy Premier say what progress has been made by the committee inquiring into citrus marketing in South Australia, and when the Government expects a report from that committee as to the future of citrus marketing in South Australia? As a result of the breakdown of C.O.C. control in South Australia, the Government appointed a committee to inquire into citrus marketing in this State. I think that the Minister would readily accept that fresh fruit marketing is still an extremely important part of the citrus industry, even though the juice-fruit side of it has been largely stabilised by the 65 per cent import duty imposed by the Federal Government on juice concentrate coming into the country. While that has done a great deal to stabilise the industry, I think the Minister will readily agree that orderly marketing is an extremely important part of the citrus industry in Australia and growers want to know just what progress has been made and when the various recommendations relating to the citrus marketing legislation will be made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would appreciate that this committee was established on the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture. I will have to inquire from him as to what progress has been made. I appreciate the points the honourable member has made about the urgency of the matter, and I will convey them to the Minister.

LOCK COAL DEPOSITS

Mr. BLACKER: In the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy, can the Deputy Premier tell the House the latest situation in the assessment of the Lock coal deposits, particularly in relation to the effect on the nearby Poldia underground water basin of possible excavation of coal? Members are aware of the exploratory work being

undertaken at Lock. I have been informed that in some of the test drilling saline water has been encountered, and as a result fears have been expressed that the Poldia basin could be affected in some way.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, on his return, for a considered reply and bring it down for the honourable member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: STATUTORY DECLARATION

The Hon J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I seek leave to make a personal explanation. Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: During the adjournment debate last night, certain allegations were made by way of a statutory declaration quoted by the member for Fisher. The statutory declaration implicated me as having had some conversation with a woman called Joan Geary. I said last night that I did not know this woman and that, so far as I could recollect, I had no knowledge of having had any conversation with her about the matter contained in the statutory declaration. On having this matter further checked this morning (and by some chance really), it now comes to my mind that I do, in fact, know this woman, but not under that name, and that is the rather peculiar thing about this whole matter.

This woman was known to me as Mrs. Jo Barry, not Joan Geary. Again, peculiarly enough, the member for Fisher said last night that he had had this information for quite some time. I think from memory (and I have not checked *Hansard*, because I have not had the time) the statutory declaration was dated some time in March. On September 23, 1977, this woman rang my office, still at that stage under the name of Jo Barry, who, of course, I could readily recollect, having known her for some years under that name, asking me for a reference, which I readily gave her. I do not think there is any need to read the whole of the reference to the House, but it starts, "I have known Mrs. Jo Barry for approximately six years"—nothing to do with Mrs. Joan Geary, so it is no wonder I could not make any connection last night.

Having ascertained the facts, I thought it apparent that the matter needed some explanation, because the woman bearing two names is evidently the same woman, whom I knew as Mrs. Jo Barry. She was never known to me under the name of Mrs. Joan Geary, and that is completely proved by the fact that even as late as September of last year I gave her a reference under the name of Jo Barry. At that time, she was still using that name. That is an explanation of my knowledge of the person. I also want to place on record that I have no knowledge of having had a discussion with Mrs. Jo Barry similar to that described by the member for Fisher.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy, say what companies other than Dow have had discussions with the Government in relation to the establishment of a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff? During a press interview yesterday the Minister of Mines and Energy said that he had had discussions with other companies. He also said yesterday in the House that "the project cannot be progressed further by Dow until the Commonwealth has made a decision on infrastructure, because that decision determines whether the project in principle is viable and, secondly, that there is no

absolute guarantee from Dow as to whether or not the project will go ahead". I understand that on October 24, 1973, the Premier announced that work on the Redcliff petro-chemical plant was due to start in April, 1974. He said he expected the indenture to build Redcliff to be signed and ratified by Parliament in that session. We are still waiting for that. In view of the unemployment situation in South Australia and the lack of new industrial development, the Government's procrastination and obvious attempt to mislead the public is quite clear.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will not spend much time on the last piece of politicising by the honourable member at the end of his so-called explanation. The Minister and I have had discussions with a company which may be involved as an ancillary to the Redcliff project, but our undertakings are to that company that no publicity concerning it will be given at this time. Therefore, it is not possible for me to enlarge upon the matter at all.

The position is exactly as has been stated by the Minister. The previous statements I made concerning the Redcliff plant were as a result of the then statement of intention that I had. I subsequently made statements in relation to the projected time table on which we were negotiating with the I.C.I. consortium but which unfortunately could not be completed, because of the parameters which were required of it in foreign trade at that time and because of escalating costs in relation to Redcliff that occurred during that time. Since I.C.I. withdrew from negotiations concerning Redcliff, we have been negotiating with Dow, and the South Australian Government has done everything in its power to proceed to conclusion in this matter. There is nothing left in the South Australian Government's power to get to a conclusion. We are at the moment depending on a decision of the Federal Government in relation to the financing of infra-structure, and a final decision from the Dow world board.

ROAD FUNDS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport say how much of the \$6 700 000 Commonwealth grant for rural local roads in South Australia for 1977-78 has been directed to rural local councils, and how much of the \$2 200 000 paid and earmarked by the Commonwealth for urban local roads in the same period has been passed on to urban local councils? I am fully aware of the substantial number of questions on this subject of financing that have been directed to the Minister by the member for Goyder in his capacity as shadow Minister of Local Government, and I have researched them and the Minister's extensive replies. While they relate generally to grants and the distribution of grants within the State, I am unable to find replies to these specific points. My question to the Minister results from a statement I have which sets out the roads assistance for South Australia for the year 1977-78, wherein the \$6 700 000 allocated for the period represents a real increase of 11.9 per cent on the previous year's allocation, and the \$2 200 000 Commonwealth grant for South Australia for urban local roads represents a 77 per cent real increase on the previous year's allocation.

With those figures and details in mind, I can say that a number of councils have drawn to my attention, after seeing the list of distributed funds so far as produced by the Minister, that there appears to be a significant difference between the sum received by South Australia and the sum so far distributed to the respective local government body. It is that difference which undoubtedly will be allocated in the remaining part of the financial

year, or one would hope so. It is in relation to the difference in those two specific areas that I seek information from the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have the detailed figures available at the moment, but I will obtain them. The general point the honourable member ought to understand is that the fact that the funds are provided by the Commonwealth Government in the various categories and in the two categories to which he has referred (urban local and rural local) does not mean that those moneys must all automatically go on to roads that are maintained by local government itself, because many roads in South Australia which are classed as local roads are built and maintained by the Highways Department. What obviously follows from the understanding that the honourable member has would be that, if all of the funds from the Commonwealth that were provided under the headings of urban local or rural local were to go to local government bodies, local government would have to assume the full responsibility for building and maintaining many roads which are presently built and maintained by the Highways Department.

I think the honourable member knows as well as I do that local government would not be prepared to do that sort of a deal, and he is not speaking with the authority of local government if he suggested that it would. Regarding the actual sums, I will provide him with that information. I have done it previously, and I will obtain it again for him.

PETROL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs take the necessary action to make available cheaper petrol to people in country areas? I think he would well know that petrol at metropolitan service stations is sold at a substantial discount, so much so that, although I am a primary producer, I can buy petrol cheaper in Adelaide than I can buy it at Crystal Brook. As the Minister would know, primary industry is charged a special rate for fuel. One will not find service stations in country areas where people can buy discount petrol. I ask the Minister to see what he can do to make available to country people some of the concessions applying in the metropolitan area. Today the Leader referred to problems in country areas now, and if the Minister could do something in this regard it would be a help.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am surprised to hear the honourable member ask such a question. I hope his question does not indicate that the Fraser Government is about to ditch the promise that it made at the recent Federal election to ensure that the price of petrol in country areas was no more than 4c a gallon above the price applying in the metropolitan area. I think the indications in the national press of the past few days are that the Fraser Government is planning to do that. I see the honourable member putting his hand up as if he were still at school and wanting to ask another question, but he can get only one question in this afternoon.

The situation in this State is, as I explained to the House yesterday in answer to a question from the member for Henley Beach, that the South Australian Government is proposing to go before the Prices Justification Tribunal to make submissions on the application that Mobil has made to the tribunal for a price increase. The Government intends at that inquiry to try to force the oil companies to explain how they can give such large discounts at the wholesale level in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Nankivell: Because the country people pay.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That may well be the

situation, but that pricing policy by the individual oil companies (the seven sisters, as they are known internationally), is forcing country people not only in this State but throughout the rest of Australia to pay vastly inflated prices for fuel. This is a national problem: it is not one that the State Government can readily resolve. It is my view that if we were to apply vigorous price control of fuel prices in country areas in South Australia the effect would be that the oil companies would impose a boycott on the supply of fuel to country areas and country people would not then be able to obtain fuel. That is obviously not the solution to the problem.

What is needed is a national solution that involves controlling the oil companies' pricing practices to ensure that throughout the nation people in country areas can obtain petrol at a reasonable price. It must be action on a national level. Members opposite may have had the opportunity of reading the recommendations of the Royal Commission into the petroleum industry. The report of that Royal Commission indicated clearly that the source of the solution to the pricing problems in the oil industry lies at a national level. We are doing what we can on a State level to try to prompt the Federal Government into action in this matter, but we are not having much success.

I hope that when we go before the P.J.T. we will get into the situation where we can induce the tribunal to bring down a finding that will force the oil companies into applying more rational and reasonable pricing policies not only in metropolitan areas but also throughout country areas of South Australia. In summing up, all I can say is that the honourable member ought to get on to his Federal colleagues and demand some action from the Federal Government, because that is where the real solution to the problem lies.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr. GROOM: Will the Minister of Transport take up urgently and impress on the Federal Government the State Government's attitude in relation to curfew hours and extensions beyond present boundaries at Adelaide airport? I refer to a report in today's *Advertiser* stating that the Federal Minister for Construction, Mr. McLeay, had announced that extensions costing \$2 350 000 were being considered by the Federal Public Works Committee and that a series of new buildings had been proposed for the airport. I understand that in a radio broadcast the Minister did not deny that this was a step towards Adelaide Airport being an international airport on a permanent basis. Obviously this would lead to extensions by the Federal Government to the airport beyond its present boundaries and a lifting by the Federal Government of the present flying time curfew hours, contrary to the wishes of the State Government and resolutions carried by this Parliament. I am aware of divisions of opinion within the State Liberal Party with respect to Adelaide Airport. If it is Federal Government policy to establish a permanent international airport at West Beach, I am sure that local residents will have something to say about it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did not hear the radio broadcast to which the honourable member refers; I did see the newspaper report. If the Federal Minister for Construction (Mr. McLeay) is under any misapprehension about South Australia's views on Adelaide Airport, he must have been way out of touch with South Australia for a long, long time, because we have said time and time again that the Government will not countenance any extensions of Adelaide Airport beyond its existing boundaries, nor will we permit the curfew to be rejected.

The Government has consistently taken this view, and I have no hesitation in saying that we will stick with that view.

Mr. Becker: Good. I'll see that you do, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear the member for Hanson agreeing with this. Perhaps he might like to undertake the very difficult task of trying to educate his fellow Liberal, the Federal member for Boothby (Mr. McLeay), to the point of view of the State Government, which obviously the member for Hanson accepts.

Mr. Becker: He's been given that message, take it from me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

WATER RESOURCES PLAN

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has replied to the written invitation from the Commonwealth Government to participate in the five-year national water resources project and, in particular, for the reticulation of Bolivar recycled water to the very important vegetable-growing area of Virginia? If the Government has not done so, does it intend to apply and, if not, why not? For many years there have been areas in South Australia lacking water; Virginia is one, Watervale and the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, Moorowie and Carribee Basin being others. An article appeared in the *Commonwealth Record* of February 12, as follows:

The Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Malcolm Fraser, has written to State Premiers inviting them to nominate projects for consideration under the five year national water resources program. The Commonwealth Government is to contribute \$200 000 000 during this period and is seeking the Premiers' agreement to contribute equally with the Commonwealth in the program in their States . . . The program will encompass the provision of funds to the States, in grants and/or loans, for programs, projects or activities for:—

I will mention only the first, because it is pertinent to the question—

Water supplies for urban and rural areas, including reuse.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has replied to the letter. Whilst I do not remember the exact order in which we placed our priorities, I know that one of the matters considered was the reuse of the Bolivar effluent. The honourable member would know that I have said in this House previously that it is beyond the financial resources of the State Government to provide the \$20 000 000 which it was estimated at that time it would cost to reticulate water to the northern Adelaide Plains but that, of course, we would approach the Commonwealth to see whether assistance was available from that direction. This would require contribution from the local people themselves to assist with any development that is likely to occur.

The problem which is of most concern to the South Australian Government is salinity, and that, I am certain, rated top priority. Whilst we looked at probably 10 or 12 matters that we considered urgent in South Australia, I think only three were listed for consideration by the Commonwealth. However, I shall look at the correspondence to see whether or not I can make it available to the honourable member so that he will be more fully informed.

MODBURY TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me information regarding the installation of traffic signals

at the corner of Golden Grove Road and North East Road, at Modbury?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall obtain precise details and let the honourable member know.

OAKLANDS CROSSING

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say when the upgrading of the Oaklands Park railway crossing is expected to commence and whether in the plan the children's crossing at Diagonal Road which caters for Christ the King school will be reallocated actuated lights? Some time ago, I approached the Minister about the problem facing students who attend Christ the King Primary School at Dunrobin Road, Oaklands Park, explaining to him that, with the new system of Catholic education, primary schools do not extend beyond grade 6. To leave these young children to act as monitors, as they are doing at the moment, on a busy road such as Diagonal Road, is grossly unfair to the students themselves and to the other people concerned. I should like the Minister to say what is to happen at Oaklands Park crossing and whether he will upgrade the children's crossing on Diagonal Road.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought I had provided details to the honourable member in a letter I sent to him about a month ago, although I acknowledge that it was forwarded whilst he was overseas. I shall get full details of the work associated with the upgrading programme, which is already under way. Certainly, the preliminaries are being undertaken. However, I shall get full details of the crossing, including the school crossing, and let the honourable member have it.

POLICE ACCOMMODATION

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Chief Secretary say what comparison of office space costs was undertaken before the decision was made to relocate police headquarters in Tara Hall, at 202 Greenhill Road, Eastwood, and what were the comparative costs of this site and the others which were considered? The public comment has been made that the surroundings are prestigious. I believe that we can look up to the South Australian Police Force and that it should be properly housed. However, in the current financial difficulties facing the State, the public would want to be assured that the relative cost of office space at this site as compared with others is reasonably close. It is on that basis that I put the question to the Minister.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I do not know the exact figures, but I shall be pleased to obtain information for the honourable member on the matter. I do know that the site was recommended by the Accommodation Committee, which goes into these things, bearing in mind the needs of the Police Department for office space, security and parking space, because of the necessity to have vehicles in this area. I do not know the rates, but I believe that, in relation to the rates in the city proper, if suitable accommodation was available, it was quite comparable.

THORNDON HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. ADAMSON: Can the Minister of Education say when Thorndon High School will be provided with the music practice rooms that it has been requesting for some time? The Minister may be aware that Thorndon High School has a number of gifted students and able and

dedicated music teachers, all of whom are working under great difficulty in conditions that are inadequate for practice and performance. Other high schools in the area are very well served with music facilities, yet this school, which frequently gives outside performances for the benefit of community groups, is greatly disadvantaged by the lack of music practice facilities.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

BIRDS

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say what stage the inquiry into the trapping of birds has reached and whether the Government intends to table the results of that inquiry? The Minister recently told the House that it was hoped that the inquiry into the activities of certain people employed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service would be completed as soon as possible. The Minister will appreciate the necessity to end widespread speculation and allegations of the most serious type concerning his senior officers and the importance of having these matters clarified as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the point that the honourable member makes, and it is my desire to clear up this matter as quickly as possible. It has been going on for longer than it should. One aspect is still being inquired into, and no finality has yet been reached, but I expect it shortly in the action that will be taken. Regarding the inquiry itself (the report that I have had, anyway), I do not intend to make that report public. It was an inquiry for departmental use, of course, but I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member of the outcome when the decision is finally made.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope that I'll be included in that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member for Mitcham wrote to me asking whether he could discuss with me a certain aspect of the inquiry, not the total inquiry: it was an event concerning a Mr. Levi. I will discuss that matter with the honourable member. The inquiry into that aspect has not yet been completed.

GAMBIER NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the inquiry he said he was going to commission into the traffic situation at North Gambier School in, I think, February, 1978, is under way and whether the results are yet available? The report was into the traffic situation and the potential need for school crossings.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not recall the actual investigation to which the honourable member refers, but it is the sort of investigation that probably would be undertaken by the local government body, under the supervision of the Road Traffic Board. I shall have the matter checked.

Mr. Allison: It was stated in a letter addressed to me in about last September.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If I wrote to the honourable member, I will get the letter checked out to see what further information I can provide for him.

MARCIANO MURDER

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Police Force has requested the Government to make available a

substantial reward to assist it in its inquiries into the Marciano murder case?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of its doing so. We always consider any request that comes from the Police Force.

Mrs. CHATTERTON

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works ascertain the actual capacity in which Mrs. Chatterton is employed by the State Government? Mrs. Chatterton has recently spoken to fishermen of our community about matters involving fishery activities around the State. Last night, when I took a deputation to the Minister of Fisheries, he was unable to meet us, but his wife was in his office at 4.30 p.m. In what capacity is she employed? I appreciate the wide knowledge that Mrs. Chatterton has on matters dealing with fisheries, but I should like clarified where she is employed and what authority she has to speak on that subject.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mrs. Chatterton is employed in my office as an executive assistant doing research for me in areas of agricultural policy. She refers to me in my office regularly, and I had a report from her only this morning relating to some matters concerning forestry policy in the South-East. In some circumstances where matters are entirely within her knowledge, she may be directed to converse with members of the public concerning such matters. That is the position now: she is employed in my office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, she does not act for the Minister; she is not entitled to act for him.

At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

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.

It amends the Industries Development Act to enable the Industries Development Corporation to employ its own staff, as it appears important that the image of the corporation as an independent statutory body should be strengthened by permitting it to employ its own staff (rather than utilising Public Service staff). Therefore, by this amendment, the corporation may employ its own staff, and any person employed by the corporation who was previously a public servant shall carry over to the corporation his superannuation and leave rights. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 repeals section 16e of the principal Act and enacts new section 16e in its place. New section 16e provides for the corporation to employ its own staff, or, with the consent of the Minister, to make use of the officers of a Public Service department. Where employees of the corporation come from the Public Service or other prescribed employment their leave rights are carried over to the corporation by virtue of this section, and employees may remain, or become, members of the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RECREATION GROUNDS (REGULATIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act, 1931-1935. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill increases the maximum penalty for breach of a regulation under the Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act from £10 to \$200. The original penalty was set in 1931 and is now insufficient to deter the committing of certain offences. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act to increase the maximum penalty for breach of regulations from £10 to \$200.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister for the Environment) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to preserve, protect and enhance the physical, social and cultural heritage of the State; to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1977; to amend the City of Adelaide development Control Act, 1976; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will be aware that we have in South Australia, many buildings and towns of local and national importance as part of the State's heritage. There are already over 350 items in South Australia which have been registered by the Australian Heritage Commission as part of the National Estate. There has been increasing awareness in the community of the need to preserve the buildings and other features of this State that reflect its cultural heritage. This is reflected in the increased number of community organisations and historical societies, increased membership within these groups, and very worthwhile voluntary activity carried out by so many of our citizens. This Government recognises their importance. Moreover, the Government considers that, while grand buildings such as Ayers House are of great importance to the State's

heritage, of no less significance are the miners' cottages at Burra and Kapunda, the early German settlements of Hahndorf and Paechtown and pioneer homesteads such as Kanyaka. We are fortunate that in some cases steps have already been taken to restore and preserve our heritage as at Dingley Dell, the home of one of South Australia's famous poets, Adam Lindsay Gordon.

The aim of the Bill now before the House is to facilitate the conservation of the built heritage of this State. This is not to deny the importance of the natural features of our heritage, but to recognise that there is special importance and urgency in dealing with our historic buildings and towns. This Government recognises that there is a need for a balanced approach between progress and conservation. With an expanding population and consequent growth of our cities, and with the Government actively, and rightly, pursuing an expansion of our industry, commerce and agriculture, there is still an obligation on the Government to have regard to those things in our history that we do not want to lose.

The Government endorses the sentiments expressed in the report of the National Estate that the loss of any part of the National Estate is essentially irretrievable, whether it is the destruction of a historic building, a group of buildings or a townscape. In recognising the importance of the State's heritage, and the need to protect it both for the present and future generations, the Government has reviewed the current administrative and legislative system and assessed its inadequacies. This Bill represents this Government's resolve to promote the identification and conservation of the State's heritage. There is, at present, no formal process whereby the heritage value of a building considered as an important part of the State's heritage can be specifically taken into account by the development control system or positive support provided. While organisations such as the National Trust have played a valuable and vital role in identifying buildings of historic and architectural merit in the State, there have been only informal social pressures to promote their preservation.

Similarly, while the Australian Heritage Act provides a process for identifying elements of the National Estate, its influence to promote conservation is somewhat indirect—through powers to recommend withholding of Federal funds where a particular proposal is felt to adversely affect the National Estate. Where items on the National Estate register are owned by the Federal Government, the controls are more direct.

In South Australia, the scope of development control measures is, at present, inadequate for conservation purposes. There are no provisions for control over demolition and only limited control over alteration to the built heritage. This has meant that some buildings of historic, architectural or cultural value have been demolished and lost forever. What remains needs immediate protection if we are not to lose that part of our heritage found in the built environment.

Too often in the past, the public and indeed the Government have become aware of the pending demolition of a historic building only a few days before demolition was to commence. This has inevitably resulted in drama and conflict and required immediate action to try to save the endangered building. The case of the South Australian Hotel is one where action was not quick enough to prevent demolition. What is needed is an early warning system so that the Government is aware of such proposals early in the planning stages and has time to negotiate and consider alternative courses of action. What has to be achieved is a new order of priorities so that due regard is paid in administrative processes to the importance of the State's heritage. This will require a co-

operative approach between levels of Government, between Government departments and from the general community.

The strategy adopted in this Bill has been to integrate conservation measures, as far as possible, with the existing system of development control. In this way, modifications to the existing decision-making process are proposed. It is recognised that control over development of heritage items should remain in the hands of the present development control bodies—the State Planning Authority and at the local government level. These controls are to be broadened to provide for control over demolition and alteration of items designated as being of heritage value. We do not intend to follow the approach adopted in New South Wales and Victoria, where a second centralised system of development control has been created for the conservation of historic buildings and areas. The Government feels that such an approach is inappropriate in South Australia. It would involve increased expense in duplicating an administrative and control system which could also be confusing and costly to an owner of a historic building with the need for approval from two separate control bodies.

The role of the Environment Department will be that of promoting heritage conservation by providing expert advice to the relevant development control body regarding development applications of heritage items. The department will also provide positive support and assistance by way of loans and grants to individuals and organisations for conservation of the State's heritage. Having considered the importance of the State's heritage, inadequacies of current arrangements for the identification and conservation of items of heritage value, and the philosophy underlying the Bill's approach, I will now turn to the provisions of the Bill, which can be followed in the sequence adopted in the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions used for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 5 formally establishes the South Australian Heritage Committee, which is to be made up of 12 persons appointed by the Governor. The committee's role will be one of providing advice to the Minister on all matters associated with the State's heritage. It is envisaged that the composition of the committee will follow the model established by the interim Australian Heritage Commission, with some members appointed from Government departments concerned with administering heritage matters.

However, the majority of appointees will be selected from individuals, groups and organisations in the community with recognised commitment to, or skills and experience in heritage conservation, such as the National Trust, Institute of Architects, local government, Historical Society and experts from universities and other academic institutions. Clause 6 is formal, and clause 7 provides for a quorum of the committee being seven out of its 12 members. Clause 8 sets out the powers and functions of the committee, and clause 9 provides for delegation of powers of the committee. Clause 10 provides for the remuneration of members of the committee. Clauses 11 to 15 of the Bill establish the processes for identifying important features of the State's built heritage. This involves the establishment of a register of the State heritage, which will list individual buildings and structures of importance in the State's physical social or cultural heritage.

The process of establishing the register will be an open one, with those items under consideration for registration to be gazetted, advertised and open to submissions by the public. Before entry to the register of the State heritage,

the Minister will consider any objections and representations, as well as any recommendations by the South Australian Heritage Committee, which will be an expert body established in the Bill to provide advice to the Minister on all matters associated with the State heritage. A similar process is proposed for removal of an item from the register.

The Government is also aware of the need to recognise that particular areas, in addition to individual buildings, are of importance to the State's heritage. Clause 13 enables the Minister to designate such areas as a part of the State's heritage. It is envisaged that the designation of an area by the Minister will come as a result of a process of consultation and negotiation between the Minister and the relevant local council. The advice of the committee will also be sought before areas are designated. Clause 15 provides for an "interim list" on which items will be placed while objections are being considered. Clause 16 provides for public inspection of the interim list and register.

Clause 17 constitutes the Minister as a corporation, under the title of the Trustee of the State Heritage. Clause 18 sets out the powers and functions of the corporation, and clause 19 provides for the creation of the State Heritage Fund in recognition of the need for the State positively to promote and support conservation of the built heritage.

As in New South Wales and Victoria, the Bill does not provide for compensation as an automatic right of owners of designated heritage items. Research in New South Wales and Victoria, and in the city of Adelaide, indicate that there is no clear evidence that classification of a building of heritage value results in a lowering of land values. As I have already noted, there has been increasing recognition and interest by the community in our heritage. Through classification, a building is recognised as a rare and scarce item. It has been found that the owner of such an item may even experience an increase in property values (through increased prestige). With imaginative development similar to that currently taking place at the Bray property, the full potential of our heritage can be exploited through development modifications which are sensitive to its heritage value. In this way the built heritage can continue to be viable and relevant to current community needs.

In the city of Adelaide, through the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, the city council already has development controls which include demolition. By means of policies, on townscape and amenity, as set out in the principles, the city council can influence the type of development that may occur. In this more ideal situation, heritage conservation has been more fully integrated with the overall development control system. No compensation is awarded for changes in zoning of land use, nor are there any provisions for this for buildings within a precinct where a policy has been formulated for the preservation of historic buildings. Indeed, under the Planning and Development Act there are provisions for the declaration of historic areas. However, regulations designated for control of such areas contain provision for an automatic entitlement to claim compensation. This has totally inhibited the use of this provision. As I have already mentioned, in some cases it is likely that an owner may experience an escalation in land values. To follow a compensation concept logically I doubt that the prospect of a betterment tax on any increases in land values would receive wide support.

The Bill, therefore, has chosen to avoid the rather negative and cumbersome mechanism of compensation and betterment tax. Instead, the Bill provides the potential for positive financial support to individual

owners and organisations through the heritage fund to promote conservation of those items or areas of the State heritage listed or designated. Support may be in the form of loans or grants for restoration, maintenance, subsidies for rate and tax burdens that an individual cannot meet, for research, and for measures to educate and promote an awareness of heritage conservation. Such support will be determined individually on a case by case basis and considered on its merits.

The Government considers that its role of promoting conservation will be complementary to the activities of the Federal Government with its National Estate Grants. These grants have provided a much needed stimulus to heritage conservation, and the State Heritage Fund will be used to provide further support in this area. National estate grants are currently administered at the State level by the Environment Department and there are indications that more responsibility may be devolved to the State level.

In the 1977-78 National Estate Programme, \$360 000 was provided for projects in South Australia proposed by the State Government, the National Trust of South Australia, and other community organisations. Projects funded included restoration of the old Armoury Building, Old Government House at Belair, and Fort Glanville. Research grants have also been provided and studies such as that currently being undertaken for the Corporation of the City of Unley will be invaluable in identifying its built heritage. In Burra, a study is now also under way which will identify its important historic buildings and prepare guidelines for the preparation of suitable planning policies for use by the District Council of Burra. The Government views such initiatives at the local government level as a high priority and also welcomes initiatives by the National Trust in undertaking research on the urban conservation areas of the State.

Clause 20 establishes the framework within which "planning controls" will be exercised over registered and listed items. The measures for control over development of the built heritage will be achieved through amendments to the Planning and Development Act. Clause 21 is a consequential amendment. Clause 22 amends the Planning and Development Act by inserting a new Part VAA and, for convenience, the proposed new provisions will be dealt with *seriatim*.

Proposed section 42A makes it clear that controls imposed by this Act are in addition to and not in substitution for controls provided elsewhere in the Act. Proposed section 42B provides that the Crown is not bound by the controls of this Part. Under proposed sections 42C and D, owners of buildings or structures that are listed or registered will be required to apply for consent for demolition or any work that will change the character or external appearance of the building. The application is to be made to the relevant development control body, which will then, under proposed section 42E, be required to refer the application to the Minister responsible for the South Australian heritage to obtain expert advice.

The Minister will then consider the application and seek the advice of the Heritage Committee before making a recommendation to the development control body. The final decision regarding the application will be made by the relevant development control body, taking into account the Minister's recommendation and the provisions of any authorised development plan, including provisions that relate to the preservation or enhancement of the area in which the relevant building or structure is situated. Under the proposed section 42F, the terms of reference for any appeal to the Planning Appeal Board relating to a heritage

item have been amended to be consistent with the terms of reference of the development control body.

Clauses 24 and 25 of the Bill provide that these amendments to the Planning and Development Act will not apply to the city of Adelaide, as controls already exist over demolition and there are, in the principles, policies relating to townscape and amenity which can achieve what this Bill proposes for the rest of the State. In that Act a mechanism already exists whereby development applications of State significance can be considered by the City of Adelaide Planning Commission.

This does not mean, however, that those items or areas of heritage value within the city cannot be nominated for entry on the register. The listing process will apply throughout the State and will mean that any individual or organisation may have access to positive support and financial assistance from the State Government for the conservation of listed buildings or designated areas. We look forward to close co-operation with Adelaide City Council, as with other councils, in the identification of historic areas so that policies may be formulated, as in Port Adelaide, which will better guide development at the local government level.

I might point out to the House that, in relation to the city of Adelaide, I have recently ordered a review of the future of Ruthven Mansions, so that the various experts can give further consideration to the possibilities for that building. We are fortunate in South Australia that so much of heritage value remains. We are fortunate that our early settlers built wisely and well. Examples of their settlements, their skill and crafts, their culture and way of life in this State are visible not only in our cities but in our country areas. That we are so rich in heritage should not lead us to be complacent about protecting that heritage. There are too many cities in other States of Australia and parts of the world where recognition of the value of the heritage has come too late. This Government is determined not to allow that situation to develop here in South Australia.

In this State's rich and diverse heritage there are workmen's cottages in the city and in the mining towns of Moonta and Kapunda, fine homesteads of the pioneer settlers, such as Pewsey Vale and Beltana, and historic ports like Robe and Port Adelaide with their customs houses and warehouses.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there are items in South Australia which would qualify for a list of world heritage items. The Government has approached the task of preservation in a co-operative spirit. We recognise the interest and valuable work of citizens and community groups, particularly the National Trust. We recognise the interest and valuable work of local government.

This Government wishes to play a part in protecting our heritage, wherever possible, enhancing it, and presenting it for the enjoyment of all South Australians. I say "wherever possible" deliberately, because with limited resources we cannot have limitless aims, nor can we ignore consideration of other factors in reaching our decisions. We have a unique opportunity, unlike the older cultures in Europe. We have a relatively short period of settled history, and in protecting our heritage we have the opportunity to begin at the beginning of white man's settlement. The Government does not intend to lose that opportunity.

We do, however, recognise the importance of the heritage associated with Aboriginal settlement and its culture. This is currently protected under the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Act. The Government now intends to be more active in promoting conservation of the built heritage of European settlement. But we recognise that

the most lasting and beneficial results can best be achieved by co-operation between levels of government and between the Government and the community at large. In commending this Bill to the House, I want briefly to pay a tribute to those officers in the department who have worked extremely hard, particularly over the past few months, on this measure. They have done an excellent job, and I hope that the House will reward their efforts by the speedy passage of this measure.

Mr. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from March 2. Page 1905.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This is a short Bill with a high import for the dairying industry in South Australia and throughout the Commonwealth. Short as it may be, the Bill is a result of an agreement between the Minister of Agriculture and the Federal Minister at Agricultural Council. It in fact extends the first stage of the Commonwealth Government's dairy equalisation scheme. With some of my colleagues I had the privilege of meeting representatives of the dairying industry from this State, with the Minister, last week. They were able to discuss at some length the proposals of the scheme.

The dairying industry has a long history in this State and it has made an extremely worthwhile contribution to the agricultural output of primary production. In recent times, we have seen the advent of margarine, running side by side with dairy products, and there has been a measure of liaison. However, the dairy product is a major part of the staple diet of the South Australian consumer.

The effect of this Bill is to set up the second stage of the equalisation scheme, and while it brings about a restraint in production it will place a tax on what are called prescribed products. That tax will be paid by the manufacturers and collected by the Commonwealth. There will be a disbursement to the States, and I understand the quota for South Australia is about 7 300 tonnes. Those payments, which will come in the form of a tax, will be reimbursed to the South Australian dairy farmer, paid as a bonus across the board to producers on a market entitlement based on their production.

The dairying industry has been consulted on these arrangements, and the discussions held last week between the Minister and industry representatives highlight the agreements reached. I know the Minister wants to get this legislation through. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins in another place, and the member for Mallee and myself from this place, were the spokesmen for the dairy industry at this meeting.

There is little point in debating the matter further. The Opposition supports the Bill, and I hope it will have a speedy passage through the other place so that it can be assented to give full effect to the agreement reached at Agricultural Council in Hobart recently.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): It is interesting to look at this legislation and to recognise, after discussions with the people involved, the intricacies of the arrangement being entered into. I trust that the end result will be advantageous to the industry which it seeks to assist. I am most interested in a statement released on March 2, 1978, by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, in which he indicates the extension of the underwriting arrangements for the dairy industry for the 1977-78 season and the

ramifications of that action. On March 2, the Minister announced the Government's decision to increase the level of underwriting for butter and cheese for the six-month period from January 1, 1978, to June 30, 1978. The media release states:

The increase follows a review of the dairy industry underwriting arrangements which the Government undertook to make following the Federal election. Mr. Sinclair said the level of underwriting would also be increased for skim milk powder and casein subject to agreement by State Governments. In addition, wholemilk powder would be included in underwriting arrangements for the second half of the 1977-78 season. In normal circumstances the levels of underwriting should allow efficient manufacturers to pay their suppliers around 75 cents per pound butterfat (\$1.65/kg) at the farm gate. Whether or not manufacturers can reach this level of pay rate will depend, however, on a number of variable factors such as their level of throughput, overhead costs, and cartage.

These factors affect all manner of manufacturing industry, whether in the secondary or primary stage or whether in the primary manufacturing industry. The media release continues:

There is very real justification to maintain adequate underwriting levels to protect the incomes of farmers during this period of transition in dairy marketing arrangements. I fully support that contention, because not only are the dairy farmers trapped by the problems associated with the overall dairy industry but they are also certainly affected by the problems of drought, to which I adverted earlier this afternoon and which were raised in the debate on the Appropriation Bill only last week. The problems of drought in many areas of Australia (and certainly in South Australia) at present are increasing the problem relating to the dairy farmer and the dairy industry. The media release continues:

The Government believes the increases should enable the dairy industry to maintain reasonable returns at a time when seasons and loss of markets have so prejudiced farming opportunities.

If that situation is achieved, that is certainly a tremendous advantage. As well as with the new initiatives that are arranged through the Bill, it is to be hoped that the vital dairy industry will have the kind of benefit assistance that is essential if we in this State in the long term are to have access to the necessary quantity of fresh milk and the products derived therefrom. The scope of the Commonwealth assistance is indicated in the release, as follows:

The Commonwealth Government has agreed to underwrite the equalised returns for domestic and export sales for butter and cheese for the second six months period of the 1977-78 season under the stage 1 marketing arrangements at \$1 240 per tonne and \$955 per tonne respectively. The Government also proposed to the State Government that skim milk powder be underwritten at \$420 per tonne and casein at \$1 090 per tonne, with the cost of underwriting to be shared by the Commonwealth with the States on a \$2 to \$1 basis.

So, there is certain to be real input by the State in this vital area. The media release continues:

Wholemilk powder would be underwritten at \$715 per tonne for the second six-month period of the 1977-78 season. As wholemilk powder was not being pooled under the stage 1 marketing arrangements, the Government's underwriting commitment would be based on the underwritten figure of \$715 per tonne and the Australian Dairy Corporation's minimum export price, currently \$700 per tonne f.o.b. bulk basis. Underwriting would be restricted to wholemilk powder exports ex January-June, 1978, production.

The dairy industry continued to face severe economic

pressures. Export returns remain depressed, particularly for butter, while there was a continued upward trend in production costs. Mr. Sinclair said that in conducting his review of the current underwriting arrangements, the Government has taken into consideration representations made by the Australian Dairy Farmers Federation and other industry bodies.

It is gratifying to know that in these vital areas of concern the responsible farmer organisations have been consulted in full in the direction of the action to be taken and, indeed, have gained from those bodies some knowledge of the area of assistance that is so necessary if they are to stay in the field. The media release continues:

The level of Government underwriting was now pitched at a high level in relation to the domestic prices obtaining for the respective products.

In other words, here again we are trapped in by the problems associated with export prices. The release continues:

The full significance of the Government's underwriting commitment, however, did not seem to be fully appreciated by some sections of the industry.

If, for no other reason, I make these comments this afternoon so that those members of the industry who will follow this debate in the official record will at least have had the opportunity of getting the total purport of the Federal Minister's announcement and will not have to rely only on the brief comments, sometimes taken out of context, in those papers and media channels that have reported, in part, what the Minister had to say. In relation to the lack of appreciation of some areas of the industry, the release states:

This was because the level of underwriting was expressed in terms of a net pool return for the respective products, whereas the Government's actual commitment also included costs associated with each pool, such as the payment of special allowances for storage, transport, and administrative costs.

In the case of butter, while the new underwriting figure was set at \$1 240 per tonne the actual Government underwriting commitment for the second six-month period of the 1977-78 season would be around \$1 320 per tonne. Mr. Sinclair said that the Government's decision to underwrite at the new levels for the six-month period ending June 30, 1978, would provide a measure of income stability to dairy farmers until a greater degree of stability was achieved under the staged marketing arrangements for the dairy industry.

Regarding the staged marketing arrangements, the Bill is to give effect to the stage 2 proposals which, associated with the stage 1 proposals to which I have just referred, will hopefully assist persons in this vital industry, offering some measure of stability to them and to their families, and ensuring that, in the longer term, the dairy industry will have a base in South Australia and will not be totally lost.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. Opportunity is given for more financial assistance to be given to certain sections of the dairy industry. It has always disappointed me that the true value of so many of our primary products (and dairy products are in this category) is not recognised. People take it for granted that they should be cheap, very often cheaper than the cost of producing them by the primary and secondary sections before they become available to the consumer. For example, one can buy a bottle of milk for 22c, and people pay 70c or more for a bottle of beer or from \$2 to \$6 for a bottle of wine. Another comparison not so directly related is that one can go into a restaurant in the evening and see people selling carnations and roses for \$1.50 or \$1.80 a head, whereas \$1

for a cauliflower would be a high price, and the seller would be abused if he tried to charge such a price. Meat producers also get little return.

The manufacturer in the dairy industry is in a similar position. The provisions of this Bill will enable some money to be allocated to this industry. Reasonable prices should be placed on goods that take into account the cost of producing, handling and processing the goods before they are bought by the consumer. It amazes me that one can buy a bottle of milk for 22c when some people pay more than 80c for some forms of alcohol. We should draw some sort of balance in our society in that regard. I support the Bill, although it is a pity that the Government must support the industry instead of the consumer doing it by paying the right price for the goods.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Treasurer may act as agent of the Commonwealth."

Mr. CHAPMAN: What steps has the Government taken to seek and allow an increased price to be charged to the consumer, rather than propping up the industry with State and Commonwealth funds? I raise this matter seriously, as I have done regarding the meat industry, because I believe a few cents on the article at the end of the line would not greatly affect the consumer, particularly regarding dairy products, but it would make a tremendous difference to the income of the grower. We are talking here about finance. We have gone to the Governments cap in hand, with justification, to support the industry. What simultaneous action has the Government taken to ensure that the consumer meets his responsibility by paying a realistic price for these valuable products?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I cannot answer the honourable member offhand, because I am not, as he would appreciate, involved in the matter. However, I imagine that the move would have to come from the Metropolitan Milk Board, which evidently makes any application in relation to the price of the commodity. I will put the matter raised by the honourable member to my colleague to see whether it can be considered.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR FUEL RATIONING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 5, line 2 (clause 14)—After the words "express or implied that is" insert the words "to his knowledge".

No. 2. Page 5, lines 5 to 8 (clause 14)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 3. Page 5, line 13 (clause 15)—Leave out "180" and insert "220".

No. 4. Page 7 (clause 25)—After line 31 insert new paragraph as follows:

"(aa) direct a person or a person of a class to do any specified matter or thing in relation to the manufacture, provision, transport or distribution of rationed motor fuel during a rationing period;"

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 and 2 be disagreed to.

The amendment made by the other place to clause 14

seems to me to make little difference and does not improve the Bill. In fact, it has the effect of limiting an offence to making consciously false or inaccurate statements and it removes the additional defence in respect of statements or representations made by the defendant which, by the exercise of all reasonable diligence, he could not have known to be false or inaccurate. I consider such a restriction to be undesirable in emergency legislation, and I oppose the amendments.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendments which, I believe, are reasonable in this case. The first amendment provides a defence for the person involved. Obviously what he does is done with his knowledge. As emergency conditions are involved, I believe that there is every right to give the benefit of the doubt to the individual.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

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

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

This amendment is identical to the amendment moved by the Opposition in this place, an amendment that was unacceptable to the Government at that time. The amendment seeks to delete the commonly used 44-gallon container from the definition of "bulk fuel". The purpose of clause 15 is to enable the Minister to prohibit any movement of large quantities of fuel that may exacerbate a fuel shortage. It is an essential power to have in such circumstances. When the Bill was previously before the Chamber I referred to the problems that occurred with the movement of 44-gallon drums in previous petrol shortages both in this State and in Victoria.

In this State rationing legislation was deliberately avoided by carting semi-trailer loads of 44-gallon drums. The power to prohibit the movement of bulk fuel is selective. Clause 15 (2) gives the Minister power to determine which consignments, or class of consignments of bulk fuel, if any, are to be restricted or prohibited. Obviously, such restrictions would not be invoked for other than undesirable practices. That is the important thing. Attempts were made and proven on the last occasion when certain people—

Mr. Dean Brown: What were they doing?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: They were selling and transporting fuel. I would be willing to tell the honourable member in private the name of the fellow involved if he wants to know. I want to prevent that situation from happening. This provision is not an attempt to stop farmers from getting petrol in the normal way. During the second reading debate, I said that farmers would be given every opportunity under this legislation provided no malpractices were occurring. This measure will certainly go to a conference, where I hope we can arrive at a solution to the problem, a solution that has not come forward so far in this amendment.

I am trying to prevent anyone from having the opportunity to resell at a profit fuel in 44-gallon drums, thus possibly making the State short of petrol in areas where it is important that petrol should be available. That is the sole purpose of the clause. I am confident that some good could come out of this at a conference, where I would be prepared to discuss it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pleased to hear that the Minister is willing to allow this matter to go to conference. The amendment will allow people who have 44-gallon drums of fuel to be exempted from the provisions of the Bill. This is important, because the Minister has power to restrict certain classes or consignments of bulk fuel. The obvious step that can be taken is to prohibit the movement of all bulk fuel.

Once an emergency occurs and a blanket cover is introduced, it is impossible to cover every case or person. If an attempt is made to freeze the supply of all petrol in the State, we cannot expect people to apply for various exemptions. The purpose of this amendment is to allow those people who already have 44-gallon drums the right to continue to use them. The Minister has said that he is trying to stop the importation of 44-gallon drums of fuel from other States. However, he already has power to do that under the legislation. The Minister may stop people from selling fuel. The Minister should realise that the case he cited of a person picking up fuel in 44-gallon drums from Mount Gambier could have been prevented under another provision in the Bill.

I am trying to protect farmers, contractors and other people who have their own fuel supplies in 44-gallon drums, and to ensure that in no circumstances can their supply be frozen. Those supplies should not be frozen. I agree that this is perhaps not a solution that the Minister likes, and I am willing to try to achieve a compromise in a deadlock conference. I still support the Legislative Council's amendment, and look forward to finding some sort of compromise that will ensure that the people whom I am trying to protect will in fact be protected.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

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

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

This amendment is identical to one moved by the Opposition in this place. It widens the scope of the Bill through the regulation-making power contained in clause 25. Members opposite have failed to recognise that the provisions of the Bill have been formulated on the basis of our experience with such legislation in the past.

In my second reading explanation, I said that the Bill was similar to the temporary legislation enacted last year, and had been based on experience gained during the administration of the 1972 and 1973 Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Acts. The powers contained in the Bill are neither greater nor less than those deemed necessary by that past experience. In effect, this amendment gives the Government power to control the whole of the oil industry, including its industrial relations.

The power in the amendment is neither wanted by the Government nor justified by past experience in rationing motor fuel. It has never been sought or suggested by any oil company, and I ask members opposite what possible benefit the inclusion of such sweeping powers could have other than to destroy the co-operation that this Government has enjoyed with employers, unions and industry in time of emergency. That type of co-operation has been extraordinary on all sides of the political arena. There has never been any hesitancy in looking after fuel supplies during an emergency crisis period, and I have no doubt that that co-operation from all sides will continue.

For that reason, the Government does not consider that the industrial relations scene in this State, whether it involves employee or employer organisations, ought to be upset by placing this amendment in the Bill. Immediately an amendment of this nature is enacted or considered, industrial disruption will occur. From all sides of the political arena, people would immediately think that the Government was trying to control their industry or their right to work or not to work in that industry. Neither I nor my Government is willing to sacrifice this harmonious relationship. For those reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: One needs to examine the circumstances facing the State when such a power is inserted in legislation. If there is a petrol shortage, one can

imagine that a desperate situation will exist. Personal movement in the State could virtually come to a halt, with only essential services able to move. For two or three weeks, the State could be without petrol and, as happened in 1972, the community would demand that the Government take action. On that occasion the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Premier stood up and said, "What can we do? This is an industrial dispute and it is up to the Arbitration Court to take action." While they were saying that, and standing aloof from the whole problem, this State was grinding to a halt. Personal freedom was restricted, because freedom of movement through the motor vehicle had been abolished.

The Minister invited members to examine the experience of previous petrol shortages in this State. Every single shortage has been brought about by an industrial dispute, a fact that the Minister does not like. He refused to acknowledge this in his second reading explanation. I reminded him of it, but he still refused to mention it when summing up the debate. Every shortage has been caused by an industrial dispute. This has caused severe restrictions and, in many cases, has meant at least a temporary loss of employment. Power must be given to the Government to take action on behalf of the community.

I know that the powers being conferred are wide. We are giving the Minister power to direct a person or a person of a class to do any specific matter or thing in relation to the manufacture, provision, transport or distribution of rationed motor fuel during a rationing period. In other words, we are giving the Minister power to direct people to return to work or to distribute petrol. We are dealing with a national crisis, and we are giving the Minister power to act in such circumstances. Does the Minister mean, by saying that he is not willing to accept this power, that he has no faith in his own ability to judge a situation? The Minister is really scared to be in a position where in a national or State crisis he is forced to take action. He is scared to put himself in a position where he must take unsavoury action against the trade union movement. He does not want to be faced with that sort of situation in future, and that is why he will not accept the amendment.

We should examine other examples where similar legislation has been introduced. The Minister invited us to do this when he introduced the Bill. He referred to legislation in Western Australia and similar legislation in New South Wales. I went to the energy authority legislation in New South Wales and found that Mr. Neville Wran, the Labor Premier, in December, 1976, introduced a Bill containing these very powers.

I think that, if the Labor Premier of New South Wales is prepared to take that responsibility, there is no reason why the Labor Government in South Australia should not do so as well. I reiterate that we are only looking at a crisis situation. This power we are giving to the Minister would be exercised only if a crisis continued on an extended basis and if essential services were grinding to a halt. It is an important power that must be given to the Minister. It is irresponsible for any Government to stand by and allow essential services in the community to be stopped and see an entire community held to ransom by a small number of people because of an industrial dispute. A responsible Government should be prepared to accept the responsibility of resolving such disputes.

We have seen the Federal Government recently being prepared to take that responsibility. It is unsavoury action at times. It demands that decisive and at times unpleasant action be taken by the Government against certain minority groups, but it is necessary. We see the situation in

America at present where such a potential dispute has arisen and where possibly 3 000 000 people may be out of a job in four weeks if that dispute is not resolved. The President there has powers and may have to use them if that industrial dispute is not resolved quickly.

That is the same sort of power we are trying to give to the Minister, not that he should use the power immediately. The Minister would be foolish if immediately an industrial dispute arose in the petrol refining industry he rushed in and demanded that people went back to work; that would be inviting trouble. However, we are giving him power so that where there is a protracted dispute and no immediate solution seems to be apparent he can act. I urge the House to support the amendment. A similar amendment was introduced here and any responsible Government must be prepared to accept that sort of power and wield it in a responsible manner. If the Minister is not prepared to accept that sort of power to protect the community, he should resign, or the Government should step down.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I can vividly remember the situation when this legislation first came before this House, I believe two years ago.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It's not a very vivid memory if you can't even remember what date it was.

Mr. TONKIN: I can remember the Minister's real embarrassment at that time over the introduction of this almost identical amendment by the Opposition. The point was made then, it has been made since, and it is made again today, that it is not enough for the Minister to have power to control the distribution of fuel, to ration fuel, if he is not going to have the power to require that fuel be transported to centres where it can be distributed, rationed and made available to essential services in a proper way.

The Minister is afraid to accept this amendment. He is afraid because this amendment will put members of the trade union movement (particularly militant members who may well be responsible for creating the very crisis that this Bill is introduced to overcome) on the same footing as other members of the community. Members of trade unions, for whom I have the greatest respect, are not in any way entitled to rights and privileges that are greater than those enjoyed by any other member of the community. This legislation, as it stands, and without this amendment, will put members of trade unions above other members of the community because they will be exempt from any sort of control. The Minister will be able to say publicly, "I am sorry; I would like to be able to require fuel supplies to be made available to the hospital at Whyalla or to other centres, but unfortunately I have not got the power. The Act does not entitle me to give those directions."

Mr. Dean Brown: He did it in the power dispute.

Mr. TONKIN: He has washed his hands every time of any responsibility. The whole object of this amendment is to give the Minister power and to take away the excuse that he undoubtedly will try to use, if the circumstances arise, to act properly in the best interests of the community.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell me when I made the last excuse about a dispute.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister continually makes excuses while industrial disputes are on. He is a little like his colleague, Mr. Hawke, in the Federal scene; he tends to wait and let things happen, and then takes the credit for them.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Very successfully.

Mr. TONKIN: That is an interesting admission. I repeat that this is a most responsible amendment; it will give the

Minister the powers that I would have thought he would want.

Mr. Chapman: He wants them over other sections of the community.

Mr. TONKIN: He wants them over every other section of the community, but because it does not suit him, because he has got all the other powers, because he has been told he must not touch the trade unions, because he must not have any power that he could possibly use to enforce the delivery of fuel to essential services, because it might upset the trade union concerned, he is not prepared to accept this amendment. For the second time in a week we are seeing the Minister showing that he has been directed from Trades Hall. He has had his instructions and he is afraid to do anything to stand up to them. I request Government members just for a change to put the best interests of South Australia first and not the best interests of the militant trade union leaders or of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not want to rehash the whole of the debate. All things that have just been said by the shadow Minister and the Leader have been said previously in the original debate. We hear this tirade against the unions on each occasion. I say to the member for Davenport that I will not be resigning and I will not be accepting the amendment, either. I will not be compromising on that amendment, because that is Government policy strong and solid. The political and industrial naivety of members opposite never ceases to amaze me. I am shocked that the member for Davenport, who I thought was learning to grasp a little bit about industrial matters, is in fact going backwards. He says that because there is legislation giving a Minister power he will control disputes and frighten people into submission. What utter rot! The Leader and the honourable member should analyse the Victorian S.E.C. dispute, where all the powers were available to the Victorian Government, and every conceivable power known in the arbitration system was threatened. That dispute was not solved through the system. In the past 15 to 20 years no major industrial dispute, either in this State or any other State of Australia, has been solved through the system, where there has been a controlling factor involved in it.

There has not been one occasion when they have been solved through the system. Do members opposite know who has solved the problem and who got some reasonableness back into the Victorian dispute?

Mr. Chapman: Bob Hawke?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Of course it was Bob Hawke. It was done by negotiation, not by standing over the workers and threatening them with all sorts of offences.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I sat in silence and listened to the member for Davenport. I will not hide behind a lack of power at any given moment in any dispute. I will buckle into that dispute and get the parties together as soon as I can to try to solve it, and I think my record is fairly good. Members opposite probably will not admit that, because their knowledge of industrial matters is not improving; they want to bludgeon the workers into the ground all the time—

Mr. Tonkin: Come on!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is true. On every occasion they want to bludgeon the workers. I want to reiterate something that was said at the Federal conference of Labour Ministers only a fortnight ago. The comment of Mr. Maclellan, the Victorian Minister, was that if South Australia was fortunate enough to be living in an industrial paradise he would like to see similar events occurring in Victoria and other States. We never get such

credit from members opposite. We always get accused of not putting power into Acts. Our success does not come about by chance, or by putting power into the legislation to control workers.

The record is on the board; it is not something I am saying. The statistics are there for all to see. It is done not by lucky dips or Christmas presents but by hard work and good understanding of all parts of industry. People in industry, employees and employers alike, have confidence in the Government, the Minister, and the department and take notice of them in time of industrial disputation. There is no possible way in which this Government will be influenced, irrespective of what is thrown at me by members opposite about my embarrassment. I am not embarrassed about this legislation; I am happy about it.

Last week in the House I was accused of all sorts of things. The member for Davempport and the Leader of the Opposition accused me of being stood over by the trade union movement in relation to the Apprentices Act Amendment Bill. They said that I could not move from that, that there had to be a unanimous decision of the committees or I could not face Trades Hall or I would be expelled for the trade union movement. Today, we have just carried new legislation providing for adult apprentices in South Australia for the first time. That has come about as a result of my efforts, despite all the assertions and all the complaints made last week. Members opposite have been made to eat their words on many occasions. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: One man has been accused over the past two years of being the worst union basher Australia has ever known. He has been accused of always adopting the wrong tactics in trying to settle industrial disputes. I refer to the Prime Minister, Mr. Malcolm Fraser. The facts, of course, stand for themselves. His record has been incredible. Under what Government did industrial disputes in Australia go from 2 300 000 or 2 500 000 (off the top of my head) to more than 6 000 000 man-days a year? That, of course, was under the Whitlam Administration. It was the Fraser Government, of course, that brought the figure to the lowest level since 1968. Malcolm Fraser's methods have worked very well, and members opposite do not like it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must tie in his comments with the amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am covering the amendment, because it gives the Minister power to take certain action. The Minister has argued that this is the wrong tactic to take. We are giving extensive powers to the Minister, and the use of such extensive powers has been shown, at least federally, to be very successful in reducing the number of man-days lost through industrial disputes.

The Minister spoke of what happened earlier today and what happened last week and what we said about his not being able to change his mind because of a direction from the Trades and Labor Council. We know what the Minister will now do. The conference was very short; it was over within 10 minutes. The amendments had been drafted when we got there. The Minister will go back to the Trades and Labor Council and say, "I am sorry, but I was pressured into doing this at a deadlock conference. We wanted to get the Bill through, and I was pressured into doing it." The conference was over quickly, and the Minister was so conciliatory that he was prepared to compromise and put the blame for this on the wicked Upper House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister mentioned that conference, and the honourable member for Davenport has since referred to it. I think we should cease referring to a conference held on another Bill. The honourable

member should confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have made the point. We know only too well what the Minister's excuse will be. I believe this power should be put into the Bill. The Bill gives the Minister power to direct the actions in relation to the use of motor vehicles and the purchase of fuel, and to direct every person in this State to come under his control on this matter, but he is not prepared to direct the people who have caused the shortage of fuel to take any action. He is prepared to take away the livelihood of people who are trying to sell fuel, and he has not commented on the hardship caused to them through petrol shortages. I understand some face financial ruin. The Minister allowed that to go on but he would not direct the people who caused the trouble to resolve the dispute. We are asking the Minister to take some action against the few who are causing the trouble, and not to pick on the community at large.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (16)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hudson and Virgo. Noes—Messrs. Blacker and Russack.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments render the Bill less effective.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 28. Page 1817.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, which simply seeks to repeal section 2a of the principal Act. By this repeal, the Land Settlement Committee of the Parliament will recommence to be legal and, therefore, it is virtually a formality that the Bill comes to us from another place.

I take this opportunity in supporting the Bill to spend a few moments in supporting the Land Settlement Committee. As a member of it over the past several years, I firmly believe that the committee should be retained. The committee does not meet often, but it meets when required and, indeed, in doing so it has carried out the duties and functions intended to be carried out by that committee in a most capable and responsible way. I pay a tribute, first, to the committee's Chairman (the member for Whyalla), a member who, I am sure, members will appreciate has a limited knowledge of rural and land affairs but, in these circumstances, he, as Chairman, has gone out of his way to become equipped with and to apprise himself of the problems brought to his attention. Indeed, he demonstrated good chairmanship and awareness of the subject, in particular, whilst on the job of interview with the settlers on Kangaroo Island.

The other members of the committee are the Hon. Mr. Blevins, the Hon. Mr. Whyte, and until recently the member for Frome (Mr. Claude Allen), who has now been replaced by the member for Rocky River. Both Mr. Allen, as we all know, and, indeed, the member for Rocky River have a sound understanding of rural and land affairs.

Whilst Claude Allen's contribution has been well received, I am sure that we can look forward to a similar contribution by the member for Rocky River.

Simply to support the retention of the committee, I cite the example of the committee's efforts during the past year. Members will recall that last year the committee was required by a memorandum from the Governor, via the Minister of Lands, to investigate into and report on the situation applying to 21 soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island—21 of the many war service land settlers who were rehabilitated there after the Second World War—who were seen by their bankers and by the Lands Department to be experiencing some financial difficulties, and who were described by some as being in a situation from which they could not recover. Before the Minister of Lands decided to remove those settlers from their broad acre leases and indeed, to cancel them, it was agreed that the committee should investigate and report back to the Minister. The committee met 14 times, visited Kangaroo Island three times, and took evidence during two of those visits to the island. Indeed, all of the committee's members visited all of the properties in question at that time.

Some 12 months has elapsed since the report was tabled in the other place by the Minister of Lands, and I think it reasonable in those circumstances in supporting the retention of the committee to report briefly on the situation applying to those 21 soldier settlers.

It will be recalled that one of the settlers during the period of investigation took his own life. His wife was rehabilitated satisfactorily (indeed, as I understand it, in her choice of district) in the metropolitan area. Incidentally, that widow of the settler, although she has not applied for the \$10 000 rehabilitation and *ex gratia* grants applicable to settlers being phased out of their property in such circumstances, if she meets the means test that is a qualification in the situation, she may well enjoy that kind of financial assistance over and above the provision of a home and the other assistance extended to her after having left the property.

That leaves 20 out of the 21 settlers referred to in the media at that time and since. Of those 20 settlers, three have either sold their properties or are in the process of disposing of them. That leaves 17 settlers. Only six of the settlers have actually had their leases cancelled, but in all cases the six soldier settlers with their families are still residing on their property. They enjoy, after having had their broad acre lease cancelled, a licence to occupy their home and an area of about 5 hectares around that home for a licence fee of \$10 a year.

Each and every one of those six settlers has enjoyed a \$5 000 non-repayable rehabilitation grant from the Government. They all have enjoyed a cheque for \$5 000 from the Government as an *ex gratia* payment because of the circumstances in which they have been placed. As I have said, they all have access to an area of land around their own home. The licence extended to them, whilst it is on an annual basis, is for the term of their life as long as they meet the conditions applicable to the licence. The licence is in the joint names of the six settlers and their wives and is available to their wives in the event of the death of the settlers.

The settlers are required as a condition of the licence to pay council rates. The local council rate in that community is \$30 a year. As a result of their circumstances the settlers enjoy the opportunity to apply to pay only half the applicable council rates to the Kingscote District Council. If their application is successful, the annual rate will reduce to \$15. They all enjoy the opportunity to apply to pay only half the telephone licence fee, the same benefit as applies to pensioners and other persons in such

circumstances.

The settlers have been granted the opportunity to purchase their motor vehicle at its book value. In most instances their vehicles have been purchased at auction at a low figure. They are in a situation where they remain as members of the community, a community which they have served in its development and in every other way since their period of occupation. I say that with no reflection on the individual efforts to act responsibly as citizens of the community.

They have enjoyed the financial assistance to which I have referred, as well as having been relieved from their total debt that accrued during the period of occupation of their property. They have no responsibility to repay all or any of their debts incurred by them or by the respective members of their family. They are, I believe, financially, socially and generally better off as a result of having been relieved of their debts and their broad acre leases because of the recommendation made by the Land Settlement Committee last year to the Minister of Lands.

The remaining 11 settlers who were allowed to continue to occupy and manage their broad acre allotments under the budget control of the Lands Department are, I understand, all going reasonably well, particularly when one takes into account the seasonal conditions that these settlers, along with their neighbours, have experienced over the past several years, particularly last year. In all instances I understand that those 11 settlers, who it was recommended be given another go, have exercised that opportunity well. In each instance they have reduced their overall debt during that period, and the indication at this stage is that they will be able to continue to do so. Despite rumours that have been circulated in the community that other settlers are likely to have their property leases cancelled, I understand that there are no further soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island considered by the Lands Department to be in a situation of that nature. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I wonder whether the Minister of Agriculture in South Australia really expects us to believe that he is serious in making his public utterances about surplus wine grapes in South Australia. I raised this matter a month ago and called on the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture to go to Canberra to impress on the Federal Government the situation in South Australia, because it is the major wine-producing State in Australia, and to bring home to the Federal Government the problems that we face here as a result of this major wine

grape surplus. At the moment we are faced with having about 40 000 tonnes of surplus grapes this year.

The Premier and the Minister of Agriculture should do their homework and show clearly to the Federal Government that the surplus of 40 000 tonnes this year will increase to 60 000 tonnes next year unless appropriate action is taken to relieve the situation. South Australia has far more to lose from this than has any other State in Australia. All we have heard from the Minister of Agriculture are statements in the press that he is waiting for replies from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chapman: Last week when he had the opportunity he sat there—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has just spoken. I hope that he will give the honourable member for Chaffey a chance to speak.

Mr. ARNOLD: When a State has a surplus it is up to it to prove its point and to ensure that the product it has in excess can be sold. I agree with the point made by the Minister of Agriculture that the carry-on loans that would apply to growers of red grapes would be insufficient assistance to overcome the problem. This week in the *Bunyip* newspaper the Minister is reported as follows:

The real answer would be for the Federal Government to give a competitive advantage to the Australian product.

Of course it would. Australian produced brandy always had a competitive advantage until Mr. Whitlam came to power and took away that advantage from the wine industry and virtually destroyed it. If only the Minister would go to Canberra and make representations on our behalf and use his influence as the South Australian Minister of Agriculture something might happen. If the Premier is not prepared to go to Canberra, the second best would be for the Minister of Agriculture to go. Since the State Government does not seem willing to go to Canberra and make representations, it should do its homework, as it can be shown that a reduction of 1 per cent in the excise on brandy would result in a 1.2 per cent increase in sales.

If there is a 30 per cent reduction in excise that is about a 35 per cent increase in sales. This can be statistically shown over a long period. Since brandy is a product that must be held for up to three years before it can be sold (the statutory time period is two years, but it is about three years before it is sold), then for every bottle of brandy sold there is, under normal management practice, a requirement for three bottles to take its place. Therefore, a reduction of 30 per cent in the excise on Australian-produced brandy would result, virtually, in a doubling of the sales of brandy in Australia. This would require an enormous intake of fruit, because for every bottle of brandy sold three bottles are needed to take its place.

The Government has not been prepared to go to Canberra and press these statistical points on the Federal Government, showing that the Federal Government would not lose by way of taxation or excise if it took this step. Moreover, it would be solving a real problem in the country by reverting to what the excise was prior to the Whitlam Labor Government coming into power. It is worth while to remember that the European Economic Community has about 200 000 000 litres of alcohol in stock. This has been accumulated under a subsidised system implemented by the Governments of the E.E.C. countries. If that figure is converted into bottles of brandy, we are looking at a surplus of more than 600 000 000 bottles. That brandy has been produced under subsidy in those countries and sooner or later we will find this brandy being deposited on the Australian market; that will worsen the situation.

If no reduction in excise occurs, if we consider the massive excess of dry red wine held in Australia at the

moment and regard about three times the normal sales as being the requirement of stock to be held, we find that we have about 44 600 000 litres of red wine over and above the stocks required for normal management. That figure of 44 600 000 litres of dry red wine is equivalent to 55 750 tonnes of grapes over and above the normal stock requirements. Obviously, if there is no reduction in the excise on Australian produced brandy, the wineries in Australia will not be buying grapes next year for brandy production; they will distill some of that 44 600 000 litres of red wine to reduce their stocks. This will mean, in effect, that we will be looking at a surplus of about 60 000 tonnes of wine grapes next year. This is such a serious situation that I believe it warranted special representation by the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture in Canberra to impress the position on the Federal Government.

I recognise it is up to the Federal Government, because only that Government can reduce the excise on Australian produced brandy, but influence by the State Government, particularly the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, would have been of great advantage. Unfortunately, they have not been prepared to give up a day to impress on the Prime Minister, the Treasurer and the Minister for Primary Industry the seriousness of the situation in South Australia.

Mr. Slater: Why don't you do it yourself?

Mr. ARNOLD: That is precisely what we are going to do. On Monday morning, the Leader and I will be in Canberra with all the figures that we have been working on to try to convince the Federal Government of the need for a substantial reduction in the excise on Australian-made brandy. Unfortunately, this representation should have come from the Government of South Australia by way of the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture. Since this has not been forthcoming, the approach will be made by the Leader and me.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I am sure that all members of this House have been following with interest the news reports over the past couple of weeks concerning the plight of aborigines in our community today. We have read of Mr. Al Grassby's reports after his visit to central Australia, there has been the letter from the Yuendumu community which was written to the editor of the *Advertiser*, and then there has been the announcement by a Federal Minister that the Government would increase the money spent on Aboriginal housing in central Australia to just over \$500 000 a year. The Minister, Mr. Viner, had the gall to call this significant progress.

Reading the report of Mr. Viner's announcement, I couldn't help wondering whether the Aborigines of Alice Springs would rather have the "significant progress" that Viner offers (and that works out at about \$500 a household), or whether they would rather have the "tough life" that the Federal Government would have given John Kerr (at something over \$80 000 a household), if public reaction hadn't stopped that. Of course, the offer that Viner made might be considered significant progress because the record of Federal Governments since 1901 has, with the exception of the honest attempts of the Whitlam Government, been pitiful and disgraceful. In fact, it would take very little to be a significant progress from what has gone before. The Aboriginal people have lived in Australia for over 30 000 years. With a simple lifestyle, they managed to survive in this country. Many of them survived in an environment more hostile than in any other part of the World save the South Pole. They survived those 30 000 years with dignity, but for what purpose—to be systematically murdered by white

Australians!

The term "murdered" might be considered harsh, but I find that Aborigines dying through excessive drinking of alcohol, fostered by white Australians, malnutrition and insufficient housing all leads to one thing—murder. In 200 years by our arrogance, cruelty and exploitation, but most of all by our apathy, we have savagely attacked this race and done more damage to them than the harsh Australian environment could do in 300 centuries. Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a famous international black sociologist said, after a visit to this country:

Australia is a racist country. To insist, as some authorities do, that racism is not part of the overall experience is to be blind to the realities of history and ignorance or insensitive to the daily suffering which the Aborigines face.

These are harsh words, but we cannot afford to be indignant about them, because they are true. The harsh truth is that the present suffering of the Aborigines is the result of white occupation of this country; that and nothing else. They have been subjected to culture shock, and we have done precious little to help them adjust.

Let us consider other Aboriginal races. The Indians of Canada and the United States, the Maoris of New Zealand, and the blacks of South Africa have survived the oppression of the white man better than have the Aborigines. That has been because we gave them nothing, and credited them with nothing. I have been interested to read of the ways in which Maori culture has been promoted in New Zealand. I am not just talking about the cheap Maori dances put on to attract tourists. Over the years, many whites in New Zealand have co-operated with Maori leaders to further Maori culture, to protect it from being swamped, and to adjust it to the modern world. There have been many problems and many crises of racial intolerance, but the end result today is a happier one than that which we see in Australia.

I am no friend of the South African Government. I have taken part in anti-apartheid demonstrations and I have signed many petitions opposing apartheid in South Africa. I have signed petitions calling for the abolition of apartheid, but the truth is that I must admit that the blacks in South Africa have come out of their experience with less damage to their spirit than that suffered by other oppressed people. They have survived the most terrible oppression, because the numbers have always been with them; they have always known that the white man can do what he will, but the blacks in South Africa eventually will win, and I think that moment is not far off.

The Aborigines have not got that hope. They know that they have been oppressed, and they have the depressing prospect that the chances are that in the future they will continue to be oppressed as savagely as before. The events of the past couple of weeks prove my point. Al Grassby has told us again of the terrible plight of Aborigines in Central Australia, and there has been a sad letter from the Yuendumu Aboriginal Community. What has been the response? Have there been letters in the papers? Has there been an outcry from the people in Australia? There had been nothing, simply a yawn from the Australian community. We heard over the news that Mr. Grassby was talking to these pitiful people, but by the following day everyone had forgotten about it. The community sits with a bored look on its face as it hears of sadistic publicans who make very high profits out of the drinking problem of many Aborigines. The publicans sell the Aborigines flagons of cheap wine at huge prices from corrugated shanties in the outback where decent white folk will not see the drunken blacks! Surely, no sight could be as disgusting as the publican himself who has so little humanity that he is eagerly poisoning a race, purely for

profit.

To my mind, the action of these publications is similar to the action of certain people in Nazi Germany during the 1930's. They killed millions of Jews, and a large section of the Australian public is as guilty as was the German public that remained quiet during that reign of terror; it is even more guilty, for there would be no immediate arrest in this country for the white man or woman who spoke up on behalf of the Aborigines.

Leaders of the Aboriginal community have pleaded to be given more authority over their own lives. They have asked for a greater say on how money is spent on them by Governments, for they are sick of the Federal Government's spending many times more money on whites who are supposedly looking after the blacks than on the blacks themselves. They have asked to control drink outlets for those Aborigines who live in country areas, taking away the power of publicans who have no sense of responsibility. They have asked for a say in social planning, and they have asked for control of their own lands. We know the answer they have had: nothing.

This State Government has done everything it can to help the Aborigines control their own future, but what can we do to stop the Federal Government from undermining the Aborigines of this country by selling them out on the land rights issue, for example, or refusing to listen to their pleas on the alcohol issue? The present Federal policy towards the Aborigines is little better than that of the farmer from Tennant Creek who said a couple of years ago that the Aboriginal problem could be solved by allowing an open hunting season on them. The Federal Government and, unfortunately, many Australians hope that if they keep their heads in the sand long enough the problem will go away. It will, and the race will die out.

Recently, an article in the *Advertiser Saturday Review* on March 4, 1978, under the heading "Rock of hope", dealt with Mr. Yunupingu, an Aboriginal who is Chairman of the Northern Land Council and who is negotiating with an American, Mr. Stephen Zorn, in trying to get the best rights for Aborigines in relation to uranium mining. This is what Mr. Yunupingu said about the Federal Government:

"In dealing with the Government we Aborigines know we are dealing with somebody who is powerful and who supports the mining people for money," he says.

"We know we mean nothing to the Government. We know this from years of being continuously exploited. We do not trust them. If the Government really wanted to support us, they would give us our land absolutely but instead they have made a Land Rights Act full of holes and escape clauses for them and the miners. They say we will talk, we will talk . . . but consultation is no protection."

In the *Advertiser* on Monday, March 6, there was a report about the Aborigines wanting a 2.5 per cent share of profits from the multi-million dollar Ranger uranium mines in the Northern Territory. Even though the Government had belatedly given the right to negotiate with the consortium, the consortium went against this and leaked the draft agreement to other mining companies and now is trying its hardest to cheat the Aborigines of their rights. The Aborigines do not want money: they only want their land. If their land is to be used for mining, they want a good deal.

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

MR. MATHWIN (Glennelg): During this session, many members opposite have consistently asked what socialism is and what a socialist is. I understand their problem. When they do not realise what it is all about, they find it difficult to differentiate between socialism and com-

munism, because there is little difference. The only difference is that communism can occur quickly, with a revolution to do the job, whereas the socialists believe that it takes longer. The aims and ends are the same. We would have expected the member for Newlands to be able to give members opposite the advice they wanted, because he came from a country that has been socialist for a long time. He would have been able to give his colleagues or comrades advice on that aspect.

I realise that there are different socialists. There are national socialists, of whom we are well aware and of whom the honourable member spoke recently. There were the national socialists of Germany prior to the Second World War. We have the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with its communists, bolsheviks, Trotskyites, and all the "isms". They are socialists, because the word "socialist" is in the name of the country. We have a communist country that is a socialist country. If you want your ideal and really want to know what it is all about, you study the Russian way of life and background. The Russians are socialists, and that is what members opposite claim to be. The dictionary definition of "socialism" is as follows:

Theory, principle, or scheme of social organisation which places the means of production and distribution in the hands of the community.

We speak of the red of communism as being the extreme, although members opposite enjoy a few choruses of the *Red Flag*, as I am sure they have done on many occasions. That is a basic ditty of the Community Party, and I can visualise many members opposite with clenched fists raised and smiling faces, singing the choruses of that song. A member of the Labour Party in the House of Commons, Bessie Braddock, the member for Exchange, in Liverpool, did the Irish Jig, in the House, to the singing of the *Red Flag* by the Labour members. Let us look at what some of the experts say. Elie Halevy's definition is as follows:

The socialists believe in two things which are absolutely different and perhaps even contradictory: freedom and organisation.

Another quote comes from Sir Winston Churchill, who in one of his earlier strictures against socialism said:

They are not fit to manage a wheel stall.

My friend will explain to his colleagues what that means. He also said:

Socialism is described as a Government of the duds, by the duds, and for the duds.

Mr. Whitten: Are you frightened of them?

Mr. MATHWIN: No, not in the least. I have another quote by Sir Winston Churchill, as follows:

Socialism is the philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance and the gospel of envy.

That is a fair run-down of just what it is. Mr. Mencken stated:

Socialist—a man suffering from an overwhelming compulsion to believe what is not true.

They are all learned people who have explained their ideas of what constitutes socialism. Sir Winston Churchill was right on this subject. Many times he took on the socialists,

and he was able to describe them aptly. In the House of Commons, in 1952, the honourable gentleman is quoted as saying the following:

Hitherto, British socialist policy has been to nationalise what industries they thought fit and to pay reasonable compensation to the owners and shareholders. This is a matter of principle in which they differ from the Communist Party. That and the maintenance of political liberty are the two main points of difference.

They are the only two main points of difference between communism and socialism. There, he is giving a little ground to the Labor Party.

Mr. Hemmings: How can you believe someone who gave the order to the troops to fire on the people of his own country?

Mr. MATHWIN: My friend from Elizabeth is talking about someone giving orders to fire on his own people. He should look at the blood record of communism and of its extermination of many millions of people throughout the world over the past few years. He should be ashamed to link himself with the reds.

Mr. Drury: And you ought to be ashamed to take their money for the wheat and wool you sell them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: I can imagine the honourable member being in private enterprise a few years ago and refusing to work for someone because he was a capitalist. We all know that the honourable gentleman hates the very sight of capitalists. He believes they are shocking people. Do I take it that he, when working in some trade or other before becoming a member, would have refused to do any work for a capitalist or a liberal? To show how close together communism and socialism are, one has only to read the writings and manifestos of Marx and Engels on socialism and communism, reactionary socialism and Federal socialism.

The member for Mount Gambier said recently in the House that Karl Marx chose the word communism as a result of the flick of a coin. When he did not know whether to call it socialism or communism, he flicked the coin and it came down heads, and he called it communism. That is how close it is, and that is how close Government members are. It is hard to differentiate between colours and to ascertain where the pink finishes and the red begins. We have the extreme left fighting on the Government benches. This is general knowledge; we know what is going on at Government Party meetings. We know that the fight is on between the extreme left and others in the Government Party. We know that it will not be long before the right prevails, and eventually the swing to the left will be halted in the Government Party room. It has gone that far.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 14, at 2 p.m.