

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 November 1979

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 34, 66, 73, 80, 84, 85, 103, 116, 124, 133 to 135, 137, 140, 148, 150, 152, 158, 160, 163, 164, 167, 171, 173, 174, 177, 184, 187, 188, 190, 194, 202, 206, 219, 225 to 228, 230 to 232, 237 to 240, 242, 243, 246 to 249, 253, 254, 257, 259, 260, 264, 273, 276 to 279, 281 to 283, 289, 290, 294, 298, 299, 304, 305, 311 to 313, 318, 319, 326, 332, 334 to 336, 367, 378, 379, 389 to 391, 395, and 397.

VENEREAL DISEASE

34. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many cases of the communicable diseases gonorrhoea and syphilis were reported in each of the years 1976, 1977 and 1978?

2. What is the relationship of those figures to the incidence of these diseases, generally?

3. Is the Government concerned at the incidence of these diseases and, if so, what plans has it in mind to control the problem and, if not, why not?

The **Hon. J. L. ADAMSON**: The replies are as follows:

1. Notified cases of gonorrhoea and syphilis in South Australia for the years 1976, 1977 and 1978 were as follows:

Year	Gonorrhoea		Syphilis	
	Number (cases)	Incidence (cases/100 000 population)	Number (cases)	Incidence (cases/100 000 population)
1976 . . .	1 885	151	501	40
1977 . . .	1 921	150	360	28
1978 . . .	1 397	109	305	24

2. The incidence of notified cases is higher in South Australia than for the rest of Australia. However, South Australia has a better notification and contact tracing system than other States, with the result that more cases are diagnosed and notified.

3. The incidence of notified cases of gonorrhoea and syphilis in South Australia is declining and reflects a real decrease in these diseases. Similar trends are recorded in other Australian States and other Western communities. The prevention and control of venereal disease in South Australia involves education (directed especially towards high risk groups), contact tracing, the ready availability of treatment facilities at major hospitals, and special clinics.

REYNELLA EAST HIGH SCHOOL

66. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What arrangements have been made to give the students at Reynella East High School access to craft shops in 1980?

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: The new Reynella East High School will open at the beginning of the 1980 school year within the buildings housing Reynella East Primary School (opened 1979). It is expected that Stage 1 of the new

school structure buildings for Reynella East High School will be available at the beginning of the 1981 school year and will include most up-to-date facilities for a variety of craft subjects. In the meantime, and for 1980 only, arrangements are in hand for students to be transported by bus, at Education Department expense, to Dover High School one half day per week to attend craft shop lessons. As enrolments are reducing at Dover High School, adequate facilities will be available to students of both schools in 1980.

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFERS

73. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration:

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred:

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) what is his current position and salary;

(d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred:

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

(c) to what position is the transfer to be made;

(d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;

(e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and

(f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The **Hon. D. C. BROWN**: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) D. Ayling, R. Thompson, M. Carmichael, P. Robinson, G. Maguire, G. Anderson, M. Conte.

(b) J. C. Hunter.

(c) None.

2. (a) D. Ayling.

(b) Information Services Officer PBD—\$21 257 p.a.

(c) Secretary to the Premier—\$21 257 p.a.

(d) No.

(e) At request of Mr. Ayling.

(a) R. Thompson.

(b) Steno-Secretary Grade III Leader of the Opposition—\$12 441 p.a.

(c) Steno-Secretary Grade III Premier's Department—\$12 441 p.a.

(d) No.

(e) At request of R. Thompson.

(a) M. Carmichael.

(b) Steno-Secretary Grade III Department of Labour and Industry—\$12 441 p.a.

(c) Steno-Secretary Grade III Leader of the Opposition—\$12 441 p.a.

(d) No.

(e) At request of M. Carmichael.

(a) P. Robinson.

(b) Steno-Secretary Grade III Department of Community Development—\$12 073 p.a.

- (c) Steno-Secretary Grade III Leader of the Opposition—\$12 073 p.a.
 (d) No.
 (e) At request of P. Robinson.
 (a) G. Maguire.
 (b) Project Officer, Department of Community Development—\$19 989 + 10% p.a.
 (c) Project Officer, Leader of the Opposition—\$18 391 p.a.
 (d) No.
 (e) At request of G. Maguire.
 (a) G. Anderson.
 (b) Project Officer, Department of Labour and Industry—\$17 392 p.a.
 (c) Project Officer, Leader of the Opposition—\$17 392 p.a.
 (d) No.
 (e) At request of G. Anderson.
 (a) M. Conte.
 (b) Office Assistant, Leader of the Opposition—\$5 452 p.a.
 (c) Office Assistant, Premier's Department—\$5 452 p.a.
 (d) No.
 (e) At request of M. Conte.
 3. J. C. Hunter.
 (a) Project Officer, Department of Labour and Industry—\$18 391 p.a.
 (b) Details regarding transfer to Community Welfare currently being negotiated.
 (c) No.
 (d) No, the officer concerned requested the transfer to the Department for Community Welfare.
 (e) Abolition of the Unit for Industrial Democracy.

REGIONAL PARKS

80. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has a full-time committee now been established to investigate the possibility of setting up regional parks similar to the English-style national parks, and, if so:

- (a) who is presently serving on this committee;
 (b) will it report to the Government; and
 (c) will such reports be tabled in the House?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No.

FLINDERS RANGE

84. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What measures does the Government propose to take to protect the fragile ecological environment of the Flinders Range if there is a substantial increase in the population in surrounding areas?
2. Is it considered that special planning and management guidelines will need to be drawn up to safeguard the natural character of the Flinders Range if greatly increased numbers of travellers visit the range in future years?
3. When, and in what way, will such guidelines be made known to the public?
4. Do the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs and the Department for the Environment liaise closely with local landholders when drawing up such guidelines?
5. Does the Outback Areas Community Development Trust have any control in the Flinders Range area?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Investigations are being carried out by officers of the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs in conjunction with other relevant departments and agencies to consider measures to protect the environment of the Flinders Range.

2. The need for planning and management guidelines that recognise the natural character of the Flinders Range and the special issues posed by the impact of transient visitors on the range will be closely monitored.

3. Where such draft guidelines are necessary, they will be widely disseminated to local landholders, interest groups and the general public for consultation and comment.

4. There is already a close liaison with local landholders, local community organisations, district councils, and interest groups, including the United Farmers and Stockowners Association. National Park rangers, in the normal course of their duties, liaise closely with neighbouring landholders.

5. The Outback Areas Development Trust may carry out works to improve, or otherwise promote or facilitate the improvement of, communications to country districts. In line with these functions, the trust is working with a number of community orientated organisations in the Flinders Range to provide community facilities. The trust has no controlling role.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

85. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What steps are being taken to ensure that all Government agencies involved in urban development plan their land development and servicing programmes on a consistent basis?

2. What Government inter-departmental liaison exists between relevant departments to ensure that this happens?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. A series of projections has been prepared for the use of Government departments, to aid the co-ordination of public involvement in urban development.

2. Relevant Government agencies are involved in updating the material on an annual cycle and the revised projections are considered at Ministerial level prior to distribution.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

103. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Is the Government aware that the maximum sums available to workers for compensation for work injuries are now far lower in South Australia than in other States, and will it promptly legislate to provide a standard of payment at least equal to that payable in New South Wales and Victoria and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The maximum sums available to workers for compensation for work injuries are not far lower in South Australia than in other States. For a worker who does not suffer permanent incapacity maximum weekly payments in South Australia are higher than in any other State. Further, the lump sum payment for dependents of workers who are killed is higher in South Australia than in Victoria, and the same in New South Wales. A committee appointed by the previous Government is at present considering matters relating to the rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work. The Government will consider amendments to the

Workers Compensation Act when the report of that committee is received.

COSMETICS

116. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Will the Government take action to ensure that the ingredients in cosmetics are listed on the labels of all cosmetic containers?

2. Will any such action include legislation?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is the Government's policy to seek uniformity throughout Australia for ingredient listing on cosmetic labels, bearing in mind that definition of the 60 000 ingredients used in the manufacture of cosmetics is a complex matter. Consideration is also being given to a proposal of the National Therapeutic Goods Committee that manufacturers be requested to maintain registers of ingredients so that information would be available to doctors and others who may require the information for health or other non-commercial reasons.

2. As most cosmetics are distributed in all States, national consensus on legislation would be necessary.

VENUS BAY JETTY

124. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine: Has the Department of Marine and Harbors any plans to rebuild or in any way modify or alter the Venus Bay jetty?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Department of Marine and Harbors is currently considering estimates and proposals for the repair of the Venus Bay jetty. The scheme under consideration is one which involves the demolition of the two small spur jetties, which are in very poor condition, and the concentration of resources to repair the main jetty for its entire length, including the head, which will maintain the deep water berths for the benefit of the larger fishing vessels now using the port.

However, before any definite commitment is made, it is intended that senior officers of the department will visit Venus Bay in the near future and discuss proposals with representatives of the fishermen having an interest in the port.

The Australian Fishing Industry Council (S.A. Branch) Inc. has been informed of the department's intentions, and the Department of Fisheries will also be consulted.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT

133. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Is it the policy of the Government to amend the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act and, if so, in what areas, why, and when is it proposed to introduce such legislation?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is the policy of the Government to amend legislation when it is considered necessary to do so. No consideration has yet been given to the need for amendments to the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act.

WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT

134. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Is it the policy of the Government to

amend the Workers Compensation Act and, if so, in what areas, why, and when is it proposed to introduce such legislation?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: A committee appointed by the previous Government is at present considering the rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work. The Government will consider amendments to the Workers Compensation Act when the report is available from that committee.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT

135. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Is it the policy of the Government to amend the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, and, if so, in what areas, why, and when is it proposed to introduce such legislation?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government still maintains the same policy it did when it answered Question 133, which is an identical question.

AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

137. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is the Government committed to the continuation of the Australian Constitutional Convention and, if so, will it continue to offer Adelaide as the venue for the next Plenary Session and, if in either case not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This matter has yet to be considered by Cabinet.

BREAD

140. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Does the Government propose to take any action in relation to the control of weekend baking of bread and, if so, why, when and how?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No such action is proposed at present.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

148. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Is it the policy of the Government to continue the construction of Government buildings with a long term view of eventually housing all Government departments and statutory authorities in such buildings and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As the number of Government employees is limited to the present establishment strength, the future trend will be to consolidate, wherever practicable, departments within one building in order to promote efficient operation and facilitate access by the general public.

The Government is satisfied that the public office buildings completed over the past decade, in conjunction with buildings presently under construction, will enable the consolidation of a significant proportion of the Public Service in this way.

The lease of buildings for public purposes will continue where this provides the Government with a cost effective solution in circumstances where a degree of flexibility is essential.

THE STOCK PADDOCKS

150. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Government now involved in discussions with stock companies or some other, and what companies, in relation to the development of those parcels of land situated at Pooraka, Gepps Cross and Cavan, usually called "The Stock Paddocks"?

2. Is the Government committed to the maintenance of some parts of this land as open space and, if so, what parts and what is proposed in respect of the current zoning?

3. Is large scale housing construction proposed in some of this area and, if so, in what parts?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Offices of the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs had discussions in October 1979 with two representatives from Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Ltd., and a consultant representing Metro Meat Limited.

2. An open space proclamation exists over the land part sections 93, 97, 2218, 2219, 2240-2244, hundred of Yatala. The land is subject to interim development control which expires on 30 June 1980. There are at present no proposals for subsequent zoning regulations.

3. There are no large scale housing construction proposals for any parts of the area.

INSTITUTE OF FITNESS AND RESEARCH TRAINING

152. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Does the Minister support the continued provision of services to the public by the Institute of Fitness and Research Training?

2. Is the Minister aware of the need of the IFRT for Government support in respect of its budget and in respect of its application to the Federal Government to receive health benefits in respect of certain treatment or tests and will the Minister urgently reconsider the application made by the IFRT with a view to granting immediate assistance?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The need of the Institute of Fitness Research and Training for additional funding to continue its programme is recognised. Representations have been made to the Federal Government with South Australian support. Consideration is being given to the appropriateness of State Government support.

OUT-PATIENTS' FEES

158. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Government considering approving increases in out-patients' fees in public hospitals and, if so, why?

2. Will such fees in future be subject to a means test to enable disabled and disadvantaged persons to continue receiving services free of cost and, if so, what constitutes a disadvantaged person?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. No.

PIRIE STREET CHURCH

160. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is the remaining rear portion of what was

the Pirie Street Methodist Church to be demolished and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Approval for the Adelaide City Council to demolish its building previously the Pirie Street Methodist Meeting Hall, has not been given by the City of Adelaide Planning Commission. Under the provisions of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, until that approval is given the building will remain.

SCHOOL EXEMPTIONS

163. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many students have been granted exemption from compulsory attendance at South Australian schools this calendar year?

2. What was the corresponding figure for 1978?

3. What were the main reasons proffered in support of these applications?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. 296 permanent and 122 temporary exemptions as at 22 October.

2. 461 permanent and 277 temporary exemptions (whole year figures).

3. Exemption to take up employment; ill health, either of the child or a parent; or family financial hardship. Temporary exemption for a specific period may be given for such reasons as fruit picking, harvesting, long service leave of parents or for temporary employment.

INTEGRATED SCHOOLS

164. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Government aware that the Australian Teachers Federation is investigating the New Zealand system of "Integrated Schools" as a possible means of resolving what it sees as the continuing problem of funding non-government schools?

2. Does the Government favour the introduction of such a system and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is not aware of the investigation by the Australian Teachers Federation.

2. The Government has papers on the matter delivered to a conference of Australian and New Zealand Ministers of Education early in 1978. This Government has not considered the matter, nor is it aware of any decision by the previous Government as to the merits of such a system.

FOOD AND CATERING SCHOOL

167. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What arrangements have been made for supplying meat to the School of Food and Catering in 1980?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The present arrangement is that the Government Produce Section and SAMCOR share the supply and disposal of meat to the School of Food and Catering, with the Department of Correctional Services supplying and utilising the pork requirements. The department has been assured that this arrangement will continue in 1980.

PETROLEUM OUTLETS

171. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many registered petroleum outlets existed in the metropolitan development area on 30 June of the years 1975 to 1979, respectively?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The information requested by the honourable member is maintained in calendar years and not financial years. Also, his phrase "registered petroleum outlets" has been taken to mean both licensed and permit holders. On this basis the figures at 31 December in each of the years quoted are as follows: 1974, 685 outlets; 1975, 698 outlets; 1976, 530 outlets; 1977, 526 outlets; 1978, 521 outlets.

TALISKER MINE-PITS

173. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. What form of protection exists to prevent people falling into the disused mine-pits at Talisker?

2. Is the Government satisfied that this protection is adequate and, if not, what additional protection measures are planned?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. Within the Talisker Mine area there were six shafts, an open costean and a collapsed drive which were considered dangerous to the public by an Inspector of Mines of the Department of Mines and Energy. These have been fenced off by cyclone fencing 1.2 metres (4 ft.) in height, the posts of which have been concreted into the ground. The erection of the fences was carried out by officers of the State Planning Authority and was completed in November 1978. An inspection of the work was carried out by an Inspector on 10 November 1978 and the work approved.

2. The protection provided by this fencing is considered adequate to prevent inadvertent entry to the openings by small children and adults.

HACKHAM KINDERGARTEN

174. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Are plans in hand to build a third kindergarten at Hackham and, if not, when will such plans be developed?

2. When and where will the kindergarten be built?

3. Will it be managed by the Kindergarten Union or the Education Department?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Plans are in hand to build a third kindergarten at Hackham. Presently, a request for approval of funds rests with Childhood Services Council.

2. The Kindergarten Union has given this kindergarten top priority in its 1979/80 capital works programme, and is awaiting approval from the Childhood Services Council. The kindergarten will be built in the vicinity of the proposed Hackham South Primary School.

3. It will be managed by the Kindergarten Union.

HELICOPTER

177. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Will the Government proceed with its predecessor's intention to lease a helicopter for emergency ambulance and traffic surveillance work and, if so, when will the helicopter be commissioned and, if not, what

alternative provision will the Government make, particularly for emergency ambulance services in the Noarlunga area?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: A committee of enquiry has investigated the use of helicopters for a variety of Government services and this report is currently being appraised.

TELEPHONE TAPPING

184. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the Minister give an assurance that no political "telephone tapping" is being carried out in South Australia at the behest of the Government?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes.

COAL

187. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. What is the quality and estimated quantity of coal deposits recently discovered by W.M.C. in the South-East?

2. What tests, if any, have been carried out on these deposits and with what results?

3. What further exploration for coal, if any, is being undertaken in this area and by which company?

4. Is the coal resource under consideration as fuel for the next power station to be built following the Northern Power Station and, if not, why not?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. At this early date insufficient evidence exists to enable meaningful estimates of tonnage or quality to be made. However, it is anticipated that the quality of the coal will prove comparable to brown coals existing elsewhere in the State; that is, a low rank coal possibly acceptable for power generation.

2. Testing of samples of coal from this area is in progress. No results have yet been released as testing is incomplete.

3. Apart from W.M.C., exploration licences are held in the Murray Basin by Dampier Mining Co. Ltd. (B.H.P.) and Theiss Bros. Pty. Ltd., within which exists the potential for further coal discoveries.

4. Until the deposits are evaluated fully by drilling and analysis to determine the extent and quality, no consideration can be given to utilisation.

COOPER BASIN

188. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What is the policy of the Government on proposals for a natural gas pipeline to connect the Cooper Basin with the North-West Shelf?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government is aware of suggestions for the construction of a pipeline from the North-West Shelf to satisfy the future natural gas requirements of States currently obtaining natural gas from the Cooper Basin. It is recognised that long term national energy requirements may well favour the eventual construction of such a connection.

SPECIAL BRANCH

190. **Mr. BANNON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Since the present Government came into office, have

any discussions been held with the Police Commissioner or any of his officers about the future role of the Special Branch?

2. Does the Government intend that the role of the Special Branch be altered in any way?

3. Has the previously begun culling of files been completed and, if so, when?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. There have been discussions with the Police Commissioner and no decisions have yet been made.

3. No.

WESTERN REHABILITATION SERVICE UNIT

194. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Premier reconsider the request made by Mr. P. Pickering, Senior Administrative Officer for the South Australian Health Commission for additional funds for the erection of a therapeutic swimming pool at the Western Rehabilitation Service Unit at Royal Park?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Available funds for capital works under the community health programme are extremely limited and it is not yet possible to give this proposal sufficient priority for funds over other very desirable developments in the community health area. This proposal is now under review by the S.A. Health Commission and approval to proceed will depend on its priority in relation to other demands for capital spending in the health area.

RADIOACTIVE STRONTIUM THEFT

202. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Has the Minister read the report that a French ecological group known as CRANE earlier this year stole 14 plates of radioactive strontium and sent them by mail to various authorities, warning them in advance so as to avoid serious damage?

2. Can the Minister ascertain what security measures had been adopted by the appropriate authorities to prevent such an incident?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No. If the honourable member will supply a copy of the report or the reference to it then I will endeavour to ascertain what action was taken by the French authorities under such circumstances.

BATTLE-AXE ALLOTMENTS

206. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Is it now possible under the Planning and Development Act to provide "battle-axe" allotments as is common in the Australian Capital Territory and, if not, does the Government have any plans to amend the regulations under the Act so that this form of development can proceed and, if not, why not?

2. Has the South Australian Housing Trust plans to incorporate such allotments in future subdivisions and, if so, where and when?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The South Australian Housing Trust first incorporated "battle-axe" allotments into a plan of subdivision which was approved under the provisions of the Planning and Development Act by the Director of Planning and the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth in 1976. Houses have now been built, sold and

occupied on these allotments. Other areas where subdivisions in which "battle-axe" allotments have been approved include: Para Hills West, Salisbury Park, Noarlunga Downs and Port Augusta West.

STREAKY BAY HOSPITAL

219. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Can the Minister give an assurance that funds will be available for the construction of a new hospital at Streaky Bay and, if so, what is the time schedule involved?

2. Have officers of the South Australian Health Commission finalised arrangements with the local Hospital Board and, if not, are they currently involved in discussions regarding the necessary planning?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Sketch plans and estimates for construction of a new hospital at Streaky Bay are being prepared. Availability of funds for construction of the new hospital depend upon review by the Government of future priorities for capital works within the health services. Planning of the scheme is not at a sufficiently advanced stage for tenders to be called in 1979-80.

2. Officers of the S.A. Health Commission are actively engaged in discussions with the local Hospital Board about the planning of the hospital.

CIGARETTE SALES

225. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to prohibit, or further regulate, the sale of cigarettes in South Australia and when will such action be taken?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: There are no plans to prohibit the sale of cigarettes. I am examining the desirability and feasibility of further regulations.

Dr. DUNCAN

226. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it now proposed to make public the report into the death of Dr. G. I. O. Duncan and, if so, when and how and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government is not disposed to release the report or any part of it unless it can be persuaded there are substantial reasons for doing so that are in the public interest. It is understood that some Ministers of previous Governments have had access to the report and have concluded there has been no justification for its release.

REPLY TO LETTERS

227. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Does the Minister propose to reply to the letter written to him on or about 5 October 1979 by Mrs. M. I. Norton of Murray Bridge, with which was enclosed a letter from Dr. F. W. Altmann, and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. What action, if any, does the Minister propose to take about the matters complained of in the letter?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. I replied to Mrs. Norton on Friday 2 November 1979.

2. The letter states what action is at present being taken.

228. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is it proposed to reply to the letter written by Mr. and Mrs. L. L. Norton on 31 August 1979 to the Minister's predecessor and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I replied to Mr. and Mrs. Norton on Friday 2 November 1979.

PARA HILLS WEST DEVELOPMENT

230. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Planning: Is it now proposed that the South Australian Housing Trust substitute residential for light industrial development in the area between Kesters Road and Maxwell Road and facing Main North Road at Para Hills West and, if so, can the Minister give an assurance that the residential area will contain adequate rental accommodation for the growing needs of pensioners and others in the South Para region?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The zoning of this land and therefore any changes to zoning are the responsibility of the Salisbury Council. No formal approach has been made to the Salisbury Council by the South Australian Housing Trust for a change in this lands zoning. The Housing Trust is aware of the need for rental accommodation for pensioners and others in the South Para region.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

231. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the policy of the Government to appoint the Auditor-General or some other independent person and, if so, who, to chair the Public Accounts Committee and, if so, when will the Bill be introduced to effect the changes?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Detailed consideration of the functions and structure of the Public Accounts Committee and the Public Works Standing Committee, together with the proposed setting up of Budget and Estimates Committees, will be undertaken in due course.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE ACCOMMODATION

232. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it proposed that every member of the Government Party shall have a private room in Parliament House or nearby and, if so, when will the rooms be available and will Opposition members receive the same facilities and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

FLINDERS RANGE REGULATIONS

237. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Does the Government intend to proceed with the Flinders Range planning regulations and, if so, why?

2. Is the Government aware of opposition from landholders who would be subjected to the proposals, particularly with regard to the restrictions on farm buildings?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The draft "Flinders Ranges Planning Area Landscape Zone Planning Regulations" were placed on public exhibition in March 1979. Following many representations

from councils and landholders in the area, and growers organisations, the draft regulations were withdrawn. An announcement to this effect was made by the former Minister of Planning.

The matter is now reviewed by the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. Investigations are underway to evolve guidelines that more appropriately implement the policies in the Flinders Ranges Planning Area Development Plan, having close regard to the issues raised by Councils and landholders.

2. Yes. Due consideration has been given to the legitimate management of rural properties including the location of farm buildings as well as the preservation of the character of the Flinders Range.

EXPLORATION PERMITS

238. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Have any companies been given exploration permits or licences to search for uranium in the Tarcoola/Kingoonya area and if so, which companies and what is the approximate area covered by the exploration licences?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Exploration licences do not specify any particular commodity of interest and they are granted for "all" minerals search. Companies operating on such licences in the Tarcoola/Kingoonya area, which would have an interest in uranium and associated minerals, include the following:

E.L.	km ²
399 Samedan Oil Corporation	1 829
407 Aberfoyle Exploration Pty. Ltd.	1 774
419 PNC Exploration (Australia) Pty. Ltd.	275
439 Aberfoyle Exploration Pty. Ltd.	728
458 Carpentaria Exploration Co. Pty. Ltd.	1 548
460 PNC Exploration (Australia) Pty. Ltd.	503

WHYALLA DENTAL SERVICE

239. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What progress has the Government made towards implementing pensioner dental services at Whyalla?

2. Does the Minister envisage using the private dentist in the town to provide the service and, if so, will it be on a fee for service basis and if not, what will be the arrangements?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Dental facilities for pensioners and financially disadvantaged persons are to be incorporated in stage two of the Whyalla Hospital redevelopment.

2. No decisions have yet been made on the details of the scheme. It is Government policy to use private services where economically possible.

AGRICULTURE RESEARCH

240. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Is the Minister aware of research currently being undertaken at the University of California which has resulted in the development of strains of wheat, barley and tomatoes which will grow in land irrigated with sea water or very saline water?

2. Is it proposed that this research be investigated by the Department of Agriculture with a view to its applicability to local agricultural conditions?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. This research, which is being carried out by Dr. Emmanuel Epstein at the University of California, was investigated by Dr. J. B. Robinson of the Department of Agriculture during a visit in 1977.

2. In these experiments, barley has been grown in small plots with sea water and yielded up to 1 000 kilograms per hectare. However, it is not considered that the work is of direct current application in South Australia as, unlike California, barley is not grown under irrigation. Experimental tomatoes were observed growing in saline hydroponic solutions in California, but water quality is not considered to be a major limiting factor in South Australian tomato production at present.

AGRICULTURE RESEARCH

242. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What research programmes are being undertaken by the Department of Agriculture during 1979-80 in the following fields:

- (a) crops suitable for the production of alternative fuels; and
- (b) more efficient use of conventional fuels through alternative farming practices?

2. What are the costs of each programme and what proportion of the total research budget do they amount to?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Crop trials are being carried out at Struan, Kybybolite and Millicent to measure the yields of fodder beet and three varieties of sugar beet as potential sources for power alcohol production.

(b) (i) Tillage fuel requirements are being measured in association with a group of co-operating farmers on Eyre Peninsula.

(ii) Minimum tillage equipment is being tested to evaluate the effectiveness of this equipment compared with that used for conventional paddock preparation. Fuel requirement differences are being measured.

(iii) Preliminary investigations into ascertaining the fuel requirements for operating alternative types of fodder conservation systems including forage harvesters, mowers and various types of small and large balers, have commenced.

2. Estimated costs of these projects for 1979-80 are:

	\$	%
(a) Energy crops	2 500	0.035
(b) (i) Tillage fuel requirements ...	5 000	0.07
(ii) Minimum tillage	23 500	0.34
(iii) Fodder conservation systems	1 800	0.03

Additional grants have been sought for energy research from three external research funds, but the results of these applications are not presently known.

SALVATION JANE

243. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What is the Government's policy with regard to the provision of compensation to apiarists and graziers who can demonstrate falls in income as a result of the introduction of biological control of salvation jane?

2. If there is no intention to compensate these people if they suffer economic losses, why not?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. The Government has no specific plans for compensation at this stage; should specific cases be

referred to the Department of Agriculture they will be investigated.

PREMIER'S UNDERTAKINGS

246. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government propose to honour the undertakings made by the Premier when Leader of the Opposition in the document dated August 1979 and entitled "Liberal Party Treasury Policy" on page 3 under the heading "Public Accounts Committee" and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: See the answer to Question No. 231.

HOUSING TRUST

247. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has the South Australian Housing Trust any record of the proposal outlined in Question on Notice 207 for 23 October 1979 to the Minister of Transport and, if so, what support, if any, will it provide and when?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The South Australian Housing Trust will provide financial aid on a share basis between the South Australian Land Commission, the Noarlunga council and the Education Department, all of whom have some interest in the adjoining land.

3. These funds will be provided after the reconstruction of Honeypot Road and Beach Road.

SALT DAMP

248. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has the programme of special research into salt damp currently being undertaken by the University of Adelaide, Civil Engineering Department, been commissioned by any Government department or instrumentality and, if so, what financial support is being provided and, if not, is such support being considered?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The programme of special research into salt damp being undertaken by the University of Adelaide, Civil Engineering Department, was commissioned by the Salt Damp Research Committee. Funding of \$20 000 for 1979-80 is being sought in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs's sub-estimates, currently before Parliament under the Commercial Division's Contingencies line—Operating Expenses, Minor Equipment and Sundries.

TRADING STAMP ACT

249. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to repeal or to amend and, if so, in what respects, the Trading Stamp Act?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A report on the Trading Stamp Act has been prepared by officers of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. The report is currently being considered by the Government.

PORT LINCOLN MARINA

253. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Is the Department of Marine and Harbors currently examining the feasibility of a marina at Port Lincoln and, if so, has a proposal been submitted for perusal by local interested organisations?

2. When is it expected that building could commence on the proposed marina?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Marine and Harbors is currently examining the feasibility of providing sheltered mooring facilities at Porter Bay, Port Lincoln, to accommodate fishing vessels and pleasure craft. Conceptual proposals prepared by the department were first discussed with the President of the South Australian branch of the Australian Fishing Industry Council (AFIC) in February 1979 and those proposals were subsequently discussed with representatives of the Port Lincoln council, fishing industry and the local yacht club at Port Lincoln and plans were left with them for further discussion with all local organisations having an interest in the matter.

Subsequently, a "working party", representing all sections of the local boating community, including the fishing industry, has prepared a simplified plan, based on the department's original concept, but incorporating facilities for the working of fishing vessels, that is, unloading catches, loading of stores, fuelling, and undertaking of maintenance work, etc. That plan has just been received and will now be examined by the department to determine its feasibility and cost.

2. It is not possible to nominate a time when construction work may commence. At this stage, discussions are proceeding in order that a scheme acceptable to all parties can be formulated.

PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

254. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: When is it expected that building will commence on the proposed extensions to the Port Lincoln Hospital, and what are the expected completion dates and cost of these extensions?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The alterations to the maternity block at the Port Lincoln Hospital to provide geriatric accommodation are being documented at present. The anticipated tender call date is January 1980, with completion in September 1980. The estimate for the work is \$450 000.

LICENCE FEES

257. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What were the amounts received by the Department of Recreation and Sport for the year 1978-79 in regard to small lotteries applications and licence fees, respectively, in the following categories:

- (a) annual licence;
- (b) general licence;
- (c) housie licence; and
- (d) sweepstake licence?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON:

	\$
(a) Application fees	45 358
Licence fees	478 206
(b) Application fees	4 520
Licence fees	99 361
(c) Application fees	14 930
Licence fees	144 084
(d) Application fees	330
Licence fees	not applicable

HERBAL TEAS

259. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the South Australian Government co-operating with the Commonwealth Department of Health in its investigation into herbal and ginseng teas and, if so, what is the nature of this co-operation?

2. Does the Government have evidence that any such products currently available in South Australia are injurious to health?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Investigations are being carried out by officers of the Pharmaceutical Services Branch of the Health Commission in conjunction with officers of the National Therapeutic Goods Committee of the Commonwealth Department of Health. The committee regularly reviews the efficacy, toxicity and safety of herbal preparations and other therapeutic goods on sale in Australia.

2. No. However, if evidence is found that any herbal preparation is hazardous to health it can be declared a prohibited import by the Commonwealth Government and legislation passed at State level to control its availability and sale.

HOSPITAL BOARDS

260. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What are the names of the chairmen and members of the boards of management of all recognised hospitals in this State?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: There are 81 recognised hospitals in this State. The expense and time involved in obtaining this information cannot be justified.

OIL SPILLS

264. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has the Department for the Environment or any other department or research institution ever undertaken an ecological survey of the sea bed in the vicinity of Port Stanvac and, if so, when and what were, in general the results of this survey and if not, will the Government have such a survey undertaken to check the possible effects on the local marine environment of oil spills?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. The Government has funded a marine biology study at Port Stanvac by the University of Adelaide, Botany Department, to the extent of \$3 150. Petroleum Refineries (Australia) Pty. Ltd., funded an equal amount. The preliminary work has established baseline data which is continuing to be monitored to detect changes due to oil spills or other causes.

SHELTERS

273. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Will the Government support plans under consideration by the Department of Community Welfare to provide shelter for homeless young people?

2. What is the nature of these plans?

3. What number of young people are currently in need of such assistance?

4. Where will such shelters be located?
5. What annual allocation of finance would be needed to support such a scheme?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Continued financial support will be given to six existing youth homes or shelters. At least one new shelter is expected to be funded. One project which provides accommodation for homeless teenagers in houses in the community with a resident supervisor is being funded. Other similar projects are being considered.
3. The Emergency Housing Office has received enquiries from 350 teenagers this year.
4. Existing youth homes or shelters are located at Adelaide, Dulwich, Norwood, Clovelly Park, North Adelaide and Elizabeth Vale. A new shelter is expected to be established shortly at Port Augusta. The supervised housing in the community project is in the Noarlunga area.
5. The allocation for children's homes and youth shelters for 1979-80 is \$915 000. Out of this an amount of approximately \$300 000 will be available for assistance to be given to the abovementioned projects. The latter amount includes some anticipated Commonwealth funding.

GRAFFITI

276. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

What action will be taken to—

- (a) clean up the graffiti on the Woodlands Park Railway Station and make it safe from vandalism; and
- (b) apply an anti-graffiti paint to appropriate wall surfaces to make them very difficult to write on?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) Arrangements have been made to paint the Woodlands Park Railway Station. The station is cleaned regularly and police patrols have been organised in an effort to restrict vandalism.
- (b) The State Transport Authority uses anti-graffiti paint in situations which warrant special attention. In general, however, the paint is very expensive and is ineffectual on rough surfaces.

FOOTBALL PARK

277. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister had any approach from the South Australian National Football League for financial assistance, by way of a Government guarantee, to extend the facilities at Football Park at an estimated cost of \$1 250 000?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS

278. **Mr. PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Premier: What will now be the specific functions and responsibilities of the Ethnic Affairs Unit and if there are to be reductions in functions or staffing, in what areas will they take place?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Ethnic Affairs Branch will continue to promote the welfare of ethnic communities in accordance with Government policy functions and responsibilities as it had under the previous

Government. There are no plans at present to reduce either functions or staffing.

HOLIDAY PAY

279. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many—
 - (a) public servants; and
 - (b) teachers,

are entitled to the 17½ per cent holiday pay loading?

2. How much is it estimated that payment of this loading costs the Government annually?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. The numbers of public servants and teachers entitled to the 17½ per cent recreation leave loading are:

- (a) public servants—17 167.
- (b) teachers—15 800.

2. The estimated annual cost for payment of this loading is:

- (a) for public servants—\$2 648 000.
- (b) for teachers—\$2 906 000.

Note: Payment of this loading is pursuant to the Public Service Recreation Leave Loading Award, and Regulation 101 of the Education Act.

SANDY CREEK DOG SANCTUARY

281. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government propose to give financial assistance to the Sandy Creek Dog Sanctuary and, if so, how much and when will it be given and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter is under investigation.

DENTAL CLINIC

282. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the total number of persons waiting for treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital Dental Clinic?
2. What is the estimated waiting time for treatment?
3. What was the cost of treatment per patient for the financial year ended 30 June 1979?
4. What action is being taken to reduce delays and contain costs?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 3 211.
2. Prosthetics—three years approximately; Restorative—two years; Orthodontics—eight-12 months. There is no waiting time for other forms of treatment.
3. \$27·33.
4. The recommendations of the working party on dental services for the indigent in South Australia are under consideration at the present time.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

283. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What are the alterations and extensions to change room facilities at the Lyell McEwin Hospital estimated to cost \$400 000?
2. Has work commenced on this project and, if so—
 - (a) when;
 - (b) to whom was the contract let;
 - (c) how many tenders were received and what was the highest and lowest; and

(d) if tenders have not been let, why not?

3. Why were the alterations necessary?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The hospital proposes to provide staff change facilities for all live-out staff. The estimated cost of the project is \$335 000 which is to be met entirely from the hospital's own internal funds.

2. No.

3. To improve staff facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

289. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What major activities have taken place within the Department of the Environment as a result of the "minor reorganisation" announced by a previous Minister for the Environment in March 1978?

2. What staff movements have taken place within the department since November 1978?

3. What are the names of the senior officers involved in these staff movements?

4. What benefits in terms of policy development and achievement of objectives have resulted from the reorganisation?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The Co-ordination and Policy Division was established.

(b) A Heritage Unit was established of the Co-ordination and Policy Division.

(c) Some re-arrangements of responsibility within the Department have been made involving transfers of officers, secondment to other Departments, etc.

(d) Some re-allocation of duties of Divisional Heads following the resignation of the previous Head of Department and the transfer of the Director, Co-ordination and Policy Division to the Premier's Department.

2. The administrative effort involved to provide information about all staff movements could not be justified.

3. Dr. S. Barker and Messrs. G. Inglis, P. C. Cornish, A. A. Wynne, N. Johnson and G. Stafford.

4. The concentration of policy development in one concentrated area has allowed a number of internal policy statements to be prepared. In recent months, priorities have been defined and satisfactory progress is being made on a number of major issues within the Department.

290. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: On what dates were the Co-ordination and Policy Division and the Projects and Assessment Division of the Department for the Environment established?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Creation of the Co-ordination and Policy Division was approved in February 1978. The Projects and Assessments Division was a re-naming in 1978 of the Environment Division which was established in 1973.

TORRENS RIVER

294. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has the Government made an application to withdraw the nomination of "the River Torrens—the whole of the River, bed and bank, from source to mouth, but excluding the section within the City of Adelaide, and including adjacent land to a depth of 60 metres from bank", as proposed by the River Torrens

Committee, from listing on the Register of the National Estate and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No. However the previous Government did make such an application on the grounds that the boundaries are inadequately defined and because certain developments of parts of the river may be necessary in the future.

DRUGS

298. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to give effect to the recommendations, and which of them, in the report of the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs and when will that action be taken?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government is considering the recommendations made by the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs. A review of Departmental submissions made to the previous Government concerning the implementation or otherwise of the recommendations is in progress. Appropriate action will then be considered by the Government when this review is complete.

FIRE SERVICES

299. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Was an inquiry into the efficiency and costing of the fire services carried out at the direction of the previous Government and was the report of that inquiry given to the then Chief Secretary before the recent general election and, if so—

(a) will the Government make the report public and, if not, why not;

(b) what recommendations, if any, are made in the report; and

(c) what action, if any, does the Government propose to take as a result of the report?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: An inquiry into the operation of the South Australian Fire Brigade was commissioned by the previous Government and the former Chief Secretary received a copy of the report shortly before the recent State election. The Government is presently considering the report and its recommendations, and when it has done so, will decide what action is to be taken and whether the report will be made public.

DRUGS

304. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is it intended to introduce a fee payable by the customer to cover the cost of recording details of drugs supplied by pharmacists in the schedule three category for drugs being recorded under new regulation introduced in South Australia earlier this year and, if so, what fee is contemplated and when will it be introduced?

2. Have any other States established this schedule and are fees charged for recording?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. It is anticipated that the other States will have brought in similar Schedule 3 Poisons legislation by the end of this year. It is not known whether any recording fees will be charged.

FOOD CONTAMINATION

305. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What tests, if any, are carried out regularly to check the level of metallic and other trace elements or chemicals which contaminate foodstuffs, including fish, in South Australia?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Under the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act, South Australian health authorities submit approximately 1 000 samples of food for analysis each year to ensure compliance with requirements of various food standards. In addition, the State participates in the National Market Basket (Noxious Substances) Surveys which the National Health and Medical Research Council has conducted on an annual basis since 1973. Other agencies, including the Metropolitan Milk Board and the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries also test food products for the presence of pesticides, heavy metals and other contaminants.

HENLEY PROPERTIES

311. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What properties have the Coast Protection Board purchased in conjunction with the Henley and Grange council at Henley Beach South in the past two years and what was the purchase price of each property?

2. What plans are being considered for the properties and what is the estimated cost of each project?

3. What is the percentage cost borne by the board and the council, respectively?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Allotment 1 at the junction of Henley Beach Road and The Esplanade was purchased for \$52 231.83.

2. The Henley and Grange Council has submitted a proposal to develop this property as a car park at a cost of \$1 800.

3. The land was purchased on the basis of 80 per cent Coast Protection Board/20 per cent Corporation of the City of Henley and Grange. Development is on a 50 per cent/50 per cent basis.

DISABLED PERSONS

312. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the policy of the South Australian Health Commission regarding employing disabled persons within hospitals and departments under its control?

2. How many disabled persons are currently employed by the commission?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Health Commission has adopted a clear policy to promote the employment of handicapped persons by the Commission itself and by health units under its jurisdiction.

2. Approximately 50.

DENTAL CLINICS

313. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the opening of school dental clinics in the last 12 months had any impact on the waiting time for dental treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

2. What are the waiting times at present for the various

types of dental treatment provided at the hospital?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no waiting time in children's dentistry.

2. See answer to question No. 282 (2).

EYE DEPARTMENT

318. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is it a fact that elderly and indigent patients must wait up to nine months for an appointment at the Eye Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and if so, what is the average waiting time?

2. How many are on the waiting list?

3. How many of those on the waiting list are only seeking to avail themselves of free spectacles through the Hospital?

4. Is it a fact that these patients, whether eligible pensioners or indigent, can obtain free eye examinations, without significant waiting, from optometrists and ophthalmologists in private practice?

5. Is it a fact that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will not provide free spectacles to eligible pensioners and indigent persons if they present a spectacle prescription written by an optometrist or ophthalmologist in private practice and if so, why and does this mean that if these people exercise their entitlement to free eye examination they forego their entitlement to free spectacles and if so, what is being done to eliminate this anomaly?

6. What is the waiting time for these people at the Eye Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Awaiting eye examination and free spectacles—565 patients. No other significant waiting list.

3. All of them.

4. Some optometrists and ophthalmologists in private practice will undertake eye examinations of eligible patients for medical benefits only.

5. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital does provide free spectacles to eligible patients upon presentation of a prescription from an ophthalmologist. It is hospital policy that all patients shall be examined by a medical practitioner.

6. (a) Urgent eye problems—immediate treatment.

(b) Non-urgent eye problems—approximately 6 months.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

319. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Will the Minister have access standard AS1428, which is presently in the building regulations, made mandatory so that handicapped persons have an equal opportunity to patronise and utilise all future public buildings and if not, why not?

2. Is the Minister aware that some semi-government buildings completed recently are inaccessible to many handicapped persons?

3. Is the Minister also aware that the Local Government Association building completed recently on the corner of Hutt and Pirie Streets is inaccessible to many handicapped persons?

4. What action does the Minister intend to take to guarantee handicapped persons are given a reasonable opportunity of access to new buildings?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. AS1428 is couched in mandatory terms and is called up in certain instances by the building regulations generally only where the public has access to buildings. The Crown is not bound by those regulations but generally builds in accordance with the technical requirements thereof.

2. No. However, if the honourable member can provide me with information as to the locations of specific buildings, I will have further inquiries made.

3. Yes.

4. The Building Advisory Committee is at present looking into this matter. It has had, and continues to have, discussions with the Access Committee of the Australian Council for Rehabilitation of the Disabled (A.C.R.O.D.) and with representatives of the Bright Committee.

GLANDORE UNIT

326. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What has been the total cost of renovations and repairs to the Glandore geriatric and psychiatric unit, formerly known as Windana, during the years 1975-76 to 1978-79 respectively?

2. Who did the renovations and repairs?

3. What was the total cost of running the unit during 1978-79?

4. What was the average daily occupancy during 1978-79?

5. How many beds are at the unit?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

Windana home was transferred from the Department of Community Welfare to the S.A. Health Commission in April 1976, therefore, the information given below is applicable to the period April 1976 to June 1979.

1. \$1 354 208.

2. Public Buildings Department.

3. \$17 904.

4. Nil.

5. 90.

MURRELL ROAD

332. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister aware of the increasing traffic hazard on Murrell Road at Para Hills and, if so, what is proposed to minimise future road accidents?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Accident records do not indicate an increasing traffic hazard on the stated road.

NELSON ROAD

334. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When is it proposed to widen, upgrade and reconstruct Nelson Road, between Miller Avenue and Billabong Road at Para Hills, to facilitate the flow of traffic in a north-south direction and to alleviate congestion in the residential streets of the area?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: This project is tentatively planned to start in two to three years subject to available finance.

AUSTRALIAN OPERA

335. **Mr. BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the Government intend to give any

money to the Australian Opera in this financial year and, if so, will the Government consider suspending this grant until it is satisfied that there is sound management of the Australian Opera?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It has been the practice of the South Australian Government to provide funds to the Australian Opera, although this year no decision has been made about such funding. A decision will not be made until the Government has been assured that the company is to be satisfactorily managed, and that it will perform in this State.

The Government has noted the appointment of an interim general manager to co-ordinate the company's management team until a decision is made regarding a new general manager. Officers of the Department for the Arts are monitoring the situation closely and the Government will co-operate closely with the Australia Council in its inquiry into opera in Australia, announced last month. That inquiry, amongst other matters to be considered, will be looking closely at the administration of opera companies in Australia, including the Australian Opera.

MUSEUM

336. **Mr. BANNON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Will the Government implement all of the recommendations contained in the South Australian Museum Study: First Interim Report which was prepared for the previous Government by Robert Edwards of the Aboriginal Arts Board of the Australian Council and, if not, what recommendations will the Government implement, which recommendations will it reject and why, will any recommendations be implemented in a modified form and when will any of the above action be taken?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government cannot undertake to implement all of the recommendations contained in the Edwards Report at this stage, because of the financial implications, estimated on present-day costs to be in excess of \$31 000 000. Specific submissions will be made to Cabinet.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

367. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government propose to introduce legislation requiring statutory authorities to justify their continued existence and, if so, what will be the judicial or other body which will determine the matter and when is it proposed to introduce the legislation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. The details of its operation are under consideration.

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFERS

378. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Chief Secretary's administration—

(a) have been transferred;

(b) have been told they are to be transferred; or

(c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

(a) what is his name;

(b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;

- (c) what is his current position and salary;
 (d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and
 (e) what was the reason for the transfer?
3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—
 (a) what is his name;
 (b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;
 (c) to what position is the transfer to be made;
 (d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;
 (e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and
 (f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. None.
2. See 1.
3. See 1.

379. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Minister's administration—

- (a) have been transferred;
- (b) have been told they are to be transferred; or
- (c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at that date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

- (a) what is his name;
- (b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;
- (c) what is his current position and salary;
- (d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and
 (e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

- (a) what is his name;
- (b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;
- (c) to what position is the transfer to be made;
- (d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;
- (e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and
 (f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. None.
2. Vide 1.
3. Vide 1.

SALISBURY HOUSING

389. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What are the proposed construction goals of the South Australian Housing Trust in the electorate of Salisbury for each of the years from 1979-80 to 1981-82?

2. What numbers of these units will be for rental and purchase, respectively, and how many of the rental units will be pensioner units, how many two-bedroom units and how many villa flats?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. In 1979-80 the South Australian Housing Trust anticipates 109 completions for sale housing in the electorate of Salisbury of which 60 are in Salisbury Downs

and 49 in Salisbury North. During the same time period, 22 one-storey maisonnettes, including 8 two-bedroom units, and 21 cottage flats in Salisbury North are expected to be completed for rental purposes.

In 1980-81 the trust proposes to complete a further 247 sale units (102 in Salisbury North and 145 in Parafield Gardens). In addition 12 one-storey maisonnettes at Salisbury North, two of which are two-bedroom units; 20 attached units at Parafield Gardens, four of which are two-bedroom units, and, 12 cottage flats for pensioners at Parafield Gardens are expected as handovers for rental use.

During 1981-82, 311 sale units at Parafield Gardens are scheduled for completion as well as 29 attached units for rental purposes, six of which are two-bedroom units. The trust would also hope to acquire land suitable for several cottage flat developments totalling approximately 40 units for completion during this time period.

HOUSING TRUST

390. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the present stock of housing units owned by the South Australian Housing Trust in the electorate of Salisbury that is either being rented or is available for rental?

2. How many of these units are:

- (a) two-bedroom semi-detached;
- (b) three-bedroom semi-detached;
- (c) two-bedroom detached;
- (d) three-bedroom detached;
- (e) villa flats; and
- (f) pensioner cottages?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:
 Electorate of Salisbury:

1. 1 619.

2. (a) Two-bedroom semi-detached	}	Double units	
(b) Three-bedroom semi-detached	}		1 500
(c) Two-bedroom detached—imported dwellings		(4)	
(d) Three-bedroom detached—			
One-storey maisonnettes			(8)
Ex S.A.R.			(10)
Rental grant homes			(11)
Single unit brick			(43)
Single unit timber			(14)

90

Medium density units 7

(e) Villa flats —

(f) Cottage (pensioners)—Cottage flats 22

ANGAS HOME

391. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the policy of the South Australian Housing Trust regarding the future use of the former Angas Home for the Deaf, and what negotiations have taken place to date to put that policy into effect?

2. When can it be expected that an announcement will be made as to its future long-term usage?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. The collection of buildings which formerly composed the Angas Home for the Deaf could have a variety of community or residential uses. At present, the South Australian Housing Trust is considering the use of

the buildings as a hostel for the aged or for other residential purposes.

PARAFIELD GARDENS SCHOOL

395. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister ensure that the property sited immediately to the north of Parafield Gardens High School is maintained in a reasonable state by regular cleaning of undergrowth to minimise the fire hazard, risk of snakes and incidence of rodents?

2. What is the proposed use of that land?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Further Education is aware of the problems caused through the build-up of undergrowth on unused properties, and arrangements are being made for periodical inspection and clearing.

2. The property sited immediately north of the Parafield Gardens High School is held for future development by the Department of Further Education, in particular to provide for community education needs in technical and further education.

CHRISTIES BEACH INTERSECTION

397. **Mr. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When will traffic signals be installed at the intersection of Beach and Dyson Roads, Christies Beach?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The work is scheduled to be completed by Christmas.

LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

In reply to **Mr. ASHENDEN** (30 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As indicated earlier, the reconstruction of Lower North-East Road through to Grand Junction Road is expected to be completed in 1982, funds and resources permitting. Drainage works form part of the road project and are progressively being carried out in conjunction with the road works.

DRIVERS LICENCES

In reply to **Mr. EVANS** (24 October).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Department of Transport has been considering the matter of driver identification for several years. The question of issuing licences incorporating a photograph of the licensee has undergone a thorough examination by most of the Australian licensing authorities. Their inquiries, as well as local investigations, have unfortunately resulted in failure to establish the feasibility of the scheme.

In the course of the department's investigations, no evidence was presented to show that the misuse of licences is in any way widespread. The vast majority of citizens are law abiding, and it is considered that the number of licences being improperly used would be a relatively minute proportion of the more than 700 000 licences issued.

Existing safeguards based on the licensee's signature on application and licence forms have proved to be reliable, simple and inexpensive. Every reasonable precaution practicable is taken against the misuse of licences, including lending one to a person who cannot pass a practical test or whose licence has been disqualified. The legislation prescribes heavy penalties for such offences.

However, the department is continuing to review this aspect of identification and has no doubt that an economical justifiable solution will be achieved. However, at this time, no satisfactory solution has been resolved.

NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY MARALINGA DRILLING

In reply to **Mr. DUNCAN** (26 October).

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:

Question. (1) Obligations of signatory countries in connection with the supply of uranium?

Answer. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Article IV, provides that "All the parties to the treaty undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy."

Question. (2) The cost of recent drilling at Maralinga, undertaken by the Mines Department, for the Commonwealth or State Government. Who were the persons who undertook that drilling and what were the results of that drilling?

Answer. The most recent drilling operations undertaken by the Department of Mines at Maralinga comprised diamond drilling (5 holes, 10 metres each) and cable tool drilling for water sampling (1 hole, 30 metres deep)—the total cost of this project was \$18 280 charged to the Commonwealth Department for Science and the Environment. A report "Radiological safety and future land use at the Maralinga atomic weapons test range" was published in January 1979 by The Australian Ionising Radiation Advisory Council; this runs to 99 pages and incorporates the results of drilling.

DEPUTY PREMIER'S OFFICE STAFF

In reply to **Mr. DUNCAN** (24 October).

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Eight staff, as follows:

Richard Yeeles—Ministerial officer grade II; James Kimpton—Ministerial officer grade II; Des Petherick—Administrative officer I; Marion Brooks—Steno-secretary III; Sandra Pitman—Steno-secretary I; John Eitel—Clerk III; Vicki Hobart—Clerk; and Mary Camilleri—Office assistant.

NORWOOD UNITS

In reply to **Mr. WEBSTER** (11 October).

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The Minister of Consumer Affairs has informed me that a block of 30 units was erected in Bridge and High Streets, Kensington, in 1978. An order for the winding up of the building company, P. Ali and Sons Pty. Ltd., was made on 22 August 1979. Following a complaint by a unit owner, the premises were visited by an inspector of the Builders Licensing Board. This officer's preliminary report confirms the existence of defects.

Both the Builders Licensing Board and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs are continuing inquiries, and will assist the unit owners in any way that is possible. The liquidator is not yet in a position to assess the amount, if any, available for creditors, and no decision as to future action can be made until this information is available.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 419 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by the Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy, Dr. Hopgood, and Messrs. Payne, Evans, Millhouse, and Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 98 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays were presented by the Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy and the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

A petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation that provided for the legal sale, cultivation or distribution of marijuana was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman for 1978-79.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PUBLIC SERVICE

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: It is clear that some members of the Opposition are deliberately seeking to undermine the status and morale of the South Australian Public Service and that sections of the media are allowing themselves to be misled by what are nothing more than scandalous misrepresentations. The Leaders of the Opposition in both Houses have persistently purveyed false information about the number of public servants involved in transfers since the change of Government. Not once but twice they have said 100 public servants were involved in the changes, though I have corrected this on both occasions. The number is 38, not 100.

The irresponsible accusations obviously designed to cause fear and unrest in what is a fine Public Service have not only involved gross exaggerations in numbers; however, less than two days ago, the Hon. Mr. Sumner made allegations of a "hit list", making it now necessary for me to give further details about the transfers that have taken place.

The largest number of the 38 public servant transfers were 11 from the former Policy Division of the Premier's Department. These arose because my colleagues and I decided, before we came into Government, that there should be a different manner of dealing with policy issues and Cabinet business.

We wanted to put an end to a situation where submissions to Cabinet from individual Ministers could be

examined and further commented upon by officials of the Premier's Department, before being discussed and decided in Cabinet. Six more transfers involved officers who, at the change of Government, were Ministerial officers and who were members of the Public Service, and therefore held a substantive position within the Public Service. They have reverted to their previous classifications, though in different positions from the ones they originally held.

Two officers in the Department of Community Development, Ethnic Affairs Branch, other than those already mentioned in the categories above, have been transferred. One other officer of this branch was transferred but has since been re-employed in her former position. One other officer of this branch was redeployed internally. Three more former Ministerial employees, who did not have a substantive Public Service position, have been found appropriate Public Service positions. Five Public Service staff employed in offices of former Ministers (they are a different category from that of Ministerial appointees) were also reassigned, although three of these placements are still being reviewed.

Two staff employed in the Unit for Industrial Democracy and not already mentioned are also being redeployed. Other public servants who have moved as a result of the change of Government include three officers who asked or were asked to join the staff of the Premier's Department. And finally, there are the public servants who sought to join the staff of the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition. They number four in all.

In addition, the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House has asked that the officer performing steno-secretarial duties to the previous Leader be redeployed and a new steno-secretary appointed. As I have said, 38 public servants have been transferred since my Government took over. Redeployment is not new and, in fact, a significant number of changes were made when the former Premier came to office earlier this year, without a change of Government. Other changes will inevitably occur from time to time as part of the normal operation of the Public Service. In addition, at the Opposition's request, three former Parliamentary members of the previous Government were offered re-employment in State Government departments following their defeat. Two of these former members of Parliament accepted the employment offered.

Let me now deal with the question of morale. First, the officers who have been transferred have been placed in jobs at the same level, and with the same salary, as the jobs they had before. They have the same rights and prospects for promotion as other public servants. In their interests, as well as the best interests of the service as a whole, the sooner the Opposition stops misinforming the public the better. These officers, for the most part, want nothing else but to settle down in their new positions and to get on with their careers as public servants.

As for the 17 000 other public service officers, they have every reason to have confidence in their future. We have pledged that the Government's objective of reducing the size of the public sector will not be achieved by sackings. The Public Service's jobs are secure, provided that they continue to work with the professional dedication which South Australians have come to expect, do expect, and have a right to demand of them. Reductions in numbers will be achieved by natural wastage: retirements and ordinary staff turnover; people resigning for personal or family reasons; or to take an opportunity in the private sector.

This means that those who remain in the Public Service can look forward to a stimulating, challenging, competitive environment, and one in which there will be

opportunity for individual self-fulfilment in service to South Australian community, as well as opportunity for advancement in rank and salary for the ones who are the most effective and efficient.

Public servants themselves know that to be true, and are happy about it, and a lot of them have told me so. That is why I am confident in saying that the morale in the Public Service is good, and the so-called morale issue raised by the Opposition is a non-issue. However, if members of the Opposition continue in their irresponsible and damaging comments about the Public Service, they will do harm. For that reason, I am answering them directly, in the interests of South Australia and of good, stable government for the whole community.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOSPITALS

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: In the *News* of Friday 2 November, a front-page report appeared under the heading "Cash blow to hospital". The report claimed that more than 200 beds at the South Australian Home for Incurables were vacant while 600 people waited for

admission, and went on to quote the Administrative Officer of the home, Mr. R. G. Rees, as saying that all approaches to the Government to open the block had been turned down.

Mr. Rees has made it clear to me that the article in the *News* was not prompted by any report from the Home for Incurables.

I wish to advise the House that there has been no approach to this Government by the Home for Incurables for operating funds to open the west block. Mr. Rees has assured me that at no time did he advise a reporter from the *News* that this Government had been approached without success. Mr. Rees told me that, as the previous Government had not been able to make funds available, the board of the home accepted this situation and realised that requests for funds would have to be deferred to the next financial year. As a result, the board had made no approach to this Government.

In regard to the figure of 600 people on the waiting list, Mr. Rees advised me that he had given a figure of 567 people to a reporter from the *News*. It should be made clear that this figure does not accurately represent the number of people urgently seeking admission and, in fact, contains people who have their names on the waiting list by way of insurance against possible future need.

The medical condition of all applicants falls into one of three classifications:

"A" Class	Ambulant	A patient is regarded as ambulant when he is either able to walk without assistance or is actively mobile in a wheelchair and can attend to his own toilet functions. A patient on crutches is ambulant.
"B" Class	Bed-centred	A patient who has to be helped out of bed but has slightly more freedom than the near bedfast patient. He should be ambulant to a minor degree, being able to move of his own accord around the vicinity of the bed but unable to move any distance even in a wheelchair without assistance from others.
"C" Class	{ Near Bedfast	A patient who has to be lifted out of bed and cannot move from a seated position without assistance from others.
	{ Bedfast	A patient who is completely confined to bed.

The summary of that list is statistical, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.
Leave granted.

Summary of Statistics

At present the following numbers are on the waiting list:

	"A" Class		"B" Class		"C" Class	
	Active	Deferred	Active	Deferred	Active	Deferred
Men.....	58	31	24	92	4	14
Women.....	89	18	56	109	7	44
Young People						
Male.....	—	3	4	5	—	2
Female.....	1	—	—	—	1	5
	<u>148</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>206</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>65</u>
Summary						
Active List.....	244					
Deferred List.....	323					
	<u>567</u>					

Mr. Duncan: Just a pack of statistics, that's all they are, aren't they?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: They give an interesting story, though. I believe that some of the cases of people seeking urgent admission need to be examined to see whether other community services, such as nursing homes and domiciliary care, can provide the health care which is required. I also believe that it is imperative that eligibility for admission to specialised institutions with high capital and operating costs should be rigidly reviewed to ensure that no beds are occupied by patients who could be cared for as effectively in other appropriate ways and at much lower cost to the taxpayer. I propose to seek the co-operation of the board of the Home for Incurables in an

inquiry to establish eligibility criteria for admission to the home and to identify alternative means of health care for those whose condition does not meet such criteria.

In addition to the report in Friday's *News*, in last night's edition of that paper, under the heading "More hospital beds lost in cuts", it was claimed that reductions in the State health budget had forced the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to close an in-patient rehabilitation unit at Mareeba Hospital. The patients who have been transferred from Mareeba to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will continue to receive the same high standard of care, but at considerably reduced costs to the taxpayer, as they will be making use of unused bed capacity at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Futhermore, the heading in the *News* stating that the facility had closed was inaccurate. The centre will continue to remain open to operate as a day centre for rehabilitation and aged care. The closure of the 26-bed ward at the main hospital poses no threat whatsoever to standards of patient care or services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It helps to achieve a highly desirable situation in which the hospital has an average hospital bed occupancy rate of 80 per cent, which is well within the optimum occupancy rate for this type of hospital.

QUESTION TIME

WEEKLY-PAID EMPLOYEES

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say whether the Minister of Industrial Affairs is acting with his authority and that of Cabinet in threatening to dismiss weekly-paid employees of the Public Buildings Department and, if he is not, can he clarify the situation? On 18 October, the Minister issued a statement which, in part, reads:

No person in employment in any department on 15 September 1979 is to be retrenched.

The Minister repeated that assurance in an open letter to all Public Buildings Department employees that was circulated complete with his photograph. However, he added:

Unless it can be demonstrated that an employee would be unduly inconvenienced or disadvantaged by a transfer, refusal to accept a transfer will result in termination of employment, in accordance with the relevant award.

The result of this letter has been widespread confusion, as exemplified in today's *Australian* where, under the headline, "Minister's assurance panics labourers", a report states:

Government workers had a right to believe that the Liberal Party's much trumpeted job security policy was unconditional.

In view of the statements made by the Premier in this House one would have thought they did have such a right. Will the Premier therefore clear up this confusion and indicate by what authority the Minister is making these threats?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think the Leader is, once again, exaggerating inordinately in suggesting that a threat has been made. The situation that I understand he is referring to is a communication setting out the details of the transfer procedures that are to be adopted between departments and the day-labour force. Obviously, the Government has made quite a point of its transfer procedures and its redeployment of the day-labour forces from one department to another to make the best use of available labour. I am quite certain that those members of the day-labour force will be pleased to be gainfully employed in on-going projects where projects are available in other departments and they have no specific employment ahead of them.

There is no threat. The Minister has, as is right and proper, simply said that he hopes that there will be co-operation in transfer procedures. I understand that the negotiations and discussions about the transfer procedures are still proceeding. I can see no question of any threat of retrenchment at all, and in no way does this override the promises given by this Government. The "no retrenchment" policy, while being held to very strongly by the Government will not, of course, affect the normal situation when people do not comply with their work requirements. It is not to be taken as a blanket policy stating that people cannot be dismissed if they do not

comply with the necessary requirements of their conditions of work.

CHRISTIES BEACH HOSPITAL

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Health inform residents south of O'Halloran Hill what is happening in relation to the proposed Christies Beach hospital? Will the hospital go ahead, and is a maternity section to be incorporated into the proposed hospital?

Dr. HOPGOOD: You can read my Question on Notice.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Residents in the south have been told since 1974 that a hospital would be built in the southern area. During the 1977 election campaign, the previous Government said that it would join the private venture and supply a maternity ward. I quote from the *Southern Times* of 22 November 1978, as follows:

Work will start on the first stage of the \$3 000 000 Noarlunga District Hospital this February [1979]. Announcing the start last Friday, S.A. Health Minister, Don Banfield, together with spokesmen for the joint developers, Mr. Gilligan of O'Connor and Gilligan and Mr. White of Hospital Corporation Australia, said the construction of Noarlunga District Hospital would combine the resources of the S.A. Government and private enterprise from three States . . . There will also be an obstetric suite incorporating three delivery rooms, a labour ward and a nursery.

To this date, people in the south still have not seen anything of this promise come to fruition. Could the Minister therefore enlighten the residents of the area?

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable Minister to answer, I indicate that Question on Notice No. 172 closely parallels the question asked by the honourable member, although there is some implication in the question different from what is specifically asked in the Question on Notice.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The position with the hospital at Christies Beach is that the processing of legal documents in respect of the loan guarantee which this Government and the previous Government proposed is now proceeding in an orderly fashion, and will be completed as soon as practicable; I would say in the very near future. The previous Government had decided, I think shortly before the election, not to proceed with the obstetrics unit, which, as a result of its own initiative, had been included in the proposal, on the basis that the State Government would contribute to the running costs. It was found that no formula could be devised by which the Government could contribute to those running costs, and the Hospitals Corporation had no intention of proceeding with the unit without some kind of heavy subsidy. As a result, there are no plans to include the obstetrics unit in the hospital.

As well as sound economic reasons for this, there are also clinical reasons. For instance, the number of births in the area would not warrant the provision of a high-cost obstetrics section, and it would not be possible for the standard of professional care required for running an obstetrics section to be maintained with the low numbers of births which are currently taking place and which are predicted in that area. However, I am investigating the possibility that some kind of obstetrics services can be provided, possibly in association with the Flinders Medical Centre. I am aware of the concern of people in that area to have access locally to obstetrics services, and whatever can be done, in consultation with local doctors and with the centre, to ensure that that need is met will be done. I hope that I will be able to consult with the appropriate organisations and advise the honourable member in due course.

Dr. Hopgood: I've got a Liberal Party pamphlet home that reads very peculiarly—

The SPEAKER: Order! To correct the record, I point out that the question was on notice and was answered, as best can be determined, last Tuesday.

EMPLOYMENT SURVEY

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the September quarter survey of employment of the Department of Trade and Industry has been completed and, if it has, what was the increase in employment since the September quarter of 1978, and why has the Government chosen not to make this finding public?

The June survey quarter of 120 firms by the Department of Economic Development recorded an increase in employment of 2 400, compared with the June quarter of 1978. The June quarter survey results were consistent with the Australian Bureau of Statistics "Civilian Employees" series, which indicated a 3 600 increase in private sector jobs in the 12 months ended June. Together the two studies indicate substantial employment growth in the State, and it is important that this trend has continued in recent months. The A.B.S. survey covers the whole workforce, whereas the Department of Economic Development's study is only a survey of 120 firms (that's why the figures differ). The Labor Government published several surveys in the past year.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The matter that the Deputy Leader has raised relates to the monthly review of the South Australian economy prepared by the Department of Trade and Industry. That document does a number of things. First, it looks at the various A.B.S. figures on employment, unemployment and other indicators for the economy. As part of that survey, the department telephones a number of large companies in South Australia and asks those companies for their variations in employment. As I understand it, that is done on a quarterly basis by the Department of Trade and Industry. It has never been Government practice (going back to the time when Mr. Dunstan was Premier, and also when the member of Hartley was Premier) to release those figures, and there is a very simple reason for that—the information is given to the Government by individual companies on the basis that it will not be released. The reason for this is so that other companies cannot find out confidential information about the number of employees of competitive companies.

Mr. Bannon: We just want the total.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I point out that that has not been the practice of the previous Governments, but I will check.

Mr. Wright: The totality has been released.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: To my knowledge the figures have not been released.

Mr. Wright: They have.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: My opinion differs from that of the Deputy Leader. I asked the former Premier regularly for those reports, and he consistently refused to table those reports in the House. On one occasion, when I managed to get a copy of that report and I quoted it in the House, I think, from memory, the Premier accused me of being in possession of stolen goods.

Dr. Hopgood: Were you?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The copy was openly handed to me by someone outside of the Government service. I point out to the Deputy Leader that those monthly surveys have never been released. However, I am prepared to ask

the companies whether or not they will consider allowing them to be released.

Mr. Wright: We want the total increase in the work force.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question has been asked, and the honourable Minister is answering.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I appreciate that it embarrasses the previous Government that a practice that it applied for some nine years has been continued by this Government for about two months. I know only too well that the previous Government consistently refused to release the figures in that report. As I say, I am prepared to ask the companies whether they are prepared to have the figures released.

Mr. Wright: We don't want figures from the companies; we want the totality.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I reiterate to the Deputy Leader that I shall contact the companies involved. Certainly, it was not the practice of his Party when in Government to release those figures.

MARALINGA CORES

Mr. OSWALD: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether he has received a report from his department regarding the storage of cores from Maralinga at the core library at Glenside? During Question Time last Thursday, the member for Elizabeth asked a question about the storage of cores from Maralinga at the Department of Mines and Energy core library at Glenside. In the course of asking his question he suggested that:

. . . drill cores containing particles of plutonium were shipped from Maralinga to Adelaide and were put into the core library of the Department of Mines and Energy at Conyngham Street, Glenside.

He also said:

The fact that this has apparently happened is an incredible reflection on the ability of the Mines Department to have any useful comment to make on the question of safety.

The honourable member repeated the allegation outside the House, and also suggested that insufficient attention had been given to the safety of departmental employees engaged in the drilling at Maralinga. On *Nationwide* last Thursday, the honourable member said:

It seems officers of the Mines Department brought core samples as a result of drilling at Maralinga to Adelaide which contained particle material of plutonium and they didn't in fact inform people in the core library that the material may have contained plutonium.

He also said that Mines Department people are "not safety conscious and are not safety experts". He later said that if core library personnel "have ingested plutonium or any of them have in any way come in contact with plutonium there is a very high risk" that they may get cancer. The Minister said in his reply that he would call for a report, and I wonder whether it is to hand.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I have received a report, which it has been suggested I would not bring forward. It is comprehensive and thorough, and to put the record straight I will read it to the House. It is a memorandum from the Director-General of my department, Mr. Bruce Webb, as follows:

During 1977 the Department of Mines and Energy assisted in an investigation, carried out by the Australian Ionising Radiation Advisory Council, of the radiological safety and future land use of the Maralinga Atomic Weapons Test Range. At that time, for obvious reasons, the details of the investigation were confidential. The department's work involved the drilling of seven diamond drill holes and one

percussion drill hole. This work formed part of that aspect of the investigation which was concerned with evidence of residual plutonium contamination.

The drilling operation was carried out under the close surveillance of health physicists and, because of the interest in ascertaining the possible presence of minute quantities of plutonium, extreme care was taken in the method of drilling and the recovery and handling of cores and samples. The material recovered was tested on site using sophisticated radiation detection equipment. In particular, the equipment used was sensitive to alpha radiation, which is the form of radiation associated with plutonium. Any material showing alpha radiation was carefully removed for subsequent testing by AIRAC.

It was sent to Lucas Heights, in fact. The memorandum continues:

The balance of the material was returned to Adelaide in core trays and sample bags for subsequent geological logging to provide additional information to assist in the AIRAC investigation. AIRAC have advised that the drilling operation and trans-shipment of material were handled in a competent and proper manner. The drillers were aware of the importance of the job they were doing and the need for particular care and for confidentiality to be maintained. In the field they were closely supervised at all times by competent scientific personnel. Consequently, they were not at any time exposed to any abnormal health risks. The material transferred to Adelaide exhibited no alpha radiation and the drillers were advised by AIRAC to treat it in the normal way cores and samples are handled.

I am further advised by Mr. O. H. Turner, who headed the AIRAC field study team, that the material transferred to Adelaide presented no abnormal health risk to personnel transporting, handling or logging the material. Considering the extreme care with which this whole investigation was carried out, it is hardly surprising that material authorised by AIRAC to leave the site in charge of drillers was not considered by the health physicists to present any health risk. The sample material was received at the departmental Thebarton depot on 24 August 1977. It was transferred to the core library at Glenside in November 1977 when that building was completed, and it was stored on a pallet containing approximately 10 boxes of material.

The cores were logged and, in the case of one core, photographed at the request of AIRAC in November 1978 and all the material discarded in May 1979 to make space for permanent storage of other cores after it was determined that it was not further required by AIRAC. The matter of disposal was first checked with Mr. Watson, of AIRAC, who confirmed that the material concerned could be disposed of safely, using normal procedures. It was accordingly removed by McMahon's Disposals to the sanitary land fill site at Halls Road, Highbury.

On the basis of information obtained from AIRAC, which organisation is, after all, the ultimate authority in this country on this matter, it is quite evident that at no time were Mines Department field or laboratory personnel exposed to any abnormal health risk. Furthermore, it is agreed that the work done by the department was carried out in a completely responsible, competent and professional manner in all respects. In confirmation of these findings, I refer also to the report on this investigation, published by AIRAC in January 1979 and publicly released in June 1979. In regard to the "Survey of the Maralinga Atomic Weapons Testing Range for Residual Plutonium Contamination", which is that part of the investigation with which this department was involved, the report (page 45) states:

Residual plutonium levels in soil, flora, fauna and the air of the Maralinga (South Australia) atomic weapons testing range are presented and discussed. It is shown that only on

rare occasions (and possibly never) would the plutonium concentration in air from wind resuspended dust exceed the maximum allowable concentration for continuous exposure of the general public. In the case of artificially resuspended dust, this maximum concentration could be exceeded for short periods, but the accompanying dust level would be such that working conditions would be uncomfortable, if not intolerable. Potential hazards from other possible exposure routes are so low that they are of no consequence.

Further, on page 48, the report states:

All samples were contained in plastic screw-top jars, numbered and sent to the Australian Atomic Energy Commission (A.A.E.C.) research establishment at Lucas Heights for plutonium analysis.

If there was any detection of alpha radiation at all that indicated plutonium, it was sent to Lucas Heights. The memorandum continues:

On page 56, the report states:

The chance of a person contracting cancer from exposure to plutonium at Maralinga is extremely remote, even when the dust concentration in the air is such that it makes working conditions intolerable. Because of the high density of plutonium oxide and the small fraction of fine particles, this material would be resistant to movement by wind. Its suspension and migration would occur only during the rare occasions when high winds followed a period of little rain and high temperature.

I refer now to the related matter of samples containing uranium ores now stored at the Glenside core library. In 1978, during transfer of material to the core library from the former repository at Thebarton, concern was expressed by some members of staff about the possible health hazard associated with the handling, transporting and storage of uranium bearing cores and samples. With the assistance of the Health Commission and Amdel, a check of gamma radiation levels and radon was made at the Glenside core library and the Glenside annexe, and of gamma radiation levels at Thebarton, in August 1978. This survey established that the radiation and radon levels were low and well within accepted limits.

Because this department's actions in relation to the Maralinga material had been under the direction of AIRAC, an examination specifically of the material from Maralinga for alpha radiation did not arise at that time.

As I have explained, that was already done. The memorandum continues:

If it had, it would have required the use of equipment not available to the Health Commission, and as confirmed by AIRAC would not, in any event, have revealed any alpha radiation or any health risk associated with the handling and storage of that material. In conclusion, I point out that the responsibilities of this department require it, from time to time, to carry out, on behalf of the Government in office, work of a nature not well understood by the general public and requiring particular skills and experience. We endeavour to do such work in a competent and professional manner and to seek assistance from other professional organisations when their particular expertise is required.

Mr. Bannon: Who is "we"?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am reading a memorandum to me from the Director-General because the member for Elizabeth requested a report. The memorandum continues:

Given a fair go, we can and do provide the necessary factual information to shed light on concerns or misunderstandings that arise from time to time, either from our own people or from the public.

We also act to change or modify procedures when professional advice determines such to be necessary. Some

recent public statements reflect unfairly on the competence and integrity of myself and my staff, and indirectly on the staff of the Health Commission. I seek your assistance in correcting the misleading implications in those statements.

Mr. BANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the question has taken up 10 valuable minutes of Question Time. The Minister has been reading a statement by the Permanent Head of the Department of Mines and Energy, which could have been transmitted easily to the member concerned. I submit that we should proceed to the next question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader has put a point of order, but by inference he now seeks to move a procedural motion for which there is no provision.

Mr. Bannon: I seek your guidance.

The SPEAKER: The matter of answering questions has been a vexed question in this House over a long period. In reading to the House the provisions of Standing Orders 124 and 125, let me say that it will become apparent that I do not intend to uphold the Leader's point of order. Before calling on questions, it is necessary that we should understand the provisions of Standing Order 124, as follows:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

In explaining a question, a member should give only sufficient information for the Minister to identify what the question is about, and should not use the explanation as a political platform. I now draw to the attention of Ministers the provisions of Standing Order 125, as follows:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

I indicate further that, in the two cases of dissent from the rulings of my predecessors on this issue, it was argued that Ministers were not members in the terms of Standing Order 125; in both cases, the members involved were Ministers who, I believe, were subject to the Standing Order.

Although members, including Ministers, may not debate the answer to a question, Ministers have always been allowed more latitude than have other members. This has been the practice in this House and in the House of Commons for many years. It is in the best interests of members and the House generally that all questions and answers be as brief as possible, and I ask all members to observe these rules to ensure that the maximum number of questions may be asked and answered.

In the specific case which the Leader has drawn to my attention, the honourable Deputy Premier is answering a question from a member, and is also providing an answer to a question raised by one of the Leader's members on Thursday last. It is necessary for all members (whether they be Ministers or ordinary members) to recognise the inter-relationship which should apply and the necessity that, if Question Time is going to traverse the greatest number of opportunities for all members to participate, both questions and answers must be reasonably brief.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The published report from AIRAC, the independent authority set up to advise the nation on these matters, makes it very clear that there was never at any time a risk to personnel at the core library, let alone the residents of Glenside or the public at large. The situation regarding plutonium needs to be understood. One of the more useful summaries is that prepared by Mr. Justice Parker in the Windscale inquiry. That report was published earlier this year. He said:

It is not true that in all circumstances small amounts of plutonium are lethal. Insoluble particles when inhaled

certainly are hazardous in small quantities. Considerably larger amounts could be eaten without appreciable harm . . . It is not true that plutonium is only safe when protected by massive shielding. As regards shielding from its radiation, it could be sat on safely by a person with no greater protection . . . than a pair of stout jeans. It is not true that an escape of plutonium would be a unique disaster. The damage done, for example, by the breaking open of a tanker of chlorine of the size which regularly travels by road and rail would be a great deal more damaging than the breaking open of a container of spent fuel with its plutonium content.

Mr. Justice Parker goes on to point out that plutonium is essential for nuclear weapons manufacture and that "If plutonium reaches a critical mass there will be a chain reaction and thereby the creation of highly active fission products." It is, of course, for this reason that legal and technical safeguards are so important in the context of the disposal of high level reactor wastes. But this is not the situation, never was the situation, that we are concerned with at the core library at Glenside.

Last week this House was treated to the sort of display for which the honourable member for Elizabeth is becoming famous or, should I say, infamous. He invents situations. He misrepresents facts. He attempts to frighten people. Not content with that, he attacks competent, reputable, experienced public servants, all on the basis of stories which, once checked out, prove to be groundless. His behaviour is scurrilous, cowardly and irresponsible.

Mr. Duncan: Is this still the report?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: These are my words. The very least he can do, in this instance, is to apologise publicly to the officials of my department for the false accusations he has made against them. The Opposition's track record on the uranium question is one of which any responsible member of Parliament would be ashamed. It is a trail of falsehoods, concealment and misrepresentation on a grand scale.

We have heard the Hon. Dr. Cornwall attempt to create alarm on the basis of a series of false statements about Radium Hill. A member of the Leader of the Opposition's staff has become a Party spokesman and released a discredited report to the media. The Leader of the Opposition himself appeared on television last week and completely misrepresented my situation in relation to that report, which I would not table because it was discredited. The infamous member for Elizabeth has charged that the Department of Mines and Energy is running some sort of spy system to amass dossiers on private citizens. That was so absurd as to be laughable. But his latest outburst is much more serious, because it represented a calculated attempt to strike fear into the minds of the public and to discredit officers of my department on the basis of false information—officers who enjoy an Australia-wide reputation for competence, excellence and responsibility. I can testify to that from my own contacts interstate since I have been a Minister. The Department of Mines and Energy in South Australia enjoys an Australia-wide reputation second to none. I know the honourable member's former colleague, Mr. Hudson, held these officers in high regard, and no doubt today he is very much embarrassed by such an outrageous attack, as no doubt would he have been by other actions of the member for Elizabeth. When the member for Hartley was Premier (and in my opinion the best Premier the Labor Party ever had)—

Mr. BANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Standing Orders state that aspersions shall not be cast on members, but the Deputy Leader, in saying that Mr. Corcoran was the best Premier the Labor Party ever had, has cast a bad slur on the former Premier (Mr. Dunstan)

and on the member for Hartley simply because he had the misfortune to lose an election and put these people on the Government benches.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I do not think that many people would draw from the Deputy Premier's remark the inference that the Leader has attempted to place on that statement. I have asked all members, including Ministers, to recognise their responsibility to all other members in the House in relation to both questions and answers, and I ask the Minister to conclude his remarks as quickly as possible.

Mr. DUNCAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A couple of moments ago the Deputy Leader of the Government referred to me as "infamous". I draw your attention to Standing Order 154, which states:

No member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion; and all—

I stress "all"—

imputations of improper motives, and all—

again, I stress the word "all"—

personal reflections on members shall be considered highly disorderly.

I ask that the Deputy Leader withdraw his remark.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I did note that the honourable member was not in a position to raise the question before returning to his chair. I ask the honourable Deputy Premier to withdraw his comments suggestive of infamous conduct on the part of the honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw the word "infamous", Mr. Speaker. The only point I make in conclusion is that the former Premier, Mr. Corcoran, was in my opinion the best Premier that the Labor Party ever had because he managed to keep his foot on the neck of the member for Elizabeth, which the present Leader appears incapable of doing. Rather, he is exhibiting disturbing signs of being a fellow traveller.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. HEMMINGS: My question, to the Minister of Health, arises because of the utter confusion which has resulted because of conflicting statements in this House (and outside of it) by the Premier and Minister of Health, particularly about the availability of further funding for hospitals that cannot meet their budget allocations or have other urgent needs.

A number of conflicting statements have been made in the area of health care, as a result of cuts in the health budget this financial year. If permitted, Mr. Speaker, I will read out a number of statements that have been made, and I hope that you will not call me to order for being too lengthy. On 11 October, under the heading of "Health" in his financial statement, the Treasurer said:

Second, there will be a major thrust by the South Australian Health Commission to further rationalise services and reduce hospital running costs. This move will be undertaken in a proper and responsible manner to ensure that the presently high standards of patient care are not undermined.

On 20 October, as reported in the *Advertiser*, the Minister of Health was present at the annual general meeting of the Adelaide Children's Hospital when the Chairman of the board said:

If the commission believed South Australian people would be best served by hospital boards manned by people who have the skills and willingness to contribute to the proper running of the State's institutions, the commission should treat the board of the Adelaide Children's Hospital with respect. Otherwise, South Australia is going to lose its

invaluable services.

The Minister in replying was reported as follows:

She was confident that the challenge could be met.

On 23 October, in reply to a question asked by the member for Brighton, regarding the situation at that hospital, the Minister said:

All the letters that went out to the hospitals advising them of their Budget allocations contained the message that, if any hospital was in genuine difficulties and could make out a well substantiated case for additional funds to enable it to maintain its services, that case would be considered by the Health Commission.

On Friday 2 November, in response to the situation at the South Australian Home for Incurables, the Minister was quoted as saying:

All hospitals have been cut to the bone, and it must be clear to everyone there is no additional money.

Dealing with that particular case, the *News* of 6 February 1979 quotes the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, as saying:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member sought leave to give an explanation about the activities of the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health was not a Minister in February 1979. I find it somewhat difficult to understand why the reference to which he is now referring should be admitted as part and parcel of the explanation.

Mr. HEMMINGS: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, I quoted statements by the Premier and by the Minister. I am dealing with the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition. It is important that the statements made in February 1979 have a relevance in relation to what has been stated today by the Minister in her statement and reports in the press.

The SPEAKER: Order! By the honourable member's own admission, he was referring to statements by the Premier and by the Minister. The Premier was not Premier in February 1979. I am prepared to hear briefly the comment the honourable member wished to make about a statement in February 1979, but it may be necessary to withdraw leave if the chronicle of events is to proceed very much longer.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir; I shall be guided by your ruling. The confusion is made even worse in light of the Ministerial statement given today and the factual reporting of conditions at the South Australian Home for Incurables, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, particularly, Mareeba Hospital.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The honourable member seems to be most confused, and I cannot help wondering whether his confusion results from the fact that he possibly was paying a little more attention to a great national event when I was making a Ministerial statement than he was paying to what I had to say about the Home for Incurables. I think that if the honourable member were to study the statement that I made, he would find that there was no conflict whatsoever. In fact, if any criticism is to be directed, it would be directed to his Party when in Government. I strongly suggest to the honourable member that he pay a little less attention to those frivolous matters which take place outside this Chamber on the first Tuesday of November just after 2 o'clock and that he pay more attention to what goes on inside the Chamber.

Mr. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is a reflection on me as a member of this House. I was in this House at 2 o'clock at the ringing of the bells, and I have not left since. I have no idea who won the Melbourne Cup and that does not worry me: what worries me is the health care of the people of this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I

have noted, as other members will have noted, the honourable member's explanation. I indicate that I have noted his presence in the House throughout the sitting today.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Mr. Speaker, that being the case, I am very pleased to withdraw any reflection on the honourable member. Apparently the honourable member was in the House but was not listening to what I had to say. In his question he raised a large number of points, and I am happy to deal with those of them that came through clearly, although not all of them did. I will deal first with the statement made by the Chairman of the board of the Adelaide Children's Hospital in which he criticised the Health Commission. The honourable member would surely appreciate that the individual hospital budgets had been prepared well ahead of time when this Government took office, and it was not possible within the short time available to make any major variations to those specific budgets. In fact, it would have been futile to attempt to do so. The best we could have hoped to do was advise the hospitals that, if the budgets were impossible to live with, representation could be made to the Health Commission and the situation would be looked at. I have said that many times. There is no lack of consistency or clarity; it has been repeated time and time again, and there is no lack of consistency with the Premier's statement in the Budget.

Mr. Crompton, Chairman of the Adelaide Children's Hospital, also said that the hospital was prepared to work with the commission but not for it, and I agree with the Chairman of the hospital, and indeed with the Chairman of any hospital board on that matter. The Government has a firm policy of enabling boards of hospitals to fulfil their managerial powers responsibly and without direction other than in accordance with policy; that is to say, we will not be issuing the kind of specific directions which were issued by the Health Commission under the previous Government, of which the honourable member was a private member.

The honourable member read out several statements, and I am at a loss to understand where he sees any inconsistencies. I suggest that, if he studies my Ministerial statement in *Hansard*, notwithstanding that he was in the Chamber, he will find an explanation regarding the matters to which he referred in his question.

DEPARTMENTAL TRANSFERS

Mr. ASHENDEN: Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs seen the reports in both the *Advertiser* and the *Australian* this morning regarding a decision taken yesterday by representatives of 20 trade unions to call a series of State-wide stoppages to protest against proposed inter-departmental transfers and secondments to private industry? Will the Minister also say whether the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia has had the opportunity to consider inter-departmental and intra-departmental proposals, and the secondment proposal and, if it has, whether or not agreement in principle to the proposals was given?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I saw the report in the *Advertiser* today in which Mr. Bill Rust reported as follows:

State Government workers plan stopwork meetings to protest against proposed inter-departmental transfers and secondments to private enterprise.

I also heard a report on the ABC news this morning which was similar to that. In light of that, I decided to ring the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council of

South Australia (Mr. Gregory), who told me that was not in fact the decision of the Trades and Labor Council last evening. He pointed out that the council had in fact approved the principle of inter-departmental transfers. However, he did point out that the council was opposed to the secondment of Government employees to private industry. I have certain evidence to back up what I would have expected to be the stand of the Trades and Labor Council. On 22 January this year the then Minister of Labour and Industry, who is now the member for Adelaide—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The then Minister sent a letter on 22 January to Mr. Gregory in which he outlined a procedure for the inter-departmental transfer of Government employees. That procedure is similar to the procedures which were approved by the Cabinet of the present Government and which were communicated to Mr. Lesses, who was then Acting Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council. In reply to that, the Acting Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council sent a letter on 4 May to the then Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Wright) indicating that the following motion was passed by the council:

That the Minister be advised that the council agrees with the correspondence regarding employment policies.

On 5 October this year I received a letter from the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council (Mr. Gregory), in which he stated:

The Executive Committee at its meeting held on Thursday 27 September 1979 considered this correspondence and determined that we should seek the continuation of this facility for employees of the Government, semi-government authorities and statutory authorities to be transferred if it be deemed desirable. Accordingly, we seek your confirmation of our request.

In correspondence to me, Mr. Gregory agreed in principle to the types of transfers that both the previous Government and now this Government have sent to him in correspondence.

Mr. Wright: What are you looking at me for?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am looking across the Chamber at members opposite because I am waiting for them to nod in approval, as they in fact—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is not required to respond to interjections:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologise for even expecting them to do that. In fact, it appears that the Trades and Labor Council has continually agreed to the types of principles for inter-departmental transfers laid down by both the previous Government and now this Government in South Australia. So, I find it hard to understand the headline that appeared in today's *Advertiser* and the item that was heard on the ABC news this morning.

No definite proposal on secondment of Government employees to the private sector has yet been sent to the United Trades and Labor Council, so I find it incredible that at the meeting last evening members expressed opposition to this proposal. I wrote to Mr. Lesses as Acting Secretary on 18 October 1979 and sent to him the proposed policy of the present Government for intra-departmental and inter-departmental transfers. I also indicated that I would like to open negotiations with him soon on the secondment proposals. Those negotiations have not yet opened, so I find it astounding and somewhat disappointing that the United Trades and Labor Council has not yet been prepared to open those discussions before rejecting them. In fact, I cannot see to what they are

objecting when they have not yet received the proposals. I ask that the United Trades and Labor Council consider carefully the proposals that the Government has put to it on the transfer of employees and on the secondment of our employees to private industry where a surplus of Government employees exists. I believe that this Government has acted very responsibly. We have said that there will be no retrenchments. The Leader of the Opposition tried to make an issue of a statement I made in a letter to the employees of the Public Buildings Department.

The point raised by the Leader was in fact part of the transfer proposal sent to the United Trades and Labor Council on 18 October. No debate or discussion has taken place on that; that is a direct quote from the proposal sent to the United Trades and Labor Council. It appears to me that the Opposition in this House is trying to create a political—

Mr. McRAE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is based on your observation earlier when you pointed out that Ministers, while having great liberties (I would say, with respect, liberties that they are currently abusing), still should not debate the matter as though it were a second reading explanation, and certainly the honourable Minister on his feet at the moment is in effect pointing to the Opposition and saying, "You have this attitude and I have this attitude" and justifying what he is saying. He is, in effect, advocating and defending a proposal in answer to a question.

The SPEAKER: I have indicated to the House earlier this afternoon what is expected of all members, including Ministers. On the precedents of this House, the Chair has never interfered with a Minister delivering an answer in whatever manner he shall so desire. I cannot uphold the point of order, but I would say again to all members, including Ministers, that they owe a responsibility to other members in this Chamber, and particularly I would ask Ministers to respond to that responsibility.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I will certainly do that. The proposals for a discussion paper on the secondment of employees to the private sector is being delivered this afternoon to a number of bodies, including the United Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. McRae: What about the members of the Opposition?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Playford has recently raised a point of order indicating the difficulties in getting a precise and short answer from the Minister of Industrial Affairs. By continually interjecting, he is destroying the opportunity of that answer being delivered with the least possible delay.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Sir, I shall ignore the interjection. I would hope that the United Trades and Labor Council will give careful consideration to that discussion paper, and I look forward to discussions with it in order to reach an early solution to the problem we have.

PORT ADELAIDE DREDGE

Mr. PETERSON: Can the Minister of Marine say what action the Department of Marine and Harbors will be taking to make up the short-fall in dredging capacity created by the loss of the *H. C. Meyer*? The inner and outer river channels at Port Adelaide are very shallow, and they have to be dredged continually. Ships are getting larger, and the three largest vessels to visit Port Adelaide were there in 1977 and 1978. In the financial statement submitted by the Government there is a proposal for dredging in the next year, and, indeed, the Marine and

Harbors report indicates that the *H. C. Meyer* is the largest dredging unit we have. In the last report lodged it is stated that the *H. C. Meyer* removed 487 000 cubic metres, and the screw dredge *South Australian* removed 50 000 cubic metres. With ships getting larger, we have a real function in the shipping of Australia as an emergency container port, and, unless we have the facilities to cater for these needs, we will further jeopardise the future of Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor as shipping ports.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The matter raised by the honourable member is indeed causing concern to and exercising the attention of the Department of Marine and Harbors. Only this morning I had discussions with the Director. The department is aware of the points that the honourable member very rightly brings before the House. The department is looking at other options to take the place of the *Meyer*, which have not yet been raised. When it is, it will have to be taken into dry dock and a full assessment made. I am not in a position to make a positive statement, but I can assure the honourable member that the department is fully considering all the issues raised. The department is aware of the dredging needs, not only in Port Adelaide but in other harbors in South Australia.

QUEENSTOWN

Dr. BILLARD: Will the Minister of Planning say what is the Government's attitude to the development of the Queenstown site owned by Myer, in view of the recent suggestions that the company was reopening negotiations about the development?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thank the honourable member for his question. For a number of years, Myer (S.A.) Stores Ltd. has had an overall development programme involving sites throughout the metropolitan area. The development of the Queenstown site was part of this programme but was stopped because of other developments in the surrounding area. I have been made aware of a number of rumours recently, in which it was suggested that the Government is about to support the development of the Queenstown site. The Government (and I make this quite clear, because we have committed ourselves previously) is committed to supporting the Port Adelaide redevelopment scheme, and I suggest that such rumours seem designed to undermine the morale of the Port Adelaide business community. I make the point firmly that the Queenstown site is zoned residential, and it is the Government's belief that it should remain so.

HOME FOR INCURABLES

Mr. DUNCAN: Is the Minister of Health now prepared to repudiate or dissociate herself from the views expressed by the former Leader of the Opposition, the current Premier, on 6 February 1979 (as recently as that) in the *Adelaide News*. In that edition, the present Premier, who signed himself "David Tonkin, Leader of the Opposition", wrote to the *News* and his letter appeared in a column entitled *Reader's Forum* under the heading "Home funds delay 'fault of State'." The Premier said that a previous correspondent had stated that the renovated west wing of the Home for Incurables had not been opened for 200 handicapped people, because the Federal Government refused to allocate sufficient funds. "This is not so," said the then Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the time.

Mr. DUNCAN: The letter continued:

The Federal Government would pay the nursing home benefits of \$132.30 a week for basic care, and \$174.30 a week for extensive care, in respect of any patients in that wing, if it were open.

The provision of funds to enable the wing to open is a State responsibility, and it is the South Australian Health Commission which has not allocated sufficient funds. This matter will certainly be raised with the Government when State Parliament meets this week.

Clearly, the present Premier had a very different attitude then from the attitude that the Minister of Health has now. It seems that either the Premier should say in this House that he was wrong, or the Minister of Health should repudiate the Premier.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I am not sure whether the member for Elizabeth was in the House when I made my Ministerial statement.

Mr. Duncan: I was.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: There were so many yawning gaps on the other side that I was not sure who was here and who was not here. I would have thought that that statement made the position quite clear, and I would have also thought that there was nothing whatever to repudiate in the present Premier's statement, made earlier this year. There is no denying the fact of State responsibility. Equally, there is no denying the fact that the Home for Incurables has made no submission to the present Government in regard to funds for the wing.

Mr. Duncan: They've made submissions to the Health Commission.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Obviously, the submissions have been made to the Health Commission. Equally obviously, the Health Commission budget, which was fairly firmly set when this Government came to office, cannot accommodate—

At 3.17 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON MEAT HYGIENE LEGISLATION

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That—

(a) pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, the House of Assembly requests the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee with power to adjourn from place to place and to inquire into and report on matters pertaining to the meat hygiene legislation as embodied in the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1978; the Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill, 1979; the Health Act Amendment Bill, 1979; the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, 1979; and the South Australian Meat Corporation Act Amendment Bill, 1979, with special reference to—

- (i) the establishment of an Industry Consultative Committee to advise the Minister and the Chief Inspector;
- (ii) the embodiment of hygiene relating to poultry processing in a separate Act, possibly the Poultry Processing Act; and
- (iii) the regulation-making powers under the Health Act, 1911-1977, relating to the upgrading and

maintenance of hygiene standards for country slaughterhouses outside proclaimed abattoir areas;

(b) in the event of the Joint Committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form a quorum of Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee;

(c) Messrs. L. M. F. Arnold and Olsen and the Minister of Agriculture be the representatives of the Assembly on the said committee; and

(d) the said committee have power to invite specially qualified persons to attend any of its meetings in an advisory capacity.

In November 1978, the previous Government presented to Parliament the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, 1978, designed to establish a licensing and inspection system for the abattoirs, poultry abattoirs and pet food works that serve the Adelaide metropolitan area and the major regional centres of the State. This Bill was coupled with Bills amending the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973; the Health Act, 1911-1977; the Local Government Act, 1934-1978; and the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936-1977. The Bills lay in the House until late in the autumn session of 1979.

In December 1978, the Report of the Working Party on Entry of Meat into the Adelaide Metropolitan Area (the so-called Potter Report) was submitted to the then Minister of Agriculture. On 6 June 1979, the Premier announced that the recommendations of the Potter Report were to be implemented by removing all restrictions on the amount of meat allowed into the Adelaide metropolitan area for trade purposes. However, entry of meat would still be subject to the maintenance of standards of hygiene as embodied in the new meat hygiene legislation. Thus, the quota system applying to entry of meat could not be abolished until the implementation of the new meat hygiene legislation.

The Bills relating to meat hygiene, as reintroduced to Parliament in August 1979, contained a number of provisions that were unacceptable to a number of groups, notably local government, the poultry processing industry, sections of the red meat industry, and some producers' groups. In September, the Labor Government agreed to the establishment of an Upper House Select Committee. The decision to hold a State election on 15 September effectively prevented the Select Committee from functioning.

It might be worth noting that, with the agreement of the Labor Party in the Legislative Council at that time and the Liberal Party to set up the committee, the committee in fact commenced to meet on the morning of 22 August 1979, elected a Chairman and fixed dates for a subsequent meeting. At 2 o'clock on the same afternoon, the then Premier prorogued Parliament for the purposes of calling an election. So much for the lack of communication at that time! As a result of our commitment before the last State election, it is now proposed to re-convene that Select Committee. The proposal for a Select Committee reflects not only my Government's pre-election public undertaking but the Liberal Party rural policy statement of September 1979, and in particular the principle incorporated in the following extract:

The Liberal Party respects the high standards of self-regulation within the dairy, wool and beef industries and will not legislate to interfere with those pursuits unless the need and the desire to do so is clearly expressed by the Industry.

In order to uphold that pre-election commitment, and to be consistent with our view, as expressed prior to the last State election, we support the reconvening of that Select

Committee. A Select Committee would, in our view, provide a forum for the expression of industry views on the new meat hygiene legislation proposals. The red meat producing industry has already expressed concern at the wide-ranging powers of the Minister and the Chief Inspector on issues such as the proclamation of abattoir areas and the granting or cancelling of an abattoir licence. Local government has expressed some disagreement, as it sees the legislation proposed earlier eroding its powers in abattoir areas.

The poultry processing industry has been most vocal in its criticism of the previous legislation, basically on two grounds: the industry implications, and the concept of individual bird inspection. However, the industry is in favour of legislation to raise hygiene standards, but wishes to see it embodied in its own industry legislation, preferably by amendments to the Poultry Processing Act. The Government respects and supports that view on behalf of the poultry meat industry, as I understand did my predecessor in Agriculture prior to the recent State election.

In summary, the purpose of this Select Committee is, as I have said, to uphold the commitment we made before the election; to support the opportunity for the industry to express its view and to place on record its various views with respect to the several meat hygiene levels that are desirable for South Australia; to recognise the role of local government and the administrative control that it should be given regarding slaughtering premises servicing the various and respective local government areas of the State; to provide an opportunity for free entry of meat on an open competition basis within the metropolitan area of Adelaide, to be defined; and that, of course, those abattoirs servicing that popular trading area of metropolitan Adelaide should be licensed abattoirs and have on-site inspection.

In order to embrace and to give recognition to those several aspects, we believe that it is essential to have this Select Committee, not to direct what should be done in relation to meat hygiene in South Australia, because the Government believes that we know already what should be done, but to determine effectively how it should be done.

Accordingly, I intend to call on the Opposition on this occasion to support the setting up of the committee and the nomination of members from this House to be represented on it: the member for Salisbury, the member for Rocky River and me. I ask that this motion be supported so that it can go to the Legislative Council as early as possible.

I emphasise the importance of seeking the co-operation of the Opposition in this instance for the purpose of having the motion carried here swiftly, so that it can be transferred to the other place, and so that it can be dealt with there equally swiftly, so that, for the convenience of the industry and also of the members of both sides of Parliament, the committee can meet and take evidence before the Christmas break commences, with a view to having it report as early as possible in the new year, and indeed, before the resumption of Parliament in the new year. If this can be done, the whole subject of meat legislation can be prepared, can be presented in the early part of the autumn session in 1980, and can be concluded before the end of the present financial year. I say that in the interest of the industry at large, and with due regard to the tremendous amount of investment in the meat industry in South Australia, and bearing in mind what might be proposed in that area in carrying out the intention of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition is not opposed to the establishment of a Select Committee, but certain comments concerning the history of the legislation proposed by the previous Government should be placed on record. The Minister is well aware of those matters. A vital part of the proposed legislation was to protect the health of people living in a large part of the outer metropolitan area, and to allow country abattoirs to compete freely in the Adelaide market against Samcor and interstate abattoirs. I think there is an urgency about both matters; they are fundamental to the legislation, and vital to the health of South Australians and to the quota system that is in operation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: But you're supporting—

Mr. WRIGHT: I am supporting them, and I believe that it is vital to be able to proceed with them. The only qualm I have about the Select Committee relates to the time factor. We are aware that the Potter Committee has made an intensive inquiry in this area, and has received submissions from interested parties. The Minister is aware of that. This morning, I talked to people in the industry and I believe that every facility was made available to all persons interested in making submissions to the Potter Committee. Mr. Potter was commended on his ability to extract from people the information necessary to make recommendations to the Government of the day.

The people in the industry, with whom I talked this morning, have given me authority to say that, in their view, there is no need for a further Select Committee. They say that it is only a delaying tactic, and that all the information that will be obtained by the Select Committee has been obtained by the Potter inquiry. The people who are vitally concerned in this area would prefer the Government to introduce legislation immediately and proceed with it rather than delay by the method of appointing a Select Committee.

I want to place on record a few comments about the way the shadow Minister, as he then was, behaved in Opposition. It is well known that he stamped around the countryside opposing the legislation on a series of false premises. He claimed that country slaughterhouses would be forced to close and that most of the State would be declared an abattoirs area. I note that the Minister is nodding his head; that indicates that the allegations I have been receiving are true.

He also claimed that the legislation was designed to give further protection to Samcor, in spite of the clear intention of the Bill to lift restrictions on the entry of meat into the metropolitan area. The then shadow Minister managed to insinuate that there was a hidden and sinister meaning to the legislation to provide protection for Samcor, although the Bill clearly stated the opposite view. The people who are under the control of the quota have said to me on occasions that they are satisfied with the intention of the Bill to increase their quota. I do not know how the present Minister was able to substantiate the statements he made during that inquiry and about that legislation.

The then shadow Minister also cast some nasty aspersions on the role of the Chief Inspector and told country people that the Chief Inspector would emerge, following the passing of the legislation, as a dictator, putting abattoirs and slaughterhouses out of business willy nilly. I am aware that, if the motion is carried, the Minister intends to establish an Industry Consultative Committee to advise the Minister and Chief Inspector, so evidently there has been an about-face on the Minister's part now that he has the mantle of the Minister rather than that of the shadow Minister.

I find it rather extraordinary that there should be a

change of face about that situation. However, I think it has been clearly established that the Minister was not expecting to become a Minister as quickly as he did and he is caught up in his own propaganda. He hopes, by further delaying the legislation through the mechanism of a Select Committee, to distance himself from his own irresponsible and false statements while in Opposition. In fact, the Minister's antics over this legislation have been something of a pantomime. Those are not my words but the words of people to whom I have spoken about this matter. As shadow Minister, he told the owners of the two Mount Gambier works that they need not fear the delaying tactics of the Opposition (as it was then) because they could pressure the Labor Minister of Agriculture to increase their quotas—and they would be all right.

Now the roles are reversed and, as Liberal Minister, he quickly told the gentlemen concerned that he could not increase their quotas, as that would upset Samcor. If ever we have seen a reversal of roles, it was over that particular incident of a couple of weeks ago, where two people (Mr. Mayney and a Mr. McPherson, from the South-East of this State) were told that there could be no increase in their quotas. One of them was facing a rather difficult period and made strong allegations (following receipt of a letter from Samcor) that unless something was done about it immediately he and Mr. McPherson would personally lead into the street the workers whom he had to retrench. The Minister was told that very clearly. The Minister acted quickly, because he did not want people marching around Mount Gambier blaming the Liberal Government for his activities in having people retrenched in that industry down there.

We have seen another reversal, because on that occasion the Minister was able to induce (I suppose that is the right word, or "order" might be a better word; I am not sure which applies in these circumstances), but certainly he was able to change the outlook and policy of Samcor, because within a few hours of that allegation being made by Mr. McPherson there was a 50 per cent increase in the quota. All in all the Minister has played a very cagey role in this part of the legislation. I suggest that his record is not a proud one regarding this legislation.

The Minister talks about a consultative committee. I do not oppose that idea; it is probably a good idea, and it will be a protection for the Chief Inspector. I am prepared to go on record and say that there will be no fresh evidence that will come to the Select Committee that will in any way have any major effect on the legislation proposed by Mr. Chatterton when Minister of Agriculture in the previous Labor Government. Maybe the consultative committee is a good idea, if for no other reason than to protect the Chief Inspector, because, if the present Minister has the same opinion of the Chief Inspector now as he had while in Opposition, I would not like to be the Chief Inspector acting in this area. I think that a consultative committee will be a good thing, and certainly it will be a protection for the Chief Inspector.

I turn now to the question of poultry hygiene. I do not believe this matter is urgent, and it could be considered at a later stage. If the Minister had wished he could have dropped all the poultry section from the Bill. That would have been preferable to holding up the meat hygiene legislation and the vital matters of public health and employment in South Australian abattoirs.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You agree.

Mr. WRIGHT: The simple thing would have been to drop that part of the legislation and proceed without it. There would then have been no need whatever to delay the matter any further, and we could have proceeded with the legislation to give these protections that I have talked

about to people and to the industry.

The Select Committee is also to look at the regulations governing country slaughterhouses. I think that is a task more appropriate to the proposed consultative committee, which would have the necessary expertise and knowledge to discuss and formulate decisions on construction and operation. I doubt that any piece of legislation has been more thoroughly investigated than has the Bill relating to meat hygiene. I will give some examples to the House of actions taken by the previous Government, and, in particular, the previous Minister and his department, to try to have this situation put in order so that the State, and also those people who were getting themselves into financial difficulties because of the quota system and Samcor control, would benefit.

First, an inter-departmental committee investigated meat hygiene in this State. That committee took submissions from local government, abattoir owners, producers and other interested parties. Members of that committee visited and photographed nearly every slaughterhouse and abattoir in the State. I wonder whether that is the intention of the Minister within the terms of reference of the Select Committee to be appointed. It seems to me that either the Select Committee members will need to be provided with all of the information that has already been made available through the departmental inquiry (the Potter Committee, and so forth), or, otherwise, it will have to go through the whole routine again and see for itself at first hand.

I am not complaining about that. I think that the Select Committee members ought to be able to do the things that they need to do in order to make up their minds so that they can make recommendations to the Government, but I am concerned about the delay. The committee visited and photographed nearly every slaughterhouse and abattoir in the State. Likewise, the Potter Committee did a complete investigation of the trading restrictions applying to the entry of meat to the inner metropolitan area. Legislation covering meat hygiene standards was drawn up in 1978 and given to interested groups for comment.

When the Bill was introduced into Parliament in November 1978, it was made quite clear by the then Minister of Agriculture that the Government would not rush the legislation through but would give the industry ample opportunity to comment and suggest amendments. Members of the Minister's department spent several days briefing members of the Liberal Opposition, who were furnished with material when they requested it. Now the Liberal Minister is proposing further delay by revisiting all this material that has been completely investigated and analysed before.

As I said when I started, I have no real complaint about, and certainly the Opposition will not oppose, the setting up of this committee. However, I believe it is an absolute waste of time. I believe that the Minister has some reason other than those stated for setting up this committee. I am authorised, as I said earlier and I now repeat, by people in the trade to say that nothing more of a useful nature can be obtained by the setting up of this committee; that everything that can be said has been said, and all the evidence that can be gathered has been gathered. No-one was deprived of the opportunity of giving evidence to either of the committees, in particular to the Potter committee. People to whom I have talked have asked me to urge the Government, as I do, to get on with this investigation by Select Committee. I am told that members of the Liberal Party, when setting up the previous committee in the Upper House, told people in the industry that this whole matter could be determined within two weeks. I challenge the Minister to fix this

matter within two months. If he can report back to the House within two months that this matter is finalised, the Opposition will be more than happy, because there are many people watching the Minister's actions closely in this matter. The Opposition supports the motion.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I did not intend to speak to this motion because I thought all members of the House would agree to it. I formally support the establishment of a Select Committee into this measure.

The SPEAKER: On that point—we are addressing ourselves to a joint committee; it is not a Select Committee in the normal circumstances, even though it has been referred to in debate from all quarters as a Select Committee.

Mr. BLACKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was probably pre-empting a decision of another place. I support the endeavours to establish that committee. One of the greatest concerns, particularly in my area, and in other areas for that matter, has been the likely consequences that such legislative measures would have on local slaughterhouses. Stories (and the Deputy Leader has mentioned them) have been circulating in the country. These are real fears and, if the former Government had tried to quell those fears by explaining to the people what was the real intention, it failed dismally in that public relations exercise.

There is no doubt that the community in the country was fearful of how it would affect them. People in the country had in the back of their mind that there had never been any problems as regards meat hygiene in the country. There was a general acceptance that there was a requirement for good guidelines and standards of cleanliness and hygiene, but there was a real fear that many of the regional slaughterhouses would be closed down (I am talking about slaughterhouses and not about abattoirs). For example, it was envisaged by one of the former Government's committees that there was to be only one abattoir on Eyre Peninsula, and that would have required the transport of meat over the entire peninsula in refrigerated vans, thus raising the fears of people. One idea promoted was that there would be a freezer at Wudinna, to which the killed or processed meat would be delivered, and that it would radiate out from there in the respective refrigerated vans. The possibility of such a provision raised the fears of many country people. I will not say any more, other than to say that I fully support the endeavours of this House to promote a joint committee and trust that the proposal will receive similar support in another place.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): There being no other member appearing interested in commenting on the motion or contributing to the debate, there are a couple of matters which, in closing, I want to put on the record. I am prompted to do this, following the rather provocative remarks made by the Deputy Leader. He made a deliberate attempt this afternoon to convey to the House that what was incorporated in the legislation before the House last year and earlier this year (and, indeed, what was apparently incorporated in drafts of that legislation over a number of years) was to have due regard to the small slaughtering premises scattered around the State. There is no question in my mind that there were officers and advisers of the previous Government (if not the previous Government itself) who believed that there should be one standard of meat hygiene to apply to all South Australian meat processors, whether abattoirs or slaughterhouses.

I did not agree with that theme when we were in Opposition, nor do I believe that it is practical even to attempt, in South Australia's vast geographical area, to implement it. If one were to explore this subject a little further, it is fairly easy to recognise that, in the export abattoirs areas, there is a level of hygiene over which we have little control. The importers of our South Australian meat, in many cases outside the country and far outside the country, determine the standard of hygiene that shall apply in those premises. With respect to the premises which are already established or which may in the future be established for the purposes of trading within the popular market of Adelaide and its near surrounds, a level of hygiene must be fixed by the Government.

Regarding the hygiene level to apply across the broad area of the State outside of the Adelaide metropolitan area to be defined, it is, and always has been, our view that local government should be involved in the discussions. It should be consulted, and deliberately so, for the purposes of fixing a code of hygiene practices to apply within its own respective outer Adelaide metropolitan area zones, council areas, communities, townships, etc. It is with that in mind that we have introduced the motion to have a joint Select Committee between the Upper and Lower Houses so that authorities such as the local government representatives in South Australia may come forward, and not tell us what should be done but, indeed, help us in laying down how it should be done.

The Government has clearly in mind what it believes to be desirable for the purposes of fixing standards, licensing premises, abolishing quotas, and requiring inspectorial functions within our licensed abattoirs in South Australia. We know what we want in that regard. It is a matter of determining how those decisions can be workable and functional. On that basis, and in line again with our pre-election policy, we propose to consult with the parties that are or may be affected by the legislation, or by any part of it. With that in mind, we certainly invite local government, industry representatives, producers and consumers for the purposes of gathering their contributions on an official record so that it may be available to the two Houses (preferably by early February 1980, despite what the Deputy Leader has said) and so that the legislation can be prepared and passed through both Houses in the early part of the autumn 1980 session, and apply in South Australia for the long term.

Regarding the Deputy Leader's comments about additional quota allocations to Mount Schank Meat and McPherson Meat, in the South-East, as Minister I have no authority to issue quotas to either of those two companies or to any other country abattoir proprietor in South Australia, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is in the public interest to do so. It is within that fine criterion that Ministerial permits for entry of meat into metropolitan Adelaide can be given. In the meantime, the Samcor board has exercised its authority under the Act and issued quotas to these two companies. As the Deputy Leader also said, in recent times their quotas have been increased by about 50 per cent each for the period until further notice, and those increases have been granted not by me or the Government but by Samcor. It is correct to say that, after receiving a request from representatives of the two mentioned companies, I wrote to the Samcor board asking it to consider increasing the quotas.

It was not in the context as described to the House this afternoon by the Deputy Leader, nor is it likely that any further quotas will be issued to those companies or to any other companies in the interim period. In my view, it is not desirable to pre-empt the legislation, although quite

clearly it is the intention to abolish the quota system within that proposed Bill.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

(Continued from 16 October. Page 73.)

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the member for Rocky River, I indicate to honourable members that, as it will be his maiden speech in this House, I would ask that the normal courtesies be extended.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

Exactly 30 years ago almost to the month Robert Gordon Menzies won office federally in Australia. He assumed office in a turbulent year at the end of a dramatic decade. His Party was a Liberal Party, not a conservative Party, not a reactionary Party, not a Party based on class, not a Party which claimed to be the saviour of mankind, but a Liberal Party. We are but two months away from the start of a new decade, we have a new Liberal Government, and I address my remarks to where we stand today, not only in a historical spirit dating 30 years, but to our future. Liberal ideals and concepts have assumed a new significance for South Australians. The application of those ideals and concepts will touch the lives of every South Australian, ideals that have survived the test of time. The streams of our democratic tradition reach far back, through costly fields of sacrifice, to the Magna Carta and beyond. All the taxes we ever pay do not clear our debt to those pioneers of freedom who made possible our way of life. An essential process has been the learning process from which we acquire knowledge. Wisdom is applying that knowledge and that is our task, our goal and our objective, with the enormous benefit of hindsight—hindsight not to shackle, retard or inhibit but to visibly display the greatness mankind has bequeathed us.

Let us recall amenities we take for granted in our lifestyle. Seldom do we spare a thought of recognition for inventors like Marconi and Baird when we switch on the radio and television. When Edison died in 1931, the United States Government plunged the nation into darkness for a minute to impress on the people the debt they owed him for his contribution in inventing the electric light. We are dramatically reminded of the debt we owe to medical researchers like Pasteur and Lister and, of course, South Australian Lord Florey for development of penicillin, for our health. When Mozart died penniless at 35 the undertaker cursed the musician for not leaving him even the price of a pint of beer. We do not settle our debt to such masters when we buy a disc or cassette. The person who senses what he owes to the past does not shrug his shoulders and say, "I cannot do anything about it." Rather, he feels obligated to serve others as others have served him in an endeavour to repay his debt. Such people showed courage and determination to achieve things to benefit mankind, and employed spirit, mustered all resources, and applied firm belief in their aspirations.

Being on the threshold of a new decade, a new era for historians, we as members of this Parliament have a duty, despite philosophical differences, to work assiduously for the benefit of South Australia. We as a Government must now firmly and resolutely stride forward into the 1980's, into a new decade, into a renewed and invigorating lifestyle for South Australia. Sir Robert often referred to Australia's pioneering spirit. In words directly attributable to the situation we face, he said, "The truth is that, when a nation gives up pioneering, it goes back. A pioneer is quite

simply one who breaks new ground or sets out on new adventures. His essence is that he is willing to tackle a new problem and has a sense of responsibility for the future." Perhaps it is apt, therefore, to start the new decade regenerated with new enthusiasm from 15 new members, representing both sides. I have no doubt that we all will strive for the attainment of high ideals, of recognition for a worthwhile contribution.

Recent years have been hard, discernably harder than the 1950's and 1960's with their rising living standards and expanding prosperity. During the 1970's old certainties have diminished and new responses and fresh incentives are required to meet the enormous challenge of the 1980's. I speak as a Liberal. There is no finer tradition in the history of mankind than liberalism, a tradition which will allow us to accept the challenges of change. We reject social pretension or advancement stemming from birth or privilege. We acknowledge and value the achievements of the able, the enterprising and the hard working. We believe in reward for effort. We support equality of opportunity, recognising, however, differing abilities.

Central to liberalism is the belief that the liberation of enterprise, talent, initiative and their resultant diffusion through the community is an essential condition for achievement, progress and a healthy society. We want to unlock that enormous potential within mankind, not shackle it or place blinkers on it but rather give it scope, breadth and vision. Despite intensified efforts to deny the validity of the proposition, to stifle enterprise and initiative in the name of proclaimed truth, security, equality or whatever, the history of mankind has shown that liberalism is the most adequate framework for achievement.

I stand here proud to be a Liberal because I believe in the individual, in tolerance, in caring for my fellow South Australians, and in a tradition dating back to Aristotle based fundamentally on the recognition of the inherent dignity of the individual; a tradition that allows the industrious to prosper, rewards excellence, but equally manages to protect the weak; a tradition that recognises the successes of individuals, and contributes directly to the well-being of all individuals. We wish to provide a more equal society, not by retarding or penalising the successful but by encouraging more success in all.

By contrast socialism and conservatism have both failed, socialism because it retards the greatest of human characteristics, the need to be different, individualism; conservatism because it ignores the reality of change, the need to progress, to move forward. A definition is that a conservative is a person who will never try anything for the first time. What a mundane disappointing life that must be? Indeed an adequate description of socialism and liberalism was given by the Labor member in another place, the not unknown Mr. Barry Jones. About liberalism he said (and I quote extracts), "Optimistic about the ability of individuals to advance themselves within the economic system; confident in the capacity of people to solve their own problems." Whereas he described socialism as "Pessimistic about the ability of individuals to advance themselves within the economic system; confident in the capacity of institutions and systems (especially new ones) to solve problems; pessimistic about personal capacity."

On 15 September, over-expectation by the people that the Government could continue to provide more and more was replaced by common sense and responsible understanding of the role of Government. As we face the challenge of the 1980s, of a changing world, we look to the Government for broad guidelines and effective policies, but to ourselves for creativity and enterprise.

In setting the pace for the future, we need to readily understand that our nation has already an abundant supply of natural resources, a huge untapped potential. We have developed an efficient and highly-skilled farming sector which produces enormous wealth for the State and which is far too often taken for granted. During 1976-77, the total gross value of rural production was \$716 000 000. The health of the South Australian economy is directly related to seasonal conditions and the resultant cash flow within the economy. Over the next 20 years the world population is estimated to increase by 2 000 000 a week. How can we not promote, support and sustain a viable rural industry when one in eight people are starving and one in three people are suffering from malnutrition, despite zero population growth in Australia? Perhaps the greatest humanitarian act that we can support is the maintenance of an industry that can alleviate or lessen that world problem.

In defining the Liberal approach to the opportunities ahead, I point out that we must be a vigorous Party, bold in the creation of new ideas. As the pace of change accelerates, as new problems emerge, the vitality of Liberalism will be put to the test—reward for effort, minimum but effective Government, and the concept that the bigger the economic cake the bigger each individual's share will be. We do not want to level people down, rather to bring out the best in everybody. In the day-to-day practical world this ideal must be tempered with pragmatism but never, never forgotten.

A colleague of mine in another place referred to an American commentator who recently described the three greatest lies of modern society: first, "my cheque is in the mail"; secondly, "of course I will respect you just as much in the morning"; and thirdly, "I am from the Government. I am here to help you." It would be wrong of me to comment on the first two for fear of giving them credibility. However, in relation to the latter point Liberals assert forcefully that the Government has no right other than providing a framework where the rights of one do not infringe on the rights of another, and to foster that spark of individuality in every person.

I wish to place on record my thanks to the former member for his contribution to this place, for his eagerness to represent his constituents with credit, and his readiness and willingness to assist my endeavours for an on behalf of my Party. He is a man who prides his rural involvement, and I am sure his continuation of service in that field will be recognised and appreciated. To the Party which had faith in my endorsement and more particularly the people within the electorate who worked untiringly for me, I express my profound and sincere thanks. I humbly trust that my involvement, performance, drive and tenacity in representing those electors will reflect credit on their choice. I will take the opportunity during other debates to refer specifically to those issues that directly affect my electorate.

I am proud to have an association with a district that is a significant economic earner for South Australia, not only now but in the past. Prior to the growth of the agricultural industry, the mining industry in the late nineteenth century provided smeltered ore from Wallaroo Smelters worth in excess of £20 000 000, an enormous financial boost to the economy of South Australia. Moreover, gifts of £20 000 were made by two associated with the mines, Mr. W. W. Hughes and Sir Thomas Elder, for the founding and establishment of the University of Adelaide. As was the case then and could be the case now and in the 1980's our mining development, that huge untapped potential, can be released to provide a better standard of living for all South Australians. We need to harness those

resources, capture the wealth and provide opportunities for our people. This Parliament has the potential to achieve that, and we must not ignore the challenge.

"Profit" or "capitalism" are two words that I do not think we should step back from or that should be a matter for concern or apology. To the credit of both, there is an historical and logical link between the two. Capitalism, whereby a majority in Western society has achieved better standards of living, is summarised by Churchill's well-known dictum about democracy which applies to this system: "It is the worst of all economic systems except for the rest." From the profits flow the capacity for providing welfare and other benefits for the disadvantaged. The strains or demands on profits is escalating in alarming proportions; in 1968 there were four taxpayers for every person on benefits, whereas in 1978 it was 2.5 to one.

Funds can be distributed only if they are earned; they cannot, as the Whitlam Government found out, be manufactured. Governments therefore have to get off the back of and out of the way of business, so that funds generated are substantial enough to benefit all sections of the community. We as Australians, however, must not become over-indulgent and raise our expectations too high, for if we do what will the consequences be for our manufacturing industry? With progress in education, in training, in expectations, who, in 20 years time, will undertake the manual jobs? Where will the tradesman, the person who is so hard to get, come from? What of the attitude of Vietnamese refugees, compared to their Australian counterparts, as it relates to the manual labour force? These are important questions that have to be answered. Let us set our sights on reasonable goals. Let us give standing and pride to those jobs I have just mentioned, as they are the backbone of development. Let no unfair, unjust claims by union radicals divert their best intent and endeavours. All the capital in the world will not achieve success without their contribution. We should encourage the educationist to place greater emphasis on retraining and the development of skills, so that tradesmen are available. We have currently a severe shortage of persons in this category, which is alarming because of their essential contribution to service industries.

Similarly, if we withhold from small business enterprises the status and recognition they deserve we undermine their self-confidence, we erode their rewards for risk-taking, we frustrate and thus retard initiative, and we then stand back perplexed when the system fails to fulfil expectations. We need to give encouragement by taking the bureaucratic shackles from their ankles and rationalising the burdensome number of licences required to run a business. Indeed, to borrow a phrase from Lord Acton, "The ship exists for the sake of the passengers, not *vice versa*."

Local government also needs fostering and encouragement to become more effective and accept more significant levels of responsibility. The Federal Government has included it in the income tax sharing arrangement. This year, 1.75 per cent of income tax was distributed back to local government. That amount will increase to 2 per cent next year. Local government in South Australia benefited by about \$19 000 000, thus affording it the status it deserved, and allowing it to undertake on certain initiatives that, no doubt, it wanted to within the community. We in this Parliament need to complement that initiative, for government closest to the people has a greater ability to assess the critical community needs. In other words local government should be a full partner in government and not, as has been the case, the poor partner in government. Local government has the capacity to directly assess the needs of its local

community, and is responsible to its electors within that community for enterprises undertaken.

The young unemployed will present to this House one of the most significant challenges for the 1980's for, unless we are able to reverse the alarming trend, we will have, in the next decade and beyond, a group of people who detest the system that has failed to provide them with employment. Thereby, we will have a group that is suspicious of the system that has been so good to Australia. Over numerous decades, these people are taught at school to question the system and procedures. That questioning reaches deafening proportions later in life, when the system that they are told will provide them with employment fails to deliver the goods, eventually leading, in some instances, to lawbreaking. Young people are going astray because of a lack of direction, a lack of meaningful involvement and a feeling of frustration and helplessness that the system has no place for them.

The reason for this development is the massive escalation in the wage bill during the 1972-75 period, when wages escalated 66.6 per cent (male average weekly earnings). Our system has priced young people out of work. We demand that the system pay adult wages for inexperience, a situation employers cannot be expected to meet. Union demands and their ready acceptance between 1972 and 1975 have created the situation and applied those enormous constraints. One man's pay increase is another man's job. We cannot allow this problem to continue, for we are creating a large dissident group with a developing emotional problem that will present enormous recurring problems in future decades. Technology is not the only bogey. That problem should transcend political barriers. We have to set the example; we have to accept the challenge.

It gives me pride and pleasure to move the adoption of the Address in Reply, for I do so supporting a Government that has honoured its election promises, that has removed some of the more iniquitous taxes—taxes that would have caused more anxiety to my constituents than any other tax—and that has the will and capacity to accept the challenge of the eighties.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the honourable member for Morphett, I ask honourable members to afford the normal courtesies to the honourable member, because this is his maiden speech.

Mr. OSWALD (Morphett): I am pleased to have the honour to second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech to this Parliament that was so ably moved by the member for Rocky River. I offer my personal congratulations to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and through you to the Speaker on your elevation to those high offices in his House. I have no doubt that you, Sir, and the Speaker will uphold the high standards and traditions of those offices with dignity, fair-mindedness and impartiality. These attributes, which are so essential for anyone holding the office of Speaker, are of great significance to this Parliament and to the people of South Australia.

Members on both sides of the House have a part to play to ensure that your term and the term of the Speaker is successful. If we, as members, undermine your authority and the dispensation of justice in this House, we are, in fact, undermining and weakening the very core of democracy in Australian communities, something we are all seeking to preserve. I am certain that you, Sir, and the Speaker will administer this Parliament in the traditions of the Westminster system, which has been evolved over many hundreds of years with one purpose in mind—to preserve and foster the rule by the people. By upholding

this convention, you will ensure that this State remains part of the free world.

I would also like to give credit where it is due to my predecessor who worked to serve the electorate of Morphett for the two years prior to my election to this House.

Today, members from both sides of the political spectrum meet here in the early days of a new Parliament and a new Government. All members should recall that we are, first and foremost, Australians, and citizens of a wonderful country. There will be times when we must join together in solving those problems that are universal throughout all democratic countries.

Australia today is confronted with the evils of unemployment and inflation, which have been with us since the end of the Second World War. We are living in a community with rising expectations. I think it is interesting to compare the South Australian communities of the early 1950's with our community today. The early communities did not get as excited or agitated in respect of tomorrow's society as long as they obtained a basic standard of living. We are now living in a society in which few people seem to be satisfied. We are seeing growing increases in demand on the public purse, with about a quarter of our total production being spent on health, social welfare and education. Personally, I do not advocate cuts in expenditure on social welfare programmes if this would result in reduced community standards. However, I believe that we will see the destruction of everything we hold dear if we do not curb some of our demands.

The Australian way of life, as we know it, depends on communities living together, communities that are prepared to be tolerant of one another and prepared to accept each other's rights and points of view. As our expectations have risen in recent years, so have we experienced internal pressures, largely politically motivated. If not checked, these will result in a breakdown of the fabric of the society we all know. One of the most evil and pernicious forces that can work to tear a community apart is greed. I would like to suggest to the House that there is no gain to the State if sections of the community attack each other with charges of greed amongst the capitalists, greed amongst the workers, and greed amongst public officials.

We have all heard charges against Ministers and public officials saying that they want more and more taxes to create their own empires or, alternatively, to satisfy the projected demands of the community for more public projects or undertakings. People must realise that they cannot spend what they do not earn, and Governments must also realise that the taxpayer must earn his income before the Government can spend the taxation received. Recent demands on the public purse do not always reflect this logic.

During his Speech, His Excellency indicated that, in the life of this Parliament, the Government will introduce a legislative programme that is designed to stimulate industrial expansion and promote industrial development, believing that a soundly based, vigorous economy is an essential foundation for all sections of the South Australian community. This legislative programme has been evolved as an expression of Liberal Party philosophy, a philosophy based on the principle of freedom and the well-being of all sections of the community.

If one studies the background of those who make up the Cabinet and the Government back-bench, one can see that the public can be assured that a Liberal Government will govern in the interests of all. Although our authority to govern came from a majority in the ballot-box, our Government will seek also to protect the beliefs and

aspirations of minority groups and care for the well-being of all people.

I have been a member of the Liberal Party for over 20 years and I am dedicated to its philosophy of freedom and free enterprise. I will continue to support and encourage such freedom, because it is a fundamental human right. However, there are times when I could be excused for thinking that this precious attribute, which in South Australia we claim to call freedom, is being slowly eroded by forces dedicated to the destruction of our way of life for other people's own political gain. I believe that freedom of speech, freedom of non-violent dissent, and freedom of worship are as fundamental to our expected lifestyles as are the possession of private property, home ownership, and income security. I believe in and support the free enterprise system, because the standard of living of a community, in the form of material possessions and in day-to-day freedom and security, can best be provided by the development of an individual's skill and initiative.

One of the most unfortunate legacies we have inherited from the previous Administration is a community which has lost its individual initiative to succeed, a community which lived under so many restrictions and controls that, instead of a public motivated by initiative, achievement, success and progress, we ended up with a community which was bewildered, demoralised, apathetic and stagnated. It is my belief that the people of South Australia want to live their lives free from the restrictions and controls which have reduced incentives in the past, unless, of course, those restrictions and controls are clearly necessary to protect the rights of individuals and for the common good of the community.

I am pleased to see that the new Government's legislative programme contains initiatives to stimulate competitive free enterprise, because this will lead to a healthy, creative and vigorous community. It will give the business sector of South Australia an opportunity to exercise its initiative, and the people of this State an opportunity to exercise their freedom of choice.

I believe that we will not achieve the goal of a healthy, creative and vigorous State without the highest degree of industrial consultation and goodwill. South Australia has been developed into the State that it is by our past pioneers—men and women determined to be individuals, and to carry the State along with their own initiative.

Never before in the history of South Australia has there been a greater need for consultation rather than confrontation within the public as a whole. For a variety of reasons, the industrial base of South Australia, which is largely comprised of small business enterprises, has been eroded, and it is the task of this Government to see that a recovery takes place as soon as possible. However, because of this erosion of our industrial base, I believe our future lies in our natural resources—our oil, our minerals and our natural gas. It is in this area that South Australia has the most tremendous potential for growth, but, unfortunately, it is an area where industrial co-operation rather than confrontation will have to prevail if we are to be given the opportunity of opening up our enormous resources for the people of this State.

I would hope that those minority groups within the community, led by a few militant, politically motivated leaders, can suppress their desires to attain their own political and industrial aims. The public is tired of seeing the decisions of elected Government overridden and of having to passively stand by while industrial turmoil is encouraged in an attempt to destroy our industrial and social system. It will be a tragedy for South Australia if such small groups of politically motivated individuals use their power within industry to slow down our economic

recovery. All their actions will achieve will be trouble, disruption and economic hardship within a State which is on the threshold of immense growth and achievement. If these militant minorities also move to prevent this Government from opening up our natural resources, they should be prepared to wear the charge of deliberately preventing the economic recovery of this State and of having a flagrant disregard for their fellow workers and for the South Australian public generally.

Australia has experienced too many strikes, particularly in essential services. South Australia has had its fair share, and I can assure all members that the public is sick and tired of militant union action. You do not have to be an industrial advocate to detect concerted actions by unionists in key industrial areas which have been aimed at bringing down the centralised wage-fixing system. We have seen self-interested groups acting with what appears to be a total disregard for the well-being of the South Australian public, by using their industrial muscle to take what they want. Sadly, they have at times shown a total disregard for their fellow workers.

I personally support a centralised wage-fixing system. It has distributed wage increases on the broadest possible basis by protecting those in need and placing restraints on the greedy, and I believe that the chance of success for any major economic recovery in South Australia is directly related to the level of industrial peace which can prevail in our community.

The South Australian business and industrial community would like to operate in an atmosphere relatively free from Government interference and control. Historically, our business community was built up with imagination and initiative by men and women who were prepared to risk their money against an idea and who worked to make that idea succeed. These people deserved to make a profit, and it was on these profits that South Australia forged ahead and jobs were created.

Personally, I am very optimistic about our future, even at a time when we have inherited some serious problems which this Government has to solve. We live in a State attempting to recover from widespread youth unemployment and economic recession, high inflation, and high State taxation, which have resulted in reduced productivity.

Whilst it is essential to promote major industries based on our vast natural resources, small businesses that employ 100 or less employees will also be a primary force in South Australia's recovery. We live in complex, difficult times for anyone in business, but I can assure all members that businessmen, in a competitive business system, must be given a high degree of freedom and flexibility if they are to survive.

Future jobs in South Australia depend directly on the ability of companies to recover. One of the greatest ways to defeat the evils of inflation is to promote competition between businesses and for all sections of the work force to work together towards increased productivity.

There is enough initiative and expertise amongst individuals and individual businesses within South Australia for the small business sector of our economy to recover, provided that this Government relieves it of restrictions and controls, and provided that relative industrial peace can prevail—a peace which is based on consultation, a centralised wage-fixing system, and correctly established relativities between trades.

I do not think it would hurt to reflect briefly on the cost to the consumer brought about by over-regulation and control by Government. The Australian consumer has realised that he is the one who is paying for over-regulation in higher prices for goods and services and, on

15 September this year, demanded a change in Government policy. As an example, I would like to quote the North American experience. In the United States this year, it has been estimated that the impact of Government regulations on consumer goods and services will cost every man, woman and child \$500 annually. This will cost an average family of four \$2 000 per year.

Government regulations, over recent years in South Australia, have not only been impossible to avoid but have been one of the major curses that have been strangling small businesses. Unfortunately, the public thinks that the costs of implementing the myriad of rules and directions issued by our Government departments are soaked up by industry and commerce. To a certain extent this is true, because we do have responsible employers who have tried to absorb these costs, but, like a rubber sponge which will hold only a certain amount of water before it becomes saturated, there will be a limit to the cost that the manufacturer or retailer can absorb before it is passed on to the customer. Under these conditions, if the cost is not passed on to the consumer, inevitably the business must fold, thereby creating further job losses.

This Government has a clear mandate from the people to rid South Australia of the web of petty laws, rules and regulations that have stifled the State, increased our cost of living and contributed to the State's unemployment figures. Contrary to the belief of some honourable members opposite, this Government does not have a vested interest in big business and big government (quite the opposite is the case), but we do have a vested interest in the future of South Australia.

The Government, the business community, and 80 per cent of the trade union membership desperately want to see an economic recovery in this State. I specifically refer to this figure of 80 per cent of the union membership advisedly. This group is made up of the moderate unions which are led by responsible, decent, law-abiding citizens whose aim is, rightly and correctly, to protect their members' wages and conditions of work. This 80 per cent of unionists are not led by communists. To say that they are only compounds the whole spectre of consultation with union leaders. Certainly, the moderate unions have leaders who follow socialist philosophy to its various degrees, but that does not make these people communists, and I think this is a very important factor, and one so often overlooked by many observers in the whole field of industrial consultation and arbitration.

At the moment, the trade union movement has trouble of its own. Unless it is resolved, it will reflect on South Australia's ability to recover from this recession. Of about 600 unions in Australia, only about 20 key unions would be under communist control. Most unions, I have emphasised, are peaceful and easy to get along with, and leaders in industry tell people that there are never any problems with unions one can talk to.

The problem in business and industry is that it is impossible to talk to a communist. There is no common ground, because they do not want to reach an agreement; their main aim is infiltration and disruption of the company, and their actions are not always in the interests of individual members. It is the majority of unionists, who are decent law-abiding citizens, who want to be protected from these people. The union movement knows that it has militant people out in front causing trouble and getting results, but it is in a predicament just as much as are the employers. The moderate unions need help, and they are looking for someone to come to their aid against the communists.

There could be no better illustration of the internal conflict between the extreme left and right of the union

movement than the manoeuvring that has gone on behind the scenes between Bob Hawke, a moderate by comparison, and the communists seeking control of the Labor Party in Victoria.

Many reasons have been advanced for the defeat of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia on 15 September. Most of these reasons have been aired in this House at great length and I do not intend going into them now, because they are South Australian oriented, but the devastating defeat must also, in part, be linked to the weakening of Bob Hawke's position in both the A.C.T.U. and the Australian Labor Party.

It was quite obvious to political observers that the radical left-wing fringe in Victoria attempted to frustrate Hawke's preselection for the Federal Parliament, and his defeat at the A.C.T.U. Congress, held in Adelaide on uranium and other key issues, clearly demonstrated the declining power of the moderate Bob Hawke and the rise in power of the communist controlled left wing. It was also quite obvious to observers that the swinging, middle-of-the-road voters, who look upon Hawke as an outstanding public figure, were particularly worried by his defeat on the floor of the congress and, as a result, they were not prepared to trust a trade union dominated Australian Labor Party in which Bob Hawke was a declining force.

The voters had a vivid example of the power of the left wing in the trade union movement in operation and how this left wing could join ranks to defeat a moderate Labor leader who had been trusted in the past to be a moderating influence amongst the extremists.

The timing of the A.C.T.U. decision on uranium mining, coming on the eve of the election in South Australia, was obviously a set-back to the South Australian Labor Government. Clearly, the uranium decision and the transport strike, in the eyes of the voters, added up to a weakening of the position of the moderates in the trade union movement.

I have taken the time to analyse this facet of the Australian Labor Party defeat, because it is the same element which attempted to undermine Bob Hawke's preselection and which joined forces to defeat him over the uranium issue, that is also causing so much difficulty in the area of industrial consultation and arbitration. Even Bob Hawke has lost control of the leftist extremists in the union movement. Regrettably, there are those in South Australia who are prepared to push their claims without regard for the public interest; there are those who do not want industrial peace; and there are those who use industrial muscle and disputation to get their own way. Most reasonable people (and I think I can be included in this category) believe in the principle of a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

There is no dispute with this expectation, but I fear for our industrial sanity if we continue to have union officials, supposedly speaking for the whole of their membership, briefing their industrial advocates with instructions such as, "We will serve a claim—you get the employer to make an offer." I suppose "meaningful negotiations" in this case really means that the employer has made a concession.

There are times when the public becomes bewildered. There are also times when the public is justified in asking why an employer should have to make an offer just because a claim has been made. Why should the unions not be asked to justify their claims? The community knows that, in the long term, it will pay for all increases in wages. It will pay in the form of increased prices for goods, commodities and services, and it will pay in the form of increases in unemployment benefits paid to those who have been unfortunate enough to have themselves priced out of work. Either way, the public pays.

At a time when South Australia is poised on the threshold of great development, the public must be reminded not to ignore the enormous inflationary effect of wage increases. South Australia's future can easily be sabotaged by the few self-interested groups to which I referred earlier, if these groups continue with the philosophy of looking only to next week's pay packet.

The way in which union power is abused, and the way in which industrial muscle is manipulated in the area of industrial relations, are two of the subjects most talked about by the average man in the street today. I was interested to hear in His Excellency's Speech that the Government intends revoking legislation involving compulsory trade unionism. It is my hope that the Government will be able to introduce some form of secret ballot to determine strike issues on the shop floor. It will be a stand which will receive great support from a broad cross-section of the community.

Some union leaders maintain that it will not work. There is nothing more democratic than a secret ballot and the right to freedom of expression, free from any coercion or intimidation. It is a fundamental right of expression by all those affected by a strike. Union leaders who say that the secret ballot will not work are throwing up a smokescreen. If the secret ballot will not work, it is because they will not let it work.

The trade union movement contains many people of integrity, goodwill and common sense who have the interests of this great State of ours at heart, and I believe that it is time that those men and women put themselves forward and exerted their influence within their organisations for the common good.

The greatest challenge facing the Tonkin Cabinet is to restore confidence and consumer spending in the South Australian economy. The public is already impressed by the speed with which the Government has moved to implement its programme. South Australian industry has been under more pressure than has industry in other States and has had to cope with problems peculiar to this State brought about by the political policies of the previous State Labor Government.

Our industries have to recover from their lost wages and cost advantage, which was once 12 per cent cheaper than the Eastern States. It has also suffered from the higher than average wage increases over the past five or six years, high State taxation, increased cost of freight to our major markets, extravagant changes to workers' compensation legislation and excessive growth and competition from the public sector, whose administration costs must, in the long term, be carried by the private sector.

If the initiatives introduced by the new Liberal Government are given a chance to work, we can look forward to a reversal in these trends, which have resulted in businesses either closing or winding down their operations in this State.

I was pleased to see in the Budget, under the Department of Trade and Industry, that this Government has increased its allocation for industrial and business incentives from \$800 000 to \$6 000 000 in this current financial year. This will provide a comprehensive range of incentives as good as those in any other State.

Since His Excellency's Speech and the introduction of the State Budget, there is now a distinct feeling of optimism amongst what was a depressed business community. South Australian companies now know that they will not be controlled by the joint forces of the trade union movement and the Government. While this fear pervaded, funds for new business projects and for expansion were not being made available from the private sector. Companies were not prepared to invest money in a

project in which the right to make major financial policy decisions was taken away from the shareholders and handed over to the trade unions and the Government. This was one of the major reasons for the loss of investment confidence, and a major reason for the reduction in business activity and job opportunities. Thankfully, many of these policy decisions by the previous Labor Government, which brought about the depressing situation, are now in the process of being reversed.

I have been elected by the people of Morphett to do my best for them and for South Australia. It is my intention to commit myself to hard work and the responsibility of seeing that I meet their expectations. South Australia deserves a period of responsible Government based on common sense and practical decisions, rather than a State for social experimentation.

Before concluding, I refer to the staff of this Parliament. I am sure that all new members were delighted with the warm welcome they received and the assistance freely given during the settling-in process.

Finally, I assure His Excellency of the loyalty of the residents of Morphett and of myself to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I support the motion. I will start my remarks by showing my appreciation for the service of my predecessor (Reg Groth), the previous member for Salisbury, not only to this Parliament but also to the community at large. I have known him for many years, and I had the opportunity over those years to see the strong and dedicated commitment he gave to the Labor movement, to the Australian Labor Party, to the Parliamentary Labor Party, and to the community at large. I have learnt, from information he has given me and from many others who have spoken to me about his dedication, of the work he has done over the years. I find in him one of the true stalwarts of the union and Labor movement, one of the true workers on behalf of the working class, who are often despised and spoken down on by some members of the community, particularly the present Government, and it disturbs me to hear the comments about the contributions that movement makes to the well-being of the people in this State and, indeed, throughout the world.

To measure that against the standards that have been set by my predecessor and his actions, the two do not tally. He was dedicated in his approach to his constituency work, and many in his constituency, regardless of their political affiliation, have placed their support on record and have indicated to him their appreciation for the services he gave. There are many on both sides of the House who have, since I entered it, indicated their opinion of Reg and the high regard in which they held him. That is a tribute to a hard-working union man, a man of the people and of the Australian Labor Party. Indeed, I have had cause to give personal thanks to him. I have had the opportunity to know him socially for nine years, for some years in a political capacity, being a political supporter of his at the sub-branch level, and of being his personal assistant when he was the member for Salisbury. I had the opportunity of developing with him a sense of teamwork and working together, handling the many problems that came to his office. I know how many constituents came to his office, compared to those who visited many other electorate offices.

His name was widely known and respected in the community and, because of that, a heavy flow of constituents would come. He involved me in that teamwork and provided me with the opportunity to undertake an apprenticeship. The only criticism I could

make of him was that, on completion of my apprenticeship on 15 September, I did not receive my apprenticeship papers.

Before starting on the substance of my speech, I will extend the thanks which are in order, namely, to the Salisbury sub-branch of the A.L.P. and the workers in the Salisbury community who worked so hard to see that the labor message got across to and was accepted by that electorate. The dedication with which they undertook that work indicates the extent to which they realise the importance of putting before the whole community the A.L.P. and its principles. They put that before the community of Salisbury, which, as we know, overwhelmingly endorsed that message with a sizable plurality in my favour and in favour of the principles and objects of the A.L.P. That is something for which I am grateful, both to my local workers and to the local electorate. It is also something which will involve me in grave responsibilities in the years ahead.

As we have had said to us today, the responsibilities that devolve on a member of this House or, indeed, of any Parliament are onerous and heavy, and should not be undertaken with frivolity and light-heartedness. I hope that in the years ahead I can undertake my execution of those responsibilities and do it in the manner and with the probity that this House and the public of South Australia and the electorate of Salisbury would expect.

Of course, many other members also retired or finished their service in this House on 15 September, and I feel that there are many of those to whom I would like to express my appreciation for the contributions that they made. Also, there were some very talented and able people who lost their seats in the election, and I think this House and, indeed, the South Australian community are much poorer for that. I refer to people such as Molly Byrne, the member for Todd, who was such a dedicated worker in her electorate and who was so open and so prepared to be available at all times to answer the demanding needs of her constituents in a growing outer suburban electorate. I refer also to John Klunder, who was a hard-working member in a similar type electorate, and Terry Groom, whose repute was of such high standing that it was well known throughout the community. Indeed, I appreciate that the present member for Morphett commented on his dedication and the enthusiasm with which he handled his electorate. I refer, too, to Hugh Hudson, who we all know is a very fine and hard-working man of principle and vision, who unfortunately is not here to continue to provide this House with his talent and intelligence.

Mr. Mathwin: He didn't do too well when he set the boundaries, did he?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we still have the member for Glenelg. Just out of sheer goodwill, I might even have been prepared to make some comments about him had he lost his seat.

I refer also to retired members such as Geoff Virgo, Don Simmons, Glen Broomhill, Jack Olson, and Charlie Wells. From my personal contacts with them and from reports I have heard of them, I know they will be missed in this House by many. From reports given to me by my predecessor and others to whom I have spoken, I understand that the former member for Mallee and the member for Rocky River also made contributions which were not without note.

I want to address myself to the issues that I believe face our community in 1980, and in so doing I want to give some interpretation or some idea of the viewpoint from which I move, from the opinions that I hold, and how I intend to tackle issues to which I must address myself. We all come into Parliament with different philosophical

bases, with different ideological viewpoints. We come here with different experiences, different family backgrounds and different upbringings, and from this background we choose to establish for ourselves a set of ideals, a set of mores, a set of rights and wrongs. Essentially, the fact that members of Parliament are chosen to get where they are indicates that they have a spirit of concern, a spirit of desire to seek for the well-being and betterment of their fellow man. We must accept that, even though we may disagree with the philosophical viewpoints of members on both sides of the House.

The starting point in my case is a Christian philosophy. I believe that the Christian philosophy outlines the bedrock of the political faith that I have. It is something which was instilled in me in childhood and for which I am eternally grateful, and I will use it to guide my deliberations in the years ahead. I make one mention of the way in which another well-known politician in America viewed the way in which that philosophy could be related to politics, because there are often many who say that it cannot be related to politics. Senator Mark Hatfield, a well-known Republican Senator from Oregon, made the following comment about the way in which that philosophy can determine one's political behaviour:

Radical allegiance to Jesus Christ transforms one's entire perspective on political reality. Priorities become totally changed; a whole new understanding of what is truly important bursts forth. There is uncompromised identification with the needs of the poor and the oppressed. One is placed in the fundamental opposition to structures of injustice and forms of national idolatry.

That is true. I think that, to become involved in the sphere of politics, one has to have a burning desire to do something about things that need righting and wrongs that need correcting, and there are long-term visions to which we must aspire. In that light I interpret those ideals against the background of the particular faith of which I am a member, the Society of Friends, Quakers, and that church has maintained an active and dedicated social role throughout its three centuries. It has sought to put into practice the religious ideals which motivate it. I believe that that is something which all people who profess faith in one form or another should attempt to do. I would like to state some of the premises through which that particular organisation operates. The First World War was a time of great social change and upheaval; it was certainly a watershed in the history of the world. The suffering of war caused a new understanding for all people and made men think anew of their responsibilities. As we know, that was the starting point of the League of Nations. That was the starting point of the uprise of many new ideas of social awareness and social conscience and the way in which they applied to people. In light of that, I want to read a few points from the True Social Order document that was adopted by the Society of Friends at that time, because I believe they have much relevance to the circumstances in which we find ourselves today:

1. The Fatherhood of God should lead us toward a brotherhood which knows no restriction of race, sex or social class.
2. This brotherhood should express itself in a social order which is directed, beyond all material ends, to the growth of personality truly related to God and man.
3. The opportunity of full development, physical, moral and spiritual, should be assured to every member of the community, man, woman and child. The development of man's full personality should not be hampered by unjust conditions nor crushed by economic pressure.
4. We should seek for a way of living that will free us from the bondage of material things and mere conventions, that

will raise no barrier between man and man, and will put no excessive burden of labour upon any by reason of our superfluous demands.

5. The spiritual force of righteousness, loving-kindness and trust is mighty because of the appeal it makes to the best in every man, and when applied to industrial relations achieves great things.

6. Our rejection of the methods of outward domination, and of the appeal to force, applies not only to international affairs, but to the whole problem of industrial control. Not through antagonism but through co-operation and good-will can the best be attained for each and all.

7. Mutual service should be the principle upon which life is organised. Service, not private gain, should be the motive of all work.

8. The ownership of material things, such as land and capital, should be so regulated as best to minister to the need and development of man.

They are thoughts that date back from the First World War and the convocation of Quakers at that time. I believe they express in many ways the urgent needs of today. Those needs and desires have not been achieved, and they are issues which many people in the community are still looking at and which we should still be looking at.

In summary of that statement, I would say that my belief is that all of mankind are stewards of the wealth that this world finds us in possession of. We are stewards in the sense that we are responsible for the correct sharing and distribution of that wealth, and in so doing we have to put to ourselves the manner in which that wealth will be distributed. Will that wealth be distributed unjustly and without regard to need, or will that wealth be distributed with regard to the basic human needs that all of us have and to the basic rights of participation in the world's wealth that all of us have?

The manner in which we exploit and use those resources becomes important—I am strongly opposed to the use of uranium, because I feel that would be an abuse of a resource, an abuse of part of the world's wealth for which we hold some degree of stewardship. To exploit such a resource and therefore bequeath to our children and our children's children such a dangerous legacy would be irresponsible, and is to be condemned.

Therefore from that set of premises, I would claim to be a democratic socialist because I believe that, in the achievement of those aims, democratic socialism is the means by which the best benefit can be obtained for the entire community. We have had comments this afternoon that the will of the individual must not be stifled, and that strong militant unions are undermining the achievements of the little man. I would suggest that that is an obscure and bizarre way of viewing the facts.

In expressing my profound belief in the democratic socialist ideal, I contend that the profit motive that is so often put forward in our society should not be regarded as the be-all and end-all of everything that happens. It should not be regarded as being the aim towards which all things in society must move. Surely, the aim to which all things in society must move is the betterment and well-being of society as a whole and its individuals in particular. Wherever the profit motive moves against that will, surely the profit motive must be regarded as being wrong in such instances. We know the many achievements of the Labor movement and the Labor Party over the years, areas in which profit has sometimes been circumscribed, but I suggest members should itemise those occasions and see in fact what benefits were achieved for the community at large.

For example, as has very often been the case, we have the present situation with the asbestos industry, where manufacturers and processors of asbestos want to continue

to make large profits from the exploitation of that resource, quite in the face of overwhelming evidence that that resource is dangerous if not used properly. It has resulted in much human cost and the limitation of that cost must involve the limitation of the profit derived from exploitation. Those who have invested in the industry for years have been trying to hide the dangers so that those who work in the industry are not fully aware of them.

I heard this morning on a radio programme reports of how one company in America deliberately withheld from workers in an asbestos processing plant details of their own health. The mine had undertaken health inspections of all the workers and found an overwhelming proportion of them to have indications of asbestosis. The decision of the management at that time, many years ago, was not to do anything about it, because it would unnecessarily distress the workers if they were told of their condition and it might hasten their path to further ill health because they recognised that their path was at that stage irretrievable.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You're not suggesting that happened in Australia, are you?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: What I am suggesting is that the motive of that employer was that it was fair enough to keep that information from the worker. I am not suggesting that all employers in this country, the majority, or even a small proportion of them are like that, but the situation is that some employers sometimes adopt unreasonable and unconscionable attitudes to the people in their care, their employees. That is what the Labor movement and the union movement have been fighting for for years, to achieve a betterment of those conditions and to minimise those circumstances. If one looks at the records over the years one will see that that has been the aim; it has not been the aim to crush individual incentive or the individual spirit.

Another matter that deserves some comment is the reference this afternoon to the success motive, that we should all promote the success motive and that everyone should achieve what they can. I believe that the aim of every individual should be to fulfil his or her life as much as possible, to achieve everything which life can give without cost to anyone else. However, on many occasions it seems to me that the success motive means rising up through the executive ranks or through some status hierarchy in society. If that is the case, we have to recognise that, as there are only so many positions of executive rank or in the status hierarchy, we cannot all aim to achieve success in them. Surely, the success we should be aiming for is sheer life fulfilment and satisfaction, and that is what I believe a true democratic socialist should be aiming for.

Being a democratic socialist, I say, without reservation or hesitation, that the fundamental cornerstone of such a belief is the democratic cornerstone. Democracy is the system by which this country operates and by which it will achieve the ultimate best for all our people if we go about working within that system with good will and the best of intentions. I believe that democracy implies and requires that there be some restriction on occasions on the way in which certain individuals operate. We have had suggested today that there are too many regulations, too many controls within society.

I notice that no mention has been made of why those limitations or controls were applied. If we were to subject each one to individual analysis and go back through *Hansard* and find out why they were introduced, we would see that there was evidence of some means of depriving others in society of their legitimate rights and the conditions in life that they should be able to expect. It is suggested that these limitations should be removed, but I

suggest that in many cases, if that were to happen, the wrongs which caused them to be imposed in the first place would return.

In other circumstances, too, I believe certain obligations and responsibilities are involved in the fulfilment of democracy, and in that light I state my unswerving adherence to compulsory voting.

I know many members of this Parliament and in the community generally feel that compulsory voting is not a democratic and fair means of election. We accept, as citizens, our obligation to help finance and fund the Government of the day to provide the services and the goods that we require in our society. We do not say that we should have the choice to pay or not to pay taxes; we recognise that compulsion is fundamental. Therefore, I would also say that in the Parliamentary system it should be fundamental that the voting process should be compulsory because we should accept our obligations to the democratic process of selecting the best will of the people to represent them in this House, and that becomes an obligation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: At local government level, too?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I think that would be useful, yes. One of the things that has amazed me about the local government system is the low level of voting. I believe there is not necessarily a true representation of everyone in the community at local government level because of the voluntary voting system.

Also, I believe a natural outcome of these ideas I have espoused must indicate a strong support of the trade union movement. Of course, the Australian Labor Party has had close and dear links with the Australian union movement over the decades. Its very birth arose from that. It is not on that basis that I indicate my strong support for it, nor on the basis, as is often put, that unions had a role to play in the 1800's, when we all imagined to ourselves stories of little match girls wandering from snowy window to snowy window and we say to ourselves that unions had a place to correct that situation. I would say that there is a role for the union movement today and that role, if members would but look, is obvious and vitally necessary.

In this country, we have achieved good working conditions in many instances; real progress has been made. We have achieved some degree of reasonable wage payments, though the erosion of wages that has taken place over the past four years as a result of the Federal Government is distressing and disturbing. On the whole, we can be pleased to have achieved some progress, and this is a positive point from which to look to the future. However, I remind members that that is not the state of affairs in many countries that surround us. We find ourselves surrounded by many third world countries which rely on poor working conditions and poor wages in order to enable them to produce goods that can undersell our own.

I have said earlier this session that I believe it is an obligation on all Australians and Australian Governments to participate in assisting the economic development of countries of this region. However, I do not believe that we do them justice and assist them well if we assist them by enabling them to perpetuate poor working conditions and low wages. If one looks at many of the countries in which such conditions exist, such as Singapore, Taiwan or Korea, and then analyses the union movement in those countries, one will find that that union movement is strongly circumscribed or, in some circumstances, non-existent. I suggest that we should not go back to Dickens to ask whether there is a role for the union movement; instead we should geographically transpose ourselves to the

nations surrounding us and say that there but for the achievements of the Australian union movements would go the workers of Australia.

That may sound somewhat implausible, but certain facts are coming to light from the American industrial relations scene at this stage. As we know, unemployment in America is also reaching disturbing heights. Large numbers of people are out of work, cannot find jobs, and are staying out of work for a long time. That fact is being used by many American employers to force unions, at their regular three-yearly renegotiations of contract, into what is termed a "give back" situation. In the decades when there was full employment and a demand for labour in that country, some of the employers found themselves forced (and it was a case of being forced) to give certain concessions to their employees. They are now insisting, in certain circumstances, that those concessions be returned before they will agree to carry on the employment of those people. It surely must depend on the strength of the representation that those employees have as to how well they come out of that debate.

We know, in this country, the number of voices that have been raised, asking for the dropping, for example, of penalty rates, or consistently asking that wage rates be reduced, or that we lower wages; otherwise this country cannot get out of its present economic decline. The only defenders that the working people of this country have are the unions, of which they should all be members, and the Labor Party, which represents them in this Chamber.

One of the other things I hope that our community will be able to work towards in the years ahead is the concept of worker participation in industry. The previous Government took good steps in this direction and it was certainly praised by the Federal Government; but these were only steps in a process. I hope those steps will not be impeded in the years to come. In endorsing those comments, I hope there will be increasing moves to form worker management commonwealths, whereby workers can take a share in the ownership of their own companies and, in consultation with managers, do something to achieve the betterment of the firm and the community.

It has often been suggested that such a concept is a radical and anarchic idea, an idea that must surely spell the doom of society. The same, of course, was said in the mid-1800's, when some people were foolish enough to suggest that the franchise should be extended to all adults! Society did not collapse then, and I do not believe it will collapse when democracy is established in the work place. We accept the concepts of political and social democracy, so surely it must be acceptable to us that we can look at industrial democracy.

I refer now to Scott Bader, who, in the United Kingdom, established a company in 1920 and became involved in various chemical productions. After the Second World War, he decided that he no longer wanted to accumulate increasing amounts of wealth and to grow into a big magnate, as he must have done because of the way in which his company was proceeding. He decided that could not be an aim for himself in society. Therefore, he undertook the task of achieving worker co-operation in his firm. He found some problems: how was he to organise or combine a maximum sense of freedom, happiness and human dignity in a firm, without losing its profitability, and how was he to do this by ways and means that would be generally acceptable to the private sector of industry? I notice that he gave the right priority to the profit motive; it followed after the achievement of a maximum sense of freedom, happiness and human dignity.

In attempting to do that, Scott Bader felt that his firm, which he turned into a commonwealth (he changed its

name to the Scott Bader Commonwealth) had four tasks ahead of it. Those tasks were: first, the economic task of securing orders which could be designed, made and serviced in such a manner as to make profit (we would accept that as the standard task ahead of the business); secondly, the technical task of enabling marketing to secure profitable orders by keeping them supplied with up-to-date product design (again, a legitimate object with which I cannot think members would disagree). The interesting proposals are the third and fourth tasks. The social task was to provide members of the company with opportunities for satisfaction and development through their participation in the working community. Lastly, the political task was to encourage other men and women to change society by offering them an example by being economically healthy and socially responsible.

That would be a good move for industry. The example is there. In many ways, we can regard ourselves as being at a new 1848 in the twentieth century, for it was in 1848 that many of the arguments about popular franchise reached their peak; when the absolute venom against such a concept reached its peak, and yet it turned into something which was inevitable and which was best for the will of mankind. Worker participation in industry must achieve such growth in the years ahead if the wellbeing of society as a whole is to be achieved.

It would not, therefore, be unreasonable for someone, after hearing those viewpoints that I hold, to realise that my support for the Australian Labor Party and its principles is unswerving and solid. I believe that the A.L.P. is the Party that will help achieve those aspirations for all people in our community, a Party which, through its membership, consists of a wide cross-section of people and which over the years has established itself as a Party of achievement and a Party of long-term vision. One of the problems has often been that it has established itself as a Party of long-term vision, because often long-term vision does not appear to be thought the most respectable in the short term. To its electoral cost, the Party has sometimes held to that long-term vision, and I think ultimately to its own greater self respect. It has not been a party to pander to the hip-pocket nerve voter, and to go out and offer to buy votes in cynical ways; it has been a Party that has attempted to put definite philosophies and programmes.

In fact, what often seems to come through to many members in the community is that the spirit of liberalism of which we have heard today is a quick silver thing. It seems to shift and be transitory; it is hard to pin down the changes from election to election. If one goes back through the election campaigns of the Labor Party and reads the policy speeches of the Leaders over the years, Federal and State, one will see a long-term vision for society, that sense of trying to work for the wellbeing of individual men and women in our community so that all can achieve their full rights. There is certainly that protection of the right of the individual to achieve his full aspirations. It has been implied that the A.L.P. is not the Party to protect the rights of the individual. I would point those who make such an accusation to the Federal platform of the Party, which says that the A.L.P. believes "in the right of the development of the human personality, protected from arbitrary invasion by the state". Its record over the years has shown that to be true.

The record of the Whitlam Government in the many initiatives it achieved between 1972 and 1975 showed that. It showed the importance of the community's being involved in its own future, being involved in trying to answer its own needs. Community health centres are an example of that. The Australian Assistance Programme was another important example. The Schools Commis-

sion, responsive to the needs of schools throughout Australia and responsive to their requests, was another example, and I do not think we need many more examples to realise the point.

I want to quote the first Labor Premier of the first all-Labor Cabinet in South Australia, Premier Verran.

Mr. Bannon: The first in the world.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am informed that he was the first democratically elected Premier of a Labor Cabinet in the world. In 1909, he made the following comments:

... [the Labor Party] advocated a policy designed for the welfare of the whole of the people. It was the policy that would better the conditions of every man who worked; it would enter into the homes of all men and help the wives, daughters, and young children. It was a policy which was in itself intelligent, and appealed to every man who gave a thought to his fellows' wellbeing . . . The Labor Party would never have succeeded as it did had it not been that, attracted by the policy, there had been men and women who had given their lives to its cause. There had been a sacrifice of time, money, and ambition, and the Party had been built up by this and the amount of intellectuality that had been devoted to its service . . .

If we look through the history of the Party, through the ranks of its many supporters, we see that dedication and that commitment that has indicated where its priorities lie. In looking at the achievements of the Labor Party, I could not go through the list, because it is so long, and goes back over decades, operating at Federal and State levels. Most of the good things we have achieved in this society today have some connection with work and struggles of the Labor Party.

One of the things that interested me this afternoon was that we received the report of the Ombudsman for 1978-79. We take that for granted, and yet the office of Ombudsman provides, for the ordinary person in this society, an opportunity for some redress from big Government, local government, and statutory authorities. I think all of us realise how vitally important that is and how successful that operation has been. It was introduced by the Labor Government—not that it was voted on by the Labor Government. It was first passed in this House in 1969 under a Liberal Government, but the legislation to appoint the Ombudsman was allowed to lapse because it was not regarded by the Government of the day as important enough to allow the ordinary person some form of redress against unfairness in Government, local government, or statutory authorities. It took the election of the Labor Government to bring that about.

Likewise, the 1970's have brought consumer protection which is a leader of its kind throughout the world. It has established the right of the consumer to protect himself or herself, or to be protected against unfair and unconscionable deals. It has not been an attempt to undermine commerce in this State; in fact, commerce figures would show that it has not undermined it. It is a recognition that, if trade is to take place, it should take place in fairness to the trader and the person purchasing the goods. We know of too many examples of people unfairly taken advantage of prior to the existence of these laws, and there are still instances of unfair advantage being taken that will require further amendments to the laws. In asking whether these amendments will be forthcoming in the next three years, I state I hope they will, although I fear the worst.

Likewise, I refer to the achievements in education and health in South Australia. It has been said in this and in other sessions of Parliament how great have been the advances in the provision of health and education services to our community. We can go back to the 1960's, and recall the schools that people like myself attended as

students, the hospitals that perhaps our families had to use, and how appalling were those services. There was no achievement, or what was achieved was wrong or bad. The good achievement for the well-being of all did not come until the 1970's.

In undertaking the task of Government or Opposition, certain responsibilities fall on politicians. Certainly, politicians have become the butt of many jokes, and polibashing is very popular in many quarters. I do not know that it achieves much, but we should ask ourselves what a politician does and what a politician should do. What are a politician's responsibilities? Let me also pose another question: what is the citizen's responsibility in the political framework? I quote a statement by the second Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjöld, who was killed in a plane crash in 1961. He said that he held the following belief:

That no life was more satisfactory than one of selfless service to your country or humanity.

He regarded that as the aim to which all activities should be devoted. He was a politician. He regarded his service as being in the political framework, and he thought that the following qualities were needed in a politician:

Politics and diplomacy are no play of will and skill where results are independent of the character of those engaging in the game. Results are determined not by superficial ability, but by the consistency of the actors in their efforts and by the validity of their ideals. Contrary to what seems to be popular belief, there is no intellectual activity which more ruthlessly tests the solidity of a man than politics. Apparently easy successes with the public are possible for a juggler, but lasting results are achieved only by the patient builder.

Unfortunately, too often we see the situation where those taking the burden of politics prefer to do the juggling. In one case in this House, I believe we have seen political juggling by one who often cannot state his own political identification. We must accept that challenge as one towards which we must move.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: All Independents?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: No. I am saying that one person who often changes his Party affiliation would be better off sticking with something solid. I think that the role of the politician is matched by the role of the citizen, the person who is politicked to, to use bad grammatical phrasing. How often have politicians found themselves forced to offer that vote-catching handful of money we saw in the advertisement some years ago, because they felt that that was the only way they could achieve the votes?

If a section of the electorate had acted responsibly towards its citizenship, and its country, that would not have been necessary. Politics could have been determined on the expression of ideals, values, and programmes, rather than on the expression of "Vote for me, and you will get this much." Therefore, I think that it is our task to see that, in the performance of our political duties, we make sure that the electorate becomes aware that it has a responsibility to help in the political process. If we are to sell messages to our community and convince people that there are wrongs that need righting, we have to convince them that sometimes the hand will not be providing money, but may have to take it away. That does not merely mean by increased taxation (and whenever we have to increase taxation, we must justify such a decision); the more awesome prospect is the redistribution of wealth throughout the world that must take place so that the Third World and the Fourth World achieve their fair share of resources.

In a sense, inevitably that must mean a lessening of our standard of living. It must mean that, if we are going to start paying fairer prices for the raw materials, for the

agricultural products that come from the other countries of the world, that must produce higher costs here and, therefore, some reduction in living standards. It is also the Government's task to minimise the effect of that. It is the Government's task to see that the effect of that is borne by all of society and not by the few. But it is the citizen's task to accept the reasonableness of the desire to achieve a better standard of living for all, and the right of other countries to achieve permanent improvements in their situation rather than temporary band-aid treatment.

The electorate of Salisbury elected me to this House as its member, and I look forward to their doing so for many elections to come. I will take up these challenges and do the best I can to serve their needs. I realise that, often, no-one can do as well as the electorate might hope, but I hope that I will undertake these challenges with the best spirit. In so doing, I want to highlight for the House some of the issues that I believe to be important for my electorate and I think, in consequence, important for other electorates in this State.

The electorate of Salisbury is a particularly large one—an outer, urban industrial area which faces many problems. These problems will not be easy of solution. Indeed, in trying to achieve solutions there must be some mid-way alleviation of the symptoms that arise. The first one must, of course, be the employment problem—the unemployment that exists in the local community. I have become all too aware of the suffering and distress that local unemployment is causing to a great many people—to a great many people whom some would call "dole bludgers" or "laggards" who are not pulling their weight in the community.

I have found (and I have mentioned this before) social distress as well as economic distress, and I shall be looking at addressing myself to any means that can achieve the creation of jobs for those people and, indeed, for the people of South Australia. It is vital that we move towards employment creation. I do not think that that will be achieved by trying to establish keep-fit classes for the unemployed to keep them occupied as a sort of occupational therapy. It must be an aggressive policy to put jobs before people, to provide them with work, because that is what they want. That is the message coming through very clearly to me from those in my electorate. In the process, that must be done with a continuing improvement in the working conditions available to those in the work place.

It has been, as I mentioned before, suggested that wages should be reduced. I believe, in fact, that this country has tremendous opportunities for job creation, particularly in the manufacturing sector, but not by means of reducing wages. Other countries overseas pay high wages to their industrial workers. One has only to look at many industrial wage rates in the United States of America or in Scandinavia to find that their industrial wage rates are, indeed, better than ours, but they are not complaining of the same types of problem that we are, because they have found that there are other ways of making their industries cost competitive: it is cost competition that is a major threat. They have found that providing cheap industrial land, cheap fuel, or cheap working capital is a way in which their industries can continue to exist.

We have that opportunity in this State. Some of these opportunities we are minimising. I have spoken before of the need to continue the programme of providing cheap industrial land. The South Australian Housing Trust has provided that within the electorate of Salisbury. I hope that it continues to do so and realises that that is one way in which jobs will be created. The other way in which jobs would be created, as the previous Government recog-

nised, was by the provision of cheap fuel. Passage of the Santos legislation, in part, was aiming to provide cheap fuel for the entire community which, naturally, includes its commercial and industrial sector. I hope that, in the years ahead, that will continue to be possible.

The second area is that of housing. There are many people within my electorate who face serious housing needs—many single-parent families, many pensioner couples and many people who, through no fault of their own, have found their house whipped from under them either because they have become unemployed and cannot continue to meet their house repayments, or because the company from which they are purchasing the house has gone bankrupt. As a result, suddenly the contractual arrangements made with that company are no longer applicable, and people then find themselves with burdensome debts.

I will also be addressing myself to the provision of proper and reasonable housing. It has been established over the years that it is an Australian right for a person to own his or her own home. I hope that that right will continue to exist in our society, but it will need, because of the pressures we are operating under at the moment, Government support. The South Australian Land Commission provided the opportunity for many people in this State to own their own home. Land prices in this State are substantially lower than land prices in other States. That, I think, we can trace back to the work of the South Australian Land Commission. I have seen this in Salisbury, where the land Commission has developed housing estates.

For those who cannot afford to purchase their own home, I hope that, in years ahead, there will be an increased commitment to provide rental housing. It concerns me that the Housing Trust is moving away from a heavy predominance of providing rental accommodation—in particular subsidised rental accommodation. When I have to deal with age pensioners who come into the office and ask for pensioner accommodation and I have to tell them that they must carry on living in their caravan for another 18 months because no place is available, or when I have to tell a family facing economic ruin because it has to pay high home rental payments on the commercial market, that it will have to consider bankruptcy because no cheap rental accommodation is available for them, I think it is urgent that we look at the demands that exist at the moment, and that the Housing Trust be asked to increase its subsidised rental programme.

Another area that has become known to me over the past years that I have been working in the Salisbury electorate is the many hazards that face our young people particularly. It gravely concerns and disturbs me that the young people of today, not only in the electorate of Salisbury but also throughout our society, are, in many cases, being left defenceless in an onslaught designed to take away their very precious right to a reasonable and decent life.

The growth in the use of dangerous drugs in our community is a case in point. I have received some evidence (again through the electorate office) of the grave suffering that the spread of drugs in our community is causing to people. I have been disturbed to see that in many cases there are just not adequate facilities available to help these people and their families achieve the assistance that they need. I hope that, in the years ahead, programmes can be adopted in this State which are similar to those that exist in New South Wales. In New South Wales, a group called "We help ourselves" recognises that those who need help to escape from drug addiction need to

be given pride and respect in themselves and that they need to be given the opportunity to partake in their own rehabilitation and cure. Likewise, they recognise that the distress caused is not caused to them alone but is also caused to their entire family, and that the family also needs counselling. We do not have adequate facilities of that type in this State.

I hope (and it is a pity that the Minister of Health is not here, because I will certainly be addressing this point to her in time to come) that we can look at the programmes being adopted interstate and can try to adopt similar programmes in this State, or at least support any private organisation that wishes to adopt that type of programme. A society that cannot protect its own young, that cannot give them the guarantee of safe childhood and safe adolescence until they reach maturity, is not a society that can respect itself and, indeed, is not a society with, perhaps, a very promising future.

Another area to which my attention will also be given is that of education. I believe that over the past 2½ to 3 decades we have subjected the students, the children of this society, to a con—that we have been the cause of the disillusionment that many school graduates now feel. Ever since the Second World War it has been the tendency of people to say, "Get a better education because you will get a better job". The two have been irretrievably linked.

What has happened over the past two decades shows that that was true. Those who had the better education got a better job but, suddenly, as the education facilities improved in society and increased and encompassed a wider share which they, naturally, should have, and all these people were given the opportunity of a better education, we found that there were only the same number of better jobs available, that is, a relatively static number.

The result is that a large number of people now find themselves on the employment market looking for the better job promised throughout their schooling career, but it does not exist. It is not surprising that they are disillusioned, upset and angry against such a system. We should have been saying that education for its own right is what our children should have been working towards to enable them to live better and more fulfilled lives and that there is no irrefutable link or strong link between education and the job they will later on get. In years to come, that message must play an increasing part in our schools. They must be educated to live in a fulfilled way, not in some cheap and dehumanised way which relies on their being addicted to one-armed bandits or to participate in lifestyles that are not stimulating but dehumanising. We find employers today, even in my own area, saying that the schools are not teaching what we need for the jobs. They are not training students for the jobs, they say. The theory is still being put around and the views are still being strongly espoused; that we must work against. Certainly, our children should be literate, able, and functional in such areas as mathematics. They should be able to speak English properly, but they should also be able to participate in life at large, not just in the one place, the workplace, and in relationships with other people, thus achieving fulfilment for themselves and their family.

As I said earlier, the area of community development becomes important, because outer suburban areas often lack the facilities needed to fulfil the lives of all citizens. They grow so rapidly that the community centres, the libraries, and the neighbourhood houses are not there. I shall be seeking to analyse the immediate needs that exist within my area and see what are the best ways of providing those needs. I hope that society at large and this State

Government will recognise that, in future, it should try to pre-empt those needs and meet them before they arise. The Housing Trust, under the Labor Government, was already recognising this need, and the new areas in Munno Para were being provided with community facilities before the need actually arose. In those areas where that did not happen, we have to achieve some remedial action.

They are just some of the tasks ahead. There are many others, and I will face them day by day. I hope I will have the ability to meet those challenges, and the electors of Salisbury will decide at the next election whether or not I have done so. All members must face challenges in regard to our individual electorates, and I hope that all members will strive to achieve those aims with conscientiousness and dedication.

In concluding, I say that obviously in the years ahead we will not achieve success in everything we want, and we may not do so for a long time. For some things, we may never achieve success. An old Jewish proverb strikes me as being an important *modus operandi* to look to. It states, "God gives us the task. He does not ask that we succeed, but he does ask that we do not lay it aside."

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack): Order! Before calling on the honourable member for Newland, I draw to honourable members' attention that it will be his maiden speech. I therefore request that honourable members extend to him the courtesies warranted on such an occasion.

Dr. BILLARD (Newland): I support the motion. First, I congratulate my fellow members who have entered Parliament for the first time at the most recent election. I know that there have been substantial changes in the composition of the House, and I believe that that is a reflection of the desires and the will of the voters of South Australia.

I have been pleased to note that previous speakers, although coming from different Parties, have displayed a certain common thread in what they have said. I discern a common concern for the well-being of all people in South Australia, and I hope that it will not simply be limited to a philosophy which they espouse and which they fail to carry through into practice. I hope that it is the intent of all members that we seek to carry through into our actions and the legislation that passes through this Chamber the common desires and the will to serve all of the people, and not simply sectional interests.

I have previously expressed my thanks through another medium to the electors of Newland, but I will also express my appreciation here of the clear and strong endorsement they gave to me to work on their behalf within the Parliamentary sphere. I believe that the mandate given to me in Newland was, at least in terms of the size of the swing, the strongest given to anyone in the election. For this reason, I propose initially at least to examine some of the detail of the reasons for that swing, and, perhaps, the wider implications of those forces operating in Newland will have significance elsewhere in South Australia.

Overall, the two-Party preferred swing in Newland was 15.9 per cent, which was easily the largest swing in the election and, I believe, the largest winning swing since Mr. Wardle defeated Mr. Bywaters with a swing of 17.3 per cent in Murray, in 1968. The swing ranged up to nearly 22 per cent in one booth in Modbury Heights, which was formerly the strongest Labor booth and which is now the strongest Liberal booth, apart from the smaller booth at Golden Grove.

It is significant in analysing that swing to note that the swing on the primaries was 17.4 per cent, which was drawn from both the other Parties, that is, 15.4 per cent came

from the A.L.P. and 2 per cent came from the Democrats. That has significance to those who debate whether or not the Liberal Party was given a mandate to proceed with mining development in this State. In addition, in analysing that swing, I point out that the seat of Newland prior to the election was the seventh most marginal Labor seat. It is now the eighth most marginal Liberal seat; it passed all the more marginal Labor seats, together with Mount Gambier, in terms of swing. It is now held with a majority of 6.1 per cent.

I know that much has been discussed in the House and elsewhere as to the possible reasons for the failure of the Labor Party at the recent election. This question is important to analyse, if we try to look beyond the superficial reasons to the real reasons. I believe that many of the reasons given are not the real reasons but are simply the effects resulting from the underlying reasons and the seeds set some time ago. Many, for example, contend that the media campaign played a large part in the election; I believe that that was an effect.

There are those who say that the campaign waged by the employers was all important. I believe that that also was an effect—an expression by people of conditions which already existed. Likewise, the strikes and the threat of strikes may have helped to drive the last nail into the coffin, but I believe that that also was an effect. Finally, the talk about an early election (although it started the ball rolling when the election was called in generating an immediate and widespread reaction against the then Government) was, I believe, still an effect: I believe that the real reasons were generated long before that time.

If we look at the figures of the swings which occurred in this election, I believe we can see that that is so. Overall in the metropolitan area, there was a swing on the two-Party preferred vote of 9.6 per cent. If we take one seat (for example, Norwood), there was a swing between 1977 and 1979 of 10.3 per cent. However, a by-election was held in Norwood earlier this year, and 7 per cent of that 10 per cent occurred at the beginning of 1979. Therefore, at least two-thirds of the swing which occurred in the metropolitan area was there at the beginning of this year. There may have been some extenuating circumstances in Norwood in that the personal following of the former Premier played quite an important part, but I believe that his personal following played an important part right across metropolitan Adelaide and not simply in Norwood. In fact, I have said in other places that I believe that the personal following of Mr. Dunstan was higher in the outer metropolitan areas than it was in his own seat of Norwood, and I think, in the figures that I shall discuss later, that this fact will become apparent.

We can see that at least two-thirds of the swing which occurred on 15 September was there for the taking early this year. There are those who say that the turning of the tide was the Salisbury affair in early 1978. Indeed, I believe that that was some sort of watershed, in that the public at that time began to question seriously the attitudes of the former Premier, Mr. Dunstan. I do not believe that even the Salisbury affair was the beginning of the rot. I believe that the problem was that the Labor Party had ceased to communicate with the electorate and had ceased to have a vision which was appreciated by the electorate. I would be the first to admit that there were many things that were done by the Labor Party which the electorate applauded. The things which I believe were in tune with the electorate were the consumer protection legislation introduced in the early 1970's and electoral reform. However, many things happened to cause the Labor Party to drift away from its electorate and to open up that communication gap.

One of the signs of that gap was Monarto, which was a grand vision for a second major city in South Australia but which simply ran against the aspirations of the community. Nobody wanted to be forced to live there. Obviously, it was a very costly exercise, and very serious questions were raised about the desirability of placing a second major city so close to Adelaide. The consequence for Adelaide was that in that period, up until about 1976, urban planning in Adelaide was largely ignored, and many urgent projects went without attention.

The second major area where I feel that the Labor Party lost contact with the electorate was in the way in which it allowed the Public Service to grow out of all proportion to the rest of the community. I believe that the absolute growth of the Public Service from 1970 to 1976 was well over 40 per cent, which was way above the growth in the private sector at that time, and it could not reasonably be supported with the system of taxation that we had. As a result, State taxes grew at an inordinate rate, and the burden on the taxpayer became impossible to bear. The end effect was that we saw a decline in the economy of South Australia—the reaping of the harvest since 1976.

I believe that, in examining the reasons for the swing in Newland, we have to look at some aspects of the demography of Newland. This electorate is the second largest electorate in the State, having over 21 400 voters. Geographically, it is roughly the northern half of Tea Tree Gully, together with the addition of a small area of Salisbury East and a small area of Salisbury Heights. It is situated largely within the City of Tea Tree Gully, and therefore derives much of its character from Tea Tree Gully.

This area has been interesting in that, during the 1960's and the 1970's, it experienced a very rapid growth; in fact, its growth has been way ahead of the predictions of the 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan. As you would be aware, Sir, the population predictions of that plan are well out of date; in fact, I understand that for Adelaide it predicted a population by 1991 of about 1 400 000. Obviously, current projections of population experts fall well short of that figure. Nevertheless, the growth of Tea Tree Gully has been way ahead of those predictions. The 1976 census shows that Tea Tree Gully was 32 per cent ahead of the projections of the 1962 development plan, which predicted a population of 38 000. The census showed that Tea Tree Gully had a population of 56 000, there being a difference of 18 000.

This placed Tea Tree Gully in a unique position within Adelaide. In passing, I might say that generally those predictions at that time were about 5 per cent higher than the figures for 1976, although there were some large unpredicted shifts within Adelaide, the largest shift being the decline of the inner urban areas and the growth of Tea Tree Gully and, to a lesser extent, Salisbury.

I believe that the reason for the growth of Tea Tree Gully lies firstly in its natural character; the area is undulating, it is traversed by several creek systems, lined with attractive river red gums, and from numerous points excellent views can be obtained of the hills face to the south and of the gulf towards the west. In fact, it is an ideal place for a home. The Tea Tree Gully Council has recognised the value of the natural features of this area for many years, and it has worked to preserve and enhance them.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Dr. BILLARD: Before the dinner adjournment, I was talking about the reasons why Tea Tree Gully had grown so rapidly during the 1960's and 1970's. I had begun to

discuss the role of the Tea Tree Gully council in that growth. The specific actions that it took were, first, that it developed a comprehensive system of parks and reserves in a network that stretched to all parts of Tea Tree Gully. A study carried out within the past two years and published in December 1977 detailed aspects of those reserves; I understand there are 230 reserves in total. With that system of reserves, which preserved basically the creek systems and the existing flora and fauna, a system of bikeways was also developed.

Secondly, it was determined that the natural assets of the area should be preserved from the undesirable effects of heavy industry. Instead, encouragement has been given to the development of the city primarily as a dormitory suburb, with some areas set aside for light industry and commercial development. In addition, it has operated to prevent the worst aspects of strip development from taking place along the main arterial roads. Thirdly, the council has operated actively to encourage high standards of housing development. All of this has resulted in Tea Tree Gully developing far more rapidly than indicated by the population projections made in the 1962 development plan. This has happened because people have chosen to go to Tea Tree Gully (not because they have been forced or directed to go there by planning), choosing the natural environment of the Tea Tree Gully area in which to live.

That growth is continuing. In fact, in spite of the figures that show an overall decline in housing during the past few years in Adelaide, I am informed that the number of building approvals is continuing to increase in Tea Tree Gully, and the approvals this year until September are 40 per cent above those of the previous year. Tea Tree Gully is an area that has experienced rapid growth during the 1960's and 1970's and is continuing to be one of the most rapidly growing areas in Adelaide. Figures show some results of that rapid growth. If one thinks about the consequences, one sees that one of the immediate results of that growth is that there tends to be a concentration of the age of residents into a narrow age band. Most young people buy a new home soon after they are married, normally between the time they are 25 and 35 years of age. It is true that in Tea Tree Gully there is a high proportion of the population between these ages, even though there is a significant proportion of the population in the older age group. Indeed, the history of Tea Tree Gully plays a significant part in the whole history of South Australia.

In terms of the age distribution, the 1976 census shows that 38 per cent of the adult population of Newland was in that 10-year age bracket between 25 and 35 years of age. That is nearly a quarter of the whole population. Along with that concentration of the adult population in that narrow age bracket, there is consequently also a concentration in the age of children. One finds that 40 per cent of the population is under 18 years of age, and there is an even higher concentration of the population under the age of four—11.6 per cent of the population. This is a pointer to the sorts of problem that the Tea Tree Gully people experience.

The area is basically a middle income area. Again, the figures of the 1976 census indicate that the percentage of families having an income over \$18 000 per annum or more is barely different from the percentage for the whole of the Adelaide statistical division. In Newland, 7 per cent of families have an income of more than \$18 000 per annum, compared to 6.3 per cent for the whole of the Adelaide statistical division. Regarding the middle income group, families with an income of between \$7 000 and \$18 000 make up 73 per cent of the Newland population, compared with 51 per cent for the Adelaide statistical division. One can see that, with the remainder, there is an

even starker comparative difference, because families with an income under \$7 000 made up 14.2 per cent of the Newland population in mid-1976, compared to nearly 36 per cent for the Adelaide statistical division.

This analysis, which puts Newland firmly in the middle income bracket, was confirmed recently in a market analysis that was done for the Golden Grove Development. They attacked the problem from a different point of view but came to the same conclusions. The report stated:

... Tea Tree Gully is very much a middle income market with a reasonable involvement of higher and lower income groups as well.

They remarked that the future trend would be for a gradually increasing emphasis on the higher income groups as the more expensive blocks in Campbelltown were used up.

Where do the residents of Newland come from? Half of the adult population are migrants but, of those, 80 per cent come from the United Kingdom. Of those migrants from the United Kingdom, the majority have been here five years or more. We can see that the migration from the United Kingdom to South Australia during the late 1960's and early 1970's played a very dominating role in the development of Newland in particular, and in Tea Tree Gully generally.

The consequences of this are that the people are generally used to the sorts of apparatus of Government and community set-ups that we have in Australia and they have therefore fitted in easily and with little difficulty in accommodating to the Australian way of life.

All of the figures I have spoken about point to what is the demographic composition of the District of Newland. They point in statistical terms, but we may look at the same figures in a different way by trying to find what is a typical family grouping in Tea Tree Gully. The typical family of the moment, therefore, is a young married couple who have a new home and normally have the usual quota of children. Because of their middle income and age grouping, it is important to note that they are normally in the middle ground politically; that is, they have no strong alignment either with the Labor Party or with the Liberal Party. They are middle ground people.

I believe that they show quite a high degree of political discrimination in the way in which they vote. Because of their background, and because they have chosen to go to this area, they place a high value on natural assets; Tea Tree Gully is rich in natural assets in terms of the environment. Because of the situation in an outer suburb such as Tea Tree Gully, which is basically a dormitory suburb without industry, they have problems associated with isolation. They are people who chose to go there because they are prepared to pay that price to gain those quality of life items which they value. Nevertheless, they have the normal needs which people in an isolated situation have; that is, they have a great need of transport services and community facilities—and I could digress by saying that I have strongly supported one of the groups which are working to obtain community facilities, people who are working for the provision of a theatre in Tea Tree Gully. I was brought up in Toowoomba, a provincial city of Queensland, with a population at that time of about 50 000 to 55 000, and until I came to Tea Tree Gully I had never experienced previously such strong local amateur cultural groups. There are very strong music and drama groups, and all forms of cultural groups in Tea Tree Gully. It is the role of Government to support and encourage these groups, because these are the means by which people find their self-expression.

Because they have young families, Tea Tree Gully people have the natural needs that arise out of a

community with a large proportion of children. The community is new, so they are generally under-provided with kindergartens and the support that parents need in seeking to raise children. Isolation, for instance, is one of the problems faced by young parents. Living on the outskirts of a city, they are normally remote from their own parents. Learning to cope with children and learning what to do, is a time of great stress for parents, and therefore young people in any outer suburb have a great need of support. Having new homes, they are subject to financial pressures, and they also have a commitment to the future of the State.

I believe that all of these are strong pointers to the issues which were immediately perceived by the electors at the last election. I shall now translate those areas of concern into what happened politically. Before 1976, the electorate of Newland as such did not exist, but we can reconstruct the voting figures from the individual polling booth figures. At least during the 1970's it has always voted far more for the Labor Party at the State than at the Federal level. The difference has never been less than 8 per cent, so the 9.8 per cent margin before the last election looks very shaky when we look at the reasons why there was that 8 per cent difference. In 1975, if we reconstruct the figures for the electorate, an 18 per cent difference was recorded between the result at the State election and that at the Federal election which followed a few months later.

There has been a strong demographic trend throughout the 1970's as the electorate has filled up, and I estimate that at about 2 per cent per annum. There were very valid reasons for assuming, prior to the last election, that this electorate was never safe. If we ask ourselves why there was this big difference between the State and Federal results, we can see the reason if we look at the sort of people who are in the electorate: middle ground people who were attracted by the image created by the previous Premier. Because there was such a high concentration of them, I believe that he had a bigger personal vote in this area, and indeed in other such outer suburban middle-income areas, than in his own electorate.

I will enumerate the specific issues which influenced the electors. The first that was expressed to me in my campaign was the need for a change, and I believe that the seeds for that change had been sown some years ago when the former Government gradually drifted further and further away from being in close communication with the people of South Australia. There came a time when the drift had gone so far that people decided that they must have a change.

There was also a real concern about their own jobs and their future in South Australia. These people have invested heavily in South Australia's future. They normally have high mortgages on new houses which they have worked and sweated to establish. Therefore, they have a high financial and emotional commitment to the future success of this State, and I believe they were hardest hit by its economic decline. Young people who bought new houses and purchased them with an 85 per cent or a 90 per cent mortgage found that, on the day they walked in the front door, they had lost 10 per cent to 15 per cent of the value of the house because of the decline in the real estate market. That is, the cost of the new house related to the cost of building, whereas, once they had walked in the front door the house was worth only what it would get on the market.

Young people found themselves trapped. If they lost their jobs, or were forced to transfer for one reason or another, they could not dispose of their house and gain back what they had put into it. In some areas in my electorate, when I door-knocked, people would point out

those houses in their street which had been the subject of mortgagee sales. The fear that this generates in young people is real and should have been taken into account by the previous Government. Because it was not, that Government lost their confidence. If the Government had communicated effectively with the people, it would have known that these fears were real and it would have moved earlier in areas such as the abolition of succession duties, which I believe to be a big factor in the exodus of people from this State.

Another important factor related to secret ballots in unions. From my door-knocking I could assess roughly how big the swing was by the sorts of people who were saying that they would change their vote. Early in the election campaign it became obvious that those former Dunstan voters, those people who voted for Dunstan at the State elections and voted Liberal federally, were changing their minds. Later, it became apparent that many people who had never voted anything but Labor, and in fact some who still considered themselves good Labor people, were voting Liberal because of our promise to bring in secret ballots in unions. I know that many of these people were concerned that their unions were being manipulated by a few people. That was a real fear that played a significant part in the minds of a certain section of people in my district.

I wish now to talk for a short time about my beliefs and political philosophies and what I believe I can bring to this Parliament, and how I believe I can represent my constituents. My first and overriding commitment, I believe, is to serve the electorate. That is a commitment which transcends all Party barriers. The power that I have to work on behalf of my electors is a power which is given to me in trust. It is not my right to use it as I will. It is a power of which I am the steward on behalf of my electors. Therefore, my primary concern must be to serve the people in my district, those who voted for me and those who did not.

I believe that the electorate of Newland has many special needs because it is an outer suburban area, which requires the sort of special service that rises above Party allegiances.

I am proud to say that I have a small "I" liberal philosophy. Liberalism arises out of a recognition of the integrity of the individual and his value as a person. It seeks to create a society in which people can express themselves in a creative and productive way so that they can reach their full potential as individuals.

I believe that if we look through history and look at the great advances made in our society we will, in fact, see that it is the work of individuals working within our society (either in a private or public capacity), and the vision of individuals, that has brought about the great advances that have been made. Individuals, to make that contribution, must be free. If individuals are free and have the opportunity for self-expression, creativity, and initiative, and the opportunity to reap the rewards of their work, then as a consequence, self-esteem will come.

Several factors now operate in our society against those principles. Let me list some of them. Right from the time that children go to school these days they are one of a large number—in fact, I believe many of our schools are far too large. Those children cease to be individuals and become just a number, another child in the large number of children at that school. This tells the child that he does not count as an individual, that he should submerge his individuality for the sake of the rest of the school.

Unfortunately, when young people leave school these days a large number of them find it difficult to gain employment. This, again, is society telling them that they

do not count. I believe that one of the strongest feelings our unemployed young people are now experiencing is a lack of self-esteem. I strongly support any measures designed to build up their self-esteem and to make young people feel as though they are wanted in society. I believe that when this happens we will start to solve the very difficult problem of unemployment that we now have, but that we will be fighting that problem for at least the next few years.

Another factor that works against the individual is that he may live in a large city in which his house is just one of many houses. He travels to work as one of thousands of others travelling to work, and his work may deal with machines rather than people. Contrary to some opinions that have been expressed, I see great hope in the coming age of automation (if we can cope with some of the problems), as it could lead to people being freed from a situation in which they are working constantly with machines.

One of the great areas that I hope will grow is that of the tourist industry. Tourism is a people industry—people dealing with people and people appreciating nature. If this industry is allowed to develop properly, I see great hope for the future of people learning to be individuals again, instead of being told all the time that they are just a number, somebody to sit in front of a machine, another one at school or occupying just another house in a street in a city of a million houses.

If I am to serve the electorate of Newland effectively, I believe that the most important priority for me is to communicate effectively with people in the electorate. I have said before that I believe that the former Labor Government met its demise because it failed to keep up that bond of communication. Therefore, I see my role within the electorate of Newland as being primarily one of two-way communication—between myself and the electorate. It is no good my simply having a liberal policy if I fail to communicate with those people who elected me.

I want now to talk briefly about the background I bring to this Parliament and what I hope to be able to contribute. All members of Parliament come out of the work force at some time and I hope that they bring something of the background of their previous employment with them into Parliament. It is one of the great advantages of our Parliamentary system that this is so, that we can have people from the whole strata of employment come here and discuss together what we will do at a State level, bringing with them their own backgrounds and expertise.

I trained as a scientist, as a mathematician, and have worked with computers and with computing science. My interest in those areas, I believe, will be of benefit in the years to come as we grapple with a society which will be rapidly changing its emphasis on automation. I can see that society will have to face many problems because of the automation that is to come. I am an optimist since I believe that human nature and goodwill will see that those problems are overcome and that automation will ultimately work to our benefit rather than to our detriment. I believe also that my background in research allows me to approach some of the more complex problems of, for example, urban planning in a way in which I hope will enable me to contribute to building a better future within the urban life of Adelaide. Certainly, I have an interest in that area, and I believe that a great deal needs to be done in the way in which we organise our cities.

Lastly, I share the problems of my own electors, in that I am of the common age group. Also, I live in a new house that I am having to establish myself, together with a young

family. So, I share much of the outlook and many of the problems of my electors.

I will now briefly discuss one problem area that concerns my district vitally. As I said earlier, I have an interest in urban planning, and I believe that I have something to contribute in this area. For those who have studied the figures, it is obvious that Adelaide is organised by age; that is, people in its inner urban area houses are old, and the further out you move the younger the age group becomes, until you reach the outer urban areas where, as I have said, in Newland the primary age is between 25 and 35 years. Several problems result because we have organised Adelaide in that way. It means, for example, that in an area such as Newland, where there is a high proportion of young people, we have to provide many more school places, hospital places, and facilities for the young. A study of the proportion of the population in primary schools shows that, in outer areas such as Newland, about 17 per cent of the population are in primary school at any one time. It may reach as high a proportion as 21 per cent in the Mawson District. However, in inner urban areas such as Unley and Torrens, the figure is only between 7 per cent and 8 per cent.

In the intermediate areas (again going by district, because they are approximately equal populations), there is a decline in the student population within schools. For example, an examination of the 1971 and 1976 censuses shows that, in the Mitchell District, which is an intermediate district, there was a 21 per cent decline in the number of children of primary school age. In that district, a further 23 per cent decline could be expected by 1981; that is, a 40 per cent decline in student numbers in 10 years. The figures for Hartley, which is another middle district, show an 18 per cent decline in student numbers between 1971 and 1976 and another 25 per cent decline to 1981; that is, a 38 per cent decline in 10 years.

This, then, has a very heavy impact on the Government Budget in providing for people who are artificially concentrated in certain new areas. How has this developed? I believe it has developed because we have followed a policy of developing the nearest adjacent undeveloped area; that is, the next area to be developed has been developed according to the minimum cost of providing electricity, water, and sewerage. I do not believe that that measures the ultimate cost to the community. We have to measure the ultimate cost of providing community services, such as schools, hospitals and sporting facilities, and we can overcome this problem if, as we develop Adelaide, we allow vacant areas to remain undeveloped for 10 to 15 years before releasing them on to the house market. This would mean that the local peak population, as it passed through the schools, would be distributed over 10 to 15 years instead of being constrained within a narrow period of three to five years. It is important that we address ourselves to these areas in the future, because the education budget, for example, is a large proportion of the total State Budget, and we can make real savings in this area.

One issue that has affected my district greatly during the year has been the proposed Golden Grove development, and I see much of benefit in what has gone in with that development. However, many problems are raised by the way in which it has proceeded. First, there has been an apparent rush to bring the development on stream. The plan, as published, was to have 25 000 people settled in that area within 10 to 12 years. That, to me, would exacerbate the problems we have already experienced with over-rapid development, thus meaning that we would have to provide many more educational and other places than we should have to provide.

Because of the haste at which that development has been pushed, there was a public involvement programme which was excellent in concept but which, in practice, was somewhat abortive. I believe that the public has a vital role to play in the future planning of new areas in Adelaide, and I hope that we can evolve schemes whereby public advisory groups (I believe that at Golden Grove they are called community advisory groups) can be enlisted to the aid of local government to allow people to be involved in helping to develop their community, without having to become entangled in the procedures and politics of becoming an elected representative.

Much of benefit was proposed in that public involvement. The Golden Grove scheme also proposed a large component of Housing Trust development. I know that, when the scheme was first touted, it was mentioned that there would be a 10 per cent trust involvement, which was then above the average for the metropolitan area. At present, there is only a 2 per cent Trust involvement in Tea Tree Gully. Subsequently, when the legislation was passed, it was increased to 20 per cent, and again earlier this year statements from the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs suggested that it might be further increased to 25 per cent. Because trust homes are provided, by definition, to people who have specific needs, I believe that placing such a large body of such housing in a remote suburb which is inadequately serviced by transport facilities and which is far from the employment centres is not desirable. I believe that Golden Grove should be about the last place in Adelaide for Trust development.

Another issue that arose was the provision of stormwater control within the Golden Grove development. Much of the scheme was novel to South Australia. Stormwater was to be controlled by a series of ponds, dams, swales, and weirs that would hold up the run-off of stormwater sufficient to spread its peak.

That is a scheme which may work. However, it was never tested exhaustively, and in fact the idea was a take-off from a similar development in America called the Woodlands New Community, where the system was exhaustively tested with computer studies. In fact, Woodlands had another difference, in that the ground there was quite porous so that stormwater could readily return to the water table if the water was held up and its run-off slowed.

Another problem associated with Golden Grove is the proposed size of the blocks. I believe that when we plan our new communities, we need to be planning for families which are going to have young children who cannot simply be let loose into the street or into the local park to play. I believe that, when we are planning for families, we need to provide areas within the precincts of the family home where children can play under parental supervision. For that reason, I am opposed to the increasing trend of having smaller and smaller house blocks and expecting families to live on them. There may well be many people who prefer smaller house blocks, so we should provide a variety of house blocks to suit everyone's needs. When planning a development which is admitted to be primarily directed at young families, I believe it is foolhardy to plan for blocks of the size projected for Golden Grove.

Finally, there were problems relating to the provision of transport to the Golden Grove area. Early in the planning, arguments were set up as to why arterial roads servicing the area should be placed along the tops of ridges. I believe those arguments were quite valid; in fact, there was a ridge line running right through the Golden Grove area, and fortunately it coincided exactly with "travel desire" lines as established in that report. That line fed

into a corridor of land which had originally been set aside for a freeway. However, this argument was not followed through, and ultimately the report recommended that the existing Golden Grove Road be used. That road follows a creek line, and it is environmentally sensitive in certain areas. Also, it is already very heavily over-used by the existing development, which is currently concentrated on either side of Golden Grove Road, on the way to the Land Commission's Golden Grove area.

I believe that one of the reasons why these problems have arisen is that the Land Commission, which is the developer, operates to make the rules through the Golden Grove Development Committee. Although that committee has two council representatives, the Chairman of the Land Commission and the Manager of the Housing Trust, as members, the material used by that committee is largely prepared by Land Commission staff. We are in a situation where the organisation which owns and develops the land is making its own rules. That is why I believe that the problems that I have previously enunciated have arisen.

In conclusion, I say that I look forward to the challenge of serving my community in Newland in a decade that offers a great many challenges to us all as urban dwellers, South Australians, and participants in an automated, information-rich but energy-starved society. The traditional dividers of our society, that is, between rich and poor, workers and employers, I would hope are no longer appropriate. I look forward to giving broad-based representation which is needed in my electorate, which I believe is demanded by my constituents, and which I believe is to the benefit of all South Australians.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the motion, and I trust that this will be a productive session of Parliament. This may be a plaintive hope, because I have not seen much productivity so far. The Government's legislative programme is markedly weak, and I hope that it will not be very much longer before we are actually told the specifics of the legislative programme.

I congratulate the new members who have spoken today; and I think that some outstanding contributions have been made. Those new members concentrated in the main on some philosophic motions, and I propose to do the same, leading on to a discussion of two problems which are often dealt with here.

Last year in the Address in Reply debate I discussed the critical notions of freedom of the individual and economic injustice. As a social democrat, it was my view that, wherever socialism and democracy were in conflict, democracy must prevail. I spoke at some length of the brutal undemocratic States and in particular of the Marxist totalitarian regimes and the other extreme of the brutal military dictatorships. I strongly maintain that the A.L.P.'s pragmatic social democratic approach had achieved great things while still maintaining essential freedom.

The speech provoked considerable comment and correspondence, some of it highly vituperative and some of it highly complimentary. However, the most acute and objective critics put to me that, while I may have been substantially right, what I had failed to do was demonstrate just how the Western system can (while still retaining its democratic forms) deal with the great economic and social problems which confront it. That is quite a challenge. I am not so foolish as to suggest the answer, but I would like to venture a method of arriving at an answer.

Last year, I specifically renounced the Marxist theory of history, and I do so again. However, I am by no means renouncing the problem of the historical consideration of

the rise and fall of societies. That problem has been considered by historians as diverse as Plato, Gibbon, Spengler and Toynbee. What I renounce is the concept of inevitable processes. What I accept, and I think must be accepted, is that in certain circumstances societies will rise, and in other circumstances societies will fall.

I am often puzzled when I hear Marxists refer to the decadence of Western society. Decadence simply means "to fall from". However, implicit in that concept is that the fall is from something higher. I do not think that is what is meant. I think what is meant is the lowering of standards, the lessening of work, and the ridicule of essential values.

Certainly, in our society with increasing education and with increasing scepticism and cynicism, many of the values accepted by earlier generations are ridiculed or ignored. Do you very often hear anybody speak of in a committed fashion, let alone invoke, the values of authority, patriotism, loyalty or love? I think quite on the contrary: People have tended to become so disapproving that these values are scoffed at. Some people say this attitude is derived from what is now given the generous title of the "higher consciousness".

Only recently I saw an observation on higher consciousness by that great psychiatrist and a thinker, Jung. It went thus: "Nature cares nothing for higher consciousness. Nature intends that the decadent society should be destroyed." Now as warned earlier, I do not accept inevitable processes in history. Perhaps that remark goes too far, but nonetheless I am prepared to heed a warning. I have no doubt whatever that, in addition to the desolation of the values once accepted, men in Western society have shown an ignorant and arrogant claim to a modern superior wisdom and have ignored the wisdom of the ancients, the wisdom of other societies, and the wisdom of history.

It would, of course, be little to the point to criticise these attitudes if the values were rightly questioned. Is there, then, some way of demonstrating the truth of these values? I say "Yes". Equally, it would be quite wrong for me to criticise this higher consciousness or emancipation of the mind if freedom is unable to co-exist with authority, but I say not only that it can but that, in order for either to properly exist, both must exist.

Both these claims are bold enough, but I go on to make a third claim that, if the first two propositions are correct, the method of politically solving the social and economic problems we face is disclosed. In the first place, therefore, I maintain that there is an absolute set of values that is discernible. These values have been given a multitude of names, but I simply refer to them as the natural law. This set of values is not provable as we might prove a theorem in algebra. That is so because one cannot, in logical fashion, derive what one ought to do from what is. Regrettably, in the past, some proponents of the natural law, ignoring the obvious force of this maxim of logic, have called their own system into discredit. In fact, our ancestors had regard to what they called practical reason.

To take an example: why should selfishness be more rational than the opposite? The answer must be that a refusal to self-sacrifice is no more rational than its opposite. Neither choice is rational. The problem is that you cannot get from a proposition of fact any practical conclusion. "You should be unselfish" can lead to being unselfish unless you insert a notion that unselfishness benefits the man and his society. Unless we extend reason to include practical reason so that judgments such as "to be unselfish is good" are acknowledged not as feelings but as rationality itself, we will never find rational value

behind any of the acknowledged sentiments of almost every human society.

There are, I admit, those who proclaim alternatives. There is the person who seeks the alternative of instinct. He does this because, while not wishing to extend the concept of reason, he can readily see the problem that will arise if those basic sentiments (which I have claimed to be included in practical reason) were totally discredited. For example, where should we be if we totally discredited the judgments "Do not kill", "Do not steal" or "Do not bear false witness"?

There is the person who looks towards a sort of manipulation of nature so that someone decides what man is to be and makes him into it—and I think we have heard that notion before. The first man is involved with more difficulties than he can cope with. In brief, his problems just begin with the insoluble question: "What is instinct"? If I ask you how mutton birds came from China to Tasmania via South America, and if you know your natural history, you will say "by instinct". But by saying that, you are really saying, "I just don't know". As I said, that is just the beginning of his problems, and I think I shall leave him without further ado.

His opponent, the man who seeks to manipulate the future, is at least far more honest but, in my judgment, absolutely terrifying, because, if having conquered his environment man is to conquer his own nature and change it, presumably a very few people will have the choice of how it will be changed and what will become of the billions. The fact is that modern Western man is driven back to the natural law precisely because he has, in his arrogance and folly, failed to appreciate what was seen long ago, understood and explained by such diverse groupings, peoples and persons as the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Hindus, the Jews, the Greeks, Confucius, Christ, Cicero and Locke. One might also add that, to the extent that tradition can teach, the American Indian and the Australian Aboriginal both professed belief in similar laws. Indeed, one can deduce such scales of values as long ago as Neanderthal man, 50 000 B.C.

These laws may be set out in general and in very specific detail. But, in so far as a concordance of all those diverse sources is concerned, it may be said that the following are the general laws of mankind:

1. That we should do good by avoiding the commission of evil against others.
2. That we should do good specifically by loving others.
3. That we have a duty to do good and care for our parents and elders.
4. That we have a duty to our children and posterity.
5. That justice demands certain kinds of conduct in relation to dealings with others, be they sexual, financial or public.
6. That good faith and truth should prevail.
7. That the poor, the sick and the hungry should be treated with mercy.
8. That above all we should give more than all these laws and be magnanimous.

Time does not permit the proof of the derivation of those laws, but I could readily give honourable members the sources. Taking for example, Law 7 above (picked at random), Hindu, Babylonian, Egyptian, Norse, Australian Aboriginal, American Indian, Roman, Jewish and Christian sources all propounded the notion.

Even Neanderthal man can be called in evidence, and I do so. A book edited by an eminent archaeologist, Desmond Collins, and entitled *Four New Studies in Archeology and History* deals with Neanderthal man in the western plateau of Europe and the period 100 000 B.C. to

50 000 B.C. The burial practices of Neanderthal man are described. Many arrogant modern commentators have treated Neanderthal man as hardly human. The book states:

Several of the burials provide indirect evidence for some kind of closely knit society in which the old and infirm were cared for and fed after they had lost the capacity to hunt and feed themselves. The Shanidar I man had one arm amputated (the earliest known case of an operation), but had survived this to live to an advanced age. He and another old man from La Chapelle were both arthritic to a degree which would have made hunting impossible, and food must have been provided by others. The latter had so little of his tooth row left that his food must have been pre-masticated for him.

These laws are, in my judgment, the simple result of reflection upon what conduct is most conducive towards co-operation with nature seen in its widest context. I am not trying to prove any authority by common consent. Its validity simply cannot be deduced.

Either you wish to see into the nature of things or you do not. Our ancestors saw this long ago and set it all out. I am not saying that this is the end of the matter, because, of course, there must be continuing development and continuing insight. I am not saying that there are not conflicts and, indeed, sometimes absurdities in the literature. I am not involved in preaching theism, although I am a theist. What I am saying is that until very recent times all teachers and even all men believed the universe to be such that certain emotional reactions on our part could be either congruous or incongruous to it. I am equally not attacking science, but on looking at history I find a strange coincidence of an almost contemporaneous development of modern science, religious revolution and capitalism.

I am most certainly not supporting the forms of society in which this natural law was accepted. There is a wide gap between saying what is right and doing what is right. That is the next and far more important question, namely, how specifically are the general laws (if they are to influence us) to be used for maximum community good? What I do say is that the natural law provides a common human law of justice and action that can arch over the rulers and the ruled alike. There needs to be some objective value if rule is not to be tyranny and obedience not slavery.

The scientific revolution to which I referred helped produce tremendous benefits for mankind. Regrettably, it also called into question, quite wrongly, the objective moral values of mankind; these need to be restated, and this I have done.

The scientific revolution, in its impact on the moral laws of mankind, has produced a strange situation, which reminds me of the Irish man, who having discovered a fuel which would halve his fuel bill, bought another heater so he could pay nothing.

In general terms one may say, therefore, that there is an objective set of authority. Of course, any number of institutions could claim, and in fact do claim, to fit within these standards. I am sure that, of all the revolutions of the last 500 years, the creation of a set of democratic institutions most certainly falls within these laws, and could enable their implementation. Furthermore, to a great extent it has allowed it. Just compare the lot of the common man in Western Europe 100 years ago, 50 years ago, and today.

The problem which is caused for many people is the conflict between authority (as exemplified in the institution) and freedom of conscience. But, I repeat that, in my belief, in order for either to properly exist, both must exist. Untrammelled freedom is really a contradiction.

At this point, I am concerned to deal with that proposition as distinct from a method of achieving specific solutions. In this latter context the actual leaders of the institutions have in fact debased their authority. For example, I do not need to press the point that never have politicians been in lower esteem. Better education and better reporting have often let the emperor be seen naked. Watergate certainly is an example, and we all know of many more.

However, in the context of the theory, let me suggest that we can find in the religious institutions a striking example to assist us. Luther began his revolution very much at the time that the scientific revolution began and as capitalism was first seen. He challenged the Catholic Church with submissions of reason and scholarship. In effect, he was a professor advising men to freely, collectively, and sanely look at the evidence and face up to the conclusion.

Rome never answered Luther but sought only to silence him. But the result, with Rome seeking unity above truth and the Reformers the reverse, was to split the Church in half. The trouble is that until very recently both parts were sick and, sadly, neither was seeking to do much about it. The Reformers have gone through a restless time, split into literally thousands of factions, all searching for truth and acknowledging very little authority. Likewise, in the Catholic Church there is a profound problem, as people demand a proper degree of free intellectual criticism. It seems quite manifest that until that freedom is reconciled with some authority the whole cause must suffer.

Latterly, the signs are, on the Catholic side, that authority should face the conclusions of truth, and, on the Reform side, that freedom of conscience without responsibility to any authority is self-destructive. So, I think, in the political order it follows that unless there is a fair proportion of each quality very great problems will persist. I briefly quote James Atkinson on *The Trial of Luther*, because I think it has remarks very relevant to our time, as follows:

There is no doubt that a critical examination of Luther's trial is a worthy and significant inquiry in itself. But over and around this study play a few subtle harmonies which it is well worth straining the ear to hear. First, there is the existentialist, contemporary tone that pervades the whole proceedings. And then, in a society which seems to drift, borne along by economic, cultural, social and political tides we can neither understand nor control—we drift into wars nobody wants, we are dictated to by economics nobody understands, we are carried along in a sea of pop art, pop music, pop urban development, pop universities which nobody questions—it is salutary to reflect on a man who would not drift but called a halt to the world with those memorable words, "Here I stand."

I think all of those comments are extremely valid indeed. We do drift along, in a sort of economic tide which we do not understand and which we certainly cannot control. We do drift along, dictated to by political forces, in such a way that we drift into wars that no-one wanted in the first place. We do have a debasement of excellence, such that pop art, pop music, pop urban development and pop universities will seem to survive against their intellectual superiors.

While the two notions on the validity of the natural law and the reconciliation of authority and freedom may seem unrelated, in fact a proper balance of authority and freedom society can best conduce to the principles of the natural law. I have emphasised these matters because there is a style of academic thought in great vogue which ridicules both propositions. Not only that, but its

advocates take every opportunity to ridicule those who state the contrary, and use their lofty education to brow-beat anyone who would oppose them.

The recent radical theorist has glorified feeling over thought, will or desire over reflection, violence over politics, and instant satisfaction over anything else. What this has led to is the debasement of the individual, not the ennoblement of the individual. It appears to glory in undisciplined, irresponsible, greedy and lawless individuals not giving a damn for anyone or anything. The fact is that our country can no longer afford to be dominated by an intellectualism which is arrogant, misguided, dangerous and wrong. In terms of our education we need to teach the pupil to like and dislike what he should, that is, to like the basic principles of the natural law and reject the opposite.

That does not affect his freedom because, when the age of reason comes, he can and will determine the basic truths as he sees them himself. Really, it is a relentless search for truth that provides the key which links the natural law to the good of society. One obtains truth only by accepting duties such as work, learning, and responsibility and setting a high standard for oneself. Of course, one will not be popular in advocating any of these things—many people have a vested interest in obscuring the truth.

Bearing in mind the principles that I have stated and arguing them to be true, I would next attempt to use those principles in the attempted solution of two major problems. The problems with which I deal are, first, law and order, and, secondly, unemployment. Law and order expresses in a nutshell the natural law. People should not hurt each other, nor should they be frightened of each other, but to understand the natural law is very different from practising it.

When people talk of the problem of law and order in Adelaide today, I understand them to demand that society remove or restrict, as far as possible, violence to the person and violence to property. There has been an overwhelming, almost a tidal wave, increase in crimes of violence throughout the Western world and throughout Australia in the past 15 or 20 years.

Mr. Payne: Not just in South Australia.

Mr. McRAE: Certainly not just in South Australia but throughout Australia and the Western world. In South Australian terms, it has been highlighted by the gruesome graveyard scenes at Truro and other horrible offences which we would not want to specify much in a forum such as this. From the ordinary people that I have spoken to, it would appear that very little intellectual theory is involved. People simply demand that girls should have a much better chance of surviving teenage, bearing in mind Truro, or of living the teenage years without being raped, molested or bashed, as far too often happens. People simply demand that they may walk the streets safely without being threatened or beaten. Nobody I have spoken to is very interested in comparative figures of 50 years ago in Adelaide, or in comparative figures with other countries. What they do want is safety now, and I agree with them.

To achieve this result you have to want to achieve it and, if you really want to achieve it, it will require a lot of money. I think that Governments of all persuasions, and specifically in this State both my Party and the Liberal Party, have continued to put the criminal justice area at the bottom of the pile because there are rarely votes in it. But it might be different now, after Truro and after some of the ghastly rapes and other sexual molestations we have seen. In the first place, I think we need to spend money on research so that we can properly understand the problem. While that is happening, however, there are certain obvious remedies, not all of them costing money.

If society wants to eliminate the problem, it should give a proper education to the child in the home and a proper education in the school. One obvious means of reducing the problem is to make the Police Force more effective by employing more officers and training them better. This is so, obviously, because the bigger the risk of being caught and punished the more the deterrent to the criminal, but that costs money. I outlined this in the lines of the Budget, in the criminal justice area, and I was perturbed to find that there had been no real increase in that area, even though the present Government has highlighted the very area. We should try to make the Police Force more effective and increase the catching the criminal ratio.

Another obvious necessity is to provide more and better-trained parole officers. At the moment their work load is ridiculous; again, this costs money. If one really wants to set out to rehabilitate people, and if one accepts that there is a certain percentage of people who can be rehabilitated, it is absurd to ask parole officers to accept a work load that is so heavy that no reasonable person can get a result.

Yet another thing that is needed is a more effective prison environment with more gradings; that is, many different types of prison rather than the very limited range we have at the moment, but that costs money as well. I will be so bold as to say that, if the taxpayer is prepared to spend the money, a great deal could be achieved. While those practical things were being done research would be under way to try and get at the underlying causes.

I think that, in terms of sentencing, society probably wants a stage reached where a person is simply warehoused out of the way. I mean by that, a person is given a sentence which reflects no rehabilitation and no deterrent to others but which simply demonstrates that society has run out of patience with a habitual offender and finds it cheaper and safer to lock him up and keep him for extended periods rather than do anything else.

Certainly (and I emphasised this in debate on some lines in the Budget), I think that the rights of the victim must be looked at, and that was one of the reasons why I mentioned certain types of prison establishment. It is to the former Government's credit that it first introduced the concept of compensation for criminal injuries inflicted by criminals and then substantially increased it. It also provided help for victims, such as the Rape Crisis Centre. However, under our current system, it is a fact that the victim tends to get overlooked. Again, it would cost money, but why should not all victims receive at least the compensation that they could receive in the civil courts? And again, in the case of those criminals where it is practical, why should they not, during and after the completion of their sentence, be required to meet that cost?

I most strongly urge this on all thinking members of the House, that an insurance scheme be worked out to compensate the victims, as we do the victims of road accidents or accidents in the work place. I ask members, also, to bear in mind (and I think I gave some practical examples of this during an earlier debate) that one of the most odious features of the situation that exists is that in many cases the criminal, even after conviction, and after receiving a substantial sentence, can still, at the expiration of that sentence, wipe the victim from his mind. He does not have to work to compensate that victim. I believe that we should have different types of prison so that a criminal, where it is safe to release him, is called on to work to earn money and to pay that money to the victim on some basis which can be regulated over a period of time and which would not make a sacrificial offering of his innocent wife and children. To the furthest extent that that could be

done that justifies the employment of many people so that we do not have these criminals laughing at us. I am afraid that that is what is tending to happen; they laugh at us and the kindness we demonstrate to them, and they do not respect us because of that kindness.

I am very cautious about any interference with judicial discretion. It is true, I think, that in the last 15 years we have seen the pendulum swing from severity to leniency, but I think the judges take into account public attitudes and I think the pendulum is now being steadied towards the centre. There must, of course, be communication between the community and its judges. Contrary to what many people imagine, many of the judges make conscious efforts to use public transport and in other ways ascertain the feelings of the ordinary citizen. So it should be, but I deplore the notion propounded recently by the Director of the Festival of Light that people should pack the galleries and, in effect, boo the umpire if they think the decision is wrong. That tends to remind me of the French Revolution or the Communes of China.

Among the research which I would propose, I would most certainly request information as to the factors which have produced the vicious and violent sexual criminal. I have conducted many criminal cases, from traffic offences to rape and murder, and I think I am not readily shocked, but I must confess that some of the pack rapists of recent times have displayed behaviour of a most sickeningly horrible kind, and one wonders where or how such attitudes develop.

That is the point of research. It is a fact that our society is afflicted with violence of every sort. Among academic circles the present battle lines of controversy lie between instinctivists like Lorenz, who argue that man's destructiveness has been inherited from his animal ancestors, and behaviourists like Skinner, who maintain that there are no innate human traits since everything is the result of social conditioning.

In his remarkable book *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* Erich Fromm, while conceding that there is a kind of aggression which man shares with animals, goes on to show that it is defensive in nature, designed to ensure survival. On the other hand, malignant aggression, or destructiveness, in which man kills without biological or social purpose, is peculiarly human and not instinctive; it is part of human character, one of the passions, like love, ambition and greed.

From this theoretical position, Fromm studies both the conditions that elicit defensive aggression and those that cause genuine destructiveness. He draws on the most significant findings of neurophysiology, prehistory, anthropology and animal psychology, and presents a global and historical study of human destructiveness that enables a sound evaluation of the date for oneself. Fromm takes into account both the subconscious forces of the individual, and the social and cultural factors as well. As a matter of interest, he studies in great depth the extreme violence of figures such as Stalin, Himmler and Hitler. Utilising anthropological evidence, Fromm also argues that primitive societies—the hunters and food gatherers—were the least aggressive, and that exploitation and war results from the growth of civilisation and the advent of patriarchal societies. I welcome this book for its solid vindication of human dignity and for its appeal to men and women to change their lives and the social-political environment in order to create new possibilities for human growth. Fromm, however, vindicates human dignity and claims that by a change in the social environment and in the standards of the individual new possibilities emerge, not only of restricting violence but of positively promoting good.

I would like to see every educated man and woman read this book so that the force of what I say can receive the support of one of the great minds of the western world. There is no question that Eric Fromm is in that category. The overall point that I make is that, in relation to law and order, by maintaining a right perspective and rigorously searching out the truth rather than the emotion, a great deal can be achieved. In this area we have surely learned that we toppled too far in favour of a so-called freedom, for which authority (and in a democracy that means you and I) is now paying a heavy price.

Never forget, however, that while it is true that many criminals have got their way through the system that we created, with little good for themselves and no good for us, there are probably an equal number who have achieved hope that was never theirs and a lifestyle they could not understand, to our great positive advantage, because of the new human style of justice in the 1970's in the juvenile and adult courts.

Finally, just in case honourable members think I might be far too intellectual about all this, I quote Britain's former top Police Chief, and Australia's new Commonwealth security adviser, Sir Robert Marks, who said in an interview in the *Listener* on 31 May 1979:

I think we are about to be subject to what I call the pendulum principle. I mean by this that there will be a shift in public opinion which will begin to disapprove of violence and which will tend to express itself by demanding more police, better-paid police, better distributed police, severer penalties in the courts. I personally hope that doesn't go too far. I wouldn't want to see us as a country in which it was openly declared that the only way we could live together was because we had so many policemen and such harsh laws, and that was the only way to achieve order. I think we shall go on showing the same tendencies, and I must say I don't see any reversal of them, but I do think that if we could inform the public more widely about what is happening, and have less sensationalism and more accuracy, we could see it in better perspective. We would, therefore, be less emotional and we might begin to find better solutions.

I turn to the next, and by far the most important issue, in my judgment, that confronts society, and that is unemployment. Surely it is dreadfully unjust that some men and women are condemned to a life of idleness against their wishes even though they may be paid a fairly humble pension. I doubt that many would be heard to deny it. Until recently I had thought there was little that could be done. However, I have recently come across a very interesting consideration of this matter by Mr. P. P. McGuinness, the economic editor of the *Australian Financial Review*.

He posed the question: "How can unemployment be overcome and why is the question of real wages crucial?" He continued:

If the economy behaves as past experience has shown it will, general measures of stimulus cannot succeed in decreasing unemployment while real wages remain fixed, except at the cost of catastrophic increases in prices and the trade deficit. This, however, means a reduction in real wages after tax. It could, however, be argued that such subsidies to increase employment would be equivalent to an increase in the "social wage", since it would greatly increase the security of incomes for those who might otherwise be under the threat of unemployment. But such an increase in the "social wage" must come about as a result of reduced real wages after tax—that is, a redistribution of income from wage-earners already in employment to wage-earners at present unemployed.

It would not be appropriate to finance such subsidies by way of increasing taxes on profits, since this would defeat the

intention of restoring the incentive of investors and companies to invest and employ labour, but there is every reason why the real wages of those on high incomes should be cut proportionately more.

However, his startling conclusion may be summarised as follows:

Dixon and Powell estimate that, to eliminate 5 per cent unemployment by real wage cuts alone, the required reduction in real wages would be 9.7 per cent. That is, on the current level of average weekly earnings of about \$214 a week, extra tax of the order of \$20 a week would be required.

On the impact calculations, a 3 per cent increase in aggregate demand combined with a 6 per cent cut in real wages would increase employment by 5 per cent and reduce the consumer price index by nearly 1.5 per cent with no change in the balance of trade. That is to say, for an average cost per employed person of about \$6 per week we could abolish unemployment and reduce prices. Again, provided that the high income groups were taxed more heavily, this could mean a cost to the ordinary wage-earner of no more than \$3 or \$4 a week.

A combination of cuts in real wages by means of the abandonment of wage indexation and by increased personal income taxation, with moderate fiscal expansion to stimulate demand, subsidies to wages (especially those of disadvantaged groups such as young people, women and Aborigines) and direct job creation could return Australia fairly rapidly to full employment.

However, it seems all too probable that unemployment will persist since the vast majority of those in employment are unwilling to accept a temporary reduction in their living standards, even of the order of a few dollars a week. On the contrary, by escalating claims with respect to real wages and demanding reduction in taxation, the majority are contributing to increasing and perpetuating the level of unemployment.

Not being an economist I would not like to proclaim that Mr. McGuinness had found the answer to the problem. However, there is support for what he says in a recent comment by Professor Richard Blandy of the National Institute of Labour Studies, Flinders University, who says:

The crucial question for youth employment is to increase the level of economic activity in Australia and to return to a satisfactory rate of growth of output and, therefore, employment. Economists' opinions are divided on how best this might be done. But, I believe most economists would accept that unemployment would fall if the Commonwealth Government were to take fiscal measures to expand aggregate demand, and our wage-fixing institutions were to commit themselves to a sustained period of wage restraint which I see as broadly consistent with the wage indexation package (at about the rate of price inflation, discount the effects of devaluation if that proved necessary). The major fear holding back fiscal stimulus must surely be the fear of rekindling wage inflation and consequently making little impact on the general level of unemployment. What is required now is, in the words of Professor Corden:

... a genuine partnership between an imaginative Government and co-operative trade unions in which the safely employed citizens of Australia—especially in their capacity as organised employees—are willing to make sacrifices for the minority who are unemployed, or whose employment is less secure . . .

What I want to know is whether Mr. McGuinness or Professor Blandy is right. I do not want people to shout slogans at me, depending on whether they are in the Labor Party or the Liberal Party, or whatever are their economic philosophies, because the issue is too important. I suspect that one of them may be thinking correctly.

If we assume that Mr. McGuinness is right, have we not reached the crunch there? Are we, as employed people, prepared to make the sacrifice which would restore total employment? Mr. McGuinness thinks not. I would like to think so, but I suspect it might take an all-Party consensus to achieve it.

I have recently (and I cannot refer to the content, because they are Questions on Notice) put an initiative to the Minister of Industrial Affairs that there be an all-Party approach on the matter of unemployment to see whether we can come up with a solution. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 4, line 28 (clause 8)—After “employer” insert “, who adds to the number of his employees by employing persons under the age of twenty years.”

No. 2. Page 4, line 32 (clause 8)—Leave out “is entitled to” and insert “qualifies for”.

No. 3. Page 4, lines 41 to 43 (clause 8)—Leave out subsection (5) and insert subsections as follows:

(5) Where the Treasurer is satisfied that an applicant qualifies for a refund of pay-roll tax in accordance with criteria for the time being in force under this section, he may make such a refund accordingly.

(5a) The amount of a refund payable to an employer under this section shall not exceed in any one year—

(a) Where the refund is payable in relation to the employment of one additional employee—six hundred dollars;

or

(b) Where the refund is payable in relation to the employment of two or more additional employees—eighteen hundred dollars.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments Nos. 1 to 3 be agreed to.

The amendments moved in the Upper House do a great deal to strengthen the Bill in two important respects: first, to ensure that, with regard to the rebate system described in clause 8, the responsible Minister is empowered to exercise an administrative discretion. The second suggested amendment more clearly brings the Bill into conformity with the well-established principle that matters of policy, especially taxation policy, should always be prescribed in statutory form and that only the administrative details of a policy proposal should be expressed in regulatory form. This would go a long way towards meeting one or two of the objections raised by the Opposition here.

In the matter of Ministerial discretion, the Government accepts that a reasonable latitude should be available to the Minister to deal effectively with unforeseen contingencies that may arise. In any legislative initiative of this kind, in which the concepts are novel and opportunities to revise and refine them in the light of experience have not yet arisen, there is almost inevitably the possibility of abuse. The Government therefore accepts that it would be wise to introduce an administrative discretion which would be exercised against an employer who may technically have established a qualification for the refund but who has not acted within the spirit of the new legislation.

The Government also believes that the statutory

expression which seeks to confer such a discretion on the Minister should be clear and unambiguous. It might be argued that the discretion is already imported, by the use of the word “may” in subclause (5) of clause 8. However, notwithstanding the provisions of the Acts Interpretation Act, courts have on occasion chosen to interpret that word as if it imposed a mandatory requirement. In view of this consideration, and in order to dispel all doubt, it has been proposed that the change be made in line 32 as well as a new subclause (5) to provide that, before making a refund, the Treasurer must be satisfied that the employer genuinely qualifies for the refund. In practical terms, this means that the Treasurer must be satisfied that the employer has acted within the spirit of the scheme and has in fact made a significant contribution to the solution of the problem of youth unemployment. I believe that that also answers some of the queries raised by members of the Opposition.

As to the second question, it is a moot point whether clause (8) explicitly states the rebate policy announced at the last election, and certainly, when the Bill is read in conjunction with the second reading speech and the Government's other explicit assurances in relation to clause 8, there can be no doubt as to the details of policy and the limits of that policy. The Government accepts, however, that debate may arise as to whether clause 8, when read alone, contains an appropriate statement of policy, and will therefore accept new subclause (5A).

I should explain that it is only on the basis of compelling advice to the Government that clause 8 was drawn in such a way as to delegate the details of specific criteria to the regulations. It has been pointed out in the amendments moved in another place that any attempt to prescribe exhaustively in this Bill all the criteria that must be met by an employer in order to qualify for a refund (that is, to take account of all possible contingencies) would be a drafting impossibility. That is the reason why the precise definitions of “continuous employment”, “full-time employment”, “additional employment” and so forth are to be left to regulation. However, the Government accepts that the maximum refund payable to an employer can be expressed in statutory form, and accordingly this statement of policy is incorporated both in the amendment to line 28 and in new subclause (5A).

Finally I pay a tribute to the work that was done by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and for his contribution to this policy proposal. He worked extremely diligently on drafting the original proposals, and I believe that he has done a great deal towards helping the special youth employment initiatives enshrined in this Bill, which is a tribute both to his concern for the unemployed youth of South Australia and to his creative ingenuity.

I believe that the amendments moved in another place overcome many of the doubts which the Opposition has expressed. I agree that, although the House agreed to the Bill when it was originally proposed, it expressed some doubts, which I accept as being genuinely held. I believe that the amendments which have now been made in another place have satisfactorily resolved those doubts.

Mr. BANNON: This is the first opportunity I have had to look at these amendments. The measure is essentially a technical one. Therefore, I would like to have the opportunity to peruse not only the amendments which have just been before us but also the remarks made by the Premier on I think his action of not giving us some forewarning showed a lack of courtesy. I would appreciate it if the Government would accept a motion that progress be reported to allow us to have time to look at them.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.
Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 757.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Earlier, I was concluding my remarks on the question of unemployment and putting the view that it would indeed be a disastrous situation if there was some possibility, by a sacrifice throughout the community, of removing this plight, but nothing was done about it. I also pointed out that it might take an all-Party consensus to arrive at the situation. Recently, the Premier of Tasmania, Mr. Doug Lowe, stated that Australia would face massive problems in the final 20 years of this century unless the political Parties were prepared to take common ground in some areas at least. If Mr. McGuinness is right, would it not be an abomination for the political Parties not to try, and, if the proposal could be implemented but was rejected by those in employment, what a dreadful thing that would be. It is by reference to the natural law that one knows the dreadful injustice here, and it is by rigorous adherence to the truth that it might be solved.

I think that, in relation to these problems and many others, the A.L.P.'s platform and policy are well geared. I think where all Australian political Parties may have to adjust is in relation to national problems, which simply should not become political footballs. Among these issues are key economic issues such as unemployment and the key population issues such as the decision that must soon be made, in the face of Australia's ageing population, as to whether large scale immigration should not recommence.

As will be apparent, adherence to the natural law, far from being a conservative approach, is, and demands, in its own terms, a radical approach. That is why many of our current leaders carefully observe only a lip service to doctrine. To achieve the justice of the natural law requires social and economic conditions favourable to the full development of man's genuine needs and capacities. That is why the Capper Commission for Justice and Peace was so violently criticised recently when it put forward constructive statements along those lines. Although those statements were radical, they were nonetheless in line with the natural law and Christian principles. Some people thought, because those radical terms did not fit in with their current terms, that it was best to brush the commission off as Marxist.

The principles that I have been espousing postulate enormous changes in the social order. That is why very early in this speech I criticised the ignorance and arrogance of modern Western man. We who have been used to rule over technically backward people have come to see them as savages. But for all our technical mastery, we are the cripples of nature and our own worst destruction. We have never been impressed by the dignity or the kindness or the co-operation of primitive man. After all, if we can send a man to the moon or destroy an entire city with the push of a button, why should we be? Just because we have our values so hopelessly confused, we can offer little help to anyone.

So I am saying that fundamental changes are necessary in the economic and political order and also in our values

and conduct. But I am asserting that these changes are possible and can be compatible with freedom if we have the faith in ourselves to dare to attempt these things.

In the first place, it must be appreciated that we live in a period of tremendous instability and public disillusion. There is no question that in the last century there has been the most tremendous improvement in the Australian standard of living and quality of life. In that century, an understanding and application of science and technology vastly lowered the ravages of disease, provided a very much better standard of housing and sanitation, decreased working hours, increased real incomes, provided universal education to one of the highest average levels in the world, provided more recreation, and generally, one would have thought, given every opportunity for a very happy life. But the fact is that if anything we are no happier, and in reality we are a very disillusioned, restless, resentful and even angry nation. We have lived in a world which has been continually at war of one kind or another throughout my life and in a continual state of turbulence. Within the last 15 years, at a terrifying pace, just about every institution that helped provide stability has been torn apart.

The divorce rate has ripped the family apart, and new science and knowledge appears, at least for the moment, to have pulled the churches down as another stabilising force. Politicians, and that means Governments, which quite rightly should be regarded with suspicion, are now regarded with the utmost contempt as the lodging places of corrupt, immoral, illegal and at times even criminal conduct, and who can blame anyone for that, after the events here, in the United States, and throughout the world in the last decade? Even the Judiciary, once free from public question, at least in this country, has now been increasingly called into question.

In summary, is it any wonder that people are confused when a mass of grubby politicians, smeared with the taint of corruption by association, ceaselessly mislead, intimidate, manipulate and cheat, to gain and then maintain a power which they then cannot use, to deal with the very problems that worry most people? No wonder extremist forces of the right and the left rejoice in this confusion and disillusion, and do everything possible to engender and increase the hatred latent there.

Democracy and our whole style of constitutional government is gravely at risk. I could not agree more with people like Doug Lowe and Bob Hawke, who point out that, if we are to gain redemption from these evils, it will be absolutely necessary to fight for some consensus on our basic aims and the commonsense methods of solving our basic problems. Extremists of both sides are a real impediment towards the real resolution of our problems. As I have already indicated, I think that by political means we could solve the unemployment question if we could gain a consensus. But, while it remains a football for each side, it will not be solved.

The two questions of law and order, and unemployment, already referred to, are, I think, undoubtedly related. There is little question that the young community brought up with high expectations will be bitter and frustrated when those expectations are dashed, either because there is no employment or because the employment holds no interest, let alone a challenge. And, against the background of a loss of the classic stabilising factors I have referred to, and a loss of understanding of the basic laws of nature, who would not expect an upsurge of violence and anti-social behaviour? If we who are employed are not prepared to make sacrifices, we pave the way for the very behaviour we complain of.

Really, then, it gets back to a question of education. All the scientific knowledge in the world will not produce a

useful or happy person unless he or she can understand the basic laws of his or her nature and of mankind. As I have demonstrated, that involves no imposition of religion necessarily, but it does provide a basis of certainty. Those who cannot or do not want to understand all this are paving the way for their own destruction.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the honourable member for Brighton, I point out that he will make a maiden speech, and I ask honourable members to afford him the normal courtesies.

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I would like to express my thanks to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to the Speaker for your words of advice and encouragement, enabling me to settle down to the task of being a useful member of the Parliament, and for the latitude afforded me as a new member during this session of Parliament. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the electors of Brighton for affording me this wonderful opportunity to be their elected representative. I hope that my dedication to the task will be received in the way in which it is given. Of course, I follow a man who left an indelible mark on this State, and I shall work towards being the personal and responsible representative whom all my electors seek and hope for in the District of Brighton. I look forward to the task with excitement and a great deal of enthusiasm.

Last week, at an interdenominational meeting at Brighton, I listened to a talk about computers and the guest speaker threw out the challenge for us to debate the question of the problems of computers versus the advantages, and to arrive finally at some general conclusion. It is apparent that in the more developed and advanced countries of the world (for example, the United States of America, Japan and the European Common Market countries) this question has been faced and largely accepted, whereas we in Australia are intent on making it an issue. Thus, I accept the challenge of a debate to reach a personal conclusion of thought and philosophy on this issue.

I accept that the technological age is not around the corner but has, in fact, been with us for some considerable time. What is happening is simply that machines are becoming more sophisticated and more advanced and are able to do the job infinitely better each year. Thus, the problem of machines replacing workers in each field is compounding each year. The cost of these machines is becoming less and they need far less maintenance; thus, the switch from manual to mechanical employment is becoming more attractive. This is not a new phenomenon. This progress of man has been going on for years. Before the industrial revolution, it was not uncommon for a man to work 12 hours a day, six days a week. If one had said to employees at that time that work would be cut to 36 hours a week, the cry would have gone up that they could not live on the wage for that period of 36 hours. We know now, of course, that quite the opposite came to pass.

The question of surplus labour in industry and commerce represents a very large number of those already unemployed and, together with depressed markets, school-leavers and the lost job opportunities from companies chased from the market place because of prohibitive costs versus depressed income, probably constitutes most of those unemployed. For this reason, the technological age of change is seen as a bogey, devouring job after job in its progressive search for digestive material. Its progress seems infinite as time goes on, and those far more experienced than I predict astounding things to come. This simply means that work, both industrial and commercial, can be done far more

efficiently and quickly than by any manual operation.

In turn, this must mean more leisure time. Therefore, the debate suggests that progress is inevitable and that machines will almost govern everything we do. Leisure time will be extensive, and fewer workers will be needed to support the community. The only part of this debate that I find difficult to accept is that part in relation to employment and the surplus in the work force. It is my belief that the role we may take is inter-related to the total question, for, if we have more leisure time and there exists a need to take up the slack in unemployment, we should look no further than the area of leisure and tourism. Therefore, I offer a basis on which to commence a fundamental debate, and I would like to throw out the challenge to industry, commerce and honourable members to argue the pros and cons of the following argument as a viable alternative and the inevitability of what may happen over the next 15 years.

I have always held to the tourist industry belief: that tourism will eventually become the world's largest industry. Indeed, it is predicted that by the mid-1980's tourism and travel will be just that—the world's largest industry. For the past 20 years, I have been a member of that industry, which has been subjected to great changes and which has travelled the road from a speculative industry to a profession, an industry that has in the space of 30 years seen the flight times from Australia to the United Kingdom reduced from 96 hours to 16½ hours. Some of the people involved in the tourist industry can perhaps be rather likened to some politicians in that all they have to offer is dreams, and usually these are other people's dreams, but the difference that I see between a good travel agent and a bad travel agent is simply that one achieves reality and the other seemingly achieves the nightmares.

The same might be said of politicians and their collective results. It is a shame that past efforts by Ministers of Tourism have effectively reduced tourism in this State to a Cinderella based fairy story. The only problem is that the fairy godmother has hitherto got lost along the way. I believe that this is because those in Parliament, local government, industry, and commerce have failed to grasp the full importance and meaning of this commodity. Most have been content to pay only a marginal lip service to this sleeping giant.

In the early 1960's, some 40 passenger vessels plied between Australia and Europe, between South-East Asia and Australia, and from the general Pacific to Australia. As the speed of aircraft increased, and as the size of the equipment grew, shipping died a slow and purposeful death. It made way for the advent of air travel in bulk numbers. Now that these bulk numbers have arrived, we see the mushrooming effect of a new industry commenced in its growth upwards. The dream has become a reality in certain parts of the world, and the dream of Sir Barnes Wallis, the noted inventor and designer who died recently, was of an aircraft, flying at 24 000 km/h, flying from the United Kingdom to Australia in two hours. How long will it take to reach reality? Not long, I think.

Tourism is continuing to grow, and with it the need to provide jobs to service that growth industry. If I suggest that honourable members should sit back and close their eyes, trying not to sleep, but to build up a mental image of what tourism might do for this State, they might grasp the importance of the industry. If tourism continues to grow in the mid-1980's, by the end of the 1980's Australia, as a destination, may expect to receive 10 000 000 visitors per annum. On the basis of this exciting growth, South Australia may receive 10 per cent of those arrivals, or a million visitors annually.

For those uninitiated in the field of tourism, this could result in perhaps the following things happening: an aircraft arriving and departing Adelaide Airport every 12 minutes, a coach arriving and departing from our central terminals every hour, and a train arriving or departing interstate from the station adjacent to this Chamber three times each day. Honourable members might now perceive the glimmering of some of the problem side of tourism in bulk handling.

Let us imagine that an aircraft holds 120 tourists and a coach to transport the tourists holds 40 passengers. That means three coaches travelling to and from the airport every eight minutes in the peak season, or it could mean a coach leaving the airport or city every 3½ minutes, carrying visitors in transit. Coupled with this, we will have those coaches transporting our visitors to and from the resorts, the touristic attractions, our wineries, and sight-seeing in general. Therefore, we might expect many more coaches and vehicles on our roads.

The problem immediately comes to mind of the need to house these tourists and the location of the hotels that we need to cope with such a demand. If we are to avoid the problems of Paris, Rome, London, and many other cities of the world, we must ensure that we do not block the city totally. Thus, a need may exist to create and locate our hotels more probably on the outskirts of our hallowed green belt. We might start around the Mile End railway sidings, or Dequetteville Terrace, or North Adelaide.

Perhaps to facilitate the speed of transferring these visitors on their arrivals and departures, a need may exist for an express ring road connecting this hotel zone with the airport, wherever it might end up being, to cope with the traffic volume that would be created by such large numbers. Following this ring road, one might also envisage a futuristic monorail type system and, of necessity, the railhead and coach terminals would need to be situated in or near the hotel zones. To service the needs of our residents and our visitors, it would be advantageous to have a free commuter type service between the city and the hotel zone and the ring road.

What sort of development would this mean for South Australia? The scene of development and success could be viewed from every vantage point in South Australia. To cope with such a visitor intake, another 300 000 jobs would be created in Australia, because it takes one person to service the needs of three tourists. Therefore, the development of housing in suburban areas would be rekindled, and once again we might see the builders scurrying up and down their ladders. Thus, in itself, we will find that tourism will lead to the need for increased traffic corridors, motorways, or freeways. It will hasten the development of our transport system, maybe even of a futuristic monorail type system which could be built over existing corridors and routes. The growth of residential areas will create suburban retail development, which will surge ahead, creating even more jobs and prosperity.

There may be a need to see a change in the educational emphasis on languages, for a need will exist for language courses for such purposes as the training of guides, shop assistants, waiters, waitresses, tourist bureau staff, transport facilities, hotel staff, and taxi drivers—and the list goes on and on. A typical example of the disadvantages we face exists, say, with Japanese tourists at present coming to Australia. I refer to groups of Japanese tourists arriving more regularly in Melbourne. They stay at the one hotel, because it is the only hotel that caters for a Japanese interpreter. They eat at one restaurant, because it is the only restaurant with a Japanese menu. They shop at one store, because it is the only one that has Japanese interpreters. Obviously, when we encourage overseas

visitors to our country, our shop assistants, our hotel operators, and our restaurants must be available to communicate with the people in their common tongue.

I turn now to the involvement that local government will need in the overall concept of tourism. Local government will, of necessity, have to be included in such a development, as it will in itself have the potential of altering the very nature of our daily lives. The local council zoning of development and for the improvement of service facilities must be considered in the light of an overall plan. The need to incorporate those in commerce and industry speaks for itself, as each person in industry, and in commercial ventures, would, of necessity, be touched by such formal developments and by the influx of so many different people from so many different nations.

To avoid the problems inherent in any such drastic change, such as experienced in other capital cities throughout the world, we need to learn the vital lesson that piecemeal development can only result in piecemeal, willy nilly facilities being provided. It also leads to the problem of developers creating cartels and holding up inflated prices for hotel accommodation, for facilities and for prices of commodities, so perhaps a control board must be set up to participate in some way by accepting the challenge and working upon it.

The trade union movement must accept full responsibility for seeing that such opportunity for the provision of jobs is not thwarted by its need to gain a greater share of the proceeds, thus forcing the product beyond the range of those very people who can, and will, provide the jobs. That simply means that a fair wage level has to be negotiated so that the provision of penalty rates can be disbanded.

At the same time, operators of hotels must look to methods of cost saving. That means that they must reach a stage where they are viable and efficient organisations. I notice in a copy of today's *Hotel Magazine*, that there is talk of the one commodity that is most important to tourism. A report states that poor service knocks tourism. No truer words have been spoken about this particular industry than those, so even those who own motels and hotels must look to their own laurels to see that they have the efficiency to create the proceeds that they need for the profitable existence of their business. The need to reinvest profits in this State will be a priority to finance other projects allied with such development.

Primary industry, as I understand it, will be pushed, but the milk industry may be the hardest hit. I wonder whether this State could provide enough pure milk to feed us all. Therefore, the development plan for tourism in such large numbers may have to improve regionalised development for dairy farmers and expansion of holdings in areas that can produce pastures for the dairy industry so that it can produce the milk needed. Our most precious commodity is water, and greater concern and development may have to be afforded to this area and consideration given to such modern things as desalination plants for the provision of fresh water.

We may ask how this is all going to take place. First, I re-emphasise the point that it will come to pass, not in five years, not in eight years, but I predict that it may happen within 10 or 15 years. I therefore ask myself whether South Australia will be ready for such a development. I seriously doubt that it will unless action is taken.

The need to develop a master plan incorporating the State Government, local government, industry and commerce is of paramount importance because, as I said before, no piecemeal, willy nilly scheme will work. Therefore, the plan must be developed over a period of time, with adjustment being made as we learn. It is a stage

by stage development aimed at an overall master plan.

A tourist development council might be the answer, incorporating Government (both State and local), the tourist bodies, industry, commerce, town planners, architects, and so on. Let us ask ourselves what has happened in the past in the field of tourism. First, what amount of money has been spent over the past two years by the Tourist Bureau to advertise in our two daily newspapers the virtues of this State to South Australians? I can tell members that a minimal \$7 632 was spent—\$3 912 in the *Advertiser* and \$3 720 in the *News*. I ask members to consider that in 1977-78 an amount of \$5 737 was thus spent or the equivalent of \$15.71 each day. In the year 1978-79, the magnificent sum of \$1 895, or \$5.19 per day, was spent in South Australia advertising the State to South Australians.

During the same period more than \$76 000 000 was spent by South Australians travelling overseas, and some \$60 000 000 by South Australians outside of South Australia. Approximately 150 travel agents in South Australia have spent nearly \$2 000 000 enticing people from this State to overseas destinations. Of those 150 travel agencies only a handful spent approximately \$200 000 on publicising South Australia for South Australians. If it were not for Ansett, TAA, QANTAS, Railways of Australia, coach companies, and tour operators interstate the total amount spent by interstate and overseas operators would have dropped to a very low \$100 000. I ask members to consider that \$2 000 000 was spent to get people to leave the State and \$200 000 to get them to stay. About \$150 000 was spent by the Tourist Bureau in the past year to get people to come here. This is truly, as I said before, a Cinderella industry shunned by the previous Government for years and years, an industry passed from one Minister to another looking for the fairy godmother or father to take an interest in it. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted, debate adjourned.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 757.)

Mr. BANNON: Mr. Chairman, are we considering all three amendments together?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are.

Mr. BANNON: First, I must protest against the insufficient time allowed by the Government to allow us to look at amendments on what is essentially an extremely technical and complicated measure, as we were at pains to point out in the course of the original debate. There are numerous technicalities and financial ramifications that have to be spelled out and dealt with. During the course of that debate, the Government was not prepared to accept that any amendment was necessary. Now, the Bill comes back to us from another place with three amendments to clause 8, with absolutely no notice. We are given to believe that the Bill must be passed tonight, and we are pleased to try to oblige the Government on this matter, because we have agreed throughout that it is an important measure, and that employers have been waiting far too long for the details to be spelled out, as the Bill is to operate from the first of this month.

The first thing to recall to members' memory is the Treasurer's remark when this measure was before us previously, namely, that he found it difficult to believe that the Leader and his Deputy could come into the House

so totally unprepared about this legislation. The return of the measures with these three fundamental amendments to clause 8 suggests that it was not my Deputy and I who were unprepared, but the Government, and it took members in another place to discover that. It is also significant to recall the Treasurer's remarks about doubting Thomases or Jonahs who wanted to sabotage the operation of the Bill. He hoped that not even the Opposition would want to do that. Members will recall that we attempted to have the Government delay the measure for a short time so as to re-examine it and investigate the problems. The Government decided to oppose any such move because, in its view at that time, no amendment was necessary. Now, it appears that amendments are necessary. If we are talking about preparation, let us throw that back in the Government's teeth.

The very things that are embodied in the amendments were referred to by the Opposition in the course of the debate, and I refer to two points in my own contribution. At page 481 of *Hansard*, I said:

It is not unknown that that sort of advantage is taken of any sort of Government tax concession or exemption scheme. Regrettably, while some employers try to do the right thing, there are a number who see the Government and any of its tax measures as being fair game, and they try to work the system to their greatest possible financial advantage.

I went on to deal with a number of ways in which this could be done, and the Treasurer rejected it totally. That was a ludicrous argument. It required no amendment or consideration of the Bill. Yet, he points out to us tonight that we must ensure that there is proper Ministerial discretion to see that employers are carrying out in the spirit of intentment what is required. In his second reading explanation, he said:

In practical terms, this means that the Treasurer must be satisfied that the employer has acted within the spirit of the scheme and has, in fact, made a significant contribution to the solution of the problem of youth employment.

Indeed it does, and that is the point which I made to the House and which was so rudely and abruptly rejected by the Treasurer. Tonight, he comes back at short notice and expects us to swallow this, but we are not going to swallow it. I referred to the other point dealt with in the amendments (and I quote again page 481 of *Hansard*), as follows:

A lot of these details have been left to administration, and that is admitted in the second reading explanation. The Premier, when in Opposition, used to wax long, loud and eloquent about leaving matters to regulation. In an area such as this, where the position has to be made clear to people seeking advantage of this scheme, the more one can spell out in legislation, the better.

Again, that was rejected by the Treasurer yet, tonight, he says that regulations ought to be clarified, that we ought to put amounts into them, and make the whole scheme tighter, because we have left too much to discretion. That is an extraordinary situation, and it indicates our basic point. This measure has been cobbled together in a hurry. Its purpose to employ more people is extremely desirable, but it has not been properly thought out or constructed.

That is why I am surprised indeed to hear from the Treasurer tonight the first reference to the Government's indebtedness to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's contribution to this policy proposal. We heard nothing of him at any stage in the discussion of the measure—nothing in the debate in this Chamber, in statements made by the Treasurer about it, or in his election policy speech. Tonight, out of the blue emerges a person who, we are told, is the chief architect of

the special youth employment initiatives enshrined in the Bill. What is going on?

The Treasurer put forward the proposal and took it as his own. His Minister of Industrial Affairs answered questions about it and effected to know something of its operation. Out of the woodwork tonight emerges the Hon. Mr. DeGaris as not just commenting on it but as the chief architect of the measure. This quite extraordinary situation indicates clearly the way in which the Government has been confused throughout on this measure and how to put it into practical effect. Let us try the measure by all means, but let us ensure that it is administratively sound and fairly based. When the Bill left the Chamber, we made clear that we were unhappy about it. Now, it has been returned for amendment, because we have been vindicated in another place by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris who has asserted his architect's right to ensure that the Bill is rewritten.

The first amendment to clause 8 is an alteration to line 28 by adding after "employer", the words "who adds to the number of his employees by employing persons under the age of 20 years". Clearly, the clause as it left the Chamber left that situation open. When I spoke of the abuses that could be possible under it, that is particularly the sort of open-endedness I was complaining about, and so did my Deputy and the member for Mitchell. Under the clause as it left this Chamber, the Treasurer had only to be satisfied that unemployment could be materially reduced (that is a broad statement), and that it would be in the public interest to exercise the powers. In relation to an individual employer, there was nothing to say what that employer had to do. Now, it appears that in another place a demand has been made by the Government's own side and by this new-found architect of the measure that something must be added. So, it has been tightened up, and the purpose of the Bill has been made clear.

In the second amendment, again the Government has recognised by leaving the matter to regulation and open-ended, by suggesting that there was an entitlement not subject to any scrutiny rather than a qualification, that an amendment must be made to clarify that situation. Again, that is something it should have recognised at the time the Bill was introduced, but clearly it was not.

The final amendment goes to the nub of the argument. As I said in the earlier debate, this Government, when in Opposition, constantly complained about matters left to regulation. Yet, it sent from the Chamber a Bill leaving the power completely open. The Act could only be administratively possible with a great range of regulations. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who has also inveighed against leaving open the door to regulation, obviously objected extremely strongly.

We have not had the advantage of seeing the debates from another place, but whether the Hon. Mr. DeGaris did so on the floor of the House or behind the scenes, by reading what the Treasurer has said it would seem that he said that this must be tightened up, and we must put into the legislation at least some basic points describing what the measure proposes to do. The Opposition made that complaint about it; we said it was too open-ended. We were told that that was utter nonsense. It goes to another place, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris intervenes, back it comes, and not only do we get the amendments that he has devised but we are also given generous praise of him in order perhaps to quieten him down from making any more criticisms of what is clearly an open-ended and difficult scheme to administer.

In amendment No. 3 certain basic things are added, including the amount of refund that is payable to employers. As the Bill left this House it was completely

open to the Government to reduce, increase or even abolish the refund, because it simply provided that where the Treasury was satisfied that an employer was entitled to a refund he might make such refund accordingly. To find the refund one must look at the regulations, which can be amended or changed at the whim of the Government. Obviously that was not satisfactory in another place. I would stress to this House that we did not consider it satisfactory, either. The Treasurer rejected that outright, and sent this open-ended measure to another place. Admittedly in his speech he said what refunds he thought would be put in the regulations. Nothing was included in the Bill.

This is a taxation measure and the Government has always said that any measure must set out clearly in the legislation what people are entitled to, whether by way of payment or refund. That is a clear principle, and I think it would be difficult to find examples of where our Government departed from that clear principle. If at any time we looked like doing so there was such a hue and cry from members opposite as you would imagine we were transgressing the most fundamental of democratic principles. I agree that it is a good principle. In most cases if you are imposing an obligation or concession on people the amount of that obligation or concession should be spelt out. However, this was not as the Bill left this House, and now it comes slinking back to the Chamber, late at night and at short notice and we are asked to agree to it.

We will agree to it because it does help put into effect some of the things we have been saying should be put into this Bill, but I can assure the Treasurer that we are still not satisfied with it. There are many administrative problems, and I am very glad to know that in the future we will be able to write to or ask questions of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris if we have problems concerning it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition is developing a reputation in the community for finding fault with whatever comes in or with whatever happens. Once again, we have seen a perfect example of his determination to find fault with any activity of the Government. He found fault with the Government because we did not have the legislation to his absolute liking when it was before this Chamber before. Now action has been taken in another place to improve legislation. In the last few sentences we heard where the Leader stood; he is actually going to support the amendments. One would not have gathered from anything he said up until that time whether he was going to support them or not.

Mr. Wright: Are you speaking to your back bench?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I know that the Deputy Leader is terribly embarrassed by this but I would ask him to contain himself. What I am saying is that one does not know where the Leader stands. He is having two bob each way. He has not been in this House very long, and I realise that he has only been in Government and not on the other side.

Mr. Bannon: Don't be patronising.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not being patronising; I am stating the truth.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

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

Mr. Wright: Why don't you answer some of the—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader would recognise, had he been here longer, that this is the normal situation when dealing with amendments which come from the other place. I am amazed that the Leader did not embrace

these amendments with open arms and total approbation at the instant they were introduced into the Committee, since he has been saying for the last 10 minutes or so how good they are, and how much he thinks, they are due to his own activities. He has had two bob each way all along the line.

It is not a question of time. There is no precedent for any suggestion that he has made. Indeed, I would say from all my experience in this place he was extremely fortunate to have the half an hour to examine the amendments from the other place; it is a courtesy that we were very rarely allowed. I think that he has to get really prepared to deal with these things as they come, and I would have thought that he was so familiar with the legislation that he would not need more time. He says that there is not time and that we should have delayed it, and then he says that employers have been waiting for far too long and that the matter should have been brought forward far more quickly; he is having two bob each way. The Government has improved the Bill. In fact, everything that he said is a great testimony to the value of the Upper House. I am prepared to record his great tribute to the work and role of the Upper House. It may be quite interesting to remind the Leader of that praise at future times.

The improvements having been made to the Bill, the Leader resents this at great length; again, two bob each way. What is he doing; is he supporting it or not? He says he supports it but everything else he said was very much against it. He complains about the whole question of there being any right of improving the legislation. It may be that it has been made too good for him and he has no basis for criticism any more. What a terrible shame! Yet he supports what has been done. Obviously, he does not know where he stands and that he is confused. I would have thought from what he said that the situation had become clearer.

I would say that the Leader is simply indulging in what is becoming rapidly known throughout the community as his usual work of criticising for the sake of criticising, regardless of what comes up. I would have thought that he would give unqualified support to these amendments, and I am disappointed that he is not able to give credit where credit is due. With regard to his remarks about the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, all I can say—

Mr. Wright interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader attempted to keep score on the fact that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, among other people, was one of the architects of this entire scheme. It is a credit to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I am very surprised indeed at the Leader's attitude. It comes back to the fundamental question of whether the Leader really wants this sort of encouragement for young people in employment. Regardless of what he says (and he is politically obliged to support the legislation), I strongly suspect that he resents the fact that the legislation is in, that it will work and that it already is attracting great support. I think he also resents the fact that he is in the position where, because of public opinion, he can do nothing else but support the legislation.

Motion carried.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I refer to the home handyman scheme. There is a need in the community for this scheme, which has had a reasonable amount of success in the past. I believe that the whole scheme is far too rigid in its interpretation and should be more flexible. The ceiling of \$10 000 to be spent by a council, with the provision that \$350 per job is available, is too rigid. Some problems are expected. Representatives of the Brighton council have told me that, under the scheme's financial limitations, the value of work to be carried out on each property is not to exceed \$350. How can one judge the amount of work that is to be done when that work should have been done many years previously, because the scheme aids mainly pensioners and invalid people? In some cases, no repairs or painting have been done to the house for 15 or 20 years. A person from the council must assess the cost of repairs and redecorations. It is very difficult to estimate where the cut off point will be.

Only certain acceptable types of work will be carried out. Painting is limited to bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchens, and the cleaning of backyards is also allowed. There is no allowance for painting the outside of houses and buildings. If a pensioner or a blind person is in need of help, I would imagine that outside painting would be of paramount importance, because it would protect the property generally. Gutters and gables cannot be painted, yet some people would find it impossible to do that type of work. Problems have been associated with this scheme some of which the Brighton council pointed out to me recently. I believe that local government should be given far more liberty and responsibility regarding the way in which this money is to be spent. The rigid provision relating to a maximum of \$350 per job is too hard and too difficult to operate, and is causing great problems.

No under-allowance or over-allowance is laid down, so the figure allowed has to be adhered to rigidly. If the figure is exceeded, all accounts must be sent to the department, which queries them in detail. The department also demands further information. Councils have had to provide time sheets and have had to itemise every particle of material used on a particular job because some aspects have been challenged by the department. In one instance, a widow who was over 80 years of age and who had been a widow for 12 years was in hospital for three days while the men were on the job. The sum expended in wages was \$669.82, and the cost of materials was \$115.85. In another case, that of an invalid pensioner, the cost of labour was \$393.48 and the cost of materials was \$88.40. In another case, a pensioner suffered from Parkinson's disease, so it would have been impossible for the old gentleman to do any work about the place. Labour costs for his job totalled \$497.29, the materials costing \$61.30. What should happen in a case like this, a very deserving case of an ill or blind person, or someone suffering from Parkinson's disease, when the ceiling of \$350 is reached? Must the job be stopped midway? Do the painters or plasterers have to stop when half way through repairing the ceiling or walls?

It is impossible for any man to assess correctly, to the dollar, how much it will cost to repair an older property (which, in the main, we are talking about) that has been left for many years. I emphasise that it is impossible for any person, no matter what qualifications he has, to assess the exact cost of repairs on an old property when there is a limit of \$350, and to also assess when the job will finish. It would be ridiculous if workmen, half way through the job, were told by the supervisor, "Stop everything. We have

gone up to \$350. Don't make another move. Let's clear the job and get out, because the department says that the sum allowed for this type of job is \$350." There is no allowance for the supervisory work, and councils can find it impossible to assess the cost of repairs to a house neglected for so long. The mass of fine detail required by the department is frustrating, to say the least.

I believe that there must be more flexibility. The situation is ironic; this can be seen from some of the letters I have received. A letter, sent by the former Minister of Labour and Industry, arrived 15 days before the election. This roneo-ed letter was sent to all people who received this benefit under the scheme. The Hon. Mr. Jack Wright's letter stated:

I am pleased to know you have recently had repair work carried out to your home under the home handyman programme. As you might know, the programme is funded almost in its entirety by the State Government under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, with your local council acting as an agent to assess and to carry out the work that you have requested. . .

It is not possible for me to visit the hundreds of individuals who have benefited from this programme, but I would like to receive some personal comment from you, so that I can assess more accurately whether it can be improved. Just a short note would be quite sufficient, letting me know whether you are satisfied with the work carried out or whether you feel some things could be improved upon.

Funnily enough, this letter was sent out 15 days before the election. I wonder how many extra votes the former Minister received because of that heartrending letter which he sent out and which stated what a marvellous job he and his Government were doing in that request for a short note. The Minister said, "Just drop me a line to let me know how you feel about this scheme and how it operates." I do not know whether the Minister lost any votes, but I agree that this scheme had a lot of advantages.

Mr. Wright: Are you criticising the scheme?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am criticising the fact that the scheme is far too rigid in that only \$10 000 was allowed for each council and only \$350 was allowed for each job under the scheme.

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

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I wish to place on record some matters which I believe are unsatisfactory in relation to an organisation known as the Bank of Adelaide Provident Fund Limited, the provident fund of the staff of the Bank of Adelaide, which is a separate entity and organisation from the bank and its finance subsidiary, F.C.A. I do this because a document has come into my possession which is addressed to all members of the Bank of Adelaide Provident Fund, and which is under the names of the trustees of the organisation: Mr. Simpson, one of the Directors of the Bank of Adelaide; Mr. Clifford, the General Manager; Mr. Gerschwitz, one of the Deputy General Managers; Mr. Bashford, one of the Deputy Managers; Mr. Crawley, Assistant General Manager; and Mr. Healey, Staff Representative. The document seeks to indicate to members of the provident fund details of a series of transactions which occurred earlier this year involving the provident fund in the purchase of Bank of Adelaide shares. The document states:

The exact position is as follows:

As at 31 December 1977 the fund had a holding of 84 725 Bank of Adelaide shares;

At at 31 December 1978 the fund had a holding of 134 725 shares; and

On 28 February 1979, after the Management Trustees of the fund had considered the position, an order for 150 000 shares—

more than doubling the fund's holding in the Bank of Adelaide at that time—

was placed to purchase at a price of \$1.50 or better. The purchases under the orders were completed by 12 March 1979. The total held then became 284 725 shares.

When allowance is made for a profit of \$20 427 resulting from previous realisation of Bank of Adelaide shares, the average price becomes \$1.57 per share.

I believe that the contents of the document, which has caused great concern to a number of Bank of Adelaide employees who were members of the provident fund, demonstrate a lack of propriety on the part of the trustees which I think is a matter of public concern. The management trustees were the senior management people of the Bank of Adelaide and included one of the directors. In February, when these shares were purchased, they must inevitably have known that the bank and its finance subsidiary were in some difficulties. For the management trustees of the Bank of Adelaide Provident Fund to use members' funds to buy—

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the honourable member's attention that the affairs of F.C.A. and the Bank of Adelaide are before the courts. I am quite happy for him to refer to the provident fund as an ancillary organisation not directly in the courts, but I ask the honourable member to be very careful in any further comment on any matter which might be *sub judice* by virtue of the action that has taken place.

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Sir. I did attempt to make the point earlier, but I must take it to this point: what I am referring to is the action of the trustees of the provident fund, as trustees of the fund, and as such those actions are not before the court, nor is the provident fund in any way subject to the current court proceedings.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member has read out the names of the trustees of the provident fund, one of whom, Mr. Simpson, is a Director of the bank. Mr. Gerschwitz is Assistant General Manager of the Bank of Adelaide and a Director of F.C.A. as it now stands. In view of your ruling, I ask you to further consider whether this matter could be *sub judice*. I think it is a very fine point.

The SPEAKER: I will not uphold the point of order in the manner in which it has been presented. I indicated that I look upon the provident fund as an ancillary organisation not directly associated with the court orders. It is a very fine line, one which I have drawn to the attention of the honourable member for Elizabeth. He addressed himself to it before I took that measure. I am listening carefully and, if I find that any aspect of the member's contribution relates to matters which are, in my opinion, *sub judice*, I will call upon him to cease. However, I do not uphold the point of order at this juncture.

Mr. DUNCAN: The shares that were purchased have dropped to a value of \$1.25 a share, which means that a loss of about \$40 000 has been suffered by the staff members' fund. My investigations into why the trustees should have undertaken this investment have led me to believe that the trustees were using the funds for what were essentially improper purposes. This transaction at the time was unknown to fund members, and they were unable to make any comment on whether or not the shares should have been purchased at that time.

Mr. Becker: What about the debentures? I think you've got to be fair. That should be in the circular.

Mr. DUNCAN: It is, and I am happy to table the circular if the honourable member insists.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in a position to table any document in this House.

Mr. DUNCAN: I thought that, with the leave of the Government, I might have been able to get away with anything, because they have the numbers.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would require the leave of the Chair, and the Chair would not be giving leave to any member other than a Minister.

Mr. DUNCAN: Indeed, that is the case, and I thank you for your assistance, Sir.

Mr. Becker: The debenture—

Mr. DUNCAN: The honourable member raised the issue of the debenture, and I will turn to that matter. On 6 April the fund was used to purchase an F.C.A. debenture with a face value of \$300 000. As I understand the situation, it is hoped that this will give a yield of 16.02 per cent, because it was bought at a discount. Even that, whilst it appears on the face of it a satisfactory transaction, was purchased in circumstances which I cannot refer to in the House tonight, and therefore I was not going to refer to the debenture. However, I believe that it is the responsibility of the trustees at all times to act in the interests of the beneficiaries, and in this case the staff members of the Bank of Adelaide are the beneficiaries. I think it is open to grave doubt as to whether the trustees, in the face of the document now before me, did act in that fashion. It appears that they have not carried out their obligation in this instance and that, as a result of the share purchase, the fund will lose about \$40 000 if and when the arrangements, which I am not permitted to refer to, are completed.

It must be particularly galling to fund contributors to find that not only were their funds used in a manner which I believe to be quite unwise in buying a large amount of Bank of Adelaide shares at that time, but further to find that they were used by the Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide to support the take-over at the meeting. I do not want to refer to that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting very close to matters which are *sub judice*.

Mr. DUNCAN: I am not going to refer to that any further. In the time I have left, I want to raise another matter. A constituent of mine came to see me, concerned that a number of birds he had owned had been confiscated by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. He alleged to me that the officers entered his premises at 17 Boronia Crescent—

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): First, I will make one or two comments relating to the continuing attack by the Opposition in relation to the mining and export of uranium particularly, and the future development of our uranium resources at Roxby Downs. As members would be aware, earlier this year I had the privilege of going overseas on a study tour and I have referred on a couple of occasions in this House to various matters I had the opportunity to look at overseas.

Mr. Keneally: If you keep mentioning that no-one else will ever be sent over; you'll kill the study tour, because you're expected to learn something.

Mr. GUNN: I do not, at this stage, want to enter into a debate with the member for Stuart. We are aware he wishes to deny his constituents, and other people living in the iron triangle, the opportunity of the great benefits that will flow from the development of Roxby Downs. I want to refer at some length to the activities of the former Premier (Mr. Dunstan). When I had the opportunity of visiting Marcoule, I fortunately had in my possession a

copy of the speech Mr. Dunstan made to the South Australian Parliament on his return from overseas. I discussed that matter with officials at Marcoule and then sent them a copy of the speech on 25 June, after I returned to Australia. My letter stated, in part, the following.

During lunch I showed a copy of a speech to one of your public relations officer who was organising and looking after me, a Mr. Pierre Meffre. The speech was by the then Premier of South Australia, Mr. Don Dunstan, made on his return to South Australia following a visit he made to Marcoule and other nuclear establishments. Mr. Meffre read some of the speech and I promised that I would send him a copy, which I have enclosed.

I would be most grateful if you could hand this on to him and I would appreciate it if you have any comments in relation to the attitude taken and the comments made in the speech do feel free to make them available to me in writing.

I received the following reply from the Director dated 14 August, as follows (and I have had the letter translated):

I have received your letter of 25 June last, and I thank you for it. I have read with interest the document of which you have spoken with M. Meffre, on the occasion of your visit to Marcoule. The statements which have been made in the S.A. Parliament have considerably surprised me and seem to call for at least two comments.

The first concerns our idea of storing, in solid form, highly active waste products from fission. It is quite inaccurate to say that the French specialists are not interested in the problem of permanent storing of vitrified products. Indeed, although the period necessary for the first cooling of the glass blocks is rather long (several years), the storing in which the cooling down takes place offers both sufficient capacity and a great safety of exploitation. This storing is only an intermediate step, as we always tell our visitors. Studies have been undertaken by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of Geological and Mineral Research, especially in liaison with the E.E.C., to lay down the specifications of the permanent storing places whether it be a salt mine, a mass of granite or clay. The studies presently being undertaken in France are dealing with thermic gradients, twisting and movement within the granite. They are undertaken very actively, and reveal our determination to do something about permanent storage.

My second comment concerns the capacities of the Enrichment Factory of EURODIF. Although it deals with an activity which does not affect the establishment at Marcoule, I can however give you some of the following details: The EURODIF factory should attain its nominal production level in 1982, the greater part of which will be immediately used for the manufacture of combustibles for nuclear stations (light water reactors) which presently are functioning or are under construction and which will produce at least half of France's electricity production from 1985 onwards. The rest will allow our European partners to cover their own needs.

When one measures the size of the energy crisis within the world and its effects on nations which like France and its European partners have only their own territory's limited resources, one cannot but congratulate oneself on having a great enrichment capacity. In fact the question which presents itself at the moment isn't that of an eventual over-production but that of the greatness of the European demand for enriched uranium in 1985, a demand which I could liken to the construction of a second factory whose realisation here has been moreover predicted since 1976. I hope that these details meet your needs etc.

They certainly did. I have had the opportunity of reading at length the report which Mr. Wilmshurst produced on his return, which was dated—

Mr. Keneally: Was it dated?

Mr. GUNN: That is a report of his overseas visit from 19 December to 11 January 1979. It was interesting to read the recommendations, because they are clearly contrary to what we were told in this Chamber by the then Premier and other members of the Labour Party.

It has been interesting to listen to comments that have been made by members opposite, particularly those made by the member for Salisbury in which he expressed great support for the need to develop other forms of energy generation such as wind power. I do not know whether the honourable gentleman has ever lived using wind power, because if he had I do not think he would show such enthusiasm. I wonder whether the honourable gentleman has taken into account the number of windlights that would be required to provide electricity for a city the size of Port Pirie or Whyalla. I wonder whether he has ever had to rely on windmills for the supply of water. If he had, he would know that there are various months of the year when people have great difficulty obtaining water using windpower, and in most cases they have to have pumpjacks with engines alongside the windmills to guarantee a regular supply of water.

I point out to the honourable gentleman that, contrary to what he has had to say about this matter, there is, in my view, no alternative but to proceed with a well organised nuclear programme. I suggest to the honourable gentleman that he ought to make contact with those electrical undertakings in the various parts of Europe that have the responsibility for supplying electricity, unlike the honourable member and his colleagues opposite, who fortunately do not have the responsibility in this State at the moment (and who will not have it for a long time into the foreseeable future), again of guaranteeing the people

an adequate power supply those people in Europe who have that responsibility have clearly accepted that there is a continuing need to develop their nuclear generating capacities.

It is interesting to examine for a moment why the Labor Party has adopted this attitude. My view is that it is doing everything it possibly can to frustrate and hinder the present Federal Government. It was interesting that during the Labor Party's period of office (and a disastrous period it was) between 1972 and 1975 the Prime Minister and the Minister for Minerals and Energy (and other spokesmen) were doing everything possible to get the uranium industry developed in Australia. On leaving office, they suddenly realised that one way of undermining and disrupting the Government would be by organising people to march through the streets and by getting sections of the trade union movement to place black bans on the development of this important industry, as a way of frustrating the efforts of the Commonwealth Government to provide jobs, permanent employment, and supply those countries in the world lacking reliable sources of energy.

That is a mean and petty attitude to adopt. It is not in the interests of the people of this State, and it is short sighted. I predict that, if they were elected to Government again in the foreseeable future, the policy would change overnight, because the members of the Federal Labor Party would realise that this country could close down its uranium mines and sack the employees. If they contemplated that course of action, it would prove—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 7 November at 2 p.m.