

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

SHACKS

Tuesday 31 July 1979

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to Questions on Notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 60.

MUNNO PARA LAND

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

1. What area of land does the State Planning Authority own in the District Council of Munno Para and what is the location and size of each reserve?

2. What is the programme for development of these reserves and the nature of the individual developments contemplated?

The **Hon. R. G. PAYNE**: A reply to this question, which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member on 12 June 1979, is as follows:

1. The total area of land owned by the State Planning Authority in the Munno Para District Council is at present 530 hectares. The location and size of each reserve is as shown in the accompanying table.

| No. | Reserve Name | Location | Area (Ha) |
|-----|------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| 2 | Angle Vale | East of Angle Vale | 109.2 |
| 3 | Smithfield West | N-W of Smithfield | 32.6 |
| 4 | Smithfield North | N-E of Smithfield | 138.6 |
| 6 | Elizabeth East | East of Elizabeth | 61.6 |
| 7 | Penfield | N-W of Elizabeth | 146.8 |
| 8 | Waterloo Corner | East of Waterloo Corner | 32.6 |
| | Scenic Road | | |
| | Lookout No. 1 | South of Gawler | 8.9 |

2. A programme for the development of these reserves is yet to be completed. Arrangements were made some months ago with officers of the Munno Para council to commence a series of studies leading to concept plans for each of the reserves in the area, but unfortunately, a reduction in staff numbers has delayed commencement of the task, which is now expected to commence later this year.

There has been some prior commitment of reserve land, for example, at Penfield, part of the area is to serve as a flood control part for the Munno Para drainage scheme, and there may be some changes to the location of reserves. There have also been several expressions of interest from sporting bodies, etc., in use of parts of the reserves. In general, such requests will be considered at the time of preparation of concept plans.

Tree planting programmes have commenced, the 1978 experimental planting programme including Smithfield North and Penfield Reserves. Systematic large-scale tree planting will proceed from now on. Most of the reserve land is leased back to primary producers pending decisions on its development and use.

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

1. Does the State Planning Authority distribute the publication *Site Planning for Waterfront Holiday Shacks* and, if so, when was it first prepared, has it been altered in the interim, or alternatively, is it intended to alter it and what are the details?

2. Have the Department of Tourism, Department for the Environment, or the Department of Lands ever made representations about the publication in respect of "shack" or "holiday home" activities and, if so, what are the details of their individual representations?

3. If an update of the publication is in train who is responsible for its preparation and when is it expected that it will be released?

4. What will be the method of distribution of any such document?

The **Hon. R. G. PAYNE**: A reply to this question, which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member on 12 June 1979, is as follows:

1. Yes, prepared in 1967. There have been no alterations to it since its preparation. It is presently being rewritten to incorporate a much wider range of considerations, particularly matters referring to the design of structures. It is envisaged that the publication will be used by Government authorities, local councils and members of the public.

2. Representations on the draft publication have been received from the Environment Department and the Lands Department. The Environment Department has made a number of submissions as a result of inter-departmental consultation during the past 10 months. The last submission received indicated a general acceptance of the publication by the Coast Protection Board. It also included further comments from the Co-ordination and Policy Division which will be taken into account when preparing the final document. The Lands Department considers the publication appropriate for new holiday home development.

3. The amended publication is being prepared by the Urban Design (Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department) and its release is anticipated by the end of 1979.

4. Distribution will be through Government authorities and local councils.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

7. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. What is the relative production cost per megawatt of electricity generated by the Electricity Trust of South Australia at each of the following power stations—Torrens Island A, Thomas Playford A and B, and Dry Creek?

2. What is the price on gas per million b.t.u. supplied to the Electricity Trust of South Australia at Torrens Island by the Pipelines Authority of South Australia?

3. What is the price on an equivalent million b.t.u. basis of coal delivered by the Electricity Trust of South Australia to the Thomas Playford power station at Port Augusta?

4. During 1977-78 what was the total cost of natural gas purchased by the trust from the Pipelines Authority of South Australia?

5. During 1977-78 what was the total cost of oil purchased by the trust?

The **Hon. HUGH HUDSON**: The Electricity Trust considers that the type of information sought by the

honourable member is of a confidential commercial nature. The trust is not prepared to divulge it because it believes that it could prejudice the trust's position in negotiations involving fuel supplies. However, the trust would be happy to discuss the information with the honourable member so long as that occurred on a strictly confidential basis.

APPRENTICES

8. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. What percentage of persons who start apprenticeships successfully complete the full requirements and what are the respective percentages for each of the major trade areas?

2. What numbers of persons started apprenticeships in the first four months of 1979 and what are the comparative figures for the previous four years?

3. Does the Minister anticipate that the total intake of new apprentices during 1978-79 will be below that for 1977-78 and, if so, by how much?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The reply to this question, which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member on 12 June 1979, is as follows:

1. (a) Approximately 85 per cent.

| | Per Cent |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| (b) Metal Trades | 88 |
| Electrical Trades | 98 |
| Building Trades | 85 |
| Furniture and Associated Trades | 77 |
| Printing | 92 |
| Vehicle Industry Trades | 79 |
| Hairdressing Trades | 74 |

2. (a) 1979—1 215;

| | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| (b) 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 |
| 1 419 | 1 522 | 1 668 | 1 304 |

3. (a) Yes.

(b) Approximately 150.

SAVINGS BANK

9. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. How many new buildings are being constructed or have been constructed over the past 18 months for use as offices by The Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. How many existing branch office buildings of the bank are undergoing or have undergone major renovations over the past 18 months?

3. What is the total value of all building work carried out for the bank during 1976-77, 1977-78, and 1978-79, respectively?

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

1. 13.

2. Nine.

3. 1976-77—\$519 801
1977-78—\$835 272
1978-79—\$2 290 308
(to 28/5/79).

SAFCOL

10. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Has a report been prepared by the Department of Economic Development into the possible permanent closure of the Safcol cannery at Port Lincoln and, if so, what were the findings of the report?

2. Who prepared the report?

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

1. Yes. The report confirmed that tuna catches in the Port Lincoln region were declining and that the relative distribution of that catch was subject to change. The findings of the report, however, are still subject to confirmation and disclosure of those findings could pre-empt the commercial decision-making process of the organisations involved.

2. Department of Economic Development.

VANDALISM

12. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):

1. What action does the Government intend to take as a result of the findings of the committee established to inquire into vandalism in South Australia?

2. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to provide compensation to victims of property crime as recommended by the committee?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. The following action is being taken to implement the recommendations of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Vandalism. The numbers shown refer to the numbers of the recommendations contained in the summary of recommendations in the report:

- The proposed Justice Information System should enable scientific research to be undertaken.
- The Office of Crime Statistics is reviewing the results of overseas research.
- The Education Department recognises the need and is preparing staff to further implement the programmes.
- Training programmes in human relations and community-school relationships are being conducted throughout the State by the Education Department. A Parent and Community Development Adviser has been appointed. A number of scholarships in community-school relations will be available to teachers in 1980.
- The Education Department will evaluate programmes in three secondary schools.
- and 8. The Department for Community Welfare proposes to convene a meeting of representatives of the media to discuss these recommendations.
- One film is already available and a second film is proposed. The usefulness of other audio-visual resources is being investigated by the Education Department.
- This is a matter for the media. The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act permits some information to be published when a conviction is recorded against a juvenile.
- Caring relationships are an essential part of the Health Education Programme for senior students. The development of parenting skills will be emphasised when suitably skilled teachers become available.
- The Division of Recreation and Sport and the Youth Bureau are jointly looking at priorities given to the provision of recreation services in areas identified as most seriously affected by vandalism.
- and 13. These recommendations are being considered by the Departments of Community Welfare and Community Development in relation to the 1979-80 Budget.
- In conjunction with the Working Party on Information Services, the Youth Bureau in the Department of Community Development is

- undertaking examination of the existing services providing information to young people, the adequacy of these services and methods by which young people's access to information about relevant services can be improved.
15. Membership of a Standing Committee is being considered and proposals are being framed by the Police Department.
 16. A computer programme has been designed by the Public Buildings Department to provide monthly figures on vandalism costs for assets maintained by that department.
 - 17 to 20. The recommendations are to be included as appropriate in the Public Buildings Department's Job Procedure Manual and Standard Specifications.
 - 21 and 22. The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979 provides certain powers to order compensation and restitution for damage or loss.
 23. The Law Department is reviewing all monetary penalties.
 24. It is proposed to incorporate suitable provisions in the Correctional Services Act and Courts Procedure Act. The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act provides powers in relation to juveniles.
 25. This recommendation has been fully considered by the Attorney-General but in view of the major problems involved it is not proposed to take any action at this stage.
 26. Some reforms in this area will be introduced during the present session of Parliament by the Attorney-General.
- II. Not at this time.

NOISE CONTROL ACT

13. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):
1. How many prosecutions have been launched under the Noise Control Act as a result of complaints from house-holders?
 2. How many complaints on average are received a month?

3. Are the complaints increasing or decreasing in number?
 4. How many inspectors are employed by the Government to investigate these complaints?
 5. How many complaints have been related to noise produced by industry?
 6. What are the details of any prosecutions, if any, which have been launched against industrial or commercial enterprises as a result of complaints of excessive noise?
- The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The replies are as follows:
1. Two.
 2. Approximately 150 per month.
 3. Increasing.
 4. Six.
 5. 304 from July 1977 to April 1979.
 6. No prosecutions have been launched.

NATIONAL PARKS

14. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):
1. How much has been spent during the present financial year on fencing reserves and national parks in South Australia?
 2. What plans has the Government to fence these areas in the future?
- The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The replies are as follows:
1. \$74 900 to 30 April 1979.
 2. These will depend on priorities and the availability of funds.

FIRE BRIGADE

28. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): When will the committee established to inquire into the operations of the South Australian Fire Brigade report its findings?
- The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** A reply to this question, which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member on 1 June 1979, is as follows:
- Although no specific time limitations were placed on the committee appointed to inquire into the operations of the South Australian Fire Brigade, the chairman of that committee has indicated that it expects to have its report completed by the end of August this year.

DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION

29. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):
1. What was the total cost of the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs?
 2. What were the amounts paid to the Chairman, the members of the Commission, and to Mr. D. Muirhead, counsel assisting the Commission?
 3. Were the hearings of the Commission formal and, if not, what was the nature of the hearings?
 4. How many hearings were in the form of "working lunches"?
 5. What travel was involved in the expenses of the Commission (including counsel assisting)?

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

1. \$782 000, which is less than the estimated cost of \$813 690.
2. Members' Fees and Reimbursement of Members' Salaries—

| | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | Total | Duties |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | |
| Professor R. Sackville | 3 000-00 | 11 932-50 | 14 207-15 | 29 139-65 | Chairman |
| University of N.S.W. reimbursement of half Professor Sackville's salary, superannuation, long service payments, etc. | 20 809-12 | 10 784-42 | 31 593-54 | — | — |
| IMVS reimbursement of Dr. E. Hackett's salary | 8 630-90 | 34 280-30 | 26 386-00 | 69 297-20 | Commissioner |
| South Australian Institute of Technology—Dr. Nies | — | 3 500-00 | 1 500-00 | 5 000-00 | Commissioner |
| | \$11 630-90 | \$70 521-92 | \$52 877-57 | \$135 030-39 | |

Dr. Hackett was paid his normal salary by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and the Commission reimbursed the institute from 7 March 1977 to 8 April 1979.

From 1 July 1977 to 2 April 1979, Professor Sackville worked half-time with the Commission and the University of New South Wales was reimbursed half of his salary for that period.

Counsel assisting the Commission received the following amounts—Dr. Muirhead, 1976-77, \$21 007.85; 1977-78, \$79 746.59; 1978-79, \$61 760.23; total, \$162 514.67.

3. As detailed on page 10 of the Final Report of the Commission under the heading "Hearings", public hearings were held on 19 days between August and October 1977. Some of the formalities relating to public hearings were dispensed with in the interest of encouraging wide-ranging discussion and witnesses were not required to take oaths or affirmations and were not formally cross-examined.

4. None.

5. The Commission took submissions and sought evidence from Government departments, agencies and individuals outside of South Australia and members visited treatment facilities in New South Wales and Victoria. In August 1978 the chairman and counsel assisting the Commission visited England to seek information on treatment of drug users. Information regarding interstate and overseas contacts is supplied on page 15 of the Final Report.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

31. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. What was the cost of the repairs after the riot at the McNally Training Centre on 25 January?

2. Were all those repairs carried out by the Public Buildings Department and if not, which were and who were the outside contractors, respectively?

3. Was the carpet in the Sturt unit replaced and if so, what was the cost and if not, what action was taken to make good the damage to it?

4. Of the damage detailed in the answers to Question No. 1096 of last session, what was the cost of relating to those items, respectively?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. \$5 909.

2. All repairs were carried out by the Public Buildings Department except that Carpet Cleaners Pty. Ltd. were engaged to clean and repair the carpet and Chubbs Lock and Safe Division repaired locks.

3. The carpet was not replaced, but it was dried and cleaned. A small strip was inserted along one edge to compensate for shrinkage.

4. Cost of repairs to the building structure including the electrical supply was \$2 700. The cost to replace furnishings and equipment was \$3 209.

JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS

32. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Has there been at any time since 10 February 1979 a convicted homosexual rapist mixing with other inmates and/or sleeping in a dormitory unit and if so:

(a) which unit is, or was, he in;

(b) when was he placed there;

(c) how long was he allowed to remain there;

(d) is it the policy of the Government to allow this type of boy to mix with other inmates in dormitory-type accommodation;

(e) whose decision is it to house these boys together;

(f) what is the reason for this situation occurring;

(g) is it for the benefit of the inmates in general for this situation to occur;

(h) is it for the benefit of the inmate concerned for the situation to occur; and

(i) have medical checks been carried out on inmates and if so, how many cases of venereal disease have been detected and what action has been taken?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows: A reply to this question, which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member, is as follows:

Yes.

(a) Assessment Two, Three and Sturt.

(b) 17/1/79 to 28/2/79, and 13/3/79 to 22/6/79.

(c) See (b) above.

(d) Yes, where there is night officer supervision.

(e) Supervisor of the centre.

(f) Accommodation is supplied which relates to the programme of the youth and his needs. Any risk factor to other youths is considered at this time.

(g) See (f).

(h) See (f).

(i) Medical checks are carried out on all residents. Whenever there is any suspicion that a youth coming into care might be suffering from venereal disease or the youth requests it, he is referred to the venereal disease clinic for examination and any necessary treatment. Results of these visits are confidential between the clinic and patient.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

33. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Have there been any sex offenders or convicted homosexual rapists detained in open units or sleeping in dormitory units in the McNally Training Centre since July 1977 and, if so, how many and in which units were they housed?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows: A reply to this question, which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member, is as follows:

Yes. Twenty-nine youths convicted of sexual offences were held in the centre. Five of these were convicted of homosexual rape. They were housed in assessment one, two and three and Sturt and Grenfell.

34. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Have there been any assaults on staff at the McNally Training Centre since 26 December 1978 until the week of answering this question and, if so, how many and—

(a) what are the weekly totals of assaults, respectively;

(b) have any staff sustained injuries as a result of these assaults;

(c) what type of injuries were sustained, respectively; and

(d) how many staff lost work time because of these assaults and for how long?

2. Have there been any resignations of staff since December 1978 and, if so, what are the weekly totals, respectively?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

(a) Week ending 29/12/78, 1; week ending 5/1/79, 3; week ending 12/1/79, 0; week ending 19/1/79, 0; week ending 26/1/79, 4; week ending 2/2/79, 3; week ending 9/2/79, 0; week ending 16/2/79,

0; week ending 23/2/79, 2; week ending 2/3/79, 2; week ending 9/3/79, 0; week ending 16/3/79, 2; week ending 23/3/79, 0; week ending 30/3/79, 0; week ending 6/4/79, 1; week ending 13/4/79, 0; week ending 20/4/79, 0; week ending 27/4/79, 1; week ending 4/5/79, 0; week ending 11/5/79, 0; week ending 18/5/79, 0; week ending 25/5/79, 0; week ending 31/5/79, 0.

(b) Yes.

(c) Week ending 29/12/78, no injury; week ending 5/1/79, bruised thumb, strained muscle and psychological problem, bruised cheek; week ending 12/1/79, no injury; week ending 19/1/79, no injury; week ending 26/1/79, bruised fingers, cut hand and cut on face, cut on leg, cut finger; week ending 2/2/79, bruised elbow, bruised hand; week ending 9/2/79, no injury; week ending 16/2/79, no injury; week ending 23/2/79, bruised ribs, concussion; week ending 2/3/79, bruised hand and abdomen, bruised cheek; week ending 16/3/79, bruised back; week ending 6/4/79, bruised neck, head and laceration on face; week ending 27/4/79, bruises to body; week ending 4/5/79, no injury; week ending 11/5/79, no injury; week ending 18/5/79, no injury; week ending 25/5/79, no injury; week ending 31/5/79, no injury.

(d) Eight. 1 x 2 days.
2 x 3 days.
1 x 7 days.
1 x 11 days.
1 x 14 days.
1 x 21 days.
1 x 58 days.

2. Yes. Week ending 29/12/78, 0; week ending 5/1/79, 2; week ending 12/1/79, 0; week ending 19/1/79, 0; week ending 26/1/79, 1; week ending 2/2/79, 1; week ending 9/2/79, 3; week ending 16/2/79, 1; week ending 23/2/79, 0; week ending 2/3/79, 0; week ending 9/3/79, 0; week ending 16/3/79, 0; week ending 23/3/79, 1; week ending 30/3/79, 0; week ending 6/4/79, 0; week ending 13/4/79, 1; week ending 20/4/79, 0; week ending 27/4/79, 0; week ending 4/5/79, 0; week ending 11/5/79, 0; week ending 18/5/79, 0; week ending 25/5/79, 0; week ending 31/5/79, 1.

35. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Was there a disturbance at the McNally Training Centre on Saturday 10 March 1979 and, if so—

(a) what time did it occur; and

(b) at what time was it brought under control approximately?

2. Was any damage caused during that riot and if so—

(a) what was the extent of that damage; and

(b) what was the cost of repairs, respectively?

3. In what units was there damage and what was the cause of that damage?

4. How many fires were started and in which units did they occur, on 9, 10 and 11 March 1979 and what was the cost of that damage, in each instance?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

(a) 9.30 p.m.

(b) 1.00 a.m.

2. Yes.

(a) Damage to furniture, fittings and glazing; broken crockery and light fittings; electrical appliances damaged; damage to locks, doors and barriers; holes in ceiling; paint splashed on walls and floors.

(b) Repairs to the damage, modifications and

upgrading were carried out together without separate costing. The total cost of all this work was \$72 000.

3. Sturt; assessment two; assessment three. Damage was caused by residents' behaviour.

4. Three. Linen store, approximately \$100 damage.

Canteen, approximately \$21 000 damage.

Assessment two dormitory, approximately \$150 damage.

JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS

36. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. What is the Government's policy regarding visitors to inmates in institutions and are there any restrictions on visitors passing alcohol to inmates?

2. Are there any restrictions to prevent the passing of contraband to inmates by visitors, boys returning from leave or boys on escorted leave, who revisit inmates at McNally Training Centre?

3. Are effective searches being conducted at these institutions and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Residents are allowed approved visitors at least once a week. Yes, there are restrictions.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

37. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Is the under 15-year-old unit known as Ningana to be transferred from Vaughan House to McNally Training Centre and, if so, when?

2. Is the Minister satisfied that because of the recent record of McNally Training Centre and present shortage of proper accommodation there, the transfer will be successful and the staff will be able to cope with the increase of inmates?

3. Is the new unit to be a secure unit and where is it situated?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, from Brookway Park, mid June 1979.

2. Yes.

3. Semi-secure; in the western wing.

NATIONAL PARKS

38. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. How many hectares of land are proclaimed as national, conservation and recreation parks, and game reserves in South Australia?

2. How many personnel within the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department for the Environment are involved in planning with respect to this area of land, and in actual management and maintenance work within these parks and reserves?

3. Does the Minister consider that this number of personnel is sufficient to care for these parks and reserves under true conservation principles and so as to cause a minimum of adverse effects upon adjoining landholders?

4. Are these workers being used as efficiently as possible?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 3 920 940 at 30 June 1978.

2. At 30 June 1979 there were three full-time professional officers involved in planning for parks and reserves as part of their duties. At the above date, there were 151 full or part-time staff involved in the actual management and maintenance of parks and reserves. The latter figure is broken down into: 38 rangers; 81

permanent full-time park keepers and maintenance workers; 12 permanent part-time workers (guides, cleaners) employed more than 20 hours per week; 14 permanent part-time workers employed less than 20 hours per week; six casual employees.

3. No, this number of personnel is not considered sufficient. Efforts are being made to create additional positions, bearing in mind current Public Service Board manpower restrictions.

4. Yes.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

39. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. When will the new Director for the Department for the Environment be chosen and installed?

2. When will the appointment of the new Regional Superintendents of the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department for the Environment be announced?

3. How many Regional Superintendents are being selected?

4. How many project, and other officers are working in the Co-ordination and Policy Division of the Department for the Environment?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The new Director of the Department for the Environment took up his appointment on 16 July 1979.

2. Appointments are expected to be announced in approximately August 1979.

3. Three.

4. Eight Project Officers and 10 officers are currently working in the Co-ordination and Policy Division, which includes the Heritage Unit.

40. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What steps have been taken over the past 12 months to solve the problems within the Department for the Environment?

2. Have these steps been successful and if not, why not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The management of the Environment Department has been continually concentrating its efforts on steps towards overcoming whatever problems may exist.

2. Yes.

41. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What are the reasons for the "very poor" morale of 57 staff members found by the Public Service Association in their survey?

2. What action has been taken within the Department for the Environment since the beginning of April 1979 to improve morale among the staff members?

3. If action has been taken, has it been successful?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Lack of clear policies and objectives which previously existed would appear to have resulted in problems within the department.

2. It is evident that measures introduced over the past 17 months have significantly improved the situation.

3. Yes.

42. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is there a need for staff members of the Department for the Environment to be—

(a) given greater say in issues which affect them in their work; and

(b) given greater access to information with the department, and, if so, what steps will be taken by the Government to ensure that this happens?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

These matters are to be considered by the recently appointed Director of the Environment Department.

POLLUTION

43. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. How many years will the neutralisation plant, which will be built by the E. & W.S. Department to treat acid drainage waters from the mining area and adjacent tailings dam at the old Brukunga mine, be required to operate in order to control the pollution of Dawesley Creek?

2. After the capital cost of the plant (\$425 000), what annual cost will be required to operate this plant?

3. What is the success rate for the operation estimated to be?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is not possible to give an accurate figure for the operation life of the Brukunga neutralisation plant as this is dependent on several factors, particularly that of the amount of annual rainfall and hence total volume of drainage from the mine. A working life of 30 years has been adopted for design purposes; however, this could be extended as necessary.

2. Annual operating cost is \$140 000.

3. The neutralisation plant will be 100 per cent successful in its operation and will return water which could be used by stock or for irrigation, to Dawesley Creek. However, operation of the neutralisation plant will not completely remove acid water from the creek, and further rehabilitation, mainly by revegetation, will be necessary in the mine itself.

CONSTITUTIONAL MUSEUM

44. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Has the Government purchased one or more chandeliers for the new museum being established in the old Legislative Council building and if so, what was the cost of each chandelier and from whom were they purchased?

2. What is the anticipated total cost of restoring this building and establishing the museum?

3. When will the restoration be completed and when is it anticipated that the museum will open?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. The Constitutional Museum Trust has purchased six gasoliers (in two sets of three) for use in the old Legislative Council building at a total cost of \$23 400.

Details of purchases are as follows:

Investigator Gallery, Maylands, \$18 500

J. G. Elder Antiques, North Adelaide, \$4 900

The gasoliers are required to restore the building in a manner appropriate to the period of its construction.

2. The anticipated cost of restoring the building is \$2 700 000 inclusive of furniture and equipment.

Audio-visual units, fixed displays and initial establishment costs are expected to total a further \$658 000.

3. It is anticipated that the restoration will be completed in March 1980 and that the museum will open soon thereafter.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

45. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Why has Dow Chemical Corporation been so slow in completing feasibility studies into the viability of the

Redcliff petro-chemical plant since 1975, when I.C.I. withdrew from the project?

2. When Dow Chemical Corporation first announced its intention to build the plant in 1973, what was the planned date for bringing the plant on stream?

3. Will the Minister table the 1973 letter of intent from Dow Chemical Corporation for the plant and, if not, why not?

4. Is it correct that the 1973 letter of intent was not a firm proposal as suggested by the former Premier prior to the 1973 State election?

5. Why has the Government taken until 1979 to form various committees to co-ordinate and plan for the petro-chemical plant?

6. What Government committees have now been formed to assist the development of the petro-chemical project and who are the personnel on each committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. When I approached Dow Chemical to become involved again in the Redcliff petro-chemical project following on the withdrawal of I.C.I., it was agreed that no case could be made for Dow to spend large sums of money in undertaking further technical work and feasibility studies until it was clear that the funds available for infrastructure could be provided. While the detailed South Australian submission was made to the Federal Government in May 1977, a favourable Loan Council decision was not forthcoming until November 1978. Dow assembled its project team in Adelaide at the beginning of this year and work has been proceeding steadily since that date.

2. The first quarter of 1978.

3. No. The 1973 letter from Dow Chemical can be made available to the honourable member on a confidential basis.

4. No.

5. The various committees were established formally last year. Prior to that, other committees and officers had worked on the project as and when required.

6. Redcliff Steering Committee: R. D. Bakewell (Chairman); M. J. Messenger (Deputy Chairman and Executive Co-ordinator); J. Craddock; W. L. C. Davies; G. R. Inglis; C. J. Kaufmann; E. G. Knuepffer.

Redcliff Urban Planning Group: Chris Kaufmann (Chairman); Bob Chambers; David Duncan.

Redcliff Project Team: Edgar Knuepffer (Co-ordinator); Geoff Inglis; Rob Robson.

PRICE CONTROL

46. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): Did the former Attorney-General commission a report on price control in South Australia and, if so—

(a) who was commissioned to prepare the report and what were the qualifications and position of this person;

(b) what fee was paid or is being paid for this report;

(c) what other costs are being or have been paid to prepare this report and what is the total cost of the report;

(d) what industries and organisations were consulted in the preparation of this report;

(e) were public submissions requested to help prepare this report and, if not, why not; and

(f) will the report be made public and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: A reply to the question, which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member on 27 June 1979, is as follows:

(a) Mr. L. C. Wright was engaged to undertake this

inquiry. He holds a Bachelor of Economics (1968), is a Joseph Fisher Medallist and has accounting and industrial relations experience. He was employed as a Ministerial Adviser.

(b) He was engaged for a period of 12 months at a fee of \$20 000.

(c) Other costs incurred were travelling expenses, amounting to \$3 200. The total cost of the report was thus \$23 200.

(d) Mr. Wright consulted with the Prices Justification Tribunal, the New South Wales Prices Commission, the U.K. Prices Commission, and the Trade Practices Commission.

(e) Public submissions were not sought, the report being prepared as an internal document.

(f) The report has not been made public. No decision has yet been made as to whether the report is to be released publicly.

PAROLE

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

1. Who were the members of the Parole Board, which granted parole to Christopher John Worrell in October 1976?

2. Did those members interview Yatala Prison officers concerning Worrell before granting parole?

3. What were the grounds upon which parole was granted?

4. What, if any, check was maintained on Worrell following his release?

5. Were police in all districts made aware of the release?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. The members of the Parole Board at the meeting when decision was made to release Worrell on parole on 27 September 1976 were:

Chairman: Her Honour Justice Mitchell

Members: Mr. W. Baker; Dr. M. B. Pulsford; Mrs. F. M. Wallace; Mr. G. W. Pope.

2. No, the institutional reports were considered by the board and prison officers are represented on the various committees.

3. On 9 December 1975 Worrell's first application for parole was rejected and he was given opportunity to re-apply in June 1976. His subsequent application was considered by the board on 28 June 1976 but was deferred to obtain psychiatric reports. Worrell's case was further discussed by the board on 12 July 1976, 3 September 1976, and 27 September 1976. Worrell was charged with a minor breach of prison regulations in March 1975 for which he was brought before a visiting justice and cautioned. Thereafter he received good reports for his conduct and industry at Yatala Labour Prison and his probation and parole officer, who was a senior and experienced man, considered that Worrell would benefit from a period of parole supervision. On 27 September 1976, the board decided that he would be released from gaol provided he did not undertake employment in a hotel.

4. Whilst on parole, Worrell was supervised by a senior and experienced probation and parole officer. On 22 November 1976 the board considered a report from his parole officer advising that Worrell's employment had been terminated due to his leaving work without giving reason. The board issued a summons for Worrell to attend the meeting of 13 December 1976 at which time he had obtained other employment and explained his reason for leaving his former work place. The board decided that he should continue to be on parole. No further reports were

placed before the board until report was received that Worrell had been killed in a traffic accident on 19 February 1977. Until then his parole officer had found him co-operative and was satisfied with his progress.

5. There is a standard notification procedure whereby the Department of Correctional Services advises the Police Department of release dates of prisoners granted parole. This information is in turn disseminated internally to appropriate quarters. The normal practice was followed in respect of Christopher John Worrell.

PAROLE

48. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Government accept the recommendations concerning parole in chapter 7, paragraph 7.4.1, of the First Report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee and, if so, what action, if any, does it propose to take to put those recommendations into effect and when and, if it will not act, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No. Changes in the legislation relating to parole will be included in a Bill to be introduced later this session.

REPLY TO QUESTION

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

1. Why was Question No. 1195, asked during the last session of Parliament, not answered?

2. Does the Premier propose to reply to my letter of 10 May 1979 inquiring about an answer to the above question and, if so, when?

3. Why has this letter not yet been answered?

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

The information sought in your question has involved a great deal of time-consuming research by officers of the Premier's, Public Service Board, Auditor-General's and Treasury Departments. In addition, numerous inquiries had to be made to check details from authorities themselves and other departments.

In view of the detailed information you sought, I consider the time taken to supply it is quite reasonable. To do so in a shorter time would have required unjustifiable expenditure of taxpayers' funds and use of public servants' time.

The answers to your specific questions are as follows:

1. There are 249 statutory authorities in South Australia. The term, "Statutory Authority" is not a

precise one which is acknowledged in Part III of your question. All Government boards, committees, tribunals, authorities and officers appointed by statute have been included. Where provision has been made under statute for the establishment of one or more boards or committees having similar titles such as local boards of health, these bodies have been listed as a single body. Authorities marked with ø have functioned during the periods stated in Part IV of the question but have since ceased functioning. Furthermore, the list may not be exhaustive because, although provision is made under statute for the establishment of certain committees, the need has not always arisen for them to be set up. In addition, some bodies have never met, some have met only infrequently, some are still in the process of being established and others are being abolished.

2. See table attached.

3. See table attached.

4. This information will not be provided because an answer would require considerable effort which could not be justified. It would necessitate the production of vast schedules giving details of Government expenditure which would be extremely difficult to comprehend.

Certain payments to statutory authorities are listed in the Treasurer's statements and accounts each year and these can be identified fairly easily. Other payments, which cannot be identified readily with each authority, are made from general expenditure lines, while still other amounts, including grants and payments for services rendered, are paid to authorities in an indirect manner through other departments and authorities. In addition, through its trust and deposit accounts, the State operates revolving funds for housing and other purposes; acts as an intermediary for payments between authorities, and is obliged to remit moneys to authorities on behalf of the Commonwealth Government.

5. 223 authorities are required to have their accounts audited by the Auditor-General. See also table attached.

Where the words "Yes (no funds)" are quoted, this indicates that the authority may have expenditure such as members' fees and expenses and some income but these are paid and received on their behalf by a controlling department. These authorities would not have "annual accounts" as such but their expenses, etc., would be incorporated in the controlling department's estimates of expenditure and receipts.

6. In most cases, the financial accounts of authorities which are not audited by the Auditor-General are audited, if at all, by private auditors.

| Question: | Part II | Part III | III a | Part V |
|---|---------|---|--------------------|--|
| | | Authority for Establishment | When Est. (Assent) | Audited by Auditor-General (ref. to S.A. funds only) |
| Aboriginal Heritage Committee | | Aboriginal Heritage Act | 1979 | Yes |
| Aboriginal and Historic Relics Advisory Board | | Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act | 1965 | Yes |
| Aboriginal Lands Trust, The | | Aboriginal Lands Trust Act | s.6 1966 | Yes |
| Accreditation Standing Committee | | Tertiary Education Authority Act | s.17 1979 | Yes |
| ø Adelaide College of Advanced Education Council (from 1978 is Adel. Coll. of Arts and Ed.) | | Colleges of Advanced Education Act | 1972 | Yes |
| Adelaide College of the Arts and Education | | Adelaide College of the Arts and Education Act | 1978 | * Yes |
| Adelaide Festival Centre Trust | | Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act | 1971 | Yes |
| Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation | | Soil Conservation Act | 1939 | Yes |

| Question: | Part II | Part III | III a | Part V | |
|--|---------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|
| | | Authority for Establishment | When Est. (Assent) | Audited by Auditor-General (ref. to S.A. funds only) | |
| *Advisory Curriculum Boards and Committees (Appointed by Minister as required) | | Education Act | s.82 | 1979 | Yes (no funds) |
| Agent-General for South Australia | | Agent-General Act | | 1901 | Yes |
| Air Pollution Appeal Board | | Health Act | s.940 | 1971 | Yes (no funds) |
| Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board | | Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act | | 1964 | Yes |
| Appointments Appeal Committee | | Public Service Act | | 1967 | Yes |
| Apprenticeship Commission | | Apprentices Act | | 1966 | Yes |
| Architects Board of South Australia, The | | Architects Act | | 1939 | No |
| Art Gallery Board, The | | Art Gallery Act | | 1939 | Yes |
| ∅Artificial Breeding Board (defunct) | | Artificial Breeding Act | | 1961 | — |
| Auditor-General | | Audit Act | | 1921 | Yes |
| Australian Barley Board | | Barley Marketing Act | | 1947 | Yes |
| *Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, The (N.B. Council of; and *Board of Management of) | | Australian Mineral Development Laboratories Act | s.8 | 1939 } *1978 { | Yes |
| Betting Control Board | | Lottery and Gaming Act | | 1936 | Yes |
| Black Hill Native Flora Park Trust | | National Parks and Wildlife Act | s.45b | 1978 | Yes |
| Botanic Gardens, Board of Governors of the | | Botanic Garden Act | | 1935 | Yes |
| Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal | | Builder's Licensing Act | s.19 | 1974 | Yes (no funds) |
| Builders Licensing Advisory Committee | | Builder's Licensing Act | s.13 | 1967 | Yes (no funds) |
| Builders Licensing Board of S.A. | | Builder's Licensing Act | s.5 | 1967 | Yes |
| Building Advisory Committee | | Building Act | s.62 | 1971 | Yes |
| *Building Fire Safety Committees (proclaimed as required) | | Building Act | s.39a (2) | 1976 | No |
| Bush Fires Advisory Committee | | Bush Fires Act | s.8 | 1939 | Yes |
| Bush Fires Equipment Subsidies Committee (previously Bush Fires Fund Committee) | | Bush Fires Act | | 1960 | Yes |
| Business Franchise Appeal Tribunal | | Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act | | 1974 | Yes |
| Central Dog Committee (not commenced) | | Dog Control Act | | 1979 | Yes |
| Central Inspection Authority | | Road Traffic Act Pt. IVa | | 1975 | Yes |
| Children's Court of South Australia | | Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act | | 1979 | Yes |
| Children's Court Advisory Committee | | Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act | | 1979 | Yes |
| Chiropody Board of South Australia, The | | Chiropodists Act | | 1950 | Yes |
| Chiropractors Board of South Australia | | Chiropractors Act | | 1979 | Yes |
| Cinematograph Projectionists Board of Examiners | | Places of Public Entertainment Act | s.17 | 1913 | Yes (no funds) |
| Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia | | Citrus Industry Organization Act | | 1965 | Yes |
| City of Adelaide Planning Appeals Tribunal | | City of Adelaide Development Control Act | | 1976 | Yes (no funds) |
| City of Adelaide Planning Commission | | City of Adelaide Development Control Act | | 1976 | Yes |
| Classification of Publications Board | | Classification of Publications Act | | 1974 | Yes (no funds) |
| Classification of Theatrical Performances Board | | Classification of Theatrical Performances Act | | 1978 | Yes (no funds) |
| Clean Air Committee | | Health Act | s.94 (b) | 1963 | Yes (no funds) |
| Cleland Conservation Park Trust (refer Development Trusts) | | | | | |
| Coast Protection Board | | Coast Protection Act | | 1972 | Yes |
| Commercial and Private Agents Board | | Commercial and Private Agents Act | s.5 | 1972 | Yes |
| Commissioners of Charitable Funds | | Public Charities Funds Act | | 1875 | Yes |
| *Community Welfare Advisory Committees (proclaimed as required) | | Community Welfare Act | s.13 | 1972 | Yes |
| Collections for Charitable Purposes Advisory Committee | | Collections for Charitable Purposes Act | | 1939 | Yes (no funds) |
| Commissioner of Highways | | Highways Act | | 1926 | Yes |
| Commissioner of Police | | Police Regulation Act | | 1844 | Yes |

| Question: | Part II | Part III | III a | Part V |
|---|---------|---|--------------------|--|
| | | Authority for Establishment | When Est. (Assent) | Audited by Auditor-General (ref. to S.A. funds only) |
| øCommunity Welfare Grants (refer C.W. Advisory Committees) | | | | |
| Companies Auditors Board | | Companies Act s.8 | 1962 | Yes |
| *Conciliation Committees (proclaimed as required) | | Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act | 1972 | No |
| Constitutional Museum Trust | | Constitutional Museum Act | 1978 | Yes |
| Corporate Affairs Commission | | Companies Act | 1979 | Yes |
| Country Fire Services Board | | Country Fires Act | 1976 | Yes |
| County Board of the Metropolitan County District | | Health Act s.31 | 1898 | No |
| Court of Disputed Returns | | Electoral Act | 1908 | Yes (no funds) |
| Court of Local Government Disputed Returns | | Local Government Act s.142aa | 1978 | Yes (no funds) |
| Credit Tribunal | | Consumer Credit Act s.13 | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |
| Credit Union Stabilization Board | | Credit Union Act | 1976 | Yes |
| øDairy Produce Board (abolished 1977) | | Dairy Produce Amendment Act | 1934 | — |
| Dental Board of South Australia | | Dentists Act | 1904 | No |
| Dentists Act, Statutory Committee under the | | Dentists Act | 1960 | No |
| *Development Trusts—National Parks (proclaimed as required) | | National Parks and Wildlife Act | 1978 | Yes |
| *District Soil Conservation Boards (proclaimed as required) | | Soil Conservation Act | 1945 | No |
| Dog Fence Board, The | | Dog Fence Act | 1946 | Yes |
| Dog Racing Control Board | | Racing Act | 1976 | Yes |
| Dried Fruits Board | | Dried Fruits Act s.7 | 1934 | Yes |
| *East Torrens County Board of Health (County Boards proclaimed as required) | | Health Act s.31 | 1898 | No |
| Electoral Commissioner | | Electoral Act | 1973 | Yes |
| Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission | | Constitution Act | 1975 | Yes |
| Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Advisory Committee | | Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act s.11 | 1966 | No |
| Electricity Advisory Committees (none appointed) | | Electricity Trust of South Australia Act s.26b | 1954 | Yes |
| Electricity Trust of South Australia, The | | Electricity Trust of South Australia Act | 1946 | Yes |
| Enfield General Cemetery Trust | | Enfield General Cemetery Act | 1944 | Yes |
| Enginedrivers Board | | Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act | 1968 | No |
| Environmental Protection Council | | Environmental Protection Council Act | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |
| Fire Brigades Board, The | | Fire Brigades Act s.9 | 1913 | Yes |
| Flinders University of South Australia, Council of the | | Flinders University of South Australia Act | 1966 | No |
| Food and Drugs Advisory Committee | | Food and Drugs Act | 1935 | Yes (no funds) |
| Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee | | Medical Practitioners Act | 1966 | Yes (no funds) |
| Forestry Board | | Forestry Act | 1950 | Yes (no funds) |
| Fire Fighting Advisory Committee | | Country Fires Act s.28 | 1976 | Yes |
| Fruit Fly Compensation Committee | | Fruit Fly Act | 1947 | Yes |
| General Reserves Trust (refer Development Trusts) | | | | |
| Geographical Names Board of South Australia | | Geographical Names Act | 1979 | Yes |
| Guardianship Board | | Mental Health Act s.20 | 1977 | Yes (no funds) |
| Hairdressers Registration Board | | Hairdressers Registration Act | 1939 | Yes |
| Hartley College of Advanced Education | | Hartley College of Advanced Education Act | 1978 | Yes |
| Health, Central Board of | | Health Act s.12 | 1898 | No |
| *Hospitals Boards of Management (proclaimed as required) | | Hospitals Act | 1867 | Yes |
| Health Services Advisory Committee | | S.A. Health Commission Act s.19 | 1976 | Yes |
| Industrial Commission of South Australia | | Industrial Code | 1966 | Yes |
| Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board | | Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |

| Question: | Part II | Part III | III a | Part V |
|--|---------|--|--------------------|--|
| | | Authority for Establishment | When Est. (Assent) | Audited by Auditor-General (ref. to S.A. funds only) |
| ∅Industries Assistance Corporation (S.A. Development Corporation from May 1978) | | Industries Development Act | 1971 | Yes |
| Industries Development Committee | | Industries Development Act s.3 | 1941 | Yes |
| Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science | | Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Act | 1937 | Yes |
| Institutes Association of South Australia Inc. Council, The | | Libraries and Institutes Act | 1909 | Yes |
| Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation | | Constitution Act s.55 | 1937 | Yes |
| Kindergarten Union of South Australia Incorporated | | Kindergarten Union Act | 1975 | Yes |
| Kingston College of Advanced Education Council | | Kingston College of Advanced Education Act | 1974 | Yes |
| Land Board, The | | Crown Lands Act | 1903 | Yes (no funds) |
| Land Brokers Licensing Board | | Land and Business Agents Act s.49 | 1973 | Yes |
| Land and Business Agents Board | | Land and Business Agents Act s.7 | 1973 | Yes |
| ∅Land Price Tribunal (defunct) | | Urban Land (Price Control) Act | 1973 | — |
| Land Valuers Licensing Board | | Land Valuers Licensing Act | 1969 | Yes |
| Law Society of South Australia Inc., Statutory Committee of the | | Legal Practitioners Act s.40 | 1915 | No |
| Legal Services Commission | | Legal Services Commission Act | 1977 | Yes |
| Levi Park Trust | | Levi Park Act | 1948 | Yes |
| Libraries Board of South Australia | | Libraries and Institutes Act s.7 | 1939 | Yes |
| Licensing Court | | Licensing Act | 1917 | Yes |
| Local Government Advisory Commission | | Local Government Act (Am. Act No. 2) | 1975 | Yes (no funds) |
| Local Government Auditor's Examining Committee | | Local Government Act s.83 | 1929 | Yes (no funds) |
| Local Government Clerks Examination Committee | | Local Government Officers (Quals.) Regs. | 1962 | Yes (no funds) |
| Local Government Engineers' Examination Committee | | Local Government Officers (Quals.) Regs. | 1962 | Yes (no funds) |
| Local Government Officers Classification Board | | Local Government Act s.163L | 1946 | Yes (no funds) |
| Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Tribunal | | Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act s.36a | 1976 | Yes (no funds) |
| Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board | | Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act | 1975 | Yes |
| Lotteries Commission of South Australia | | State Lotteries Act | 1966 | Yes |
| Lower River Broughton Irrigation Trust | | Lower River Broughton Irrigation Trust Act | 1938 | No |
| Medical Board of South Australia | | Medical Practitioners Act | 1919 | Yes |
| Mental Health Review Tribunal | | Mental Health Act s.29 | 1977 | Yes |
| Metropolitan County Board | | Food and Drugs Act s.15a | 1922 | No |
| Metropolitan Milk Board | | Metropolitan Milk Supply Act | 1946 | Yes |
| Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board | | Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act | 1956 | No |
| Mines and Quarries Managers, Board of Examiners for | | Mines and Works Inspection—Regulation 208 | 1958 | No |
| Mines and Works Appeal Board | | Mines and Works Inspection Act | 1970 | Yes (no funds) |
| Monarto Development Commission | | Monarto Development Commission Act | 1973 | Yes |
| Motor Fuel Licensing Appeal Tribunal | | Motor Fuel Distribution Act | 1973 | Yes |
| Motor Fuel Licensing Board | | Motor Fuel Distribution Act | 1973 | Yes |
| Motor Vehicles Act Consultative Committee | | Motor Vehicles Act s.139b | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |
| ∅Murray Park College of Advanced Education Council (now part of Hartley College of Advanced Education) | | Colleges of Advanced Education Act | 1972 | Yes |
| Murray River Commission (S.A., Vic., and N.S.W.) | | River Murray Waters Act | 1935 | Yes |
| Museum Board | | S.A. Museum Act | 1939 | Yes |
| North Haven Trust | | North Haven Trust Act | 1979 | Yes |
| ∅National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council (replaced 1978 by Reserves Advisory Committee) | | National Parks and Wildlife Act | 1972 | Yes |
| Nurses Board of South Australia | | Nurses Registration Act | 1920 | Yes |

| Question: | Part II | Part III | III a | Part V |
|---|---------|--|--------------------|--|
| | | Authority for Establishment | When Est. (Assent) | Audited by Auditor-General (ref. to S.A. funds only) |
| Occupational Therapists Registration Board of S.A. | | Occupational Therapists Act | 1974 | Yes |
| Ombudsman | | Ombudsman Act | 1972 | Yes |
| Optical Registration, Board of | | Opticians Act | 1920 | Yes |
| *Oriental Fruit Moth Committees: Renmark (proclaimed as required) | | Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act | 1962 | Yes |
| Outback Areas Community Development Trust | | Outback Areas Community Development Trust Act | 1978 | Yes |
| Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee | | Land Settlement Act | 1944 | Yes (no funds) |
| Parliamentary Superannuation Fund—Trustees | | Parliamentary Superannuation Act | 1948 | Yes |
| Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal | | Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act | 1965 | Yes |
| Parole Board of South Australia | | Prisons Act (Amend. Act, 2/69) | 1969 | Yes |
| Pastoral Board | | Pastoral Act | 1893 | Yes (no funds) |
| Pay-roll Tax Appeal Tribunal | | Pay-roll Tax Act | 1971 | Yes (no funds) |
| Pest Plants Commission | | Pest Plants Act | 1975 | Yes |
| *Pest Plant Control Boards (proclaimed as required) | | Pest Plants Act s.18 (1) | 1975 | Yes |
| Pharmacy Board of South Australia | | Pharmacy Act | 1891 | No |
| Phylloxera Board | | Phylloxera Act | 1899 | Yes |
| Physiotherapists Board, The | | Physiotherapists Act | 1945 | Yes |
| Pipelines Authority of South Australia | | Pipelines Authority Act | 1967 | Yes |
| Planning Appeal Board | | Planning and Development Act s.21 | 1967 | Yes |
| Plumbing Advisory Board | | Sewerage Act—Regulation 7 (reconstituted 1961) | 1935 | Yes |
| Police Appeal Board | | Police Appeal Board Act | 1925 | Yes (no funds) |
| Police Inquiry Committee | | Police Regulation Act | 1952 | Yes (no funds) |
| Police Pension Fund | | Police Pension Act | 1929 | Yes |
| Poultry Farmer Licensing Committee, The | | Egg Industry Stabilization Act | 1974 | Yes (no funds) |
| Poultry Farmer Licensing Review Tribunal | | Egg Industry Stabilization Act | 1974 | Yes (no funds) |
| Poultry Meat Industry Committee | | Poultry Meat Industry Act | 1976 | Yes (no funds) |
| Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Advisory Committee | | Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act | 1967 | Yes |
| Public Accounts Committee | | Public Accounts Committee Act | 1972 | No |
| Public Examinations Board Council | | Public Examination Board Act | 1968 | Yes |
| Public Parks Advisory Committee | | Public Parks Act | 1969 | Yes |
| Public Service Board | | Public Service Act | 1967 | Yes |
| Public Works Parliamentary Standing Committee | | Public Works Standing Committee Act | 1927 | Yes |
| Racecourses Development Board | | Lottery and Gaming Act | 1972 | Yes |
| Radiological Advisory Committee | | Health Act | 1956 | Yes (no funds) |
| *Red Scale Committees (proclaimed as required) | | Red Scale Control Act | 1962 | Yes |
| *Regional Cultural Centre Trusts (Pirie, South-East, Whyalla) | | Regional Cultural Centres Act | 1977 | Yes |
| Rehousing Committee | | Land Acquisition Act s.26a | 1972 | Yes |
| Renmark Irrigation Trust (capital works funded only) | | Renmark Irrigation Trust Act | 1893 | Yes |
| Reserves Advisory Committee | | National Parks and Wildlife Act | 1978 | Yes |
| Residential Tenancies Tribunal, The | | Residential Tenancies Act | 1978 | Yes |
| Road Traffic Board of South Australia | | Road Traffic Act | 1961 | Yes |
| Roseworthy Agricultural College, The Council of the | | Roseworthy Agricultural College Act | 1973 | Yes |
| Rundle Street Mall Committee | | Rundle Street Mall Act | 1975 | Yes (no funds) |
| Rural Industry Assistance Committee | | Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act | 1971 | Yes |
| Salisbury College of Advanced Education Council | | Colleges of Advanced Education Act | 1972 | Yes |
| Sanitary Plumbers Examining Board | | Sewerage Act—Regulation 5 | 1933 | Yes (no funds) |

| Question: | Part II | Part III | III a | Part V |
|---|---------|---|--------------------|--|
| | | Authority for Establishment | When Est. (Assent) | Audited by Auditor-General (ref. to S.A. funds only) |
| *San Jose Scale Control Committees (proclaimed as required) | | San Jose Scale Control Act | 1962 | Yes |
| Savings Bank of South Australia | | Savings Bank Act | 1875 | No |
| School Loans Advisory Committee | | Education Act ss.85, 86 | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |
| Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board | | Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act | 1971 | Yes |
| Sex Discrimination Board | | Sex Discrimination Act | 1975 | Yes |
| Solicitor-General | | Solicitor-General Act | 1972 | No |
| ∅South Australian Board of Advanced Education (discontinued 30/6/79) | | South Australian Board of Advanced Education Act | 1972 | Yes |
| ∅South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research (discontinued) | | South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research Act | 1975 | Yes |
| South Australian Development Corporation | | Industries Development Act | 1978 | Yes |
| South Australian Egg Board | | Marketing of Eggs Act | 1941 | Yes |
| South Australian Film Corporation | | South Australian Film Corporation Act | 1972 | Yes |
| ∅South Australian Film Advisory Board (reconstituted 1975; abolished 1978) | | South Australian Film Corporation Act | 1972 | Yes |
| South Australian Health Commission | | South Australian Health Commission Act | 1976 | Yes |
| *South Australian Health Commission Advisory Committees | | South Australian Health Commission Act s.18 | 1976 | Yes |
| South Australian Heritage Committee | | South Australian Heritage Act | 1978 | Yes |
| South Australian Housing Trust | | South Australian Housing Trust Act | 1936 | Yes |
| South Australian Institute of Technology Council | | South Australian Institute of Technology Act | 1972 | Yes |
| South Australian Land Commission | | Land Commission Act | 1973 | Yes |
| South Australian Local Government Grants Commission | | South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Act | 1976 | Yes |
| South Australian Meat Corporation | | South Australian Meat Corporation Act (previously M.E.A. Act, 1936) | 1972 | No |
| South Australian Potato Board | | Potato Marketing Act | 1948 | No |
| South Australian Psychological Board | | Psychological Practices Act | 1973 | Yes |
| South Australian Superannuation Board | | Superannuation Act | 1974 | Yes |
| South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust | | Superannuation Act | 1974 | Yes |
| South Australian Teacher Housing Authority | | Teacher Housing Authority Act | 1975 | Yes |
| South Australian Theatre Company (now State Theatre Company of South Australia) | | South Australian Theatre Company Act | 1972 | Yes |
| South Australian Timber Corporation | | South Australian Timber Corporation Act | 1979 | Yes |
| South Australian Totalizator Agency Board | | Lottery and Gaming Act s.31b | 1966 | Yes |
| South Australian Trotting Control Board | | Lottery and Gaming Act s.31x | 1971 | Yes (no funds) |
| South Australian Waste Management Commission (not commenced yet) | | South Australian Waste Management Commission Act | 1979 | Yes |
| South Australian Water Resources Council | | Water Resources Act | 1976 | Yes (no funds) |
| South-Eastern Drainage Appeal Board | | South-Eastern Drainage Act s.51 | 1971 | Yes |
| South-Eastern Drainage Board | | South-Eastern Drainage Act s.10 | 1931 | Yes |
| ∅South-Western Suburbs Drainage Board (defunct) | | South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act—Regulations | 1959 | Yes |
| State Bank of South Australia | | State Bank Act | 1925 | Yes |
| State Clothing Corporation | | State Clothing Corporation Act | 1978 | Yes |
| State Government Insurance Commission | | State Government Insurance Commission Act | 1970 | Yes |
| State Manning Committee | | Marine Act | 1968 | Yes (no funds) |
| State Opera of South Australia | | State Opera of South Australia Act | 1976 | Yes |
| State Planning Authority | | Planning and Development Act | 1967 | Yes |
| State Transport Authority | | State Transport Authority Act | 1974 | Yes |
| Stock Medicines Board | | Stock Medicines Act | 1939 | Yes (no funds) |
| Sturt College of Advanced Education Council | | Colleges of Advanced Education Act | 1972 | Yes |
| Superannuation Tribunal | | Superannuation Act | 1974 | Yes (no funds) |

| Question: | Part II | Part III | III a | Part V |
|-----------|--|---|--------------------|--|
| | | Authority for Establishment | When Est. (Assent) | Audited by Auditor-General (ref. to S.A. funds only) |
| | Supply and Tender Board | Public Supply and Tender Act | 1914 | Yes (no funds) |
| | Surveyors Board of South Australia, The | Surveyors Act s.6 | 1935 | Yes |
| | Surveyors Disciplinary Committee | Surveyors Act s.29 | 1975 | No |
| | Teachers Appeal Board, The | Education Act s.46 | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |
| | Teachers Classification Board, The | Education Act s.30 | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |
| | Teachers Registration Board | Education Act s.55 | 1972 | Yes |
| | Teachers Salaries Board | Education Act s.34 | 1972 | Yes (no funds) |
| | Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Committee, The | Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Committee Act | 1978 | Yes |
| | Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia (commenced 1/7/79) | Tertiary Education Authority Act | 1979 | Yes |
| | *Tertiary Education Advisory Committees (proclaimed as required) | Tertiary Education Authority Act s.21 | 1979 | Yes |
| | Third Party Premiums Committee | Motor Vehicles Act s.129 | 1959 | Yes (no funds) |
| | ∅Torrens College of Advanced Education Council, The (discontinued 1978) | Torrens College of Advanced Education Act | 1972 | Yes |
| | Trade Measurement Advisory Council (previously Weights and Measures Ad. Ctee.) | Trade Measurements Act | 1975 | Yes (no funds) |
| | Trade Standards Advisory Council (not commenced yet) | Trade Standards Act | 1979 | Yes |
| | Training Centre Review Board | Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act s.62 | 1979 | Yes |
| | Underground Waters Advisory Committee | Underground Water Preservation Act | 1969 | Yes (no funds) |
| | Underground Waters Appeal Board | Underground Water Preservation Act | 1969 | Yes (no funds) |
| | University of Adelaide, Council of the | University of Adelaide Act | 1874 | No |
| | Valuer-General | Valuation of Land Act | 1971 | Yes |
| | Vertebrate Pests Control Authority | Vertebrate Pests Act | 1975 | Yes |
| | *Vertebrate Pests Control Boards (proclaimed as required) | Vertebrate Pests Act | 1975 | Yes |
| | Veterinary Surgeons Board | Veterinary Surgeons Act | 1936 | Yes |
| | Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund—Trustees | Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act | 1949 | Yes |
| | Waste Management Technical Committee (not commenced yet) | South Australian Waste Management Commission Act | 1979 | Yes |
| | *Water Resources Advisory Committees | Water Resources Act | 1976 | Yes |
| | Water Resources Appeal Tribunal | Water Resources Act | 1976 | Yes |
| | Weeds Advisory Committee | Weeds Act | 1956 | Yes |
| | Well Drillers Examination Committee | Underground Water Preservation Act | 1969 | Yes (no funds) |
| | West Beach Trust | West Beach Recreation Reserve Act | 1954 | Yes |
| | Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee | Wheat Delivery Quotas Act | 1969 | No |
| | Wheat Delivery Quota Contingency Reserve Committee | Wheat Delivery Quotas Act | 1970 | No |
| | Wheat Delivery Quota Review Committee | Wheat Delivery Quotas Act | 1969 | No |
| | Workers' Compensation (Silicosis) Committee | Workers' Compensation Act—Pt. IX | 1971 | Yes |

∅ Not counted in total

* Counted as "one" in total

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

50. Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many statutory authorities are there in South Australia?
2. What are they?
3. Pursuant to what statute, or other authority, was each established and when?
4. How much was paid, and for what purposes, to each by the Government in each of the financial years 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78?
5. How many of such authorities are required to have their annual accounts audited by the Auditor-General?

6. What financial supervision, if any, is exercised over the others and by whom?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: See answer to Question No. 49.

MINISTER OF HEALTH

51. Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What Acts, pursuant to the Administration of Acts Act, are committed to the Minister of Health?
2. Why, in the case of each such Act, is it committed to him?

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

1. Aged Citizens Clubs (Subsidies) Act, 1963-1971; Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, 1961-1976; Anatomy Act, 1884-1974; Bakehouses Registration Act, 1945-1973; Benefit Associations Act, 1958-1974; Bread Act, 1954-1974; Chiropodists Act, 1950-1973; Cigarettes (Labelling) Act, 1971-1975; Dentists Act, 1931-1974; Emergency Medical Treatment of Children Act, 1960; Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1976; Health Act, 1935-1976; Hospitals Act, 1934-1973; Medical Practitioners Act, 1919-1976; Mental Health Act, 1935-1974; Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934-1978; Noxious Trades Act, 1943-1974; Nurses Registration Act, 1920-1973; Occupational Therapists Registration Act, 1974; Opticians Act, 1920-1974; Pharmacy Act, 1935-1973; Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1973; Psychological Practices Act, 1973; Public Charities Funds Act, 1935-1974; Sale of Human Blood Act, 1962; South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1979; Transplantation of Human Tissue Act, 1974; Vaccination Act, 1936; Venereal Diseases Act, 1947; Companies Act, 1962-1974; Business Names Act, 1963; Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1965; Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1974; Sharebrokers Act, 1945-1975; Marketable Securities Act, 1971; Securities Industry Act, 1979.

2. As a result of the exercise of the Premier's discretion.

DISABLED PEOPLE

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

1. Did the Minister tell a delegation protesting at the closure of the Semaphore railway that he is tired of hearing about disabled people and, if so, why?

2. Is the Minister tired of hearing about disabled people and, if so, why?

3. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to assist disabled people to use public transport?

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

1. No.

2. No.

3. The matter is continually under review, especially so far as defining the types of disability and the number and location of people suffering handicaps, so that services to help those people can be introduced in areas having the greatest need as soon as the limited finances permit.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

53. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What action, if any, has the Minister taken, or does he propose to take (and when) as a result of the visit to him of a group of children from the Highgate Primary School asking for the installation of a pedestrian crossing near their school on Cross Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department has carried out a further investigation into the need for a pedestrian crossing on Cross Road to serve children attending the Highgate Primary School. The investigation confirmed that the criteria for a pedestrian crossing cannot yet be met.

WARDANG ISLAND

54. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): How much money, for what purpose, and with what result, has been spent by the Government on Wardang Island in each of the financial years 1976-77, 1977-78 and 1978-79?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A reply to this question which was forwarded by letter to the honourable member on 25 June 1979 is as follows:

1. Expenditure incurred on the development of the Wardang Island Outdoor Education Centre has been—

| | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1976-77 | Salaries | \$ 58 497.02 | |
| | Contingencies | \$143 050.81 | \$201 547.83 |
| 1977-78 | Salaries | \$ 67 666.77 | |
| | Contingencies | \$163 322.53 | \$230 989.30 |
| 1978-79 | Salaries | \$ 79 821.03 | |
| | Contingencies | \$ 84 195.53 | \$164 016.56 |

2. The Government leased the island from the Point Pearce Council for a five-year period commencing 1 January 1976. The Department of Further Education was requested to develop the island as an outdoor education centre while providing training and employment for residents from Point Pearce. The moneys have been spent on:

Restoration of buildings and equipment, boat and generator purchases, furnishings and educational facilities.

Salaries have covered the employment of education officers, maintenance workers/trainees from Point Pearce and short-term specialist workers.

3. All mechanical and marine services have been upgraded and are on a maintenance schedule. House restoration has proceeded with seven of the 10 houses now available for use by staff and/or visiting groups. It is planned to have all buildings upgraded by the end of the first lease period, 31 December 1980. The project has provided:

Employment and training for up to six Point Pearce residents at a time.

Facilities and services for groups to visit the island for education purposes.

A working party has now been established and will advise on the future direction of this programme.

MRS. ANNA KOTARSKI

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

1. When does the Minister propose to write to me about Mrs. Anna Kotarski in reply to my letters to him of 2 March and 2 May?

2. Has he yet made a decision in the matter and, if so, what is it and, if not, why not, and when does he propose to make a decision?

3. What leave has the Minister had since 2 March and why?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The position of Mrs. Anna Kotarski is still under consideration.

HON. D. A. DUNSTAN

56. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Did the Hon. D. A. Dunstan make a claim against the Government for workmen's compensation, pursuant to the Workmen's Compensation Act, and, if so—

(a) when was the claim made;

(b) upon what grounds was it made;

(c) for how much was it made; and

(d) what has happened to it since it was made?

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

(a) Mr. Dunstan, by letter dated 20 February 1979, advised his intention to claim compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act. No formal claim form has been lodged.

(b) Mr. Dunstan's letter stated that, on medical

advice, he was resigning through an incapacity to undertake the duties of his office and that the incapacity was work induced.

(c) No specific amount.

(d) Mr. Dunstan has advised that he will not be pursuing any claim.

MINISTERS' TRAVEL

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

1. What disadvantages, if any, have there been to the State, in the case of each of the Ministers who was travelling abroad, coming home to be present during the first days of the present session?

2. How much has it cost the Government in the case of each, for him and his party to come home and how is that cost made up?

3. Do these Ministers propose to go abroad again this year and, if so, why and at what cost to the Government?

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

1. Any disadvantages to the State caused by Ministers returning to South Australia was outweighed by the advantages to the State of the legislation that was being considered at the time they were recalled.

2. Exact costs are not known because all accounts have not yet been received but as the Ministers were overseas for a shorter period than anticipated there will be an actual saving in costs.

3. The Minister of Labour and Industry and the Minister of Health have no plans at present to travel abroad this year. A proposal that the Minister of Agriculture travel to the U.S.A. and U.K. to discuss matters with the World Bank is under consideration. This proposal has only reached the initial planning stage and proposed costs have not been calculated.

PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

58. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Has the Government established a working party to look into the question of the control and licensing of professional groups and, if so—

(a) when was it established;

(b) who are its members;

(c) has it yet reported;

(d) what is the effect of its report; and

(e) what action, if any, does the Government propose to take as a result and when?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No working party has been established to look into the question of the control and licensing of professional groups.

CERAMIC TILE MAKERS LIMITED

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

1. What financial assistance, if any, did Ceramic Tile Makers Limited receive from the Government, and through which Government instrumentality, when and under what conditions?

2. For how long did the company carry on business and when?

3. Is the company now in receivership?

4. Was an auction of its plant held on 8 May and if so, what did that plant bring, and was the auction advertised as being of "important tile manufacturing plant commissioned in 1976 at a cost exceeding \$1 000 000 and run for three months only"?

5. How much, if anything, has the Government lost through its financial assistance to the company?

6. Did the company occupy premises built for it by the Housing Trust and, if so—

(a) what were the rental arrangements between the trust and the company;

(b) how much, if anything, has the trust lost through these arrangements; and

(c) what was the cost of building these premises?

7. Are these premises being used at present and, if so, by whom and for what purpose?

8. What proposals, if any, does the trust or the Government, and which, have for the future use of these premises?

9. Was the then Premier, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, filmed looking over the premises and, if so, when and for what purpose was that carried out and how?

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

1. The following loans were advanced to Ceramic Tilemakers Limited by the South Australian Development Corporation:

| Amount | Date Drawn down | Term | Rate |
|---------|-----------------|---------|----------|
| \$ | | | Per Cent |
| 200 000 | 30/9/74 | 6 years | 9.8 |
| 20 000 | 26/11/75 | Demand | 13 |
| 80 000 | 1/3/76 | Demand | 13 |

In addition, the Government guaranteed advances by the ANZ Bank to the extent of \$11 645 plus cover for some wages.

2. The company was formed in March 1973 and a receiver was appointed on 15 September 1976.

3. Yes.

4. Yes. Proceeds yet to be finalised, but gross proceeds to date total \$33 690.

5. The South Australian Development Corporation has written-off all principal and accrued interest totalling \$368 000. Some minor recovery is anticipated from auction proceeds. The Government guarantee to the ANZ Bank has been called upon.

6. Yes.

(a) An agreement for lease dated 12 August 1975 at an annual rental of \$122 520 with rent commencing 1 July 1976. An option to purchase was also offered.

(b) The trust has capitalised the outstanding interest and retains the property.

(c) \$1 021 000.

7. The liquidator surrendered the property on 30 June 1979. Presently, the property is unoccupied.

8. Several companies have inspected the property for continuation of floor and wall tile making, roof tile making, warehousing, ceramic kiln manufacture and lagging of pipes for gas and oil mainlines. Presently, the trust is planning a subdivision of the main building for occupation by smaller tenancies.

9. Not known.

BINGO MACHINES

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

1. Have licences been issued for bingo amusement machines, and if so, when, why and for how many machines?

2. Are such machines similar to poker machines and in what ways?

3. Were complaints made to the police during the month of May about such machines by the member for Hanson and another and, if so, what action, if any, was taken as a result of those complaints, why and when?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. These machines are not considered to be similar to poker machines in any way.

3. I understand that a Mr. R. Worth has forwarded a letter for the attention of the Commissioner of Police expressing concern at the introduction of In Line Bingo Amusement Machines into this State.

STANDARDS OF DRESS

The SPEAKER: Standards of dress of honourable members in the House of Assembly have been relaxed in recent years and, after consultation with the table Clerks, it has been decided that standards of dress for them will be relaxed also.

TABLE CLERKS

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, following the retirement of the Clerk of the House, Mr. A. F. R. Dodd, I have temporarily appointed Mr. G. D. Mitchell, Clerk Assistant, to carry out his duties and Mr. D. A. Bridges to carry out the duties of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

PETITIONS: MARIJUANA

Petitions signed by 14 969 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation that provided for the legal sale, cultivation or distribution of marijuana were presented by Messrs. Corcoran, Eastick, Gunn, Becker, Mathwin, Wilson, and Mrs. Adamson.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: NEAPTR

Petitions signed by 11 385 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation which would enable the Government to adopt the proposed north-east railway transit route through Botanic Park and along Victoria Drive were presented by Mr. Groom and Mrs. Adamson.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

Petitions signed by 461 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible were presented by Messrs. Wilson and Becker.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: LAND TAX

Petitions signed by 3 358 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to revalue all

properties assessed this year and to abolish land tax on residential properties immediately were presented by Messrs. Becker, Eastick, and Dean Brown.

Petitions received.

PETITION: COORABIE AND BOOKABIE ELECTRICITY

A petition signed by 63 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a 240-volt power supply to the Coorabie and Bookabie area was presented by Mr. Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: PENONG AND BOOKABIE ELECTRICITY

A petition signed by 49 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Minister of Mines and Energy to request the Electricity Trust of South Australia to urgently supply power to the district of Penong and Bookabie was presented by Mr. Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: EYRE ROADS

A petition signed by 261 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to provide maintenance funds for the Tulka to Fishery Bay and Spalding Cove, Fishery Junction to Sleaford Bay, and Spalding Junction to Wanna Roads was presented by Mr. Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: SPEECH THERAPISTS

A petition signed by 2 198 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to increase funding to the community health programme for speech therapists was presented by Mr. Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: PAROLE

A petition signed by 80 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to review the parole system and membership of the Parole Board to ensure that the public was safeguarded from dangerous criminals was presented by Mr. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two Houses for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. Jessie Mary Cooper.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Public Works Standing Committee, together with minutes of evidence:

Automatic Data Processing Centre, Wakefield Street,
Largs Bay Primary School Redevelopment,
Mount Barker High School Redevelopment,
Mount Barker South Primary School—Stage I,
Reynella East High School,
Willunga High School Redevelopment—Stages I and
II.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to adhere to the State platform and the policy decisions adopted by the Australian Labor Party this year, and if it does not, in what areas and in what respect will the Government depart from the decisions made at A.L.P. conferences? During the past 12 months, important policy and platform decisions have been taken by the A.L.P. for adoption by the Government of this State. These include: the maintenance of succession and gift duties, and progressive taxation on unimproved land values; provision for higher State taxation, to avoid cuts in public expenditure; maintenance of the ban on uranium mining and export; wider controls on private sector financing of minerals and energy industries, with maximum possible State Government ownership; the establishment of a Corporate Affairs Commission to monitor and regulate all levels of business activity; and absolute preference to unionists (or, as I would interpret it, compulsory unionism). In what way, if any, does the Government intend to ignore the directives of its Party machine?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The short answer is "Yes." The Leader would be fully aware that, whilst the policy convention democratically forms Party policy, which a Labor Government is expected to follow, the decision when to implement that policy is largely left in the hands of the Government. The Leader mentioned succession duties. We all know that the Leader is opposed to that tax; he has said so many times. He has also said that his Government (if he ever gets into Government) will abolish succession duties, and therefore at least \$17 000 000 a year would go down the drain. The Leader has not bothered to tell the people of this State what services would be cut in order to save that \$17 000 000. He claims, of course, that nothing need be cut. He would put the waste watchdog on the job; no doubt it would find out what is being wasted in Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Becker's bark.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Is it Becker's bark? I know that the Leader has a leash for him.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Leader has a leash for him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order, and I hope he will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader mentioned land tax as well as succession duties. He knows full well that these two taxes are possibly the only remaining wealth taxes available to the State Government. From time to time the Deputy Premier and I have made perfectly clear that the Government does not intend to abolish either of these taxes. I said earlier this year (in the last session, I think) that I would certainly examine some anomalies that exist in the succession duties law, and that I would certainly look at any hardship cases with a view to making alterations if I considered any necessary; that examination

is continuing. Regarding the policy on uranium, the Government, and I, as the Leader, have made statements that must clearly indicate, even to the Leader of the Opposition, that the Government believes in, and upholds, the policies enunciated by the Party in the February conference this year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: As the Leader did in March 1977.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was going to add that. A couple of years ago the Leader and members of his Party (except perhaps an odd new member) were part of a unanimous decision of the House regarding uranium. Since then the Leader has told us absolutely nothing that could cause him to change his views about safeguards. He has been overseas recently for six weeks and had a look at the scene, and I hope he will tell us some of the things he has seen. I hope he will be specific about the advances of technology that have been made in an attempt to prove to this House, if he can, that it is in fact safe to mine, treat, sell and use uranium as a source of power. We will be waiting anxiously to hear that.

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader is already forecasting that I will not change my mind on the matter. That is how confident he is about the knowledge that he will impart to this House. I can tell the Leader that the policies enunciated by the Party are well known to the Government and, if and when the Government decides that the time is right and that the State can afford what those policies will bring forward, we will put them into effect.

ROAD FUNDS

Mr. KENEALLY: In view of the dramatically increased revenue derived by the Federal Government from the Australian motorist in the past 12 months, has the Minister of Transport any reason to believe that a greater contribution will now be made by the Federal Government to national highway construction? In the past six months, under the guise of import parity pricing for oil, the Federal Government has ripped off the Australian motorist to the tune of about \$1 200 000 000, and this rip-off has gone towards reducing the deficit.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. KENEALLY: I accept your ruling, Sir; I thought it was a statement of fact.

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

Mr. Gunn: Throw him out.

The SPEAKER: I might throw out the honourable member for Eyre, if he keeps interjecting.

Mr. KENEALLY: In 1979-80, the total amount contributed by motorists to Commonwealth Government revenue in petrol tax and crude oil excise for the whole of Australia is expected to amount to \$2 500 000 000. However, Commonwealth Government road grants to all States for 1979-80 amount to only \$546 000 000, or 22 per cent of the total estimated collections from motorists in petrol tax and crude oil excise. It should also be noted that the cost of the Stuart Highway of \$67 300 000 is only 2.7 per cent of the estimated revenue collections from motorists in 1979-80.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I wish I could tell the honourable member that the State would get some of the additional funds that the Federal Government is ripping off motorists and road users generally but unfortunately

no such advice is available and indeed, as I have said in this House on many occasions, the real value of funds made available to the States has shown a very sharp decline. Although members opposite have said, when I have made those claims before, that I have been simply politicking, I hope that they will examine, and I hope that the Federal Minister (Mr. Nixon) will have a look at, the report of the Minister's own Bureau of Transport Economics which showed clearly that the real value of funds from the Commonwealth area to the States for roads had declined markedly, while the real value of money provided by the States from their funds for roads had noticeably increased.

What the member for Stuart is saying regarding the rip-off that has taken place over the past 12 months, and indeed over the past few weeks, under the guise of world parity prices is nothing short of a scandal. We still hear some members opposite comparing the situation when the Whitlam Government was in power with the situation now that the present Government is in power. Let me give them a word of warning on this.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When the Whitlam Government was in power the constituents of the member for Eyre were paying 5.8c a litre in excise. Today these people are paying 13.755c a litre, all of that under the Fraser Government while the States have been getting less and less for roads. I hope that at least one member of the Opposition will take up the invitation I gave them to approach Mr. Nixon and support the State Government. Members opposite have been given all of the details about the Stuart Highway, including the cost of building it. There is an unanswerable case, but they should make the approach if for no reason other than to make Sinclair honour the promise he made in 1977.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say what discussions, if any, he has had with Sir Arvi Parbo, of Western Mining, in relation to the proposed development at Roxby Downs and what assurances he has given him that have led to the announcement of the expenditure of \$50 000 000 as a first stage in the project and the statement by Sir Arvi that he is confident that the Government's policy in relation to uranium mining will be changed in due course? The development of the Roxby Downs mineral deposits is of vital importance to the economic well-being of South Australia. The magnitude of the operation will be enormous, as has been pointed out by Mr. Norton Jackson, Managing Director of AMDEL, last week, when he indicated that the output from the mine will be \$825 000 000 a year, of which \$250 000 000 would remain in the State and \$10 000 000 annually would be paid in royalties. Mr. Jackson states:

In the whole history of South Australia we have never had such a dramatic find. It is an entirely new mining province of world importance. The figures indicated are achievable now, and they are only a start.

He has also explained that, if we in South Australia decide to go into uranium enrichment, the financial returns to the State will be increased by a large amount. The Liberal Party believes that we are in the nuclear age and that we have a moral responsibility to supply this material—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question. I have called the honourable member for Stuart to order for debating a question, and I hope that the honourable Deputy Leader will not continue in that vein.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I simply point out that customer countries are short of alternative fuels, and we believe that we have a moral obligation to supply this material.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have spoken to the honourable member already. The honourable member for Stuart ceased immediately I called him to order, and I hope that the Deputy Leader will not continue in this way.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not pursue that line of explanation. The Premier, in his reply today, has mentioned the question of safeguards. We believe that they are adequate. The Premier also said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is still debating the question. That has nothing to do with his request for leave to explain the question briefly.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Premier stated publicly on Friday that he would not comment on the announcement of the \$50 000 000 expenditure, and he said that the Premier was handling the matter. That seemed to me—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is continuing to debate the question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have taken the point.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member does not continue in this vein; if he does his question will not be proceeded with.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The final point I make (and this is not debating the question)—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There is a real danger, because of the announcement by BP that it can withdraw from this project at any stage. I explain by saying that much importance is attached to this matter. BP, the company that is putting up the \$50 000 000, has stated:

BP has various rights of withdrawal in the event that it is either unable or unwilling to proceed with development of the project.

I think that highlights the importance of the Government's decision in relation to the welfare of this State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member rambled on for so long that I have really forgotten his question. I think he asked whether I had had discussions with Sir Arvi Parbo, and the answer is "Yes, on one occasion". The second question was about what assurances I gave Sir Arvi Parbo. I am not certain whether the honourable member meant in connection with the deal announced on Friday. Is the honourable member alluding to that?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The only assurances given by me personally to the Western Mining Corporation, not to Sir Arvi Parbo, but, I think, to a Mr. Morgan, were in an exchange of letters which dealt with the conditions that would obtain if exploration was to proceed in return for some security on the issue of licences. They are the only assurances involved.

I think the third question had to do with the policy of the Labor Party in respect of the mining and treatment of uranium. I have already told the Leader of the Opposition that those policies are clear: they are clear to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, they are clear to the public of South Australia and they are certainly clear to the mining interests that have entered into this particular programme of exploration. Whilst the Deputy Leader talks as though there would be an immediate return to the State of certain amounts of money, \$10 000 000 annually and so on, he knows as well as I do that, if the development of Roxby Downs proceeded with all haste from this moment without interruption, nothing would eventuate until 1986. He

knows that, and yet he makes it appear as though this State is now being deprived of nothing short of a bonanza. That is wrong. No assurances were given to Sir Arvi Parbo by me or by the Deputy Premier in relation to the likelihood of a change in this policy. Indeed, the statement I issued on Friday said quite specifically that it had been pointed out to the companies involved that there was no likelihood of a change in the safeguard policies.

Mr. Millhouse: Why, then—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot be any clearer than that.

Mr. Millhouse: Why—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If these companies have made a judgment to continue with exploration, I do not know the basis on which they have made that judgment.

Mr. Millhouse: You must have said something.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has interjected three times. I call him to order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We indicated clearly that, at the time of their making the announcement, I would issue a press release which would contain that statement and which would make perfectly clear that there was no likelihood of a change in the safeguard policy. They have made a judgment and have decided to go ahead on that basis. The honourable member talks about B.P. Australia being able to opt out at any time. It is not for the reason he thinks; it is for other reasons and they will be resolved soon.

FUEL SUPPLIES

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Deputy Premier comment on a recent newspaper report—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister may not comment, but may answer a question.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Deputy Premier give his views on the statement made recently by the Minister for National Development (Mr. Newman), in relation to petrol supplies? The Federal Minister said that he was adamant that Australia would never be short of motor spirit supplies or have a system of coupon rationing. That is a strong statement that does not seem to tie up with the general views expressed in relation to future petrol supplies in Australia. In the light of the remarks of the Commonwealth Minister, I would appreciate the views of the State Minister on whether we will ever need to have a system of coupon rationing. If it is possible to make statements of such certainty as the Federal Minister's statement this could stop many unfortunate developments, such as the storage of fuel in a dangerous situation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: After a conference of Ministers of Mines and Energy in Brisbane last Thursday, an agreed statement was issued to the press. Whilst that statement made clear that there was no likelihood in the immediate future of coupon rationing, I do not think it said that there would never be any coupon rationing in Australia. I would be very surprised if Mr. Newman said that.

The basic position in Australia for the rest of the year is that there may be some difficulties relating to fuel oils and distillate in the last quarter of the year, but, broadly speaking, in relation to petrol, provided that sufficient care is taken by the community at large, there should be no overall difficulty with supplies. With that sort of immediate prospect, clearly there is no likelihood of any requirement for coupon rationing.

The nature of Australia's oil supplies from Bass Strait results in a greater degree of self-sufficiency in relation to petrol and products from the lighter end of the barrel than

with regard to products from the bottom of the barrel. The Bass Strait crude is a light crude oil, while the crudes we import from the Middle East are heavy and much more suitable for fuel oil production. At present, our self-sufficiency in respect of petrol, because of our production from Bass Strait, is very much higher than is our self-sufficiency with regard to fuel oil, distillate, or heating oil.

Regarding the position in the 1980's, I think everyone will need to recognise that Australia faces a relatively serious position. From about the mid-1980's onwards, Bass Strait production will start to decline, and our self-sufficiency in overall oil supplies will decline from some 70 per cent to 50 per cent. Furthermore, by the early 1990's, Bass Strait production will fall to very low levels.

If there are further major discoveries of oil in Australia, the lead time in relation to further exploration and development would be such that it would be highly unlikely that that oil could be brought into production before 1986 or 1987. Furthermore, the lead time with regard to any project involving the liquefaction of coal or the use of shale oil is probably of the order of 10 years, so that any major contribution to our oil problems from projects that were to be developed in relation to those substitute fuels could not have an impact on our position before 1989, at the earliest.

I think the basic position is that, while for the next few years there is no immediate likelihood of any requirement for coupon rationing, the same probably could not be said about the position that will face this country in the latter part of the 1980's. Certainly, no-one could make proper allowance for the sort of blow-ups that have occurred in Iran, and further difficulties of that nature could alter the overall position.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry indicate the petrol stocks currently available in South Australia, and will he say what plans the Government has to increase the State's refining capacity and to build up long-term reserves of both crude oil and petrol? In the last month or so, the Minister has had a number of meetings with oil companies in South Australia, at which meetings available petrol stocks have been discussed. I understand that the Minister asked the oil companies to supply him with detailed figures, as at about two weeks ago, of the stocks then held. This State has only one oil refinery, which refines less than its full requirement of petrol.

I understand that normal reserves for the whole of Australia are about 60 days supply of local crude oil and about 180 days supply of imported crude oil. I understand that South Australia's normal reserve is about 30 days supply of refined petrol. I also understand that in the past two months two of the oil companies have been dropping their new supplies into empty tanks in South Australia and that at least one company was unable to meet requests for petrol from service stations under its flag, so the service stations were dry for at least one or two days. I think that all clearly points to the fact that South Australia needs to build up its oil reserves.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not know whether or not the member for Davenport is trying to inflame the situation in South Australia, but his question is framed in a leading way. There is no acute shortage of petrol in South Australia. I have been in regular consultation (for reasons other than those of supply) with oil companies in South Australia. Almost everybody is aware of the acute situation into which the Southern Cross Company has either been forced or got itself (I am not quite sure which). As a consequence of this situation, I have been having a lot of discussion with the oil companies. The honourable member knows that full well; he has made all sorts of

allegations about the Government's attitude to this matter, and I challenge him to prove them at some stage. The situation in South Australia at the moment is quite sound; in fact, it is quite good. That is the important message that ought to go out to the public, because the one thing we need to avoid is panic buying in any circumstances; hence, I shall be making an announcement later today about the Bill that I shall be introducing.

For the past two or three weeks, maintenance work has been in progress at the South Australian refinery. It is now back to full production and, as I have said, there is no acute shortage of petrol in South Australia now, nor do we visualise one in the near future. I make the point (although the member for Davenport might not like it) that the oil companies have been co-operating to the fullest extent with information about supplies in South Australia. They have been supplying us for some weeks with the actual tankage and input figures so that we will know the exact position. For competitive reasons, these figures cannot be made public; I assure the public of South Australia, and the member for Davenport as well, that there is no problem and no acute shortage.

Mr. Dean Brown: That wasn't my question. Why don't you listen?

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

SOUTHERN CROSS PETROLEUM COMPANY

Mr. CRAFTER: Will the Deputy Premier say what action he has taken as a result of the failure of the Golden Fleece Oil Company to maintain the supply of petroleum to the independent petrol retailer, Southern Cross Petroleum Company? I have received representations from a Southern Cross petrol station proprietor in my electorate who sought the support of the State Government to try to get a fair deal in relation to the supply of petrol to his service station. His company, which is a co-operative of small businessmen, has made representations to the Federal Government, which I understand has clear powers in this area, but has received no assistance from that quarter. I understand that the Minister has had discussions with the management of Golden Fleece recently, and I should be pleased if he would inform the House of the results of those discussions.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Both the Minister of Labour and Industry and I have been involved in discussions with oil company representatives in South Australia. It was arranged for us to visit with senior management of Golden Fleece in Melbourne last Wednesday. Unfortunately, the Minister of Labour and Industry was not able to go because of pressing matters in Adelaide, but I was involved in those discussions with Mr. Sleight and Mr. Cumberlidge, of Golden Fleece.

It was clear from their account that Golden Fleece's difficulties have been related to the problem at the Kurnell refinery in Sydney. Golden Fleece does not have a refinery of its own but is associated with Caltex in the Kurnell refinery and has a significant investment in that refinery. The problems that Golden Fleece has had in maintaining supplies throughout Australia have arisen because of the problems at Kurnell.

As a consequence of discussions we had with Mr. May in Adelaide and with Messrs. Sleight and Cumberlidge in Melbourne last Wednesday, Golden Fleece has agreed, at least for the month of August, to make about 500 tonnes of super petrol available to Southern Cross Petroleum in South Australia. I know that that amount is not adequate for Southern Cross's full purposes, but at least this move

indicates that Golden Fleece, if greater supplies are available, is willing to ensure that Southern Cross receives a proportion of those supplies.

That is the current position. I cannot, as a result of the discussions with representatives of Golden Fleece last week, give any guarantees about what will happen after August, but certainly some limited supplies from Golden Fleece will be available to Southern Cross outlets in August. As honourable members probably know, Esso is maintaining some supplies to Southern Cross, and no doubt Southern Cross itself is attempting to make other arrangements so that supplies to its outlets can continue.

I think I should say that both the Minister of Labour and Industry and I emphasised with the oil companies, as I did last week in discussions with members of the head office of Golden Fleece, that it is absolutely vital for oil companies to be equitable in their dealings with petrol outlets. The question of equitable treatment has been discussed with the Federal Government, first at the conference of Ministers of Mines and Energy in Brisbane last Thursday, and secondly in approaches to Mr. Fife. After all, it was Mr. Fife of the Federal Government who proposed a five point plan (I think it was) for the petrol distribution industry in Australia last year. The South Australian Government accepted the proposals put forward by Mr. Fife, part of which contained basic support for independently owned outlets to be provided by government. I think the position that we as a Government want to take is that fundamentally the scheme must be Australia wide, and one of the problems regarding Southern Cross at the present time is the we cannot get any effective commitment from Mr. Fife about what his future attitude will be, despite the fact that last year he put a series of propositions to all States, which were accepted by the South Australian Government. No doubt, the matter will come up again in further discussions with the Commonwealth Government, but obviously, if there is to be effective action to protect the position of independents, it must be dealt with on the national level. The matter is not likely to be effectively resolved by one State acting on its own.

PROPERTY VALUATION

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Premier consider amending the South Australian Valuation of Land Act to widen the criterion on which valuers shall value land, and incorporate in that amendment a requirement that will cause valuers to have positive regard to the existing land use at the time of returning both unimproved and/or capital property values?

Following the release of recent quinquennial valuation assessments in this State, it has become clear from both reported public reaction and cited anomalies that it is time to revise the paramount guidelines of our Valuation of Land Act. From reports emerging from both metropolitan and rural areas of the State, values are being fixed on potential land use in cases where those potential uses ought not to be considered relevant for the purpose of fixing their valuation, and it is upon those values that rates and taxes are levied. It is conceded that valuers are valuing properties strictly in accord with the Government's policy and within their interpretation of the Valuation of Land Act as it now stands. Accordingly, I have no personal criticisms of the employed valuers at this time, but I wish the Premier to take action to amend the system which those officers are currently locked into observing. I draw to the Premier's attention an example of the public reaction to the present system, and I refer to a very brief

letter that was prepared for direction to the Minister of Lands, who has control over that area of valuation, as follows:

We the undersigned electors of South Australia believe that a revised method of property valuation which related existing land use to the value determined is urgently required in this State.

That message was considered at a meeting that I attended on 20 July, where some 250 electors were present—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. Quoting the letter was quite correct, but now he is commenting on the letter and the meeting.

Mr. CHAPMAN: In conclusion, I point out that at that meeting a senior officer of the Valuation Department was present and, I believe, concurs in the importance of this message.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to have a look at the proposition that the honourable member has put to the House. We are currently looking at the Act. The honourable member would be aware of the independent status of the Valuer-General since 1971, and he would also be aware that the staff of the Valuer-General have no interest in the tax consequences of their valuations, but I am looking at the present appeal provisions and also at the possibility of establishment of a panel, for example, where both the person whose property is being valued and the valuer could come before the panel to give the reasons for their objection and the valuation respectively. The present system, of course, has been simple and not costly, and generally speaking it has worked, but I shall be pleased to have a look at the points the honourable member has raised.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Health assure the House that, despite the vicious cuts in funding by the Fraser Government, the quality of clinical services has not been lowered in South Australian Government hospitals? In the *Adelaide News* of last night, an article attributed to David Lewis states:

The Royal Adelaide Hospital has slashed spending by \$4 400 000 in the past financial year, and more cuts are likely this year. The curb on spending has been achieved despite an increase in the number of people treated at the hospital.

The Minister will be well aware that the press is liable to exaggerate and has headlines that are not all true and correct. Another part of the report states that the number of inpatients last year increased by 13 per cent, and in the casualty section last year the hospital had 75 162 attendances compared to 72 814 in the previous year. The Minister probably would be well aware that the report would tend to show that cuts in hospital expenditure are also attributable to clinical—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting on the report.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I certainly, from the Government's point of view, can give the assurance that the honourable member is seeking, and I can also say that I am painfully aware of the misdemeanours of the press to which he has referred. However, I want to say something about the standard of care in hospitals. There is no length to which this Government will not go to ensure that the standard of clinical care in Government and recognised hospitals throughout South Australia is kept at the same high standard as that to which the people of this State have been accustomed since 1970. We will do everything in our power to try to ensure that that standard is maintained, and, where possible, improved. However, that task will not be easy, given the fact—

Mr. Becker interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The member for Hanson has some comments to make. He may like to say where services should be cut, because that is the sort of thing that the Fraser Government wants. We cannot cut \$4 000 000 000 off—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member for Hanson will have a chance to ask a question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We cannot cut \$4 000 000 000 from the health, education and welfare budget of this country without that having a dramatic effect where the services are provided. Honourable members opposite and people throughout the community know that the sort of crisis confronting so many human services at present is directly the responsibility of Canberra colleagues of members opposite. We are doing whatever we can in this State to try to cushion the effects of the policies of the Fraser Government, but the extent to which the State can do that is restricted because we have only limited financial means at our fingertips.

It is all very well for members opposite to say that we can keep cutting and paring and that economies can be made here and there. The funds spent in the big public hospitals in this State are funded 50-50 by the Commonwealth and the State, and every \$1 that we save is a saving of 50c for the State and 50c for the Commonwealth. The efficiencies and economies that we are making are also making for the Commonwealth savings that the Commonwealth is not re-injecting into the system. South Australia is doing everything it can to try to ensure that we have the best possible services in the health area commensurate with the amount of money spent.

On the other hand, the amount of money that we are saving is being taken out of the system by the Commonwealth Government and being handed back willy-nilly in tax concessions and the like for big business and its friends. The services that we provide will be the best that we possibly can, and I think even members opposite will concede that the Corcoran Government, and the Dunstan Government before it, have lifted health services for the people to the highest standard in the nation. That is well recognised by many experts in the field. Members opposite know that it is the case. We will fight to ensure that the standards achieved are maintained, and improved where that can be done.

It will be an important task for all members of this Parliament in the next few weeks to try to bring home to the Federal Government the effects that that Government's policies will have, not only on the services provided by the State Government in the health field but also on the services provided by a wide range of voluntary organisations. Reference was made to some of these in the press in the past few days. It was interesting, when I went to Regency Park on Monday, to find that the basic cause of retrenchments made at that time was that the Federal Government had instructed Regency Park to cut back the number of hours of professional services being provided by 78 a week.

So, it was the Fraser Government that was responsible primarily for the difficulties into which Regency Park was getting before the retrenchments occurred. This sort of thing will continue unless we can get the Fraser Government to change its policies and start showing a bit of heart and sympathy for the sick people of this country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The people of this State

and this country may well recognise over the next few weeks the cause of the problems that are now confronting the health and welfare services of this State, and the best way out of that is to throw out the Fraser Government and get rid of its policies.

LAND TAX

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier say what the Government intends to do in relation to the savage land tax levied on the house owners of South Australia? Every other State gives generous concessions to the house owner. New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia exempt totally from land tax the principal place of residence if it occupies an area of up to $\frac{1}{2}$ acre, $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres and 5 acres respectively. In Victoria and Tasmania, there is total exemption from land tax on principal places of residence if the unimproved total value is less than \$33 000 or \$30 000 respectively. No concessions or exemptions from land tax are available in South Australia on land that is a principal place of residence, and South Australia is out of line with all other States in what the Premier earlier this afternoon called a wealth tax.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Again, the honourable member is singling out a particular tax. I have spoken in this House before about the method of attacking a tax and the fact that the overall situation must be looked at in order to get the situation into proper perspective. The honourable member knows that we have already exempted rural properties from land tax and that, if we exempted domestic properties as well, a substantial loss to the Government would occur. That would mean that we would have to cut services that are not only necessary but vital to the wellbeing of the people of this State. The honourable member knows that.

Mr. Becker: Nonsense!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member can say "nonsense" if he likes, but the people who say that have not the responsibilities of government. They are in Opposition, and they can be as irresponsible as they want. Like the member for Hanson, they can crow about tax reform and on the next day claim in the press that we ought to be spending more on this and that. He had no compunction at all about doing that.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I have given the honourable member for Hanson a fair go this afternoon. I hope that he will not continue to interject.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Hanson has no compunction at all about doing that, and it is a gross irresponsibility on his part, but he could not care less. I will not put the member for Glenelg into the same category, because I think that his inquiry was genuine. I am concerned to see that people are not caused any hardship as a result of any tax, but the honourable member knows that this is a progressive tax and that it bears on those who can most afford to pay it. The Government does not intend at this stage to change the method or the application of this tax.

INTENSIVE NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE SCHEME

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare provide information on the success or otherwise of the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Scheme which was introduced recently by the Community Welfare Department?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for her question. I know that she has been

interested in this scheme since its inception. She was kind enough to tell me that she would be asking this question, so I am able to provide information on the matter.

Although it is still in its early stages, already the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Scheme has shown an encouraging rate of success. I am encouraged by the number of people who have come forward and offered genuinely to undertake some responsibility in this serious area. As the Minister responsible, I have been concerned with the many problems of institutional care for young offenders. People should consider seriously that, once these young offenders have been in institutions for a long time, it becomes more and more difficult for them to re-enter the community to lead a worthwhile lifestyle.

The scheme, which is unique in South Australia, has positively lessened the likelihood of these young offenders reoffending, while at the same time it has offered positive rehabilitation. All told, 28 families in South Australia have looked after 31 youths in all sorts of circumstances, and overall the results of the scheme have proved to be excellent. I am certain that it will continue to prove to be successful.

MINISTER OF HEALTH

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question to the Premier is supplementary to a question which I asked him on notice and to which he replied today. Why should not, in accordance with custom, the Attorney-General administer the following Acts: the Companies Act, the Business Names Act, the Associations Incorporation Act, the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, the Sharebrokers Act, the Marketable Securities Act and the Securities Industry Act? My Question on Notice No. 51 today asked what Acts, pursuant to the Administration of Acts Act, are committed to the Minister of Health, and why? The answer I received today was that 29 of them one would expect the Minister of Health to administer, because they concern health matters. The other seven, which I have read out, are obviously Attorney-General's matters, and one wonders whether this shows a lack of confidence in the new Attorney-General (described by one newspaper as very conservative) or whether there is some special reason why the Minister of Health should administer matters which obviously concern another portfolio. I remind the Premier that one reason why he had to move the Hon. Peter Duncan from the position of Attorney-General to that of Minister of Health—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to allow the honourable member to continue in this vein. He is now commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the Premier probably knows the reasons why.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind him that the Associations Incorporation Act was one very sensitive area which the present Minister of Health really did mess up in the last few months—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already spoken to the honourable member once. I call him to order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I probably have explained the question sufficiently anyway.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was going to say that there is no doubt about the member for Mitcham—he has a fertile mind. The reason why the Acts listed by the honourable member are under the administration of the Minister of Health at the moment is that he is at the moment the Minister responsible for corporate affairs. The honourable member knows that.

Mr. Millhouse: Why is he?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reason why he is the Minister in charge of corporate affairs is that, when I allocated portfolios to the various Ministers, the Minister of Health was involved midway in lengthy, complex, protracted discussions with every other Attorney-General and the Federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs in relation to the establishment of a national corporate affairs organisation.

The honourable member must know, because he has read the paper from time to time, about the kerfuffle that went on about where the headquarters of this organisation would be located. With the best will in the world, we advocated vigorously that it should be in Adelaide, because South Australia is the central State, and, because Melbourne and Sydney could not agree, it would seem that we had a golden opportunity to press that. We did so, but we missed out on the compromise, and this means that the Ministerial Council will be in Sydney and headquarters in Melbourne. I have made clear that, when this matter is resolved—and I am talking about the establishment of a corporate affairs organisation on a national basis—I will examine whether or not the situation should be looked at again. I shall do that in due course.

WATER MANAGEMENT

Mr. DRURY: Will the Minister of Planning say whether any specific Government action is being considered on the recommendation contained in the Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study, which was released in mid-June for public consideration? I am particularly interested in the recommendations which suggest ways of reducing the quantity of water used on gardens, as I understand that gardens account for about 50 per cent of domestic water usage.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is fitting that the matter be raised by a member who is responsible for an area in which considerable development is taking place, an area with a growing rate of building, where families are establishing themselves and perhaps setting about establishing their garden.

The honourable member will be pleased to know that yesterday Cabinet adopted a formal policy requiring Government departments to apply low water-use landscape design principles to all new Government buildings, works and other public properties. In addition, each department will be required to review the landscaping of existing properties with a view to conversion, where feasible, to low water-use designs. Cabinet also resolved to request semi-government bodies to take similar action. As an important adjunct to this policy decision, the Public Works Department is already formulating guidelines for the landscaping of Government properties, with the specific aim of minimising water consumption.

The Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study mentioned by the honourable member places very strong emphasis on water demand management as a means of making very substantial long-term savings in Loan funds through the deferral of major capital works. In the short term, there will be significant savings in the operating costs of the Engineering and Water Supply Department which are met in part from Consolidated Revenue. The study recommends the continuation and expansion of public education campaigns about water demand management because, as the honourable member pointed out, gardens consume about half of domestic water usage. Cabinet has decided that the Government should give a lead in this

matter and practise the water economics it is preaching to the public.

There would be other spin-off benefits. Low water-use plants are usually Australian natives which are quite suited environmentally to the kinds of planting that should be carried out in future, both on the Government scene and, hopefully, by private citizens setting up their garden.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the licensing of persons who sell certain petroleum products in South Australia and for other purposes.

Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

I seek leave to introduce a Bill to replace the loss of road revenue resulting from a decision earlier this year, by all States, to abolish road maintenance charges (commonly known as the ton mile tax) as from 1 July 1979.

Members will recall that South Australia, along with all other mainland States (excluding the Northern Territory), has imposed road maintenance charges on heavy road vehicles for a number of years. Those charges were designed to recover the cost of the excessive wear and tear caused to roads by heavy vehicles, particularly by interstate hauliers, who also enjoy a privileged position in respect to motor registration charges and other charges, on constitutional grounds.

Members will also be aware that this system of road charges has been the subject of considerable criticism and mounting pressure for its removal, by the road transport industry and its members. The extent of avoidance, particularly by interstate hauliers, who in many cases adopted a practice of establishing "straw" companies as a device to avoid the charges, has been a matter of considerable concern not only to the Governments involved but also to those members of the transport industry who accepted their responsibilities in accordance with the legislation.

These problems have been recognised by all State Governments for many years. Indeed, much time and effort has been spent by State Governments and the Australian Transport Advisory Council in seeking a more equitable alternative to the road maintenance charges system.

Of the alternatives considered by the Australian Transport Advisory Council, all but one were rejected on the grounds that they offered no better arrangement than the then existing road maintenance charges system. They all suffered from shortcomings in the areas of equity, evasion, safety and ease and cost of administration.

The system which the respective State Governments supported as an appropriate alternative to the road maintenance charges system involved the Commonwealth Government levying and collecting a fuel charge on behalf

of the States as part of the Commonwealth's fuel excise system. It was supported for the following reasons:

- (a) it would be constitutionally valid;
- (b) it would provide little scope for evasion and avoidance by any groups of road users;
- (c) it would be administratively convenient and cheap to operate as it would be an extension of the Commonwealth's existing customs and excise arrangements for which administrative and collection procedures are already operating; and
- (d) from an economic management point of view, it would make sense for a charge on fuel (like a tax on income) to be co-ordinated at one central point.

I regret to say that, despite persistent requests from all State Governments, Labor, Liberal and National Party alike, the Commonwealth Government has refused, steadfastly, to co-operate with the States in this particular matter.

Members, of course, now know the final outcome. Long-distance road hauliers blockaded key roads earlier this year and forced the Queensland Government to submit to their pressure that road maintenance charges be abolished. The unilateral decision of the Queensland Government left all other States with no alternative but to agree to abolish those charges as from 1 July 1979. That decision resulted in an annual loss of approximately \$5 000 000 to the Highways Department for road maintenance purposes. It is a loss which the department cannot afford if it is to continue to maintain the State's roads at a level which is considered essential for the effective operation of the road transport industry and also for the use of the motoring public generally.

It is a loss which could not be met from the general revenue and Loan funds available to the State. These funds are under heavy pressure as a result of considerably reduced Commonwealth Government support in recent years for general purpose loan funds and for special purpose funds.

With a similar situation confronting all States, the members of the Australian Transport Advisory Council set up a working party in April 1979 to inquire into and recommend an alternative method of raising the equivalent amount of revenue lost through the abolition of road maintenance charges.

The working party's report was considered by the Australian Transport Advisory Council in June 1979. It recommended that a charge be made on certain petroleum products used in propelling road vehicles, coupled with an appropriate adjustment in motor registration fees so that the burden remained, as far as possible, with the heavy road vehicle user.

The working party also recommended that:

- (a) the charge should be levied and collected by the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the States for reasons similar to those I mentioned earlier. This approach was supported strongly by the oil companies;
- (b) in the event that the Commonwealth Government would not support that approach, then the charge should be levied and collected at the oil company level rather than the retail level in order to avoid the problems associated with previous fuel franchising systems.

As to the Commonwealth Government levying and collecting the charge, this matter was raised at the recent Premiers' Conference. I regret to say that, once again, the proposal was rejected out of hand by the Commonwealth Government.

As a consequence, all States are now left with no alternative but to introduce a business franchise fuel licensing system. Western Australia and Victoria have already legislated to introduce this type of system. New South Wales and Queensland are considering the question.

In respect to this Bill, the Government is following closely the major principles incorporated in the current Victorian legislation as uniformity between States is essential in order to avoid border problems which could be detrimental to the industry.

Basically, the legislation provides for each oil company to pay a nominal licence fee plus a fee based on the value of its sales in a previous period for certain petroleum products (namely motor spirit and distillate) used in propelling vehicles on roads and for each retailer to pay a nominal licence fee only, provided he purchases his supplies of those products from a licensed oil company.

In essence, the system involves two licences:

A class A licence—where the wholesaler, generally the oil company, will be required to pay \$50 per month plus an additional fee per litre of 4.5 per cent of the bulk wholesale reseller's maximum price for petrol and 7.1 per cent of the bulk wholesale reseller's price for distillate, on the sale of those products.

A class B licence—where the retailer, or service station proprietor, will pay a \$50 annual fee only.

The higher rate for automotive distillate is consistent with the Victorian approach and is based on the premise that the heavy vehicle road hauliers should bear the brunt of the new charge. Most heavy vehicles are diesel powered.

On the basis of the latest available figures for consumption of petrol and distillate, it is estimated that these charges will produce revenue of approximately \$14 000 000 in a full year.

In view of this, and as a first step towards the "user pays" principle, the Government has decided to reduce motor registration fees for private vehicles and light commercial vehicles, thereby creating a package deal and offsetting some of the effects of the additional fuel costs. It is also anticipated that, with some increased registration fees for heavy vehicles combined with the increased rate for diesel fuel, payment by the heavy haulier will approach that which he would have paid under the road maintenance charges system.

Regulations to give effect to these changes in motor registration fees have been prepared.

Discussions have been held with the oil companies and it is hoped that the legislation can be passed so as to give them time to apply for and gain a price rise from 1 September 1979. This should enable them to collect approximately the equivalent of one month's fee by 1 October 1979, the date from which it is proposed that this Bill will apply.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 provides definitions of terms used in the Bill. The term "petroleum products" is defined to mean motor spirit or diesel fuel, that is, the two petroleum products that are principally used for the propulsion of motor vehicles.

Clauses 5 to 10, the grouping provisions of the Bill, are designed to prevent avoidance of the liability to pay the fee for a class A licence or the full amount of the fee. The class A licences proposed by this Bill may be regarded as corresponding to the tobacco wholesalers' licences under the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974-1978. Under the Bill, as with the tobacco wholesalers' licence, the class

A licence is to be a monthly licence and the fee for the licence is to be based upon the value of petroleum products sold by the licensee during the calendar month; that is, the last calendar month but one preceding the calendar month during which the licence will be in force. The fact that the fee is based upon sales during an antecedent period enables a seller, if he splits his business into two or more businesses, takes out separate class A licences for those businesses and directs all or the bulk of his sales through different businesses in different months, to eliminate or reduce his fees for the licences for those businesses. The grouping provisions in the Bill, which correspond to sections 4a to 4f of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, therefore, are designed to enable those separate businesses to be treated as one business requiring one class A licence, the fee for which would be based upon the total of the sales in all of those businesses during the relevant antecedent period.

Clause 11 provides that the measure shall not affect the operation of other Acts, in particular the Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973, as amended.

Clause 12 provides that the Commissioner of Stamps shall have the general administration of the measure. Clause 13 provides for the constitution of a Business Franchise (Petroleum) Appeal Tribunal which under Part IV of the measure is to hear any appeal against a refusal to grant a licence or against any assessment by the Commissioner of the fee for a class A licence.

Clause 14 provides for the appointment of a Registrar of the tribunal. Clause 15 provides for the appointment of inspectors. Clause 16 empowers inspectors to enter premises used in connection with the business of dealing with petroleum products, to inspect any such premises and any records that relate to any such business, and to ask questions with respect to any such business.

Clauses 17 and 18 are the most significant provisions of the Bill. Under clause 17, a person is to be guilty of an offence if he sells petroleum products on or after the appointed day without having obtained the appropriate licence. The appointed day is to be specified by proclamation. The clause provides for two types of licences referred to as class A licences and class B licences. A class A licence is required by any person who sells petroleum products and delivers them within the State for consumption or resale where he has not purchased those products from the holder of a licence under a sale made in pursuance of that licence. The major oil companies will, therefore, be required to obtain class A licences. A class B licence is required by any person who sells petroleum products and delivers them within the State for consumption or resale where he has purchased those products from the holder of a licence under a sale made in pursuance of that licence. Subclause (3) of clause 17 provides that a holder of a class A licence may sell petroleum products in pursuance of that licence where he purchased those products from another class A licensee or from a class B licensee.

Clause 18 fixes the fees for class A and class B licences. The fee for a class B licence is to be an annual fee of \$50. The fee for a class A licence (which is to be a monthly licence) is to be \$50 together with an amount of 4.5 per cent of the value of motor spirit and 7.1 per cent of the value of diesel fuel sold by the applicant during the calendar month that is the last calendar month but one preceding the calendar month in which the licence will be in force. The value of motor spirit and diesel fuel sold during that relevant period by a class A licensee to another class A licensee for resale is to be disregarded. Under the clause the value of diesel fuel sold that is not to be used for propelling diesel engined road vehicles and the value of

motor spirit or diesel fuel sold for delivery and consumption outside the State shall also be disregarded. Subclauses (4) to (8) provide for the fixing by the Minister of a value for motor spirit and a value for diesel fuel. The respective values are to be published in the *Gazette* not more frequently than quarterly and are not to exceed the maximum prices for premium grade motor spirit and for diesel fuel, respectively, fixed under the Prices Act, 1948-1978, at the relevant time and applicable to bulk wholesale resellers.

Clause 19 provides for reassessment and adjustment of the fee for a class A licence. Clause 20 empowers the Commissioner to require any person dealing with petroleum products to furnish him with information as to those dealings. Clause 21 provides for the grant of licences by the Commissioner. A class B licensee is to be required to keep the Commissioner correctly advised as to the premises from which he conducts his business. Clause 22 provides that class A licences are to expire at the end of the month in which they are granted and that class B licences are to expire on the next anniversary of the appointed day occurring after they are granted.

Clause 23 provides for the surrender of a class B licence. Clause 24 requires the Commissioner to keep a register of licences. Clause 25 requires class A licensees, on or after 1 July 1980, to endorse every invoice, statement of account and receipt issued for or in relation to the sale of petroleum products with the words "Licensed petroleum wholesaler". Clause 26 requires any person carrying on the business of dealing with petroleum products to keep records of a kind to be prescribed by regulation for a period of five years after they are made.

Clause 27 provides that there shall be a right of appeal to the tribunal against a refusal by the Commissioner to grant a licence and against an assessment or reassessment by the Commissioner of the fee for a licence. Clause 28 provides for the time for lodging an appeal to the tribunal against a refusal to grant a licence and provides for the powers of the tribunal upon such an appeal. Clause 29 provides for appeals against assessments or reassessments by the Commissioner of the fees for class A licences. The clause provides that an appeal lies to the tribunal only after the licence applicant has lodged with the Commissioner an objection against his assessment or reassessment.

Clause 30 provides that licence fees less the cost of administering the measure are to be paid into the Highways Fund under the Highways Act, 1926-1979, on a monthly basis. Clause 31 prohibits the improper disclosure of information obtained in the course of administering the measure. Clause 32 provides that it shall be an offence to make false or misleading statements in providing information required in connection with the administration of the measure. Clause 33 protects the Commissioner, the tribunal and inspectors from personal liability for acts or omissions in good faith made in the course of the administration of the measure.

Clause 34 provides that the Commissioner may make an additional assessment and recover a further amount in payment of the fee for a licence where the deficiency in the amount of his original assessment was caused by a false statement made by the licensee. Clause 35 provides for the recovery of an amount equal to the licence fee which should have been paid by a person who was required to obtain a licence but did not do so.

Clause 36 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 37 provides for the summary disposition of proceedings for offences against the measure. Clause 38 provides that where a corporation is guilty of an offence against the measure the officers of the corporation shall, also, in

certain circumstances, be guilty of an offence. Clause 39 provides for the service of documents. Clause 40 provides for the making of regulations.

Mr. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963-1979. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for the amendment and subsequent expiry of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963-1979. The Bill provides that the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act shall not apply to any journey, or part of any journey, occurring after 1 July 1979. The Bill, if enacted, would, therefore, effectively remove the liability to pay road maintenance charges as from that day. In addition, the Bill provides for the expiry of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation in order to enable road maintenance charges that fell due before 1 July 1979 to be recovered.

This decision to remove the road maintenance charges was taken in order to resolve the long distance hauliers' blockade of key roads in April and to forestall any further such action. It is proposed that the revenue raised by means of road maintenance charges will be replaced by revenue raised by means of licence fees under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Bill, 1979, if enacted.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 provides for the enactment of new sections 14 and 15. New section 14 provides that the Act shall not apply and be deemed not to have applied to any journey, or part of any journey, occurring after 1 July 1979. New section 15 provides for the expiry of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Mr. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR FUEL RATIONING BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for temporary rationing and control over distribution of motor fuel during periods of scarcity; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is in substance much the same as a previous Bill which was introduced during the last session of the present Parliament but which failed to pass because of

disagreement between the Houses.

While there have been some shortages of motor fuel they have not been severe or widespread, and at the outset I want to make it quite clear, and emphasise, that there are no plans to bring this Act into operation, no permits have been printed, nor has any thought been given to that being done.

However, the ever-increasing demands upon the world's energy resources and the uncertainty of future supplies of such resources, particularly crude oil, has led Governments to consider legislating to ensure the maintenance of essential services in the event of the supplies of energy resources becoming unobtainable or in critically short supply for one reason or another. In recent years both the New South Wales and Western Australian Parliaments have enacted legislation to give their respective Governments control of energy resources of all types.

The Western Australian Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act, 1972-1974, set up a Fuel and Power Commission for this purpose, while the New South Wales Energy Authority Act, 1976, provided for the creation of an Energy Authority of New South Wales. Both Acts contain separate parts to deal with emergency shortages of energy resources and give the Governor of the State power to proclaim a state of emergency and make regulations in respect of the control of the form of energy in short supply.

In South Australia it is not considered necessary at the present time to set up an energy authority of the kind established in Western Australia and New South Wales. However, this State's reliance on petroleum products as a major source of energy makes it extremely vulnerable to any interruption of regular supply. South Australia is reliant on a single petroleum refinery for the provision of a substantial proportion of its petroleum requirements.

Whenever production at the refinery ceases or is restricted for any reason for longer than about two weeks, severe shortages of essential petroleum products are experienced. In fact, in five out of the last seven years this has been the case, necessitating the introduction of petrol rationing in 1972 and 1973, while in 1974, 1976 and again in 1977 such action would have become necessary if the restrictions on production or movement of the product had continued for a few more days. During the petrol crises in 1972 and 1973, Parliament was asked to consider and pass, in a period of somewhat less than 24 hours, legislation to control and ration the remaining supplies of liquid fuel. Both the resulting Acts expired shortly after their enactment.

Members will recall that in 1974 the Government introduced an Emergency Powers Bill, which sought to give the Governor power to declare a state of emergency if at any time he "is of the opinion that a situation has arisen, or is likely to arise, that is of such a nature as to be calculated to deprive the community or any substantial part of the community of the essentials of life". At that time Opposition members were swayed by events then occurring in Western Australia and were placed under the misapprehension that there was something sinister about the Bill. Amendments moved to the Bill at that time were unacceptable to the Government and the Bill was laid aside.

In August 1977, Parliament considered and passed the Motor Fuel Rationing (Temporary Provisions) Act, a measure having a limited life but capable of dealing with any emergency occurring in the ensuing three months. In the event it proved unnecessary to invoke the Act and it subsequently expired on 31 October 1977.

While this Bill differs from the Liquid Fuel Rationing Acts of 1972 and 1973 in some respects, it is based on the

premise that should an emergency arise the Government should have the authority to be able to control supplies of petroleum products. The differences in detail result from the experience in administering the 1972 and 1973 Liquid Fuel Rationing Acts so that problems then encountered need not be repeated should it ever be necessary to bring this Act into operation. The other difference is that the Act can be proclaimed, by the Governor, to come into operation in the event of an emergency instead of having to hurriedly convene Parliament.

This Bill also differs from previous rationing legislation in that it is intended to remain indefinitely on the Statute Book. From the experience gained previously it has become obvious that, whenever a critical shortage of petroleum fuel exists, the Executive Government should be armed with sufficient power to ensure that appropriate action can be swift and effective. As I mentioned earlier, that is provided in the legislation in force in both Western Australia and New South Wales. However, unlike the legislation of those States, the essentials are contained within this Bill rather than left to be dealt with in subsequent regulations.

The Government recognizes that in cases of protracted shortage there will be a need for Parliament to be called together to consider further action to be taken. The Bill allows for a rationing period of not more than 30 days to be declared and provides that no further rationing period may be declared within 30 days of the conclusion of that period. This means that the Bill is in effect limited to relatively short rationing periods.

It is well known that, because of events that occurred in Iran earlier this year, the world production of crude oil has been insufficient to meet the continually increasing world demand for petroleum products. However, the situation in Australia has not been nearly as difficult as some newspapers have suggested.

Members will have heard that the State Ministers of Mines and Energy and the Federal Minister for National Development last week agreed to the formation of a national petroleum advisory committee. They announced, and I underline this, that coupon type rationing is not needed, but that it is prudent to continue studies of possible contingency measures which can be applied quickly should unforeseen shortages of motor spirit arise.

For some months senior officers of the Commonwealth Government with a senior representative of each oil company have been meeting as the Oil Industry Supply Liaison Committee, and at future meetings a representative of each State will also attend. In South Australia there has been consultation between representatives of the oil companies, firstly with the Minister of Mines and Energy and myself and last week the Director of my Department and the Director of the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy agreed with oil company representatives on the procedures that are being adopted at a State level to keep the Government fully informed of the situation.

This Bill is introduced so that this State, like Western Australia and New South Wales, will have emergency legislation that can be used with a minimum of delay should it become necessary.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 contains definitions required for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 4 empowers the Minister to delegate powers conferred on him by the new Act.

Clause 5 deals with the initiation and duration of a rationing period. The maximum duration of a rationing period is 30 days (it may of course be shorter) and at least 30 days must intervene between the end of one rationing period and the commencement of another. The

proclamation by which the rationing period is initiated will also state the kinds of motor fuel that will be subject to rationing.

Clause 6 prohibits the sale and purchase of rationed motor fuel during a rationing period except in pursuance of a permit. Motor fuel purchased under a permit must be used in accordance with the conditions of the permit. Clause 7 deals with the issue, transfer and cancellation of permits. Clause 8 empowers the Minister to grant exemptions from the provisions of the Act relating to rationing. These exemptions may operate territorially or according to certain other criteria.

Clause 9 empowers the Minister, where he believes that it is in the public interest to do so, to give directions relating to the supply and distribution of motor fuel. This provision will enable the Minister to ensure that reserves of motor fuel are deployed to best advantage in times of acute scarcity. A person who suffers loss through having to comply with a direction may obtain compensation for the loss by action against the Crown.

Clause 10 enables the Minister to obtain information relating to supplies and distribution of motor fuel that he will require for the proper administration of the new Act. Clause 11 prevents actions for injunctions or mandamus being brought against the Minister in relation to his administration of the new Act. Clause 12 provides a high penalty for profiteering during rationing periods. Clause 13 empowers a police officer, during a rationing period, to stop a vehicle and investigate the source of motor fuel on or in the vehicle. Clause 14 is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 15 deals with the summary disposal of offences. Clause 16 is a regulation-making power.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

In moving the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech, I am conscious of, and acknowledge with thanks, the honour that has been conferred on me in being entrusted, in my maiden speech in this House, with this task. I would like, on this occasion, to outline some basic principles by which I will try to be guided in forming my attitudes towards the issues that come before this House for resolution, and to speak on some matters which I believe are of particular importance to the people of South Australia.

Before doing so, I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy you have extended to me today and for the assistance you have given me since my election to the Parliament. I also thank all those members from both sides of the House who have made me welcome in this institution. I wish to thank my Parliamentary and Party colleagues who have placed great confidence in me, and the people of the electorate of Norwood who upheld this

confidence and who have so warmly accepted me into their service.

The two basic principles which I shall attempt to place at the centre of my consideration in the determination of the issues of the day, are, first, the maintenance of the dignity of each individual person. That each human life is of inestimable value is a fundamental tenet of our society which can never be diluted or set aside without weakening the community as a whole. Societies are judged in the fullness of time, I believe, by the care and consideration they give to the least and lowliest of their members.

The second basic principle is the ideal that all human beings are equal. We all know that this is not so in reality, and, in fact, in Australia inequalities are increasing, not decreasing. Yet equality must remain the touchstone of our existence, for without it the first principle to which I have referred cannot be achieved either. It will be my intention to be guided by these principles in the enactment of laws and the deliberations of this House of Parliament.

I begin my term of Parliamentary service in the knowledge that gross inequalities exist in the Australian community and that assaults are being made relentlessly, every day of the year, on the dignity of men, women and children. The level of unemployment in Australia is now a national disgrace and has already stricken a generation of young Australians with a malaise and bitterness, the results of which we will live with for the rest of our lives. The diminution of real wages in the last four years, together with the dismantling of controls on prices, has meant that tens of thousands of working men and women and their families have to live a life of fear, insecurity and reduced living standards. For those persons on fixed incomes, particularly those in receipt of social security benefits, a dignified existence is fast becoming a dream, and the reality is very much a nightmare for many.

Abortion has become an acceptable form of birth control in our community, and euthanasia will become a more palatable alternative to death without dignity, unless there is a reassessment soon of the fundamental aspirations of those who possess power, wealth and technology in this country. There must also be an honest analysis of how we relate to other nations, particularly those which suffer from war, oppression, exploitation and poverty.

This reassessment is beginning in the community, and more and more individuals and groups of people are considering such vital matters as their use of fossil fuels, their responsibilities towards refugees, the real value of the formal education process, who should own and control our natural resources, the morality of corporate behaviour, and the nature of human relationships, to mention a few. I am sure that all members would see this type of discussion as healthy and constructive.

The unfortunate element is that, to a large extent, these people do not see the Parliamentary system as capable of coming to grips with these great issues. Too often they see Parliament as a compromise rather than consensus, and representing vested interests rather than the community interest. Whether that is in fact the truth or not, it is generally agreed that politicians are not held in high regard by the community.

His Excellency, in opening this session, referred to the reintroduction of the Bill relating to the disclosure of pecuniary interests by members of Parliament. This measure is fundamental to any change in attitude by the electorate to politicians. The cynical and shallow objections to this Bill that have been voiced in the past are contemptuous of the community we serve.

Public accountability is a concept which must be embraced more honestly and forthrightly than ever

before, in both the private and public sectors. Failure to disclose information used in the public interest to arrive at decisions affecting the community can lead only to a diminution of respect for the decision maker and a suspicion of the *bona fides* of the decision-making process.

The rejection by the Opposition of amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act in 1976 is an illustration of my concern. That Bill sought to appoint a non-lawyer to the Law Society committee empowered by Statute to investigate complaints against lawyers. That such a proposal was rejected out of hand by the Law Society and the Opposition is clearly contrary to any concept of public accountability. While professional groups such as medical and legal practitioners, who provide essential public services, are allowed to determine their own ethics and standards of service and discipline, without public participation, the more difficult it will be for those professions to gain public respect.

With the ever-increasing aggregation of authority by the administrative arm of Government, it is essential that public servants do not lose sight of their relationship with the public that they serve.

His Excellency has referred to the Government's intention to introduce a new Public Service Act. This measure will add public respect for and understanding of the role of the State Public Service. Most of my working life has been spent in the State Public Service. I first joined the Harbors Board Department in February 1962. I served in four other departments in 11 years of service. I trust that I can bring some of the experience I have gained in the public sector into the deliberations of this House. Great emphasis is placed on the accountability of the Administration to Parliament in the Westminster system of Government. The checks and balances that are provided in our Constitution Act, I believe, require Parliamentarians to treat the powers and privileges they have with respect, and to establish an understanding of the nature and function of the Public Service.

I have seen, as a public servant, that frivolous, pedantic and overtly political questions cause much frustration and a loss of respect for the Parliament among public servants. On the other hand, the knowledge that the Parliament is accountable to the public for the actions of public servants is an over-riding influence on all public servants. No public servant is beyond the supervision and direction of his Minister in responsible government. When he is, it is the public that are harmed, and the structure of our society is weakened accordingly.

I have in my work had considerable contact in recent years with members of the Judiciary. The current debate on the sentencing process, unfortunately fuelled by some for political purposes, shows (and it is probably the only thing it does reveal) an appalling ignorance of the criminal justice system and of those who are responsible for its administration. I have great respect for judicial office, but it would appear that all too often elevation to the Bench means a removal of that person from the humdrum and reality of community life. The very respect which the community pays to judges and magistrates makes it hard for them, I am led to believe, to lead a normal life in the community. The need to be impartial and above reproach at all times, and to be seen to be so, appears to be an over-riding influence in the relationship that holders of judicial office have with the community.

I find this to be an overly narrow view of judicial life: if ever anyone needs to know what is going on in the broad community, it is judges. The Constitution Act provides for public accountability of holders of judicial office to only a very limited extent and in extreme circumstances. The community seems to be clearly calling for a greater degree

of accountability and, I believe, is frustrated that it is not readily attainable.

I do not have an easy answer, and certainly I do not favour governmental interference or direction beyond that provided in the law. However, I feel that judges themselves should give serious consideration to their standing in the community and how they can be more clearly seen to be performing their duties in the public interest. Recent debate in law journals and in other forums regarding the role of judges in non-judicial duties appears to deny the community, if supported, of scarce talent, and adds to the trend of judicial office holders removing themselves from normal community life and service.

We can live in a society that has a respected Judiciary, excellent laws and a network of checks and balances to provide for the public interest, but they are in vain if there is not access to these arms of service. This is probably the single most disconcerting factor for one beginning a Parliamentary career, for it is a fact that far too many people cannot afford the protection of the law, or to assert the rights that are theirs according to law, the very laws that have been created by this Parliament.

Access to the law is too often beyond the reach of those who most need it. At my very first lecture at law school I was told by my lecturer that the law was like the Waldorf Astoria Hotel—open to everyone, as long as one can pay the bill. Those words have rung in my ears on countless occasions since. Legal aid programmes are not the answer; they help, but at present only to prop up a system that can be likened to providing a band-aid to mend a broken limb. Whilst the cutbacks by the Federal Government in funding legal aid offices are unjust and heartless, legal aid offices, as they currently exist, can only provide help for those who find themselves in a position of conflict, usually within marriage, or with the State because of criminal behaviour.

But the law is also, and must be seen to be, a tool for the creation of a more just and harmonious society. It is not only a set of rules for deciding disputes but a force for eliminating those elements in the community that bring about conflict and anti-social behaviour. Unfortunately, the law is used for this purpose all too rarely. As a consequence, the common law is not extended in this area, judges and legal practitioners are unfamiliar with it, and the public does not see the law in this light. Over 90 per cent of the legal practitioners in this State practise in or near the square mile of Adelaide, and of all practitioners the vast majority are reliant upon corporate and other clients who can afford to pay their fees. This results in their time and talents being directed into specialised areas of law and away from the broad community interest to which I have referred.

It was indeed encouraging to be present at a recent national conference of 240 Labor lawyers who came together to discuss the relationship between the law and community development. It brought together members of the Judiciary, legal practitioners, those working in allied professions and consumers of legal services. There is in Australia now a highly skilled and dedicated group of practitioners, albeit small, concerned to bring about a change in the nature of legal practice and the delivery of legal services, and to bring these changes about not for any vested interest, but for the community interest. I am confident that the next decade will see great reforms in the delivery of all professional services, and a far greater degree of public accountability will be the catalyst for these reforms.

His Excellency referred in his Speech to the introduction in this session of legislation to implement further recommendations of the Criminal Law and Penal

Methods Reform Committee, commonly known as the Mitchell Committee. This legislation relates to the reform of the treatment and rehabilitation of offenders. These aspects of penal reform are conveniently overlooked by those in the community who seek harsher penalties and punishment as a simplistic answer. In their desire for deterrents, they seem not to realise that there is a responsibility to rehabilitate offenders, and that this is a much more difficult, complex, and all too often unresponsive process than simple incarceration. The community's problems do not end with a prison sentence—they do go away for a while, but the question that must be asked is, "Will the offenders return to the community in due course, better or worse for the experience?" I am sure that those who have had any contact with the administration of criminal justice will be very concerned if they consider that question in depth.

The Mitchell Committee recommendations are far reaching and will provide programmes for offenders that will lead to a more responsible and responsive community attitude towards criminal and anti-social behaviour. Regardless of the nature of the crime committed, no person vested with a function in the administration of criminal justice can afford to view offenders as other than human beings, with a dignity and right to rehabilitation, and an opportunity must be given to them to repair the damage caused to the community. I was shocked to hear, a few weeks ago, an A.B.C. commentator refer to an offender as an "animal". However heinous the crime committed, I trust we will never return to the 18th or 19th century approach to criminal justice where offenders were treated like animals, and a violent class-ridden society prevailed.

In 1970, in his first speech in this Parliament, the then member for Coles and Attorney-General, Mr. King (as he then was), said:

Not the least of the areas of law requiring the attention of the reformer is the criminal law: its provisions closely touch the lives of the people. Many of the present provisions of the criminal law are either obsolete or ineffective in modern conditions. The offences it creates are often out of touch with modern conditions, and the penalties it imposes frequently do not reflect current attitudes and thinking. The promotion of high standards of sound morality must always be a primary consideration and objective of every community. There are, however, good reasons for thinking that many attempts to use the criminal law to promote high standards of private morality have utterly failed and have, on the contrary, produced only misery and degradation and disrespect for the law and indeed, in some cases, frustration or attempts to rehabilitate those whose lives have been degraded.

Those words so clearly illustrate the need for the work of the Mitchell Committee to come into law. That committee has worked for most of this decade on reform of this area of the law. It has carried out the most comprehensive and careful review of the criminal law ever undertaken in Australia and, I am sure, the resultant laws will serve this State well for many generations to come. I am pleased, as are other members on this side, that the reforms will be translated into law in this session of Parliament.

I would like to take this opportunity, in the making of my first speech in this House, to mention the work of the former member for Norwood, Don Dunstan. In the fullness of time, history will record the contribution that this great South Australian made to the life of this State. On this occasion, however, I refer to his service over 26 years to the electors of Norwood. Don Dunstan and Norwood were not only synonymous in this State but were an association known throughout Australia. Norwood would undoubtedly be the best known electorate in

Australia. It became very obvious to me, after only a few weeks as the member for Norwood, that Don Dunstan had a deep understanding of the lives of many many people in the electorate.

His years of unstinting personal attention to their needs and aspirations have brought him not only electoral success but a sound and relevant series of reforms based on the lives of those very people in his electorate, and I think one can see so clearly, in the reforms with which he has been associated, the very problems that have existed for so many years in that electorate and in the community at large. Those reforms were to become, years later, much appreciated by South Australians when they were translated into law, and they are envied by other Australians.

The highest standards of Parliamentary service that have been obtained by Don Dunstan and his understanding of the needs of his electorate will be a guide and inspiration to me throughout my career in public life. When the time comes for me to leave this House, I trust that I will be judged to have represented my electors faithfully and to have made a contribution to lawmaking consistent with the principles I embraced at the beginning of this address. I look forward to serving the people of this State as the member for Norwood in this House.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): It is with pleasure that I second the motion and congratulate the mover, the member for Norwood, on a fine maiden speech. The member for Norwood had a deep involvement with the community, especially the youth in South Australia, before being elected to this place. He has been associated with the Youth Christian Workers, the Youth Council of South Australia and the National Youth Council of Australia. As he said, the seat of Norwood means a lot to the Australian Labor Party. Over 25 years it has been built up from a marginal seat to a safe seat for Labor, and that is especially due to the efforts by the former Premier, Don Dunstan.

The Liberal Party pulled out all stops to win the Norwood by-election, and true to form the *News* campaigned heavily with the Liberal Party, especially over succession duties, orchestrated by Mr. Simon Galvin himself. After the result, the Liberal Party claimed a large swing against the Australian Labor Party, but let us analyse the result. The swing was 6.6 per cent on a two-Party preferred vote basis and, when the minimum personal vote figure is deducted (I am just using the minimal personal vote), the reduction in the Party vote for Labor is 3.7 per cent. It has been further estimated that the A.L.P. lost .5 per cent on account of the number of votes cast on that Saturday being down on the 1977 levels by 1 170. Thus, the erosion of the Labor Party vote is 3.2 per cent. A miserable 3.2 per cent was all the Liberal Party could achieve.

Let us look at what the Liberal Party had to offer against the Australian Labor Party in the Norwood by-election. There was really nothing. As I have already stated, that Party carried out a scare campaign on succession duties, and the results showed that in only two areas, Joslin and Kensington Park, was there a swing of any significance, possibly because people in those areas had more wealth to preserve. By and large, voters in other areas rejected that campaign. The Liberal Party had a completely lacklustre candidate whose sole attribute was that he looked presentable.

In fact, he looked like a tailor's dummy! Couple him with the Leader of the Opposition in their door-knocking campaign and it is patently obvious that the Liberal Party had no show in that by-election.

The member for Norwood will find out very quickly, as I did, that the real issues facing the ordinary people of South Australia are totally ignored by members opposite. Those issues are unemployment within the community and all that it brings, the breakdown in family life, the increase in wife battering and violence towards children, the tendency by young people to turn to drinking and drug taking, the increase in crime, especially in the young, youngsters being denied job opportunities and the prospect of economic self-reliance.

In Australia today up to 30 per cent of all people arrested for various offences are unemployed. In some States, juvenile crime has shot up by 60 per cent during the present economic crisis. In this State, where accurate statistics are kept, offences committed by the unemployed were up by 240 per cent. Mental disorders are on the increase, and suicides are up. Research has shown that people without jobs are between seven and 12 times more likely to try to kill themselves than are those with jobs. Studies conducted by the Department of Economics, Macquarie University, Sydney, show that the level of unemployment is closely connected with heart disease. I can assure the member for Coles that these problems facing the people are Australia-wide and are not just confined to the people of South Australia, as she so often implies. The member for Coles is quick to blame the breakdown in family life on enlightened legislation, community welfare or on pornography: in fact, if anything goes wrong, it is the fault of the State Labor Government.

These problems, however, can be sheeted home fairly and squarely on the Fraser Government, with its persistent refusal to provide to the Australian economy a controlled stimulus which is vitally necessary to get Australia working and moving again. As a result of its totally discredited economic policies we have a situation where, throughout Australia, unemployment is up yet again, and interest rates and inflation are up, creating even more misery for the ordinary people in this country. Their plight, however, falls on deaf ears with members of the Opposition, because they have always been and will continue to be a Party that puts profits before people. They believe that people are expendable. The Opposition tries to disguise that fact, but time and time again the Liberals come out in their true colours.

That philosophy of profits before people—promoting the quick quid—has been demonstrated quite recently in the Opposition's support for the Alan Bonds of this world. Only three of their members in the other place put the people of South Australia first and voted accordingly, and we know what has happened to two of them so far. The Hon. Jessie Cooper has been eased out on an early retirement. It is obvious that she would not have obtained preselection in any way whatsoever. The Hon. Dick Geddes has been dropped from the shadow Ministry, and one wonders what they have in store for the Hon. Don Laidlaw. Again we can see the Opposition's devotion to profit at all costs, with no regard to the people, with its cynical somersault over the mining of uranium in this State. The Leader is now saying that our economic survival depends entirely on the mining of uranium at Roxby Downs, yet two years ago the Leader and the rest of the Opposition voted unanimously on a resolution not to mine uranium in this State until all safeguards could be met. The *News*, true to form, has supported the Liberal Party in this matter. In fact, it has gone further and given us a figure—"A 54 billion dollar bonanza"—disregard the safeguards, never mind the hazards facing future Australians; mine it quickly and make a fast dollar!

The Opposition has ignored the overseas trends with the scaling down of projected demands for nuclear power

stations and, now that nuclear reactor safety is in doubt since the Harrisburg incident, one would think that even the Leader would have doubts but no: he has assured us that it is still a goer as far as uranium is concerned. He most likely made his recent assessment of Harrisburg like he did over Redcliff (and that was another somersault) by flying over the place at so many thousand feet up—but that is like the Leader of the Opposition, always with his head in the clouds.

Mr. Groom: What do you think of the shadow Cabinet?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I will deal with that soon. Back in October last year, Rex Jory of the *News* wrote an article which dealt with Mr. Fraser's concern over the poor performance of the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party and said that the South Australian Liberals had been little short of a national embarrassment. We would all agree with that comment. In fact, the majority of South Australians would go even one step further and say that Mr. Fraser was an even greater national embarrassment with his handling of the nation's economy.

Mr. Millhouse: He will not last long, will he?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Not too long. Mr. Jory wrote:

It would be no exaggeration to say South Australians have suffered for the past sins of the State Liberal Branch, every cent of Federal funding handed to the Labor Government is earned the hard way.

The Fraser Government offers no economic or development favours to South Australia. South Australia has only one representative in the 27-member Federal Cabinet and none in the 14-member Inner Cabinet. Until the South Australian Liberal Party mends its fences, improves the standard of its State and Federal representatives, and offers a genuine challenge to the South Australian Labor Party it will continue to be pushed aside in Canberra.

The question then is whether the State Liberal Opposition is now providing a genuine challenge to the Corcoran Government. After six months of soul searching (it took that long because the talent in Opposition ranks was so thin) the new 14-member shadow Cabinet has been announced.

Mr. Whitten: Why was there one more member than the number of Ministers?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I do not know. We can talk about that later. The new 14-member shadow Cabinet has been announced and I do not see the Government front bench quaking. The members for Chaffey, Hanson and Torrens soon will wish they were back in the seclusion of the back bench.

Mr. Whitten: What about the member for Fisher?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I will deal with that matter later. I do not intend to make any judgment on the new shadow Ministers, but surely to goodness there is room for ample criticism of the past lot for their attitudes to wholesale Federal cuts in spending in the areas in which they were supposed to represent the people of South Australia. Not once did they stand up for the people of South Australia. In fact, they support Fraser's actions in denying South Australia any favours whatsoever. Even though he was not a shadow Minister then, to give him his due the member for Chaffey has shown concern for the grapegrowers in their plight over the 1978 Budget decision to increase the brandy excise to 83.5 per cent. However, even that member would not go so far as to condemn the Federal Government on the grape surplus issue. It seems that his objection was that I moved an amendment to that motion and condemned the Federal Government. He and others were most annoyed that I had had the temerity to speak on rural affairs when I represented a metropolitan district.

Where was the shadow Minister of Agriculture when the scandalous treatment of the grapegrowers was going on?

He was doing nothing. In every instance in which the rural community is being slugged by the Federal Government, it has been the Minister of Agriculture, with rural industry groups, who has taken up the cudgels on behalf of that section of the community, a section that is supposedly ignored by the A.L.P. and championed by only the Liberal and National Country Parties. One day the rural community will realise how they are let down continually by the Liberal and National Country Parties. The Minister of Agriculture repeatedly told the Federal Government that the increase in excise on Australian brandy would result only in reduced sales. He was ignored, yet we read in the *Advertiser* on 25 June this year that brandy sales were down 35 per cent. The Wine and Brandy Producers Association, dealing with the 35 per cent sales decrease, stated:

The Chairman of the brandy sector of the Australian Wine and Brandy Producers Association, Mr. G. J. Kraeche, said yesterday the pattern of continuing heavy losses in brandy clearances since October was a "written indictment" of a Federal Government decision based on poor advice.

The Government's decision to increase brandy excise to 83.5 per cent in the 1978 Budget had been motivated by revenue-raising priorities without regard for the viability of the Australian brandy distilling industry.

Brandy clearances for April this year had been 35.6 per cent down on April last year or 141 000 lals (litres of alcohol) compared with 219 000 lals. Calculations indicated revenue would fall \$65 000 000 short of the Budget estimate of an additional \$139 000 000 from the excise increase on spirits.

"The depressed state of the Australian brandy industry is a major contributor to this shortfall," Mr. Kraeche said. It was estimated that, if the Government did not take "corrective measures", Australian brandy clearances in the 12 months to 30 September this year would fall to 2.1m. lals.

This would be the lowest clearance since 1961-62 and a fall of 30 per cent compared with the 3 000 000 lals in the 12 months to September 1978. Taking into account the 900 000 lals loss in clearances and an estimated surplus build-up of 5 600 000 lals in stock, it was predicted the brandy industry would not need the 63 000 tonnes of grapes it would otherwise have taken during the next few vintages.

There were strong submissions from the South Australian Government to the Industries Assistance Commission in February 1978, at the inquiry into long-term assistance to wine and spirituous beverages, and in the draft report of that inquiry. In October 1978, following a draft report, a submission to the I.A.C. inquiry into grapes and wine by the South Australian Government requested the following:

The Industries Assistance Commission (I.A.C.) to not recommend any reduction in protection to the wine industry until after the effects of the removal of section 31.A have terminated and also until a supply and demand balance for grapes has been achieved.

At that time, if a reduction in the level of protection is recommended, it be implemented without imposing a sales tax or other impost on Australian wine, in line with the I.A.C. reasoning on page 30 of the draft report. The excise of \$18.75 per litre of alcohol (lal) on Australian Brandy be reduced to \$12.50 per lal.

That in light of above, the I.A.C. gives further consideration to, and reports fully on, the socio-economic effects of its recommendations, particularly on the Riverland of South Australia, in line with its reporting requirements under the Act.

An Area Redevelopment Authority, funded by State and Federal Governments, as requested in our previous submission to the I.A.C. reference on "Grapes and Wine", be supported.

The Minister also stated at that time that the recommendations of the commission would add to the growing poverty and imminent bankruptcy of many South Australian wine grapegrowers, especially in the Riverland. He also stated that, on the recommendation to reduce protection on wine from the average rate of 40 per cent to 25 per cent, there was every chance that a 15 per cent sales tax would be placed on Australian wine in line with other alcoholic beverages. If that happened, there would be an immediate reduction in sales. Officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department have estimated that the reduction could be 15 per cent, representing a surplus of 42 000 tonnes of grapes. That, combined with this year's 30 000 tonnes, would mean that the wine grapegrowing industry would be in real distress. What was the shadow Minister of Agriculture doing then to play his part in obtaining fair play and justice for the grapegrowers? He was doing nothing. In fact, he has done nothing all along.

I refer now to how the horror mini-Budget affected the South Australian rural sector under the new measures announced by the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Howard). The amounts expected to be raised throughout Australia on the new tax measures are \$15 800 000 on the livestock slaughter levy, \$14 000 000 on meat export inspection, and \$2 600 000 on non-meat export inspection. That is a total of \$32 400 000 to be extracted from the rural community. I refer now to existing programmes that have been cut. Under the Commonwealth Extension Services grants, the loss was \$5 000 000. For the nitrogen fertiliser bounty, the amount was \$4 000 000, and the amount for rural adjustment was \$22 300 000. That is a total of \$31 300 000 that, because of the horror mini-Budget, the rural community will not get. I was interested to read the June issue of *Farmer and Grazier*, which is one of my favourite magazines. I read it avidly every month. An article by Mr. J. M. Kerin in that issue on his view on the levies and cuts states:

The recent Federal Government cutbacks on expenditure affecting primary industry could have wide ramifications. Measures such as an increase in cattle slaughter levies, less money for rural adjustment and token assistance for the purchase of nitrogen fertilisers are bad enough. But the one that really worries me is the 50 per cent reduction in finance available for State Departments of Agriculture through Commonwealth Extension Service grants.

This money is used to carry out many vital extension and research projects and I find it very difficult to see how the Government can justify such a short-sighted approach. Will it mean, for example, that projects say in mid-stream are now to be dropped? If so, then Mr. Fraser and Mr. Sinclair should re-read the 1973 I.A.C. report on rural research where they would find positive cost-benefit conclusions made by the commissioners as far as the whole community is concerned.

Research and extension directed toward reducing costs in production, processing, handling and packaging are more essential than ever before. If improvements are not made our export competitiveness will diminish even further. I note where the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Day, has said reduction in funds could mean the abandonment of 70-80 projects.

At the time of writing, I haven't seen Mr. Chatterton's response and forecasts but I do know that senior officers in his department are very worried about the consequences of the Federal Government's decision. In announcing the decision, the Treasurer, Mr. Howard, said: "Favourable rural conditions afford an opportunity to scale down some programmes of Commonwealth assistance to primary producers in 1979-80." Is this another way of saying, "You've never had it so good!"

Mr. Kerin said he had not seen the Minister's response on the subject. The Minister responded well in press releases and a statement in the monthly report issued by his department. He also successfully exposed for what they are statements by two South Australian Federal Liberal members of Parliament on the cutbacks. Those statements are cheap political humbug. The Federal Liberals have got so used to distorting the facts that I doubt whether they could lie straight in bed. The Minister of Agriculture wrote the following letter to the *Stockowners Journal* concerning statements made by Mr. Giles and Mr. McLeay on the availability of Federal funds for rural adjustment. His letter states:

Recent statements by Mr. Giles and Mr. McLeay on the availability of Federal funds for rural adjustment cannot go unchallenged. They have demonstrated their failure to understand the rural adjustment scheme and the Federal funding which supports it. During 1978-79 the Commonwealth provided \$5 100 000 but during 1979-80 they will only provide \$700 000 in cash. In addition, the Commonwealth has undertaken to provide \$1 400 000 for 1980-81 which they have told me can be allocated during 1979-80.

I have treated this cheap attempt to inflate the Commonwealth level of funding from \$700 000 to \$2 100 000 with the contempt it deserves. Anyone with a knowledge of farming would know that it is impossible to approve applications for farm build-up and debt reconstruction and then put them on ice for 12 months until Commonwealth funds are available. The honest approach for the Commonwealth to take is to admit that only \$700 000 can be spent this year and that they have cut funds by 85 per cent instead of trying to disguise the fact by an accounting con trick.

Mr. Kerin should have asked what response would be forthcoming from the shadow Minister for Agriculture, or perhaps he already knew that there would be nothing.

I received in my mail in June, with the compliments of David Tonkin, M.P., a copy of the Liberal Party policy on local government, which was prepared by Mr. E. K. Russack, M.P., shadow Minister of Local Government, and which was released on 19 April 1979.

Mr. Whitten: Would that still be current?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I take it that the shadow Minister was then the member for Goyder. He has now been sacked from the shadow Ministry, perhaps because this document is a blueprint for disaster for local government. I will not read all the document, one paragraph only being required to show exactly what importance the Opposition places on services to the community, the needy, the elderly and the young. This release states:

There are certain areas in which the Liberal Party believes it is more appropriate for local government to serve the needs of its ratepayers and citizens than if such services were provided by the State or Commonwealth. Such areas include extended responsibility in: town and district planning; environmental control; community welfare; local health services; elderly citizens and youth services; community information services; and leisure, recreational and cultural facilities, including libraries.

In each of these areas local government is recognised as having a natural inbuilt responsiveness to its local community and a consequent ability to provide services in keeping with the community's needs.

The last sentence shows us how some, in fact, many, councils would react about their "ability to provide services in keeping with the community's needs". It has been known for years that local government has not been able to maintain services in these areas, and that is why the State Government has had to take them over. Yet, in 1979 we have the Liberal Party going back to the 1920's.

Perhaps here in its local government policy we have a clue on how the Opposition would cut down the State Public Service. Opposition members are always saying the Public Service is too large, but up to now have been loath to tell us where the cuts would take place. Now we know. If it ever becomes the Government, and God forbid that it does, we know there will be reductions in community welfare personnel, and in back-up health personnel. The responsibility will be loaded on to local government, and when they cannot, as they obviously cannot, maintain the services, the Liberals will sit back and say that it is nothing to do with them—it is all local government's fault.

I am interested to see whether this document will be endorsed by the Hon. Mr. Hill, the new shadow Minister, or perhaps he will introduce an equally disastrous document: either way local government cannot win, but will always be the loser.

We come now to the more damning area in which the Opposition has failed in its duty to the people of South Australia—education. Here, more than in any other shadow Ministry, there has been an utter failure by an Opposition spokesman to stand up for the rights of South Australians over attacks by the Fraser Government. The member for Mt. Gambier has retained his position despite a dismal performance in the previous shadow Ministry. The member for Fisher was dropped, and I agree with what Greg Kelton said in the *Advertiser* about the Leader of the Opposition making a powerful enemy there. I have a sneaking suspicion that he was dropped because he was showing too much interest in millipedes as against housing, recreation and sport. At least he did get a line or two in the press concerning his portfolio.

The shadow Minister of Education is renowned for his complete lack of concern about education and we have not heard one squeak from him about this in the press or anywhere else. What does the South Australian Institute of Teachers think of the member for Mt. Gambier? In the June issue of the *S.A. Teachers' Journal*, their President, Mr. John Gregory, who must be popular with teachers because he has just been re-elected President, had this to say about the Federal Government's decision in the mini-Budget to slash education funding by \$41 000 000:

Massive cuts have caused chaos to the school building programme and to pre-school education. Last year the State Government used funds which would have given more non-contact time to primary schools to save jobs in pre-schools. The State also said then that it doubted it could offset any further cuts in this area. These are expected, unannounced as yet, so pre-schools face a grim future.

The State reluctantly offset Federal cuts last year. Now that more have been made the capacity and intentions of the State to maintain, let alone improve, education provisions is in doubt. Improvements which will be harder to get include primary non-contact time; country incentives; and learning leave. Fewer than 600 of an anticipated 3 500 teacher applicants will get jobs. Transfers will be more difficult and more displacements are likely. The Teacher Housing Authority needs at least an extra \$1 000 000 annually just to stay afloat, so further rent increases are going to be hard to avoid.

Advisory services will be jeopardised, and negotiated salary increases are out of the question. School equipment grants, cut already by 50 per cent, will be that much harder to restore. Promotion will be a rare event. A tax surcharge will make school books more expensive. That is a brief summary of what the Federal mini-Budget means to us, and more detail will be supplied in the coming weeks.

This is the crunch of what the President said about the shadow Minister of Education:

The State shadow Minister has maintained his characteristic silence about this disaster. In any event, his probable response is that the State will get more tax-shared revenue and they could easily use that to offset the cuts, and make improvements.

That is hardly a recommendation from the teaching profession to the shadow Minister of Education, but the Leader of the Opposition insists on retaining his services. Again, the *News* of 22 June 1979, under the heading "Liberal spokesman gets teacher blast", contained the following report:

The Opposition education spokesman, Mr. Allison, is not acting as an effective Opposition, the S.A. Institute of Teachers said today. Institute President, Mr. John Gregory, said Mr. Allison had broken two appointments to discuss education. Mr. Gregory went on to say the second appointment broken by Mr. Allison was his last minute failure to join an inspection tour of five South Australian primary schools.

Perhaps the member for Mount Gambier had perfectly valid reasons for not keeping those appointments. If he can convince me that he had, I will gladly apologise. Perhaps it was because he would have been acutely embarrassed by what he saw, and he would have had to make some statement decrying the Federal Government and its cuts in education funding. As usual, the member for Mount Gambier has nothing to say about the Federal Government cuts; all he says is that the State system is no good.

I believe that the retention of the member for Mount Gambier as shadow Minister of Education underlines the Opposition's attitude to education. As long as the non-government schools do not suffer, as long as funds are being diverted from Government schools to those schools catering for the rich, then let us not make a fuss. The State Labor Government has a great record in education. We produce the finest teachers in Australia and our school rebuilding programme is second to none. The State Labor Government's record in providing pre-school education, as a result of the Pre-schools Commission set up by the Whitlam Labor Government, was unsurpassed by any other State but has been eroded since 1975. Malcolm Fraser stated in his 1975 election policy speech that the social commitment of Labor would continue. He further said that he believed that pre-school education had important social and educational functions. Total funding by the Federal Government throughout Australia has been cut from \$49 000 000 in 1976-77 to \$3 000 000 in 1978-79. That is how important pre-school education is to Mr. Fraser; he even breaks promises to four-year-olds!

The Leader of the Opposition has said that this new 14-member shadow Cabinet will win the next election. He has also said that it brings with it a spirit of co-operation and harmony. On the first point, the Opposition will never gain the approval of the people of this State whilst they support vested interests, share raiders, and the like. The suggestion of harmony and co-operation within their ranks is extremely suspect. It is common knowledge that a leadership struggle went on for most of last year and has been going on for all of this year. As I said, the Leader has made a powerful enemy in the member for Fisher. It is interesting to note that at least one Opposition member, the member for Light, sticks to his principles and will not agree to serve in any shadow Ministry of the Leader. So the answer to the question of whether the Opposition offers a genuine challenge to the Corcoran Government is "No." Until a Labor Government is restored Federally, and, fortunately, that is not far off, South Australia will continue to suffer from Mr. Fraser, and we will hear not one voice of protest from members opposite.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Members will be pleased to know that I intend to devote my speech to matters affecting the State, and not to trying to shift the blame to the Federal Government for poor State Government performance.

As we come to the end of one decade and approach the threshold of the next, it is appropriate that we assess the achievements of the past and examine South Australia's prospects for the future. After a decade of unbroken Government a judgment can now be made by the people of South Australia, not on politicians' promises, or Government publicity, but based on the record. And when the record has been examined and analysed, then people can judge for themselves whether the present Government is capable of dealing with the growing problems of the future, or whether a new approach is necessary.

It is important that we move into the new decade with vision, with dedication, with a real conviction that not only can we overcome the problems inherited from the 1970's, but that we can meet the challenges of the 1980's.

In South Australia at present there is a considerable feeling of depression, gloom, and resignation, and, what concerns me even more, of powerlessness to determine our own future. Many South Australians have become disheartened, disinterested, and disillusioned. That fundamental need to have a purpose in life is greatly depressed in South Australia because this State Government is moribund, and is not providing the opportunities we need. It has no answer to our present difficulties, many of which stem directly from its own mistakes and misguided policies, and still less does it have any practical vision to offer for the 1980's. Unfortunately, the dead hand of this Government has heightened the tendency to lose interest, to turn off altogether from unpleasant facts, because no-one wants to hear bad news all the time.

But the real answer, Mr. Speaker, is not to turn off, but to turn on, to face the unpleasant facts, and do something positive to change them. Certainly, there is little to be proud of in the South Australian Government's record as it presently stands. Like it or not, an objective assessment of South Australia's current record of performance, and of its economic management, reveals a most depressing state of affairs. When we consider the events of the past 10 years, and examine the results of the policies dictated by the South Terrace Party machine to the Labor Government, this is not surprising. The last decade has not been one of positive achievement for South Australia; in fact, quite the reverse. The Government has been strong on promises, propositions, and proposals, but very weak on actual achievement.

People who were looking for a new-look Government were enthused by the earlier announcements. Now they are disappointed and dejected as a result of the long list of failures this Government has chalked up during its term in office. Consider these major projects: Chowilla dam was promised as an A.L.P. election policy in 1970, and abandoned soon after winning that election; the Redcliff petro-chemical plant was first promised in 1973, and again in 1974, and hopefully is still a possibility in the 1980's; the uranium enrichment plant was promised in 1974, also to be at Redcliff, but now we have lost our former front-running position to another, more enterprising Labor State, New South Wales; Monarto was first promised in 1973, and has steadily emerged as an impossible, impracticable, and, for the taxpayers, a most expensive dream.

Other proposals come to mind, such as the development of the railway station site, a 1974 proposal for an \$80 000 000 redevelopment with an 8 000 seat stadium, an international hotel, and offices, shops and restaurants. Other proposals include the international hotel in Victoria

Square, Dial-a-bus (more popularly known opposite as "Dial-a-prayer"), and the Frozen Food Factory, one project which actually did get off the ground, and which proved to be a disaster.

Mr. Dean Brown: It's probably a good job the others didn't get off the ground, otherwise we would have had million-dollar disasters all over the place.

Mr. TONKIN: That is entirely possible. It is very difficult to find many outstanding major projects announced by the Labor Government during this decade which have actually come to fruition, with concrete benefits in terms of jobs, income, return to the State, and benefits for its people. The major achievements of the Labor Government have been in legislation and regulation, in the creation of licensing and registration boards, in promoting more and more consumer legislation, and in advancing the militant union cause in industrial affairs.

As has so often been stated before, the ultimate result has been actively to discourage free enterprise development and investment in South Australia, and an examination of the record shows quite clearly how serious the situation has become. The record shows that South Australia continues to deteriorate while other States are recovering strongly.

Our position has actually worsened since the previous Premier, in November of last year, promised total recovery within 12 months, and the position has worsened in the five months since the present Premier promised that his Government would do everything possible to get the economy of South Australia on the move again.

But, so far from taking the necessary action to stimulate the State's economy, one could be forgiven for believing that this Government has done everything possible to maintain or even worsen the problems. In the five months since the Premier himself set the yardstick by which his Government should be judged, the Labor Party machine has again refused absolutely to abolish succession duty and relieve land tax on the family home. The Premier has refused to lighten the onerous burden of taxation in this State, and to bring South Australia into line with the commonsense and equitable tax policies of every other State. In the same five months he has been forced by his Party machine to reaffirm the Government's total ban on uranium mining (and we heard that confirmed again this afternoon), and in so doing has callously disregarded the realities of the global energy problem and the realities of this State's economic future.

Indeed, but for a handful of votes at the A.L.P. State Conference, this Government was almost bound by the Party machine to a policy of repudiating lawfully binding contracts with companies involved in purchasing uranium, or investing in South Australian uranium projects. This close vote by the Government's masters did not go unnoticed by the nuclear fuel industry overseas, and it has further depressed the South Australian Government's reputation in international eyes.

In the same five months this Government has enacted the Santos legislation, which clearly telegraphed to the business community, both here and abroad, that the present South Australian Government will not hesitate to dispossess investors of their lawfully acquired property. In the same five months we have seen the Minister of Labour and Industry defiantly tell the business community that his amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act will be enacted, regardless of the consequences to industrial development and employment opportunities throughout the State. These intentions are also wellknown overseas and interstate.

In the same five months nothing has been done to

dismantle the labyrinth of regulations and red tape that confounds business and impede recovery. Is it any wonder, therefore, that we are still the Cinderella State and, worse, that the gap between South Australia's performance and that of the rest of the country is widening? Can anyone in South Australia afford to remain apathetic in the face of these fundamental facts?

Of course, I know there will still be people who would prefer to fix the label of "knocker" to anyone who speaks the truth about the State's economy. But there are now many others who have been commendably forthright and honest and whom even this Government cannot call "knockers." Let me quote Sir Robert Norman who, as a Director of the Bank of New South Wales, a Director of Chrysler Australia Ltd., and President of the Australia-Japan Society, was instrumental in negotiating the Mitsubishi investment in Chrysler. In other words, he was instrumental in saving a basic industry and thousands of jobs for South Australia. At a Chamber of Industry and Commerce luncheon in Adelaide only a fortnight ago, he said:

Trends in several key economic indicators make disheartening reading. The recorded rate of unemployment [in South Australia] has been consistently higher than the national average. In May 1979 the rate of 7.5 per cent was the highest among all the States. The ratio of registered unemployed to notified vacancies was 33:1 in the same month, again well above the national ratio of 23:1. The most disturbing aspect of the employment market is the dearth of opportunities in the private sector. New employment opportunities have tended to be concentrated almost exclusively in the public sector which accounted for 34 per cent of the State's total civilian employment at the end of 1978, compared with 30 per cent in New South Wales and 32 per cent on a national basis. By contrast private sector employment has actually been dropping.

The lack of employment opportunities and slow rate of economic expansion has been reflected in a net loss of population through interstate migration. In 1978, South Australia was the only State to record a net migration loss. The loss attributable to net overseas and interstate migration amounted to 1 700 compared with gains of 26 000 and 7 000 in New South Wales and Victoria respectively.

Mr. Wotton: But our Premier says that people aren't moving out of South Australia.

Mr. TONKIN: Our Premier is so far out of touch with reality that he would not know whether it was morning or evening. Sir Robert Norman continued:

Economic conditions in South Australia have been mirrored strongly by the prolonged recession in the building and construction industry. Building approvals, commencements and completions have all fallen substantially during the past two years and the industry continues to operate well below capacity. Hesitant consumer spending remains a major problem. Sales of retail goods and new motor vehicles have not kept pace with national growth rates. On the other side of the coin, as it were, South Australians have increased their personal savings in banks and building societies at a much faster rate than have residents in other States.

According to the June Quarter Survey of Industrial Trends conducted jointly by the Bank of New South Wales and the Confederation of Australian Industry, South Australian manufacturers were generally less optimistic than the national consensus in respect of their own rate of operation, the general business in the next six months, and capital expenditure plans for the year ahead.

The seeming lack of business confidence and apprehension about the likely extent and direction of Government intervention in corporate and consumer affairs have had unfavourable repercussions on the investment climate.

On the mineral front, that catalyst for so much investment elsewhere in Australia over the past two decades, South Australia is distinctly behind the other States. This cannot be blamed entirely on the capricious distribution of mineral resources. Whereas the pace of development for the open cut copper prospect at Kanmantoo or of the steaming coal prospect at Lake Phillipson is dictated by mineral economics, political considerations have to be taken into account when assessing the major copper/uranium prospect of Roxby Downs.

He goes on, later, as follows:

Another field in which South Australia has lagged in recent years is new investment in mineral-based processing ventures such as the development of aluminium smelters in the Eastern States and Western Australia. At present manufacturing industry in the State is largely being channelled into the expansion of existing companies rather than the establishment of new ventures . . . Further evidence of the State's lack of growth is provided by its borrowing programme. In 1978, the Loan Council authorised each State to raise loans on the international capital market for approved infrastructure projects. Of the \$1.8 billion approved as the total sum to be raised over seven years to finance 12 projects, South Australia accounted for only \$186 000 000, and that was for the still tentative Redcliff project.

As I say, they are the exact comments of Sir Robert Norman, a man who has had the courage to point out the truth of South Australia's decline under this Government. They confirm precisely what has been said repeatedly by the Opposition. Professor Ted Wheelwright of Sydney University, Australia's foremost Marxist economist, a former economic adviser to the Whitlam Government, and doyen of the Annual Convention of Labor Economists said on the A.B.C., as recently as 27 May, that South Australia was "depopulating" and that its economy was "stagnating". Those were his actual words. He did not say the same about any other mainland State. In fact, he made a point of saying that Western Australia and Queensland were progressing at such a rate that increasingly they had less and less in common with South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's pretty rough when their own mob say it.

Mr. TONKIN: That came from a distinguished Labor economist who certainly has not been backward in supporting the Labor Party in the past, so those words are significant indeed.

The *McCabe letter*—an independent bulletin which does not carry a brief for any particular interest in this State—says in its latest issue:

South Australia needs a real kick, but where it will come from is difficult to say. It will need the Premier, Mr.

Corcoran, to do something positive, as South Australia runs the risk of becoming Victoria's most westerly country city. The truth, of course, is that Sir Robert Norman and Professor Wheelwright, and the *McCabe letter*, are all indisputably correct, for the evidence overwhelmingly indicates further decline in South Australia and strong recovery in all other States. As I have said in the House before, new investment in South Australia is at an all-time low, and our share of national investment in basic industries is only 2 per cent. In the mining sector, for example, not one new mining operation is under way in this State involving a capital investment of \$5 000 000 or more, but in the rest of Australia at least 26 such projects are already operational with a total investment of well over \$2 billion.

Similarly, another 56 possible mining projects are being studied for feasibility in the rest of Australia, involving more than \$7½ billion of capital investment, but there is

only one such project in South Australia, which must of necessity be restricted to feasibility studies while this Government maintains its present uranium policy. In the manufacturing sector (and remember that for years South Australia has been the third largest manufacturing State), there are at present throughout the country 49 non-confidential projects already under way costing a total of \$3.15 billion. But, of this total, South Australia accounts for only two projects, and their total cost is only \$14 000 000, or .4 per cent of the total.

When we turn to employment, the figures of the Bureau of Statistics show that, in the year to April 1979, 52 700 new jobs were created in the other five States while 4 200 jobs disappeared from South Australia. In the manufacturing sector alone in the two years since April 1977, 7.1 per cent of all jobs in this State have disappeared, compared with an average loss in the other five States of 2.5 per cent. In other words, our loss in this basic industrial sector, which is of greater importance to South Australia than to any other State, is running nearly three times greater than the national average. And yet in the face of these and many other statistical realities, this Government claims that South Australia's performance levels in the main are no different from those throughout the nation, and that where there are differences the fault lies with Canberra.

Members of the Government should sort out their differences on this matter, too, as well as their differences on various other fundamental policies that are causing a great deal of disturbance within Caucus and the Labor Party conference. Only recently, on the Phillip Satchell show, the Attorney-General tried to argue that trends in the South Australian economy could not be examined separately from the national trends.

The Premier, however, seems to think differently, for he told the A.L.P. State Conference that separate trends could be discerned and that, when they were examined closely, it was obvious that employment generation in South Australia surpassed that in all other States in the first half of this year. All honourable members probably read the report of that statement, and I believe that many people were heartened to think that this might be true.

Of course, the Premier cited no evidence to support his claim, and his comments were reported uncritically by a docile press. Nobody thought to mention even the most obvious flaw—that at the very time the Premier was describing our achievements in the first six months of the year, figures were available for only the first three months.

But, that aside, the truth is that, regardless of whether we look at the last six months, 12 months, or even longer, South Australia is the only State that continues to record negative annual growth in total employment. In fact, in the last six months for which figures are available, from November to April, the growth rates in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have all been more than twice that in South Australia, and the growth rate in Tasmania has been an amazing four times greater than our own. There is no pleasure for any South Australian in facing the truth of this Government's record, but it must be done, especially by those whose responsibility it is to elect Governments—the electorate of this State.

We must fully understand the urgency and magnitude of the task before us in rebuilding prosperity and confidence, by developing the resources that can provide South Australia with a sound and secure future. It serves no useful purpose, not even to the Government in the long term, to avoid the truth, to play with the figures or to deceive the public as to the seriousness of our position. All Australia, it is true, has suffered a prolonged recession in recent years, but the fact is that South Australia continues

to wallow in the mire while all other States are recovering strongly. No better measure of this lamentable fact is available than to compare South Australia's share of basic economic activity, the fundamental indicator by which South Australia's performance can be measured.

Only then does it become glaringly obvious that, although there has been a national recession, South Australia has fallen, and continues to fall, far behind the rest of the country. Examples are as follows:

Our share of national population, which in the eight years to December 1978 fell by the equivalent of 21 900 persons to 9.01 per cent.

Our share of unemployment, which has risen from 8.3 per cent in June 1976 to 11.5 per cent in June 1979 (44 800 people).

Our share of advertised job vacancies, which has fallen from 8.5 per cent in 1974 to 5.3 per cent in May this year.

Our share of new dwelling commencements, which has fallen from 10.6 per cent in the March quarter 1975 to 6 per cent in the corresponding quarter this year, and is now lower than at any time on record.

Our share of retail sales, which since 1976-77 has resulted in a loss of turnover of \$134 000 000 a year.

Our share of new motor vehicle registrations, which has declined by 10 000 units a year since 1974-75.

Our share of new capital investment in basic industries, which has fallen to an incredibly low 2 per cent.

Our share of total savings bank deposits, which has grown by \$81 000 000 since 1971, even though our population share has declined, which reflects a grave insecurity in the minds of depositors in the future of this State.

Our share of permanent building society deposits, which has grown by \$73 000 000 in the last two years alone, because South Australians are unwilling to risk their money by spending in this State.

Our share of trading bank current deposits, which has fallen by \$56 000 000 in the last 12 months, because sales have fallen and employment is stagnant.

Our share of trading bank loans and overdrafts, which has risen by \$115 000 000 in the last year alone, not because business is investing in new plant, new premises and new equipment but because business does not have the cash flow to meet its fixed obligations.

Our share of new business written by finance companies, which has fallen by \$284 000 000 in a full year since 1976 because sales in this State are far more depressed than elsewhere.

They are the hard facts which illustrate just how far South Australia has declined under the mismanagement of this Government, and no less do they illustrate how urgent it now is for South Australia to develop the resources at its disposal and to take on a measure of financial independence again. I returned from overseas full of optimism for South Australia's future because I had learnt there that our enormous mineral resources were attracting great interest among potential customers and investors. But I was also depressed because, as a State, we are not availing ourselves of the potential benefits that would flow from the development of those resources.

Everyone agrees that South Australia badly needs jobs, income to the State, and the general industrial expansion which inevitably follows mineral development. Look at what Western Australia has been able to achieve in a few short years. But I find it incredible (and so did everyone to whom I spoke overseas) that it is our own State Government which is denying us these sorely needed benefits.

It is the State Labor Government which is holding back our economic recovery, and no-one else. It is the State

Labor Government which is standing in the way of more jobs and restored prosperity for South Australians. It is the State Labor Government which is denying us a prosperous future. Is it any wonder that the South Australian Government's reputation is at an all time low in every one of the countries I visited, and indeed, I am told, throughout the world. Whether with Government officials, members of the nuclear fuel industry, merchant bankers, international brokers, trade union officials, or businessmen generally, assessments of the present South Australian Government's reputation range from extreme naivety to irresponsible stupidity.

Mr. Gunn: And South Australia is a laughing stock.

Mr. TONKIN: South Australia has indeed been converted into a laughing stock by the policies and activities of the South Australian Government. Potential investors and customers have kept in close touch with events in South Australia. They do not trust the present Government, not only because of its misguided uranium policies but also because of the debate at the A.L.P. Convention on whether or not to repudiate proper agreements, and of course because of the Santos legislation.

With the departure of Don Dunstan from the political scene, intensive efforts have been made to promote a different style for the new Premier. But try as he will, the new Premier cannot escape the dictates of the Party machine. Regardless of who the Leader may be, the Parliamentary Labor Party is still firmly bound by the policies of the A.L.P. convention and of Trades Hall, and that fact was borne out again in the answer that the Premier gave to a question this very afternoon. A change of style there may have been, but their hearts are not their own to change, and there has been no change of heart. It is still the same Labor Party, and the same Party machine. The decisions of the convention are still ultimately binding on the Government and there is little joy for South Australians in those decisions.

The State A.L.P. Convention in June, with its renewed commitment to higher capital taxation, further Government intrusion, radical industrial legislation, and a continuance of the uranium policy, is clear evidence of that fact. The people of South Australia will do well to remember that a new style of Labor leadership has not changed this Government's blinkered policies or the ultimate control exercised by its South Terrace masters. While this Government continues to follow its insular, parochial and selfish policies it is not only abrogating its immediate duty to the people of South Australia but also failing in its wider duty to participate in solving the global energy crisis. Clearly, South Australia must contribute where and how it can to solve a massive world problem, and we can do so in the certain knowledge that this State will benefit, too, from the assistance we render.

Western Mining Corporation has recently announced a \$50 000 000 joint venture with B.P. for further exploration and feasibility studies at the Olympic Dam site on Roxby Downs. Extensive preliminary investigations promise one of the largest mineral deposits in the world, involving copper, uranium, and some gold. The very mix of minerals makes it a most attractive proposition for development, yet it is the presence of uranium which under the Labor Government's policy would totally prohibit mining from going ahead.

But the State Government has given its approval to the present project, while saying that the Government's policy of a ban on actual uranium still applies.

Indeed, I cannot understand how a Party in Government can find itself painted into such a corner that

the Premier of the State cannot with open arms welcome a development project which could lead to wonderful things for this State, without making a proviso and restating the very policy which will prevent that development from occurring if it remains in force. I feel that "hamstrung" is probably exactly the word for it.

Sir Arvi Parbo has once again confirmed that the actual mining operation cannot commence in the face of the Government's ban on uranium. He states, quite frankly, that Western Mining is taking a risk in investing \$50 000 000 together with B.P., but it is obvious that he believes either that the Government will change its policy or that the Government itself will change. The Government is quite hypocritical in allowing this study to continue in the face of its uranium ban, and the whole two-faced exercise is strongly reminiscent of the Government's approval of on-going uranium exploration at the same time that Don Dunstan was emotionally advocating a total uranium ban during the Federal election in 1977. It is time they came out and said exactly where they stood on this matter. It is the future of South Australia that they are playing politics with.

Perhaps the Government is depending on time to deal with the left-wing activists who are proving so strong within the Labor Party in their opposition to uranium. After all, we all accept that the lead time for Roxby Downs is about nine years, and in that time, surely they may think even those activists may have disappeared. But if Sir Arvi Parbo is prepared to take a risk for Western Mining and B.P., I am not prepared to take that risk for the future of South Australia and, indeed, Sir Arvi Parbo should not be required to do so either. Under the present conditions there is no incentive for the joint venture to proceed with any urgency, or even with expedition. As a consequence, thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of income are being lost on the way. It is a measure of the moribund attitude of the Government and of the general apathy of South Australia that such a course would even be contemplated.

South Australia's desperate financial situation, and the world energy crisis together, require that Western Mining and B.P. be given every incentive to move forward as rapidly as possible. What is more urgent, and it is obviously something which the Government does not wish to be generally known, is that at least one firm (Oilmin) could begin open-cut mining at Beverley near Lake Frome within a few weeks of the ban being lifted. Actual uranium extraction and milling could begin within six months and exports of yellow cake could be in full swing within three years. That company has completed its exploration and feasibility study. It has arranged finance in a joint arrangement with Western Nuclear, a subsidiary of the Phelps-Dodge Corporation, and markets are guaranteed. The project would provide hundreds of jobs, and eventually involve millions of dollars of investment, much of which would flow to the people of this State. This company has literally been poised, ready to begin, for years, and the only thing that stands in the way of that development is the South Australian Labor Government. The Government has continually fallen back on the argument that it has not been demonstrated that it is safe to supply uranium to a customer country. At least 110 other countries in the world believe that this attitude is totally out of touch with reality. As one French official put it, quite bluntly, "It is crazy," and, from the discussions I have had overseas, I am quite convinced that both the present Deputy Premier and the former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, are also privately of that opinion. The former Premier, during the speech he made on his return from

investigating the nuclear fuel industry, did not give the full story to this House. The 110 countries I mentioned before are members of the International Atomic Energy Agency, based in Vienna, an organisation responsible for setting both safeguards and safety standards, and for monitoring most carefully the safeguards agreements.

The work of the International Atomic Energy Agency has contributed greatly to international recognition of nuclear power safeguards. Indeed, it is a tribute to its effectiveness in that area that there has never been a breach of an I.A.E.A. safeguards agreement. Its work is still expanding and during this year the safeguards department will be expanded, the number of inspectors being increased to more than 100. These inspectors are drawn from more than 40 countries, and it is their job to ensure that I.A.E.A. safeguards, to which all countries with a nuclear power programme have agreed, are constantly adhered to.

From \$1 000 000 spent by the I.A.E.A. in enforcing safeguards in 1970, \$20 000 000 is now spent annually. As well as safeguards, the I.A.E.A. also acts in an advisory capacity in setting standards of safety; that is, of safe operation. These are the responsibility of individual utilities, companies or Governments. Each country with a nuclear power programme has its own safety requirements, based on the I.A.E.A. safety guidelines and supervised by a body such as America's Nuclear Regulatory Authority.

The industry itself would be the first to admit that safeguards against diversion for non-peaceful use was an area that was greatly neglected when nuclear power generation first began in the 1950's, but now massive amounts of money are being spent in the enforcement of safeguards at international and national levels by Governments and the industry.

The Australian Government's safeguards requirements are said by both Britain and France to be, if anything, too strict. An official of the Uranium Institute in London told me he felt that Australia's safeguards agreement could possibly be relaxed when dealing with "friendly" countries, such as Britain, America, and so on.

However, I do not hold to that view. I believe Australia should continue to insist on its safeguards agreement being met before exporting its uranium to any country, regardless of whether it comes into the "friendly" category. The former Premier did not visit Vienna and talk to the agency responsible for monitoring the safeguards which the Labor Party in this State insists are vital to the entire uranium question and which it says are inadequate. He did visit the vitrification plants for high level waste at Harwell, and at Marcoule (not Tricastin as he reported to this House) and I, too, have stood on top of the air-cooled interim storage for containers of vitrified waste that are being held until there are enough of them to warrant depositing them in stable underground sites.

It has been suggested that technology for the disposal of high level wastes has not been adequately developed or, indeed, devised. This is not true. Storage of spent fuel rods in water tanks for about 12 months is a necessary part of the cooling down process, not a stop-gap measure pending further research as claimed by some people. Reprocessing has progressed successfully for many years, and the method of vitrification for high level wastes was known 20 years ago. The building of a commercial plant was delayed until a few years ago simply because of the low quantities of high level waste produced by the nuclear fuel cycle. The present plants have a capacity far greater than the amount of waste produced each year, and this will continue to be the case for years to come.

What people do not understand and cannot envisage may perhaps be brought home by saying that the amount of vitrified waste, if all energy was delivered from a nuclear power source, coming from the nuclear fuel necessary to generate that energy for one person in one year would be represented by a shirt button, so the total amount of vitrified high level waste for one person's energy needs during his lifetime would be represented by a cupful of shirt buttons.

The vitrified wastes, encased in steel and stored in shafts drilled into geological formations that are known to have been stable for millions of years, will be more safely disposed of than the toxic waste products of any chemical process. Intensive exposure of the vitrified matrix to the most unusual and intensive testing, including water leaching and radiation, has demonstrated that glass provides a most suitable and stable vehicle to contain these wastes.

The techniques may be improved but, if they are, they will be improvements only on techniques that already are sufficient to almost an absolute degree. I am completely satisfied, as have been many other visitors to Harwell and to Marcoule, that this process does provide a safe answer to the problem of high level waste disposal, which has so much concerned all thinking people. Indeed, I agree with scientists throughout the nuclear industry who say that waste disposal is now not a technical problem but basically one of public relations and reassurance.

Finally, on the nuclear fuel cycle itself, what has been the significance of the Three Mile Island incident? Nuclear energy officials in Washington, D.C., say that it was the result of an improbable series of events that nevertheless occurred. Those who are critical of nuclear energy say that the risk was immediate and great and that disaster was barely averted, while those who favour nuclear power assert that the risk was not great, and point out, quite correctly, that the incident was contained with no casualties. In truth, the position was not as black or white as these points of view would paint it.

As one would expect, the incident received very wide attention from the media, and was reported largely in terms of answers to the question, "What is the worst thing that could happen now?" Politicians, scientists and administrators all tried to answer this question from the media honestly, but the reservations and opinions they added as to the actual likelihood of the worst actually occurring were completely lost sight of in the reports. Differences of opinion, however small, were seized upon and amplified. We all know the result. The headlines splashed across the front pages of the world press did not give an accurate or balanced assessment of what was certainly a serious situation.

The Three Mile Island incident has been a salutary lesson to the United States nuclear industry and its Government regulatory authority. As a result, I am assured there will be significant changes, particularly further improvements in reactor design, and modifications to existing reactors; increased standards for operator training; more stringent inspection procedures by the Nuclear Regulatory Authority; and greater co-operation and organisation between State, Federal, nuclear and other agency officials, with a clear statement of respective responsibilities.

Following the incident, environmental monitoring in Pennsylvania, Maryland, New York and New Jersey has not shown unusual radioactivity, that is, anything more than normal background radiation under which we all live, beyond the immediate plant site. Estimates of the health impact on the population of 2 000 000 living within 50 miles of the plant have been carried out, and will be

monitored. They indicate only a minimal increase in the risks to health of that population, almost so small as to be immeasurable. Translated into terms of fatal cancers and ill-health occurring from natural causes during the remaining lifetime of that population, the figure of 325 000 normally occurring, deaths one will expect to occur from cancer, will possibly be increased by two.

The nuclear fuel industry still enjoys a safety record far better than does conventional coal, oil and gas generation. It is not generally realised, but the safety rules applying to nuclear fuels throughout the world are much stricter for radioactive materials than for other dangerous substances. In fact, the permitted levels for radionuclides released from nuclear power stations are 100 times lower in terms of lethal doses than is the case with the amounts of sulphur dioxide emitted by oil and coal-fired power stations in vast quantities (20 000 to 30 000 tonnes per year from a 1 000 megawatt plant).

According to a recent study by the United States Academy of Sciences, sulphur dioxide emitted by a single 1 000 megawatt coal-fired plant causes annually about 25 fatalities, 60 000 cases of respiratory disease, and \$12 000 000 in property damage. The United States Government alone spends \$1 billion a year in compensation to coal miners suffering from silicosis and related disorders.

I predict that the energy debate will, in a decade, shift emphasis to the dangers of continuing to burn fossil fuels. There is a widely accepted theory mentioned by all the scientists I met that the carbon dioxide being released into the atmosphere will change the world's climate, with disastrous long-term results for the entire community. All of this comes back to the fundamental point, which so many people seem not yet to have grasped or accepted. The only way of making up the energy needs of millions of people throughout the world is by using nuclear fuel. This is the reality of the world energy situation and no amount of talking or wishful thinking can change this reality.

Millions of people depend for their livelihood and their well-being on electricity generated by the nuclear fuel cycle, and they have done for years. The demand is continually increasing, and at present there are no other viable alternative energy systems able to make up for the power which is now generated from nuclear sources.

Although I am confident that further research will ultimately provide viable alternatives, there is no way that the nuclear power programme can stop in the immediate future. Many countries have come to recognise that they must embark on a nuclear fuel programme now, if they are to be assured of their vital electricity supplies after the year 2000.

In France, the programme provides for one new reactor coming into service every two months until, by 1985, 55 per cent of the power consumed will come from nuclear fuel. At the present time more than 15 per cent of France's electric power already comes from nuclear fuel. This is equivalent in a saving to that country and to the world oil supplies of 9 000 000 tonnes of oil a year, and this provides France with a measure of independence from politically unstable Middle East countries.

Britain, with its coal, oil and gas reserves, is developing its nuclear fuel programme more slowly, but already it is planning to raise the proportion of nuclear power from 12 per cent to 20 per cent in 1985, and to 50 per cent by the year 2000. Other major countries, like West Germany, Japan, Russia, United States, Taiwan and Canada, are in similar situations, the progress of their programmes depending largely on the size of their indigenous reserves of fossil fuels, if any. In other words, there are countries that have no other sources of energy, having exhausted

their coal supplies and having to import coal and gas. Put bluntly, the world cannot do without nuclear fuel and, the sooner we recognise and accept that fact in South Australia, the sooner we will make our contribution to relieving the world energy crisis.

In Australia, we have been largely insulated from the world scene, at least until recently. Although we complain whenever the price of petrol increases, we are still paying far less than overseas consumers. While we have talked about conserving energy and developing alternative energy sources, we have spent far too little time and money doing something about it. While there were ample supplies of fuel for our cars and unlimited electricity at the touch of a switch, it was hard for us to take the problem seriously. After all, we said, alternative sources of energy (a very glib phrase which covers a multitude of subjects) would surely be available when the need really arose.

Our complacency has finally caught up with us. The world energy crisis has created that need for alternative energy sources now and it is clear, after my investigations and discussions, that most of those which have been so often quoted are just not able to make up for the energy shortage at present. If it has done nothing else, the energy crisis has forced the world to make a positive and realistic assessment of the alternative energy resources available to it.

My discussions with many eminent scientists have confirmed that there is an enormous gap between theory and practice. Fusion, to provide the basis for the so-called "hydrogen economy", is a long way from us and is most unlikely to be available until well into the next century. The practical difficulties of harnessing this form of energy, not to mention the sums involved in financing the experiments necessary, are immense, and the technology just does not exist at present, although I am confident that ultimately it will come.

Wave power, attractive in theory, has considerable difficulties in practice, and can only ever supply a part of the world's energy needs. The scale of the necessary installations bring problems of anchorage, maintenance, energy conversion and transmission in what, of necessity, are exposed and hazardous ocean conditions. The general environmental effect of a chain of enormous floating platforms would also be considerable, and must be taken into account. Wave power has an important but limited contribution to make in the foreseeable future.

Tidal power has been successfully harnessed to provide local energy for many centuries, through tidal mills. It has been applied to commercial power generation in the barrage and power station constructed by the French electricity authority, E.D.F., across the estuary of the Rance Valley, near St. Malo. It is a most impressive engineering achievement, and has a capacity, when fully operational, of 240 megawatts. However, to be feasible, such a tidal generator requires a tidal difference of at least 10 metres, preferably 20 metres, and the extreme conditions in Brittany are found in very few other places in the world. As with wind and sun, tides will only generate electricity while they are running and not for 24 hours a day. The Rance station supplies only a very small fraction of France's electricity needs, and there are no plans in the immediate future for any similar stations. Even wind power will require massive installations, if it is to be effectively utilised, and these will also present enormous problems of siting and stability. Although pilot projects have been operating, very few generators have as yet been connected into commercial grids. Vertical wind generators are just now being made available on the market in the United States, and we should be examining the possible use of these in South Australia.

Solar energy offers the best hope of boosting domestic energy supplies at present, but there is still a great deal of work to be done in applying it to energy generation on a national scale. The slogan, "Solar not nuclear", reflects a desire shared by all, but the fact is that solar energy just does not represent a viable alternative at present. Four hectares of tracking heliostats (222, each costing over \$20 000) and a central collector are necessary to generate five megawatts of thermal energy, equivalent to about one MW of electrical energy, at an advanced installation at Albuquerque, Mexico.

The pilot plant being built in California to generate power for 10 000 people (that is, 10 MW), will take up an area of between 50 and 80 hectares, and will cost more than \$45 000 000 even before the generator and the turbines are installed. Obviously, there are enormous difficulties of scale, but it is the energy crisis (or, rather, the signs of the energy crisis, which have finally convinced us that it exists) which has forced us to accept the reality of alternative energy source development.

Those countries which for more than 20 years have been developing nuclear energy to supply an increasing proportion of their power needs have done so because there has been no practical alternative. South Australia is in a most favourable position as far as natural resources are concerned. The Deputy Leader will expand on that subject. It is important that we act positively and swiftly to make the best use of those resources, both in our own interest and those of the world generally. This is the most exciting challenge facing South Australia today. In meeting this challenge, we will be standing on our own two feet and taking the responsibility for our own affairs, and our own economy again. No longer need we be dependent on what the Federal Government may or may not do—our own economy could be sufficiently healthy and buoyant for us to be independent of national trends.

The world needs energy and minerals. We can supply both, and not only is it in our own interests to do so, but we have a responsibility to the rest of the world to do so. We have oil and gas, coal, copper and uranium, iron ore, and a climate suited to solar energy, and just as important we have experience, an industrial base, and specific skills in the work force.

I know of overseas interests which want to invest in and trade with South Australia, but which cannot or will not because of the present South Australian Government's policies and reputation. I repeat that I am amazed that the State Government, the Government of South Australia, should be standing in the way of the most amazing potential and opportunities for the prosperity and the advancement of this State. When we get over that hurdle we can once again become a prosperous State, creating employment and industrial development by meeting that responsibility.

I am confident that the future of South Australia can be both exciting and rewarding, if we are prepared to accept the challenge; but we will have to work for that future.

The people of South Australia will soon face a clear-cut choice. Do they want more of the last Labor decade, more of the same, with higher taxes, increasing Government interference, and a total barrier against the creation of more jobs, and of income for the State? Or do they want a Government which will make certain that industrial and mineral development will go ahead, with more jobs, lower State taxation, independence, and general prosperity shared by all? This is the choice which faces them.

Without doubt the Liberal Party in Government will be far more effective for the welfare of South Australia than the Labor Government has been during the last 10 years. More than anything else, while the Labor Party remains

bound in the straitjacket of its doctrinaire policies, we recognise the need to get South Australia's economy moving again, so that we may all benefit. It is no good Labor Ministers and members of the Labor Party whining and whingeing about the Federal Government. The future of our State is in our own hands. It is in the hands of the Government of this State, and that Government has fallen down in its responsibility to further advance our prosperity.

The Liberal Party recognises that energy is the key to the future, and we will develop our existing resources, and conserve our existing oil and gas, while giving our full commitment to research into renewable energy sources, particularly solar energy.

There is potentially an exciting and challenging future ahead for South Australia, if we wish to achieve it. But this will not come about while the Labor Government stays in office. In choosing the Liberal Party at the next election, the people of South Australia will be reopening the way to development and prosperity in the 1980's. They will, in voting Liberal, be voting to secure the future.

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): I support the motion. In moving it, the member for Norwood made his maiden speech, and a very impressive one at that. As the Leader finished up with an exhortation to the people of South Australia to vote Liberal at the next election, I should like to refer to some recent elections when people took no notice of his Federal or State counterparts. It reads like a roll call of doom for an electoral Party.

We will start with the two Federal by-elections. The first was for the seat of Werriwa, in September 1978, where there was a swing of 11.7 per cent. Admittedly, it was a Labor stronghold held by a former Labor Prime Minister, one of the greatest this country has ever seen, and one who contributed significantly to the Christie Downs railway line, something for which we have not seen any contribution from the Liberal Prime Minister since he came to office. There has been a noticeable lack of funds for improvements to that line.

The second Federal by-election was in the seat of Grayndler in June of this year, and the swing was considerable. Again, it was a Labor stronghold, but nevertheless, the swing was indicative of the mood of the electorate. Perhaps even more indicative of that mood and the esteem in which the Liberal Party is held, going back to October 1978, was the New South Wales State election, a classic. Not only did the Liberals lose the election, but they also lost their Leader. That is a first for the Liberals—the first time they have ever lost the Leader of a State Party in a poll.

Mr. Hemmings: It could happen here.

Mr. DRURY: It cannot happen here, because the Leader is well and truly entrenched in a blue ribbon Liberal seat. The only way in which he could lose would be if he were deposed. In Victoria, in May of this year, quite significantly the Liberals lost a number of seats, and almost went into coalition with the Country Party, which they despise.

Last Saturday was the clincher: Tasmania, where we had another Liberal Leader deposed, by the electorate this time, not by an inter-Party squabble, not a Brutus job with a knife in the back, but a straight-out electoral hammering. Mr. Bingham has gone, and the Liberals are in process of finding a new head for the Liberal body. It says much for the Prime Minister that he tries to use a furphy to hide the inadequacies of his Government.

Mr. Chapman: What's a furphy?

Mr. DRURY: I suggest the member for Alexandra should consult a dictionary and enhance his education. An

article in today's *Financial Times*, under the heading "Poll shock for Liberals in Western Australia", refers to a poll taken at the time of Mr. Fraser's intention to get tough with the unions. It is a condemnation of the practice of trying to use industrial issues to curry favour with an electorate which has been dealt with despicably in the past four years or so.

The poll was carried out only 24 hours after Mr. Fraser's "get tough" telecast, and it showed that support for the Liberals had dropped from 40 per cent to 36 per cent, that support for the A.L.P. increased among those interviewed from 32 per cent to 35 per cent, that a staggering 19 per cent was undecided, that a combined 9 per cent blamed the Government and the unions, and that, predictably, 37 per cent thought the unions were responsible. That is not unusual, because there would be a reasonably high proportion who would blame the union. More surprisingly, 20 per cent blamed the State Government, while another 7 per cent blamed Sir Charles Court personally. It is amazing that a Liberal Party Leader who is so allied to Mr. Fraser and who is so determined to try to stir up strife to get electoral kudos should try this stunt. The result is that the electorate reckons that he is partly to blame—to the extent of 27 per cent. I commend that article to members opposite; it might enlighten them.

The electoral results of the past two years are damning for the Federal Government. We could not expect anything else, of course, because Mr. Fraser did say in November 1975, after the bloodless coup, that he would cut back on Federal expenditure; that he has done, and done well. Of course, his State counterparts have had to take the blame. Two Leaders have been deposed by the people. Mr. Hamer is sitting on a one-seat majority, and, if he got any closer to a coalition with what are regarded as his despicable country cousins, he would be in real trouble. About New South Wales, the less said the better. That was a landslide, and so were the two by-elections.

Mr. Wilson: Why the less said the better?

Mr. DRURY: I have not finished yet. Let us look at our own seat of Norwood. The Labor Party retained the seat of Norwood earlier this year with a majority of 3 per cent, the previous sitting member having had a majority of 10 per cent. However, the missing 7 per cent did not go to the Liberal Party. If, as the Leader says, the State is in such poor condition, and it is being continually knocked overseas, in this State and wherever else he goes, why did not the Liberal Party pick up that 7 per cent? I leave it to members opposite, in the long string of speeches that will follow in this debate, to try to explain why the Liberal Party did not get that swing. I notice that there is silence opposite. I hope that I have contributed to it. The Norwood by-election was won by the new Labor member, and that seat will remain in the Government camp for many years to come.

Having made those opening remarks, I now turn to some comments made by the Leader. He said that the State Government has continually blamed the Fraser Government and that it was always whingeing and moaning that it did not get certain things. I think I have already answered that criticism. The electorate has already given the Opposition an indication and, if it cannot accept that, I do not know what it can accept.

Nevertheless, Mr. Fraser's bubbles are bursting one by one. Interest rates and the deficit are increasing, and unemployment has reached about 463 000, the highest since the depression. Although the Whitlam Government is maligned from time to time by Opposition members, we had two things while it was in office: money and jobs. Listen to Opposition members laugh! However, unemployment during the Whitlam Government's reign reached

a peak of 270 000. Mr. Fraser has doubled that, which is not a bad effort!

Mr. Goldsworthy: You don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. DRURY: Of course, the Deputy Leader would have to defend Mr. Fraser, as the State branch of the Liberal Party is wedded to the Federal Liberal Party and, should a poll be conducted now, the result is rather predictable. I notice that the Leader has not suggested that the State Government should go to the polls now.

Mr. Keneally: Ask the defenders of Fraser to stand up.

Mr. DRURY: I think that they would all be rooted to their seats. Then, we have the matter of succession duties, which the Opposition loves to air. It ignores the fact that, in 1974-75, 4 per cent of the wealthiest estates paid about one-third of the duty collected by the Government. I do not know how that sum of money could be redistributed. Members opposite might like to go to the outer electoral districts north and south of Adelaide that need more buses, water filtration, to have their kindergartens maintained at the 1975 level, and jobs, and explain to the people there how they would make up that money or what they would take away from them. Either way, I wish them luck, because they will need it.

The Leader of the Opposition devoted nearly one-third of his speech to uranium. However, he never once mentioned the poll that was reported in the *Advertiser* on 23 July. Headed "No 'N-power', says 56 per cent", the report states that 63 per cent of those who opposed nuclear power were women. This poll was taken in the wake of the Harrisburg disaster. While sitting in front of the television set, I heard the N.B.C. announcer say, "Pregnant women and children were evacuated from that city in that order." I wonder why they did that. It was probably because they felt like selecting from the population. But why did they not choose older men and women, younger school children, high school children, or married couples? That did not happen. Rather, they picked pregnant women and children, in that order. The answer ought to be fairly obvious to members opposite and to the Leader, who is not now in the Chamber. He has probably gone out to recover from his own self-hypnosis. In addition to the one-third of his speech that the Leader spent on uranium, he mentioned fuel prices, which is interesting. Let us examine that matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Alexandra that trips made by the member for Whyalla are not relevant. The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak later if he so desires.

Mr. DRURY: I refer to the fuel crisis. The Government's decision last August immediately to raise the price of all Australian crude oil to import parity has already boosted inflation by .5 per cent, but will do so much more strongly in the next two quarters. The current round of petrol price increases will add about 1.5 per cent to the consumer price index directly and indirectly, and possible further OPEC price rises will add to that. We have no-one but the Liberal Party to thank for that because, when the Whitlam Government introduced world parity prices in 1974, it did so for wells that were then in production, not for new oil.

Increased fuel prices, which will hit every Australian, will greatly affect people who live north and south of the city in the outer metropolitan electorates. It will throw on the ordinary people even greater burdens in relation to running their cars, just as it will throw greater burdens on the State Government to provide public transport.

Mr. Wilson: What about your fuel tax?

Mr. DRURY: That will not impose as great a burden as

will the Federal Government's excise tax, which will net the Federal Government \$600 000 000 this year and will, it hopes, help to reduce its Budget deficit. However, each subsequent year the deficit will probably blow out again, because the oil companies will take more and more of that excise. It is no wonder that the oil companies and the Liberal Party are not good friends at present. However, they probably will be next year and in subsequent years. I am sure that the Liberals will get more and more contributions to their coffers in about 1981.

Mr. Wilson: Are you a supporter of the oil companies?

Mr. DRURY: I have been, am and always will be a supporter of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Wilson: You haven't answered the question.

Mr. DRURY: I think that answers it sufficiently. These fuel prices relate not only to motor vehicles but also to industry and heating. How will people continue to heat their homes in winter? What effect will it have on age pensioners in their claims for greater pension increases? Of course, it will add inflationary pressures. The Federal Government, no matter how inhumane it is, will have to consider giving these people extra money to enable them to stay warm during winter. However, humanity is at a bit of a discount in Canberra at present. The reason for this is obvious, and the electorate does not like it.

The Liberal Party has the same basic philosophy in the State sphere as it does in the Federal sphere; it seldom changes. As well as experiencing fuel price increases, we are suffering from Federal cuts in education, affecting kindergartens, primary schools and high schools. I have been approached by three school councils, which have condemned these cuts.

I might as well speak to the wall as to tell members opposite about this, because it has no effect. Indeed, now that I think about it, the wall looks much better than does the new Liberal line-up. Having said that about the Liberal Party, I now refer to what the State Government has done in my district.

The Highways Department has already begun construction of the Christies-Lonsdale road. When completed next year, it will provide an alternative route, enabling traffic using the South Road to flow more freely. The State Transport Authority has ordered 100 new buses, to be in operation by early 1980. These buses will provide a welcome addition to the public transport resources, so that a better service will be provided. Needless to say recurrent expenditure will be required to maintain those services, and the Government cannot afford to throw away the moneys collected in succession duties from the top 4 per cent if it is to have the money to maintain those services. It is not easy to find a solution to how those buses are going to be replaced when they, inevitably, wear out.

The Lonsdale bus depot, which will cost \$2 000 000, is already half completed. When it is completed, it will provide a facility for 50 buses. This means that, when a bus breaks down, only about a five-minute trip from the depot to Darlington will be necessary to collect the passengers, because most of the breakdowns occur going up or close to the top of Tapley Hill. It will require only about a five-minute trip to get the passengers off the broken-down bus to resume their trip.

Mr. Wilson: Do you think that your area is serviced properly by the S.T.A.?

Mr. DRURY: There could be improvements. I thought that when it was a private bus service and since the S.T.A. took over.

Mr. Wilson: Do you think Lonsdale Road will be the answer to the traffic problem?

Mr. DRURY: I think it will help considerably. If the explosion in population growth resumes, the problem will

resurrect itself by the mid-1980's. At present, replacement buses have to be sent from Morphettville bus depot when there is a breakdown. Buses already have two-way radios, and the S.T.A. has plans to co-ordinate bus and train arrivals and departures to prevent unnecessary inconvenience to commuters. In addition to the transport improvements, the Noarlunga Centre bus-rail interchange will be another benefit to commuters. That interchange is progressing on schedule.

I turn now to education facilities in my electorate. The State Government has been able to advance the construction of the Sheidow Park school, the holding school at Morphett Vale East known as the Yetto East Primary School, and the Reynella East Primary School, which is now in use and which was advanced from an anticipated opening date in 1980 to February of this year. This has been done in my electorate by a Government which has had to suffer reductions in Federal Government spending.

Mr. Arnold: Do you regard that as preferential treatment in your district?

Mr. DRURY: I regard that as necessary treatment and in line with Government policy that, in areas where population requirements necessitate such action, it will be taken.

Mr. Arnold: Do other electorates receive the same benefits?

Mr. DRURY: Until this year the electorate that I represent was one of the fastest growing in the State, which is so often stated by honourable members opposite. I believe, from figures I have received recently, that its growth has slowed considerably. That, in itself, need not be a bad thing, as it will enable both the State Government and local government to catch up with the demand for services and will give people as high a standard of living as is possible at this time.

The Noarlunga Regional Centre is a combined project of the A.M.P. and the South Australian Housing Trust. We can combine with private enterprise, despite statements made to the contrary by the Leader. It is coming along well.

Dr. Eastick: How much will your new community college cost?

Mr. DRURY: I do not know.

Dr. Eastick: Who is funding it?

Mr. DRURY: The Noarlunga Regional Centre will be completed by about the middle of next year. It will incorporate department stores, a bus interchange and a railway station, and it will include a multi-storey building for office space. It will be the community hub.

Dr. Eastick: Augmented by an \$11 000 000 community college financed by the Commonwealth.

Mr. DRURY: And when the Commonwealth builds it, it will be a pleasure to see.

Mr. Wilson: You believe it will be good to have Federal Government finance in your area?

Mr. DRURY: I think that the Federal Government has the facility to finance much more, not only in my area but also in other areas. I think, if the Commonwealth was dinkum with the people of Australia, it would do that. If it had done that (and I refer again to the statistics I read out about elections), members opposite would be a lot happier now than they are.

Mr. Nankivell: Buying votes?

Mr. DRURY: Electorally. I know that in Address in Reply debates each Party usually praises its own achievements. The Liberal Party praises the achievements of the Federal Government and its spurious claim that it has reduced inflation (at the cost, of course, of tremendous unemployment and social deprivation). The

State Government will battle on (as usual) with less funds to do more and more work. It will continue doing that. I have noticed that members opposite never tell us what they are going to do; they always tell us what is wrong. They never tell us, for instance, what schemes will be cut back, what money will be reduced, or where it will be spent. They do not tell us who they are going to sack if they come into office. They do not tell us whether or not they will maintain the superannuation fund for public servants. They do not tell us any of these things. All they do is sit here criticising and knocking; they put up nothing that is constructive. That is in parallel with their Federal counterparts, who have had little joy since they won the 1977 election. They won that election on the basis of Federal tax cuts. The tax cuts have gone; we do not see them now. The alternative, of course, in December 1977 was to trade tax cuts for grants for public projects. Of course, we do not have the public projects, and we no longer have the tax benefits; instead, we have a tax surcharge. What we have here in the State Parliament is a mirror image of the Federal Liberal Party. Members opposite know that the State is getting along as best it can under adverse circumstances.

Mr. Hemmings: And doing very well.

Mr. DRURY: I agree with my colleague; we are getting along well in the circumstances. We would like to do more and, given the opportunity, we would, as we have done in the past. As we can testify in the electorate of Mawson and the adjoining electorate of Baudin, we do have monuments to Federal Labor Governments.

Mr. Mathwin: The electrification of the Christies line and those millions of dollars for the railways.

Mr. DRURY: Would the honourable member support us in an approach to the Federal Government?

Mr. Mathwin: What about the money wasted—those hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. DRURY: That is called Government spending, and that is a dirty word to them. This is an example of where they criticise but do not offer.

The SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member for Mawson should say "honourable members" not "them".

Mr. DRURY: I apologise, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wilson: Would you like them to electrify the Christie Downs line?

Mr. DRURY: I would like to see Federal Government support to electrify the Christie Downs line, which would be a continuation of the way it was originally financed.

Mr. Wilson: Why did you sell all the electrification equipment?

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not Question Time.

Mr. DRURY: I think that members opposite are relieving the tensions of last week-end which have been thrust upon them by the debacle in Tasmania—they are still shocked. Having made those few comments, which I know will be taken to heart by members opposite, I refer, finally, to a letter I received from the Leader. I think the member for Napier, too, received one of these letters. I think the Leader must be writing to all of us. According to the letter, a Liberal Government will "return South Australia to prosperity and security with industrial development, investment, jobs and security". If the State Liberal Party reckons it can provide that security, why the hell doesn't Fraser do that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I was lulled into believing that the dreary stuff churned out by the last two Government speakers who contributed to this debate was going on endlessly. Fortunately, I can feel a sense of relief that at least that has dried up.

This Address in Reply debate evolves from what is

really—and I will not use the word "dreary"—a low-key speech by the Governor. It is not replete with the usual political comments that we became used to hearing when we had someone else at the helm in the Premier's seat in South Australia. Nonetheless, there are one or two ominous references in this Speech to which I want to refer. A little later in my remarks I will deal with the question of energy supplies and our responsibility to the rest of the world in relation to that matter. However, there are a couple of other things that should be dealt with before I do that.

It is appropriate to have regard to the opening remarks in the Governor's Speech, where acknowledgment was given to the services of members who served in this place and who died since the last session of Parliament. Those members mentioned are Sir Baden Pattinson, John Leo Travers, Leslie Charles Harding and George Stanley Hawker. All of those gentlemen came from this side of politics and all made a significant contribution to Parliament and to the people who they represented in this place. In fact, Sir Baden Pattinson was Minister of Education from 1953 to 1965, which was a period in which we saw a very significant growth in education facilities in South Australia. I do not believe that during these remarks, in which I am expressing condolences to the families of past members, it is appropriate to reflect on the administration of the Education Department since that time; I will do that on another occasion. Certainly, during the period when Sir Baden Pattinson was Minister of Education, we saw a tremendous development of educational facilities and resources in South Australia, at a time when the effects of the vastly increased school population was being felt in South Australia. Unfortunately, we now have a declining school population, and that is a matter which should be of some concern to the Parliament of this State.

The first page of the Governor's Speech refers to the fact that the Government again intends to introduce some amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. In part, His Excellency said "To give greater security of employment to workers consistent with the economic well being of the State." That indicates some reservations on the part of the Government. From my knowledge of what that Bill is likely to contain (and I believe it will be similar to a provision introduced in this House earlier), we will have some cause for considerable concern. I say that because it is a fact of life that, in seeking to give greater security of employment to members of the trade union movement, the Government also intends to further its policy of compulsory unionism under the guise of absolute preference to unionists, which of course is simply an exercise in semantics. The choice offered to workers in this State is: join the union or be unemployed. What sort of a choice is that?

This matter has recently arisen in my own electorate. The Government likes to believe that it represents the workers of this State. It promulgates the untruth—it is not even a half truth—that it is the Party that represents the workers of this State. People come into my office, including builders, subcontractors and barmen, who are being pressured to join the appropriate trade union (in the case of the barmen, the Liquor and Allied Trades Union), and it goes very much against their grain. Union officials do not hesitate to apply very heavy blackmail.

Mr. Becker: Standover tactics.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Standover tactics, certainly. Fortunately, there are one or two hotel proprietors in my electorate who stand up to the standover merchants. I now understand that, when a union secretary comes to one of these establishments, he behaves more like a whipped

puppydog than the big noise union secretary he was when he first appeared on the scene. This is because clauses 128 and 129 (I believe they are the relevant clauses) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act were quoted to him and, in fact, his bluff was called.

I certainly hope that the amendments envisaged in that Bill are not designed to force people to join trade unions against their will. I have always been puzzled by the attitude of members opposite, but then I realise that most of the members opposite, and certainly the majority of the back-benchers, pride themselves in coming from a union background. However, they were union secretaries or union leaders, and it is a fact of life that such people are not on the same wave length as a lot of their members.

The results of a survey commissioned by Century Holdings Limited were recently released to members about a week ago. It is a reputable national opinion survey which was conducted by McNair Anderson Associates Pty. Ltd. in association with Professor Roger Leighton of the University of New South Wales. That survey made some interesting findings which former union leaders and union secretaries opposite would be well advised to heed. It indicated clearly that the way union leaders are behaving in this country at the present time is not supported and that the sort of nonsense which is churned out in this place by the Minister of Labour and Industry and other union officials does not reflect the view of the average worker in this State, or indeed that of union members in this State and in this country.

For the edification of members opposite I will quote from a section of the survey entitled "The role of unions". The survey states:

While 80 per cent of union leaders feel that all employees should be made to join a union, large majorities ranging from 75 per cent to 100 per cent of the other four groups disagree. (The other four groups were the unionists themselves and other management categories.) Union leaders and workers also hold widely divergent opinions on whether a person should be a member of a union, before acting as a worker representative on a company board: 80 per cent of union leaders think a representative should be a union person and 61 per cent of the workers disagree. A substantial 63 per cent of the work force does not believe that union pressure for wage increases is supported by the rank and file.

All the pressure for increased wages in this country is said to come from the workers. It does certainly not come from the workers—it comes from the union leaders. The survey continues:

Fifty-four per cent (more than half) of the work force does not think that wages should be maintained if industry is unable to afford the costs. A sizeable 78 per cent of the work force and substantial numbers of the three leadership groups including union leaders think that union leaders often seem to be looking for something to justify their existence.

That is the view of the average worker in Australia regarding their leaders. Under the heading "Are wage increases wanted?" the report continues:

In view of the current economic situation, 69 per cent of Australians believe another wage increase would not help much. They are willing to forgo an increase until the economy settles down.

That seems like a responsible reaction from the workers of this country, and it does not line up with the culminations of their leaders. I would like now to refer briefly to what is now a famous document—the study leave report of Max Brown, member for Whyalla, which has attracted some notoriety in recent times.

Dr. Eastick: At least he produced one, though.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, he did indeed. Full marks to the member for Whyalla for putting pen to paper.

Mrs. Adamson: Unlike the Chief Secretary.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: His report has not seen the light of day. I do not want to appear to be like the members for Napier and Mawson, who seem to be better fitted to be gossip columnists for a Labor rag than to be members of this House; I do not want to sink to the level of their contributions to the House, so I will not dwell on the unconscious humour of the emission from the pen of the member for Whyalla. However, I read this document with added interest after the notoriety afforded it, to see whether it contained anything of value to the public of South Australia. One section of the report refers to wage levels and costs in South Australia and Australia. The report states, in part:

Back in Athens I did visit the ruins of the ancient part of that city, but to me more importantly I became acquainted with a night porter at the Hotel Bretagne who spoke English and had worked in a leading hotel in Sydney. He advised me that he had had to return to Athens because of his young daughter's bouts of asthma.

The interesting part of our conversation was that he advised me that his wage standard in a leading hotel in Sydney was approximately \$A160 clear per week, whilst at the Grand Bretagne he was not clearing that amount per month and was obviously finding it very difficult to exist on his income. Accommodation in the Sydney Conrad Hilton would not be very much over \$A40 per night, whilst at the Grand Bretagne the accommodation cost was \$A75 per night.

The conclusion that the member for Whyalla drew from the facts is as follows:

Obviously this "ballyhoo" which is carried on with of late re wage structure in Australia and, according to hotel owners, the need to cut out penalty rates, etc., is quite ludicrous and under no circumstances could be regarded as anything but a joke.

These comments show the extent of the insight of the member for Whyalla into what the wage explosion has done to the economy of Australia. That was the conclusion reached by the member for Whyalla, and that was the benefit and insight he obtained from his stay in some of the tourist resorts overseas. I was going to call him "the oracle", but perhaps that term is not appropriate. These comments highlight the blinkered attitude and superficial judgment shown by the member for Whyalla. However, they highlight the attitude of members opposite and what they are doing for the economy of this country. I will remember the comments of the member for Florey (which I looked up this afternoon to refresh my memory), another union official, about his overseas visit. He did not lapse into unconscious humour. The report to which I referred earlier had some unfortunate consequences for the institution of Parliament and everyone. The member for Florey went overseas to study union affairs and conditions on the waterfront. His conclusion was that in Germany, for instance, conditions were appalling (I think that is the word he used), because waterside workes were shifting too much cargo. The report states, in part:

I found that working conditions in Hamburg were extremely unfavourable when compared to those in operation in Australia or in Italy, i.e., dockers may be called upon, and often are, to work double shifts . . . the first shift being paid at the appropriate day rate, and the second shift being worked for the meagre addition of 15 per cent to the day rate. This of course would be totally unacceptable to Australian waterside workers, and as these double shifts are worked so frequently, I pointed out that, if those practices were not followed, the employment of a greater number of dockers would be required by the shipping authorities to ensure the fastest turn around of vessels possible. This would

also be of value when the redundancy of dockers is contemplated. Dockers in Hamburg work a 40-hour week in three shifts, 7-3, 3-11, 11-7, and the staggering total of 50 000 000 tonnes of cargo is moved annually.

What sort of attitude do members opposite have? They have no breadth of perspective at all in matters that are of vital concern to the welfare of people in this country and in this State. No wonder we are in an unhappy situation where even in this place we have union leaders who do not reflect the views of their members. Significant examples have been seen recently, one being the Western Australian disruption, where a deliberate confrontation was engineered by the principal, Mr. Carmichael, the itinerant communist. Union people approached the local police and told them that the gathering was to be held, but the necessary procedure, of which they were perfectly well aware, was not followed! A confrontation was sought. Permission was not sought for the rally, as was required by law; however, the police were tipped off so that a confrontation would occur. These people went ahead with the demonstration and in the process disrupted the compulsory conference, which had been called for that day, to resolve industrial problems that had been going on for weeks in the Pilbara. The recent Telecom dispute resulted in union leaders changing ground. At first the only thing that would satisfy them was a cash offer; this was churned out over the media. However, the leaders backed off and finally said, "All we want is arbitration", which is what the responsible authorities had been saying from the start. The communist union leaders and imports from other places are as slippery as they come. The member for Napier can get up and fulminate about conditions as though he is an instant expert on the matter of energy, but he would be run out of England if he said that sort of nonsense there. If he went to any one of a dozen places in England and said, "You people have no right to have uranium or nuclear reactors", he would be run out of town and sent as far away as possible—but we are stuck with him in Australia. What a tragedy!

My comments relate to the reference in the Governor's Speech to industrial legislation, which is to come before this House, unfortunately. There is a fleeting reference to tourism in the Speech. The Minister has been particularly magnanimous in the South-East of South Australia. The magnanimity of the Government was seen before the last election, not only regarding tourism but also in the large sums of money that flowed to the South-East of the State. This reflects credit on the member for Mt. Gambier, because of whom the Government has seen fit to be so generous.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although the Government has for some time now tried to endear itself to the lower South-East area of South Australia by its generosity to that part of the State, it has not really endeared itself to other parts of South Australia. I refer especially to the very generous tourist grant made to the area recently. I have here, from a number of cuttings, one from the *Murray Pioneer*, which I would like to quote for the benefit of the Minister or any of the Government members interested in this question. It relates to the grant made to the South-East recently and states:

A deputation from the Riverland Tourist Association held discussions with the Minister of Tourism, Mr. Hudson, in Adelaide on Monday. The meeting was arranged in response to an invitation from Mr. Hudson following an association protest over a State Government decision to allocate \$100 000 for tourist promotion in the South-East. The

association president, Mr. John Nitschke, was accompanied by two promotions officers, Mr. Allan Todd and Mr. Tony Hersey, at the meeting. Mr. Hudson explained that the funds allocated to the South-East were intended to help promote the formation and establishment of a regional tourist body, with a view to developing this region and a section of south-west Victoria as recommended in the "Green Triangle" Report.

However, it was not possible to make matching grants to other tourist regions in the State. In his letter of protest, Mr. Nitschke claimed that it was unfair that Government aid on such a scale should be directed to a region where no "self-help" schemes of the type evident in the Riverland region had been demonstrated.

Mr. Hudson recognised and praised the efforts of the Riverland body and said he hoped that the forthcoming South Australian Budget would make provision for increased grants to all regions.

The Government's attitude does not appear to have been particularly even-handed. The Government's generosity to the South East, to which it has paid particular attention without any tangible political benefit to the Labor Party, has not been applauded by the rest of South Australia, which is desperately looking for funds to promote tourists in its own part of the State. In his study leave report, the member for Whyalla also made some observations about tourism in Whyalla.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Get off that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As I said earlier, we have had to sit through speeches from the member for Napier and the member for Mawson which would have been better suited to a gossip column in a Labor rag than to the ears of members of this House. I make no apology at all for making a real point about tourism, namely, that the Government has been less than generous with the rest of South Australia in relation to tourism. This is what the local Whyalla paper says under the heading "Mr. Brown should have left it alone—says council":

It might have been better had the M.P. for Whyalla, Mr. Max Brown, said nothing of Whyalla's efforts in the promotion of tourism than make the remarks he did in his recent report, Cr. Les Harris said at council's meeting on Monday, "If you don't know what you're talking about"—and this is good advice for the member for Whyalla and also the member for Napier—

"it's best to leave the subject alone", said Cr. Harris . . .

That is sound advice particularly to members opposite who have spoken in this debate, other than the member for Norwood, whose maiden speech contained one or two points of interest to the House. I do not think it is recognised in the Governor's Speech, but there has been some reference to the introduction of a Bill to amend what the Government has so pleasantly called a loophole in relation to land tax. I would think that that is one area of which the Government would steer well clear, because the record of the Government—the friends of the little people and of the workers—in relation to land tax is in fact appalling.

I think it was the member for Glenelg earlier today who asked whether the Government intended to do anything about land tax, and the Premier indicated that it was not, just as he indicated in reply to another question that it was not going to do anything about succession duties—the "tax on the wealthy". Have you ever heard such nonsense? Succession duties cut in at a very low level when there is a succession to members of the same family, and in relation to land tax this is the only State which does not give any concession to the principal place of residence, that is, the family home. Every other State, including little Tasmania,

gives generous concessions in relation to land tax. So I think we will be watching with very great interest the Government's legislation to close this so-called loophole so that it can collect more land tax.

Do not let the Government claim that this is a low-taxed State. It claims we must include mineral royalties, but we do not get much of that in this State, and any chance we have of getting it seems to have gone out the window. That leads me to my next point, that is, the reference in the Governor's Speech to the Roxby Downs deposits and the question of energy supply. The whole world is fast approaching a crisis in relation to the provision of energy, particularly in the form of liquid fuel supplies. This applies not only to the Western world but also to the non-free world, and of course the situation is desperate in relation to the under-developed countries.

There is a very close connection between the provision of energy and the standards of living and welfare of a country. It is all very well to say that we must conserve energy. Of course, we must make efforts not to waste energy but, if we are going to improve the lot of the developing nations and sustain anything like the standard of living which we in this country and the rest of the developed world enjoy, we must have an adequate supply of energy, and that demand for energy certainly will not diminish: in fact, it will increase. Let me just quote to the House some figures which indicate the consumption of energy in certain countries. These figures refer to the consumption of energy in kilograms of coal equivalent per year.

Mr. Harrison: Quoting from what?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: From the United Nations source, if the honourable member wants to know. These are figures from the United Nations, not something I have dreamt up in my head, and it would be to the very great advantage of people in this State if some of those somnolent members of the back benches opposite took some time to do a bit of reading on these matters. I will give them some references later. The figures for the developed countries are as follows:

I will give them some references later. The figures for the developed countries are:

| Country | Energy consumption per kilogram equivalent of coal, per head per year |
|-------------------|---|
| U.S.A. | 10 999 |
| Canada | 9 880 |
| West Germany | 5 345 |
| Australia | 6 485 |
| Japan | 3 622 |

The figures for the developing countries are, by contrast, as follows:

| Country | Energy consumption per kilogram equivalent of coal, per head per year |
|---------------|---|
| Kenya | 174 |
| Tanzania | 70 |
| Thailand | 284 |
| Colombia | 671 |

There is an indissoluble connection between the welfare of a country and the energy available to it. If we are to improve the lot of developing nations and maintain the standard of living of the Western world, there must be adequate energy supplies. I will give the example of a big increase in oil prices in 1973-74. As a result of those increases in price—

Mr. Harrison interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish the honourable member would go back to his normal habit of peaceful sleep. I do not believe that his remarks are assisting him, the House, or me. During 1973-74, owing to the steep increases imposed by the OPEC countries in the price of oil, there was a reduction in the use of oil, and it is believed that that contributed significantly to the recession in the Western world. The power strike in Victoria that went on for several weeks resulted in loss of production amounting to about \$500 000 000. It also caused a large number of small businesses to close, and it caused hardship to the families of those who were on strike. If energy is not available to a country, its services and welfare will decline. In any country, if electrical or other sources of energy are not available, the population's health, well-being and standard of living will be diminished.

Mr. Dean Brown: They couldn't care less about that here. They have energy here and a high standard of living.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is right. Let me now deal with these moralists opposite (I am pleased that the member for Mitcham is with us) and these people who are adopting this moral stance about saving the human race by denying them access to uranium from Australia, including South Australia.

Mr. Dean Brown: They will kill thousands of people.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will deal with that matter, too. In my judgment, after much inquiry and research and a private trip to Great Britain and the continent to inquire at first hand, the only moral stance to adopt in this situation is that we have an obligation to supply this fuel.

Mr. Hemmings: To whom?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: To customer countries. Earlier today this oracle from Britain, the member for Napier, sounded off about the hazards of nuclear energy. What does he know or what has he read about that?

He has swallowed the prejudices of the left wing, including some of its more voluble and more fluent exponents, hook, line and sinker. We have been sneered at in this place by some members of the legal profession when we have had some of their tricky legislation before us. They have said, "You would not understand: you are not lawyers." Some members of this House have formal scientific training.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you one of them?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but I am not sneering or bragging about it like some lawyers do. We have people here who have the wit, intelligence, and sense of responsibility to do some reading and independent thinking for themselves and to assess the situation logically. We have concluded that the only moral position is to supply the energy needs of these developing nations.

Regardless of whether members opposite like it, we are in the atomic age. A country like Japan gets about 80 per cent of its energy from imported oil, as that country is extremely short of energy supplies, and 70 per cent of that oil is used in electricity generation. What will happen to the standard of living in Japan if that country does not have an alternative to electricity generation? What will be the repercussions for these comfortable people in the Government side when the economy of Japan goes bust? There will be serious economic repercussions for them.

If our friend from Napier was back in his home country and was faced with the options of lighting a kerosene lamp and chopping the wood to heat his house, or of having in his locality a nuclear reactor providing safe and cheap power, I know what his decision would be. He has come to us from the other side of the ocean, and it is a different story. He has his comfortable bungalow. He can turn his light on. We are still getting coal from Leigh Creek

reasonably cheaply. It is all right for him to come here and sit in judgment of his former compatriots in Britain. Then, over the channel, France is worse off. That country has not extensive coal deposits. It has no option but to go nuclear to generate electricity. I wonder what sort of song and dance the member for Napier and his cohorts would be making in France. If by some quirk of chance he had been born in Japan, I wonder what his attitude would be. I also wonder what his attitude would be if he lived in South Korea.

Mr. Wilson: He would look better than he does now.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I cannot disagree with my colleague. What would be his attitude to nuclear energy if he was born in those countries? South Korea is developing nuclear reactors and, at the turn of the century, I think it will have 30 or more nuclear reactors. To maintain the standard of living in these countries, there is no alternative to the nuclear option, and there is no alternative, despite all this ballyhoo, that is suitable for the generation of electricity other than the nuclear options.

I will now give an authoritative assessment of alternative energy sources available or under investigation at present. In liquid fuels (shale, tar, sands), the technological development status is known, and its likely economic potential is fair. Further, we hear much about alcohol. For biomass alcohol, the technology is known, and likely economic potential is fair. For synthetic alcohol, the technology is known and the likely economic potential is poor. These are known facts. South Africa, in particular, is going in for coal conversion. The technology is known, and the likely economic potential is fair and improving. In coal conversion, new processes are developing, but the likely economic potential is unknown, although it could be good in future.

We have heard of oil direct from water plants. The technological status is low, and we have no idea of the likely economic potential at the moment. As to low-grade heating and cooling (solar), the technology is known and improving, and the likely potential is fair to good. Power stations and industry generate waste heat. How is it harnessed? The technology is known, but it depends on the location as to whether there is any possibility at all. Electricity generation is the area in which nuclear power, in informed scientific view, has a great contribution to make. In respect of nuclear, the technology is known and the economic potential is good. As to wind, we hear a lot about windmills; the technology is known and the potential is poor. As to wave, the technological status thus far is low; there is a lot of research needed in relation to wave power. I understand that the British are the leaders in that field, but the likely economic potential is poor. As to geothermal, the technology is known, and this is good in a few areas. With ocean thermal, there are differences in temperature between regions of the ocean. The technology is not highly advanced; it is low, but the likely impact is poor. With solar, as far as electricity generation is concerned, the technology is known and developing further, but the potential for generating electricity is poor.

The point I make is that no reasonable option is available at present for the generation of electricity other than nuclear. We have a responsibility to supply the fuel for electricity generation and for energy overseas. What about this highly emotive question of disposal of waste? If ever a pack of lies was generated by the anti-nuclear lobby, it is in this area. If ever there was the most uninformed opinion promulgated by so-called experts, it is in this area. We all tend to be frightened of what we do not understand, and unfortunately in the area of waste disposal and the hazards—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He doesn't frighten me, and I don't understand him.

Mr. Tonkin: There is not very much that the Minister does understand.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know the Minister is obtuse, and we know in this case that the Minister does not want to understand. I believe that members opposite who are denying the access of energy to the rest of the world, which desperately needs it have the responsibility to inform themselves.

Mr. Groom: What happened at Harrisburg?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: How many were killed there? Nobody! There is all the talk about what might happen. That was a triumph for the people who engineered—

Mr. Keneally: It could be so catastrophic.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It could be, but it has not been and it is not likely to be. I want to refer members opposite to a book which we have in our own Parliamentary Library. If they are responsible people they will read this book.

Mr. Dean Brown: Tell them where the library is.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The library is down the end of the corridor; turn left and take about 12 paces. There are very obliging librarians on the staff. This book is available in the library and makes an attempt to put some rationality into the so-called nuclear debate, although it is not a debate, because one side just does not get heard. This book, called *The Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear*, is written by Petr Beckmann, who is a scientist at the Colorado University. I strongly recommend that members opposite read this book and, if they have any sense of responsibility at all, they will. I include in this the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitcham gets a guernsey from time to time. He is one of the lawyers who only occasionally flaunts his legal knowledge in front of us, but he is not a scientist; he is reasonably intelligent, and I am quite sure that he could understand—

Mr. Millhouse: You are in a generous mood tonight!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I am not, but I am quite sure the honourable member could digest the contents of this book. It puts in perspective the relative dangers of energy generation by a whole range of means. It also acknowledges that no conversion of energy—it is the conversion of chemical energy or some form of energy into a use which is valuable to man—is safe, but he argues quite convincingly and scientifically that nuclear is the safest. We take for granted that no harm is done and that no harm would accrue from the use of solar energy and the use of windmills, which is not feasible. We take for granted that coal-mining is safe. This book argues convincingly and scientifically (and it is backed up by reputable scientists who understand the question) that the nuclear option is by far the safest available to the human race at present. I strongly recommend this book to members. I will quote one or two points briefly. On page 14 the author discusses the alternatives, as follows:

Besides which, there is no need to "knock coal". Though fossil fuels are far more dangerous than nuclear power, they save far more lives than they take, as does any form of large-scale energy conversion—one need merely compare the public-health statistics of an advanced, energy-intensive economy with those of a backward economy, no matter whether in the U.S. in the past or elsewhere in the present. And the need for energy to maintain the U.S. standard of public health (as well as the general standard of living) is such that we cannot afford, or even quickly achieve, the exclusive use of the safest; we must settle for the second safest and third safest as well.

Further on, under the heading "Poisoning the Entire Globe", referring to the scare tactics of the anti-nuclear lobby, the book states:

And yet, and yet, and yet . . . People just don't like the idea of radioactive wastes being put out of the way for thousands of years, and the reason is one of the many quirks of human psychology: They fear this danger not because it is great, but because it is new. They are used to millions losing their lives in wars, to thousands losing them in famines, and to hundreds losing them in railroad and airplane disasters, mine explosions, floods or hurricanes. But radioactive poisons underground, threatening somehow to get into your food—no matter how absurdly small the probability, it's new, it's a danger that wasn't there before!

The hell it wasn't. There are some 30 trillion cancer doses under the surface of the United States—the deposits of uranium and its daughters. They are not sealed into glass, they are not in salt formations, they are not deliberately put where it is safest; they occur in random places where Mother Nature decided to put them. And they do occasionally get into water and food, and they do occasionally kill people.

It goes on to explain that the number of people killed is relatively small from that source. However, it is there. There is a reference somewhere that life was not meant to be radioactive. The author says, "What nonsense! We are surrounded by radioactivity, and levels of it that are variable." The contribution made by nuclear reactors is less significant, and many times less significant, than that of coal-fired stations. Nobody has ever worried about coal-fired stations. Nobody has done all the research that has been done on nuclear reactors. We know to the minutest degree the radiation which comes from a nuclear reactor. However, the study that has been done clearly indicates that radioactivity emitted from a coal-fired station is about 400 times greater than that from a nuclear station. Furthermore, in America, tons and tons of the ash from coal-fired stations is used as land fill, and it contains much more radioactivity than is allowed into the biosphere from a nuclear reactor.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a statistical fact of life that the production of coal kills scores more people and is a far more dangerous energy system than is the case with a nuclear system.

So that members opposite will have heard something of it, even though they have not got the gumption to read the book, I shall read a further quotation from it, as follows:

"There is nothing we can do about those 30 trillion cancer doses," some people say when they first learn about them, "but at least we need not add any more to them." But we add nothing. We take uranium ore out of the unsafe places where Nature put them, and after we extract some of its energy, we put the wastes back in a safer place than before, though we do put them back in fewer places in more concentrated form.

How concentrated? Within 10 years, more than 99.9 per cent of the original radioactivity of the wastes disappears by decay, and the majority of the waste products then has a half-life of 30 years. In 1 000 years, the wastes are less radioactive than pitchblende (which contains 60 per cent uranium, but also some shorter-lived and hence more intensely radiating elements such as radium). Plutonium, with its half-life of almost 25 000 years, slows the decay process, but it remains there only as an impurity that failed to be recovered for further use as a valuable fuel. And what if the Luddites have their way and dispose of the plutonium unused? Like the proverbial man who killed his parents and then demanded the court's mercy on the grounds that he was an orphan, they want to waste plutonium and then scare people with the long half-life of nuclear wastes.

He is saying that plutonium can be used in fast breeder reactors, it can be almost entirely burnt up, and we have a source of energy that is available for centuries if we go into that technology. Inevitably, the world will go into it. There is no question about that, and nothing the little old South Australian Government can do will affect that.

Mr. Harrison: Nothing you can do.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I hope the honourable member will read this book. It will do him good, because he will know there is a rational side to the argument that he has not heard.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me give the honourable member some statistics he would not be aware of in relation to coal-fired stations. I shall quote from a chapter headed, "Let future generations worry", as follows:

The tens of millions of tons of ash generated by U.S. coal-fired plants every year are dumped in landfills. There is enough coal in the U.S. to last for at least two more centuries at the present rate of usage. But for how long is there enough space where to dump the wastes?

Let future generations worry.

There are no provisions to prevent the poisons in coal ash being leached out by rainwater (they are dumped close to the surface) and creeping into aquifers. The metals in it (selenium, mercury, vanadium and others) do not, like plutonium, have a half-life of 24 360 years; their half-life is infinite. There are carcinogenic (cancer producing) hydrocarbons, such as benzopyrene, among the poisons. How many other carcinogens does the ash contain? How many mutagens (substances causing mutations) are among them?

Let future generations worry.

The radioactivity of the radium and thorium isotopes in coal ash exposes the public to at least 180 times the dose received from nuclear plants of equal capacity and would violate NRC standards if the NRC were responsible for coal-fired plants, but it isn't. The radionuclides contained in coal ash are chemically active and soluble in water; yet the stuff is dumped close to the surface without strict control and without even any monitoring. Will that be dangerous in coming decades or centuries?

Let future generations worry.

I could quote at length from this book, and I hope that members opposite will read it. I will not read all the passages that I think are valuable, but the last quotation I shall read is in the chapter, "Routine emissions from conventional stations", and it is a reference to some of the anti-nuclear lobby, the American crusaders with no scientific background or training, who are obviously not interested—

Mr. Millhouse: Do you believe that everyone who is against nuclear energy has no scientific background?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Many of those who are against it have some scientific training, but I hope the member for Mitcham will read the book, because a number of scientists involved on either side of this lobby are documented in some detail. Scientists involved in the earth sciences and biosciences may have joined the anti-nuclear lobby, but the people who know what they are talking about and who understand the nuclear process are overwhelmingly in favour of that option. The article states:

But that does not make Nader's or Brower's attitude any less despicable. Having flatly declared that the nuclear power issue cannot be left to scientists but must be settled by "citizen activity", they cannot escape moral responsibility for these deaths. It would be callous enough to crusade against a technology that saves hundreds of lives every year, whatever the alleged motivation. But it is vile to crusade against it in the name of safety.

Let this voluble lobby chew on that.

Mr. Dean Brown: I guarantee the member for Mitcham won't read it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he will not, although I hope he will, but he has locked himself into this emotional attitude in the name of humanity, along with his left-wing mate, the former Attorney-General. They are so used in court to making black look white that they do not know the difference between right and wrong half the time. Perhaps that is a little unkind. We have been accused of adopting a purely economic outlook on this matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Listen to the parrots! We are accused of adopting a purely economic view. There are members opposite who are in favour of developing the vast mineral resources at Roxby Downs. Do not let the Government say that its members are unanimous on this matter. If Government members say that, they are hypocrites. We know that members of their Party would like to change the policy of the Party. We know that the former Premier went overseas to get evidence to change their minds. There was a run against him while he was away, and that was the beginning of the end for him. I would be surprised if the Minister of Mines and Energy and some of the people more enlightened on this matter would not like to change the minds of members opposite.

If we argue the matter at the economic level, there can be no argument. The Government does not want to get rid of taxes, because of its blinkered attitude to the so-called wealthy, the people who own a house. The Government does not want to remove land tax on a family home, because that home is owned by the wealthy. What tripe! It does not want to reduce charges on motor cars. Our charges in South Australia are higher than those in the other States, and to put a car on the road here costs three or four times as much as in some of the other States. The Government is getting at the wealthy! It does not want to reduce those charges. What balderdash! It does not want to get rid of succession duties in the case of a home passing from parents to children, because it is taxing the wealthy! What nonsense and what hypocrisy!

If members opposite want to argue this at the economic level, the only way to do that is to get this world class mine going at Roxby Downs. The Redcliff project is looking a bit rosier, because fuel is getting dearer. Do not let us argue solely at that level. We are in the nuclear age, and customer countries will get the fuel. We can do nothing to control the situation, so we might as well sell it. Do not let us argue at that level, because the member for Mitcham and the former Attorney-General would moralise. Let us argue at the moral level.

I would be prepared to argue at the moral level any day of the week. We have a moral obligation to supply not only people in the developed countries with energy supplies, but if we are to improve the lot of the human race we have an obligation to supply any customer country which is prepared to recognise reasonable safeguards in relation to this source of fuel. The human race will kill itself one way or another.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a nice attitude.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It will.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You could kill a few more off, like—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister accepts that. Gas was used during the First World War.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who used it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Both sides.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The rotten Tories.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They had the sense not to use that again. The fact is that we have an obligation, if we are

to improve the lot of the human race, to supply this source of energy.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a typical Tory attitude that you are expressing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is nonsense. The question of the long-term handling of waste, of plutonium, is dealt with adequately in the book to which I have referred. I have not had time to quote that part of the book, but I believe that all members of this House have a responsibility to inform themselves on this matter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We have. That's why we've got the attitude that we've now got.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that the Minister has a closed mind in relation to this matter, as indeed he and other members opposite have regarding other matters, and that is what will bring down this Government in the short term.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Not in your life time, not the way that you're going. You'll bring mankind down the way you're going.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What nonsense the Minister speaks! Will the Minister read this book?

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I greatly appreciate the Government's courtesy in allowing me to speak.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We didn't allow you to speak. You put your name on the list.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, you did. I appreciate the Government's courtesy in allowing me to speak at this point in the debate. For the Minister's edification, the member for Stuart was kind enough to allow me to speak.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me get this straight. When he offered to allow me to speak tonight in his place, the member for Stuart said that I had to say kind things about him. So, I was about to say kind things about him for letting me speak at this time.

Mr. Keneally: My colleagues won't say kind things about me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should have thought that anything I said about the member for Stuart would be taken as a commendation of him. Anyway, I am pleased to be able to speak at this early point in the debate, so I hope that members will let me get on with it.

There is no doubt that the most topical issue politically at present in South Australia is whether or not we will have an early election. I do not believe, unless most exceptional circumstances obtain, that a Parliament should run for much less than its full term, in our case about three years. When the present Premier took over, I was pleased to hear him say the same thing a couple of times: that he thought that, as a rule, Parliament should go its full term.

Mr. Slater: You aren't worried about the next time, are you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will say something about that. I acknowledge that it must be very tempting for the Labor Party at present to find an excuse to call an early election.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There are a number of reasons, and perhaps I can give them. First, there is the lamentable standard of the Liberal Party in this State. There is no doubt whatever that, if an election was called, the Liberal Party would be badly beaten. I do not think they themselves would say anything else.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They don't want Robin Millhouse.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Minister please to give me a chance to develop my argument.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One advantage to the place (and I cannot help answering the Minister, as he has so persistently interjected) is that he will be gone after the next election, whatever the result, and perhaps that will be a good thing.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I've still got 18 months to go.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is perhaps one reason why we might not have an early election! The Minister has a colleague who must also make way for the eager beavers in the Party. We have the lamentable standing of the Liberal Party and the fact that, like the member for Light before him when he was Leader, the present Leader of the Opposition has now had his overseas trip. One remembers that the member for Light, when Leader, had his trip overseas and was immediately executed on his return. Now, we have the present Leader of the Opposition in much the same position. Then, there was what I heard my Federal colleague, Senator Chipp, call the "debacle" in Tasmania last Saturday. There are perhaps other factors that would influence the Government's decision.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about the shadow Ministry? Do you think they would worry us?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot talk about everything in this speech; there will be time later to talk about the shadow Ministry. My own assessment of the situation is that the Government cannot really now afford to call an election until it knows what the Federal Budget will contain. I do not think we could hold an election in time before 21 August, and it would be overshadowed, anyway, by what happened then. However, if it is an unpopular Federal Budget, I guess that we are likely to have an election and that the State Government will use that as an excuse so to hold it. I do not think I am saying anything—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're right: you're not saying anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that is not known to anyone. Even the Minister's departure is probably known only too well to members opposite. I warn the Government that, if an early election is called, one of the big issues therein must be the Premier's state of health. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I make clear that I am sorry indeed that the Premier has had a spell in hospital and about the reasons for it, which we all know. Anything that I say in this way is said with sympathy for and friendship to him. The fact is that it would be quite wrong for the Labor Party to use up Mr. Corcoran as Premier to win an election and then allow him to retire immediately thereafter. That is undoubtedly what it has in mind, because the successor (and, again, I am not saying anything that has not been said one hundred times around this place) will—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's the Liberal grapevine.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not take any part in that.

Mr. Allison: Do you think that Jack Wright has got the numbers?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that. I should have thought that Hugh Hudson, the Deputy Premier, was the one to take over.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He has a good deal of ability. The Liberals should not kid themselves about that. However, he is not the most popular of people, and the ploy would be to use a popular figure. The Premier is a popular figure, who has done much to establish himself in the past few months. I do not think he should be used to win an election and then hand over to a man who is not well known or particularly popular in the community. However, if that is the scenario, the Labor Party will have

to put up with the fact that one of the issues in the election will be Des Corcoran's health.

I pass from that to the subject that I, I suppose like everyone else, like best, namely, myself. Everyone has been busy writing me off as the member for Mitcham. If I go I go, and that is my bad luck. Whether it is the bad luck of other members in this place or the House itself you, Sir, can judge. I can only say that I have enjoyed my time in this House, but there are other things to do in life besides being a member here. The member for Kavel was kind enough to give me a bit of a mention in his speech. I have my profession, and there are, of course, other forms of political activity and other spheres beside the State Parliament.

Since I have realised (and even I can see this) that there is a strong possibility that I will be beaten at the next election, I have been determined to say just what I think on any public topic without being concerned about the consequences. If, as a result, people vote against me—well, so be it. I am quite determined to say and to do what I think is right. I have found out in the past few weeks that some people in the community (and I expect they have been encouraged by others in this place) call me a "stirrer". Maybe I do deserve that title, I do not know, but I do not greatly enjoy it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish, if the Minister and senior members of the Labor Party want to interject, that they would do it singly so that I can hear what they are saying. When I have a battery of questions from the Minister, your Deputy, and the Whip it is rather difficult to hear and answer what they are putting to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I can ask for your indulgence on that one. The sad fact is that in this place someone has to take on the role of opposition to the Government. It should be the job of the Liberal Party, but members of the Liberal Party are so preoccupied with their own internecine strife that they have failed. It has obviously been the policy of the Government to keep the Liberals fat and contented and a docile Opposition, so I have had to take on the role of opposition and for that I have earned the title of "stirrer".

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's not the full title.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is good enough for this place. All I do know is that it has certainly brought me a great deal of work. My workload electorally, both from my own district and from all over the State (both from Liberal-held and Labor-held electorates), has continued to go up and up and up. I sometimes wonder what other members do with their time, the way their constituents come to me for help. Anyway, that is by the by.

Before I go, there is one person whom I particularly want to mention. He has retired and was an officer of this Parliament. I am not sure of his exact status, but he was on the library staff—Mr. Peter Host. Nobody has said anything about him. He was one of the few people who was here when I first started as a member in 1955. At that time there was the librarian, Peter Host and, I think, dear old Jim Ball came a few months later. They were the entire staff. Mr. Host retired during the past few weeks. While he and I sometimes had differences of opinion (I think that he is one of my electors, as a matter of fact), he gave me a tremendous amount of help over a long time and I think something ought to be said in this place in appreciation of the services that he rendered to us.

I am glad that the Premier is here now, because I would like to say something about him and his Government. He

has been in office, I think, since February of this year.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you sure of that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not exactly, but I think it was February. One thing I am sure of is that he waited a jolly long time to get the job and he had awfully bad luck in 1967.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I never ever thought I'd get it, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I bet you didn't. Still, it is an ill wind, and he just dipped out in 1967. If I may say so, it might have been better for the State if he had won (as the Hon. Frank Walsh hoped he would at that time), but that is all in the past. Since he took office he has done everything he can to establish himself as Premier and to give people a very different view of the Premier from that of his predecessor.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He's done a tremendous job, hasn't he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe he has done a very good job in that way; he has established himself. He has appealed to lots of people to whom his predecessor did not appeal at all as somebody who is honest, straightforward and moderate. I give him credit for that.

Dr. Eastick: Do you want him to call the dogs off in Mitcham?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had not thought of that; maybe I had better ask him to stay while I say a few more things.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I can't stand it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said all the pleasant things that I was going to say about him, so maybe it is all right if he goes. Let me pose this question rhetorically: are he and his Government very different from what preceded them? To me, the underlying policies and attitudes, as shown by a number of Ministers, seem to be precisely the same. This Premier says he is not anti-business, but we have had quite a number of instances to show that there has really been no change at all and that the Government is a socialist Government in the proper sense of that word, that it believes in Government control and ownership, despite what it says. We know what happened in the case of Santos, and I will not rake that up again.

We all know that the economy of this State is in a bad condition indeed. Ironically enough, knowing that, I received the other day this marvellous looking glossy brochure put out by the Economic Development Department and called *Development 1979*. Looking at the rather glowering photograph of the Deputy Premier inside and its foreword one would think that the State was doing marvellously well. I venture to think that the best products of South Australia at the present time are the Governmental brochures that are put out, because the reality of the situation is very different from the impression that one would get from reading an expensive bit of nonsense like that. I often wonder who on earth reads such things; I doubt whether many people do.

Let me give a few examples of the difficulties we are having at present. One matter reported in the paper the other day concerned the heavy construction industry. Typical of the *Advertiser*, it was a good story, written by a competent journalist, that was shoved on a back page. The fact is that the heavy construction and engineering industry in this State is on its knees—that is the term that was used to me today when I was discussing this matter. I will repeat the statistics that appeared in the paper the other day. In the past 12 months, the industry has lost 47 per cent of its labourers, 52.5 per cent of the skilled labourers and 30 per cent of the key staff. All these people have been put off because there is not enough work for them. It has also lost 38 per cent of its apprentices. Plant and equipment is under-utilised by 47 per cent; in other

words, it is being used only at a bit over half pace.

I was told (and this may be hyperbole) that in 12 months, if this goes on, there will be no heavy construction industry in South Australia. The secretary of its association said that she has lost one member this week, who has pulled out of South Australia, another member is thinking of doing the same thing, and the only people (and this can be said again and again throughout secondary industry in South Australia) who are doing at all well are those who are working interstate.

While this is happening, the Government is busy taking in its own washing. We have the Marine and Harbors Department building, an overpass at Cavan, and so on. It is absolutely absurd. There seems to be an absolute insistence on not retrenching anybody employed by the Government. Just what is so good about being employed by the Government rather than a private employer, I do not know. The Minister of Transport wrote to the association, as follows:

Of course, this work will be done at cost.

He is referring to work that is done by the Government rather than by private contractor. He continued:

There will be no profit margin, as would be the case if done by a contractor.

Of course, nobody knows what the costs are. I would think it will cost a great deal more, and the Government departments do not have a number of taxation imposts, which private concerns do have and through which they contribute to Government revenue.

That is a very serious situation, and a specific example of it appears in the answer to a question I asked on notice today. I do not know whether anybody has picked this up, but I asked question No. 59 on the Notice Paper about a crowd called Ceramic Tile Makers, and I received the answer to that question today. I had been told that Ceramic Tile Makers had operated for three months, had cost a great deal of money, and had just gone through the hoop. Therefore, I asked a series of questions about this company and received the answers today. The answer was:

The following loans were advanced by the South Australian Development Corporation and they come to \$300 000:

In addition, the Government guaranteed advances by the A.N.Z. Bank to the tune of another \$11 645.

Mr. Dean Brown: This is all old news.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the company was formed in March 1973, and a receiver was appointed in September 1976.

Mr. Dean Brown: I gave those figures about two years ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Davenport will get the leadership of the Opposition in due course; he need not worry about that. He needs only to wait until after the next election. Because of the member for Davenport's impatience, I will now turn to a figure that he could not have given me two years ago, because it is the result of the auction sale of the factory on 8 May 1979. In my question I asked how much the plant had brought, whether the auction was advertised as being of important tile-manufacturing plant which was commissioned in 1976 at a cost exceeding \$1 000 000 and which had been in operation for only three months. The answer I received was, "Yes, proceeds are not yet finalised, but gross proceeds to date total \$33 690". I do not know whether the member for Davenport was aware of that figure and whether he gave it two years ago or not, but that is the figure I was given today regarding the auction sale of the plant. That shows again the appalling industrial situation we have to the north of this city. In addition, the factory was built by the Housing Trust at a cost of \$1 021 000 and

it is now unoccupied; that is a really pitiful situation, yet it is what is happening in South Australia.

Both this Government (and we as members of Parliament) and the Federal Government seem to go on spending money as though it grows on trees. One of the things that really bugs me, to use an "in" word, is the waste we see in Government and in so many areas of public life, but I will refer to that in a moment. There is no doubt that the bigger an organisation the less efficient and the more wasteful it is. We in South Australia have a very small community compared to world standards, yet when one looks at the waste that is apparent, which is bad enough in itself, one wonders what happens in bigger communities such as at the Federal level, in bigger States and overseas. Let me now mention, as I said I would, a few examples. The first example involves semi-governmental bodies. I do not know whether the member for Davenport will get on to the band wagon on this one. Incidentally, I noticed that he did so this afternoon when I suggested sunset legislation. I can tell the member for Davenport that the Government is actively considering it. However, he is going to try to jump the gun by introducing a Bill for it himself.

Mr. Dean Brown: You will appreciate it when it is drafted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Davenport need not try very hard, because he will have the leadership in the bag after the next election, so let him sit back with a little patience and in due course he will move down two positions to his right. I do not know how many colleagues he will have left, but he will get the job, so let him just be patient. I do not think the member for Mt. Gambier will be here either. He faced the expenditure of public money when Cabinet went down to Mt. Gambier, so his electoral chances have not been greatly improved. I now turn to the example I was going to give, which arose from an answer to question No. 49 on the Notice Paper. I informed the member for Davenport that I gave this matter a bit of publicity myself, because I received the answer by letter. However, I asked that the answer be given in the House today so that all members would know. The question referred to something which I believe are called Quangos or semi-government authorities. I was amazed when I received this answer a few weeks ago to find that there were 249 of them in South Australia. It took nearly six months for the Government to work out what they were and to give me the answer to my question which I put on notice in February. Even now, the Government does not know and is not going to find out how much they cost us. The answer I received to my question on how much was paid, and for what purposes, to each by the Government in the financial years 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78 was:

This information will not be provided, because an answer would require considerable effort which could not be justified.

It is probably a good thing that people do not know how much we are spending. Of course, this is not all the responsibility of the present Government. However, the list in *Hansard* shows that a majority of these semi-government bodies were set up in the last 20 years. The answer continued:

It would necessitate production of vast schedules giving details of Government expenditure which would be extremely difficult to comprehend.

I will bet that the final total will not be too difficult to comprehend, but it may take people's breath away. This is an example of the way in which Government has got out of control. In little South Australia (and I say that with due deference to the shadow of the former Premier who said we had to be the pacemakers in everything and that we

were the centre of the universe—that is not so, of course) we have 249 of these jolly semi-government authorities and we do not know how much they cost.

Another example arose when I probed about and received a bit of interesting information about Wardang Island. I was given the tip, again by somebody outside of my own electorate, that vast sums of money were being poured into Wardang Island on behalf of the Further Education Department. Therefore, I asked a Question on Notice, which the Minister of Education answered before the due time, so I received a letter dated 25 June showing that in the years 1976-77, 1977-78 and 1978-79 the Government had spent a total of \$596 553-69, which is just under \$600 000, on Wardang Island.

Mr. Becker: My report was correct, then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps your report was correct. The letter continues:

The project has provided employment and training for up to six Point Pearce residents at a time.

An amount of \$600 000 is pretty good going! The letter continues:

. . . facilities and services for groups to visit the island for education purposes.

I wrote back to the Minister and said that I was staggered at the amount of money spent. I said that I thought that that money could have been better spent elsewhere, and pointed out that on my rough calculation the \$600 000 could have been used for salaries for about 20 teachers for a year. I then received another letter which rather lamely tried to justify the expense. In part, that letter states:

Employment and training since the commencement of work on the island in August 1976, 27 Aboriginal persons have been employed and/or trained for periods ranging from several weeks to continuous employment. Two officers have been employed under the Further Education Act to facilitate on-job training which has provided confidence and skills, for example, welding, painting, seamanship, etc., sufficient for a number to gain employment outside the Point Pearce-Wardang environment.

[No numbers are given; just a "number".]

Seven other persons have been employed on short term contracts to provide specific training and work schedules, e.g., plumbers, electricians, carpenters, builders.

Development of Assets and Availability of Facilities: with such employment and training, the assets of the island have been upgraded to the level described in my letter of 25 June 1979 and are available for use by interested groups. Since January 1977 a variety of groups has visited the island, coming from schools (primary and secondary), universities, colleges of advanced education and further education colleges. Parties of scouts, divers, photographers, fishermen, etc. have also visited.

Total "official" usage from 1/1/77 to 30/6/79 has been 1 067 (including an estimate of 250 persons for 1977). In addition, it is estimated that a further 200 people have used the island for camping and fishing without using the facilities.

I do not suppose the \$600 000 has done them much good. That is the way in which money is being spent, in my view most unwisely. I know that Wardang Island has been a headache to all of us for a long time. What should be done with it, and who owns it? But why, in the name of all that is precious, when we are so hard up in this State for money at the moment, is money being poured into Wardang Island in this reckless way? There is no guarantee that it will stop, and really it has been for nothing. I just do not know what to do except to mention it, and there it is.

Now let me come a bit closer to home—to Parliament House and Parliamentarians. I do not want to go over everything that has been debated in the past six months regarding superannuation, salaries, perks, etc., but I will

say one or two things. Almost the only amusing aspect of the controversy about superannuation (which I still regard as the most scandalous exercise of self-interest by members of both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party) is the letters that I had from members in reply. The member for Light need not worry; I will not quote him again—his reply was one of the silliest of all, but I quoted it in the last session, and will not do so again.

Besides writing to individual members, I wrote to the Parties. The President of the Labor Party turned out to be the member for Price (which I did not know at that time). I had a gem of a letter from Mr. O'Neill, who I understand will come into this place later. I also wrote to Mr. John Olsen, who, I think, cannot get in here quickly enough for the Liberals—the member for Davenport is hoping he will beat him to the post, and from the smile on the honourable member's face he obviously thinks he can. I now come to the letter from Mr. Howard O'Neill in answer to mine.

Mr. Dean Brown: Did you write to your President, too, or don't you have one?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My President was absolutely satisfied with me, I can tell you. Howard O'Neill's letter of 21 February stated:

Dear George . . .

that must be the member for Price—

Your letter of 16 February last and the attached letter from an individual who is not a member of an affiliated body is acknowledged. Under other circumstances the letter from the member for Mitcham may have received some consideration. However, in view of what can only be described as a scurrilous attack on the reputation of our former Premier by that person in the T.V. programme *Nationwide* on Monday 19 February last, I have no intention of in any way assisting the member for Mitcham in what has been portrayed by a cartoonist in the *Advertiser* as scraping the bottom of the barrel.

I find his use of the word "integrity" quite grotesque and doubt if he knows the meaning of the word. His apparent concern for keeping matters "above Party politics" seems strangely out of character with his past activities, which appear to me to have been extremely "party-political" and spread over some four or five Parties during his rather spotty career. I hope you will agree with my sentiments.

Best wishes,

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) Howard

The letter I received from my friend from Price stated:

Dear Sir,

Please find enclosed copy of a letter received from Mr. H. O'Neill, State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party (S.A. Branch) in response to your submission concerning the Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment Act (No. 2).

That was the end of it: it never even hit the deck in the Labor Party. I guess one cannot wonder at that, because Mr. O'Neill, who apparently has the responsibility for fixing the agenda, might soon be a recipient of the large sums we vote to ourselves.

The letter from the Liberal Party was more to the point, and the tone was more friendly. I wrote to Mr. Olsen on 9 February and it took him until 12 March to compose his reply, but eventually it came. The letter stated:

Dear Robin,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 9 February 1979 re Parliamentary Superannuation. I believe the matter to now be one of personal conscience, and therefore each member has to determine their own course of action.

Yours sincerely,

[signed] John Olsen.

The letter was more to the point but did not get any

further. Some members of the Liberal Party replied, guided by their own conscience. I will deal only with some replies—they become boring after a while. I will deal first with the reply from the member for Coles, who wrote to me on 6 December 1978 and stated:

Dear Robin,

In reply to your letter of 24 November, I share your concern about the haste with which the Superannuation Bill was put through Parliament.

She did not do anything to stop it but she shared my concern, so that was something. This is the significant part, and it goes rather wider than superannuation as a key to her career, apparently:

However, I see no useful purpose being served by responding to your invitation to refuse the additional benefits for the simple reason that I do not expect to obtain any benefits from the scheme at all. I expect to retire voluntarily before the time I become entitled to benefits, and therefore your proposal has no application to my situation.

Yours sincerely,

[signed] Jennifer

Mr. Venning: The last letter you will get.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The first as well. It sounds as though the member for Coles does not expect to be here even as long as six years, because she intends to retire voluntarily. This may be the reason why she turned down, as I understand it, a place in the shadow Cabinet, saying (and she was quite right in doing so) that the whole damn thing is a farce anyway and she will have no part of it. When I heard that I looked back and found she apparently does not have the ambition to stay in Parliament and lead the Party, which some people ascribe to her.

Let me mention the member for Fisher, because he has written me a number of quite direct, almost rude, letters. He used to start his letters by saying "My dearest Robin", but I asked him not to do that; I did not like it. In his letter to me of 23 February he said in part (and I read this just to show the abysmal ignorance that the member for Fisher has of these matters):

I know that people who are in business or professions can use forms of tax avoidance and use facilities of an office which reduce their operating costs as a member of Parliament, whereas a person on a set salary has none of these privileges, and trying to justify your own position or mine would be fruitless.

Just what schemes of tax avoidance the member for Fisher thinks could be used (and the implication was that I could use) I do not know. If that is his outlook on business and professional people, whom he is supposed to represent in large measure, I pity him and I pity his Party. It is no wonder that he is out of the shadow Cabinet.

I will leave superannuation and come to the question of Parliamentary salaries. I have been criticised again for what I have said about this matter, but I have said (and I stick to it) that I believe that we as members of Parliament and therefore as leaders in the community have an obligation to set an example of restraint. I was fortified in that view by a number of things by economists that I have read in the last few months.

Mr. Arnold: Do you have the same philosophy in relation to your legal fees.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You had better ask some of my instructing solicitors whether they think I charge moderately or not. I try to charge moderately, I believe that I charge less than some, but one tries to charge a fair thing.

Dr. Eastick: Do you charge for your services when you're down there and should be here?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course I charge when I am in court, if that is what the member for Light is suggesting.

There is no secret about that. Let me suggest (and we have had this debate many times) to the member for Light that I do make some contribution of significance in this place. I do manage to keep up with my work, and I am satisfied I do that. If my constituents do not like it, they can push me out. That is well known, and I make no apology for it. The member for Light is, in his usual rather heavy manner, going on and on and on. I would like to get through just a few more things. He will no doubt have a chance in a little while to speak himself.

Let me now give some justification for the view that I have taken that we ought to set an example, and you are one of those who wrote to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, calling me "elitist" and all sorts of things. Let me now give the justification for this, and I hope that members on both sides will take this seriously. This is an article which appeared in a publication called *In Unity* put out by the Australian Council of Churches and which was written by Professor John Neville, of the University of New South Wales, about inflation. In this place we have a hell of a lot of prating about inflation and unemployment, and how this Government or that Government has to do something about it, but it comes back to ourselves. Listen to this:

Inflation today is different. It still arises because people want more goods and services than the economy is capable of producing, but the mechanism which produces inflation is different. What happens now is that everyone wants an increase in income, and these increases in income in aggregate add up to more than the total increase in income that the economy can deliver.

I will skip a few sentences. It then continues:

The greater the level of unemployment the greater the moderation in income claims, at least by the majority earners and profit makers. But unlike the case where inflation is purely demand-determined, the moderation in income claims induced by high levels of unemployment takes a long time to wind down the rate of inflation and unemployment may have to be kept at a high level in order to prevent the rate of inflation from rising again. Thus, in a real sense, inflation in Australia today is the result of the unwillingness of many of the community to moderate their demands for large incomes. It is not just wage earners demanding higher incomes that are the problem.

He goes on in this way, and I will give the member for Hanson a few more references if he wants them to much the same thing, but this set it out pretty clearly—clearly enough for me to understand:

Unemployment is an immoral way of combating inflation in that it puts almost all the cost on one group in the community—the unemployed. A far better answer, if possible, would be voluntary moderation of income claims. Very few people in positions of leadership, in government, in unions, in professional associations, and very few people in the community generally seemed to be prepared to work for this.

That is the very reason why I said what I did and why I am disappointed that other members (because we are all examples, or could be examples, in the community) were not prepared to follow the lead. I will say no more about that. The honourable member for Hanson can justify himself if he likes but he knows, as I know, that what I have read out is spot on. It is absolutely correct, and if we or someone in the community do not set an example and take a lead in this, no-one will, yet we prate about unemployment. I have heard him prate about unemployment and inflation and so on. He is not prepared to take the lead in doing anything about it. When he speaks, let him justify himself.

The other example on waste here which I want to mention (and the member for Kavel got into a bit of

trouble with one of the Ministers beforehand for mentioning it) is the trip of the member for Whyalla. I do not propose to canvass it at any length, because I do not believe that the member for Whyalla is unique. I think he was damn silly to have put in such a report as he did and then to put it around. It was on my table for three weeks. I was not going to read it until someone outside asked, "Have you seen that report and what is in it?" I then looked at it, and every time one looks at it one sees something else. I looked at the part about his visit to Paris, and saw that he calls the Cathedral of Notre Dame a colosseum. I think he meant a mausoleum. Then he went on to say:

Apart from that aspect, Paris lived up to its name. I must mention that I did visit the palace of Versailles, where Louis XXI ruled France.

They only got up to XVIII in 1830 and I believe, if my history is correct, that the Palace of Versailles was built by Louis XIV in the eighteenth century. I did not pick that one up until tonight, but of course the whole thing is a damn travesty. We will get together tomorrow in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to pick three more people to go on these jolly study tours overseas. The Parties take it in turn to decide whose turn it is to nominate two and whose turn it is to nominate one, and whose turn it is to go. I know, because I was in the Liberal and Country League at one time, that there is a good deal of competition to get the trip. To send the honourable member for Whyalla overseas apparently to investigate tourism is just absurd. He cannot do that, nor could many of us. If we are going to do this, why cannot we just say, "All right, we are going to vote ourselves holidays overseas from time to time" instead of resorting to subterfuge like that?

Mr. Gunn: Would you take a trip if it was offered to you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and I never have.

Mr. Becker: But you won an American Government trip.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was offered the trip by the American Vice-Consul in this State. I was offered a leader grant such as many other people from other countries have been offered by the United States Government—and my word I took it! It was offered to me by the United States. I believe (and the honourable member for Hanson might like to know this) that it was offered first of all to the then Premier, Mr. Steele Hall, and he said, "No, I cannot." They offered it to me, and I understand that the reason why we were offered it was that we were rather admired at the time for our stand on the franchise for the Legislative Council, which caused a good deal of heartburn in the Party. I understand that was the reason, but I must say that I never inquired too closely. This was offered to me by another Government in a recognised way, and I had no compunction at all about taking it. I went to New Zealand as Attorney-General to a conference of Attorneys in Wellington, but apart from that I have never had a trip overseas at the expense of the taxpayers of this State. I never want to have one, unless I could thoroughly justify it, and I certainly could not. These so-called study tours cannot in any way be justified.

Sometimes I despair about the future of this country and of mankind. I do not know whether I will have time to reply to all the garbage that we have heard tonight from the member for Kavel and earlier from the Leader of the Opposition about uranium, and so on. I may get to that, but to me it is as clear as daylight that Australia is heading for an extremely difficult period, and there are, above all, three big problem areas. They are the areas of unemployment, industrial relations, and energy.

I do not know why we do not spend more time trying to solve these problems than we spend dealing with the petty sorts of things that I suppose I have dealt with and other speakers so far in this debate, as well as the Speech itself, have dealt with. These are the great problems that face us in Australia, but we are doing virtually nothing except talk about them and justify each other, ourselves, or something like that.

A few weeks ago I got the report of the State Energy Research Advisory Committee. We find that in this State (and it is set out as though it was a great achievement) the Government has spent a total of \$380 498 on research on 20 projects, but even in South Australia there were 74 applications for research into alternative forms of energy. The total request was for grants of \$1 350 000. I guess that some were madcap and did not deserve to be funded. However, when we think that, of 74 applications, only 20 were funded in South Australia in two years, at less than \$400 000, it really is piffling. I am not suggesting that we in South Australia can solve the world's problems and find alternative energy sources, but I believe we could have spent much more than we have. The money we wasted on Wardang Island would have trebled the amount if we had spent it on energy research instead.

The argument that we have about uranium wears fairly thin and we go over the same things again and again. Each side thinks that it is right and that the other side must be absolutely wrong. There are ways of getting further energy apart from uranium. I do not know whether members ever read or see the *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, but to me it contains the best articles on the economy and the most readable articles by economists that I come across. I suggest that members may care to look at the June 1979 issue. It is put out by Flinders University and I think one of the young Ministers, the Hon. Mr. Bannon, was on the editorial board at one time, although his name has gone now. The article to which I refer is an excellent summary of our situation. One thing that I have marked and wanted to quote is on page 2. Professor Dick Blandy is the editor, and I think he writes these articles. The one to which I refer states:

The crux of our problem is, fundamentally, not economic at all, but political. It revolves around our capacity to evolve institutions which will subordinate sectional vested interests to the common good.

He goes on to quote Doug Lowe, the Premier of Tasmania, and this may appeal to some members opposite. He deals with one matter and then he states:

We would endorse, therefore, the views of Premier Lowe stated in the *Australian Bulletin of Labour* last year that the survival of our Parliamentary democratic system must involve a change in our political and economic institutions over the remainder of the century which will diminish their fundamental orientation towards conflict and increase their ability to formulate consensus.

I know that members take pot shots at me, and so on, and I know that I get difficult, quarrelsome, silly, and all the things members say about me at times. However, that article is what the Australian Democrats are on about. That is what we want done. Although I am not a good example of it, I wish we could get more of a spirit of consensus rather than talking all the time the sort of nonsense we hear across the Chamber from Ministers. The member for Davenport, who is waiting to speak in the debate, is one of the worst offenders on this side, and it may be that I am not too good at times. The Minister of Transport is another.

It is so idiotic for one side to say black and for the other automatically to say white. There is no need to tackle our problems in that way. That is not a new warning: it has

been given many times. Sir Mark Oliphant said that the two-Party system may well be the death of Parliamentary democracy in Australia. Although I may not be the best person to say it, that is what I sincerely believe.

I come now to what to me is far more important than anything I have talked about or anything that we in this place ever talk about. I refer to the wider world picture. We in Australia spend most of our time trying to get more for ourselves as individuals, groups, and a nation. We are not alone in this: I suppose every country does the same. We do not give much thought to people outside and we do not acknowledge how fortunate we in this country are. All that we do is try to get a bit more, get into office, or something like that, yet, when we think of the problems in the world, we should be ashamed of ourselves. We should think of the Vietnamese boat people and the fact that one in three of them drowns in getting away from their own country, and we should think also of the hundreds of millions of refugees in the world. We have no conception of these things. We argue about things day after day and enjoy it, but we do not get anywhere. We are utterly selfish in these things.

Finally, I will quote something that I found moving. I do not know how many members see the *New Internationalist*, but I get it.

Mr. McRae: An excellent publication, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. This issue celebrates the Year of the Child, references to which we see on the Minister of Education's letterhead, etc. I will read a statement by a child in Accra, Ghana. This shows how lucky we and our children are. The child states:

My name is Kweku. I am 9 years old. A lot of people call me a small boy, but I live alone. My work is that I sell chewing gum around the Orion Circle at cinema time. Plenty boys and girls come buy the "PK" before they see cinema. I don't go to school. I don't go because I don't have money. My mother died before they born me. My father nobody know. Some woman give me milk when I am a little baby, now I am old so I work. I sleep in the far night at 2.00 a.m. sometimes 3.00 a.m. morning time. I no have sleeping house. I sleep at the lorry petrol station. I buy goods they sell on road.

The world for sick proper. I want 1979 to have no war and no children born like I am. I suffer plenty. You don't get soap, sugar and plenty plenty things. I want 1979 to bring house for us and water for village people to drink. Don't take photo of me. I don't want white man to see me dirty.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): In replying to His Excellency the Governor's Speech, I join with him in expressing appreciation of the outstanding service to South Australia by the late Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Justice Travers, Mr. Harding and Mr. Hawker. As Parliamentarians, they served our State and the community well.

I welcome the commencement of a new Parliamentary session. During this session, and at the next election, three key issues will be dominant. These are the lack of economic development and the high unemployment in South Australia, the rise in State Government taxes and especially those based on property values, and industrial strikes and trade union power.

All properties in the electorate of Davenport have been revalued during the past two years. As a result of those valuations, land tax and water and sewerage charges have escalated greatly.

The recent revaluation of properties in the Burnside district increased values by an average of 122 per cent. Whilst many doubled, a large number increased by more than that—some more than trebled. Although value

equalisation has meant the percentage increases in land tax and water and sewerage charges have been less than the increase in property values, there have been increases, and most have been substantial and unjustifiable.

One cold night during threatened power black-outs in June, 750 residents from the Burnside district packed into and overflowed the Burnside Town Hall for a public meeting on property valuations and the associated charges for water and land tax. That meeting passed three resolutions which called for—

1. the reassessment by the Valuation Department of property valuations in the Burnside district, especially where objections had been lodged;
2. the abolition of land tax on residential properties; and
3. the adoption of a water pricing system based on the water used, rather than property values.

Property valuations are arbitrary and subjective. Market values only reflect what one person is prepared to pay for the property, if it is for sale, and in most instances it is not for sale. Unimproved value, being the value of the land without improvements, is even more subjective. As the Burnside district is now almost fully developed, it is unrealistic to calculate the value of all land by the market value of a very few vacant blocks.

The Valuation Department's assessment of unimproved values seems to be ridiculously high, especially by comparison with the total capital value and the cost of building houses. Many people were astounded to find their respectable homes valued at only \$20 000 or less, but their modest block of land valued at \$55 000. In one case a 14-room stone house was valued by the Valuation Department at only \$8 000, yet the block of land was valued at \$112 000. Perhaps the valuers should find out the cost of building even a Housing Trust home. Property values cannot be accurately assessed, no matter how good the valuer, from the footpath. This highlights the subjective nature of the valuations.

The Premier claimed the valuations were not excessive. How does he account then for properties selling in the past six months for well below his Government's valuation? I give two specific examples. First, a five-room house in Erindale sold in November 1978 for \$34 750, and again in March 1979 for \$34 750, the same price. However, the capital value determined by the Valuation Department was \$42 000, or 20 per cent above market value.

Secondly, a three-bedroom house in Hazelwood Park sold in March 1979 for \$65 000, while the capital value assessed by the Government was \$70 000 or 7.5 per cent above market value. These are just two of hundreds of valuation injustices which will cause unfair and unjust additional taxation being imposed on residents for the next five years, unless corrected now.

However, the method of valuation with these inherent weaknesses is only part of the problem. Even more subjective is how these valuations are used. Land tax, based on unimproved value of the property, is an iniquitous tax, especially on residential land. This tax is inequitable as it takes no account of the ability of the resident to pay. It could possibly be justified as a tax to discourage people hoarding vacant blocks of land or maintaining, unnecessarily, large areas of land. The Liberal Party has indicated clearly its stand on this tax—land tax will be abolished on all properties of half a hectare or less used as the principal place of residence by the owner.

It is worth noting the situation in the other States. South Australia is the only State that has a full land tax on the land where the principal place of residence stands. In New South Wales, there is complete exemption from land up to half an acre in size. In Victoria, no land tax is payable for a

property or land valued at less than \$33 000, and there are exemptions above \$33 000. In Queensland, no land tax is paid on the principal place of residence if it is less than 2½ acres. In Western Australia, the situation is very similar. In Tasmania, there is total exemption on the principal place of residence if it has an unimproved value of \$30 000 or less, and there is a partial exemption above \$30 000. Therefore, South Australia is the only State in the whole of Australia which maintains a full land tax on the land associated with the principal place of residence.

The progressive nature of land tax, where the tax rate escalates with the value of the land, is also quite unjust. For land not exceeding a value of \$10 000, the tax rate is 1 cent for each \$10. For land valued at \$50 000, the tax rate is 2.6c for each \$10. So, if land value increases five times, the amount of tax collected by the Government increases 13 times. With this progressive tax, the aggregation of all land values for land held under common ownership, and the taxing of multiple holdings at the tax rate of the aggregated value, the State's Premier and Treasurer starts to look like Ned Kelly.

Property values are also used to assess water and sewerage charges. For some time I have argued the stupidity of such a system. In June I was heartened at the release of an Engineering and Water Supply Department report which indicated that charging for water on the basis of property values was encouraging waste of our scarce and precious water resource. The report revealed the inequitable nature of the present charging system. Residents of home units were effectively paying 41c per kilolitre of water used, while residents of houses paid only 21c. The effective cost of water to residents varies between suburbs. The Burnside average was 22.6c per kilolitre, while the average price for the whole of Adelaide was only 20.8c per kilolitre in 1976-77.

Incidentally, only 50 per cent of residents used the full amount of water for which they were charged—another case of public theft. The report suggested that water should be charged on the basis of the amount used. This recommendation was a major step forward in the fight for a fairer water charging system. I shall continue that fight. Common sense and the future good of the State must finally prevail.

Taxes and charges based on property values are now having a crippling effect on many residents, especially those on part pensions or fixed incomes, and there are many of those in Davenport. Since 1974, general costs have inflated by 79 per cent. However, based on escalating property values, payments to the State Government for water, sewerage and land tax have increased by much more. Water and sewerage revenue has increased by 114 per cent, the cost per kilolitre of water by 120 per cent, and land tax receipts by 130 per cent.

There is no doubt that these property taxes and other taxes are inhibiting initiative, confidence, and consumer spending. It is time Government learnt from the experiences of California, where millions of dollars were redirected from the Government coffers back to the taxpayers' pockets through a 57 per cent cut in property taxes. Californians called it "Proposition 13". Despite predictions of increased unemployment and economic depression through reduced Government expenditure, the reverse has actually resulted. In the first year following the tax cut, California's private sector generated 552 000 new jobs. Personal income rose about 14 per cent, well above the national average. New homes built exceeded even the most optimistic forecasts. The level of unemployment improved. Certainly, the Government was forced to tighten its belt and to become more efficient and less

wasteful, but public services did not collapse as predicted by the proponents of "big government". The South Australian Government could achieve much by applying the Californian tax-cut principle here.

Mr. Groom: Why don't other States in the United States follow them if it is so good?

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't they? They have.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is interesting that the member for Morphett could be so ignorant about what is occurring in the United States, especially as the fact that other States have followed suit is well reported in the local newspapers.

With that Californian experience in mind I turn now to economic development and employment opportunities in South Australia. Late last year most were optimistic of a gradual improvement in this State's economy as a flow-on from the national improvement. As Parliament commences another session, and as the Premier prepares the State Budget, it is appropriate to review the past 12 months.

While every other State in Australia created new jobs during the past 12 months (March 1978 to March 1979), South Australia lost a total of 4 000 jobs. This State was the only State not to employ more people than it did a year ago. At the end of May, South Australia had 7.9 per cent of its work force unemployed, while the Australian average was 6.1 per cent. There are about 38 000 people looking for work in this State.

The rate of growth of population is now a critical factor in determining the level of economic activity in key areas of the economy, such as houses built, demand for teachers, and the development of public utilities. During the last 12 months, South Australia was the only State to have a net migration loss, including both overseas and interstate migration. The claim about people deserting this State for greener pastures is obviously correct. We lost over that 12-month period a total of 1 700 people. If we include births with these figures for 1978, our population growth rate dropped to 0.55 per cent compared to a national growth rate of more than double that. It was the lowest growth rate for South Australia since the depression.

Future job opportunities in South Australia will depend largely upon the development of our manufacturing and mining industries compared with that in other States. Figures recently released by the Federal Government show that this State had only \$255 000 000 committed to new investment in manufacturing and mining industries, representing only 2.1 per cent of the national total, even though we have over 9 per cent of the national population.

In the short term, this lack of planned capital expenditure will be offset by an increased demand for both consumer goods and exports. High agricultural returns (up 50 per cent last year) through better product prices, and a good season, have helped improve domestic markets. Many manufacturing companies must be congratulated on their efforts to increase exports. There are other achievements and successes which must not be overlooked.

This brief review of the State's economy and employment opportunities is gloomy but, I think, realistic. No doubt the Government will claim it is knocking South Australia, but it is not; it is being realistic as to where South Australia is heading under the Government's present policies.

We must not become depressed. Over the years, South Australians have developed a reputation for their toughness and persistence under hardships. Our State is not the most blessed State for natural resources and development potential, but it is certainly not the least blessed. The disappointment is that we have potential,

opportunities, abilities, and determination which are not being utilised.

Most of all, we need a renewed inspiration from our State's leaders and Government—a confidence in the future, a feeling of achievement, a purpose in tackling our problems, and the strength of unity. Just look at some of the possibilities.

At a glance, local manufacturing industry will be disadvantaged by the new energy crisis. With local industry exporting a majority of its production to interstate markets, marketing costs of our manufactured goods will be increased and their competitive position eroded. However, rail transport is more energy-efficient than is road transport and must be encouraged.

Adelaide's rail handling facilities for containers and other goods need to be completely upgraded and modernised to increase efficiency and to reduce handling times and costs. The standardisation of the Port Pirie to Adelaide railway line must be given a very high priority. South Australia is the natural despatch point for goods travelling to the Northern Territory. The rapid completion of the railway line to the Territory is essential. South Australia could become the central point of a national distribution network by rail.

Greater priority should also be given to the completion of the Stuart Highway by both the State and Federal Governments.

The State Government must withdraw from its absolute dominance over private industry which has stifled and even strangled development. Much of the legislation which is largely ineffective in its operation but expensive to administer should be reviewed and amended. Many of the regulatory boards come within this category. Much of the consumer legislation could be more effective and cheaper to operate if presented in a different form. The Builders' Licensing Board is one classic example.

The preoccupation with Government involvement has created a severe imbalance in size between the public and private sectors in South Australia. With a rapidly expanding Government work force and static private employment over the past eight years, an increasing tax burden has been imposed on private industry and individual taxpayers. That tax burden has retarded development. Surely the Californian tax cuts hold the solution. The State Labor Government needs to change its entire attitude to contracting of Government work and the role of private industry within our economy before this imbalance can be corrected.

Sunset legislation should be established to ensure a constant review of the efficiency and operations of all Government boards, authorities, and committees on a regular basis. Parliamentary approval should be required before such a board is allowed to operate for another 10 years. I am pleased to say that it is my intention, as indicated in the House earlier today, to introduce a private member's Bill to put sunset legislation into effect here in South Australia.

Procedures need to be adopted to ensure a more detailed examination of legislation before it is adopted by Parliament. The procedures should include the use of cost-benefit studies, a report on the continuing costs of administering legislation, and greater use of Parliamentary Select Committees.

With the change in the world price for oil and gas, the Redcliff petro-chemical plant should now become a certainty. A heavy responsibility lies with the State Government to ratify an indenture agreement and to supply the infrastructure as soon as possible. The co-operation of unions must be sought at the beginning to minimise delays through industrial disputes.

In an energy-deficient world, the Labor Government must lift its ban on the mining of uranium within South Australia. It should direct its attention and efforts towards specifying rigid standards to ensure safe mining, utilisation and disposal of uranium wastes. This State has contributed nothing towards the safer use of uranium. By lifting the ban, the development of Roxby Downs and other uranium mines, and the construction of an enrichment plant, it could create major new employment opportunities and renewed industrial confidence.

As part of the new leadership role the Government should take on, it should grant new financial incentives to existing industry in South Australia so that our industry is more competitive on national and international markets. All additional employees given jobs within a company should be exempt from pay-roll tax for that year. In addition, the base exemption from pay-roll tax should be substantially increased to assist the many small businesses that exist.

During the financial year just completed, the State Government gave \$10 400 000 to arts, film and cultural activities, but only \$2 800 000 to assisting industry. The little offered to industry was not used, as it was mainly offered to new industry, and rigid restrictions were applied. For example, although \$1 900 000 was allocated this year to the industry establishment scheme to attract new industries, only \$142 000, or 7 per cent, was used in the first eight months because of those restrictions.

Financial assistance to industry should be allocated to all industry, and especially existing industry. This can best be achieved by lowering Government taxes and charges (such as car insurance and registration, land tax and licence fees) and by granting general exemptions on pay-roll tax. It will be easier to make existing local companies more competitive than to attract major new industries to the State.

The Premier must withdraw the proposed amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. It is the worst industrial legislation proposed in South Australia in the past 40 years. If passed, its effects on job opportunities will be devastating. The Premier has been warned of its consequences, but has recently restated his intention to proceed with that legislation.

With record youth unemployment and a 27 per cent drop in new apprenticeships over the past two years, but with a predicted shortage of most trade skills, the State Government must show initiative, and change the apprenticeship scheme. The Liberal Party has proposed a new scheme of industrial and commercial training to operate in conjunction with the existing scheme. This scheme will be shorter, more flexible and cover broader areas of training. It also enables practical retraining to cope with the problems of rapid technological change. These are just some of the many challenges facing the State of South Australia and its Government. There are many more.

Six months ago, when Mr. Corcoran became Premier, he promised that recovery of the economy would be his number one priority. Since then, he has made some sympathetic and down-to-earth speeches. But speeches will not produce economic recovery and jobs. Government action and a change in key Government policies are essential.

Finally, I turn to the current wave of industrial strikes, about which two features are outstanding. First, certain unions are using the strike as the initial move in an industrial dispute, whereas traditionally strikes were used as the last resort. The traditional unionists used to apply four conditions before a strike was contemplated. There had to be a just cause; there had to be a real possibility of

winning the issue; there was to be no violence; and the strike was to be used only as a last resort. Unfortunately, strikes are being used as a political weapon by the extreme left-wing unions. In doing so, the rank and file union members are being used and manipulated by militant union leaders.

Mr. Keneally: Which left-wing unions and which militant union leaders?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I hope that the honourable member will listen, as I am about to name the unions and the leaders.

Mr. Keneally: Telecom, I suppose.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member's interjection is interesting, as the member for Stuart was reported on the Australian Broadcasting Commission as encouraging railway workers to stay out on strike. It is the member for Stuart who, because of his absolute dominance by the trade union movement, is prepared to put union matters ahead of the interests of this State. The second feature is that many of the strikes are held without the support of the majority of union members. In many cases, members are not even consulted about the strikes. "Our organisation told members 'You have no say. The decision is made.'" Mr. John Scott, Stat Secretary of the A.M.W.S.U., is reported as having said this at the Trades and Labor Council meeting on Friday 22 June 1979, when he condemned other unions and unionists who did not participate in a national stoppage. The A.M.W.S.U. leadership was not interested in democratic principles or the views of the rank and file members.

The obvious failure of the two recent national strikes highlights the resentment and lack of support coming from the majority of union members towards the strike demands of their militant union leaders. These two undesirable features are causing the community to think again about the rights of trade unions. Union leaders claim that their members have a right to strike, but they conveniently ignore the public's rights and the rights of union members to determine whether they strike. What has happened to the right to work?

A recent Gallup poll showed that a clear majority of the community, whether Liberal or Labor voters, whether young or old, had no sympathy with strikers. Over 75 per cent of people were unsympathetic towards Telecom, postal and oil refinery workers on strike, and between 65 and 72 per cent were unsympathetic towards railway workers, other public transport workers, and air traffic controllers on strike. The use of strikes as an industrial and political weapon places an obligation on the rank and file union members and on this Parliament. The obligation on union members is that they insist on a vote before a strike, and that they attend and express their opposition to the strike.

The obligation on this Parliament is to pass legislation that will enable the union members present at a meeting to vote according to their wishes rather than be directed by fear and mob pressure, as currently occurs. Although those present at a strike meeting may request a secret ballot, few would dare. It is not unusual for such requests to be completely ignored by those running the meeting. It would seem reasonable to require a secret ballot on a motion relating to a strike. If this Parliament had the courage to grant such protection to individual union members, many more of them might feel encouraged to attend and express their opposition to strikes.

On the same basis, most union members would endorse a compulsory dispute-solving procedure before workers could strike in essential services, such as public transport and the power industries. Compulsory conciliation, followed by arbitration and a fixed cooling-off period,

should precede a strike that may cripple the functions of the community. A majority vote of at least a certain percentage of workers would need to support a strike before it could actually occur. Then, at least the Minister of Labour and Industry could not claim that he was unaware of a pending strike.

I urge the Labor Party members of this Parliament to consider such measures, as their prime responsibility is to the community, not to the union hierarchy.

Australia has the opportunity to be a great nation, and South Australia the chance to share in the undoubted benefits. As a nation and State, we will need maturity, sacrifice and unity to reach this goal without being distracted by the dictates of the detractors. It is up to us.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I take this opportunity to air a concern of mine about Government wastage of money in the field of fisheries research. The problem area to which I refer concerns the research vessel *Joseph Verco*. On 23 September 1976, the Minister of Agriculture announced that the Government had decided to purchase a 75ft. (22.86 m) vessel, a former tuna pole fishing vessel, for fisheries research. The Minister, in announcing that new purchase, stated:

The vessel is capable of staying at sea for several weeks at a time. It has radar, radio and echo sounder and accommodation for 10 people and a crew of four. Present planning is for the vessel to operate for up to 200 working days at sea a year.

This vessel cost the South Australian taxpayers \$300 000. Since then it has had considerable refitting and other things done to it.

What good is this vessel doing the South Australian fishing industry? Is it a white elephant? Is it a burden on the South Australian taxpayer? Just what do we have in this vessel? We have a large, ocean-going vessel tied up doing practically nothing. I say that advisedly, because we have heard of nothing but hundreds of thousands of dollars being spent on the vessel with little or no return. This matter is of concern to the fishing industry. When the vessel was commissioned the Minister of Agriculture stated:

The cruise programme for the *Joseph Verco* for the rest of this financial year [1977] will concentrate studies on prawns, rock lobster, whiting and snapper with work also being done on blue crab abundance (as these are caught at the same time as prawns) and on abalone.

The fishing industry to which I have already referred is well established. It was established by fishermen, who have been able to get the optimum return from this industry. It was not good enough for the Government to continue on that basis. At that time the prawn fishing fee issue arose, and the Government said that prawn fishermen were making too much money.

As a result of that, I inquired of the Minister in charge of fisheries, on 12 September, what were the operating costs of the *Joseph Verco* for the 12-month period ending 30 June 1978. The figure given was \$182 653. That is considerably in excess of the average income of a prawn fisherman who operates for the whole season in prawn fishing. That was not all. I then inquired how many days

this vessel was at sea. The reply I got was that for the 12-month period it went to sea on 96 days. I should explain that "vessel at sea" means being away from the Port Adelaide wharf.

Whilst the vessel was tied up at Port Lincoln and at other ports all around the State, it was considered to be at sea. We must seriously ask just how much practical work this vessel has done during the past 12 months. I then asked what was the cost of the operation of the vessel while it was at sea. In reply I was given the staggering sum of \$1 126 a day. That is taxpayers' money which is used to operate a vessel for what result? I then asked about the slipping charges and the maintenance charges which, incidentally, were \$17 053. On asking what alterations were made in relation to equipping the vessel and the cost of this work, I was told that a trawl winch, a rock lobster pot hauler, a prawn trawl rig and a cork nozzle and propeller were added amounting to \$71 774. Therefore, the cost to the taxpayer is mounting, and we must seriously ask of what benefit this expenditure is to the industry and to the South Australian taxpayer. We must also seriously question whether or not the South Australian Government has bought a pup. The industry cannot substantiate this expenditure.

When this vessel was first purchased, there was considerable support from the fishing industry. The industry believed that this was the vessel it needed and that it could be used to inquire into new industries. However, that was not the case. As an example, I recently heard that the *Joseph Verco* left the Port Adelaide wharf and toured down south. I will not give the specific direction in which it went, because that might identify its actual mission. It had to anchor part-way because the hours of the skipper were up. Therefore, it anchored while the skipper had his so-called required rest. It then continued on to get some water samples.

The Minister and the department attempts to claim that this vessel is an asset to the South Australian community because the original cost of \$300 000 is now worth \$750 000. Therefore, we had a \$750 000 vessel running around collecting water samples. Incidentally, I believe they went down to collect three water samples but one bottle fell over on the way back so they returned with only two bottles.

This is a massive cost, and a full-scale independent inquiry should be conducted into the operations of this vessel. No Government department can afford to allow such a wanton waste of public money to continue. This expenditure cannot continue, and I strongly suggest to the House and to the appropriate Minister that there be a full-scale independent inquiry into this white elephant and the cost it incurs to the taxpayer.

The cost so far is in excess of \$1 000 000, and it has produced practically no results whatever. There have been no tangible results to benefit the prawn industry, the lobster industry or the abalone industry. How many days work has this vessel done for each of those specific industries? More to the point, how many days work has it actually done in looking into new industries? If it were doing that, it would be achieving a useful purpose.

The biggest crunch of all came when I was recently informed that a \$250 000 refit was currently under way. I have just explained that we spent about \$71 000 on it last year, and now another \$250 000 is being spent on it. One must seriously question the Government's priorities when it looks to wasting money on a vessel which is not achieving any results. It is not carrying out a detailed research programme; the Minister and the department have not given us any details of that research programme. There is no real aim or objective. This vessel must be a

severe embarrassment to the Government, and something must be done about it.

I cannot see how any Minister can say "Where will we cut expenses?" when we have absolutely wanton waste going on in this way. I repeat that this Government should immediately implement an independent inquiry into the cost and operations of the *Joseph Verco*, because it is a white elephant and a burden on the taxpayer of this State. The situation cannot go on and, unless the Government is prepared to act in this way, it cannot seriously claim to govern the State in a rational way.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter which I consider is of great importance and which has received far less consideration, let alone action, than it should have. I refer to the general field of preventive medicine and to the general field of fitness research and training considered in its role of preventing sickness and disease and in its role of helping the recovery of people who have already suffered sickness or disease, in an orderly and efficient manner. In doing so, I wish to be as totally objective as I may.

Therefore, I am very deliberate in saying that in no sense am I referring to any particular political Party or Government, State or Federal, in what I say. This is not, I repeat, not, an exercise in point scoring. It is, I hope, a positive and constructive contribution. Every member of the House knows the enormous cost to the nation of the provision of health and hospital services. It represents an enormous percentage of our State Budget and, likewise, an enormous percentage of the expenditure of our total national funds.

It would follow then that any expenditure that could responsibly reduce the present total cost without reducing the current standards of care must be well spent. However, it is appalling to consider that only 1 per cent of our total health expenditure goes towards these aims. I have been very fortunate in receiving tremendous help in the past three years from the Adelaide based Institute for Fitness Research and Training.

The excellent medical attention and the friendly, expertly prepared and effectively planned fitness programme were quite beyond anything I could have reasonably expected and at a very modest cost. There are other members of this House who will warrant the same, and one at least, the member for Gilles, already has done so in an address to this House.

Far more importantly, there are thousands of people in the community who, as a result of the careful research and services provided, have benefited greatly, some in quite a spectacular fashion. In the case of those being rehabilitated, it would be, I suppose, foolish for anyone, let alone a layman, to guess the saving to the taxpayer. Surely, in the case of those who have not yet suffered any serious illness, it would take a veritable ostrich to ignore the gigantic savings that must have been made and will continue to be made. Likewise, surely only the same ostrich could ignore the gigantic capacity for saving were the programme properly entrenched and enlarged.

In saying all this, I wish in no sense to reflect in any way on those surgeons and physicians who work in the health service and to whose expert care I owe everything and could not be more grateful. However, they would surely join me in saying that prevention is always better than cure and, quite apart from cold cash, the tremendous benefits of a fitter community, in mind and body, must surely be obvious.

In these circumstances, I am positively appalled at the situation which has befallen the I.F.R.T.; not only has it not been enlarged, it has been effectively cut back 40 per

cent by the withdrawal of medical benefits from its programme. That, surely, is the most retrograde step that I can think of. Surely, it is the most negative, backward thinking to gain a small temporary saving at an almost certain future enormous cost.

I might say that anyone who has been at the I.F.R.T. well knows that the structure is not feather-bedded, and certainly the professionals, if they wanted to make a dollar, could make it more easily and more quickly in many other places. After so much progress, to throw half of it away is madness. In my view, that is just as silly as if the nobles who fought King John had got his signature on the *Magna Carta* and then proceeded to tear it up. I therefore make a plea in the strongest possible terms for members to join me in ensuring that, by non-partisan co-operation, State and Federal Governments will not only right the present wrong but ensure a firm, more vigorous future programme.

I now turn to another matter that I consider it is high time I raised—the question of workers' compensation benefits in South Australia. It has often been claimed by the member for Davenport and his colleagues that these benefits are too great. Such statements, I have said before, are absolute nonsense, and I repeat it again tonight. It is a disgrace that, because of the campaign wilfully, wrongfully and stupidly maintained by the member for Davenport and his cohorts, the ordinary working people of South Australia have had their workers' compensation benefits reduced, traduced to a lower level than that provided by that Fascist dictator in Queensland.

In Queensland at the moment the benefit is \$31 550 and, in addition, \$7.50 for each child under 16 years of age. In Tasmania, a smaller and poorer State than South Australia, the sum is \$32 000, and in Western Australia it is \$44 000. In 1973, when the total maximum pivotal sum of \$25 000 was introduced, the average weekly earnings were \$110 per week. As at December of last year, they were \$212 per week. The absolute minimum that the working people of South Australia demand in all justice is that the sum of \$25 000 pivotal payment become at least \$45 000 and, more realistically, \$50 000. It is a disgrace that that has not occurred up to date, and I call on sensible and thinking members of the community to ignore the stupid and absolutely unjust campaign that has been run by the member for Davenport and his colleagues and cohorts elsewhere to downgrade just workers' compensation benefits in this State simply for their own industrial purposes.

There is no question that the member for Davenport, in the light of the figures I have quoted tonight, can suggest that industry in South Australia would be hurt by at least bringing the figure up to a level approximating that in Western Australia or Queensland, or even by fixing a midway figure. The campaign that has been waged by that honourable member (and I have said it to his face) is a disgrace to his Party and to himself. It gives no justice and no fairness at all to the ordinary working people of South Australia. They have no superannuation or other proper insurance to fall back on. They rely on we legislators to give them decent and just minimum compensation, and that is all it is.

Even the sum of \$45 000 that I am talking about does not represent many years of total salary at current average earnings. It is high time that people in the community saw through the smokescreen that has been put up by the member for Davenport and his cohorts in relation to this matter. It is just as stupid as the campaign that he wanted to wage last year in which he tried to convince the people of South Australia (and, to my incredulity, managed to convince some of them) that the housing costs in this State

were greater than those in the Eastern States. I can remember his saying that many times in this House.

From the replies that I got and also from my own independent survey in Sydney and in Melbourne I realised what categorically I had known in the first place. The whole thing was a pack of nonsensical statistics. The reality was that the cost of any comparable land and home in Sydney and Melbourne was far, far greater than the South Australian counterpart. It is on the basis of such lies and half truths that the honourable member has been able to downgrade the status of the workers' compensation legislation of this State.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member for Playford—I should not use the word "honourable"—the member for Playford has just accused me of telling lies and half truths, and I ask him to withdraw that.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will withdraw the word "lies".

Mr. McRAE: I certainly will withdraw the word "lies" and say it was an untruthful statement on the part of the member. He knows that to be the case, and he was pleased to be able to use that point of order to cut down my speaking time so that I could not get on to some of the other points that I want to make.

However, he will not be successful, because in the Address in Reply debate I shall be dealing with him and some of his colleagues at greater length in relation to this topic. I will not be browbeaten by the honourable member. I will make sure that people in the community know what he has been up to over the past few years and the nonsense he has been going on with. The people will realise how foolish he has been. I conclude by demanding that this Act be amended.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has concluded. His time has expired.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Earlier we had from the member for Mitcham yet another hypocritical presentation, and the sheer hypocrisy of what the honourable member was saying in relation to the need to show restraint in respect of increases in wages and salaries is borne out by the fact that when regulations were tabled in this House on 21 February 1978 dealing with the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1975, the Supreme Court rules, 1978, scale of costs for legal practitioners, and again on 12 September 1978 when the rules of court, Local Courts Practitioners Fees, were presented to this House, the honourable member did not take the opportunity available to him (or any other member) to move a motion of disallowance of those increases that would have the effect of increasing the salaries and allowances of the legal profession.

I say quickly that I am not averse to legal practitioners and am not singling them out. I am merely making the point that the honourable member, who called on every other member of this place and on everyone in the State to show restraint, showed no restraint himself in relation to the profession that nets him a considerable part of his income.

Normally, I have tremendous respect for the South Australian Housing Trust, and I hope that that respect is something that I can have in future. However, I must draw attention to a circular sent to tenants. It was a revised form of lease for commercial properties and was distributed by the trust in June 1978. In particular, I refer to new clause 2 (z) (a), quarterly report. I ask members to listen carefully, because this is an indication that 1984 has arrived already. The circular states:

Within fourteen (14) days after the expiration of each quarter ending March June September December during the

term hereby granted to certify in writing to the trust the amount of gross receipts of each and every business conducted on or from the demised premises (including but not limited to the gross receipts of any arrangement involving any licence assignment transfer mortgage pledge under lease or parting with possession or of granting rights in respect of the demised premises or any part thereof) during the immediately preceding quarter.

For the purpose of clause (z) (a) "gross receipts" means the total amount of money or moneys worth received by or on behalf of the lessee or any person or body (whether incorporated or not) without any deduction being made for costs expenses and liabilities incurred by the lessee or such other person or body in connection therewith or otherwise.

This will require a person who leases commercial premises from the trust, on a quarterly basis, to indicate to the trust the total income of that business undertaking, and that information will then be used, one can only guess from the nature of the other terms of the document, to determine the rental of those premises on the conclusion of the two-year lease permitted.

This is a direction of the Government, and as such I call upon every Minister and member of the Government to have this matter withdrawn, and withdrawn promptly. We cannot, in the interests of businesses, large and small, create a situation whereby a person's ability to perform shall determine the rental he will be called upon to pay for his premises. We have a situation that was outlined by my colleague the member for Davenport only a few minutes ago, in which nothing is being done to increase business confidence in South Australia and, indeed, the clause to which I refer will destroy confidence in the business area.

I am in complete accord with the general basis of that clause, should a business undertaking be seeking some consideration for a reduction in rental from the South Australian Housing Trust. If a person were seeking a concession and, therefore, a discrimination which is not available to other people in the community, I would expect that those sort of details would necessarily be made available to the authority. I strongly deplore such a situation, which adversely affects people who are going about their business undertakings and are prepared to rent a property with a rental value based on its capital valuation, with a due business percentage attached thereto, and meeting that rental. If a person is capable of employing a greater number of people without causing damage to the premises, and if he is able, by his business acumen, to make a greater return than are others, that is his business and his business alone, provided he makes the details available to the Federal taxation office.

I ask the Minister responsible and all Ministers to take heed of new clause 2 (z) (a) on quarterly reporting, which is an indictment against the Government. It is certainly not something that is going to bring about the business confidence that we need so much in this State. The member for Mitcham earlier today indicated that he had received an answer to a Question on Notice showing that a large firm, Ceramic Tile Manufacturing, with premises previously constructed by the South Australian Housing Trust, was lying idle because of unfortunate business activities. Other business premises are affected, and I suggest there will be many more in the future if this clause is allowed to remain. I ask members opposite to use any influence they have on their Minister to have it withdrawn promptly.

I refer now to a very cruel article which appeared in the *Stock Journal* of 26 July 1979. The article, headed "Chatterton still backs biological control for salvation jane", is by John England, and it is a falsification of the facts. I compliment the Minister of Agriculture for having

heeded the strong representations put to him by the apiary industry that the decision taken at the Christchurch Agricultural Council meeting in January of this year, relative to the biological control of salvation jane, be rescinded or reconsidered. I have taken deputations to the Minister. I was party to a major conference held about two weeks ago in the Agriculture Department involving the Minister, the Director, the Deputy Directors, a large number of members of the senior staff of the department, representatives from Waite Institute and representatives of a cross-section of the apiary industry, when the matter was duly discussed, revealing the problems that exist or will exist in South Australia if biological control of salvation jane comes into effect.

I understand that the Minister will be seeking to have that decision of the Christchurch meeting withdrawn when

the Agricultural Council meets in Perth on 5 August next. I am of the opinion, from details provided to me by the apiary industry and by members of the Agriculture Department, that this statement attributed to the Minister of Agriculture was never made, nor is it at this stage a decision which has been taken. It is a cruel comment made against an industry which is a major one on the fringe of agriculture in South Australia, and I deplore it.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 1 August at 2 p.m.