

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

RADIUM HILL

Thursday 18 October 1979

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 153 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to ban and destroy the worst pornography, enforce tighter restrictions on all forms of pornography, remove restricted pornography from newsagents and delicatessens, and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by Messrs. Becker and Millhouse.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SUNDAY TRADING

Petitions signed by 537 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels to open their bars on Sundays were presented by Messrs. Chapman, Wotton, Blacker, Becker, L. Arnold, Trainer, Schmidt, and Lewis.

Petitions received.

QUESTION TIME

AUDITOR-GENERAL

Mr. BANNON: Does the Premier agree with the attack made by the member for Hanson in the House yesterday on the Auditor-General, and, in particular, does he believe that the Auditor-General or his deputy has been intimidated by any person or persons, or in fact that the member for Hanson himself has attempted to intimidate the Auditor-General? What action does he propose to take? The Auditor-General is appointed under a special Act of this Parliament, the Audit Act, and he reports directly to the Parliament each year. He is independent, therefore, of both the Executive and the Public Service. However, in the House yesterday, the member for Hanson said:

I am very disappointed in the presentation of the present Auditor-General's Report. It is the poorest document I have read in the 9½ years I have been in this House. As far as I am concerned, it is lacking in initiative and punch.

He went on to say:

There is no doubt in my mind that either there has been an instruction or the message has been passed around. I believe the Auditor-General or his deputy could have been intimidated.

The member for Hanson also told the House that he had told the Auditor-General, in the course of private conversation, not in any official capacity, that he would be watching his activities and reports very closely. In view of those statements, the Premier must go on the record.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am happy to go on the record for the Leader at any time. Everything the Leader has said in explaining his question makes it quite clear that the member for Hanson was expressing a personal view when he was speaking, and that is how I regard his comments. I am quite certain that it is open to anyone in this Parliament to make whatever comments they like about any document laid on the table.

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy give an absolute assurance that Radium Hill or any other site in South Australia will not be used as a repository for any overseas nuclear waste? I ask this question following reports that the use of the Radium Hill site or some other South Australian site might be offered as a repository for waste from overseas reactors using fuel derived from South Australian uranium. It has been suggested that this offer may well be used as a trade-off in negotiating contracts for the sale of uranium from Roxby Downs. That any part of Australia should be used as a dumping ground for overseas nuclear waste, including highly active waste, is not a novel suggestion. I am sure the Minister knows this. It has been suggested in the Japanese Senate, by prominent United States nuclear interests, and by the Premier of Western Australia in the past. The Minister will be aware of the controversy and considerable public disquiet following contracts requiring Britain to take Japanese waste.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am very glad that the honourable member has asked this question. It highlights the fact that the Labor Party is doing its damndest to drum up fear in the minds of South Australians, on completely false premises. Let me put this matter in context. A report appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser* to the effect that Radium Hill was being considered as a possible place for the radioactive residues from tests at Amdel.

Yesterday, a prominent Labor spokesman said that a rather strange report had emanated from the office of the Minister of Mines and Energy in relation to this dumping. That statement is completely false: no report emanated from my office or, indeed, from the Minister of Health. That statement was false. The next statement made by this member of the Liberal Party was that it was to be used as some sort of dumping ground for nuclear waste. That statement is also completely false. It was further stated that the area would simply be used to store core samples from Roxby Downs. That is another complete fabrication. None of the material under consideration for ultimate disposal comes from Roxby Downs or has come from Roxby Downs. In fact, the material under consideration was accumulated during the life of the Labor Administration as a result of tests authorised by it at the Amdel laboratories. The following statement was also made by this member of the Labor Party:

... this is really a survey preparatory to making South Australia a dumping ground (Radium Hill in particular) for highly toxic wastes from overseas.

That is another complete and utter fabrication. There is no proposal at all for South Australia to become the repository for overseas wastes. He went on to say:

... highly toxic wastes from overseas, which inevitably we must accept as the *quid pro quo* in connection with exporting uranium in any of its various forms.

That, again, is a complete and utter fabrication. If I were allowed to say so, I would say that it was a lie.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Who is the spokesman?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will tell my Leader shortly. The Labor Party spokesman also said:

Australia cannot be in the export business without taking back the by-products.

That is another complete and utter fabrication. The spokesman was the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, from upstairs. The fact is that the Labor Party is desperately trying to seize on some issue in relation to uranium to instil fear into the hearts of the public of South Australia, and it is being prompted by its advisers, whoever they may be. My best

advice to the Leader of the Opposition is that he should sack these advisers, because they are not basing their comments on fact. They are building up a structure on the basis of complete fabrication and asking the Government to respond to that fabrication. All this does is increase the contempt I have for the Opposition's tactics in relation to this matter. It is the will of the Government that we put before the public the facts in relation to this uranium debate. There is no proposal whatsoever before the Government, nor is there any contemplated, whereby Radium Hill would be used as a repository for waste from overseas. We have this complete fabrication of lies to build up a case and to ask us to comment on it. Where does the Opposition's credibility lie in relation to this sort of operation? If it thinks it is going to make any marks by fabricating false situations and by expecting us to comment on them, it has a lot to learn before becoming an effective Opposition.

COMMUNITY BUSES

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Transport say whether there has been any policy change in respect of annual grants of \$100 000 for the purpose of providing community bus services? For some time prior to the election, in my own district various community groups had been requesting local councils to apply to the Transport Department to seek a grant in order to obtain a community bus for the southern area. Many groups, particularly the aged, find it difficult to get to and from their meeting places without such a service. If councils knew that such a policy still existed, and that they could apply for a grant for a community bus, it would serve the councils and, more important, the community in the south.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The answer is "No"; there has been no change in policy. In fact, an amount of \$100 000 has been allocated in the current Budget, the same amount as was allocated last year. I believe that at the moment there are two community buses in service at Campbelltown, two at Tea Tree Gully and one at Meadows. Members may be interested to know that the Government funds the initial purchase of the bus and pays for six months registration; it is then the responsibility of the local council to pay the operating costs.

INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

Dr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier say whether a contract has been concluded for the purchase of Moores in Victoria Square as a site for the proposed international hotel, or for some other purpose? If it has, how much was paid and, if a contract has not been concluded, is one being negotiated?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The former Minister is obviously drawing on information that was available to him some four weeks ago. The answer to his question is "No"; it is not being negotiated. Therefore, the second part of his question is not relevant.

BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Has the Premier had his attention drawn to a report which appeared in this morning's press and which stated that South Australia had a Budget deficit

of \$14 100 000 for the three-month period ended 30 September? If so, will the Premier say whether this report is accurate?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the member for Brighton for his thoughtful question and his concern about the State's finances. I did notice the report in question. Far from recording a deficit of \$14 100 000 for the quarter ended 30 September, the combined Revenue and Loan Accounts recorded a surplus of \$14 100 000 for that period—a rather dramatic change from the picture painted in this morning's press. The actual statement in the press release I issued yesterday was that the combined accounts had recorded an excess of receipts over payments of \$14 100 000. The same press release stated that in the corresponding quarter last year receipts had exceeded payments, though not to the same magnitude. For some reason, that statement was also reversed in this morning's press. Having set this matter straight, I remind the House that the recent quarterly figures may not be taken as indicating how the year is likely to finish, since variations occur from quarter to quarter.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mr. HEMMINGS: Has the Minister of Health received support from the Premier and Cabinet for her proposal to outlaw the printed advertising of cigarettes and, if so, how and when will that proposal be put into effect? Following the recent controversy in New South Wales about the anti-smoking campaign, the Minister made a praiseworthy statement on *Nationwide*. On behalf of the Opposition, I congratulate her. The Minister said that she favoured legislating against the advertising of cigarettes, and that there was a possibility of legislation being introduced into this Parliament soon concerning that matter. Many letters have appeared in the press from concerned citizens, including doctors, in favour of such legislation being introduced. Is there any chance of that legislation being introduced during this session of Parliament?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The *Nationwide* interview to which the honourable member refers followed a *Four Corners* segment, which indicated what had occurred in northern New South Wales when tobacco companies attempted to thwart the efforts of the New South Wales Health Commission to introduce a programme of health promotion to try to encourage responsible habits relating to smoking. That programme foundered because the tobacco companies engaged in litigation which required the Health Commission to withdraw its promotional campaign. I was asked to respond and I did so by making a statement of fact, not of opinion or intent.

I said that, if the States were to follow the example set by the Commonwealth in terms of prohibiting any tobacco advertising on the electronic media, they would proceed to ban any print advertising of tobacco. I regard that as the ideal situation that all States should aim to achieve. I then went on to say that the Government's health policy relies heavily on preventive medicine and on the promotion of good health. Under the previous Government, the Health Commission undertook programmes, which are now in train, to educate people about the dangers of tobacco smoking. Those programmes will be continued and intensified.

I said that I regard as the ideal the prohibition of tobacco advertising, and that will be my aim. I am not able at this stage to say when that aim will be achievable. The present law in South Australia has not yet been proclaimed, because it relies on other States to endorse the notion of even printing warnings on display

advertising. I intend to work towards the end I have indicated. This is obviously an extremely controversial matter which cannot be undertaken by one State in isolation. It is a subject to which I am turning my attention. I hope my ideal will be achievable in South Australia.

ESCAPED PRISONERS

Mr. WEBSTER: Will the Chief Secretary tell the House what, if any, action has been taken in regard to the recent spate of prison escapes in this State? I assume that all members in this House are concerned about the increase in violent crime in South Australia. Figures in relation to my question have recently come to my attention. I understand that in a period of less than five weeks, nine prisoners escaped from custody. On 13 August, 1979, one prisoner escaped from the Adelaide court; on 24 August, six prisoners escaped from Yatala prison; on 1 September, one prisoner escaped from Yatala prison; and on 17 September, one prisoner escaped from the Modbury Hospital. Can the Minister say what action has been taken, or is proposed, regarding prison escapes?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Unfortunately, what the honourable member has said is correct. Regarding the escape of 13 August, when the previous Government was in office, a prisoner escaped from a holding cell during a court hearing. That cell has now been secured by the Public Buildings Department on the advice of officers of the Department of Correctional Services. The escape of six prisoners from Yatala on Friday 24 August was connected with the erection of a new tower in the north-east corner of the security wall of the prison compound. Construction personnel have now been instructed on the need for security, and security measures have been increased. No further attempts have been made by prisoners to escape from this area.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

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

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: On Saturday 1 September a prisoner secreted himself in a rubbish bin and was carried out of the gaol. The prisoners who assisted him have now been charged. The procedure relating to rubbish disposal has been tightened and disciplinary action has been taken against the officer concerned.

Following the break from the Modbury Hospital on 17 September, all inmates attending hospital will now be handcuffed or restrained in some way. Hospitals have been requested to arrange future attendance dates for inmates with medical officers and not to discuss any of these arrangements with the inmates. Where maximum security inmates are involved, a certificate from the departmental medical officer indicating that a visit to hospital is absolutely necessary is required.

AUDITOR-GENERAL

Mr. CORCORAN: My question is supplementary to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with statements made in this House yesterday by the member for Hanson. As I understood the reply, the Premier said that these statements were personal statements by the member for Hanson and that the Premier saw no need to intercede. Will the Premier reconsider that decision? I believe the statement made by the member for Hanson to have very serious implications. As a former Premier, I resent very deeply and gravely

indeed the implications made by the member for Hanson, and I have no doubt that the Auditor-General would also feel this way. It is well known that the member for Hanson has a loose mouth and is prone to make allegations that are not well founded. I can well recall allegations made by the member for Hanson which, when they were subject to examination by the present Chief Justice (the then Attorney-General), were shown to have passed through 52 different people before the member for Hanson raised them in this House. I take very seriously indeed his statements and, whether they are personal or otherwise, I would ask the Premier to take firm action to have an inquiry made, if he needs to do that, and to demand an apology from the member for Hanson, first to the Auditor-General, and secondly to the former Government.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I point out that the question asked by the member for Hartley is in fact a rehash of one that was previously asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will determine whether it is a rehash or whether it is admissible.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: My answer is exactly the same as given to the Leader of the Opposition.

ESTABLISHMENT PAYMENTS SCHEME

Mr. OSWALD: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government intends to continue the establishment payments scheme along the same guidelines as those of the previous Administration, or is the scheme under review?

This scheme became operative on 1 September 1978 and was designed to encourage capital investment and employment creation by firms being established or expanding in South Australia. The eligibility criteria is too complex to go into now; suffice to say that assistance would be made available to both new and expanding firms, provided that a substantial proportion of resultant output was produced for markets outside South Australia, and I emphasise "outside South Australia". I ask this question in response to approaches made to me by business men who are looking to expand their operations within the State and who are anxious to study this Government's guidelines. In fact, in the light of the most encouraging advertisement which appeared in yesterday morning's *Advertiser* and which was addressed to the South Australian business community, I would be very keen if the Minister would particularly refer to the eligibility criteria of the establishment payments scheme, if in fact this scheme is to continue.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, the establishment payments scheme will continue during the current financial year. I think that, when members look at previous comments made in this House, including comments made by me, they will realise that there are certain deficiencies within that scheme. I think we are realistic enough to appreciate that, although the pamphlet contained a "carrot", the scheme had a few deficiencies.

I can assure the honourable member that the establishment payments scheme will continue. All the industrial incentives so far offered in South Australia and the new ones promised during the election campaign are currently under review, so that the new Government can ensure a comprehensive range of industrial incentives at least as good as those in any other State in Australia. We believe certain areas of our present incentives need to be upgraded. That review will take some time and, during the course of the review and certainly during this financial

year, all companies can be assured that the existing industrial incentives and any new incentives offered by the new Government will continue.

The Department of Trade and Industry is currently preparing a detailed summary of each of the industrial incentives, and I will make sure that all members of the House receive a copy when it is available. The Budget this year contains a line of \$6 000 000 for industrial incentives. I am delighted to say that the allocation has been increased from \$800 000 last year to over \$6 000 000 in the current financial year. This clearly reflects the emphasis to be placed by the new Government on attracting major new industrial development to South Australia.

CROYDON CENTRE

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Premier say what assistance he, as Minister of Ethnic Affairs, is prepared to offer to the Indo-Chinese-Australian Women's Association to establish a community or cultural centre at Croydon? About three months ago the South Australian Housing Trust approved a request to let the association use a house at 2 Queen Street, Croydon, to develop preventive health and welfare programmes. Approval by the council has not been successful owing to the inadequate parking facilities. The Housing Trust does not agree, and has said that sufficient other parking is available. In the meantime the association has been pushed from pillar to post and the arguments still go on.

An officer of the Health Commission, who is a volunteer worker with the association, has told me that, when she made inquiries to see the Premier about the centre and these problems, she was told that the Premier would be too busy. Will the Premier implement the so-called Liberal Party ethnic affairs policy?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, we will implement the Liberal Party policy as set out before the election. The honourable member need have no fear about that. I am most grateful to him for bringing this matter to my attention, as I had not heard of it before. If he will let me have the details, I will certainly look into the matter.

NORTHERN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Water Resources state the exact position that the new Government found in relation to planning and approval for the water filtration plant at Whyalla that was promised by the former Premier during the last election campaign? The *Northern Argus* of 10 October 1979 states:

It was announced shortly before the recent September elections by the then cocksure A.L.P. that these areas would benefit from filtered water, with construction of the plant starting within 18 months. The then A.L.P. Government said this was more than an election promise and filtered water would be available to Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla, the mid-north and Yorke Peninsula towns.

The article said many other things. I therefore think it would be appropriate if the Minister could explain the position so that all and sundry are aware of the facts.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Although the Government regards the filtering of water to the iron triangle as a project of high priority, it considers that the present Murray River salinity control programme entered into by the previous Government is the number one priority for South Australia, on the basis that it affects all water users in South Australia—the domestic supplies for the iron triangle, the metropolitan area of Adelaide, and other

parts of the State. However, the situation has not changed from that which prevailed when the previous Government was in office. The Budget documents which we inherited from that Government made no provision for the commencement of the filtration project in the next financial year.

As a result of the filtration of the metropolitan Adelaide water supplies, members would be aware of the time factor involved from the commencement of the design of a filtration plant to the time when it operates and filtered water becomes available. I am aware of the existing problems, which are highly undesirable, in relation to the quality of the water supply in the iron triangle. In fact, it is similar to the quality of the water I have used all my life as a resident along the Murray River. The turbidity of that water varies considerably from month to month, depending on whether the water is coming from the Darling River or from some other tributary of the Murray River system. The water that I have used all my life comes from the same source. Most people in the Murray River areas use the water for domestic and garden purposes, but very few use it for drinking or cooking purposes. Most tend to use rainwater from a storage tank for that purpose.

I readily accept the undesirability of drinking Murray River water which is unfiltered and unprocessed. There are problems because of the length of the Morgan to Whyalla pipeline, and additional chlorination beyond the normal level is necessary during the heat of summer. We recognise that this is a high priority project. We agree with what the previous Government said: the project will proceed as soon as State funds enable that to happen. The matter was raised with me in a discussion three or four weeks ago by the Most Reverend Bryan Gallagher. The point has been made from other high sources in the iron triangle area, and I readily accept its validity. Provision had not been made to fund the commencement of this project. However, we will proceed with it the moment funds permit.

URANIUM

Mr. PETERSON: Will the Deputy Premier say whether he intends at this time to release the reports on nuclear waste disposal made by Messrs. Dickinson and Wilms-hurst, the two technical officers on the overseas working party on nuclear matters and, if he does not, why not? The mining of uranium and the use of nuclear energy are two of the most divisive topics in the community today. If there is any evidence at all that could be put to the people of South Australia to help them make up their minds on whether or not to support it, it is the duty of the Government to make the information public, but not in a piecemeal manner, as the Minister has suggested. I quote two of his comments. The first is as follows:

The Government is seeking to give the public accurate information. It does not want to put anything over the public. The second was this:

The Government intends to put the facts to the public in relation to the whole of the uranium issue. If that evidence is available, it is the duty of the Government to put it to the public, and it has no right to withhold the information.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is about the most intelligent question we have had from the other side of the House since we began sitting, and I congratulate the honourable member on the perspicacity inherent in his question. I hope that his former confreres on the Opposition side take notice of the common sense he has displayed. I intend to make a speech, during the Address

in Reply debate, in relation to uranium mining and associated matters, and to make the information in those reports available. Without going into detail now, I can say that, on the basis of evidence that has come to me from various sources since I have become Minister, it is clear to me that the previous Government has been engaged in a complete cover-up in relation to the facts on uranium mining. Even at this stage, I can say that it deliberately sought to mislead the public.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. LEWIS: Can the Minister of Agriculture ensure that loans now under review by the State Rural Industries Assistance Authority will not incur higher interest rates or a reduction in loan repayment periods, and will he say whether it is true that, of all States, South Australia has the highest interest rates for rural assistance loans, and that other States either absorb or subsidise the costs of administering the scheme?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The Government is obliged, by virtue of the Commonwealth-State rural reconstruction and rural adjustment agreements, to review arrangements with assisted farmers and to terminate loans if a farmer ceases to work his property properly and personally and fails to observe his undertakings under the agreement or if the authority decides that his prospects of successful economic operation no longer depend on concessional finance. What that really means is that the terms and conditions are laid down before an applicant enters into a loan arrangement with the authority, and those conditions must be adhered to, as would be required if the loan were sought and obtained from a trading bank.

The rural adjustment agreement requires that the authority shall review those terms of repayment, including the interest rates, at regular intervals. At this stage, the review period is five years, with the objective of the borrower being encouraged to transfer to commercial credit as soon as the circumstances surrounding each case permit. Applicants are informed of these obligations at the time of notifying terms and conditions attached to the approved loans and securities incorporate these relevant legal provisions. It was the previous Government's intention to increase interest rates on review to 10 per cent and, at the same time, where applicable to reduce by up to 10 years the period for repayment of farm build-up assistance.

Quite apart from the reported remarks of my predecessor, implying that there was little finance left at the disposal of this authority, I suggest, with great respect, that it was on the basis of this fear of having the term reduced and the interest rates increased under the previous Administration that there was a significant reduction in the number of applicants seeking rural industry assistance funding.

The average rate of interest currently charged in South Australia is 7 per cent per annum, and the Government intends to adopt a consistent interest charge. It will also pay due regard to individual clients' capacity to meet their respective principal and interest repayments. I am conscious of the concern of the rural community about this loan arrangement. Hopefully, because of recent reports about the amount of money now available in South Australia for rural industry assistance and farm build-up, linked with these comments today, the community at large will be somewhat relieved (if not encouraged) to do business with the Government, thus making the best use of available rural funding.

The member for Mallee asked whether interest rates

applicable to loan finance in South Australia were the highest in Australia. They are not. In fact, the average rate of interest of all other States is about 8 per cent, which is about 1 per cent higher than the rate in South Australia. The range of interest rates charged across the Australian States varies from 7 per cent to 10 per cent. Finally, the honourable member has asked who pays the administrative expenses. All States bear those costs themselves, except for 1 per cent which is paid on behalf of the States by the Commonwealth.

COASTGUARD

Mr. SLATER: Is the Chief Secretary aware of the recent increase in the cost of marine radio licences imposed by the Federal Government? If not, will he make himself aware of those costs and make representations to the Federal Government on behalf of the volunteer coastguard of South Australia for those costs not to be increased, because increased costs affect the coastguard operation? I have received from a member of the volunteer coastguard in South Australia a letter, which states:

I wish to draw your attention to the increase in marine radio licences, by the Federal Government, effective from last July. Marine radios as used by the coastguard are only permitted two frequencies, both used for safety purposes when on the water. At the same time CB radio licences were not increased, although for the cost of \$25 an operator has 18 or more channels, and five sets may be operated for the one licence.

The coastguard does not receive financial assistance from any source; therefore, purchase, installation and maintenance of these radios is entirely at the member's expense. This means 24 hours a day any person needing assistance on the water is helped free of charge by coastguard members. For this dedication to public safety the Government has seen fit to increase the cost of the licence.

Will the Minister make representations to his Federal colleagues about this matter on behalf of the volunteer coastguard of South Australia?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am not aware of increases in the cost of marine radio licences; nor am I, to coin a phrase, a full bottle on the subject that the honourable member has raised. I acknowledge the importance of these voluntary organisations that do so much to preserve life by carrying out rescue operations. I shall be pleased to examine the matter raised by the honourable member, and I would be grateful to receive a copy of the correspondence he quoted this afternoon. I will raise the matter with the proper authority.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether he has seen the report in this morning's *Advertiser* of the speech by the Opposition Leader last night in which he claimed, *inter alia*, that unemployment in South Australia has been falling all this year?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I saw the report in the *Advertiser* this morning of the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition. I also saw a report (I presume from a press release from the Leader of the Opposition) several days ago, and I read the Leader's speech made in this House last evening, in which he stated:

The main economic indicators in South Australia have been moving in the right direction for all of this year. The Premier has inherited an economy which has been showing a healthy rate of recovery for some time.

I bring to the attention of the House an assesment made on the South Australian economy, and particularly on unemployment statistics, by the Economics Division of the Department of Trade and Industry. The Leader of the Opposition would know that these reports have been prepared for the Government of the day on a monthly basis for, at least, the past two or three years. The Economics Division of the Department of Trade and Industry is one which the former Premier, and certainly the Premier before him, boasted was the best economic forecaster of any Government in Australia. It was said that the division was the envy of every other State Government, especially when former Premier Don Dunstan attended Premier's Conferences. It was said that one could almost see the saliva dripping from the mouths of the other State Premiers when they listened to Mr. Dunstan. I therefore bring to the attention of the House what the latest survey by the Department of Trade and Industry indicates.

Mr. Bannon: Are you tabling the full monthly report?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If the honourable member cares to listen, I will quote part of the report. Regarding unemployment figures, the report states:

South Australia's share of total Australian unemployment worsened substantially in the four months from April to August 1979.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the House the exact figures, which show that, in June 1979, 43 265 persons were unemployed in South Australia, and, in August 1979, 43 693 persons were unemployed, an increase of about 400. Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition believes that an increase in unemployment is a move in the right direction, if one takes what he said in his speech yesterday as a fair indication.

I also point out to the Leader of the Opposition that, in April 1979, South Australia had 10.3 per cent of the national unemployed; in May, 10.5 per cent; in June, 10.4 per cent; in July, 10.8 per cent; and in August, 11 per cent. Those figures show that there has been a substantial and significant increase in the percentage of unemployed persons in South Australia, yet the Leader of the Opposition is gullible enough to stand up and try to fool this House and the public of this State into believing that economic indicators are moving in the right direction. It is interesting to note that, although the Leader referred to the main economic indicators, the last one with which he dealt in a scant fashion, and used select statistics, was unemployment.

In fact, he placed in higher priority than unemployment figures the indicator of overtime, which I have always believed is a very poor indicator of the state of the economy. The speech given by the Leader of the Opposition last night was grossly misleading and one of which he should be ashamed. Having been in Government and having had access to those monthly reports for the time that he was in Government, he knows that his speech was quite wrong, inaccurate and misleading.

RADIUM HILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question, to the Deputy Premier, is supplementary to the question asked by my good friend the member for Mitchell at the beginning of Question Time, and it is about waste disposal.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will come to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Immediately, Sir. Why is the Minister so vehement in his denial that Radium Hill will be

used as a repository for nuclear wastes from overseas? I was slightly surprised by the Minister's answer a little while ago because, as I understood him to say in this place a week ago, the problem of waste has been solved—that in many parts of the world there is no problem about the disposal of waste products whatever any more. I do not accept that, but the Minister made this very bold assertion, and stuck to it. If there is no problem with the disposal of wastes, why should they not be disposed of anywhere in South Australia or anywhere else? It seems to me that there is a contradiction between his assertion last week that this problem has been solved and his assertion that in no circumstances will Radium Hill, or presumably any other part of South Australia, be used for that purpose.

Mr. Corcoran: The best place to dispose of it would be in the Minister's backyard?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why not? If the problem has been solved, it would not matter where it was put. Why does the Minister make this denial that Radium Hill or anywhere else will be used for this purpose? There just seems to be, as in so many of his utterances on this matter, a fundamental contradiction.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The first observation I am prompted to make is that if the member for Mitcham had been in the House yesterday—if it was one of those rare occasions when he was in attendance—he would not have asked the question. However, I am prepared to repeat for his benefit what I said yesterday. A press report appeared yesterday and, as I pointed out in my Ministerial statement, it did not emanate from my office or from the office of the Minister of Health. A whole tissue of lies was built up on the basis of that press statement by members of the Government, and that would explain, perhaps, the degree of vehemence—

Mr. KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand the Deputy Premier to say that a whole tissue of lies was built up by members of the Opposition. If he means members of the Government, I will allow them to take the point of order; if he is reflecting on members of the Opposition, I ask that he be required to withdraw that statement.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. There was nothing specific and, as has been pointed out, the Deputy Premier indicated that it was the Government which had made the assertions.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thank the honourable member; of course, I was referring to the former Government. That may explain the alleged vehemence of the member for Mitcham. When one is confronted by a tissue of lies, one tends to be vehement in repudiation of those lies. In fact, I explained to the House that consideration was being given to the use of Radium Hill as a repository for some material which had accumulated during the life of the Labor Government; there was no question of handling of overseas waste.

Members of the Opposition were seeking to instil fear in the mind of the public by suggesting that we would have to receive waste back in to South Australia. That is not a consideration with which this Government will have to come to terms during the life of this Government. When I make available the information requested by the member for Semaphore, I think many of the problems which are worrying the member for Mitcham may be solved.

ST. KILDA BOAT CHANNEL

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Environment say what progress has been made in the dredging of the St. Kilda boat channel? Problems at St. Kilda have concerned

boat owners and fishermen for a long time, and I know they will be anxious to hear about progress on this important matter. Many boat owners and fishermen, some of whom live in my district, are keen to use the facilities at St. Kilda, but the shallowness of the launching area has made this extremely inconvenient and difficult in recent years.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I can appreciate the interest shown in this matter by the member for Goyder, and I thank him very much for the question. The new Government has been asked by representatives of the St. Kilda Boat Owners Association whether it will be prepared to continue with the work. I can assure the House that that work is now in progress. In fact, work commenced on 1 October, and it has been progressing slowly but surely since then. It has been delayed because of the inclement weather and because of the nature of the work itself. Dredging of the channel has already commenced, starting adjacent to the boat ramp, and it is expected that this project will take from four to five months to complete. We are hoping (and we are almost certain) that it will be ready by part-way through the summer period.

The House will recall that approval was given for the allocation of a subsidy of \$140 000 to the City of Salisbury to dredge the channel. This subsidy was 70 per cent of the estimated cost of \$200 000, and I understand that the balance is to be provided by the Salisbury council. I can assure the member for Goyder that the Government is anxious to have this project completed as soon as possible.

WORKING WOMEN'S CENTRE

Mr. PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government intends to maintain its support and funding for the Working Women's Centre?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will reply to the question, as it relates to a matter dealt with by the Premier's Department. That centre is an extension of the Division of Equal Opportunity and the Women's Adviser. The matter has not been considered. I will certainly take it up and get a report for the honourable member.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Premier indicate to the House and to the public what is the Government's policy on the abolition of daylight saving? Since the election, many people have contacted me inquiring about the future of daylight saving. Many people are of the opinion that, with a change of Government, we will see the end of daylight saving in this State. As this matter is of great concern to many of my constituents, particularly those in the country areas, I would appreciate a clarification of the Government's policy and its future intentions.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am well aware of the considerable concern in country areas, particularly in country areas on the West Coast, where the time meridian makes the imposition of daylight saving somewhat of a burden on the people. Various representations have been made to me over the years that daylight saving presents difficulties to children going to school and to the farming community in relation to the timing of deliveries to silos, and so on. I have considered those views seriously, because obviously they are well based as far as the individuals are concerned. However, when one examines the attitude of the overall community in South Australia

(and I believe that at least one survey has been done on this subject), there is no doubt that the general consensus of opinion is that daylight saving is desirable, and it is wanted by most people. That does not mean that we resile in any way from the position we have always adopted as a matter of policy, that is, that daylight saving will be continued in its present form but that we have undertaken to put the matter to referendum at the first possible opportunity. That does not mean that we will have a separate referendum, but it does mean that at the time of the next election it will be one of the subjects (there may be others) that could be put to a referendum, which would be held in conjunction with the next State election.

At 3.6 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ABSENCE FROM THE HOUSE

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My attention has been drawn to remarks made last evening during the adjournment debate by the member for Hanson. I regret that he is not here to hear my personal explanation. I have now read the *Hansard* of his speech—

Mr. Corcoran: He's in the lavatory reading the wall. He gets a lot of his stuff from there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hartley may be correct. I have, as a result, had the records of the House for the last 25 years checked, and I find that during that time I have been absent for 41 days out of 1 416, and in 18 of those 25 years I did not miss a day. In the last three sessions I have been absent on only one day. That was last session when, by unanimous vote of the House (I was already out), I was suspended for three days. I presume that the member for Hanson was here and took part in my suspension.

It is true that I was away on Tuesday, as I had to go overseas, but I was in the Chamber for some time last evening during which time I listened to an excellent speech by the member for Flinders, and I was in the building for a considerably longer time, working in my room. I did not at any time see the member for Hanson either in the Chamber or elsewhere. To those many members who find the deliberations of this House the poorer for my not being present, I apologise for my absence on Tuesday. I surmise that the member for Hanson said what he did out of irritation because—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's irritation has nothing to do with the personal explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir—at least twice when he was speaking on the Budget a quorum had to be formed, and later he was provoked by Labor members over the gift which has been given to him by the Government of the free use of a Government motor car.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 October. Page 167.)

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): In taking part in this Budget debate, I propose to outline the Government's energy strategy for South Australia. The statement on uranium mining, which the Government has promised to deliver, will be provided later in the present session.

Honourable members will recall that, during the recent election campaign, the Liberal Party's policy on energy called for strong management of the State's existing energy resources, encouragement for the discovery and development of additional energy resources, and incentives for research and development of alternative energy sources and energy conservation.

In the short time since this Government came to office, we have been concerned to implement our undertakings by means of the measures I will outline in a moment. But first, let me describe the energy situation in South Australia. The South Australian energy situation can best be described as one of imbalance. In other words, the available supply of energy does not match up nearly as closely as would be desirable to the requirements for consumption of energy by domestic, commercial and industrial consumers.

For instance, South Australia has extensive coal deposits which amount to more than half of our energy reserves but satisfy only about one-quarter of our current energy demand. Members are no doubt aware that, as well as the deposits at Leigh Creek which are used for electric power generation, deposits have been located at Lake Phillipson and Port Wakefield. There is a small deposit at Lock, on Eyre Peninsula. However, extensive evaluations need to be undertaken to determine how these deposits can best be utilised, and in particular to examine the suitability of the Wakefield deposit as a future source for power generation.

On the other hand, we face a much tighter situation with regard to natural gas. Natural gas from the Cooper Basin constitutes about 4 per cent of our presently known energy reserves, but accounts for about one-third of our energy usage. In fact, unless there are further major gas finds in the Cooper Basin, supplies of natural gas for Adelaide are not assured beyond 1987. The Government has already announced a major programme to assist in the exploration effort to identify further supplies, as I will cover in a moment.

Apart from uranium, the only other non-renewable energy source now available in South Australia is petroleum liquids, consisting of crude oil, l.p.g. and condensate, associated with the natural gas reserves in the Cooper Basin. While it is expected that further exploration will locate additional petroleum reserves, the presently known liquid reserves constitute about 1 per cent of our energy reserves, while petroleum products constitute about 40 per cent of our energy usage. The value of these petroleum liquids, though, should not be under-estimated. The l.p.g. reserves in the Cooper Basin are estimated to amount to about 90 000 000 barrels which, if developed over, say, a 20-year period, would supply on an annual basis over 10 times our current annual consumption of l.p.g. Overall, the crude oil and condensate of the Cooper Basin constitute 5 per cent of Australia's liquid petroleum reserves.

Thus, the situation is one where South Australia is more than self-sufficient in coal resources. However, it should be understood that, because of the qualities of these coals, they present problems in utilisation and considerable work will need to be done to enable their use as an energy resource. We are able to rely on natural gas supplies until 1987 and are totally reliant on imports of petroleum products.

I now deal with this Government's approach to the energy situation. Let me say, though, from the outset that, while this Government sees the energy situation as challenging, we do not see it as presenting problems that are insurmountable. We are confident that, with sound management and appropriate policies, South Australia can enter the twenty-first century with a sound energy base.

Essentially our approach to the energy situation has two aspects: we are concerned to increase the supply of energy available for consumption, while at the same time reducing the overall level of demand for scarce energy resources.

Let me first detail the measures we are taking to increase the supply of energy available for consumption. The Government's approval of an accelerated exploration programme in the South Australian portion of the Cooper Basin by the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation amounting to some \$31 500 000 over the next three years has already been announced. In practical terms, South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation will be able to increase its drilling rates to a minimum of 22 wells during the next three years. I use the word "minimum" because, if there is private sector participation in the future, as there has been in the past, the rate could be much more than that. There will also be an expanded programme of seismic surveys.

This programme recognises the need to explore in areas away from the presently known gas producing areas, as well as testing for extensions of known fields. This balanced programme will therefore be designed both to add to presently known reserves and to provide information on the ultimate reserves likely to be available in the South Australian portion of the Cooper Basin. It is also probable that additional petroleum liquids reserves will be identified as a result of this programme.

The Redcliff project is a major priority for this Government, as it was for its predecessor. This project offers South Australia many major benefits, of which members are no doubt aware, including the opportunity to provide a strong impetus to the development of the Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Whyalla area and the very real strengthening of the South Australian and Australian economies because of the financial impact of the complex and the role that its output will play in import substitution. The present situation is that Dow's feasibility studies are continuing, with every possibility of a favourable conclusion in 1980. The changes to the Redcliff Steering Committee announced at the weekend are intended to further demonstrate the Government's commitment to the success of the project, and to further enhance the contribution from the Government's study team. This also is demonstrated by the provision of \$96 000 for the Redcliff Urban Project Group.

The liquids pipeline to be constructed as part of the project at an estimated cost of more than \$50 000 000 will make the Cooper Basin liquids available for refining and use. Funding for the liquids pipeline is covered by the Loan Council borrowing approval for Redcliff obtained last year.

With regard to coal, supplies other than Leigh Creek pose some particular problems to be resolved before they can be utilised effectively. We are nevertheless exploring all possibilities with a view to improving this outlook as soon as possible. In particular, the Electricity Trust is conducting combustion tests on Wakefield coal. Costs so far associated with its evaluation of Wakefield coal are of the order of \$4 000 000. The Energy Division of my department is also investigating other options for processing and utilisation of South Australian coals.

Reserves of coal sufficient for the requirements of the new Northern power station at Port Augusta have been established. Their recovery will necessitate mining to much greater depths than at present, and the Electricity Trust will spend \$60 000 000 over the next six years to purchase the heavy equipment necessary to undertake this mining. To facilitate this mining, the township of Leigh Creek is being relocated at a site known as Leigh Creek South, 13 kilometres distant, at a cost of \$36 000 000. Construction of the new power station, which will have a capacity of 500 megawatts, will involve the Electricity Trust in expenditure estimated to be in excess of \$300 000 000 over the next five years. When complete it will cope with anticipated increased electricity demands of the mid-1980's.

I now turn to energy conservation. Many of the short-falls in the energy supply situation are due to over-use or inefficient use of scarce fuels. To the extent that overall energy consumption is reduced and made more efficient, and to the extent that demand can be switched to relatively less scarce energy resources, there is great potential for existing energy supplies to more effectively satisfy the requirements of all users. We see the question of energy conservation depending upon public education, Government example, and research and development. I will deal with each of these in turn.

In terms of public education, provision has been made in the Budget for expenditure of about \$109 000 on the national energy conservation programme. This campaign will comprise a major advertising campaign, a booklet for motorists, public relations activities, four specialised leaflets, and manuals on management for industry and commerce. The advertising, which commences on 21 October and extends to April 1980, is concerned primarily with the conservation of petrol by private motorists and will consist of television, radio, press, and outdoor advertisements. These will feature commentary by Peter Wherett and animation by Larry Pickering's drawings and will urge motorists to save up to \$100 in 12 months by fuel-conscious driving.

I am pleased to say that officers of my department made a significant contribution to the preparation of this campaign. It is expected that the proposed level of expenditure, over the six-month period, will lead to much greater awareness throughout the whole community of the need to husband our energy sources much more carefully than has been the case in the past. In addition to participation in this national campaign, the South Australian Government has under consideration the establishment of an energy information and advisory centre, to provide advice to the public on the use and conservation of energy.

As I mentioned a moment ago, I believe that it is important for the Government to be setting an example. This is being done in a number of ways. The decision of the previous Government to reduce the State Government's fuel consumption by 10 per cent has been continued by the present Government.

Perhaps one of the most visible examples of energy conservation by the South Australian Government is the conversion of the Ministerial car fleet to smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles. This was promised by the Premier when he delivered the Government's policy speech during the recent State election. I am pleased to be able to report that the process of vehicle replacement has already begun and will continue as vehicles become due for replacement.

With regard to research and development, this is being undertaken in two ways. First, the Government itself is undertaking appropriate research and development projects. For example, the Energy Division of my

department is investigating the possibility of reducing lubricating oil consumption by heavy vehicles. Similarly, the division has initiated a study to assess the potential for energy recovery from domestic, industrial and other wastes in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The Energy Division is currently undertaking a major study of the processing options for Cooper Basin crude oil and natural gas liquids and the possible introduction of Cooper Basin l.p.g. into the South Australian market. This study also involves an assessment of the potential utilisation of l.p.g. as a replacement for motor spirit. Currently, there are still some matters to be resolved in the establishment of adequate safety standards and procedures, and the more extensive usage of l.p.g. as a motor vehicle fuel will need to be associated with a significant increase in the number of refilling points.

The Government will take the necessary steps to ensure that the l.p.g. market is developed in an orderly manner and, in particular, will seek to maximise the benefit to South Australia of utilising l.p.g. from the Cooper Basin, as a motor vehicle fuel, as it becomes available from about 1984. With adequate planning now, this will allow time for the establishment of adequate safety standards, for the necessary expansion of the distribution network, for the development of suitable vehicles and conversions, and for the development of the large potential market for this important supplement to our motor vehicle fuel supplies.

The Government is also looking into the question of the early establishment of a pipeline from the Cooper Basin that would make l.p.g. available to allow the development of this important market, in addition to being utilised to deliver the feedstocks for the Redcliff project.

The second approach to research and development is to encourage appropriate activities by the private sector. The philosophy of this Government is to support the private sector wherever possible. In the case of energy conservation research and development, we believe this to be particularly important because the contact that businesses have with the market place will ensure that those projects that have the greatest chance of success will proceed first. There will thus be an early pay-back, not just in terms of individual firms' performances and the employment prospects that will result from that, but also in terms of the achievement of the Government's energy conservation goals.

The annual allocation to the State Energy Research Advisory Committee has been increased by almost \$50 000. This committee, which now functions as a subcommittee of the South Australian Energy Council, allocates funds to energy research projects likely to benefit the State. In the recent past these have included solar energy, energy storage, building design and fossil fuel use efficiency.

While the prime purpose of these projects has been, as the committee's name implies, energy research, it is impossible not to overlook the employment potential of some of the projects. In particular, solar energy (and the committee's projects have included both domestic and industrial use of solar energy) has great potential for increased employment. This is because of the manpower required to fabricate solar energy appliances and to install them.

In addition to the programme of funding through SENRAC, the Government has included an allocation of \$120 000 in the Budget for a demonstration programme to support development of the Flinders electric vehicle. The \$120 000 will be used to subsidise the purchase of 12 electric vans, six of which will be used by Government departments and six of which will be used by the private and semi-government sectors. The aim of the programme

is to provide a detailed technical and economic evaluation of performance as an aid to establishing the Flinders electric vehicle technology in the market place. Successful development of the vehicle is expected to lead to significant royalties and manufacturing opportunities for the State.

The demonstration programme will be co-ordinated by the Energy Division of my department, and is contingent upon successful trials of a prototype of the van in normal operating circumstances, and on confirmation that the required conversions can be carried out at a reasonable cost. It is hoped that evaluation of the prototype can commence later this year.

In passing, I point out that we would have liked to make more funds available for research and development. However, in the present tight budgetary situation this is not possible. In the event of additional royalties becoming available from uranium mining and other mining developments, we would expect a percentage of these to be devoted to energy research, particularly on alternative energy sources.

Before closing, I want to say something about energy management in this State. The energy situation is complex and fast changing and yet, particularly in the face of continued oil price increases by OPEC and shortages of supply of some products, there is an increasing need for sound and effective decisions by Government.

In these circumstances the Government, in framing the Budget, has had regard to the resources available to its two main sources of advice: the Energy Division of my department and the South Australian Energy Council. The Energy Division has broad and important functions, including:

- (a) The co-ordination and development of State Government energy activities and the formulation of policy advice.
- (b) The assessment of the State's energy resources and analyses of the options for the development of future energy supplies for the State.
- (c) The study of ways in which energy is utilised.
- (d) The development of policies to encourage the conservation of energy and the development of alternative energy sources.

In addition to these responsibilities, the division has also had on-going responsibility for the State's relationships with the Commonwealth Government, refiners and major users regarding energy supply, availability and distribution.

Through the Energy Division, this Government is co-operating with the Commonwealth Government in an evaluation of the appropriate strategies that should be developed to handle shortages in petroleum product supplies which may occur in the future.

It is important to recognise that the Middle East countries are unlikely to increase their levels of production in the future to fully accommodate increases in demand, and that this could lead to shortages in crude oil or petroleum product supplies that continue for considerably longer periods than have been experienced in the past. Governments therefore need to develop policies to conserve the demand for petroleum products, and to plan appropriate strategies for handling longer-term shortages in supply. This Government is actively participating in such developments through the involvement of the Energy Division in the Commonwealth-State Oil Supplies Liaison Committee and the National Petroleum Advisory Committee.

The South Australian Energy Council is serviced by the Energy Division. Its function is to provide advice to the Minister on energy conservation; development and co-

ordination of existing energy supplies; development and utilisation of energy resources; rationalisation of final uses of energy; and research into alternative energy sources, in particular, solar energy.

The great strength of this committee is that it provides a forum where important members of South Australia's energy community, from both inside and outside Government, can meet and share their knowledge and experience and provide balanced and considered advice to the Government.

In fulfilment of its functions, the council has in the past undertaken projects on its own account or commissioned them from outside sources. These projects have been of great value and have included a survey on the domestic uses of energy, energy audits of industrial, office and domestic premises and, in conjunction with Amdel, a study on the characteristics of South Australian coals.

In the past, the funds available for studies of this type and for other activities such as projects to demonstrate effective alternative energy applications have been limited.

In view of the council's role, and the challenges facing it in the future, the Budget increases the allocation of funds to it by \$30 000. The Government looks forward to advice of continuing high standards from the council in the future and to acting on that advice.

It is also intended that there will be closely co-ordinated operation of the Energy Council, the Energy Research Advisory Committee and the Energy Division. This Government regards integrated and co-ordinated energy management as essential in the present situation. Moves that the Government is making are directed to that end.

In conjunction with the initiatives I have outlined, important consultative groups also will be established to ensure effective consultation in the formulation of advice to the Government on factors and policies affecting the ways energy is used. Key areas which will require particular consideration include the use of liquid fuels and the use of energy in buildings.

Advice on liquid fuels supply is obtained already from the South Australian Oil Industry Supply Committee, which includes the State Managers of the nine major oil companies. Further advice and consultation is obtained through this State's participation in the Commonwealth State Oil Supplies Liaison Committee and the National Petroleum Advisory Committee.

To extend these consultations, and to ensure that proper consideration is given to the needs of all sectors in South Australia, especially in the light of some supply problems which could be encountered in some areas in the future, it is intended to establish a Liquid Fuels Utilisation Consultative Committee. This body will enable effective consultation between users and the Energy Division on all vital areas of liquid fuels utilisation and will assist in the formulation of proposals for consideration by the Energy Council and the Government.

Mr. DUNCAN: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Another important matter considered in the Liberal Party mines and energy policy was the question of energy in buildings. To assist the Energy Division in the work in this area, which it will be asked to undertake and co-ordinate, it is intended to establish an Energy in Buildings Consultative Committee, which will provide advice on the formulation of policy measures to conserve energy and to contain energy costs in houses and buildings. Details of these two consultative committees will be announced in the near future.

The intention to establish these consultative bodies indicates the positive approach this Government is adopting towards formulating effective policies to deal with important areas of energy use, to seek measures to contain costs, and to consider the important aspects of the adequacy of future supplies and the equitable distribution of available supplies in any future period of possible shortage.

I have set out the Government's policies with regard to energy in the light of the Budget currently before the House. Faced by the twin challenges of budgetary constraint and a demanding energy situation, the Government is adopting a most positive approach. New exploration is to be undertaken. Planning for Redcliff is to proceed. Possibilities for the use of the State's huge coal reserves are to be investigated. A public education programme on energy conservation is about to begin. The Government is actively setting an example in energy conservation. Energy research and development programmes by both Government and private industry are to be actively and materially encouraged, and energy management is to be strengthened. All these steps should assure the State's energy future and equip the State for the challenges of the twenty-first century. I commend the Budget to the House.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the second reading of these Bills. I think that you, Sir, would be tempted to agree with me when I suggest that, having listened to the last speaker setting out what are supposed to be this Government's initiatives relating to energy, one could have been forgiven for a moment for thinking that one was listening to the previous Minister of Mines and Energy (then the Hon. Hugh Hudson), because the speaker gave a complete outline and listing of the initiatives implemented by the previous Government.

I propose to deal briefly with some of the points that he made. First, I take up with the Deputy Premier his initial remarks in which he said that the Government's policy called for strong management of our energy resources. I am taking him out of context and do not wish to discuss the other matters he mentioned in relation to that matter, but I was surprised to hear him say that, because I have a copy of the mines and energy policy of the Liberal Party, and I cannot find the words "strong management" anywhere in that policy. It may be that a supplementary sheet has been issued containing those words, but I got my copy of this document headed "Liberal Party policy", subheaded "Mines and Energy", from the Parliamentary Library. I think that the Government was probably second guessing on its policy, it having stood for a few weeks during the election campaign and the Deputy Premier having now had the opportunity to have another look at it.

The first point that the Deputy Premier made was that supplies of natural gas were not assured for South Australian usage beyond 1987. My response to that is, "What's new?" I recall the former member for Brighton, when Minister of Mines and Energy, making that point on more than one occasion in the House and stressing that point when telling the House about measures that the then Government was taking to try to improve that situation.

Secondly, the Deputy Premier said that the present Liberal Government was going to enter the next century on a sound energy basis. I am not sure whether he was suggesting that it was the South Australian society or only the present Government that was going to enter the next century on a sound energy basis. I take issue with the latter, because I have other plans, as has my Party, about the time the present Government is likely to spend on the Treasury benches. If the people of South Australia do

enter the next century on a sound energy basis, that will be because of the work done by the previous Government, and particularly the previous Minister, who held the portfolio that the Deputy Premier now holds. I mention, for example, that under the direction of the Hon. Hugh Hudson, as he then was, the Department of Mines and energy commenced the great work, which is going on now and which has been going on over the years, of trying to prove further gas reserves for South Australia and searching for new oil deposits. I can recall the previous Minister announcing in this House not long ago that an oil show had occurred in a well being drilled, and so on.

As further support for the contention that I am now putting forward, I mention that over the past several years continuous reports have been provided because of the efforts of the previous Government, the departments concerned, and the Minister during those years, about the finding of further coal reserves in new locations and new deposits of coal of different types. Work is already under way to analyse the uses of those coal deposits.

The Deputy Premier cited, as an important point of the new Government's energy policy, the fact that \$96 000 was provided in the Budget for the "Redcliff Urban Planning Project Group". I think that, if *Hansard* is studied, one will see that the Minister said "Urban Project Group". I sympathise with him because I have had a few changes of portfolio in my time in this House, and I suspect he is having trouble grappling with the one he has been landed with and that he is not entirely familiar with some of these titles. So far as I am concerned, it is called the "Urban Planning Project Group", as it was called when I was Minister of Planning. It was the efforts of the previous Government, long before the people of South Australia dreamed that they would suffer the calamity of having to live under a Liberal Government, that provided this money. I do not quarrel with the present Government about this, because at least it has not interfered with that wise move made by the previous Government in allocating money to that project group.

The Deputy Premier went on to say that reserves for the Leigh Creek fired power station in the North were proved. Once again, it would be apparent to anyone, and not necessarily a member of the House, that that kind of work is done over a long period. Therefore, no credit for this move would be due to the Government now occupying the Treasury benches in this House.

Perhaps by way of light entertainment, the Deputy Premier then threw in the conservation issue, and stated that some hundreds of thousand of dollars were to be devoted to a national conservation campaign. I suppose he was speaking with one hand behind his back and his fingers crossed, although I did not observe him closely. That programme has been planned for some time. I suspect that the idea originally came from the mind of the Federal Minister, Mr. Newman, and his advisers, because of the shortage of liquid fuel resources and supplies in Australia. Mr. Newman decided to come up with a conservation campaign, but a decision had been made by the previous Government to go along with this worthwhile proposal. I do not quarrel with the aims of the proposed campaign.

The Deputy Premier then went on to say that the Government was looking at the provision of advisory centres for energy conservation. I have news for him and other members of the House: that concept was considered by the previous Government, which obviously had a similar project in mind. The Deputy Premier then revealed one of the more blatant attempts by the Government to try to crib the last bit of credit for

something done by the previous Government, when he referred to the Government's car-conversion, energy-saving effort. It was pointed out in this House yesterday, and also stated in the press long ago, that the decision to convert to smaller Government vehicles, less gas-guzzling monsters, was taken by the previous Government. Some time is needed to set a project like that in motion. I am sure that the Minister was not suggesting there should be a wholesale bundling out of vehicles immediately the decision was taken, irrespective of losses that would be incurred because of a hasty sale. Fancy that coming from a Minister who professes to represent a waste saving and a waste cutting Government!

The Deputy Premier went on the talk about energy conservation in other areas, and put this concept forward as an effort of the present Government. The public of South Australia would not be fooled if subjected to this tirade. I suppose the Minister is operating on the premise that only a limited number of people read *Hansard*; therefore, if these comments were bundled into *Hansard*, they might get some credence, and nothing would be lost. I cannot, for the life of me, understand the reluctance of a member of this House, who has been elected by the people and is now a member of the Government, to give credit to the previous Government where it is due. What is wrong with giving credit where it is due? How would that action undermine one's position? I have never been able to understand this approach to the matter. More than once in this House I praised Senator Guilfoyle, the Federal Minister for Social Security. I did not always praise her, but I did so when she did something with which I agreed or when I felt praise was due. On other occasions, I have praised persons in the State or Commonwealth sphere irrespective of their political background.

There is no need for the Government to try to score political points all the time. Everyone in South Australia knows that the previous Government did many good things. As a member of that Government, I do not claim that it was perfect. The previous Government did many good things; there is no quarrel with that in the mind of the community. Let me assure new members of the House that that is the feeling abroad. Perhaps the former Government made mistakes, but at least it should be recognised by the present Government that we did some good things. The present Government should not be ashamed to give credit to the former Government on occasion. Members on my side of the political fence can only be driven to the conclusion that members opposite have nothing to put forward that could gain them any credit.

The Minister spoke about energy conservation in regard to housing and buildings. He wandered around, but he was not too specific. He then said that consultative committees would be set up. That had already been done by the previous Government. An officer from the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs was sent to the United States on a cost-sharing basis with a private firm. It is claimed that we on this side will have nothing to do with private enterprise. However, on that occasion a senior officer was sent overseas to investigate energy conservation in relation to buildings. He has since returned and has produced a report, which was available before the election took place. We are now told by the Minister that, as an important point in its energy policy, the Government will set up consultative committees. The officer of whom I speak visited California and other centres in America; he had the opportunity to see the latest ideas, both in the legislative field and regarding actual building methods used.

In California, as some members may know, points are awarded, on a point scoring sheet, in relation to whether

development approval for the erection of large buildings is given. Approval depends on the obtaining of a proper energy saving points score. That is a positive way to approach energy conservation. That knowledge was brought back to this State by the officer concerned, yet the Government now says that it proposes to set up consultative committees. I have no quarrel with this proposal if additional information is needed, but why did the Minister put that forward in a snide way? First, it was read out—the whole damned lot. I am prepared to allow for that.

Probably no member in the House has had more portfolios than I, especially if it is assumed that I am now dealing with another portfolio. There are ways to get on top of subjects covered by a particular portfolio. I do not think anyone in this House would expect a new Minister to get up and waffle for hours, with or without sense, on topics he has recently inherited. It would not be sensible to expect new Ministers to do that. I would not expect the Minister for Planning to get up immediately and talk on planning in all of its aspects.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I would certainly not get up and waffle.

Mr. PAYNE: I would not expect the Minister of Environment to get up and cover all aspects of his portfolio, although I would expect him to have a good knowledge of these concepts, because he covered those subjects during his time as a shadow spokesman—or the shadow Minister, which was the term used by the Party previously occupying these benches. I do not understand the Minister's attitude. He went on to say that the Government is looking at a pipeline from the Cooper Basin. That has been heard before from the previous Minister; this fact was public knowledge. The Minister stood in the House reciting everything done by the previous Government, endorsed the policies, approved of them, said the proper action was being taken, and put them forward as being the Government's policies. How shallow and shabby can the Government get regarding these matters?

It did not end there. The Minister went on to speak about Flinders electric vehicles. This was another example of the proper use of energy. He said that a sum of money would be put forward to enable this work on the Flinders electric vehicles to continue, especially in relation to the provision of a number of vans which would be equipped and which would be used on a trial basis as a private project. Every bit of that project had already gone to air, been in print and so on, and had been given full media coverage. I will not go on any longer about those points; they do not deserve any more than the original attention I gave them and the label I gave them which was that they are examples of the wrong approach to these matters in this House. There is no need for any member to be ashamed of ignorance of a matter about which he has not had time to get information. What members need to be ashamed of is the failure to want to get the information and the failure to make the attempt to get the information.

When I originally rose to speak I had some other topics in mind, and I would have continued in that vein if I had not been provoked by the previous Minister's shabby attempt to grab credit for the previous Government's efforts. I intend to concentrate mainly on what I see as very important matters pertaining to the Budget which, despite their apparent innocence as statements in that document, call for some correction or amplification. One matter in this category that I would like to canvass is that of the threat to public safety and to the environment which has been precipitated by the decision of the Government to proceed headlong with uranium mining in South

Australia. I think I am justified in using the term "headlong" because the Liberal policy on mines and energy states: "A Liberal Government will encourage the development of Roxby Downs."

As stated earlier, I can also produce the actual photocopy from the Parliamentary Library that contains that same statement. Try as I may I cannot find in the remaining four paragraphs of that policy the words "mine uranium". I want to make that point quite clearly. There is a matching statement in the Budget document paralleling the statement I have already outlined, as follows:

Our financial planning recognises the importance of the northern power station, Redcliff, and Roxby Downs developments.

It does not say anything about mining there either. It does not even put in the word "mining", but it does refer to Roxby Downs development. The Liberals argue that they received a mandate for that development. But, clearly, the perception of the electorate in South Australia is that exploration and development would occur over some years before any actual mining took place. Yet in the *Advertiser* of 21 September 1979, six days after the election, the Deputy Premier is quoted as saying that approval for uranium mining at Lake Frome had been given. The report of an interview with Chris Milne states:

The new Minister has caused a flurry with his announcement of approval for uranium mining at Lake Frome, and he reveals he will be having discussions "within a week or two" with the principals of Honeymoon.

I am referring to the approval given, as announced in an interview on uranium mining, to the Honeymoon deposit at Lake Frome. We have here an announcement that actual mining is to proceed. The real point I want to raise for the consideration of this House is that of protection for the environment and for people in this State. The same article dismisses that topic in two lines, as follows:

At Honeymoon the environmental impact will be minimal.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Read the rest of the statements regarding the feasibility studies and environmental impact statements that will be carried out.

Mr. PAYNE: After nine years you can occasionally throw out a line and know you are going to get a bite. I knew I would get a bite, and I had it covered. What does the statement "At Honeymoon the environmental impact will be minimal" actually mean? Will water be used in any of the processing at the Honeymoon site? Can the Minister answer that?

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Why do you think we've said we'll have an environmental impact statement, in the first place?

Mr. PAYNE: He is not going so well. Where will the water come from? I have other questions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time.

Mr. PAYNE: Well, Sir, I always respect your ruling and I am certain you understand that I am putting forward my speech in what is called the interrogatory manner, and I expect that you are only too willing to accept that form of speech. The third point that I raise by way of a query is: will the water that is used become contaminated? What method of disposal will be used for that water or for any other contaminated products? Is contamination of artesian water likely during the disposal of contaminated water? What will be the effect on the ecological balance in that arid area? They are just some of the questions which must arise in relation to the mining of that one small area and which are unanswered at this stage, notwithstanding all the assurances of the Minister, who is doing his best (and I give him credit for that) to defend the Deputy Premier, albeit unsuccessfully.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You're just showing your complete ignorance as to what the environmental process is all about.

Mr. PAYNE: I will come to that in a moment. After 21 September, after the date it was announced that uranium mining would take place and had been approved, then we were given information in the House, only after some questioning that put pressure on the Government. It came from the Deputy Premier by way of what we all know was a Dorothy Dixier, and it took the form: "Don't worry; she's apples; the Department for the Environment will take care of it." That sums up what was said.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: The Minister can get up and make his speech in due course.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You should have had a look at the policy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Minister should let the honourable member continue.

Mr. PAYNE: Is there a legislative requirement for an environmental impact statement to be carried out on such a project? Let the Minister interject now.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: No, because the previous Government did not bring any—

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

Mr. PAYNE: Now we are getting to the nub of it. Maybe the Minister, who has just fallen into that trap, will come to understand why he should never have departed from the measure voted for in this House not that long ago that unless and until certain safeguards existed there would not be mining of uranium in this State. Our Party is in a clear, unequivocal position on this matter. That was the holding operation that gave time for legislation to be brought forward, information to be obtained, public debate to take place, and so on. That is the one proper position to adopt on these matters.

Let us develop this a little further. How are environmental statements obtained? They are obtained by requests to the organisation proposing the development. Certainly approval might be withheld unless a report was made, but what happens if, after the approval, an environmental statement is made and something is required of the organisation which received the approval, and it then tells the Government to jump in the lake? Is there any legal requirement for it to do anything about it? I have discussed this today with officers of the Minister's department, who have assured me that there is no legal requirement whatsoever.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Do you expect us to have done it in a month, when you had 10 years to do it?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not expect the Minister to do anything; that is his problem. He is one of those who sought to get the reins of Government. He has to work it out in conjunction with his fellows. I reserve the right to tell the people of this State what has happened in this matter, that a precipitate decision was made to jump in and give approval. I bet there were a few rumbles in Cabinet after the Deputy Premier slipped a cog and jumped in both feet and head as well, because there is no legal requirement. The department has requested environmental statements before in matters of development in this State.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: At least you're allowed to get information from the department. We were not allowed to.

Mr. PAYNE: There was never any problem of getting information from any departments of which I was Minister when the request was put in the correct way. I will demonstrate by saying that once the member for Glenelg

telephoned an officer in the Department of Community Welfare and said, after a discussion about certain figures, "Why don't we get together and have a beer sometime?" I am sure that was just gratitude because he had been given such good information when he made those requests to that officer in the department; I would not dare to put any other connotation on it.

Mr. Mathwin: I don't drink beer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I am getting home on this matter. The time lag element that was built into the policy expressed in the motion that this House voted for, admittedly some time ago, has been taken away, and now the rescue attempts are in progress. We have seen the attempts today by the Minister to point out that assurances have been given. We had that assurance I think yesterday in reply to a question. After getting on to really shaky ground the Deputy Premier said, "Let the people be reassured that no mining will take place." He has never contradicted the article whereby he has already given approval for it. How is he going to stop it? The position the Government has steered itself into is one from which it will take some time to recover. I hope for the sake of the people of South Australia that it can recover from it. I do not want to get political mileage out of it. I believe the Government has been less than sensible in this matter. I suspect it is trying now to recover from it. I hope it will be able to do so.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak from this side of the House in a Budget debate. It is pleasing to have had the opportunity of listening to the Premier introduce his first Budget. Obviously, from reading the document, it will be the first of many that he will be introducing. It was a realistic assessment of the financial situation facing the people of South Australia, and it was pleasing to note that the document was not laced with abuse in relation to the policies of the current Federal Government. Unfortunately, during recent years we have had to tolerate abusive statements in the Budget document in relation to the Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible comment.

Mr. GUNN: It was interesting to listen to the contribution by the member for Mitchell. He spent much of his time setting out to chastise the Deputy Premier, who has delivered to the House a statement dealing with certain aspects of the policy that this Government intends to put into effect.

I think the member for Mitchell should clearly understand that the people of this State made a conscious decision. When they elected the Tonkin Government on 15 September they were aware of the policies of this Government and they were fully aware that the Liberal Party, and I understand the National Country Party, were clearly committed to continue the development of the Roxby Downs site. I do not think anyone could be under any misapprehension whatsoever. We made no secret of the fact that if the Liberal Party was elected to Government we would do everything possible to get this project off the ground.

I make no apology for saying that I completely support that course of action. I do so for many reasons. I think one should stop and reflect for a few moments on what the previous policy was doing to South Australia, and the effect it was having on confidence in relation to investment in this State. It was clearly obvious that a power struggle was taking place within the Australian Labor Party. There

was a force led by the former Attorney-General Duncan and a force led by the former member for Brighton and former Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson. The Hudson forces were clearly more realistic in their approach to the energy situation in South Australia and throughout the world because of the difficulties with which we are now faced because of a shortage of oil. The Duncan forces—

Mr. TRAINER: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GUNN: I was referring to the split within the Labor Party which became evident as its policy evolved. I was explaining to the House before I was interrupted by the new member for Ascot Park the effects the Duncan policy was having on the people of South Australia. One can accept that the Labor Party will not always support the commonsense line that the current Government is putting forward, but one would have thought that a group that was claiming to represent the underprivileged in society would want to see a resource developed which would give to those in undeveloped countries the opportunity to produce a cheap source of energy.

Mr. Trainer: It's capital intensive.

Mr. GUNN: I hope the honourable member will get an opportunity to look around the world to see which countries are developing their nuclear capacity for the generation of electricity. It is absolutely criminal, if we are concerned about the over-use of oil, not to drastically reduce as soon as possible the number of oil burning power houses that are currently operating throughout the world.

In the United States and in other countries, massive quantities of oil are used to produce electricity. If we can reduce those quantities by 50 per cent, we are doing something to conserve a finite resource.

Mr. Hamilton: You should read the Fox Ranger Report.

Mr. GUNN: I suggest that the honourable member should look at some of these projects. As I said yesterday, it is fortunate for the people in this State and in the countries requiring large supplies of electricity that people such as the honourable member do not have the responsibility to guarantee, today and in the future, to meet the energy demand. The major demand will be for electricity. In many countries, the people who have this responsibility have come down firmly in favour of nuclear power for electricity generation. It is all very well for us to sit smugly in South Australia, or in Australia, where we have huge supplies of coal, and say that we are all right. If the Labor Party were successful in having the nuclear industry stopped around the world, one of the greatest economic down-turns we have ever seen would be created.

Mr. Hamilton: Rubbish!

Mr. GUNN: I hope the honourable member will listen to what I am saying. In a few years, France will outstrip West Germany as the greatest industrial country in Europe. By 1985, France will be more than 60 per cent dependent on nuclear power for its electricity requirements. It has no other source from which to generate its power requirements. Where will France get electricity if it does not use nuclear energy? I pose that question to all members opposite. Wave power has been tried. France has little or no coal and little uranium, although uranium is being imported from Africa and France wants to import uranium from Australia.

In Germany, coal supplies are harder to get and more expensive, and that country has no alternative but to continue with its programme. The same situation applies in Belgium. What will happen to Japan if we say the Japanese cannot have any more uranium?

Mr. Hamilton: They are going to come and invade us, are they?

Mr. GUNN: Obviously, that is at the back of the honourable member's mind or he would not have come forward so readily with that explanation. Members opposite do not seem to have any concern about countries with little or no other avenue of meeting their energy demands.

I suggest that the opponents of nuclear power should explain how we can meet future energy demands. An honourable member opposite spoke about solar energy, but that can have only a very limited application in supplying the huge amounts of electricity required. We can produce alcohol, but if we have to produce it in the quantities required we will take up vast areas of agricultural land which are needed to produce food. The honourable member spoke about wind power. I wonder whether he has had any experience of living with wind lights or relying on windmills for water. I have, and I suggest that perhaps he should do a practical course in their maintenance.

There are other alternatives. I believe that we will see the continuation of the construction programme of nuclear power houses throughout the world, and there is nothing members of the Labor Party, in South Australia or elsewhere, can do about it. It is all very well for members opposite and for other people to march and to hold placards. The moment the lights go out in some of these places, the fun will start. I suppose we have all been involved in power blackouts for a few hours, but if the lights are put out regularly for six or seven hours a day, as will happen in many parts of the world if we close down the nuclear capacity, that will be a different matter. I believe that nuclear power will be used in the future for the generation of electricity, and that we will see a continuation of the situation prevailing in South Africa, where large quantities of coal are being turned into oil.

Mr. Trainer: Quite successfully, too.

Mr. GUNN: Very successfully. If the honourable member goes overseas, he should look at some of the large projects in that country. They have been operating since 1951 and have a greatly expanded capacity. I believe that type of operation will develop rapidly in the United States of America and that we will see that process used to supply oil as supplies run out in the Middle East and elsewhere.

I am pleased to see in the Budget the decision of the Government to honour its undertaking to abolish succession duties. We have heard members opposite criticise this decision, but let me put the matter to them in a simple way. If we want South Australia to continue to attract capital, if we want people to be prepared to invest their savings, and if we want the rural sector of the economy to continue to develop and produce, this tax must go.

Since I have been a member in this House, I have been involved in dealing with many unfortunate cases brought about by the effects of succession duties. Only this morning I saw a constituent who is now suffering from the ravages of this tax. I am reminded of an eagle on a lamb; the lamb is completely helpless, and that is how people are in the face of this tax. A reasonably viable property or business, operating successfully and often employing people, suddenly loses its viability. No reasonable person wants to see that happen, and the only way to ensure that it does not happen is to get rid of this tax. No matter what has been said by members of the Labor Party, it appears that succession duties are paid on properties about once every 20 years. It is obvious, therefore, how the burden of this taxation has been falling on viable businesses. In my view, it has not done any good. It has been a disincentive

for people wishing to invest in South Australia. Once the decision was made in one State to abolish death duties, every other State had to follow; otherwise, people would have planned to move to Queensland. When the decision was made in Western Australia, the fate of death duties throughout Australia was sealed.

Over recent months, I have received complaints in my district in relation to the operation of the Teacher Housing Authority, and people have written to me expressing concern at the rents charged. In some cases, it is cheaper for teachers to seek alternative accommodation rather than to use the accommodation provided by the Teacher Housing Authority. I hope that the Minister of Education will be able to implement quickly the policy which we announced at the State election in relation to revising rents paid by teachers in country areas.

I have been approached by constituents of mine at Leigh Creek on a matter and have received a letter from the Poochera Memorial Centre that I think would be of interest to members. The letter states:

We the Poochera Memorial Community Centre are writing to you over a matter that is of great concern to our community. This is the use, or more importantly the lack of use of the Education Department housing provided in this town. Whilst we do not wish to dwell on the past, as it is the future that we are now more interested in, some history of our position may assist you.

Several years ago when an area school was first approved and Karcultaby decided as the site it was generally accepted the teacher housing would be shared between the two nearby towns that were to lose their schools, namely Minnipa and Poochera. It is history now that, for reasons unknown to us, Poochera finished up with only three houses.

What is now of the greatest concern to us is that even these three houses are now and have been for all of 1979 unoccupied. This appears to be so for two major reasons:

- (1) Incoming teachers have not been encouraged to take up vacant housing at Poochera.
- (2) Education Department housing rentals have become so high that teachers are moving out of departmental houses (this is happening at Minnipa also) and finding alternative accommodation.

In regard to reason (1) we would like you to ensure that, should any new appointments be made to Karcultaby for next year, they are not discouraged from taking accommodation in Poochera. And that it be taken up with the necessary department that rents be lowered throughout the State to encourage teachers to stay in houses provided for them.

The letter goes on to cite one or two of the benefits of staying in the area, and is signed by several concerned residents. I urge the Minister to respond immediately by implementing our policy in this regard. I think it is fair to say that the easiest way to cause dissatisfaction among Government employees in the country, or anyone who has to live in the country, is not to provide adequate or acceptable accommodation. It is essential that we ensure that accommodation is not only provided but that it is provided at a reasonable rent. There have been certain anomalies, of which I am sure the authority is aware. Regarding Leigh Creek, a comparison of rentals paid by the Electricity Trust employees and those paid by some of the teachers is interesting. This matter should be closely examined.

I turn now to another matter affecting my district, namely, the provision of electricity at Beltana. No doubt certain members have not been to Beltana, which is a town with a considerable history. It is small. One or two of my constituents have purchased some of the old dwellings in the area and are seeking to have electricity connected. However, they are experiencing problems similar to those

faced by a number of my constituents in the Hawker area; everything possible has been done to prevent them from having power connected. There has been environmental consideration, Flinders Range planning regulations, and all the other nonsense in the world to prevent them from having power connected. The authorities have gone one step further at Beltana by requesting (and in one case, I understand, a person has agreed) the use of underground cable. I have never heard of such nonsense in my life.

I hope that when the responsible Minister visits Leigh Creek soon, he will have the opportunity to go to Beltana and see for himself the sort of nonsense that has been put forward. Unfortunately, the Hon. Mr. Foster, a member of another place, became involved in making representations about something of which he knew little. He would have been far better off if he had not put his bib into something that did not concern him. What he has done is cost one of my constituents about \$1 000 that he should not have had to pay. I think that matter should be immediately reviewed. I have had considerable correspondence on the subject, and have again taken up this matter with the Deputy Premier (the responsible Minister). I am looking forward to his early reply. I sincerely hope that all those people in the Flinders Range area who want 240-volt power connected will have their requests met soon.

One of my constituents, the Chairman of the council, was invited to join an environmental officer on a trip through some of these areas in the Flinders Range. After travelling some distance, the officer said, "You'll have to paint those poles green so that they won't affect the environment." The Chairman said, "That'll be all right in winter, but what about when there is a drought? Must we paint them brown?" That nonsense in which the department has been engaged would be funny if it were not so serious. I say to those people who are preventing my constituents from being connected with power that they should have their power cut off so that they are placed in the same position. Anyone who has had the opportunity of travelling overseas and seeing power lines in the mountains of Austria and Switzerland would realise that they cause no harm. I have yet to be convinced that people in certain parts of the range should not have power connected to their properties.

I am fortunate in having in my district a number of interesting parts of the State. During the previous Government's regime, we were all aware that the State was running down but, because of the hard work and initiative of people in Coober Pedy, it is now one of the few developing parts of the State. However, I draw to the attention of the Minister of Education the urgent need to upgrade and provide extra facilities at the Coober Pedy Area School. What is taking place there is a clear example of the free enterprise spirit: people are prepared to work hard, provided that there is an opportunity of their being rewarded. If one goes to that part of South Australia one can see what hard-working people can do under difficult conditions. I am pleased to give them all the encouragement I can.

Certain projects are urgently required in that part of the State. The airport should be sealed, and lights should be provided there. To demonstrate what I am saying, I will read to members extracts from a copy of a letter, dated 28 September, which the school council sent to the Minister of Education, who not long ago visited that part of the State and who is now sympathetic to their cause. The letter states:

Although most schools have falling enrolments, the opposite is the case at Coober Pedy where enrolments are expanding rapidly. Currently, there is a total of 578 students

comprising 60 in the child-parent centre, 383 in years R-7 and 185 in years 8-11. For some months the Principal has been stressing to the department the urgency of our need.

In all, the school has requested that six additional classrooms, preferably in the form of three double blocks, be supplied currently for the following reasons:

- (1) General classroom accommodation is at a premium with over-size classes in years R-7, the average class having 29.5 children, with some being well above this figure. There is just one small room in the entire school that can be devoted to films, drama, movement and other indoor activities. This then emphasises the need for a double classroom block to be placed on site immediately.
- (2) One double timber classroom block is due to be modified and converted to science laboratories by the beginning of the 1980 school year. This classroom block is currently used as general classroom space and hence the need for a second classroom block is obvious, because when conversions begin it will no longer be available as general classroom accommodation.
- (3) This school has a community school library which currently occupies two classroom spaces and part of a wet area. The space available is simply quite inadequate for the book stock and resources that we currently hold. In addition, book stock and resources are continuing to be expanded at a rapid rate. The library is housed in a Samcon building and could easily be expanded into two adjoining classroom spaces. This, however, would then generate the need for another double classroom block. We therefore request that this matter also receive your urgent attention.

As can be seen from the above, Coober Pedy Area School faces a real accommodation crisis.

I will not dwell on this matter at length, except to say that I hope the matter will be urgently examined by my colleague. There were a number of matters I intended to speak about, but, as I entered into an agreement with the Whip about the time I would take, I conclude by saying that I am pleased to support the Bills.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I will make a few comments relating to these Bills: In doing so, I support the remarks already made in this debate by my colleagues on this side of the House. This Budget will do nothing to solve the problem of unemployment or of the severe hardship suffered by many people in the community. According to a confidential Federal Government report compiled by the Employment Department, unemployment could increase by up to 50 000 persons a year until at least 1983, which means that this country's unemployment level will escalate to 700 000 people or more by that time.

The Government's decision to abolish the State Unemployment Relief Scheme is a stunning blow to this State. Numerous community bodies received assistance from that scheme, and thousands of unemployed workers were able to earn a reasonable income from it to support their families. In view of the predicted unemployment levels, the abolition of SURS should be delayed until such time as the number of unemployed in this State is lowered considerably.

The Premier has said that the Government hopes that in future community bodies in local government areas that have received assistance from unemployment relief funds in the past will be assisted with funds from the State Grants Commission. In addition, he said, they might qualify for assistance from special funds made available to the Minister of Local Government and the Minister of

Community Welfare. The amount provided in the Budget for community welfare grants is a drastically reduced one. I cannot find any record showing where that amount has been included in the amount allocated to be used for grants by the Department of Local Government. It is quite clear that the Department for Community Welfare will be less able to assist the unemployed and certainly less able to assist those many community projects that received valuable help under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme.

It is obvious that this Government is not at all concerned about the poor and the needy. A large reduction has been made in the area of financial assistance to people suffering hardship. South Australia does not have as large a number of voluntary agencies assisting the poor as exist in other States, so the Government's action in reducing the overall amount of financial assistance means that the poor will do without. In the past, the Department for Community Welfare in South Australia was able to influence Commonwealth policy because it had implemented programmes of quality which showed sensitivity to the special needs of the poor. Examples of this are pensions to male parents and increased Commonwealth use of special benefits for the unemployed. An increase could be a powerful incentive to the Commonwealth Government and to other States to help the poor, whilst a decrease, or even indexation, could further disadvantage the most needy. Some of the payments made to people in need are very small because of a lack of finance. Further, the poor are getting poorer because of the economic climate, and demands for assistance have become much greater.

Studies show that, in 1978, 48 per cent of unemployed people had cash savings of less than \$50, and 95 per cent of unemployed beneficiaries had no other income greater than \$6 per fortnight. Members of Parliament from both sides of the House often ask for this emergency assistance to be used to alleviate suffering that has been made known to them. I can recall that, only a few months ago, the member for Eyre (who has just taken the Chair as Deputy Speaker) and the Hon. Mr. Cameron from another place approached me as Minister of Community Welfare about a family in dire straits at Hallett. I understand that those members assisted that family by buying it some secondhand mattresses. That is the sort of need that many families in financial trouble face throughout South Australia. Demand has more than doubled, and it is continuing to grow. The amount needs to be indexed each year so that payments can be used efficiently and to the greatest advantage to the poor. The Government should support those financial assistance programmes and consider new programmes in that area to counteract the continual tightening of programmes by the Commonwealth Government and to reflect our commitment to the poor. It should not reduce or cut back the amounts set aside to help the poor.

I will now quote from the Report of the Joint Study of Emergency Relief, which is a study of agencies and clients conducted by the Department of Social Security and the Australian Council of Social Services. Under the heading "Purposes and Objectives", the report states:

1.1 Limited studies have been made of emergency relief in Australia during the last ten years. The emergency relief study, which has been carried out by the Department of Social Security, the Australian Council of Social Service and the State Councils (with the co-operation of a large number of welfare agencies and individuals), and State Welfare Departments in Victoria, Queensland and South Australia, has provided a more detailed understanding of the people who seek emergency relief, and the agencies which administer it.

1.2 Basically, the study has been concerned with obtaining information on three aspects of emergency relief, namely, how much emergency relief is provided by welfare agencies, and to whom and for what specific purposes it is provided. Within this basic framework, the following set of objectives were drawn up for the study:

- (i) To make the best possible assessment of the extent and total value of emergency relief (money and in kind) provided by welfare agencies.
- (ii) To ascertain who are the major recipients of emergency relief and their social and economic characteristics.
- (iii) To establish the reasons for which emergency relief is sought.

To achieve these objectives, it became apparent that it would be necessary to consider a further two subsidiary objectives; accordingly, the following were also incorporated:

- (iv) To ascertain the operating characteristics of welfare agencies.
- (v) To ascertain the number of recipients of emergency relief who have applied for or are receiving each type of pension and benefit payment.

Under the heading "Summary of Findings", the report states:

(i) A conservative estimate of the value of emergency relief provided by welfare agencies in Australia is \$11 000 000. This estimate is based on data supplied in the agency questionnaires and "census" forms for agencies' last financial years ended in or before April 1978.

This figure most likely understates the value of emergency relief currently provided, with agencies reporting considerable increases in their provision of emergency relief since the financial year reported in the census. To account both for this increase and for any omissions in agency provisions, estimates were also derived from the client survey data, which are based on questionnaires completed in respect of each applicant by agencies in the sample in a two-week period in April-May 1978. Based on the client survey data, a reasonable but probably still conservative estimate of the value of emergency relief currently provided in Australia in a full year would be of the order of \$12 500 000 to \$14 500 000.

(ii) Emergency accommodation provided in agencies' own hostels, which has been excluded from the figures in (i) above, is estimated to be \$1 370 000 in Victoria alone.

(iii) It has become evident that the provision of emergency relief goes beyond that provided by welfare agencies as defined in the study. For example, a high proportion of churches and service clubs provide between \$50 and \$1 000 p.a. for emergency relief, but no estimate has been made of their total contribution.

(iv) The annual number of applications to welfare agencies for emergency relief in Australia was conservatively estimated to have been between 400 000 and 450 000. These applications were made by between 130 000 and 145 000 clients, with most clients applying more than once. Conservatively, between 78 000 and 87 000 families with children sought emergency relief over the same period.

(v) The most frequent users of emergency relief were: those not employed (up to 96 per cent of clients); recipients of, or applicants for, statutory income security payments including State welfare payments (up to 91 per cent of clients); those below Henderson's poverty line at the time of application (up to 89 per cent of clients); those born in Australia (up to 83 per cent of clients); Department of Social Security pensioners or beneficiaries (up to 75 per cent of clients); those living in accommodation other than houses, such as flats, caravans, rooms and emergency accommodation

(up to 71 per cent of clients);
 people who had changed their address in the last six months (up to 71 per cent of clients);
 single adults without dependants (up to 47 per cent of clients);
 one parent families (up to 43 per cent of clients); and
 one and two-child families (up to 35 per cent of clients).

(vi) The most vulnerable groups (i.e. the most over-represented groups when compared with the general population) were:

- separated persons (up to 11.5 times the proportion found in the State population over 15);
- single adults without dependants (up to 7.8 times the proportion found in the Australian population);
- recipients of Department of Social Security benefits (up to 7.3 times the proportion found in the Australian population over 15);
- one-parent families with children (up to 6.7 times the proportion found in the Australian population);
- people not living in houses (up to 5.1 times the proportion in the Australian population); and
- persons not currently employed (up to 2.3 times the proportion found in the State population over 15).

(vii) The most under-represented groups found in the study were:

- the aged (as low as one-tenth of the proportion in the State population over 15); and
- the employed (as low as one-fifteenth of the proportion found in the State population over 15).

(viii) The most frequent reasons for seeking emergency relief were:

- waiting for a first pension or benefit cheque to arrive (up to 34 per cent of clients);
- waiting for an overdue social security cheque to arrive (up to 30 per cent of clients); and
- sudden financial commitments and debt payments becoming due (up to 31 per cent of clients).

(ix) The most frequent types of emergency relief sought by clients were:

- food (up to 64 per cent of clients);
- clothing (up to 39 per cent of clients); and
- cash (up to 32 per cent of clients).

(x) The most frequent types of assistance provided to clients were:

- food (up to 65 per cent of clients);
- clothing (up to 39 per cent of clients); and
- cash (up to 28 per cent of clients).

(xi) The majority of emergency relief applicants had applied to that agency in the previous 12 months. Across States, the average number of previous applications varied from 1.46 to 3.31. Including the current application, between 10 and 16 per cent of clients were applying at least once every two months on average.

(xii) There was an extremely wide variation within each of the States included in the study in relation to the philosophies of different agencies' staffs, assessment procedures they adopt, and the forms in which they provide aid. This variability was typical in all States in which the study was conducted.

(xiii) Despite the wide variation between agencies, there were a number of identifiable groups of agencies in each State which share common traits. These common traits exist in terms of:

- accessibility of agencies;
- staffing;
- limitations on assistance, type of aid and aid considerations; and
- eligibility criteria and assessment procedures of clients.

(xiv) Welfare agencies are unable to meet all demands for emergency relief. With few exceptions, the average value of

each type of emergency relief requested exceeded the average value of each type of emergency relief provided.

xv) There were a large number of referrals between various levels of government and the non-government sector.

(xvi) The main source of funds for the majority of non-government agencies providing emergency relief was their own fund-raising activities.

In relation to the extent, value, and types of emergency relief, the report continued:

The South Australian Government's primary involvement in emergency relief is the direct provision to clients through forty-one outlets of three types of assistance. Special assistance is used in crisis situations and is payable for such purposes as payment of overdue electricity and gas accounts, emergency food supplies, fares and medical expenses. Family assistance is used for the specific aim of maintaining a family unit when there is a risk of breakdown. Special assistance U/519, introduced in December 1977 as a result of the Commonwealth's decision to pay unemployment benefit in arrears, is used to provide assistance to persons in severe hardship awaiting unemployment benefit who have been declined a special benefit (hardship) by the Department of Social Security. In 1976-77, the Department for Community Welfare contributed \$368 000 for emergency relief, or 49 per cent of the State total.

Today, I believe that that amount is about \$1 000 000. The level of funding for financial assistance payments to sole supporting parents, the unemployed, and others in circumstances of special need, has been based on about the same numbers as those receiving assistance at the time of this Budget. This level of funding is not appropriate because the demand is increasing week by week. It is disappointing that this year will not see the introduction of any major new initiatives, following the introduction of the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Scheme late in 1978-79.

The Intensive Neighbourhood Care Scheme, which is unique in South Australia, has positively lessened the likelihood of young offenders re-offending, while at the same time it has offered positive rehabilitation. However, the Intensive Neighbourhood Care Scheme (good as it is), is only an additional facility of institutional care for young offenders. Much more in the provision of welfare services needs to be done. It seems that it is the intention of this Government to pay less attention to community welfare services in South Australia. It is a fear that is also held by many people within the community. The importance of the portfolio has been downgraded by its transfer to a Minister in another place within this Parliament. This year's Federal Budget has not taken any consideration in increasing the funding for women's shelters.

Health, among urban Aborigines in particular, is a disaster and the Government should judge a community by the welfare of its most under-privileged members. The health of our Aboriginal population is a national disaster.

Essentially, the Government has a responsibility to provide medical and hospital services for the community. How are we going to sort out the present health insurance mess? The community has never been more confused.

Much publicity recently has centred around the crisis of the homeless young, many of whom are out of work and require accommodation, and much more needs to be done in this area. The Federal Government, through the Department of Social Security, should be approached to fund a programme to assist homeless youth. Most other States have such programmes and, as this social problem increases, we must give due attention to the needs of youth. The problem will not go away, and a failure to provide accommodation in the community will mean

additional high expense in the State's institutions and possible additional institutions.

The current world-wide economic crisis, I believe, has placed strains on the family life not experienced in the forties, fifties and sixties. Increased unemployment, job insecurity and an increased reliance on welfare assistance have all placed major strains on the traditional family unit. The sometimes destructive effects on children caused by severe marital tension is of major concern throughout the world. For many families, this is the first time ever they have faced a crisis of such dimensions and the results are often alarming. Some of the consequences include increased marital tension, family disruption and unnecessary conflict between family members, the deferment of essential services, often relating to children, and the compounding of marital and family problems caused by isolation, feelings of despondency, and lack of self-worth.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I take this opportunity to make some comments on a variety of factors that have arisen in the past few days in relation to the Budget. A question was asked by my Parliamentary colleague, the member for Newland, about aid for Kampuchea. I concur very much in the answer the Premier gave when he said that the matter was a serious one and that the plight of the people in Kampuchea deserved the strongest support from all citizens in South Australia. He also emphasised that support should be given in a proper and meaningful way and not tied in any way to any suggestion of politics.

I think it is most important that the disastrous and serious situation should be treated with all probity, not as a political ploy. It seems to me that the honourable member for Newland made some mistakes in the way he approached this matter. He indicated that either his box is not cleared very often and that the letter has been there for 3½ weeks since it was posted or that he has a substantial time lag in dealing with what comes before his attention, which is not a healthy sign for someone who is about to deal with the many demands of the constituents of Newland.

The other point that I think he should remember is that this is the State Parliament of South Australia, not the Federal Parliament of Australia, and it is not within the province of the members of this Parliament to extend their concentration to foreign affairs matters; to attempt to make that a political matter underscores the point even more. It also concerns me that the member for Newland did not bother to read all parts of the letter. He left out some important paragraphs and points that were made. The first thing I should like to mention is that the letter was sent 3½ weeks ago (on 24 September) and referred to situations current at that time. It is normal that letters are dealt with in terms of the situation current at the time. At that time we had only the reports of the Australian media and the international media on the situation that existed in Kampuchea and, if the honourable member had quoted in full from the letter, he would have quoted the following paragraph:

The Australian press this morning reported Vietnam is the only country attempting to hold back the famine in Kampuchea with supplies of food and drugs which it badly needs to combat its own critical shortages.

After reading that paragraph, I thought I would also check

some of the other press reports that appeared on that same day, 24 September. The *Advertiser* contained a report stating:

For the West, saving the children of Kampuchea would mean co-operating with Vietnam.

That letter invited people to do precisely that. Since that time many international agencies have inspected the position and have realised the grave seriousness of it. They are now rushing, with due haste, to attend to it. There are now, following the writing of that letter, many agencies that are involved actively and in a worthwhile way in attempts to aid the situation in that country. The Premier mentioned some of these agencies: the United Nations Children's Fund, the Save the Children Fund, the International Red Cross, and many others are now involved (and, I may add, involved in co-operation with the Vietnamese Government) in trying to bring assistance to the people of Kampuchea.

Of course, the suffering in Kampuchea is not recent. It has been going on for many years, and the Australia-Vietnam Society, with which I have been associated over the years, has been aware of that and has publicised the matter. That letter is not the first of such letters: there have been others. I note that the response from some people has been extremely poor. The suffering and the mass starvation are not new phenomena. It was reported in the international press many months ago, but, unfortunately, despite attempts by the Australia-Vietnam Society, it did not make the headlines in this country. More shame to the Australian media that it did not!

At that time, the only avenue through which support could be got into the country was through agencies working with the Vietnamese Government. That list of agencies has now grown larger and I endorse it. I call on all citizens of South Australia to make any contribution they can to the suffering in Kampuchea, through any agency that they feel will do the job best. The qualifications of the many agencies already involved are of the highest standard. I congratulate the State Government on its decision to grant \$10 000 to the campaign. It is perhaps a pity that it was not able to see its way clear to make as large a grant as the New South Wales Government made on a per capita basis. Doubtless, that is being considered by the Cabinet and in due course we may hear of further allocations.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Wasn't there a large private grant of \$100 000, or something like that, in New South Wales?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: A large private donation was given. There was also the decision by the Federal Government to make all concessions and donations to Kampuchea tax deductible. That was a praiseworthy decision, and I think it heralds the start of future foreign aid programmes whereby all donations to overseas aid can be made tax deductible. I would, however, lament the fact that over the past four years the present Federal Government has taken an appalling attitude to the suffering that has gone on in South-East Asia and Indo-China. The United Nations and its various agencies have examined the disastrous situation in Vietnam and Kampuchea resulting from floods, drought, warfare and various other situations, and they have reported on the dire need of that region to be rehabilitated. The present Federal Government has not previously seen its way clear to assist and do its part in this aspect of regional co-operation. I am pleased that it has seen fit to make contributions to Kampuchea tax deductible.

I am also pleased to note that, apart from the comment made by the member for Newland, other people do realise that this is a non-political issue. On Saturday night, groups

representing various political persuasions at the University of Adelaide are getting together to organize a fund-raising cabaret for the starving in Kampuchea. That cabaret was arranged by the University Liberal Club and supported by the University Labor Club and other people. This is a real sign which we need; this should not be turned into a political issue.

In your speech earlier today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you made some comments about the energy prospects for the future, suggesting that some people were not being totally realistic about the situation. Your assessment of who was not being realistic was not totally correct. We should remember that energy consumption per household is a vital area that we can look at in terms of meeting the energy demands of the 1980's. It is possible, without any effect on lifestyle, to alter the energy consumption of a household. It is true that the citizens of West Germany and the United States of America have roughly comparable lifestyles. Yet, the energy consumption per household in the Federal Republic of Germany is about half of that of the United States of America. That is achieved by various differences in the way in which energy is used and applied but at no real cost to the lifestyle of the citizens of Germany. If we are facing the dire energy shortages of the 1980's, as I believe we are, one of the first steps that we should be taking is finding means to conserve energy and use it more wisely and appropriately.

I turn now to a point I was unable to finish in the previous grievance debate. It has been suggested that there is no potential for solar energy. The Bariloche Foundation of Argentina sees a very real prospect. Latin America was one example where it did a study, and solar energy can be used in vast quantities. It is suggested that by the year 2010 industrial, urban and rural areas can call upon solar and non-conventional energy sources for 30 per cent of their total energy demands. There are marked job creation possibilities for this State. If Latin America were to meet that goal, it would need 214 000 000 square metres of flat solar collectors—a vast amount, of which we have some production capacity in this State. I was suggesting that that is possible and feasible and that this State should be looking at the possibility of meeting that demand and not meeting the other more hazardous and dangerous demands as proposed by nuclear energy.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to draw the attention of the House this afternoon to the matter of the Auditor-General's Report on this year's builders licensing.

Mr. Kenelly: What do you think of the report?

Mr. MATHWIN: I said last night what I thought about the Auditor-General. I agreed with some of the remarks made by the member for Hanson. Indeed, this year the Builder's Licensing Board rated only four lines of the Auditor-General's Report.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. MATHWIN: Last year, the Builders Licensing Board rated a full half page in the Auditor-General's Report, which explained what had occurred during that year in the builders' licensing area. Indeed, this gave members some idea of what was happening, but this has not happened this year. This matter rates merely four lines in the massive document that has been produced by the Auditor-General.

There has in the past been quite a bit of empire building in this area. I refer now to the composition of the board. Its members are Mr. Michael Andrew Birchall, LL.B., Neil Sarah, a builder, Joseph Baldino, another lawyer,

Henry Williamson, and Margaret J. Bradley Russell.

Mr. Peterson: Do you think there are too many lawyers?

Mr. MATHWIN: I do. Having looked at the board's record during the past 12 months, I believe that it has failed in its duty and has not done what it should have done. The board should not have put the emphasis on revenue raising by allowing every applicant for a builder's licence to be successful in his application. The board should have examined the quality of the people who wished to obtain a licence and to become members of the building trade.

There is indeed great concern in the community regarding the formation of small companies that have been incorporated for the purpose of erecting blocks of units for the purpose of selling them. A number of these groups, which appoint a builder, have experienced trouble in relation to the supervision of the construction of units and flats. A number of these companies go broke and become insolvent, and those who are unfortunate enough to have bought a unit find themselves in a difficult situation as they must rectify the bad workmanship that has occurred during the construction of the property. Because the builder has gone bankrupt, the unfortunate people who purchase the properties cannot, because of the period of time that has elapsed, call on him to make good any deficient work.

Mr. Kenelly: That's because of your system.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is not. This system was introduced by the former Government. We are swamped to the neck by regulations that were introduced by that Government. Unfortunately, however, no-one is available to ensure that the regulations are complied with. In my day, lenders used to oversee the construction of buildings, as did the local council. One had to run the gauntlet before any progress payments were made. Now, we have over-regulation, brought about by the Government of which the member for Stuart was a member, and there are not enough people to cope with the massive quantity of regulations.

Only a few weeks ago, I received a complaint from one of my constituents. A block of flats had been built by an incorporated company comprising people who had no idea about building. They appointed a former builder who had a shocking record.

The Builders Licensing Board is failing in its duty in allowing such people to be in charge of building projects; it is done simply to raise revenue. There must have been a direction from the previous Government that that was the criterion to be used, rather than the past record of the builder. I believe that members of the staff of the department are failing in their duty, because it is their duty to protect the public.

A case came to my notice recently of some new units. There was trouble with the roof and with the tiles in the bathroom. The floor had been put in after the tiles, and the water seeped down, causing damp and rot in the kitchen cupboards. There was trouble with the windows and with all the timber work. On the paths outside, the concrete was above the damp course, in itself causing massive problems. In spite of all this, the people involved had no comeback, because the company had gone bankrupt. The person who had been put in as a supervisor had a record of three previous bankruptcies in the building trade.

Mr. Hemmings: What's the name of the builder?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is not my policy to supply names in this place under privilege, but I can supply the name to the right people.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much conversation across the Chamber.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is time the Builders Licensing Board did the job it was appointed to do. The members of the board have a responsibility. They were appointed by the previous Government, and it is up to them to see that the people in the community get the protection to which they are entitled.

The Auditor-General's Report lists some of the things that are missing from the various departments. In relation to the theft of Government property, we see that there has been a big run on chain saws this year, because six have disappeared from the various departments, including two from the Belair Recreation Park and a couple from the Highways Department. The only items that came close to the number of chain saws were traffic counters, five of which have disappeared from the Highways Department. I cannot imagine why anyone would want a traffic counter around the house. A couple of fire hydrants have disappeared, and the Marion Community Welfare Centre has lost \$1 822 worth of sundry tools. Two motor cycles have disappeared from the Department for the Environment, and from the Engineering and Water Supply Department a Toyota truck is missing, together with a Holden panel van and two doors from a Holden station sedan.

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

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I wish to refer to some of the comments made last night by the member for Glenelg. Since I have come into this House, I have been most interested in his style, but I am concerned to hear some of the statements that he has made. In my opinion, they are most erratic, especially those in relation to the Labor Party and the trade union movement.

Last night, amongst other things, he is recorded as having said that the unions take money from their members' wages and pay a sustentation fee to the Labor Party. Whether or not a union affiliates to the Labor Party is entirely a matter for the union concerned: no force is involved. However, most of the so-called blue-collar unions affiliate, some do not. Most of the white-collar workers' unions do not affiliate, although some do. If a union decides to affiliate, it is required to pay a sustentation fee in respect of each member for which it affiliates.

Mr. Mathwin: Do they vote on that?

Mr. O'NEILL: Yes, they do vote on it. This decision is also made by each union involved. Having become affiliated, an organisation naturally accepts certain responsibilities in line with the aims and objects of the Party. There is nothing clandestine in such a procedure, and the responsibilities of membership are consistent with the general practice in this type of action in many areas of social activity.

The member for Glenelg also made some rather rhetorical remarks in respect of preselection. In particular, he referred to the preselection in the Semaphore District. The manner of voting in preselections is a matter for the Party involved. The Labor Party has decided, and its membership has voted and decided, on a certain system. There are proponents and opponents of the system within the Party. However, the majority at present supports the current system, which would not be so different from the system which, I suppose, applied in respect of a vote taken last Sunday on whether or not the shareholders in a major bank wanted to bale out of the State for purely pecuniary reasons, regardless of the detrimental effects such a course might have on the future of the State and of the ordinary people in it; but no Government member seems to bother about the voting systems in companies.

Nevertheless, to suggest that the A.L.P. candidate in Semaphore had a walk-up start in the preselection is to display an ignorance of the facts. There were three candidates in that ballot and, had a few more delegates in the ballot voted for one of the other two candidates, the count could have gone to preferences. As it happened, the person who won preselection was elected with an outright majority.

Mr. Mathwin: What were the numbers?

Mr. O'NEILL: From what I know (and I do not know much about it, because I am not a member of the Liberal Party), I think that the last person to take people to task on preselection should be the member for Glenelg, because, in my Party, when you win preselection, you have won it—you do not get another run if you can work a "rort". Comments were made about Mr. Apap, who is a resident of the district and who has been a member of the A.L.P. for many years. He is an officer of the sub-branch in the area, and he has worked hard for many of the people of Semaphore in the trade union area and in other areas of social contact. He has been on a school committee there, and he has been involved in helping many of the age pensioners in the area. He was, however, the victim of a particularly obnoxious campaign, to which I will not refer now. He was the only Labor Party candidate in the Semaphore District ballot, although some people seem to be confused about that.

Finally, I was concerned to hear the unwarranted attack by the member for Glenelg on the member for Peake. He made a strange remark to me but, nevertheless, in some legalistic sense he may have been correct if he went to the Arbitration Commission. He said that it is impossible for any member to see the balance sheet of a trade union unless he is a member of the union and unless he obtains permission from the Industrial Court.

Mr. Mathwin: It's in the Act.

Mr. O'NEILL: Yes. If he fronts up to the Industrial Court and asks for a copy, that may be the situation, unless he has a valid reason for seeing the balance sheet. I am not a member of the A.W.U., but within an hour of the honourable member making that statement I had copies of the balance sheets for the year ended 31 July 1978 (which were the easiest ones to get hold of at the time) from the following branches of the A.W.U.: New South Wales, Western Australia, Queensland and South Australia.

Mr. Randall: Are you going to table them?

Mr. O'NEILL: Yes, I will do that if the honourable member wishes. If the honourable member knew what he was doing he could have got these documents too, because I got them with the great co-operation of the staff of the Parliamentary Library. I walked out of the door of this Chamber, into the Library, told them what I wanted, told them the journals in which the material could be found, and here I have it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not display any material.

Mr. O'NEILL: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The member for Glenelg has been in this place for a lot longer than I have, but he made some pretty naive remarks about the availability of material relating to trade unions. All the material that trade unions produce is available.

Mr. Mathwin: How much of it is in the library?

Mr. O'NEILL: The material is in the library. I did not have time to research all of it. If the honourable member is so interested, he can go to the library and I imagine that he can get a lot more material. All he has to do is ask for the journals. If the library does not have them it will get them. This is one of the amazing things that a new member learns when he hears experienced members shoot their mouths

off on the basis that they are experts on particular subjects.

Last year, while I was in the United Kingdom, I had the opportunity of seeing on television a demonstration by members of the National Front ("Fascist yobboes" they are called over there), and standing right in the front row was a little, round, fat man with a moustache and steel-rimmed glasses. He was leaping up and down, hatred showing all over his face, and he was screaming out racist terms. I am amazed at the resemblance between that person and the member for Glenelg. I do not know what

the norm is so far as business men are concerned. However, the trade union movement has nothing to hide. Its business affairs are there for anyone who wants to see them. If anyone wants to find out what is involved, all he has to do is use a little initiative. If the member for Glenelg wants this material, to save himself the trouble of going to the library and getting it he can have what I have here.

Motion carried.

At 5.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 23 October at 2 p.m.