

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 9 August 1979

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

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) BILL

At 2.1 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendment No. 2:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon this amendment and the House of Assembly make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 13, page 7, line 13—Leave out “such term of office not exceeding five years” and insert “a term of office of three years”.

And that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos. 5, 6 and 7:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon these amendments and the House of Assembly make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 18, page 10, lines 13 and 14—Leave out “the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette* as” and insert “regulation”.

Lines 19 and 20—Leave out “the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette* as” and insert “regulation”.

Lines 22 and 23—Leave out “the Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*,” and insert “the Governor may, by regulation”.

Line 26—Leave out “published by the Minister”.

Line 28—Leave out “notice” and insert “regulation”.

Line 29—Leave out “published under that subsection”.

Line 30—Leave out “Minister shall not publish a notice” and insert “Governor shall not make a regulation”.

Lines 45 to 47—Leave out subclause (8) and insert subclause as follows:

- (8) Where a determination is in force under this section, a further determination, that comes into force before the expiration of three months from the day on which the former determination came into force, shall not be made.

And that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 8:

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

As to Amendment No. 9:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon this amendment and the House of Assembly make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 15—After line 9 insert new clause 29a as follows:

29a. “*Appeal to Local Court against decision of Tribunal*—(1) Subject to this section, an appeal to a Local Court of full jurisdiction against any decision or order of the Tribunal may be instituted by any person who was a party to the proceedings in which the decision or order was made.

(2) An appeal under this section must be instituted within one month of the making of the decision or order appealed against, but the Local Court may, if it is satisfied that it is just and reasonable in the circumstances to do so, dispense with the requirement that the appeal should be so instituted.

(3) The Local Court may, on the hearing of an appeal under this section do one or more of the following, according to the nature of the case—

- (a) affirm the decision or order appealed against;
 (b) quash the decision or order appealed against and substitute any decision or order that could have been made by the Tribunal;
 (c) make any further or other order as to any other matter as the case requires.

(4) No appeal shall lie against a decision or order of the Local Court.”

And that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 10:

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

As to Suggested Amendments Nos. 1 and 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon its suggested amendments, and the House of Assembly make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 18, page 9, line 45—Leave out “and”.

Page 10—After line 4 insert paragraph as follows:
 and

- (d) the value of any motor spirit sold by the applicant or, as the case may be, a member of the applicant’s group during the relevant period (being a relevant period commencing on or after a day fixed by regulation for the purposes of this paragraph) that is to be used otherwise than for propelling road vehicles on roads,

And that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to. I am pleased to be able to report that wiser counsel prevailed and we were able to find satisfactory solutions to the points that had been raised by the Legislative Council.

Amendment No. 2 sought to amend the period of time of appointment of the appeal tribunal from a period not exceeding five years to a fixed term of five years. It was pointed out to the Council the difficulties that could flow from such an inflexible approach. Accordingly, the Council accepted the compromise of reducing the period from five years to three years but with a fixed term. It seems that the flexibility that the Assembly insisted upon was overcome to a large extent as a result of that.

Amendment No. 3 was to require the tribunal to be a judge, a magistrate or a legal practitioner. Again, the Council was informed that such an inflexible approach could create difficulties in the future. Without saying that the person appointed should not be a judge, a magistrate or legal practitioner, the Assembly held the view and still does that there should not be that inflexible approach, and that view was accepted by the Council.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6 and 7 all relate to the one matter of fixing by legislation the amount that the Minister may determine from the point of view of the taxation under clause 18 (4) and subsequent clauses.

The legislation presently provides that the Minister will fix the taxation by publishing a notice in the *Gazette*. The Council took the view that the Minister, and the Government, ought not to be able to raise revenue without the approval of this Parliament. I said that the Government would have no objection if it were done by regulation; that would provide the same flexibility as a notice in the *Gazette*; that was accepted. I believe that that was the key that meant that the conference did not break down, and it also meant that the inevitable result that I talked about last night did not occur.

Mr. Chapman: Where?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said it in here.

Mr. Chapman: I know you did: you often make wild statements in this place.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have an idea that the managers from the Legislative Council thought I was serious this morning, particularly since two of them have not got preselection.

Amendment No. 9 is the appeal provision that the Legislative Council wanted to insert so that appeals against a decision of the tribunal could be contested in the Supreme Court. The Assembly has attempted, and certainly the Government has attempted throughout, to keep the whole of this legislation out of the arena of the law to the greatest extent possible; but, by the same token, it wants to ensure that justice is seen to be done and is done. It was finally agreed that there could possibly be some areas of dispute where an opportunity to appeal against a decision made by the tribunal could be necessary. So the amendments presently before members show that the conference has agreed that the Legislative Council's amendment No. 9 will not be insisted upon, but there will be a new clause which will simply provide for an appeal against the decision of a tribunal to be heard in the local court; more important, it ensures that that decision is final and is not to go any further.

Amendment No. 10, about which the House of Assembly was not all that fussed, related to the provision that no liability should attach to the Commissioner, tribunal or an inspector if he is acting or purporting to act in accordance with the powers prescribed within the legislation. Because the clause is not of sufficient importance to constitute an argument, the Assembly is not pressing any further with that matter.

The final point that is contained in the report deals with suggested amendments; it must be borne in mind that the Legislative Council, under the terms of the Constitution Act, does not have the power to deal with financial matters. The subject matter of the suggested amendment, which was finally agreed upon in a different fashion (and in this regard I pay due respect to the member for Torrens for his contribution), related to the question of exempting from franchise tax any motor spirit that is used for other than road vehicles. We in this place had, as honourable members all know, previously canvassed this matter at length. The Government indicated, and I certainly did, that I was not unsympathetic to the desire to exempt motor spirit in exactly the same way as diesel fuel had been exempted, but at this stage no provision exists for that to happen.

A suggestion was put forward at the conference about how an exemption might be attained. The managers from the Upper House wanted that provision written into the decisions of the conference and also into the legislation. It would be quite irresponsible of the Government to do that, because no-one knows how, or if, the provision will work, at what cost, how much cheating will occur, and 101 other associated things. I have assured the managers, and I also assure this House—

Mr. Gunn: Thank you.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You do not have to thank me. I assure the House that the Government will do what it said it would do; that is, we will require our officers to look at the suggestion that has been put forward and to report as soon as possible on the practicability of either adopting the proposal put forward or, alternatively, adopting some other proposal, if it can be found to be workable. I stress as strongly as I can, as I did at the conference, that I am not optimistic that this will be found to be workable. Nevertheless, that pessimism will not be reflected in the

Government's desire to require the officers to report as soon as possible. The Government will then take a decision on the report of those officers.

In the meantime, to give an indication of the Government's genuine approach to this matter, it has been agreed to insert a new provision (*d*), which will not, however, come into effect until it is proclaimed to do so by regulation. I draw to the attention of members the wording "after a day fixed by regulation for the purposes of this paragraph". In other words, it is a machinery paragraph that has been inserted in the hope that a solution will be found. If a solution can be found, it will simply be a matter of bringing this new clause into operation by regulation. If a way cannot be found, the provision will simply lie there until the legislation is next before Parliament, when it would presumably be repealed. I commend the report of the managers to the House.

Mr. WILSON: I support the recommendations of the conference. The conference was a good one, and the managers from both Houses did everything in their power to reach an agreeable compromise. The question that hung over the conference, of course, was the whole constitutional question. In other words, if compromises were made that would make it easier to challenge the legislation in the High Court, that would not be advantageous to the legislation or the State.

I believe that the compromises that have been reached are excellent, since all parties left the conference feeling pleased about the result. Before the Bill went to conference, it contained three particular provisions that gave the Opposition and the people of South Australia much concern. The first was the Government's unfettered power to accrue additional revenue over and above what it would have received from road maintenance charges, without any brake on that power. Secondly, there was the question of B class licensees, the small business people, the service station proprietors, who would be subject to another licensing system and another licence fee.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We've changed that.

Mr. WILSON: Yes, I will come to that. Last, there was a question of off-road use of motor spirit. Regarding the Government's unfettered power to accrue additional revenue, as a result of the conference, whenever the Minister wishes to exercise his powers under the provision that allows him to set the price upon which the tax will be levied, that can be done by regulation, which means that the regulation will have to come before Parliament. That is a protection that the people demanded and received.

Regarding B class licensees, because of the agreement by the Government and particularly because of the negotiations in the conference, those licensees, the service station proprietors, will receive relief under the Motor Fuel Distribution Act, as the Government accepted last night. That is an important point.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should confine his remarks to the recommendations of the conference.

Mr. WILSON: It is a point that needed to be made. Regarding off-road use of motor spirit, as the Minister has said correctly, a clause has been inserted that will enshrine the undertaking that the Minister has given to examine this matter closely. Once again, we are faced with constitutional problems here and it would be better if all States agreed about this. The Opposition accepts the Minister's assurance that he will get his officers and legal advisers to examine this question closely and that he will introduce legislation as soon as he can. Because of that, the conference agreed to enshrine that promise in the legislation under clause 18 (*d*).

Because of the action of the Opposition in representing

the views of the public on this Bill, the Government has agreed to certain provisions and has agreed that the undertakings to the public in the Bill as first presented did not provide what was required. Because of the action of the Opposition in both Houses, this has now been achieved.

Mr. TONKIN: I wish to add briefly to what the member for Torrens has said, because the recommendations of the conference represent a considerable change of attitude by the Government. In my view, they improve the Bill considerably and the action of the Opposition and of the Liberal Party has prevented the Government from taking advantage of escalating fuel prices to increase its revenue far above the amount that would have been obtained from road tax. I believe that the Opposition has stopped a tax hike of remarkable proportions and that, by requiring that the determination be made by regulation, at least it is bringing the matter back to this Parliament. That is a fundamental procedure that should be adopted on all taxation matters, particularly this one.

I was pleased to hear the Minister's assurance about exemption for petrol for non-road vehicles. I accept that assurance. I also accept that there may be difficulties. Once that assurance has been given, I am certain that the Minister and his department will do everything possible to ensure that a workable solution can be found. Indeed, I am certain that the matter will constantly be brought to the Minister's attention until such a solution is found. The Liberal Party, in my view, can take great credit for keeping the Government honest in this regard by protecting the taxpayers and, more particularly, the motoring public from what would have become an exorbitant and totally unjustified imposition of State taxation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's totally untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WILSON: The Minister implied that the Legislative Council was influenced in its deliberations at the conference, because of the threat of an election. The Opposition will not be influenced by threats of an election when it considers legislation, but will consider that legislation on the basis of what is best for the people of South Australia.

Motion carried.

Later:

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

PETITION: MOUNT GAMBIER SEWAGE

A petition signed by 114 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to provide adequate treatment for Mount Gambier sewage, as detailed at the hearing of the Public Works Committee in Mount Gambier on 27 September 1977, was presented by Mr. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

A petition signed by 53 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation that provided for the legal sale, cultivation or distribution of marijuana was presented by Mr. Mathwin.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

A petition signed by 48 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 was presented by Mr. Allison.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

STATE'S ECONOMY

Mr. TONKIN: If the Premier really believes, as he said yesterday, "that the responsibility for an up-turn in the economy of this State lies fairly and squarely with the Commonwealth Government", why did he say, on taking office six months ago, that the State's economic recovery would be his Government's number one priority, and why are the other mainland States doing so much better than South Australia under identical Commonwealth policies?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the Leader had listened attentively to what I said yesterday, he would know that, although I did say that the economic up-turn in this State lay fairly and squarely with the Commonwealth Government, I added that there was a limited amount that the State Government could do to assist. That is what I meant when I said (when I became Premier of this State) that we would do what we could, as a State Government, to see to it that economic recovery took place in this State. The Leader must surely understand that. I do not think that anybody in this State would have expected me to be able to lift the economy of this State in such a way that it would have outdistanced that of every other State. Even the Prime Minister often claims that he is not entirely responsible, for example, for inflation because of things happening on the international scene. The Leader knows that; he has heard the present Prime Minister and the previous Prime Minister say that. A similar situation applies to the States equally, and he knows that. I went through the whole range of things with which the Government is involved in relation to assisting industry in order to try to inspire confidence in the people who in fact, to some extent, dictate what the economy of this State will be. The Leader knows that; that has been done, and I will not go over it all again.

Mr. Tonkin: Well, why are the other States doing better?

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the third day on which I have had to speak to the Leader about interjecting after he has asked his question.

Mr. Tonkin: He's not answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader knows that, when the Speaker is on his feet, interjections are definitely out of order. This is the third day on which this has happened. I will warn the honourable Leader if he continues in this vein.

NATIONAL COACHING SCHEME

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Community Development say whether the National Coaching Accreditation Scheme announced last month by the Federal Government will have any effect on the coaching scheme already conducted by the Recreation and Sport Department in this State? From a study of the National Coaching Accreditation Scheme it appears that there is some duplication of the scheme already operating so successfully in this State and no doubt of schemes operated in other States.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: Although the honourable member is quite correct in drawing attention to the similarity between the two schemes, I do not think it can be said that they are duplicating each other. In fact the national scheme will complement and support the coaching accreditation programme that we have been running in South Australia for the past four years. I suppose that if imitation is the sincerest form of flattery the fact that the national scheme is so closely aligned to the method of operation and the principles that we have had in our State coaching scheme can be seen as that sort of compliment from the Federal Government department.

In fact, Federal officers came to South Australia in the course of preparing this scheme to talk to officers in my department and look closely at its working. I think they openly admit that they have based the national plan on our South Australian example. I think it is worth mentioning that, in the four years it has been operating, our scheme has trained over 1 000 coaches in 24 sports, and about 700 at the basic level and a further 100 at the advanced level have passed the course. A third stage due to come into operation in the next year will provide even more highly skilled coaches.

I think it is fair to say that already the results are showing up. If one looks at the performances of South Australian sportsmen in a whole range of sports at the national level, particularly in the so-called minor sports, and looks at the proportion of them represented in national sporting teams, one can see that (and we believe largely because of this coaching programme) several highly skilled athletes are making their mark. We were not surprised that the Commonwealth in attempting to develop the national plan took the principles of our scheme and operated them.

I am certainly pleased that the Federal Government has introduced this scheme. We have been pressing for it to do that and it has now taken it on. We have been pleased to co-operate in helping it establish the scheme. I suppose my remarks here can be seen in some way as a counterweight to stringent criticisms I am making about the resources that the Commonwealth is putting into sport. It is only a pity that it does not add to efforts, such as this national sporting scheme, the finance that is needed at the national level to really create a proper national sporting plan. Unfortunately, that just does not seem to be possible while the present Federal Government is in power.

URANIUM

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier accept that there could be significant economic gains to South Australia in mining uranium now from the Honeymoon and Beverley deposits near Lake Frome? We could alleviate some of South Australia's current economic ills if a decision was now taken to mine uranium. Attention has been drawn to Roxby Downs simply because it is of world magnitude and the economic benefits that could flow from—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want the honourable Deputy Leader to comment. He has asked his question, and he was granted leave to explain it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was explaining the reason for attention being focused on Roxby Downs. The fact is that Roxby Downs is a mine of world class and ultimately—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader went further than that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me proceed to explain that other uranium deposits have been discovered and proved in South Australia, namely, the Honeymoon and Beverley

deposits near Lake Frome, and these are of some immediate economic benefit to the State. In a recent speech Mr. Norton Jackson said that Beverley could be operating within three years with production lasting eight years. In that time the mine would produce \$700 000 000 of product which would be disbursed as \$260 000 000 in operating expenses, \$160 000 000 in pre-production expenses, \$120 000 000 in taxes, \$10 000 000 in royalties to South Australia, and \$150 000 000 to repay capital and profit. On site it is estimated that there would be 260 wage earners.

The Honeymoon deposit could be producing within one year (if we started now) of the uranium ban being lifted. It is a much smaller deposit than Beverley but would still have an annual income of about \$38 000 000 and royalties would be about \$1 000 000 annually.

It is also a fact that South Australia has the lowest percentage (2 per cent) of funds committed to mining and industrial development of any mainland State. The equivalent commitment in the Northern Territory is 5 per cent; in Victoria, 13 per cent; in New South Wales, 14 per cent; in Western Australia, 42 per cent; and in Queensland, 33 per cent. The comment on Roxby Downs has been to the effect that, even if the ban was lifted now, we could not get into uranium mining. The fact is that there are now mines which have been proved and which would be of economic benefit to the State if a decision to lift the ban was made today.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The first point I make in reply to the honourable member is that he assumes, of course, that if mining commenced in both of the mines that he referred to there would be a source of sale for that uranium. My understanding of the situation is that new contracts for the purchase of uranium have not been made for some time. I draw his attention to the *Australian* dated 9 August which contains a report on the Ranger sale. Indeed, we wonder why the Federal Government is getting out. It might not just be that it wants to capitalise on its investment; it might have some other reason. The report is headed "Ranger sale faces cold shoulder as glut looms". The Deputy Leader has not applied himself to this aspect because it does not suit his argument. What is apparent is that the Deputy Leader would sell his soul for the mighty dollar. He knows that the policy of the Government at the moment prevents the mining of uranium in this State. I believe that at least 50 per cent of the people in South Australia agree with the Government's policy relating to the mining, treatment and use of uranium. I do not believe that this Government will ever be in the situation in which it will apply the sort of approach that the Deputy Leader would obviously apply if he were in the seat of power. I draw his attention to this article, because I doubt very much that the demand is such at the moment that people would open up and exploit the mines to which he has referred.

UNDER-COVER PARKING

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of providing covered facilities for commuters who park vehicles on railway property? Constituents of mine complain that vehicles are being damaged because of constant exposure to the weather. It has been suggested that, with lock-up car park facilities being made available at a nominal rate of rental, vehicles would be protected from exposure and vandalism.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have the department consider the suggestion to ascertain whether it is practicable, and I will report back to the honourable member.

STAFF MORALE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say what is being done to restore the morale of the staff employed in the Economic Development Department who are unable to fulfil their charter because of the restrictions imposed on them by the anti-business policies of this Government?

It is common knowledge that, despite the untiring efforts of the skilled public servants who are charged with the economic development of this State, their endeavours are continually being frustrated by the policy decisions of the South Australian Government. More than one senior officer of the department has been told by potential investors that they will not risk any venture in a State which dispossesses shareholders of their lawful property, which is overburdened with Government regulations, in which the governing Party contemplates repudiation of business contracts, and in which Government contracts are proposed to compete with the private sector.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart is out of order. I hope that the honourable member for Eyre does not continue commenting.

Mr. GUNN: I think that the Premier understands the question, and I await his reply with interest.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand the honourable member, he mentioned repudiation of contracts; I would like him to be more specific about that. I do not think the honourable member quite knows what he is talking about.

I am not aware of any morale problem in the Economic Development Department. As the honourable member knows, that department is headed by Mr. Bakewell, for whom I think every honourable member in this House would have a great deal of respect. The Minister of Economic Development, the Deputy Premier, has never in any way indicated to me that there is a problem such as the one to which the honourable member refers.

Mr. Mathwin: He would not listen anyway.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is no doubt that the honourable member was referring to the legislation involving Santos. It is remarkable that I have never heard any comment from the many business people to whom I have spoken that the State's reputation has been damaged in the way suggested by the honourable member. Indeed, I think that the honourable member will find, if he goes into the community (and he can go to people in business, finance, commerce or whomever he wishes), that there is a large measure of support for what the Government did in relation to Santos. Certainly, the Santos Directors, apart from Mr. Bond or his representative, would tell the honourable member that. The honourable member knows that the Government demonstrated that it was prepared to stand up and be counted when a natural resource, and particularly an energy resource, was under threat in this State. That is what the Government did. The Government makes no apologies to anyone for that action.

I do not believe the honourable member when he says that the Government's action has affected morale in the Economic Development Department. I will certainly make inquiries to establish whether the honourable member is just flying a kite or whether specific statements of this kind have been made to senior officers to whom he has referred. I will check that out and let the honourable member know whether there is any truth in the matter.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. HEMMINGS: I wish to ask an intelligent question.

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

Mr. Mathwin: That is impossible for him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is out of order. That is the second occasion.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Planning provide the House with up-to-date information about present holdings of water in the State's reservoirs? Everyone will be aware of the dryness of the current winter season, and I am sure all consumers would appreciate knowing the likely position of the State's water supplies in the coming summer.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member's question was received as intelligent, and I trust I shall be able to give an intelligent answer. At the beginning of the week (and that takes into account the remark that I heard the member for Eyre make regarding the fact that it has been raining for two days), the metropolitan reservoirs held only 38 per cent of their total capacity compared to the figure at the same time last year of 45 per cent. In the country storages, the difference between the two figures is much more marked; the present holdings of 45 per cent can be compared with 84 per cent at the same time last year. From this, it can be seen that extensive pumping programmes from the Murray River will be needed this year.

However, I point out that no water restrictions will apply in the coming summer, despite the fact that to date the State has experienced an extremely dry winter, generally speaking. The rains of the past week, referred to by the member for Eyre before he shot through, have been of some use, but they have represented only about 1 per cent of current storages. I also point out (and I think it is interesting) for the benefit of the House that it looks at this stage as though the department will need to pump about 211 600 megalitres of water, which is substantially more than the entire capacity of all metropolitan reservoirs.

Mr. Hemmings: What will that cost?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Undoubtedly, the cost will be a factor, and I will refer to that later. I understand the interest of the honourable member in the cost, and I am pleased that he has raised that matter, because for some time the Government has been engaged in a campaign to educate South Australians and try to get them to understand the high cost of providing the water that we all expect to be able to control at the turn of a tap. The supply of water costs the State a large amount in capital costs that must be paid over very long periods and, in the history of the operation in this State, that has resulted in the fact that we must get closer and closer to providing for a proper return from the water that the people use. I think the honourable member will be interested to know that we will be relying on the Murray River, unless there are long and late rains, for 83 per cent of the water that we will need in the metropolitan area. The figure throughout the whole State would be about 70 per cent of the total amount of water we will need for the season. The estimated cost of power for pumping alone is more than \$6 000 000, and during the past year we spent \$2 800 000. That shows that, unless we get late rains, there will be an additional cost to the State. I and, I think, all other members, believe that those figures show how vital to South Australia are the current moves to have enshrined in legislation the fact that the River Murray Commission should be responsible for the water quality in the Murray River, not individual States or any one State. That could not be borne out more than by the figures that I have given. They show how the major percentage of our water, in a possible dry year,

discounting rains giving a boost to our storage capacity, is such that it is four-fifths of the State's water needs. I also point out to the member for Napier and other members that we will continue the campaign, to which I have referred, to try to get people to manage their water demands. That is the term that I prefer to use, and I believe that it is the one recommended in the major report brought down on the future water needs of South Australia.

Mr. Slater interjecting:

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

URANIUM

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question is to the Premier, and it is further to the question asked yesterday by the member for Eyre about Roxby Downs. If, as the Premier said yesterday, he believes that it must be possible for technocrats to come up with the uranium safeguards demanded by the Australian Labor Party, what specifically are these safeguards and what is his Government doing to ensure that they are satisfied by the technocrats? I will quote briefly what the Premier said in reply to the member for Eyre yesterday, as follows:

I believe that, if sufficient pressure is put on technocrats or on customer countries which will be relying on uranium to produce power or for use in peaceful purposes, it may well be that the policy of the Labor Party and of this Government can be satisfied. We know that technocrats may come up with technology that will in fact satisfy the safeguards we demand.

We know that it is possible; it must be possible.

So far the Premier has not outlined any safeguards, and certainly he has not outlined what his Government is doing—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was quite in order in asking his question and in reading the statement from *Hansard*, but now he is commenting, and I do not intend to let him do that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In the reply yesterday, I could see no reference to how the safeguards will be achieved by the technocrats.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not propose to tell the honourable member how technocrats will achieve the safeguards that we have spoken about so often. I imagine that is the task of the technocrats. Surely, he does not expect me to be able to tell him. If I knew that, I would not be sitting here, but would probably be making much more money elsewhere. Regarding what the Government is trying to do to satisfy the demands made in relation to safeguards in the mining, treatment or use of uranium, the honourable member would know that guidelines have been drawn up in connection with the mining of uranium, and they are still in existence. He would also know that there is a Uranium Enrichment Committee (I think it is called), which has met and which keeps in touch with technological advances and the latest techniques in relation to the treatment of uranium, and, no doubt, the necessary safeguards.

Mr. Dean Brown: What are the safeguards?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Davenport to order, and this is at least the second occasion on which I have had to call him and one of his colleagues to order this week.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He also knows that the former Premier (Mr. Dunstan) made a journey overseas at the beginning of this year and presented a lengthy and detailed report to this Parliament of what safeguards were expected and what were looked at. The honourable

member may shake his head. I draw his attention to the speech made in the House by the former Premier on his return from overseas. He took experts with him, and the honourable member would see from the report that a detailed and close examination was made of the advances in technology that had been made in the countries he visited regarding the safe disposal of waste material from the use of uranium used in producing power. That was done specifically to check whether or not these were satisfactory and whether they would meet the policy of the Party. The answer was clearly, "No, they would not."

I do not intend to foreshadow for the honourable member what further studies the Government will take in due course to check whether any advance has been made. We can and will keep in touch to see whether there is any advance. I will not go over the whole matter again. I refer the honourable member to the former Premier's speech, in which he will see what sort of things were looked at and what sort of things we would expect to happen before we would consider uranium and the disposal of its waste to be safe.

COMMUNITY WELFARE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare confirm that he has approved of a change in the name from McNally Training Centre to the South Australian Youth Training Centre and say whether the change has given a new emphasis to the department's programmes? In the Address in Reply debate last night the member for Glenelg kept referring to McNally, and he continues to use the name McNally Training Centre in his Questions on Notice.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The name McNally Training Centre has been changed to the South Australian Youth Training Centre. I have also approved a change of name to Vaughan House, which is now known as the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre. Press statements to this effect were made about two months ago. I listened to the Address in Reply speech made by the member for Glenelg last night with a good deal of amazement. However, it did not surprise me, because he has been making similar speeches year after year. He even finds it necessary to refer back to comments made by the Hon. Len King, when he was Minister, and also by my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Payne. I think that the honourable member should give the Government some credit for assisting him in preparing his Address in Reply speeches from the answers he obtains to Questions on Notice. I am sure that the questions he has placed on notice today will be used by him this time next year in his Address in Reply speech.

My department is currently involved in reorganising its community-based residential care facilities and the aim is to provide residential care programmes to meet the individual needs of children more appropriately. Following a disturbance at McNally earlier this year, I immediately established a working party consisting of senior officers of my department and representatives of the Public Service Association. Since then a number of steps have been taken to ensure that such a disturbance does not occur again. They include the development of a formal training course for residential care workers, the introduction of set guidelines for programmes to be followed through each unit, and also the appointment of a new Superintendent of the training centre in the person of

Mr. Rob Maslin. Under the new Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, only last Wednesday the first review board that was chaired by a judge was held. Following that, it is hopeful that the new security unit will be operable at the training centre and, as appropriate, youths will be placed in that unit. All of those steps have been taken with the constructive co-operation of the Public Service Association, and I want to express my appreciation to the Public Service Association for that assistance and co-operation.

Since I became Minister, there has been only one incident at the South Australian Youth Training Centre. Whilst it is true that certain sex offenders are detained in open units and dormitories (I point out that this is under the continuous attention of the supervisory officers at the centre), my department has already looked at plans to provide single accommodation at the training centre. However, under the present budgetary restraints these initial plans were considered to be far too costly, and my department is presently looking at alternative arrangements. I expect to have a report on those alternative plans within the next few weeks.

MONARTO

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Premier state what steps the Government is taking to reduce the massive debt which is accruing daily as a direct result of the Government's policy on Monarto? The latest report of the Monarto Commission shows an operational loss in two years alone of \$6 100 000, which is nearly \$8 400 a day for every day of the year. In addition, the report shows that the Monarto Commission owes more than \$4 000 000 in deferred interest payments, the total debt now being well over \$25 000 000. Suggestions have been made that the Government should consider selling or at least leasing the acquired land at Monarto to help cut these enormous losses.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would appreciate that, if Monarto was sold, the money would go back to the Commonwealth Government. It would not accrue to the State Government at all. He would know that. We are currently negotiating with the Commonwealth to see whether or not there can be a deferral of the payment of interest until the project is recommended. Those negotiations are proceeding. The honourable member for Davenport has an affliction, from the look on his face.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. It is probably wind.

The SPEAKER: So is the Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Those negotiations are proceeding, and the honourable member would know that the Government some short while ago (in fact, it may be a little longer than a short while ago) did take a decision to defer any action on Monarto for a period of five years. I am not sure, but I think it was a little more than 12 months ago. It will depend on the outcome of the negotiations with the Commonwealth in relation to the stay on repayment of interest and principal whether or not the Government will have another look at the matter. That is where it stands at the moment.

SCHOOL GRANTS

Mr. CRAFTER: Can the Minister of Education say what effect the Federal Government cut-backs in education expenditure will have on the availability of

consultant services to non-government schools? I had occasion recently to visit a small parish school in my district which had received a letter from the office of the Director of Catholic Education explaining the cut-backs that would soon take effect in the provision of consultant services normally provided to the school by the State Education Department. Of particular concern is the cut-back in health and general behavioural specialist services to schools. Half the students at this school come from one-parent families and, in addition, many of the children come from families in which English is not the first language. These children will now miss out to some extent on the multi-cultural education facilities, and further, because of the limited recreation space available to the school in an inner suburban area, the inability to use the outdoor education unit of the department will be a further blow to that school. For these reasons, I would be pleased if the Minister could explain the effect of these cut-backs.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is no doubt that there is a problem. We have endeavoured to make our consultancy services available as freely as possible to non-government schools. These consultancy services are often on a regional basis. If we were to look at the central eastern region of the Education Department, we would find that there are nearly as many non-government schools as there are government schools there. In the past, it has been our endeavour to try to make these services as freely available as possible but, because of the factors already outlined by the honourable member, of course, it has proven more and more difficult for people in the non-government schools to have access to these services.

The honourable member mentions the Federal Government cut-backs, and there is no doubt that they have happened. In part, I blame the non-Labor States, which for four or five years have been putting on quite a turn about the way in which the Schools Commission funds. Their attempt has been to reduce the area of direct funding to schools from the Schools Commission and to untie these grants. That has been happening, but the additional money has not flowed into the untied area, and it is from this tied grants area that much of this money comes for the underpinning of specialist consultancy services. The non-government sector in the past has done reasonably well out of this—as well as have the Government schools. With the Federal squeeze on, a good deal of that money has disappeared, and our capacity as a department to be able to service our own schools as well as the non-government sector adequately is very limited indeed.

Some restoration of the level of those tied grants from the Schools Commission in the areas the honourable member has indicated in his question (multi-cultural education, health services, and so on) would continue normally. We are not talking about large sums of money; we are talking about modest amounts which occurred even in the early years of the Fraser Government and which would, if that growth had been maintained, be sufficient largely to meet the demand. But there is a real problem which currently faces particularly the systemic schools in the non-government sector in being able to get access to these facilities.

We as a department will do all we possibly can to ensure that some access is still there. We will have problems, again because we cannot completely make up the money that has been withdrawn through Schools Commission grants to be able to service our own needs adequately. Unfortunately, our ability to do further is going to be restricted.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say what are the details of the four multi-million dollar projects recently mentioned as possible developments for South Australia? Six weeks ago the Director-General of the Industrial Development Corporation (Mr. W. L. C. Davies) told a meeting of the Master Builders Association that four companies were considering multi-million dollar developments in this State. He said that two were connected with food processing and two were connected with raw material processing. He also said that the timing of these projects ranged from commencement in the current year to commencement within five years. Does the Premier now have any firm details of these projects and, if so, what are they?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think I have referred several times in this House to matters that were in the pipeline, and these are such that I cannot give the honourable member any more details. At this stage I do not want to give the honourable member any more details than he has gleaned from the speech made by the Director-General. The honourable member would appreciate that negotiations that have been conducted cannot always be made public, because to do so could be to the detriment of the firms involved, and it could in fact lead to the initiatives that have been taken suffering as a result of any disclosure. I do not propose to do that at this stage.

VEHICLE LOADS

Mr. RUSSACK: Because of the need to conserve motor spirit, will the Minister of Transport consider reintroducing the provision regarding 40 per cent of load mass above manufacturers' specifications for the transportation of primary products? Experience indicates that, when the provision was in force, there was a very good safety record, road wear was kept to a minimum because of the speed restrictions, and in many instances it meant a saving of one trip in three from place of production to the point of storage.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the Government is as conscious of the need to conserve fuel as is anyone. I think the action that we have already taken indicates that. I think it will be a sorry day when any Government or any person places the saving of a small amount of fuel ahead of the safety of people on the road. For this reason, the answer is definitely "No".

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Health explain the nature of the inquiry into Modbury Hospital, its terms of reference, and who will conduct the inquiry? Last evening on the Channel 10 news service the Minister of Health said that he would order an inquiry into Modbury Hospital. He did not explain who would conduct the inquiry, what its specific objectives would be or, indeed, why he thought it necessary to have the inquiry.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I did no such thing. I was asked to comment on a petition that I had not seen at that stage; it was the first I had heard about it, and I have still not seen it. Furthermore, inquiries I have made in the department have not indicated as yet where that petition might be; it might be that it was lodged with Channel 10, but I do not know about that. I said in answer that I would hold an investigation into any complaints made in the petition. That would be done in the normal way. I would

ask one of the officers of my department to investigate the substance of any complaints made, simply in the same fashion as any complaints which are made by members opposite or any members of the community.

This Government has always held the view that it must treat complaints made by members of the public seriously, and on this occasion, if and when the petition that is alleged to exist reaches me, I will then have the appropriate inquiries made.

CABINET RESHUFFLE

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether, against the background of Ministerial responsibility changes associated with the new Cabinet appointed in February of this year, there has been any loss of efficiency, or any additional cost occasioned by the changes? I am not aware of any specific problem, but when changes of this magnitude are made, and when departmental heads are brought into apposition one to the other where there has not previously been the same type of connection or action, invariably difficulties arise. I wonder whether, in fact, any difficulties have arisen and whether any changes will be made to the economic benefit of the State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that the honourable member would appreciate that I, in regrouping the portfolios, strove to get those with a common interest as close together as possible. For example, the Marine and Harbors Department was placed under the Minister of Transport because I believe that is the logical and proper thing to do. There would have been absolutely no expense engendered as a result of that move. I am not aware of any moves that have to take place, apart from individual Ministers moving into other Ministers' offices, that would cause any additional expenditure. I will check the matter out for the honourable member and ascertain whether or not there has been any extra expense. I think that he would appreciate that the moves made were not made unnecessarily but for a specific purpose; hence my brief explanation for the reasons for doing this at the beginning of my reply. I think that the changes made are working well indeed. I certainly have no reason, at this stage, to be dissatisfied with any of them. I have no intention of changing them in the foreseeable future.

SALARIES INCREASE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say by what authority he delays payment of salary increases lawfully ordered by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and endorsed by the South Australian Industrial Commission? Today is payday for many (if not all) State Government employees. It is also the third successive payday over a period of six weeks on which the salaries of Ministerial officers have not contained the last indexation increase awarded by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. My inquiries to the departmental paymaster reveal that all other State Government employees received this increase on the first payday after the decision. Ministerial officers have not been paid the increase and will not be paid unless and until payment is authorised by the Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is the first that I have heard of this matter. It is a wonder I have not had some very discontented officers on my doorstep. It may well be that the necessary administrative paperwork, or whatever, has not arrived on my desk. I have not entered into any action that would delay this increase. I will check for the

honourable member and, if necessary, give somebody a rocket to get it moving.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act, 1936-1977.

Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The primary object of this Bill is to prevent avoidance of land tax by manipulation of joint ownerships. I announced my intention to introduce this legislation on 27 June 1979 for the purpose of warning that the amendments would be operative for the 1979-80 financial year.

Substantial amounts of tax are being avoided by splitting up the ownership of various parcels of land in an artificial manner. Frequently, companies are incorporated for this purpose, although in some cases the practice has been adopted by natural persons. The Bill provides that, if any person or persons have an interest in land, the value of which equals or exceeds 75 per cent of the total value of the land, that person or those persons may be treated as the sole owner or owners of the land. This will allow aggregation of the value of that land with the value of other land in the same ownership. If related companies have a similar interest in land, any one of those companies may be treated as the sole owner and hence the value of the land will be aggregated with the value of any other land owned by that company. The proposal does not affect the vast majority of taxpayers. It will not affect related companies that may hold land in their sole ownership unless those companies also hold other land under some form of joint or common tenure.

Whilst there are existing provisions in the Act to counter avoidance schemes, the Crown Solicitor has expressed doubt whether they would be effective against the schemes at which this legislation is directed. If there are further attempts to use related companies or other devices to avoid land tax, further amendments may be necessary to counter them.

Another significant proposal in the Bill is a provision enabling intending purchasers of land to obtain a certificate showing the amounts payable or estimated to be payable by way of land tax in respect of the land. If those amounts are paid the purchaser is released from any further liability for land tax which may accrue in relation to the land for the financial years covered by the certificate. Where a vendor holds other land, the information necessary to enable an exact calculation of multiple holding tax is usually not available in the early months of the financial year. The new legislation enables the Commissioner to estimate the tax for the purposes of a certificate in these circumstances. The proposal has been discussed in detail with representatives of the Law Society and bodies representing land agents and land brokers and they have indicated that it has their support. It is proposed

to charge, for each certificate, the same fee as is charged for similar information relating to water and sewer rates (at present \$1.50). As some time will be required to develop administrative procedures, this particular provision will have effect from a date to be proclaimed.

It is also proposed to exempt from land tax land owned by controlling authorities established under Part XIX of the Local Government Act. Land owned by municipal and district councils is exempt under existing provisions and this provision is a logical extension of that exemption. Other minor amendments of an administrative nature are proposed: they include the correction of an anomaly in the rate of tax for partially exempt land; a provision by which the Commissioner may refuse to recognise that land is held in trust until notice of the trust is given; and a provision imposing time limits in relation to the correction of assessments of tax.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Bill will be retrospective to 30 June 1979. This does not apply, however, to clause 15, which will be brought into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act, which deals with the interpretation of expressions used by that Act. New provisions are inserted defining the circumstances in which companies are to be treated as "related companies". These provisions are similar to corresponding provisions in the Pay-roll Tax Act. Clause 4 amends section 10 of the principal Act. The purpose of the amendment is to exempt from land tax land held by controlling authorities constituted under Part XIX of the Local Government Act.

Clause 5 amends section 12a of the principal Act, which deals with land that is partially exempt from land tax. Under section 12a certain kinds of non-profit associations may be declared to be partially exempt from land tax. The promoters of an equity housing scheme for aged persons at West Lakes have pointed out that the existing provisions are not wide enough to cover their housing project. This kind of non-profit development obviously merits the kind of concession envisaged by section 12a. In order to make it possible for the concession to be granted in this case and in other similar cases that may arise in future the Bill provides that a non-profit association that is prescribed, or is of a prescribed kind, may be declared to be partially exempt from land tax.

Clause 6 amends section 15 of the principal Act. This clause introduces the major amendments proposed by the Bill. New subsection (2) states the general principle that the value of land owned by two or more persons should not be aggregated for the purpose of calculating land tax with land owned individually by any of the owners or with other land involving different permutations or combinations of owners. However, under new subsection (3) the Commissioner is empowered to treat any person or persons whose interests are worth 75 per cent or more of the value of an estate of fee simple in the land as the sole owner or owners of the land. Thus, if A owns land in his own right, and also owns land in common with B, the Commissioner could tax A on the basis of the aggregate value of that land if B's interest were worth less than one-quarter of the value of the land held in common by A and B. New subsection (4) is a corresponding provision dealing with related companies. New subsection (5) empowers the Commissioner to choose between various categories of owners in assessing tax in respect of land.

Thus, where there is a legal and an equitable owner of land, the Commissioner may, at his discretion, tax either the legal owner or the equitable owner. This provision should, to some extent, prevent the use of trusts as devices to reduce the incidence of land tax. New subsection (6) protects a trustee from the possibility that the value of land

held by him in trust might be aggregated with the value of land to which he is beneficially entitled. New subsection (7) empowers the Commissioner to aggregate the value of land where there are different legal owners but the land is held subject to the same trust. This provision may be of some limited use where there are discretionary trusts and the identity of the beneficiary cannot be ascertained with certainty. New subsection (8) contains definitions necessary for the purposes of the new provisions.

Clause 7 repeals section 16 which is rendered redundant by the amendments to section 15. Clauses 8 and 9 make consequential amendments. Clause 10 provides that, where there are two or more taxpayers in respect of land, their liability for the tax is to be joint and several. Clauses 11, 12 and 13 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 14 is a consequential amendment. Clause 15 empowers the Commissioner to issue certificates to purchasers of land as to the amount of land tax outstanding on the land. Where the amount certified is paid the purchaser is absolved from further liability. Because the issuing of these certificates is dependent upon the establishment of a computer system which is not yet complete, the amendment will come into operation on a date to be proclaimed.

Clause 16 places a three-year limitation on the amendment of land tax assessments. There is an exception to this if a scheme to evade land tax is uncovered, after the expiration of that period. Clauses 17 and 18 provide for objections and appeals to be made against decisions of the Commissioner treating one or more persons as the sole owners of land with a view to aggregating the value of that land with other land.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 8 August. Page 513.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Before the adjournment last night I told the House that, although past Ministers of this Parliament have shown concern (even the recently demoted Minister of Community Welfare has shown concern, as have judges, staff at McNally, doctors, psychiatrists and the public generally), the Government and the department have allowed the mixing in dormitory accommodation of first offenders, in some cases innocent boys, and convicted rapists. The Minister and the department have condoned, and continue to condone, this situation.

I wish now to bring to the attention of the House a letter sent recently to the Minister of Community Welfare, which he has not seen fit to answer. The letter was from a person who applied for a job at the McNally Training Centre (I suppose I must be careful because the member for Price will say that I should be calling it the South Australian Youth Training Centre, because it has a new name). I remind the member for Price and other members on the other side of the House that some people still call their Party the Labor Party when in fact it is the Socialist Party. This letter was written to the Minister of Community Welfare, as follows:

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you as a concerned member of the community. This concern is expressed for the kids that are in your care at the Department of Community Welfare's McNally Training Centre.

Mr. Groom: Who wrote this?

Mr. MATHWIN: I will tell the honourable member if he waits for a moment. The letter continued:

Recently, I applied for a position as a Residential Care Worker to work at the McNally Training Centre. The selection for this position is very intense, which is only right. This takes the form of an application which takes into account work and educational experience. If selection is made, a group interview is arranged to sort out the wheat from the chaff. From this group interview, suitable people are selected for a trial shift. This was arranged for me at the McNally Training Centre on 9 July 1979 to cover the late shift, being 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. I will try to cover the functions and happenings of the trial shift as briefly as possible. On arriving at the centre, I was introduced to a senior member of the staff whom I had known previously during Adult Matriculation studies.

There was the normal conversation of the few years that had passed, then talk about what is involved with the job, conditions and staff. During the conversation was discussed staff shortage through sickness, workers' compensation claims for nervous breakdowns and general sickness, which was high; the reason will become apparent as this letter unfolds. Staff which had started at the same time as him had left and he estimated a loss of 95 per cent of that staff over a 3½-year period.

After introduction to the staff on duty who were a woman about 26 years of age, a man 40 years and an older man about 48 years, I saw the kids, who were a mixed bunch, ages from 14 to 17 years, 11 in all. Some were watching television, others drifting aimlessly around the two-room area of Assessment Unit II. I must warn you of the type of language that will be used, as it will be the only method to express the atmosphere that was present on the shift.

For obvious reasons, I will not read the actual wording of the next part of the letter, but I am willing to table the letter for all members to read, if they wish. The letter contains the foulest, lowest, gutter-type language that I have ever seen written—language certainly not allowed in any normal household. One would hear this kind of talk in the lowest community areas in any part of the world. This letter shows the language that is used, and allowed, at McNally. The boys are not chastised in any way if language like this is used. When it comes to the pinch, if there is a lot of tension, a boy might have no other means of expression but to blow up and cause problems within the institution—that has occurred. The letter continued:

At the beginning of the shift I was told that duty staff were supposed to set a programme for the kids to follow; there was no evidence of this. During the night we did see a film on drug addiction that featured police brutality; the film stirred the kids even more. There was no discussion after the film because of the competition with the TV and the cassette playing.

The staff were only just in control. Both staff had only been in the job for only three months at the centre. Both had just completed 16-hour shifts, working straight through, starting at 7 a.m., to 11 p.m. No normal person can in any type of work be constructive over such a period, especially under this type of strain of kid tension and long hours. One member was due to be on duty the next day at 7 a.m. with only six hours sleep, and seven hours break from the kids; this cannot be beneficial to kids or staff. No wonder there is gross staff turnover and sickness.

There is evidence of victimisation of introverted kids with no visible concern by the staff I saw; the reason I cannot understand. During visiting time the kids are confined to the lounge area of the unit, while visitors met their relatives in the dining area. Visitors were subjected to a display of visual and verbal abuse. This must be distressing to outsiders. At no time was there intervention by the staff.

I must conclude that, if an assesment was to be made of the kids, the courts are being misled as assesment through staff working under these conditions is worthless. Interaction with the kids was almost nil, and anti-social behaviour is being encouraged. When the shift concluded I was assured that that was a normal shift.

I realise that I am untrained in this field, but must stress that all through the interview common sense was stressed as the main stay of residential care worker. No training is given to the staff before they start working with kids, and what I saw of the staff, was of tired and strained faces.

I feel, as a concerned member of the community, for the community, and for the kids under your care, I would appreciate if this letter could be considered as a constructive criticism of the running of the assesment system I was involved with. I hope that this letter will enlighten the uninformed.

The letter was signed by Mr. Paul Westermann. I am willing to let any honourable member read the paragraph that I omitted. If the Minister reads that paragraph he will see the situation that is developing.

A former Minister of Community Welfare, who is now Mr. Justice King, regarding overtime, in the *Advertiser* of 5 April 1974, said:

If staff at South Australia's juvenile institutions banned overtime the inmates would have to spend more time locked up . . .

"Such a ban would have very unfortunate consequences," he said.

"Overtime becomes necessary in the institutions because of sickness of staff, which is unpredictable, and because of special security arrangements which have to be made at certain periods."

That indicates to me that over the past five of six years problems have been developing. People in the community have told the past three Ministers of Community Welfare about problems associated with the department. Some Minister should have been brave or smart enough to find an answer to the problem. The fact is that the Ministers have not bothered.

The present Minister and the Director of his department should ensure that staff do not work double shifts or one-and-half shifts. Staff sometimes work from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. When trouble occurs in the dormitories, as is almost inevitable at McNally, it will almost certainly occur in the last shift, or from 11 p.m. to 11.30 p.m. The Minister knows that well. His only answer to a Question on Notice was that he was content that, if trouble occurred in the dormitories, the one officer in charge would handle the situation. The Minister referred to "one officer", not an intellectual, the person who makes the order, or the Minister who sits in his office. Any staff member at McNally would tell the Minister that he would not dare to enter alone a dormitory of sleeping boys. The Minister should know that. If the Minister does not know that, I am sorry for him, and it is about time he visited McNally to see the situation as it really is.

I went to McNally some time ago with my colleague and friend, the member for Alexandra, to look at the situation. We were amazed. So much of the area could be developed. The boys would be pleased to be allowed to work in the garden and develop some areas. We were appalled by the fact that the department will not let them work. The department is not interested in letting the boys work. It is all right for the new Minister; he has got away with things fairly lightly. I have not put difficult questions to him in this House but, if he wants it that way, I will do so. Since he has been Minister, he said that there has been only one riot at McNally. Did the Minister see the front

office, which was absolutely wrecked by an inmate?

My Question on Notice was the second I have asked on the matter. It is about time the Minister, as I stated yesterday, realised that he should have put away the person about whom I spoke at great length last night. That boy should have been put into Yatala under section 70. However, the Minister refused to sign the letter for two days, until the new Act was brought in, and then it was too late. That boy remained in McNally, later walked out of that institution, remained out for two weeks, and has just been put back there. I refer to the statistics quoted by the member for Newland. I agreed with him in part regarding population, and I ask leave of the House that the statistics—

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

Mrs. BYRNE (Todd): I wish to devote the time allocated to me to the interests of the area and the people I represent, and to promote their interests by trying to identify present and future needs and requirements of residents to facilitate future planning programmes for the greater benefit and comfort of all. To do this, I will trace the history of the district. The Tea Tree Gully district, of which the District of Todd forms part, covers a vast area of the north-east of metropolitan Adelaide. The first occupation of the district began after the settlement of South Australia in 1836, and within 20 years the pioneers transformed the land into productive farms.

Again, in the past 20 years, mainly as a result of the influx of migrants to Australia, the district has been transformed from a series of rural townships into a collection of closely settled urban metropolitan suburbs. The replacement of vineyards, market gardens, orchards, and grazing lands by suburban subdivision has caused the rural identity to disappear gradually, but hopefully not to vanish altogether. The small country townships of Tea Tree Gully, Modbury, Highbury, and Hope Valley have been blurred by this expansion. The Tea Tree Gully council has formed a township advisory group, which is concerned with the preservation of the original township of Tea Tree Gully, and the group has made several recommendations. If these are adopted, as well as the original township being preserved, it could become a tourist attraction, with social and economic benefits for the district. The growth of the population in this council area has been dramatic over the past two decades, and the following table shows the number of persons living there:

Date	Population
30 June 1954	2 561
30 June 1961	5 857
30 June 1966	21 315
30 June 1971	36 708
30 June 1976	56 039
30 June 1978	about 62 000

Later figures are not available, but the total population at present could be estimated to be about 65 000. In 1976, 11.8 per cent of the population was under four years of age, compared to 14.7 per cent in 1971. In 1976, 2.6 per cent of the population was over 65 years of age, compared to 2.4 per cent in 1971. The 1971 census data for head of family figures is as follows:

Family with male head between	Tea Tree Gully	Adelaide statistical division
26-30 years	19.6 per cent	—
31-40 years	31.9 per cent	17.0 per cent
41-60 years	27.3 per cent	35.1 per cent

These figures show the concentration of young families in the district. The district also has a high proportion of

overseas-born residents. In 1971, 39 per cent of the total population was overseas-born, compared to 28 per cent in metropolitan Adelaide, and normally it is the inner suburbs that show this trend. It is expected that this district will continue to grow, and research suggests that, by the turn of the century, Tea Tree Gully will have reached a population capacity of about 103 000. The zoning emphasis is residential, and the area can be described as a series of dormitory suburbs. The district will tend to remain so. I mention here that the areas of Houghton and Inglewood have, since 1976, been in another council area.

A developing area has important physical priorities that must be provided for, such as roads, sewerage, schools, health facilities, kindergartens, telephones, and postal services, as well as other amenities, the need for which is dictated by the age structure of the user individuals and groups. They include sporting and recreation facilities, playing fields, shopping facilities, reserves, playgrounds, community centres and halls, churches, drive-in theatres, restaurants, and hotels. These are provided for by the three tiers of government, groups, and private individuals.

However, not only has the physical environment to be met: the less tangible psychological requirements must also be met. A healthy community is reflected by the sense of worth and belonging, intellectual stimulus, and emotional and spiritual security of its people. This happens in a variety of ways, such as job opportunities, learning and sharing skills, productive leisure time, and social contact with others. All these add to the quality of life of the citizens. It can be judged that at present about 10 per cent of the population is below four years of age, about 50 per cent is below 25 years, and about three per cent is over 65 years, showing a predominantly youthful district population.

This age structure has caused some social problems to emerge. One is the housebound woman, particularly the young mother who is relatively immobile. Repetitive housework, the continuous demands of the children (although they love them very much), lack of contact with other adults, loss of opportunities to use one's skills and develop new ones, added to financial hardship in some cases, can combine to cause stress, resulting in emotional disorders and loss of self-confidence. Access to a car may improve matters, but it will not always overcome the difficulty.

The problem is recognised by social workers and others, resulting in group craft activity, mix and chat sessions, and other activities. The rapid development of playgroups has also contributed towards alleviating this problem. Another matter is unemployment among young persons, both male and female. It is estimated that about one-third of the population is aged between 15 and 25 years. Regrettably, some are unemployed, but this does not apply only to this area: it is Australia-wide. While there is no substitute for work, and it is important that unemployed persons maintain job skills, learn new ones and hobbies, and understand interviewing techniques, it is also important that they receive advice on how to stretch the small amount of money that they have and how to use their time productively, thus trying to keep up their morale until they get a job. In addition, the marriages of young couples, particularly when they are under stress through financial problems, are at risk, and support is required so that they can cope through the difficult times.

Another group that has special needs comprises the senior citizens. These persons represent about 3 per cent of the population, and this number will increase. Also, with persons retiring earlier, the group at that end of the age structure will increase. Some of these people come from overseas to live with their relatives, who both work,

and these elderly citizens suffer from loneliness and immobility. Some do not own a car and some cannot drive. Regrettably, sometimes the happiness that these families think will ensue by the grandparents coming from overseas does not materialise.

Other people are housebound for health reasons. These recognisable community needs and problems are being tackled in a variety of ways on a governmental and local government level, by church bodies, service clubs, local organisations and groups, business people, and individuals. We are also fortunate in having the benefit of the St. Agnes Community Health Centre.

This State Government has always recognised the need to improve and maintain the quality of life of the people, and this is carried out either directly, or indirectly through grants and subsidies. It works through such Government departments as Community Welfare, Community Development, Tourism, Recreation and Sport, Environment, and Labour and Industry (through the SURS), the Health Commission, and probably other departments that I should mention. This Government approved the objective of the use of school facilities by community groups, clubs, individuals, and generally other responsible persons to enable them better to use their leisure time for creative recreational or educational purposes, subject to certain conditions and control. I point out that the maximum use of school and council facilities makes sense.

Evidence of the State Government's improving the physical environment can be shown just by the number of schools that have been built in this area in recent years. Also, the Modbury Hospital was opened in 1973, and this was a major contribution to the area.

Summing up: the development of citizens' intellectual, cultural and social quality of life is important. People must have something to look forward to which is satisfying and which benefits their all-round functioning. An unproductive isolation can have adverse effects on the health of the community. Social interaction is very desirable, whether it be by involving people in learning new skills, creating objects, sharing resources, producing events such as organised excursions, or simply by a chat over coffee.

Although much is being and has been done to improve the less tangible requirements of the people, nevertheless, from time to time, assessments should be made to ascertain whether what is being done is still effective or requires change, whether it is sufficient, or whether there should be a thrust in another direction.

I will now link my remarks with the Governor's Opening Speech, as examples exist of where this Government, despite financial restraints, is continuing to provide and plan for facilities for present and future communities in the district I represent. I quote from paragraph 13 of the Speech, which states:

Work on the reconstruction of the Lower North-East Road will continue.

The increased population in the area brought an increase in the number of motor vehicles using this arterial road, and this caused the need for reconstruction and widening, including improvement in respect of alignment, drainage and visibility at road junctions. I am pleased that this work is in progress, and I know that my constituents are pleased, too. The present section of work, if on schedule, is due to be completed by November this year, and I trust that resources will permit the next section to proceed as programmed without delay. However, I realise that programming of this work depends on the terms of the Commonwealth Government's road legislation to replace that which expires at the end of this financial year.

While speaking about roads, I will refer to another arterial road that traverses this area, namely, Grand

Junction Road, from the intersection of North-East Road, Holden Hill, to Anstey Hill. This road is no longer wide enough to serve present-day traffic generated by the increased population in the area. This work will also result in the construction of footpaths and water tables that would be in the interests of pedestrian safety, particularly that of mothers wheeling prams and that of children.

I have been informed previously by the Minister of Transport that, based on present priorities and the anticipated availability of funds, work on this road is not expected to commence before 1981. While I wish that this road had a higher priority, I trust that these plans will be able to be adhered to. Paragraph 13 also states:

In consequence of my Government's decision to proceed with the North-East Transit Project, a division has been established within the Transport Department to undertake preliminary work. It is expected that early in 1980 detailed contracts will be let with a view to the project being completed by the middle of the next decade.

Since this statement was made on 24 July 1979, the Government has announced its final decision on the city route. The need for a new public transport system to serve the north-eastern suburbs now and in the foreseeable future has been proven. The option chosen to satisfy those needs of a high-speed tram linking Tea Tree Gully with the city and beyond is an ideal choice. The light rail transit system is an energy conservation project. In addition, on all comparisons of noise pollution, modern tram systems are far superior to cars, buses, or trains, and they reduce air pollution.

Paragraph 14 refers to a comprehensive water filtration system, to improve the quality of Adelaide's water, being under construction, but progress during the next financial year will depend on the extent of Commonwealth funding. This refers to the Anstey Hill water filtration plant. On commissioning, which is expected to be by the end of this year, the plant will supply filtered water to about 50 000 homes in the north-eastern suburbs, including the district I represent; this is eagerly awaited. Paragraph 15 states:

The Public Buildings Department is continuing with a vigorous programme of public building works. Apart from extensive hospital and school building projects, the department has recently completed . . .

At least one school project of this programme is in the Todd District. A new primary school is to be built at St. Agnes West, at a cost of about \$1 600 000, and siteworks have begun. It will be known as Ardtornish Primary School. It will be of solid construction, and is programmed for completion during the first term of 1980. In my opinion, solid construction buildings should be planned to be flexible, because, as the age of the people increases, so will the school population decline, and the buildings need to be planned to meet changing requirements. No doubt, thought has already been given to this at a departmental level.

Paragraph 15 refers also to hospital facilities, and I will now refer to health services. I regret (and I know that others share my concern) that the use of the additional new facilities at the Modbury Hospital had to be postponed owing to financial restrictions contributed to by the Federal Government's financial cut-backs as a result of steps to achieve the targets of its monetary policy.

I trust that the planned objectives will be able to be achieved this financial year, if not in full, then progressively, and I understand this is expected to be the case. Paragraph 19 states, and I note, that the Further Education Department has given high priority to the problems of the young unemployed and has introduced a number of courses designed to equip them with the skills and qualifications necessary for employment, action I

applaud. Paragraph 11 refers in part to housing, and states:

Despite a reduction of \$6 605 000 in low interest funds, the Housing Trust has been able to assist 5 000 tenants and 1 100 home owners with their housing needs during the 1978-79 financial year. Approximately 1 900 new dwellings will be completed by private builders for the trust. The trust continues to give high priority to providing housing for disadvantaged persons. Because of the reduction in Commonwealth funding, the trust has entered into various joint ventures. Amongst those are the construction of cottage homes for the aged at Henley Beach and Port Augusta and the Noarlunga regional centre project.

I would like to see some cottage homes for the aged built on the St. Agnes Land Commission land. At present, the nearest trust cottage homes are at Gilles Plains and I think they should be extended out farther into this area. There are other cottage homes built at Modbury by a service club and a church body at Tea Tree Gully, and we are very fortunate this action has been taken. However, before all the vacant land on the St. Agnes Land Commission estate is occupied, I believe the trust should acquire some for this purpose, particularly as there is insufficient of this type of accommodation and a considerable waiting period to be allocated one. Senior citizens, when the time arrives to need this type of accommodation, often prefer to remain living in the same district where they have friends and also to live near their relatives, particularly their children, who can then visit them more frequently and be close at hand to help them if necessary.

In conclusion, I want to add my congratulations to the mover of the motion, the new member for Norwood, on his excellent maiden speech. In doing so I wish his predecessor, Don Dunstan, the former Premier of South Australia and my former Parliamentary Leader, a speedy return to good health. I publicly thank and applaud him for the outstanding leadership and service he gave to the South Australian Parliamentary Labor Party and the Australian Labor Party generally, and his contributions towards the quality of life of South Australians, a community record that probably will never be surpassed.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Mr. Deputy Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to contribute in this debate in support of the motion. If we are looking at the document that was presented to us by His Excellency at the opening of Parliament, I believe we can see much of the philosophy and ideology that separates the Liberal Party from the Labor Party—the reason why we are continually at odds with the Government over the economy of South Australia. There is a lack of acceptance by the Government of the need for competitiveness in the community, for us to achieve an adequate return for every dollar spent in the community. Until the Government realises that there must be competitiveness if we are to receive the maximum benefit for every dollar of taxpayers' money spent, the economy of South Australia will continue to decline and we will fall further and further behind the other mainland States of Australia.

The general feeling in the community is reflected in the following article from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry's *Journal of Industry* for the month of April 1979:

There is at present a disturbing feeling amongst the people of South Australia, and particularly the business community, that this State is not sharing in the apparent general recovery in the Australian economy to the extent to be expected or hoped for.

That is the crux of the disagreement between the Liberal Party and the Government in South Australia. Our approach to the management, development and produc-

tivity of this State is totally different from the one being adopted by the Government. The Government is determined that everything should be done in this State by Government departments, and they are not competing with the private sector to undertake that work. I suggested in this House earlier this week that the opportunity should be given for Government departments to tender for work in open competition with the private sector. In that way we would gain far more for the dollar expended. If that is done, the only way to prove the point is to put it to the test. Once that has been done it will be there for all people to see.

The productivity and jobs available in this State can be clearly indicated when we look at the statistical information available regarding population. These figures have been referred to in the House, but it is absolutely necessary that we continue to refer to them so that the people of South Australia become aware of what is the true situation. It is no good camouflaging the facts behind high walls and making out that the situation does not exist. It does exist, and until the Government comes to accept this fact and grapple with the problem, South Australia will fall further behind the more competitive States.

In the 12 months to 31 December 1978 the Bureau of Statistics estimated the net migration as follows: New South Wales gained 26 082 people; Victoria gained 7 158; Queensland gained 6 757; Western Australia gained 8 407; Tasmania gained 104; the Northern Territory gained 2 386; and the Australian Capital Territory gained 3 129. The only loss in population was in South Australia, which lost 1 724 people. There must be a reason why this situation exists, and it is very much to do with the philosophy and policies of the Government in this State.

I will now refer to a further set of statistics which is equally important. It shows that, in the 12 months from April 1978 to April 1979, 52 700 new jobs were created in the other five States, and 4 200 jobs were lost in South Australia. New South Wales gained 29 500 jobs; Victoria gained 7 600; Queensland gained 12 800; Western Australia gained 800; and Tasmania gained 2 000. During that period South Australia lost 4 200 jobs. Not only did we have a loss during that period of 4 200 jobs but also we had a loss in population of 1 724. We just cannot continue to run away from that situation and pretend it is not happening. It is a fact of life which clearly indicates that the policies and philosophy of the Government in South Australia are not conducive to new jobs being created. They are certainly not attracting people to this State. In fact, the figures clearly indicate that people are leaving this State and going to other States.

Let us consider statistics of capital investment in projects exceeding \$5 000 000. Of the total of such investments in Australia, Western Australia gained 43 per cent, and Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland gained substantial percentages, with South Australia gaining an miserable 2 per cent. Many of the economic problems that we have in South Australia revolve around our lack of competitiveness. If we are not productive, no matter how many people the State Government employs in Government departments, we will slip further and further behind. Until we can lift our productivity and become competitive once again with the other States the situation will go from bad to worse.

It is not a matter, as the Premier claims, of the Opposition's continually knocking South Australia. The majority of us were born in South Australia and we have much pride in our State, but we also have great deal of concern about what is happening to it, about the lack of opportunities that now exist in this State, and about the people who have something to contribute, who have

assets, and who are moving from this State. The figures clearly indicate that people are leaving South Australia, and the figures on investment show that those people are taking their capital with them. Obviously, that investment that is taking place in other States is very much made up of part of the capital of persons who still live here or formerly lived in South Australia. In other words, the South Australian people are not investing in South Australia; they are investing their capital in other States. To me this is a crying shame. Until the Government is prepared to acknowledge that fact, the position will continue to deteriorate and go from bad to worse.

The member for Morphett can shake his head; he cannot interject because he is out of his seat. There is ample proof in this State that industry and investment are leaving this State because of better opportunities in the other States that provide the opportunity for production at lower cost. Obviously, the member for Morphett does not have any involvement in industry and commerce in South Australia, and therefore he is not aware of the true situation. I can provide the honourable member with ample proof of companies which were created in South Australia up to a century ago, which have been totally based in South Australia, and which are being forced to develop their expansion in other States. Without any difficulty I can give the honourable member examples, and show him precisely where the companies have shifted to. The increase in productivity and the reduction in costs of manufacture have enabled those companies to be competitive not only on the Australian market but also on overseas markets. If they had remained here and not moved to other areas of Australia their competitiveness would have been eroded completely.

It is interesting to note also some of the projects of the South Australian Government since it came into office in 1970. We have only to look at the Monarto project. We all know that Monarto certainly has no chance of proceeding at this stage, and it might be many years into the future before it can proceed. Yet the Government persistently hangs on to the Monarto Development Commission, which is costing this State millions of dollars annually. Undoubtedly, members of this House will have seen the article in yesterday's *Advertiser* which, under the heading "Monarto loses \$6 100 000—reports", states:

The Monarto Development Commission has lost \$6 100 000 in the past two financial years, according to annual reports.

The reason I highlight this matter is that \$6 100 000 would build several primary schools, possibly two high schools, or in fact \$6 000 000 would adequately build another bridge across the Murray River. Yet we see this continual drain on the State's resources, the taxpayers' money. It is not the Government's money; Governments do not have any money. Theoretically the Government is vested with the responsibility of effectively utilising that money. Unfortunately, this is not the case with the \$6 100 000 lost in the Monarto Development Commission over the past two years. This is an absolute scandal and a complete waste of the resources of this State. The article continues:

The 1976-77 annual report tabled in the Assembly yesterday by the Minister of Planning, Mr. Payne, shows a loss for that year of \$3 100 000. The Auditor-General's Report for the 1977-78 financial year shows that the M.D.C. had had a loss on its operations of \$3 000 000—giving a two-year cumulative loss of \$6 100 000.

I would be interested if a member of the Government could indicate to the House what value the State has received from that \$6 100 000. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I can imagine that that money could well have been put to use in providing additional school or

hospital facilities in this State, instead of being used in maintaining the Monarto Development Commission. That is one indication of where the money in South Australia is going, yet the Government continually complains at the cut-backs in funding from the Federal Government. With wastage of this nature and magnitude taking place, it is a wonder that the Government in South Australia can convince the Federal Government to hand over any moneys at all, with the obvious lack of management that exists.

I now turn to the South Australian Land Commission. The history of the Land Commission was outlined to the public in this morning's *Advertiser*. That article states that the South Australian Land Commission was established in 1973, and that it was one of the Government's most competitive interventions into private industry. It was initially funded with Loan funds from the Whitlam Labor Government. Land Commission liabilities now total \$87 500 000.

The original concept of the Land Commission was that it would be a land bank from which private developers would be able to draw land, as they desired, at a reasonable cost. However, that was not good enough for the Government. Believing that there were massive profits to be made from land development, the Government entered that market, through the Land Commission, which now has debts totalling \$87 500 000. The Labor Government argued that private developers were making excessive profits, ripping off the consumer, and unnecessarily inflating living costs. South Australians were assured that Government control and the management of land subdivision would end these evil practices and help lower the cost of housing. Six years later we cannot be exactly sure what benefits the public has enjoyed from this move and we find that the Land Commission is an \$87 500 000 liability with no clear indication of the benefits that have accrued.

Had the Government been satisfied to remain with its original concept that the Land Commission should be a land bank for developers, it would have provided a real service to South Australia. However, once again the Government felt that the private developers were having a field day, so it set up the Land Commission to enter the land development industry. As I have said, the Land Commission now represents a liability totalling \$87 500 000.

I have referred to the Monarto Commission and the Land Commission, and I now wish to refer to what is probably just as great a disaster, but on a somewhat smaller scale, the Frozen Food Factory. Looking at the major projects entered into by the State Government during its decade in power, we see one disaster after another, purely because of its philosophy that because the private sector was involved there must be a fortune to be made. Monarto, the Land Commission, the Frozen Food Factory and the Hospitals Commission all amount to one disaster after another.

Eventually, we reach mineral development and the enormous potential of Roxby Downs. Once again, because of the State Government's philosophy, that massive project cannot be touched. How on earth does the Government believe we can ever become competitive in South Australia while the Labor Party philosophy remains as it is!

The Premier made great play in the House yesterday about the Leader's claims on pay-roll tax, saying they were not honest. When the State Government received the pay-roll tax from the Federal Government it was at the rate of 2½ per cent. The State increased the levy to 5 per cent, and now we have this massive disincentive to industry. That is

the only way pay-roll tax can be described; it is the greatest disincentive ever created for employers to take on more employees. Every employee taken on means another 5 per cent addition on top of his salary and the appropriate workmen's compensation payments which must be paid by the company for the privilege of employing one extra staff member.

Turning to the situation in other States, we find that the incentives provided there are far greater than are those available in South Australia. The pay-roll tax incentive schemes announced in South Australia in the past 10 years have been of no value whatsoever, and virtually no company in South Australia has been able to avail itself of the so-called advantages to be derived from the schemes provided by the Government.

In 1973, I embarked on a programme of trying to convince the South Australian Government that it should introduce a Decentralised Industries Pay-roll Tax Rebates Act, along the lines of the legislation introduced in Victoria in 1972, which has become an important part of the development of that State. New South Wales has done likewise, and Queensland is now talking about abolishing pay-roll tax. The principle of the Decentralised Industries Pay-roll Tax Rebates Act in Victoria is that industries outside a radius of 50 miles can apply for a rebate of pay-roll tax, thus giving Victorian manufacturers a distinct advantage over South Australian manufacturers in decentralised areas.

Although the State Government eventually agreed, after a long period, to the Riverland Development Fund, which was a rebate of pay-roll tax in selective instances, it gives nowhere near the benefits conferred by the Victorian legislation. In many instances, companies receiving the rebate do not see it; it goes back into the Riverland Development Fund, and it is only by the grace of the State Government that companies receive grants from the fund. The co-operative wineries, for instance, are not contributors to it because the Government would not agree to their participation in the scheme, yet, across the border in Victoria and New South Wales, the wineries in direct competition with our South Australian wine industry receive the benefits of the 5 per cent pay-roll tax rebate. Apart from that benefit, those wineries have the added benefit of being much closer to the major markets of Melbourne and Sydney.

The wine industry has traditionally been a major part of South Australia's economy. It is an industry in which we have by far the majority of the production, yet we are suffering under the disability of having to carry this additional 5 per cent pay-roll tax as a disincentive to the industry in this State.

I believe that the most important matter before this Parliament, and before the people of South Australia, is to recognise the true situation so far as the economy is concerned (to get it into perspective, closely analyse the reasons for it, come to grips with it, and acknowledge it). South Australia has no chance of progressing or becoming competitive once again unless we are prepared to acknowledge what the problems are.

The Government has been very effective, with the massive line-up of journalists on its pay-roll, in keeping the true situation buried. The Minister might look up and wonder what I am referring to, but he knows quite well what I am referring to. We have limited funds and resources in South Australia, and we must get the maximum value from those funds and resources. If we are going to undertake a capital works programme that is going to cost three or four times as much if that work is carried out by a Government department, the productivity of the State as a whole must suffer.

We must have capital works to develop the resources of the State, and we must be able to get those works done at the lowest possible cost. If we are going to pour countless millions of taxpayers' dollars into projects that could be done for much less, less money is available for further development and further productivity for this State. It is throughput, in any form of production whatsoever, that counts. I believe that the Minister of Planning, who is in the House now, was closely involved with the electronics industry, so I think he would readily accept that throughput, volume of production, reduces the cost of any article, and we must approach all our projects with that in mind.

As I said in this House earlier this week, with the expertise, equipment and facilities available to Government departments (particularly the constructing Government departments), they should be even better placed than are most businesses in the private sector to enter competitive prices and, in fact, win in most instances. I can see no reason why a Government department cannot be just as effective in the construction and maintenance field as is anybody else. I think that departments should be given the incentive to go out and be involved in the competitive area of this State, so that we can see that we gain value for each and every dollar and become competitive with the Eastern States, because that is where our major competition is based. Those States are closer to the major markets, and therefore have an advantage over us from a freight point of view.

I will leave the economy at that point, and will now refer to some problems that have occurred in my district regarding education and the school building programme. As I said earlier, I am a member of the Public Works Committee, which receives numerous references regarding the construction of new schools or the redevelopment of existing schools. I never cease to wonder just how the Government works out its priorities and on what basis the construction programme is undertaken. Urgent references continually come before the committee. In some cases, references must be dealt with as quickly as possible because the school must go to tender within three or four months, or by the end of the year. Sometimes references come before the committee on exactly the same basis as was presented two or three years earlier, but the work has not been started.

I refer particularly to a school close to home—Barmera Primary School. About two or three years ago, the Government agreed to the rebuilding of the existing primary school on a new site. The matter went to the Public Works Committee (before I was a member of that committee), and all formalities were completed. There has been delay after delay in the commencement of the project. On 31 July—only a fortnight ago—I received a letter from the Barmera Primary School staff, the school council, and the parents club, which stated:

We, the teachers, parents and friends of Barmera Primary School, after due consideration, submit for your information and action the following special needs of our school. The rebuilding programme instituted by the South Australian Education Department in pre-1969, and for which the current schedule is to commence building in January 1980, be not deferred for any longer. That the programme, which has already commenced, be continued to conclusion without further interruption.

I believe that the staff and the parents of children at the Barmera Primary School have been extremely patient. The Government proposed the rebuilding of the Barmera Primary School on numerous occasions, but still this proposal has not come to fruition. I ask the Minister of Education to look at his priorities and ensure that such a

project is not continually deferred as has been the case in the past. I trust that the latest scheduled commencement date of January 1980 will not be deferred any further.

Again on the education scene, a letter dated 30 July 1979 which is from Loxton High School Council regarding teacher housing and which quoted significant figures, states:

At its last meeting, this council was disturbed to learn of a proposed Teacher Housing Authority rent increase in September 1979 of approximately 25 per cent, not allowing for all improvements. This comes upon the recent February, 1979, 32 per cent rise.

We ask that you pursue the question of rentals through the Parliament, as other Government employees are not facing such steep rises. It is our opinion that the long term effect on country schools will be detrimental as staff morale and mobility decline as a result of these rises. As well, country incentive, once the vaunted policy of the Government regarding teachers, would now seem to be abandoned, and this will also inhibit the desire of good, experienced teachers to come to the country or to remain.

We would ask that you and your party remind the Government of its promise on this issue.

We look forward to your active support in this matter, as it is the quality of education for our children which will suffer in the long term from these moves.

The figures in the letter are significant. A further increase of 25 per cent in September this year, on top of the 32 per cent increase in January, makes a significant increase for teachers living in country areas who are being provided with housing through the Teacher Housing Authority. I again ask the Minister to consider closely this matter and the effects it will have on the standard of teaching and the attitude of teachers in country areas. I conclude my remarks by indicating my support for the motion.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I commence by expressing my support for the motion, and I congratulate the Governor on the way in which he delivered the address on behalf of the Government. At the same time, I express reservations about the sincerity of some Government members when they spoke in support on the motion. The Address in Reply debate has on previous occasions been of paramount importance to the House and has taken prime place in debate at the commencement of the session, but on this occasion probably about six or eight Bills have been introduced and given prime importance.

Those Bills have been debated to their conclusion, and the Address in Reply debate is still a considerable time from ending. That makes one wonder about the extent to which the position of Governor and the pride of place formerly given to the Address in Reply debate are being diluted by this Government. It is not a good thing. I think the office of Governor, and the respect we owe to the Governor because he represents the Queen, cannot be taken lightly. Therefore, I hope that the precedent set in giving pride of place to several Government Bills will not be the order of the day for future sessions.

I will refer now to some matters that Government members have raised. They have referred to the castigation of the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Ministers by none other than a correspondent who is an employee of the Government (Bruce Muirden) and whose articles have been published in *Nation Review*. Whilst that newspaper used to be the flagship of the Gordon Barton chain of industries, members will be delighted to hear, as will the people in the community who do not know, that it has been purchased by a Maoist, Geoffrey Gold, who uses it as a communist mouthpiece.

The current issue of the *Labor Star*, which is the official organ of the Victorian branch of the Australian Labor Party, advises members of the Party to support this Maoist newspaper, the *Nation Review*, which has been identified by the *Vanguard* (and I am sure that Government members will recognise the *Vanguard* as being the newspaper of the Communist Party of Australia, which is a Marxist-Leninist oriented paper).

Dr. Eastick: Are any of them more likely to know about it than others?

Mr. ALLISON: I am assuming that they can all read it, but that might be a false assumption. The *Nation Review* has been identified by the Communist Party of Australia's Marxist-Leninist newspaper, the *Vanguard*, as being an Australian communist newspaper run by, as they are described, a handful of ultra-revolutionaries masquerading as Marxist-Leninists who have split away from the C.P.A. (Marx-Lenin).

The Maoist political view of the new owners of the *Nation Review* does not concern the Victorian A.L.P., it seems, since that Party is recommending subscriptions to the *Nation Review* by its members. Any Opposition member who is taken to task by such a newspaper should regard that as a source of pride rather than a source of real criticism. With that out of the way, I hope that the public of South Australia will realise that, when a Communist Party newspaper attacks Opposition members, it generally does so because it fears them.

Mr. Slater: Who founded the *Nation Review* in the first instance?

Mr. ALLISON: It was a fairly innocent, tongue-in-cheek, satirical newspaper run by the Gordon Barton group of companies. It used to scatter buckshot wherever it thought it was obvious, and that went across both sides of the political spectrum, but now it is directed more to the right wing of politics. I say that in case anyone took seriously the comments made by Government members during the debate.

The next issue I raise is the matter of the significance of the Tasmanian elections. Quite a deal was made of these in passing comment by Government members, but what one should really have a look at is the true significance. There was, to some extent, a swing towards the A.L.P. About two or three weeks before the election, in the *Hobart Mercury*, predictions were that the swing would be about 15 or 16 per cent. The *Mercury's* privately obtained public opinion polls taken both by the A.L.P. and the Liberal Party showed that there would be quite a landslide swing.

Mr. Slater: They have a record majority, haven't they?

Mr. ALLISON: Let us develop the theme a little further. Significantly, during the campaign, who was moving about the electorate? Certainly not the Ministers, who were noted by their absence. Neil Batt, the Deputy Leader, was in Adelaide at the A.L.P. conference, when one would have thought he would spend time better in Tasmania. Darrel Baldock, a former Tasmanian/Victorian football star (one of my St. Kilda favourites) and John Devine, the former Geelong captain, were moving around with the other personality cult figure, the current Premier (Doug Lowe). It is significant that, while the entire campaign was based on an anti-Federal Government ploy, what it turned out to be was a personality vote. Three of the five electorates found a Liberal Party member topping the poll.

Doug Lowe topped the poll with an alarmingly high rate—25 000 personal votes, as against the previous best by Eric Reece of 14 000-odd, but significantly, with a personal vote of over 25 000 in his electorate, he still could not get five members in, and yet with 14 000 Reece

managed it for the first time ever in a Tasmanian electorate. It is an unusual electoral system, as the House will realise, but preference votes from the first are distributed throughout the members of his Party. On the previous occasion the 14 500 votes had been enough to get five A.L.P. members in, yet with 25 000, Doug Lowe managed to get only four A.L.P. members in. It is significant that the balance of the team was unable to draw the same massive support that the Leader had. Labor received a record majority, but Labor did expect to win—after all, it has been there for 42 out of the past 45 years, so the odds would have been fairly strongly in favour of the A.L.P.

An honourable member: Did you put money on them?

Mr. ALLISON: I never bet on anything at all; I am a man of fine moral rectitude. But the fact remains that the election was fought very strongly along anti-Federal Government lines. A 15 per cent swing was predicted and, on the face of it, it seemed quite possible. In fact the real swing was 1.9 per cent in favour of the A.L.P. Not all the swing against the Federal Government in fact went to the A.L.P.

Mr. Keneally: What was the swing against the Liberal Party?

Mr. ALLISON: As I said, not all the swing against the Liberal Party went to the A.L.P., which is certainly not a vote of confidence for the A.L.P. In other words minor Parties in Tasmania benefited by a little over 2 per cent, while the A.L.P. benefited by about 1.9 per cent, and all in all the general attitude of industry and commerce during the election in Tasmania is interesting, too. It bears a close parallel to the opinions which are coming forward in South Australia. For example, let us look again in the *Hobart Mercury*, this time at the opinion expressed by the Tasmanian Chamber of Industry and Commerce, which is a non-political organisation. For the first time in 45 years of electioneering, the Tasmanian Chamber of Industry and Commerce came out with an opinion against the Labor Party's chances of improving the economic situation in Tasmania. It said it did not think that the Labor Government with its philosophies was capable of resolving the current Tasmanian financial and economic problem. Look at the parallel between Tasmania and South Australia. What has happened?

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: The thirty-seventh.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, that is probably about as close to politics as the election really came, too.

Mr. Drury: You've been reading Peter Rae.

Mr. ALLISON: No, I have not, but I am going to. Thank you for the reminder because Senator Rae did write an article, probably in the *Australian*, in which he commented that Labor was the real loser and, in spite of the strong anti-Federal attitude it had taken during the election campaign, a swing of 2 per cent was really a minuscule one, compared with what had been expected.

Mr. Drury: He'd give an unbiased opinion, wouldn't he?

Mr. ALLISON: One could hardly expect a completely unbiased opinion, but from the comments he does make I find them objectively accurate, since I could not fault his statistics. I find that the statistics given in the *Hobart Mercury* as post-election statistics, are very close to those that Senator Rae published.

Mr. Keneally: What about the statistics in the *Bulletin* last week?

Mr. ALLISON: In South Australia, in spite of the comments that have been made in this House by the Premier in a half-hearted reply to questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition, banking and finance generally in South Australia are showing some surprisingly

unpleasant trends despite the improvement in all other States, with the exception of Tasmania. The South Australian economy is depressed, probably because, like the position in Tasmania, it has been found that the Government's socialist philosophy is not conducive to the encouragement of private industry.

I refer to the reasons for the discouragement of private industry. I was invited to quote the *Bulletin* a few moments ago, and I will quote it. In November 1978, fears which were strongly present in South Australia were enunciated, and included industrial democracy. This policy provides that one-third of directors represent shareholders, one-third represent employees and the other one-third represent the community. The business community fears that developmental control might be taken away from it at a time when it is being asked to commit ever-increasing amounts of capital both for expansion, development and salaries and wages. I am sure that the industrial democracy policy has been an embarrassment to the present A.L.P. Government because, although it has not really implemented the policy, and although the Premier's Department receives many inquiries from industry about the intent of the proposed legislation, it does still remain a firm plank of A.L.P. policy.

In fact, there is no guarantee about what might happen in the hands of another Premier, for example, the Minister of Health, whose opinions have been so loudly expressed, and expressed so independently of Cabinet. The Minister claims that he speaks for himself but, should he become Premier, he would then be speaking for South Australia. There is no guarantee that the current paper tiger will not develop some savage teeth, and that is something that industry and commerce is thinking about.

Workers' compensation in South Australia is the most generous scheme in Australia, and there is a possibility that an injured workman could obtain a full weekly-base wage plus average weekly overtime for the past 12 months. Workmen at the bench (still in employment) have expressed concern to me that people who are taking sickies for genuine or other reasons are able to obtain more money out of work than they can obtain when they are in employment, and that point was made during the debate in this House last year.

The Opposition suggested that the amount of compensation received by a workman should not give him a greater incentive to stay away from work than it did to get back into work, and that matter was not really solved satisfactorily for employers. One result of this situation has been soaring premiums for workers' compensation insurance. A survey of Chamber of Commerce and Industry members showed that premiums had risen by an average of 98.2 per cent in 1973-74, another 92.9 per cent in 1974-75, then 39 per cent in 1975-76 and 13.9 per cent in 1976-77. They soared alarmingly in that four-year period. Dr. Barry Hughes, a former adviser to the Premier, argued that a comparison of workers' compensation claims and premiums since 1972-73 showed that South Australia's claims experience had been in line with that of the other States, but that its premiums had risen disproportionately.

In other words, it is costing more in South Australia to employ people whereas, in the Playford era, and even only seven or eight years ago, South Australia had a much stronger incentive in the cheapness of labour for employers to establish here. The proportion of Government employees, too, in South Australia is higher than in other States. Consumerism has been subject to a wave of enthusiasm by the Government, with the contracts review legislation being able to set aside or modify contracts written interstate. Such contracts are now brought under South Australian jurisdiction. Even if they are written

outside South Australia, they are not absolutely secure and binding. They can be the subject of litigation, and this may make people think twice about entering into contracts between South Australia and New South Wales, or even South Australia and overseas.

The result is that people would think twice before entering into contracts with people in South Australia. The full legal implications of this are open to argument, but there would appear to be conflict with established commercial practices in New South Wales and South Australia, for example. The question of which State law was the one that was finally to be used in litigation could cause endless problems.

The Debts Repayment Bill established a debtors assistance office, which incidentally is working extremely well in Mount Gambier and has been the subject of observations from the Victorian Government recently. This Bill goes a step further than one would imagine was reasonable by removing the right of creditors to enforce security relating to debts. Finally, of course, we had that possibility of class actions being taken against companies in South Australia, class actions which had caused massive problems in the United States of America, where the idea originated and which could lead to massive losses of money, which in no way can be insured against by industrialists, by businesses or commerce. Should that type of legislation be introduced into South Australia there would be far less likelihood of business and commerce entering here to establish itself. We are assured that class action legislation has, for the time being, been shelved, but there is no guarantee that, under a future Premier, the matter would not be resurrected. There are potential future Premiers on the other side of the House whom the public of South Australia hold in low regard. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): This evening I wish to draw the attention of the House to the incompleteness of the Leader of the Opposition's explanation about Proposition 13 given during the Supply Bill debate last Tuesday. I do this because the Leader's statement sounds too plausible and could lead people to make comparisons such as, "If it can be done in California, why not here?" This view could arise because the Leader omitted two very important facts relating to Proposition 13.

First, the State of California had a \$5 000 000 000

surplus before the passage of Proposition 13, which was not mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition anywhere. I know, because I have been through it and checked. When Proposition 13 was passed in June 1978 Governor Brown used that massive surplus to make up most of the lost revenue. We in South Australia, or indeed in any other State in Australia, have no such surpluses available to throw into the breach.

Therefore, it is true to say that California has benefited from the passage of Proposition 13 only if one says that it has benefited from it for the first 12 months after the vote. The second and subsequent years are the ones which will show that the reduction in revenue will cause hardships because that surplus, having been used up, is not recurrent: it is of a capital nature and is gone once it is spent. Since those people have property tax restrictions on them, hardships will be experienced. In addition, the California State Legislature increased State and local income taxes. The taxation situation in America is divided between Federal, State and local governments, and all three can levy a variety of sales and income taxes. True, Proposition 13 placed a restriction on property taxes. However, it did not impose a restriction on other taxes. Consequently, some of these taxes were raised at the local level.

Mr. Becker: What for?

Mr. DRURY: It was done to help defer the effects of Proposition 13. Indeed, there have been severe increases in sales and income taxes. The shift of \$7 000 000 000 has not been an unqualified boon, as at least \$2 000 000 000 is expected to filter to Washington as higher income tax payments, and about \$3 000 000 000 will be funnelled into businesses outside California.

Resentment is already building up that the largest benefit from the property tax reductions will be experienced not by home owners but by commercial property owners. In addition, those people who rent houses as a result of the passage of Proposition 13 will find that they do not benefit from the reduction in the property taxes but that the landlord does. There is a considerable number of taxes—

Mr. Becker: You read the whole story and tell the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson will have an opportunity to speak on the right occasion.

Mr. DRURY: Mr. John Shannon, Assistant Director of the Advisory Committee on Inter-Governmental Relations, an organisation that monitors Federal, State and local fiscal affairs, said that a number of factors peculiar to California contributed to the agitation for Proposition 13. Among them was the previously mentioned surplus, which in itself allowed voters to opt for Proposition 13 with the full knowledge that such surplus would be used. However, it was a once-only surplus.

In addition, California has one of the easiest systems for initiative proposals in the country. No other State in the country has such an easy system of getting proposals on to the ballot paper. In most States, it would be much more difficult to enact constitutional amendments limiting taxes.

California also had a better than average assessment system. As a matter of fact, in the weeks preceding the vote on Proposition 13, opinion polls showed that 42 per cent of the people were in favour of it, 39 per cent opposed it, and a massive 19 per cent were undecided. What undoubtedly tipped the scales in favour of Proposition 13 was the action in sending out new reassessment notices one week before polling day. That would be an act of what we in Australia would call political suicide; which it was.

Californian tax assessors act independently of local authorities and do not determine tax rates. As in South

Australia, property taxes are paid in lump sums in California, and high State income tax is levied on a similar basis to ours—pay as you earn. Among the opponents of Proposition 13 were, predictably, the American Federation of Labour, the Bank of America, which contributed \$25 000 to the campaign (even though it stood to save \$13 000 000 in taxes that would not be collected), the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the California Retailers Association and the State Board of Education.

Very little relief has been felt by tenants, and the huge savings have not filtered down to ordinary householders as expected. There have been some falls in unemployment. Those falls have occurred in local education (with an unemployment drop of 8.9 per cent), in county Government (with a drop of 4.6 per cent), and in city Government (with a drop of 8.5 per cent). However, there is a possible increase in unemployment because, although “only” 5 000 public employees have been laid off, if the wage freeze imposed by Sacramento in violation of union contracts is overturned by the High Court, lay-offs could rise 100-fold. Further, 80 000 summer jobs that are usually available to students have been cancelled because they involved the school system, which has suffered cutbacks and therefore the jobs have disappeared. Therefore, I query the Leader’s claim that 552 000 new jobs have been created.

As well as a reduction in unemployment, there have been other reductions in services such as street lighting; for every light left on, the next light is turned off. That system has also been used in Australia over the last 4½ years. Every library department in California State had its book purchasing funds cut by half, which is an actual reduction of 50 per cent. In the San Bernadino county, parks and gardens now open for only five days a week, whereas they used to open for seven days a week.

I now turn to the increase in fees. In one San Diego suburb, builders have found since early 1978 that the cost of fees and permits has risen from a trifling \$43 to between \$1 200 and \$1 500. Further, the fees for emergency ambulance transport have skyrocketed, the cost of street repair work has increased tremendously and rubbish collection rates have also increased tremendously. There is no doubt that Proposition 13 has forced down property taxes, but not to the benefit of ordinary people. When members look at Proposition 13, call public meetings and agitate in that fashion, they should tell the truth.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It has been an interesting exercise to listen to the speech of the member for Mawson, who, clearly, is out of touch with reality. The next time he addresses a group of people, if he ever gets an invitation to do so, I suggest that he should try this nonsense out on them. The average person, I believe, is sick and tired of taxes, charges, regulations, and new laws. He wants to be left to his own devices. I believe the honourable member will see many more Proposition 13’s throughout the democratic societies of the world. The only people who opposed Proposition 13 were the trendies and the public servants. The average man had had a gutful of them.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order!

Mr. GUNN: I want to turn now to another subject, and to deal with some comments made by a left-wing organisation which occasionally writes nonsense for the local papers that circulate in my area. On this occasion, they have set out to insult the intelligence of the community. The group is known as Far West People Against Uranium—a good socialist left-wing name, for a start. The report states:

The horrors of Hiroshima are small considering the potential of today’s nuclear devices and obviously such an

event must never be repeated.

We all agree with that. The report continues:

One of the ways in which nuclear weapon proliferation can be minimised is for Australia to leave its uranium in the ground.

What garbage and nonsense! They do not recognise that, if we deny the developed countries energy, international incidents will result. Let me turn now to a gentleman who used to be claimed as a colleague by members opposite. I refer to Chancellor Schmidt, of West Germany, a country with a booming economy following very similar lines to those of the Federal Government in Australia. The report states:

QUESTION: What should the consuming nations be doing about the energy crisis?

SCHMIDT: First, we have to educate our societies and induce our economies to conserve energy to a much greater degree than we so far have been able to bring about. One of the most important instruments in so doing is to let people feel the fast-rising real costs of energy. Second, to a growing degree we have to replace oil by other primary resources of energy, especially coal and nuclear energy. Foreseeably, we will within the next one or two decades get into a world-wide debate about the irrevocable consequences of burning hydrocarbons, whether oil or coal or lignite or wood or natural gas, because the carbon dioxide fallout, as science more or less equivocally tells us, results in a heating up of the globe as a whole. This leads to the third point, namely the necessity to put up rather large sums of money in order to develop scientifically and from the engineering side, sources of energy like nuclear, geothermal, solar energy, all of which enable us to avoid the CO₂ consequences . . . And third, I will point to the great danger that if nuclear energy is not developed fast enough, wars may become possible for the single reason of competition for oil and natural gas.

Surely, the people who advocate leaving our uranium in the ground should heed what he said. What alternatives have those countries got if we cut off access to that energy? The parrots on the other side have been screeching about nuclear energy but they have not told us—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will refer to "honourable members" opposite.

Mr. GUNN: My colleagues opposite have never informed us what alternative sources of energy we should use. Let us look now at what an eminent gentleman, Professor Teller, had to say. He was speaking at open discussions on nuclear energy organised by the Commission of the European Economic Community. Speaking on the subject of safeguards, and the risk of losing control over the use of nuclear material through terrorist activity, he said:

I am for energy conservation and I am working on it. I am for co-generation of electricity. I am for solar heating of houses. I am for wind energy—where there is wind, but not where there is none; it depends on the wind strength very much, on the third power. I am for oil. I am for gas. I am for coal. And I am for nuclear energy. And to neglect any one of them for superficial reasons, to neglect any of them because we lack a sense of balance, because we are carried away by our oratory or fears or nightmares, this I claim is wrong.

Let me tell you, I was, in 1939, almost 40 years ago, playing a Mozart sonata—a violin sonata—on the piano with a good friend. I got a phone call from New York from another friend, Leo Sillar, another Hungarian emigré. He told me on the phone: "I've found the newtons". We already knew about fish! From that time, for 39 years, the greatest part of my conscious life I have lived with the possibilities, with the hopes and with the fears of atomic energy. I opposed Hiroshima as best I could. I did not oppose—and I never will oppose—a technological development, because this I

believe: everything that is technically feasible can be used or can be misused. As a technical man I must work on technology.

One of the things that the Labor Party unfortunately fails to realise is that the nuclear power industry is relatively new. The Labor Party is not prepared to adjust its thinking to today's needs and to the position we find ourselves in.

Dr. Eastick: They are theorists, not realists.

Mr. GUNN: What the honourable member for Light says is correct. This Government has spent millions of dollars on various hair-brained schemes in this State (Monarto, the Land Commission and the waste in the Hospitals Department) but it has not, as I pointed out earlier, ever gone to the trouble of inviting the people from South Africa to look at our coal to see whether it is suitable to turn into oil. I believe that a State which is lucky enough to have large deposits of coal should be closely examining the liquefaction process which has been operating successfully in South Africa. I believe that in the future we are going to have to rely heavily on the coal deposits we have here not only for the production of electricity but also for the production of oil to drive our motor vehicles. I believe that the inquiries and investigations that ought to take place in this area should be treated as a matter of urgency.

At the beginning of this century coal supplied about 96 per cent of the world's energy needs. By the beginning of the Second World War the contribution made by coal decreased to 70 per cent, and that of oil increased to 18 per cent. In 1977, oil and natural gas provided, respectively, 52 per cent and 18 per cent of the free world's energy needs and coal only about 21 per cent. The years 1985 to 1990 are already seen by most oil experts as the watershed period so far as the balance between supply and demand of crude oil is concerned, so we do not have long to develop our alternative forms of energy. To avoid serious shortages of crude oil in the 1990's, the persistent increase in the contribution of this source towards the total energy requirements of the world would not only have to be halted but would, in fact, have to be reversed. This, in turn, would require a sharp increase in the relative contribution of nuclear energy at a rate which may be impossible to achieve in practice. The reason for this is that decisions on new projects are being delayed and hampered by groups opposed to nuclear energy. It is, in my view, most unfortunate that this process of opposition is still taking place.

I am pleased to see the member for Morphett has come back into the House, because he is one of those people who are going to have to answer in the future when the lights go out in certain parts of the world if these people are denied uranium. We know that he is normally a fairly slippery character; he is a bit like an eel and can normally worm his way out of difficult situations, but he will not be able to escape the future consequences, nor will his colleagues, of their decisions.

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I would like to raise the subject of the participation in policy making of groups and individuals within the community. I was appalled, to say the least, to read in *Hansard* the statements of the shadow spokesman on local government. He stated:

I therefore believe that the Government should scrap its grandiose plans to have community development boards as envisaged, which boards will do nothing more than local government can do if it is given the encouragement and opportunity.

I can only take it that that is the policy of the Liberal Party regarding the role of community groups in the formulation of policy at various levels of government. I will expand on

that point in a moment.

I presume that the honourable member is the spokesman for the Opposition on community development matters. In all the publicity that I have researched there seems to be no public spokesman for the Opposition on matters relating to community development. The Opposition has a spokesman for sport and recreation, and local government, but no spokesman for community development. I presume, therefore, that the Opposition is not interested in the subject of community development and has nothing to say about that matter to the community. As all members are aware, hundreds of people in every community give many hours every week to the development of a strong and healthy community. The shadow Minister of Local Government in another place stated:

I stress again that people for these boards are appointed by the very Minister who should be the champion of local government and its principles.

That is clearly a misstatement of fact, because there is a very lengthy and exhaustive process of selecting people for these boards. That is the crucial issue in this whole area—the involvement of members of the community in the formulation of policy and programmes that affect the community.

There are, I think, only two appointments made by the Minister. I refer to public servants who are designated to assist these boards. Appointments are made by the Minister after consultation with the local community. So, the spokesman is well astray if that is his view of the guidelines for these boards. It appears from his speech that the basis for the spokesman's opposition to this involvement of the community is his analysis of what he calls the functions of these boards. I have looked at what he terms the functions of boards and in fact they are the guidelines for selecting people for the boards, not the functions at all. The honourable member has obviously misunderstood the whole concept. I can only presume that he is not the spokesman for the Opposition on matters of community development. The functions of these boards are:

The involvement of the people themselves in efforts to improve their quality of life, the need for communities to have access to resources and the need for co-operation within communities and between communities and Government.

It appears that the Opposition opposes all of those concepts. It says that those concepts are already covered in the work that local government is doing. We all know of the work that local government has to do. So much of that work is voluntary and there are so many limitations on the activities that local government can accept in a community. In fact, this Government has helped and encouraged local government to take on more and more responsibility in the community.

Dr. Eastick: With less and less money.

Mr. CRAFTER: I would have thought that the Constitution Conventions that the honourable member and I have been attending for many years would bring local government into some constitutional status in this country; it was the Whitlam Government that brought about this constitutional status—

Dr. Eastick: It was the member for Goyder who provided for them to go into the Constitution and it was the Fraser Government that gave them a percentage of the income tax.

Mr. CRAFTER: Those things would not have been possible without the Whitlam Government's interest in constitutional reform, and the acceptance of local government—

Dr. Eastick: It is the Corcoran Government that starves local government of funds.

Mr. CRAFTER: The honourable member may join with his colleague, the member for Davenport, who took a directly opposite approach to the spokesman for local government at a public meeting that I attended on Monday night.

He publicly castigated local government for its tardiness in taking on more community responsibilities. Many of these functions do not cost money and, unfortunately, there is little interest, in many areas of local government, in taking on a broader responsibility. Following statements that I had made about the lack of interest by the community in local government, and the lack of interest by some candidates and councillors in the community, a lady wrote to a newspaper as follows:

I received not one piece of publicity about any candidate in my ward so, firstly, how could I make any choice regarding whom to vote for and, secondly, if the candidates show so little interest in the electors, why should we vote for them?

Obviously, there is a need in many areas of local government for a re-thinking, and the sort of attitude displayed by the shadow Minister of Local Government in his speech would send local government back to the dark ages. His speech is full of factual inaccuracies and casts slurs on many community groups that are trying to do something and are genuinely looking to local government for assistance in the work they are doing. It involves such basic matters as co-ordination of activities in a community, encouragement for the work they are doing, and some basic support.

It is interesting to note that, of the councils that have taken some initiative in these matters, the Adelaide and Burnside councils are the only two in the State that employ social workers. I would not think that social workers were the most important people to put on the staff as a priority, and those councils probably need them the least.

It is also interesting to note that Unley council has a community arts officer and, as the member for Light has said, that is the area where funds are flowing to local government. There is interest in and financial support for programmes such as this from the State Government. There are 15 recreation officers employed by local government. Following the Crawford Report, funds are available for community libraries to a larger extent than applied previously. There is financial support for community bus services, a vital area of community life.

There is a review, with local government, of community health services, another area where decentralisation is so vital. In all these areas, it can be seen clearly that there is a deep interest shown by the State Government in the welfare, growth, and various activities of local government, and I am sure that before long local government will take its place in the State Constitution, as it will soon in the Federal Constitution, as the third tier of Government.

Dr. Eastick: The Minister has said he would support the member for Goyder this year in doing that.

Mr. CRAFTER: Yes, and it is appropriate that such measures should come from the community and members who have committed themselves to local government. I agree with that. There are many issues in the community that must be met by people at the local government level, and the relevant information must be given to other spheres of government. In a report in the *Australian*, a recently-appointed sociologist (Dr. Graycar) states:

The rash of national strikes is an example of people turning to confrontation to get a better welfare deal. But a taxpayers' backlash was being fed on ignorance of the fact that Australia was one of the "meanest" welfare payers.

Then referring to welfare costs he goes on to say:

"And in case people get uppity," Dr. Graycar announced, "that cost would buy only 12 minutes of the Commonwealth's \$12 500 million on health, education and welfare.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has

expired.

Motion carried.

At 5.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 21 August at 2 p.m.