# HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 February 1981

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

## PETITION: MUTAGEN TESTING UNIT

A petition signed by 147 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to re-establish the environmental mutagen testing unit, to reinstate Dr. J. Coulter to his previous position, and instigate an inquiry into the administration of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science was presented by Mr. Bannon.

Petition received.

## PETITION: GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

A petition signed by 11 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that it does not let contracts to private enterprise to the detriment of Government employees was presented by Mr. Bannon.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornogrpahy and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr. Peterson.

Petition received.

## PETITION: AMDEL

A petition signed by 281 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to use all necessary powers to bring about the cessation of operations at the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, Thebarton, and provide for the necessary health checks and records to be maintained in order to establish compensatable claims now and in the future was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

## PETITION: ADULT BOOK SHOPS

A petition signed by 511 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to enact legislation to prevent the registration and conduct of adult book shops anywhere in South Australia, or alternatively prevent the distribution of the material from any site in the State was presented by Mr. Evans.

Petition received.

## PETITION: NETLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide immediate funding for adequate staff to be employed for additional remedial and specialist help at Netley Primary School was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 270 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to strengthen existing laws against the prostitution trade, reject any proposal to legalise the trade and request the Commonwealth Government to sign the United Nations Convention on Prostitution were presented by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran and Messrs. Evans, Millhouse, and Peterson.

Petitions received.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HORWOOD BAGSHAW LIMITED

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Members will be aware that on 3 February this year Horwood Bagshaw Limited was temporarily suspended from trading on the Adelaide Stock Exchange and that the temporary suspension was lifted two days later on 5 February. One of the reasons behind that action by the Stock Exchange was that doubts had been raised regarding the company's liability for non-payment of pay-roll tax in respect of its Mannum operations since July 1976. The amount of tax unpaid between July 1976 and December 1979 is $396 172.85.

The background to this matter is that in April 1980 the State Taxation Office became aware that Horwood Bagshaw Limited had not been paying pay-roll tax on its Mannum establishment since July 1976. Upon investigation the company claimed that it had been granted an exemption from pay-roll tax on its Mannum pay-roll by the previous Government.

I promptly asked Treasury to search all available files for evidence of an undertaking for exemption given by the previous Government. No evidence could be found to indicate that the matter had been approved or even considered by Cabinet, for under the criteria then applying to pay-roll tax exemptions it would have been necessary to secure Cabinet endorsement of a special arrangement for Horwood Bagshaw Limited.

I then wrote to the former Premier, Mr. D. A. Dunstan, who was the Minister at the time in charge of industrial development. He has stated in his reply that he has no recollection of an undertaking being given. However, Mr. Bakewell, who at the relevant time was the head of the Premier's Department, has advised that he recalls that a discussion took place during 1976 between the late Mr. D. R. Hill, the then chief executive of Horwood Bagshaw Limited, and Mr. Dunstan. Mr. Bakewell did not stay for the discussion, but believes that he remembers Mr. Dunstan saying that he would submit the matter of pay-roll tax exemption for Cabinet consideration.

Having regard to the uncertainty of any formal exemption arrangements, Horwood Bagshaw Limited recently referred the matter officially to the Ombudsman. Since the Ombudsman was head of the Premier's Department at the time the alleged commitments were given by the previous Government, he chose not to conduct the investigation personally lest any conflict should arise or his impartiality should be impugned. The inquiry and subsequent recommendations were undertaken by the Ombudsman's Senior Investigating Officer, Mr. G. Edwards.

The Ombudsman's report discloses, first, that no legally binding agreement was ever entered into by the previous Government with Horwood Bagshaw Limited. It is also reported, however, that Mr. Dunstan concedes that it may have been possible, from discussions he had with Mr. Hill, for the company's chief executive to believe that a moral undertaking for remission of tax had been given by the former Premier. Certainly, on the documentation presented by the company, there is no doubt that Mr. Hill was under this impression, although no letter of confirmation was subsequently sent by either Horwood Bagshaw Limited or the Government.

Additionally, the then Director-General of Trade and Development is of the impression that some form of moral undertaking or obligation was given to Mr. Hill between the months of June and October 1976, and the then board members and Secretary of Horwood Bagshaw Limited have each deposed that Mr. Hill reported to the board the former Premier's approval to a pay-roll tax exemption application for the Mannum plant.

It has also been suggested that the matter of pay-roll tax remission was mentioned by a senior Government officer at a public meeting at Mannum in October 1977.

In all the circumstances, the Senior Investigating Officer of the Ombudsman's Office has reported that, although there is no legally binding obligation on the present Government to honour any legal undertaking by the former Government, a moral undertaking was given by the previous Government and acted on in good faith by Horwood Bagshaw Ltd.

I am sure that all members will appreciate the difficulty facing the present Government in resolving this awkward matter justly and equitably. It is a difficulty that stems from the unsatisfactory way in which the previous Government conducted and recorded (or failed to record) its business transactions. For that reason alone, the Government must now rely entirely on the memories of various participants and others who received information second-hand in an attempt to reconstruct the situation correctly and accurately.

In the light of the Ombudsman's report, Cabinet has today decided to acept that an undertaking was given by the previous Government to exempt Horwood Bagshaw Limited from pay-roll tax on its Mannum operation for the period July 1976 to December 1979. Cabinet has further decided that that undertaking, although of a moral nature, must be honoured by the present Government and that, therefore, the company's technical liability of almost $400 000 will be waived.

Finally, I wish to make it perfectly plain to the public that the Government considers its decision regarding Horwood Bagshaw as exceptional. Owing to the thoroughness with which this claim has been investigated, and the special circumstances of the case, it is not to be construed by other companies as a precedent for obtaining concessions on the basis of an understanding, as distinct from any firm evidence, of any agreement with the former Government.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Mr. L. G. ROWE

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I wish to inform the House that Mr. Lincoln Rowe has been appointed Director-General of the Department of Trade and Industry. The appointment of Mr. Rowe reflects the high priority that the State Government places on rejuvenating and expanding manufacturing industry in this State. Mr. Rowe has extensive experience in private industry and is highly regarded within the business community. He is the ideal person to oversee and continue the aggressive campaign that the Department of Trade and Industry is carrying out to attract new industry to this State and to help existing industry expand.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** Yesterday the Premier made a statement to this House in which he attempted to denigrate me and all other members who seek to gain information from this Government by way of Questions on Notice. He also implied that such questions reflected on the disinclination of certain members to work. I take particular exception to those remarks, which have also been reported in this morning's *Advertiser*. In the course of the Premier's statement he selectively quoted from Question No. 1020 standing in my name and directed to the Minister of Health. By quoting only the first dozen words of a five-part question he not only misrepresented me, but sought to ridicule the issue which the question raised. In fact, Question 1020 goes on to seek specific information concerning the incidence of cystic fibrosis in South Australia, the drugs used in its treatment, and their availability in this State. As this is the International Year of the Disabled I believe that the question is of considerable relevance. It is certainly worthy of the time and effort—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would ask the honourable member not to debate the issue, but purely and simply to refer to a personal explanation.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** It has been put to me that it is certainly worthy of the time and effort of the Public Service officers, not to mention the Minister. I regard the Premier's attempt to make a poor joke at the expense of sufferers from this disease as being disgraceful.

# QUESTION TIME

## YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. BANNON:** Can the Premier say why youth unemployment in this State has risen by 2 800 over the past 12 months, and what steps in a positive way the Government is taking to do something about this alarming situation? The A.B.S. employment figures for January 1981 were released today. The figures show that total unemployment in South Australia has risen from 47 900 a year ago to 49 800 today. South Australia has the highest rate of unemployment in Australia, at a level of 8.2 per cent. South Australia was the only State to have an increase in the unemployment rate over the 12-month period—the only State. My question refers specifically to youth unemployment, where the figures show that the numbers have risen from 16 000 in January 1980 to 18 800 in 1981. In terms of absolute numbers this is 2 800. In terms of percentage the figure has risen from 24·1 per cent for youths seeking employment and in employment to 28·2 per cent—one of the highest rates ever, if not the highest rate, and certainly one of the highest rates in the world today in developed countries.

In addition, over the last few weeks we have seen population figures which disclose the fact that to the

period June 1980 there was an exodus from this State of 6 900 people. An analysis of the figures demonstrates that it is not persons of retirement age going to Queensland, but in fact, they are predominantly persons of the ages 20 to 24, the youth group in our community, who are leaving this State for the Eastern States.

Secondly, we have had crime statistics revealed, not only in the report of the Police Commissioner but also in other areas, which indicate clearly that not only has the level of crime increased alarmingly, but that the major area of increase has been among young offenders, and the major area of victims is among young people. In addition, even more disastrously, we have seen figures published on suicides, which show an alarming increase.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would ask the honourable Leader to relate his remarks to the thrust of his question, which is unemployment.

**Mr. BANNON:** Thank you, Sir. My remarks are related to the plight of youth in this community, and particularly to youth unemployment. The suicide rate among young people is alarmingly high, and certainly well above the average in this State and in this country. All of this leads back to the figure of 28·2 per cent in this State, far higher than that in any other State. As a matter of major urgency and importance we should be told why this has happened and why the Government has done very little about it.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader asks why this has happened, and I shall be very pleased to tell him.

*Mr. Langley interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think that, before he quotes statistics in the way in which he has now quoted them in an attempt to make political capital out of what is a matter of extreme concern to everyone in this Chamber (except, perhaps, from his reaction, the member for Unley), the Leader should think back to the time before this Government came to office, when 20 000 jobs were lost in slightly less than a two-year period. I refer him back to a time when the prospects for the future in this State during the last two or three years of the former Government's office were so bleak that people were not only actually leaving the State but were making arrangements to leave. That continues on, because there is no way that this Government or any other Government can reverse the troubled times that the former Government left in its wake.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Premier has been called upon to answer a question, and I ask that his answer be heard in silence.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There is no doubt that these problems will be overcome, and they are being overcome.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** When we get back to office.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I strongly doubt it. If that ultimate tragedy were to occur and the Hon. Mr. Wright should get back into office, I shudder to think what will happen to South Australia. There is no doubt that, over a time, we will bring the situation under control and back to normal, and indeed we are doing a great deal for that now. I would like to suggest to the Leader that he should be honest in the figures that he quotes. Certainly, we are all disturbed about the high rate of youth unemployment and the disastrous effects that it is having, not only in South Australia, but in Australia. I resent—

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** What about speaking to Malcolm about getting something done about it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Members opposite, in the one breath, ask for the answer and then do everything they can to stop me giving it when it does not suit them. I resent the fact, as do all honourable members, that South Australia has the highest level of youth unemployment.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Do something about it.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not going to say what I was going to say; it would be very rude. Obviously, the member for Elizabeth is trying to make political capital out of what I think is a tragedy. There is no question that youth unemployment is far too high and we will do everything possible to restore prosperity to this community, to develop investment potential, and to widen our industrial and our mining bases so that we can create the jobs that are necessary. What the Leader of the Opposition has not quoted and has carefully refrained from quoting is the fact that in 13 months, since September 1979, the same sort of figures that he quotes show quite conclusively that we have created 3 800 jobs in South Australia.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** There are 4 000 unemployed in my district.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have given a general warning to all members of the House in relation to the answer that is currently being given. Any further interjections will be treated as an individual matter and the honourable member concerned will be warned.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I rise on a point of order: have you just warned me, Sir?

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I did not warn the honourable member for Elizabeth. I indicated quite clearly that a general warning had been given in relation to this question, and that any future interjection would be treated with a warning to that individual member, with subsequent consequences.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I repeat that, in that 13-month period, 3 800 jobs have been created, and the clear inference from that is that we have converted a 20 000 job loss over the last two years of the previous Government's term into a 3 800 gain in employment figures.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** That's not true.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is entirely true, and the point is that, if this Government had not come to power and if we had continued along in the same trend as was shown in the last two years of the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments, we would have been at least 3 800 jobs worse off than we are now, and probably a great deal more.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Are you feeling—

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

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** We must get this into perspective. It is tremendously easy for anyone to stand up in Opposition and point to one lot of figures—the unemployment figures. They are of great concern. However, I believe that the Opposition should examine most carefully its own record, during its time in office, in this matter—

**Mr. Hamilton:** You're in Government now; do something about it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Albert Park.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** —and not seek to make political capital out of the difficulties that are being experienced at present, difficulties that are not as great as they would have been had the previous Government remained in office.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** They're bloody disastrous.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I name the Hon. Peter Duncan, member for Elizabeth. Does the honourable member wish to explain his actions?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I would certainly be happy to explain my actions. The Premier, this afternoon, has alleged that this Government has created over 3 000 jobs.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to return to his seat. In giving an explanation of the action that led to his being named, an honourable member shall not enter into a lengthy debate, and I warn the honourable member that I will hold him to making an explanation of the reason for his action that brought about his being named.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I had hardly got into a lengthy debate: I had hardly started.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** There are 4 000 people unemployed in my district, more in one district than the number of jobs that the Premier says he has created in 18 months or so.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** This sort of statistic should be made available—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:**—to the people and to this House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not accept the explanation of the honourable member for Elizabeth. He has defied the Chair. The honourable member was asked not to debate the issue but to explain his actions, and he knows full well that, if he wants to refute a statement that has been made by another member in the House, he has the opportunity to do so by way of a substantive motion or a personal explanation.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I rise on a point or order. Could I have some clarification, Sir? I understand that you have not accepted the honourable member's explanation. I take it that, your having named the honourable member, he should now withdraw from the Chamber.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member for Elizabeth to withdraw.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. Surely the situation is that the Premier or someone on that side of the House should now move for the suspension, before the honourable member leaves the House.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Read Standing Order 171.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am not asking you; I am asking the Speaker, if you do not mind.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would seek that all honourable members read their Standing Orders and proceedings of this House. In the absence of any member's having moved that the explanation be accepted, there was only one action for the Chair to take and that was to ask the honourable member for Elizabeth to leave the Chamber, and that action has been taken.

**Mr. BANNON:** I move:

> That the explanation of the member for Elizabeth be accepted.

The reason I did not rise earlier, Mr. Speaker, is that there was some doubt whether or not you were deeming the explanation being given by the member to be in order or out of order. Until that point was clarified, I was not clear at what stage the motion I am now moving should be moved. I would ask your indulgence, in the absence of that opportunity being accorded, to do so now.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I believe that this motion that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, albeit very belatedly and, I suspect, reluctantly—

**Mr. BANNON:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is restricted by Standing Orders in the remarks he may make in this debate and he has just made a remark I would respectfully suggest is totally out of order. The reason, as I have stated quite clearly, was that I was attempting to clarify whether the explanation had or had not been accepted as in order and, pending that decision, had not moved the motion. I thank you, Sir, for accepting the motion when it was moved. Certainly, it is moved with absolutely no reluctance but with full support for the honourable member in the stand he has taken and the things he has said.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has complained of imputation in words used against him by the honourable Premier. I ask the honourable Premier whether he desires to withdraw those words of imputation.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I would be quite happy to withdraw those imputations. It seems to me that there is a clear-cut case here where the member for Elizabeth, in spite of his explanation, which I believe was not at all convincing, has repeatedly defied the Chair. It is my belief that, because he has defied the Chair in this way, there is no satisfactory explanation for his so doing. I therefore oppose the motion.

A division on the motion was called for.

*While the division bells were ringing:*

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have had more experience of this than anyone else, I think. My recollection is that I have always been turned out before this motion has been moved or put. I know I have been out—I have listened to it on the blower.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. On reflection, the honourable member will find that the occasion when the offending member is not present occurs subsequent to this vote.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I see—this is the explanation. I apologise; I was mistaken.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae, O'Neill, and Whitten. Noes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Lewis, and Wotton.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member for Elizabeth to withdraw from the Chamber.

*The honourable member for Elizabeth having withdrawn from the Chamber:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I move:

> That the honourable member for Elizabeth be suspended from the service of the House.

A division on the motion was called for.

*While the division bells were ringing:*

**Mr. Keneally:** To suspend a member for his concern for unemployment in his electorate is a shame.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the honourable member for Stuart's attention to the fact that the suspension relates to a defiance of the Chair and not the subject matter of the interjection.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), and Wilson.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon

(teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Lewis, and Wotton. Noes—Messrs. McRae, O'Neill, and Whitten.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** To pick up the threads of the answer that I was giving, I have pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition that, bearing in mind that employment fell from August 1977 to August 1979 by 20 600, or nearly 4 per cent and, by contrast, that since October 1979 and November 1980 the number of people employed in South Australia has increased by 3 800, it is quite obvious that, had it not been for a change of Government, the unemployment situation, which is so distressing for everyone, would have been very much worse than it is now. As for positive measures that have been taken, the youth unemployment scheme, which we deliberately brought in because of our concern for unemployed young people, has resulted in 2 225 additional young people being taken on by 527 employers, as at December 1980.

**An honourable member:** Big deal!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is a great deal better than the negative result which was being experienced by the previous Government. The number of new apprentices recorded as at 30 December 1980 increased by 168, compared with the position the previous year. It is the first time since 1977 that the number of new indentures has, in fact, increased. Unemployment certainly continues to be unacceptably high, but there is no doubt at all that at this time of the year the influx of school leavers turns our attention particularly to the plight which those young people face.

An extra $1 600 000 will be applied to apprenticeship training this year. There are 400 or so young people in prevocational training for this year. After strenuous efforts and representations by the Minister of Education and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the school-to-work transition programme has been approved by the Prime Minister today, and $2 300 000 will be applied for that programme, largely directed through the Department of Further Education, and developed and directed towards apprenticeship and trade training.

A fifth point is that there has been initiated group apprenticeship training with the Master Builders Association and the Metal Industries Association. Respectively, 96 of these have been taken on by the Master Builders Association, as I announced at a dinner that I think the Leader of the Opposition attended. I am surprised that he is unaware of these things; his memory is very poor.

In the Master Builders Association group apprenticeship training scheme, 96 apprentices are being taken on, and another 50 are being taken on this year with the metal trades industry.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** How many Government apprentices have been put off?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There are 84 group 1 year apprentices using E. & W.S. and E.T.S.A. facilities.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** How many Government employees have been put on?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** A CITY worker has been allocated to the very area, the Salisbury and Elizabeth area, which has caused the member for Elizabeth such great concern. This Government has done a great deal to help the unemployment situation.

*The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is clear that this Government has done a great deal to help the unemployment situation. It is important to realise that the situation would have been much worse had the initiatives that we have put into operation not been so successful. Having said that, I would not want anyone to believe that this Government is satisfied with the results that have been achieved so far, encouraging though they are. We will continue on with those policies, we will continue on with those schemes, and above all, we will continue on with the development of our industrial and mineral resources, as we have undertaken during the last 12 months. I repeat to the Leader what I said to him yesterday, and that is that, if he is really concerned about the economy, and if he is really concerned about employment and opportunities in this State, he will put his weight behind Olympic Dam, Roxby Downs, and the other mining ventures, because inevitably those mining ventures will bring multiplier effects in general industrial development.

*Mr. Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** If the Leader of the Opposition wants to demonstrate his appalling and abysmal lack of knowledge, it is not for me to stop him. The point is that employment at Roxby Downs on site has increased steadily over the last 18 months. I think the final figure at this stage is approaching 200 people on site.

**Mr. Bannon:** We are talking about 45 000 people unemployed.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** But that's made up of single people, isn't it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Bannon:** Because they're single, that doesn't—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** That will probably get him some balancing kudos, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to come back to the question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I believe the course which has been charted by this Government to reverse the direction which the State was taking under the previous Government will be more than adequate to reverse the trends and bring us back into prosperity. The attitude of members opposite which is negative and which does nothing but destroy will not help confidence in this State at all. I accept that the Leader is concerned about unemployment, particularly youth unemployment. So are we, but I maintain that this Government has done more in the almost 18 months that it has been in office to overcome that problem than the previous Government did in all its two and a half years in office.

## NEW INVESTMENTS

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** Will the Premier inform the House of the most recent survey of new investments in mining and manufacturing industries which was compiled by the Department of Commerce and Industry and which was issued since Parliament rose for the Christmas break?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, and I think this is very pertinent to the remarks I have just been making. Since Parliament rose in December the Commonwealth Department of Industry and Commerce has released an undated survey of capital investment in mining and manufacturing industry projects. In fact, as honourable members will know, those projects are those of $5 000 000 or more. As with earlier surveys, the projects are divided into categories: they are committed, final feasibility, preliminary, and possible. Only those first two categories, including projects which are under way or likely to

commence in the next three years, are considered.

South Australia's investment figures over the last three issues of the survey, from October 1979 to June 1980 and December 1980, make very interesting reading. In October 1979, the value of committed investment in manufacturing industry was $110 000 000, or a 1·5 per cent share of the Australian total. In June 1980, the value was $140 000 000, or 1·4 per cent, whilst in December 1980 the value was $310 000 000, or 3 per cent of the general Australian total. In other words, committed and likely investment in South Australian manufacturing has increased by $200 000 000, or 180 per cent, and the State's share of national manufacturing investment has doubled since the last election.

Turning to mining investment, we have here to discount Roxby Downs, because $60 000 000 is being spent on that project. South Australia's mining investment forecast has increased by $2·14 billion, or more than 1 100 per cent since the last election.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** You don't hear the Opposition talking about that.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have not heard Opposition members quoting those figures. I would have thought that every South Australian would be pleased and proud to trumpet those figures from the rooftops, but the Opposition does everything possible to denigrate them. In October 1979 the value of committed mining investment was $190 000 000. In June 1980 the value of committed mining investment was $3·27 billion, or 17 per cent, and now, having allowed for the Roxby Downs commencement and the fact that it is taken out of that category, we find still that in December 1980 the value of committed investment in South Australian mining was $2·33 billion. We are still running at 10·1 per cent of the national share, even allowing for Roxby Downs.

Those figures are not figures in isolation. They have been confirmed by a number of other surveys, and it is important to remember that. The latest survey by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry shows a similar picture of confidence. Highlights of the survey, released in January of this year, covering 132 South Australian firms (and it must be quite creditworthy, because it has been quoted in the past by the Leader of the Opposition) were that 20 per cent of firms recorded higher sales in the December quarter, 62 per cent of firms recorded higher sales in the previous year, 37 per cent of firms plan to increase their capital expenditure, while most firms expected a higher sales volume this year.

**Mr. Whitten:** Any higher employment?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes—3 800 additional jobs created since September 1979. I thank the honourable member for giving point to that figure. A joint survey by the Australian Chamber of Commerce and the National Bank revealed that a greater proportion of business people was optimistic in South Australia than in other States, with the exception of Tasmania and Queensland.

I cannot let this question go by without commenting on another initiative made by the Leader of the Opposition to destroy confidence in this State. I refer to a reported statement which he made in the press of 21 January, headed "Bankruptcy rate rockets." Without going into details, the allegation that the Leader made that South Australian businesses were going bankrupt at a dramatic rate was totally refuted by the members of the Housing Industry Association, as follows:

> Chief executive, Mr. Don Cummings, said the home-building industry was relatively stable, contrary to impressions given by the Opposition Leader, Mr. Bannon. Industry bankruptcies had, in fact, fallen for the calendar year 1980.
>
> Mr. Bannon, in comments about rising bankruptcies in the State, claimed this week building industry bankruptcies had increased 30 per cent in the year to June.
>
> "Comments such as those by Mr. Bannon are dangerous," Mr. Cummings said. "They give bad feeling among the public."

## AMDEL

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Will the Minister of Health say whether tests were conducted in mid-January this year by the Health Commission into radiation levels at Amdel premises at Thebarton and Frewville? If so, were those tests conducted with newly acquired monitoring equipment that can detect radon gas and alpha rays, and when will the results of those tests be made public?

Yesterday in this House, the Minister of Mines and Energy defended Amdel and praised that organisation's work in assisting the mining industry. I do not intend to attack Amdel as an organisation. However, as the member for the area which includes Amdel's Thebarton site, I was most concerned at a report by the Health Commission last year that pointed to serious weaknesses in the handling of uranium ore at Amdel. There is no need again to detail the hazards identified by the report of Mr. D. J. Hamilton, Scientific Officer of the Health Commission. However, his conclusion was that Amdel did not show a positive attitude towards minimising the risks associated with handling uranium ores. Mr. Hamilton also stressed Amdel's responsibilities in the environmental area because both these sites were located in residential areas.

I am most concerned by statements made by the Minister last year about the safety of a number of sites in the Adelaide metropolitan area, including the two Amdel sites and Western Mining's core depot at Lonsdale. Members will recall that the Minister tried to assure the public by saying that radiation levels at Lonsdale were no higher—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader not to further comment by ascribing a motive to the Minister's statements.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Very well, Sir. The levels at Lonsdale, we were told, were no higher than radiation levels on the front steps of Parliament. However, we were informed that the monitoring equipment used by the Health Commission was inadequate and could not detect radon gas or alpha rays. In the words of Mr. D. J. Hamilton of the Minister's own Health Commission, the Health Commission did not possess the proper instrumentation.

Naturally, my constituents are concerned that last year specific assurances were given by the Minister about safety when she did not have the facts available to make those assurances, and knew it. Some of my constituents regard this as a gross breach of her public responsibilities as a Minister of the Crown, and so do I. When will the Minister release the reports of these new tests, and do they give any cause for concern about radiation levels at Frewville?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I have no information available as to a test conducted in January of this year. However, I am pleased to inform the House of the tests that have been conducted, as follows: in August 1980, high sensitivity gamma radiation survey tests were conducted; in September 1980, alpha radiation counters for radon daughters and long-lived alpha emitting dusts were conducted; in February 1981 (and this may be the test to which the Deputy Leader referred), tests were conducted for radon gas detection, measuring radon in air; and in

December 1980, surface contamination monitors of alpha and beta radiation were conducted.

In his explanation, the Deputy Leader made several points, with which I would like to deal. The first point was that the report of the Health Commission, which was conducted by Mr. Hamilton in August last year, demonstrates the independent role that the Health Commission plays in monitoring, surveying and establishing standards for radiation control in South Australia. I would think that the fact that the report highlighted defects in the existing situation at Amdel, which have now been corrected (and I emphasise that), should demonstrate to the honourable member and his colleagues that the Health Commission performs an independent role, that its health physicists and technical officers make reports as requested, either by employers or employees, and that those reports are made up on the basis of independent scientific judgment. That point cannot be stressed too strongly.

Incidentally, regarding the talk of reports being made public, the policy of the commission is that reports are provided to the party that seeks the information. If that party is the trade union, a copy of the report is made available to the employer, in this case the management of Amdel, a report having been sought by the P.S.A. The reports are not made available to third parties, and that is as it should be; the report is the business of the employer or the employee, as the case may be.

The fact that Mr. Gregory, of the United Trades and Labor Council, has complained that the commission does not make reports available to him shows a complete ignorance of the proper management of reporting. I do not suppose Mr. Gregory would expect that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry should be provided with reports sought by employers. Nor should he expect that his council should be provided with reports by the commission that are made by the commission to unions. If the union wants to make available a copy of that report to the council, that is the union's responsibility; it is not the responsibility of the Health Commission.

Dealing with the question of the situation in August 1980 and the fact that the highly sophisticated equipment was not available at that time, as far as I am concerned, that is an indictment of the Opposition for not recognising the importance of proper monitoring and surveillance, and not making available resources that were required at that time to ensure that monitoring and surveillance could take place. As soon as this Government came to office it assessed the situation, received advice from the commission, and made certain that resources were available. The Budget papers will give testimony to that. All the latest equipment required for effective monitoring and surveillance has been provided or has been budgeted for. As far as I understand it, virtually all that is now acquired, so that the Health Commission can carry out its proper statutory role. There is nothing to hide. Reports that are sought are made available. The commission maintains an independent monitoring and surveillance role, and I am satisfied, on the advice of the commission and its radiation control section, which is staffed by health physicists, that the situation at Amdel is satisfactory.

## TELECOM

**Mr. RANDALL:** Can the Premier inform the House of the latest figures released by Telecom Australia which indicate the current level of the communication industry growth in South Australia? Telecom is a public body, which seeks to communicate its position and activities to the public on a continuing basis. I refer to its latest report because it clearly demonstrates that the communication industry is a growth industry and needs to be protected.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have come into possession of facts which are extremely interesting and extremely encouraging, and which tend to reinforce still further the general upturn in confidence which is occurring in South Australia. The new telephone demand at the present time is 9 per cent higher than was predicted and 15 per cent above the figure for the corresponding period last year. Connections are keeping pace with demand in most areas but the Telecom authorities in South Australia are extended to their limit in maintaining the service to respond to demand. There is a strong demand also for telex, which is running 40 per cent above the target and, indeed, 70 per cent above the level of last year. Again, the connections are matching the demand for that service. Data transmission is higher than last year by 30 per cent and miscellaneous services are 20 per cent above the level of last year. These figures demonstrate quite conclusively that there is increased Telecom demand for industry and business and that business is confidently expanding and is making provision for its ability to cope with the new era of growth and development which is expected in South Australia.

## YOUTH HOUSING

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs provide the House with details of all recommendations submitted to Cabinet by the inter-departmental committee set up to advise Cabinet on individual recommendations on the report of the working party on youth housing? Will the Minister also explain what action the Government has taken in this matter and, if none, when we can expect a decision on this major problem?

The Government working party report issued on 16 November 1980 revealed that at least 4 500 young people experienced serious housing problems in South Australia each year and that this figure was likely to be conservative. A survey conducted by the South Australian Council of Social Services earlier last year shows that 9 000 young South Australians were either homeless or facing serious accommodation difficulties. As the Minister has often said that the Government places a high priority on dealing with the pressing problem of youth homelessness, I ask whether the Minister can state what progress has been made in this matter.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I thank the honourable member for the question, because so often he or one of his Parliamentary colleagues has sounded off about this publicly not knowing the facts or not being prepared to reveal the truth of the situation. In 9½ years of Government, the previous Government did absolutely nothing for the youth housing problem in this State. It was this Government that initiated the moves that resulted in a report being made which recommended specific action that should be taken by both the State and Federal Governments. I have heard the honourable member once or twice being quoted publicly as asking why the problem has not been solved. It took 9½ years for the honourable member's Government, helped by the Whitlam Government, to create a massive housing and unemployment problem in South Australia, and such problems cannot be suddenly solved in three or four months, as suggested by the honourable member.

However, to answer the specific question about whether the details of the interdepartmental working party will be released, that is not for me to say; it is a decision for

Cabinet. As a former Cabinet member, the honourable member would know that. We are now starting to have some doubts about how the previous Government's Cabinet really worked. We had the classic example earlier this afternoon from which it would appear that its Cabinet did not even bother to document approvals that were given, and this resulted in a cost of $400 000 to the State.

The interdepartmental working party has several specific tasks to undertake. The first is to identify potential facilities that could be used for housing young people in this State who have a housing problem. That work has already commenced. Government departments and statutory authorities have been asked to notify the working party of any suitable accommodation that might be available. I am delighted to be able to say that I am going to look at one of these facilities this coming weekend.

The interdepartmental working party has been asked to prepare a number of policy papers and recommendations that can be made to the Federal Government. There has already been liaison with the Federal Government department involved. I praise the interdepartmental working party, which has Mr. Lindsay Bowes, a very respected and experienced public servant, as its Chairman. The committee has met many times, and Mr. Bowes tells me that things are going well. It is a difficult task that will probably take a long time to solve, if it can be solved at all. As the previous Government did nothing about this for 9½ years, I hardly see that it is in any position to stand up and try to make an issue about it when the Government's record for the last 18 months in this area has been good. If anyone has any doubts about that, he should read a recent editorial in the *Canberra Times*, perhaps the most independent newspaper in Australia. That editorial praised the South Australian Government and the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment for what it is doing, and particularly for the report that it released.

## HIGH TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIES

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Following the statement from the Leader of the Opposition that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 9 February calling upon the Government to pay greater attention to the need for high technology industries in South Australia, can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say what the Government has done and is doing to attract such industries to this State?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I heard the statements from the Leader of the Opposition during the weekend and, frankly, I was somewhat amused by them. First, in his statement the Leader of the Opposition said that the Government should move quickly to start negotiating with P.A. Management for consideration of setting up a large biotech research centre in South Australia. Let me point out the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition when it comes to a matter of honesty. The Leader, by his statement, tried to imply that the South Australian Government had done nothing and asked when it was about to do something. He said that the Government should hurry up and start negotiations. The Leader of the Opposition had obviously seen an article in *Australian Business* of 29 January 1981 which stated:

> Recently, Patscentre director, Mr. Gordon Edge, visited Australia for discussions with the Canberra Development Board and the South Australian Department of Trade and Industry (if the project went ahead in South Australia, it would form part of the Government's proposed Technology Development Estate—modelled on science-based industrial "parks" in the United States and tied into the South Australian Institute of Technology).

If the Leader of the Opposition had read that article, and I strongly suspect that he had, he would have known that Patscentre was already negotiating with the South Australian Government. How dishonest of him to come out then and make, by implication, the suggestion that no action had been taken. That is the sort of credibility you can put on the Leader of the Opposition.

Last Friday, just two days before he made his announcement, P.A. Management rang and asked to make an appointment to see the Leader of the Opposition on 20 February, and I understand that they specifically informed him of one or two of the reasons why they would like to see him. I suspect that also they informed the Leader of the Opposition that they were seeing the Minister of Industrial Affairs earlier that morning. That is the sort of credibility that the Leader of the Opposition has.

**Mr. Bannon:** I rang them.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** You rang them; that is O.K. with me. He has just admitted the deceit that he tried on the South Australian public. He knew that they were coming to see me.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that in referring to any member of the Chamber it is usual to name the honourable member and not to use the term "he" or "she".

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Well, the fact is that he knew that we were negotiating—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Sorry, the Leader of the Opposition knew that Patscentre was negotiating with the Department of Trade and Industry and that it had been doing so for seven months. I also point out that as a Government we have tried to attract new high technology industry to this State and we are in the process of carrying out a feasibility study for a technology development estate, which is a major initiative of the Government. We have also amended the guidelines for the Establishment Payments Scheme so that we can give specific financial incentives to high technology industry that would like to come to South Australia.

I share in the concern of the Leader of the Opposition that we should be having high technology industry here in South Australia. The record shows that this Government has done a great deal already to attract that high technology industry.

## KINDERGARTENS

**Mr. PETERSON:** Is the Minister of Education aware of the large disparities in the Childhood Services funding allocations for the programme for 3½-year-old children, and can he explain why this exists? I have been informed that the Kindergarten Union will cater for 80 per cent of the children who will be taking part in this programme in 1981. Incidentally, this means that only 29 per cent of the children in the State are eligible. The Kindergarten Union will receive 65 per cent of the funds available, and 82 of its centres will be involved. The other sponsoring bodies, with only 20 per cent of the children in 11 centres, will receive 35 per cent of the funding. This will mean that the Kindergarten Union will receive $63.20 per child, while the other participating groups will receive $133.50 per child. Why is there such a difference in the allocations?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. As members will realise, it was the announced policy of this Government that 3½ year-old

children in areas of need would be encouraged to enter kindergarten.

There is, of course, no compulsion on parents to send their children to kindergarten, whether they are 3½ years or up to six years of age, six years being the compulsory age of entry into South Australian schools. The Government announced in the Budget session last September that $150 000 had been set aside specifically for this programme, and that there were two alternatives. As members would probably be aware, at the time of the Budget debate we pointed out that one-third of all of the State's 3½ year-olds were already included in pre-school programmes. They have been included simply where there has been sufficient room, and are additional to the normal 4-year-olds and upwards catered for by Federal Government and State grants. The problem is not one which we are tackling from the very base upwards; we are already accommodating a considerable number.

The question to which we addressed ourselves was whether to expect the Childhood Services Council to establish areas of need, and we said that those areas would be the first to be tackled, or whether to give the responsibility to the three organisations currently responsible for the education of pre-school youngsters. The Kindergarten Union absorbs about 80 per cent of all the State's childhood services and State grants for pre-schoolers. The other 20 per cent is divided, not evenly, between the Education Department and the Catholic education people. That does not mean, necessarily, that the Kindergarten Union would have access to the majority of 3½-year-olds in need.

We decided that the Childhood Services Council would be the body responsible for apportioning that $150 000 to the three organisations. This it did. Those organisations put forward their own priority lists. It was the Childhood Services Council's decision to allocate the funds, roughly as the honourable member has indicated. That means that, in addition to the one-third already accommodated, an additional series of pilot projects is now under way in areas of need. The scheme will be evaluated consistently during the present year. At the end of the year, and in conjunction with the Keeves Committee of Inquiry recommendations, the whole of our 3½-year-old education programme, and the question of priorities will be revised. Any decisions which have been arrived at are not necessarily final, and a full appraisal will be made at the end of the year, in light of what we learn during the present 12 months.

I suggest that there are probably other areas of need which will not be catered for. The question to which the honourable member addressed himself, quite specifically, on the basic cost really of educating children in childhood services is one that will have to be dealt with on the basis of each individual pre-school, for the simple reason that the Childhood Services Council and the Kindergarten Union tell me that some 300 different variables are applicable in assessing the cost of educating students in the pre-school area. It could be relatively low. Indeed, the Catholic Education Council has a record of educating relatively cheaply at that level. Costs could rise as high as $600 per student, which is probably as high as could be found anywhere in Australia. The variables will be considered in the next 12 months. We will be looking for an economical but sound delivery of childhood services across South Australia, not only to 3½-year-olds, but to 4-year-olds and upwards.

I thank the honourable member for his obvious interest. If he has one specific example that he would like to pass to me for examination, I shall be pleased to pass it to Childhood Services or the Kindergarten Union, so that if there is any discrepancy, that we should be made aware of we will table that as a matter of urgency.

---

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Yesterday, in a statement to the House, the Premier referred to my questions on notice 572 to 584, inclusive, all of which referred to the employment of consultants by the Government and its various departments. In relation to these questions, the Premier said:

> Efforts to provide detailed and satisfactory answers to these questions have already cost the taxpayer several thousand dollars to date.

The Premier went on:

> I think one of the problems is that the honourable member did not realise the implications of his question when framing it.

I clearly considered the implications of my questions when I gave them to the Clerk, so that they first appeared on notice on 22 October. This is a matter of considerable public concern, and I believe that the Deputy Premier admitted this in his news release of 3 February, when he said:

> Mr. Bannon can be assured that Cabinet maintains strict scrutiny of proposals for the appointment of consultants, which are based invariably on recommendations from the Public Service.

The Opposition in any Parliament has a responsibility to probe all aspects of public policy. The discrepancy between the "We are on the ball" attitude of the Deputy Premier in his quoted statement, and the 3½-month—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that this is a personal explanation, and I ask him to come quickly to that aspect.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The point is that my motives have been impugned. The Premier has implied that I put questions on notice purely for the sake of putting them on, or in order to involve his Government in additional expense. What I seek to point out is that I have already discharged a valuable public function in exposing the discrepancy between the "We are on the ball" attitude of the Deputy Premier in his quoted statement, on the one hand, and the 3½-month wait to date for information on a matter over which he says the Cabinet maintains strict scrutiny.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MEAT

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Representatives of the meat industry in South Australia have asked me whether proclamation of the suspended sections of the Meat Hygiene Act and its regulations is nearing fruition. Secondly, they have asked me whether there is any substance in the rumour that sections of the meat industry are seeking reimbursement of some of the fees paid by them for the inspection of meat entering the Adelaide metropolitan area.

**An honourable member:** Can we have a copy?

**The SPEAKER:** It has been the practice that copies of a Ministerial statement given during Question Time would be supplied. It has not normally been the practice for Ministerial statements given outside Question Time to be distributed before being made.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I apologise to the Opposition, and respect the opportunity to be able to proceed. I have two Ministerial statements, and have not had copies of either prepared.

Rumours in the meat industry field are correct. Victoria, for instance, since 1 January ceased to charge reinspection fees for meat entering that State. Indeed, it is high time that we acted in concert with the meat industry there. I am therefore pleased to announce that, on 9 February, Cabinet approved the format of the regulations under the Meat Hygiene Act 1980, and that today His Excellency the Governor ratified these, the enabling Act, and the amendments to the other Acts for the measures to become law. They will operate from today.

As to the question of fees for reinspection of meat from interstate, it is true, as I indicated, that the Victorian Minister of Agriculture has decided that charging of fees on meat entering that State should cease from 1 January 1981. That decision was as a result of negotiations between South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, which, incidentally, has to date resolved only to reduce its reinspection fees by 50 per cent from 1 January, and I understand, to abolish them on or from 1 January 1982.

Physical reinspection will remain between South Australia and Victoria until we have devised mutually acceptable methods of certification of meat consignments destined to cross our common borders. Following discussions with my colleagues at the Agricultural Council earlier this week, I am satisfied that resolution of that matter is not far away. So that meat to be reinspected will only involve that meat where it is suspected that it requires that attention.

However, New South Wales has indicated that it will continue with its reinspection for the present. The question of reimbursement of inspection fees is under examination, and, in keeping with the spirit of our arrangement with Victoria and in light of the proclamation of the meat hygiene legislation today, I have recommended fees received from the industry from 1 January 1981. The estimated cost of reimbursing both local and interstate traders for their reinspection expenditure from that date is $32 000. Steps are also being considered to ensure that the South Australian Meat Corporation, which has carried out that work in the form of a service under its own legislation, will not be disadvantaged by this payment. An answer on that latter matter is expected within the next few days.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WOOD CHIPS

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Forests):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** In an effort to demonstrate its concern, the Opposition has produced a scatter-gun approach to the wood chip industry issue, and I think that it is time in this place, and indeed for the benefit of the public, that certain basic factors are understood. I am satisfied that members of the Opposition, in their attempts to attack the Government generally, and me in particular, have not achieved their political objective. In fact, they have confused even their own colleagues in this place, and indeed have confused the public by some of the statements that they have made. Therefore, in this statement to the House today I want to cite just one or two of those basic factors that ought to be understood, so that those who are interested in the subject can have it clarified accordingly.

There were two contract agreements between South Australia and Punalur Paper Mills principal, Mr. Dalmia; one was a woodchip agreement and one a pulp agreement. The woodchip agreement was negotiated by the previous Government. The pulp agreement was negotiated and entered into by the present Government. The same quantity of South Australia's wood resource, some 3 300 000 tonnes, applied to both contracts and was available within the ambit of those contracts for a period of 10 years. The royalty price in each of those contracts was subject to annual indexation to the local wood royalty price.

Then came the cancellation of the first contract, which actually occurred after we came into Government. The cancellation of that contract was by direct request of the Punalur Paper Mills Limited principal, Mr. Dalmia, when simultaneously he signalled to this Government that he wished to extend his interest into a pulp plant. The Government has come under considerable criticism for failing to meet its obligations to that gentleman with respect to the expenses incurred by the vehicle company, and for failing to do the right thing by Mr. Dalmia, for failing to pay him out, to the extent where we have been criticised by the Opposition, and indeed by some of the South Australian media, as a result of approaches apparently made to it by the Opposition. In a moment, I shall cite a document signed by Mr. Dalmia which indicates his receipt of payment and indeed completely cancels all claims on this State as far as he is concerned.

Then came the new contract, the pulp contract, and it is my recollection, from reports at the time of announcing that new contract, that the Opposition supported it. Indeed, the timber industry supported it, and the public supported it. It was honoured throughout the period of that term by the Government and then, at the termination of that contract, again the Opposition sought to criticise the basis on which that termination occurred. I repeat that the termination of that contract was as a result of Punalur Paper Mills Limited being unable to fund its obligations within it, and, with no money, there was no deal.

In conclusion, the Government has applied (and I am the first to admit it) a firm businesslike approach to that subject, and the Government is critical, and indeed I am critical, of those in the Opposition (and I appreciate that apparently it is not all Opposition members) who have been responsible for loose and unbusinesslike negotiations in the past, failing to demonstrate their ability to carry out their financial transactions in a businesslike manner. The decision that the Government made was on a sound commercial basis and in the same circumstances it would be made again if either partner of a contract failed to meet its financial obligations.

Having undertaken to cite in this place the statement signed by Mr. Dalmia, I now present it to the House. At the termination of the contract on 28 August 1980, this is what Mr. Dalmia signed and delivered to me:

> Received from the South Australian Timber Corporation—
>
> The sum of two hundred and eight thousand six hundred and eighty-seven dollars and five cents; $208 687·05 being reimbursement of all funds transmitted by me for the purpose of establishing Punwood Pty. Ltd. and refund of all other expenses claimed by me and incurred pursuant to a certain deed dated the 5th day of March, 1980. This payment represents full and complete discharge of all claims so incurred by me and Punalur Paper Mills Limited for and on behalf of the South Australian Minister of Forests, South Australian Timber Corporation and Punwood Pty. Ltd.
>
> (Signed) L. N. Dalmia

I would hope that that statement is recognised by the Opposition and by the media, certain sections of which

have chosen over the past few weeks to peddle incorrect information with regard to this financial matter. Those few members of the public who are interested in this subject should have the truth.

One other thing that I want to point out to the House, and this is in rebuttal of an allegation that was made in this place recently when a member of the Opposition accused me of failing to treat the gentleman, Mr. Dalmia, with the necessary degree of respect; in fact, alleging that the Government had failed to co-operate with him and his company during the term of our agreement. I have a heap of evidence to support the high degree of co-operation extended to that company and to that person, not only by me but by officers of my department, officers of the Premier's Department, and by other people we engaged to do so. However, to demonstrate the point I put forward a single example.

A fellow called Kamahl Agarwal was appointed by Mr. Dalmia to reside in Adelaide and to act as his agent. Accordingly, under our obligation, we extended to him the style and degree of co-operation that I mentioned earlier. Mr. Agarwal, on or about 5 June 1980, sought from the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs a visa so that he and his wife and children could take up residence here. On 5 June 1980, I wrote to the Regional Director, Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, as follows:

> It is with pleasure that I support the enclosed application by Mr. Agarwal and his family for a visa for permanent residence in Australia. I understand Mr. Agarwal's desire to have his family with him during his involvement here as agent for Punalur Paper Mills Limited. Whilst in South Australia Mr. Agarwal's activities have established him as a person of high credibility and a person more than worthy of support.
>
> Subject to the performance of contract obligations by Mr. Agarwal's principals in India, Mr. Agarwal will oversight the export of $60 000 000 worth of softwood chip from the South-East of South Australia and, later, the development of a wood pulping plant there. The South Australian Government—

and this is important, because it does demonstrate that, in writing to that arm of the Federal Government, we demonstrated our support for the project—

> has placed a great deal of emphasis on this project, particularly when viewed in terms of increased employment opportunities and the State's economy generally. Therefore, the recognition of Mr. Agarwal's role would be greatly appreciated.

That is simply a single sample of the material that we have collated to demonstrate that we did co-operate and indeed, at the same time, to negate the quite ridiculous and unfounded claims that have been directed to us by the Opposition during its obsessed period of attack in relation to this issue.

It is noteworthy, in conclusion, that the subject was taken from the spokesman in the other place, and raised this week by the Leader of the Opposition personally. Yesterday, he passed it on to his Deputy Leader. Today, I understand it was passed on to someone else down the line. I would hope that, in their efforts to do their job as a responsible Opposition, members on the other side would be honest and straight, and apply themselves to their responsibilities in the appropriate and accepted way, and not carry on further with the type of dishonesty that they have displayed in the application of their job on this issue.

*At 3.33 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

> That, for the remainder of the session, Government business take precedence over all other business except questions.

The days allowed for private members' business in recent years have been as follows: in 1975-76, eight; in 1976-77, nine; in 1977-78, six; in 1978-79, eight; in 1979-80, four; and in 1980-81, nine. I think all members must conclude, therefore, that the time allowed for private members' business has been more than generous.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** I rise, if only briefly, to speak to the motion but not necessarily against it. I seek clarification from the Minister that the usual arrangements which would apply subject to the carrying of this motion would so occur.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Arrangements will be made for votes to be taken on matters which have progressed to the normal stage at which we take votes, without any debate.

Motion carried.

## PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1974-1978. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It proposes a number of amendments to the principal Act, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1974-1978, in order to rectify certain anomalies which have been discovered.

First, because of the form of an amendment in 1978, it is possible in some circumstances for the spouse of a deceased member pensioner who retired prior to 4 April 1974 to become entitled to a pension greater than would have been received by the member pensioner had he or she lived. It is now proposed that in no case shall the spouse's pension exceed the latter amount and that this limitation shall be made retrospective to the date on which the 1978 operation came into effect.

Arrangements have been made to pay to the widows affected by this section the higher pensions which it is believed Parliament intended (and not the pensions in excess of the member's pension), so that no question of a refund arises.

Secondly, the Act properly contains provisions whereby a member who was previously a member of another Australian Parliament can, on making a contribution to the fund of an amount determined by the Public Actuary, have his service with that other Parliament counted as service with the South Australian Parliament. However, the Government has been advised that the provision applies only where membership of the two Parliaments was continuous, a condition with which it is in practice impossible to comply. It is therefore proposed that this provision shall apply if the intervening period between membership of the Parliaments does not exceed four years. It is also proposed that the required contribution to the fund under this provision be calculated on a basis specified in the Act.

Thirdly, the Act presently incorporates the principle that a member who ceases to be a member for the purpose of standing for another Australian Parliament shall be treated as having retired involuntarily, but the existing

provisions contain a number of anomalies and uncertainties. The relevant sections have been redrafted to remove their shortcomings.

Fourthly, in certain circumstances where a member is required to make a contribution to the fund, the trustees presently have the power to allow a payment to be deferred, but have no power to impose conditions (such as the payment of interest). It is now proposed to give them that power.

Finally, it is proposed to correct certain technical anomalies and errors existing at present.

I would like to put on record my thanks to members of the Opposition who have examined these principles in some detail and who have indicated that they are necessary amendments to the Act. The remainder of the explanation relates to the formal provisions of the Bill, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Clauses**

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of operation of the measure. Clause 3 amends section 6 of the principal Act which sets out the circumstances in which a member will be deemed to have retired involuntarily. Under the section, as amended, a member will be deemed to have retired involuntarily if his term of office expires or he resigns and a judge of the Supreme Court is satisfied that, upon doing so, he genuinely sought election to the South Australian Parliament or any other Australian Parliament, but, having stood as a candidate, failed to be elected, or failed to be a candidate for certain specified reasons. Those reasons are, under the clause, failure to secure the support of a political Party from which the member reasonably sought support, expulsion from a political Party, ill-health or any other good and sufficient reason. Alternatively, a member who stands for another Australian Parliament will be deemed to have retired involuntarily if he is elected to that Parliament. In either case, the election which the former member contests must be an election not later than the next general election for the particular Parliament occurring after the member ceased to be a member.

Clauses 4 and 6 correct a technical error occurring in sections 19 and 22, respectively. Under the formula contained in each of these sections the amount represented by the letter "N" might, in a particular case, be nought which would then produce a negative result. The clauses amend these sections so that the amount represented by the letter "N" will not be less than one. Clause 5 corrects a drafting error that was not detected when section 21a was enacted in 1974.

Clause 7 amends section 24 of the principal Act which makes provision for the pension payable to the spouse of a deceased pensioner. The clause amends the section so that the amount of any such pension shall not, in any case, exceed the notional pension that the member pensioner would have received on the day that he died. This amendment is, by clause 2 (2), made retrospective to the time at which the Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1978, came into operation.

Clause 8 amends section 25 of the principal Act which makes provision for the pension payable to the spouse of a deceased member. The clause corrects a reference in subsection (1) of the section. The clause also inserts a new subsection (3) designed to ensure that a pension will be payable under the section to the spouse of a former member who, having resigned, dies during the course of an election campaign in circumstances which would have constituted involuntary retirement under section 6 if he had not died, but failed to be a candidate due to ill-health.

Clause 9 inserts a new section 26a which is designed to ensure that a child benefit would be payable in circumstances corresponding to those referred to in the new section 25 (3) proposed by clause 8. Clause 10 corrects a drafting error in section 37 of the principal Act.

Clause 11 amends section 29 of the principal Act which makes provision for the child benefit payable where no spouse's pension is payable. At present, the full child's benefit is not payable unless a pension is not payable to the deceased member's spouse owing to the death of that spouse. This provision would exclude entitlement to the full child's benefit for an orphan child of a deceased member and a person who ceased to be the spouse of the member as a result of divorce.

Clause 12 amends section 36 of the principal Act which deals with the contribution to be paid in respect of previous service that is to be counted for purposes of a pension entitlement. The clause inserts new subsections designed to authorise the trustees to impose conditions (including a requirement for the payment of interest) where they allow a member further time to pay the contribution required under subsection (1) or subsection (3). The clause also amends the section so that service with another Australian Parliament will be counted for the purposes of a pension entitlement under the principal Act only if the intervening period between membership of the Parliaments does not exceed four years and the member pays an amount to the fund calculated in accordance with proposed new subsection (7). Under proposed new subsection (7) that amount is to be 11½ per cent of the total salary that he would have been paid if, for a period equal to the period to be counted as service, he had been in receipt of the salary first payable to him after he became a member.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING BILL

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision for industrial and commercial training; to repeal the Apprentices Act, 1950-1978; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Well-structured training arrangements are vital to the overall economic growth and development of South Australia and to the people of this State to give them the opportunity to gain the skills and knowledge needed for vocations and careers. It is a sad reflection on the policies of the past that at a time of high unemployment companies have been forced to bring in skilled labour from overseas. For too long successive Governments in Australia representing both political Parties have relied on importing trade skills rather than training our own people. Australia is on the verge of a minerals and resources boom which will create a significant increase in demand for skilled tradesmen and technicians in this decade. In addition, significant new investment is being made in manufacturing industry.

Last year, the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce, Sir Phillip Lynch, released details of future projects which estimate that approximately $30 billion will

be invested in Australia during the 1980's. This is a staggering sum, but already consulting economists and planners in Australia's leading companies have suggested that this figure is conservative and that as much as $60 billion or even $70 billion will be spent in resources projects in this country in the decade up to 1990. Whichever figure one prefers to use, the conclusion is still the same—coupled with the rapid introduction of new technology, Australia and this State will need large numbers of skilled workers, including those in professions.

Further evidence of these forecast shortages was produced by the Departments of Labour Advisory Committee (DOLAC) Working Party on Skills Shortages in its report during 1980 on "The Prospective Demand for and Supply of Skilled Labour, 1980-83, with Particular Reference to Major Development Projects". The working party estimated that, in the years 1980 to 1983, there will be a demand in Australia for 4 000 additional metal tradesmen each year. In the electrical trades, the demand is expected to be for an extra 2 000 each year, and an extra 1 000 tradesmen will be required each year in the building trades.

Throughout history, apprenticeship has been an important means of training skilled craftsmen. This Government recognises the importance of the apprenticeship system of training. However, insufficient skilled tradesmen have been trained through the apprenticeship system to meet the country's requirements. In addition, there are many industries in which training is either not provided, or it is offered in an unco-ordinated way. The fact that there was an overall reduction of some 30 per cent in apprenticeship intakes between 1977 and 1979 has been a matter of considerable concern to the Government. A number of steps have been taken to improve the situation, and it is of significance that, in our first year in office, that decline has been reversed.

In 1981 the number of places made available in Government departments and instrumentalities in South Australia for training under the Commonwealth Group One-Year Apprentice Scheme has been increased to 84—more than double the number of places for 1980. Ninety-nine apprentices have commenced indentures in Government departments during 1981, and late last year Cabinet approved of up to a further 50 places being made available for apprentices to undertake training, utilising spare training capacity in State Government departments.

During December last year, I wrote to some 4 000 employers, advising them of the need to recruit and train additional apprentices in the metals and electrical trades areas, and as part of that campaign arranged a special telephone advisory service within the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment to help acquaint interested employers with various forms of financial assistance available to them from State and Commonwealth sources.

During the first week of February, as part of the launching of the Master Builders Association of South Australia group apprenticeship scheme, I presented the first group of apprentices in that scheme with their tool kits. During this year, 96 first-year apprentices are expected to be taken on under this scheme. In addition, 50 apprentices who had lost their jobs in the building trade have been offered positions. Although this is the first scheme of its type in South Australia, a similar scheme will begin shortly with the Metal Industries Association of South Australia, which is expected to create jobs for 50 first-year metal trades apprentices this year.

In both cases, funding of the administrative costs is being borne on a dollar-for-dollar basis by State and Commonwealth Governments and other practical assistance has been rendered by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, the Department of Further Education, and the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Youth Affairs in order to commence operations. These and other training measures have involved an additional outlay for the State Government in the order of $1 600 000 during 1981, with an expected increase of some 15 per cent to 20 per cent in the number of new indentures over the 1979 figures.

However, the need for flexible and more mobile skills has been developed over the last decade. One of the purposes of the Bill is to co-ordinate the administration of all areas of commercial and industrial training, including apprenticeship, into an integrated whole and to ensure that training opportunities will be available to men and women of all ages. The discrimination against older people under the old apprenticeship system will at last come to an end.

In order to develop effective training policies, it is necessary to have an effective means of forecasting future employment needs. Following the 1980 report of the State Working Party on Manpower Forecasting, the Government decided to set up a Manpower Forecasting Unit within the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. I expect that the staff of that unit will be appointed within the next few weeks. One of their functions will be to provide information and advice on the expected demands for various occupations, both skilled and semi-skilled.

The Government has also established a Council for Technological Change to advise it of the effects of new technology, including the needs of skilled workers, particularly in respect to the upgrading of skills. Under the chairmanship of Professor D. R. Stranks, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, the council has a widely representative membership. The council will assist in consultations between the Government and employers, trade unions, professional bodies and academics on training in the context of technological change.

The Liberal Party's industrial and commercial training policy stated that, in the fields of manpower planning and industrial and commercial training, the Government's objectives would be to "ensure that people are taught trade, technical and commercial skills to participate in the restructuring and development of Australian industries during a period of rapid technological change" and that such training should have similar status as academic education. That policy will be implemented through this Bill.

Over the past nine months the contents of this Bill have been widely discussed with unions, employers and the large number of bodies which have an obvious interest in training. I have personally met representatives of the four employer associations and representatives of the United Trades and Labor Council. I found a broad consensus of agreement with employer and education bodies. Following lengthy talks with the U.T.L.C., some significant changes have been made.

We have assured the trade unions that apprenticeship will remain a fundamental part of training. The rights of tradesmen will be protected. Whether the unions wish to support this Bill or not is up to them. However, as the Minister responsible, I am determined to ensure that vested interests are not allowed to prevent essential changes occurring in our training system. To do so would be neglecting my responsibility to the advancement of South Australia and to the well-being of the unemployed.

The Bill repeals the Apprentices Act, 1950-1978, and establishes an Industrial and Commercial Training Commission comprising a Chairman (to be appointed by

the Governor), the Director-General of the Department of Further Education or his nominee, the Director of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment or his nominee, three members representing the interests of employers, and three members representing the interests of employees.

The commission will be empowered to develop and facilitate the establishment of training strategies to meet existing and projected needs in respect of:

1. Those trades or occupations in which formal contracts of training (including indentures of apprenticeship) are required.

   Throughout the Bill, specific references are made which reflect a recognition of the importance of the apprenticeship system and the intention to retain apprenticeship as a vital strategy for skilled training. I stress that we do not want to abolish the present apprenticeship scheme or to downgrade it. Rather, there are other forms of training that can, and should, go side by side with the apprenticeship system.
2. Other industrial training schemes.
3. Post-secondary school pre-vocational training. This is an area previously ignored, and we are now placing emphasis on the integration of secondary school education with occupational training. It is specifically designed to equip young people with the necessary skills to obtain meaningful employment.

   In South Australia in 1981, 400 young people will be given pre-vocational training for up to 12 months in Department of Further Education establishments. This programme is being run in conjunction with the Federal Government's school-to-work transition scheme. Under this scheme, people receiving pre-vocational training will receive unemployment benefits, plus $6 a week. This training will be given to people who have been unemployed.
4. Retraining arrangements. With the rapid introduction of new technology, particularly automation, new skills will be needed. The need for some skills will decline and it is important that people be given the opportunity to retrain so that they can get meaningful work.

The commission itself will not be authorised to conduct training programmes; the actual training will be provided by the appropriate specialised education and training institutions.

Before seeking to have the rest of this speech included in *Hansard* without my reading it, I would like to pay a special tribute to the very important role played by officers of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment in helping to prepare this Bill. It is a major change when an existing Act is repealed and the Apprenticeship Commission abolished. Over the past nine months, the staff of that department played a very vital and essential role in negotiations with many different outside parties involved. I pay a very special tribute to the officers in that department for that work. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

**Remainder of Explanation of Bill**

Amongst its functions, the commission will be responsible for:

1. matters relating to contracts of training, including the approval of those employers or employer associations which have the facilities to train an apprentice or a person under a contract of training;
2. the monitoring, supervision and general oversight of apprenticeship training including the numbers of apprentices in training;
3. shortening the term of a contract of training if the commission is satisfied that the apprentice or trainee is competent (provided that at least 75 per cent of the period of training has been completed), and if the employer and employee agree.

To enable the commission to give due attention to policy matters, and relieve it of the responsibility for day-to-day administrative matters, provision has been made for:

1. the appointment of committees to either undertake the duties of the commission or to make recommendations to it;
2. certain powers to be delegated to the Chairman, Deputy Chairman, or a Training Advisory Committee;
3. the commission to establish Industry Training Advisory Committees in such industries as are determined by the Minister, on the recommendation of the commission.

The main purpose of the Industry Advisory Committees will be to make recommendations on what the training needs are for that entire industry. They will comprise equal numbers of representatives of employers and employees in the industry concerned, together with a nominee of the Director-General of Further Education and a representative of the National Training Council, under the chairmanship of the Chairman or his nominee. I anticipate that the Deputy Chairman of the commission will be the Chairman of most of the Industry Advisory Committees.

In addition, Training Advisory Committees may appoint sub-committees in respect of a trade or group of trades or on any other basis. If a sub-committee involves a trade it will be called a Trade Advisory Sub-Committee.

In order to deal more expeditiously with disciplinary problems that arise during the course of a training contract (including an indenture of apprenticeship) the Bill provides for a Disciplinary Committee, comprising the Chairman (or his Deputy) and any one of the members of the Commission representing employers and any one representing employees.

The Disciplinary Committee will have the full powers of the commission in disciplinary matters, and will be empowered to seek advice on any matter before it from the relevant Training Advisory Committee. As a result of the in-depth consultations with interested parties in respect of this important aspect, the Bill contains measures to protect the interests of all parties.

A trainee or apprentice will have the right to bring a matter before the Disciplinary Committee if he or she alleges that his or her employer is breaching the terms of the training contract. Conversely, the employer also has the right to refer a matter to the Disciplinary Committee if he considers a trainee or apprentice is breaching the terms of the training contract.

The commission itself may initiate action where it believes that a party to a contract of training is in contravention of, or failing to comply with, a provision of the contract or of the Act. However, some cases do arise (I understand that normally there are not more than 20 cases a year) when some immediate action is necessary because of the serious or wilful misconduct of an apprentice. The Act provides that an employer may suspend a trainee or apprentice who, in the employer's opinion, is guilty of

serious and wilful misconduct. In such a case the employer will be required to refer the suspension forthwith to the Disciplinary Committee and to confirm such suspension in writing within three days. No suspension will have effect for more than seven working days unless confirmed by the Disciplinary Committee, and in those cases where it does not confirm the employer's action in suspending the trainee or apprentice, the suspension will be considered null and void and the employer will be required to make up his or her wages during the full period of suspension.

Earlier, I referred to the need for flexible and more mobile skills and the need to develop training approaches to complement the apprenticeship system, which in itself will continue as a vital training strategy. The Bill contains the necessary provisions to enable occupations (including the traditional trade occupations) to be prescribed by regulation to be "declared vocations". The effect will be to enable contracts of training (including indentures of apprenticeship) to be entered into in respect of people being trained for those occupations. The commission's functions include the approval of training facilities in relation to training under any such contracts.

No person will, by reason of age, be disqualified from entering into a contract of training. I should emphasise at this point that the Bill does not affect the requirements of those awards that prohibit the employment of juniors in traditional craft occupations other than as apprentices.

The commission will have power to transfer a contract of training (including an indenture of apprenticeship) from a full-time to a part-time basis and vice versa. Also, in appropriate cases, it is empowered to vary any term of a contract or indenture.

The main purpose of a contract of training is to create the flexibility in approach to training which is so necessary, whilst at the same time providing means for the co-ordination and administration of all relevant areas of industrial and commercial training.

Apart from the formally constituted training contracts in declared vocations, the commission is empowered to determine and approve other schemes of training appropriate to non-trades and non-declared vocations but for which a training contract is not considered necessary. It may also determine and approve courses of pre-vocational training designed as preparation for training in declared vocations (including the apprentice trades) as it considers necessary. A person who successfully completes such a course will be entitled to credits in respect of the training required for a declared vocation as may be determined by the commission.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 of the Bill are formal. Clause 4 repeals the Apprentices Act, 1950-1978, whilst preserving the validity of any indentures of apprenticeship and decisions and approvals of the Apprenticeship Commission in force before the commencement of the Act.

Clause 5 contains a number of definitions required for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 6 enacts that where there is any inconsistency between the provisions of this Act and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1979, or any regulation, award, order or industrial agreement made under that Act, then the provisions of the present Act shall prevail. The clause also preserves the provision contained in some State awards that non-apprentice junior trainees cannot be employed in areas that are declared vocations (involving traditional trade areas), where apprentices are employed.

Clause 7 binds the Crown. Part II deals with the administration of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission. Clause 8 establishes the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission. Clause 9 provides that the commission will have nine members including the Chairman, who is the only full-time member; the Director of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, or his nominee; the Director-General of Further Education or his nominee and a further six persons nominated by the Minister, three of whom will be appointed after consultation with the employer associations to represent their interests and three after consultation with the United Trades and Labor Council.

Clause 10 sets out the terms and conditions of office of members of the commission. The Chairman will be appointed initially for a term of five years whilst the Deputy Chairman, who in the absence of the Chairman will act in his place and exercise all his powers, functions, and duties, will be a public servant. The initial terms of appointment of the employer and employee representatives will be staggered to allow for continuity in the membership of the commission. Thus one employer and one employee representative will be appointed for an initial term of one year, two for two years, and two for three years. All subsequent appointments will be for a period of three years. Provision is made for the appointment of deputies to all members of the commission other than the Chairman. The same provisions relating to nomination and consultation apply to these appointments. The usual grounds for removal of a member from office are included and provision made for the filling of casual vacancies.

Clause 11 entitles the Chairman to a salary, in addition to allowances and expenses as determined by the Governor. Part-time members are entitled to allowances and expenses only. Clause 12 regulates the conduct of meetings of the commission. There will be no quorum of the commission unless five members of the commission, including the Chairman, one employer and one employee representative are present.

Clause 13 empowers the commission to delegate any of its powers or functions to the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the commission or to a Training Advisory Committee. Clause 14 sets out the functions of the commission which include investigating and reviewing all methods of training, both present and future, that should be provided to develop those skills and knowledge required in industry and commerce; investigating, monitoring and reporting to the Minister upon systems and methods of apprenticeship training and making recommendations to the Minister concerning those occupations which should be classed as trades or declared vocations. Where practicable the commission is required to consult and co-operate with persons or bodies that may be affected by any of its recommendations or actions. The commission is also empowered to establish committees and subcommittees to advise it upon any facet of the commission's functions.

Clause 15 provides that the Minister may appoint Training Advisory Committees to advise the commission upon matters relating to any area of industry or commerce. Such Training Advisory Committees will be constituted of not less than seven members including the Chairman of the commission or his nominee; the Director-General of Further Education or his nominee; a nominee of the Commonwealth Government Minister responsible for matters relating to industrial and commercial training whilst the remainder, who are to be appointed after consultation, will be divided equally between persons representing the interests of employers and employees engaged in the relevant area of industry or commerce. A Training Advisory Committee is empowered to co-opt additional members as it sees fit, although such co-opted members have no voting rights. Finally, there is no

quorum of the committee unless at least one employer and one employee nominee are present.

Clause 16 empowers a Training Advisory Committee to establish subcommittees (on the basis of a trade, group of trades, or any other ground) to assist it on any matter within its sphere. Whilst the sub-committees must include amongst their membership some members of the Training Advisory Committee, non-members of the Advisory Committee also may be appointed. Employers and employees must be represented in equal numbers on the subcommittees which are trade advisory subcommittees.

Clause 17 provides that the function of a Training Advisory Committee is to advise and make recommendations (on a variety of matters including apprenticeship and new forms of training) to the commission, either on its own initiative, or at the request of the commission. Clause 18 establishes the Disciplinary Committee of the commission. The committee sitting as the commission, from whose decision there is no appeal, will be constituted of three members, namely, the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the commission and one employer and one employee representative.

Clause 19 provides for the appointment of staff to the commission. The terms and conditions of employment are to be approved by the Public Service Board in all cases. Clause 20 contains the powers of entry and inspection which may be exercised by any authorised person. These powers include the power to question any person involved in training on any matter relevant to the inspection and the power to inspect places or premises and any work in progress therein. It is an offence for anyone to hinder or obstruct a person in the exercise of any of these powers, or to refuse or fail to answer truthfully any question put to him in pursuance of the powers conferred by this section. However, a person is not obliged to answer any question if the answer would tend to incriminate him of an offence.

Part III deals with forms of training. Clause 21 makes it an offence for an employer to train a person in a declared vocation unless such training is undertaken pursuant to a contract of training. However, this requirement does not apply to any further training or re-training of a person who has already completed the training required under the contract of training, or who has some equivalent qualification. In addition, an employer cannot employ a person pursuant to a contract of training unless the place of employment, the equipment and methods of training and the work supervisors have been approved by the commission. After entering into a contract of training the employer must notify the commission of such fact and file a copy of the contract with the commission. In certain circumstances the commission itself can enter into contracts of training, assuming the rights and obligations of an employer. Such power is to be exercised only upon a temporary basis and where it is not reasonably practicable for some other employer to enter into the contract of training.

Clause 22 provides that there is no age limit for entering into a contract of training. Clause 23 provides that the time period for any contract of training is to be determined by regulation. However, the time period may, in certain circumstances, be shortened by the commission. Where a person has completed at least 75 per cent of his period of training the commission may, on its own motion or where a joint application has been made by the parties to a contract of training or indenture of apprenticeship, terminate the contract where it is satisfied that the trainee or apprentice has reached a standard of competency acceptable to the commission. In other circumstances the commission may increase or reduce the time period of the contract.

Clause 24 provides that employment pursuant to a contract of training shall be either full-time or part-time and empowers the commission, on the application of the parties, to transfer contracts of training from a full-time to part-time basis, or vice versa. Clause 25 deals with the obligations upon a person employed under a contract of training. These include attending approved courses of training, complying with the hours of attendance at approved courses of instruction and completing his course of instruction to the satisfaction of the commission. The employer who does not permit a person employed by him under a contract of training to carry out his obligations is guilty of an offence.

Clause 26 deals with disciplinary powers. A party to a contract of training who believes that the other party has contravened a provision of the contract of the Act, or the commission where it has reasonable grounds for suspecting that a contravention has occurred, may refer the matter to the Disciplinary Committee. An employer who considers that a person employed by him under a contract of training is guilty of serious and wilful misconduct may suspend him from his employment. However, in these circumstances, he must refer the matter forthwith to the Disciplinary Committee and confirm such suspension in writing within three days. No such suspension can be for a period in excess of seven working days unless confirmed by the Disciplinary Committee. Before reaching a decision on any matter before it the Disciplinary Committee may consult with the relevant Training Advisory Committee. Penalties which the committee may impose include reprimanding the party at fault, imposing a period of suspension, confirming or revoking any suspension imposed by the employer (where such suspension is revoked, order the employer to pay any wages that would, but for the suspension, have been payable under the contract) and extending the period of the contract or cancelling it. No suspension imposed by the Disciplinary Committee can exceed four weeks.

Clause 27 enables the commission to approve and determine schemes of training which it considers necessary or desirable to advance the knowledge and skills required in areas of industry and commerce other than training in trades or declared vocations. Those who complete these courses successfully may be issued with certificates by the commission. Clause 28 enables the commission to determine and approve courses of pre-vocational training. A successful completion of the course entitles that person to credits, determined by the commission, in respect of the training required for the relevant trade or declared vocation.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 February. Page 2751.)

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** One of the most important statements in the second reading explanation was as follows:

> In these circumstances, the correct assessment of hydrocarbon reserves within this State and the planning of field development programmes that will maximise gas recoveries and resources is seen as vital to State energy planning.

The Opposition certainly agrees with that. In fact, we indicate our general support for the Bill. However, some comments need to be made. The second reading explanation also pointed out that the State is seeking alternative sources of supply and has, in fact, entered into discussions with the Northern Territory Government, the Queensland Government and the Federal Government with regard to access to natural gas reserves located in the respective places mentioned. It would seem to me that one of the great plans of the late Rex Connor was for a major gas grid to span the continent and to make provision for supplies to the peculiarly settled country we live in, which settlement is clustered mainly around the coastline. This might well come into being and that would be a very fitting tribute to a great man who is no longer with us. What is really being asked of the House here and of those persons who will be affected by the provisions of this Bill is approval for a greater degree of control with respect to those persons holding petroleum licences.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Say that again.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** A greater degree of control in respect of persons holding petroleum licences. The proposition is not one that we particularly oppose. In fact, we would support it. However, I think it fair to say that at least implied in the second reading explanation is that there is agreement from producers such as Santos in relation to the provisions contained in this Bill. I would be happy if I could report that fact to the House, but I cannot, because contact that I have had with Santos today indicates that it does have some opposition to certain provisions contained in the Bill and, in fact, I am informed that it has registered that opposition by way of correspondence with the Minister.

I believe that the kind of worries, as put to me anyway, are that not only Santos but also other producers in the Cooper Basin do not believe that there is any need, from their point of view, for this degree of control in the legislation. The suggestion put to me was that the Minister could not cite a situation that has occurred so far which in the view of the producers would justify the additional requirements which are being placed on them. I am not able to make a judgment on that situation, because it is the Minister who has had the responsibility in these matters, and he, of course, is the only one privy to any of the correspondence to which I have referred. However, I thought it reasonable that that ought to be put forward.

In the circumstances, we will be seeking some assurance from the Minister when he replies that, in relation to the requirements for the lodgment of development plans and the fact that his approval may be given, such provisions would not be operated capriciously. I am not saying that that would happen, but I believe there would be some value in the Minister's giving that assurance in any response he may make in these matters, bearing in mind the information that was given to me by Santos and the reference made by it to other producers.

The Bill contains some interesting features. In clause 4, we are asked to insert a new section 35a, whose subtitle is "Development plan to be submitted to the Minister". This is just a very minor point, but I think it is worthy of comment that this might well have been placed in existing section 36, which already deals with the schedule and programme to be submitted to the Minister. One would have thought that would be a cosier home for a development plan, rather than to stick it in a provision which at the moment is headed "Royalty". Nevertheless, there may be some drafting reason which is not apparent to me or to the Minister.

Clause 5 amends section 36 of the principal Act by including new subsections. The previous subsection (1) *(a)* was a schedule requirement, but the new provision is a requirement for a programme of drilling. Where there was previously a programme, we will now have provided a schedule. There may be some sensible reason for that, but it is not apparent to me. Nevertheless, it obviously will not hurt, since it will still come into the same section.

In clause 6, section 37 of the principal Act is amended by providing for a new requirement. I support this provision, and I have had no sign of opposition about this from Santos. It does not find iniquitous at all the requirement for a report relating to estimated petroleum reserves and other matters relevant to the extent of prospective production from a field. Santos feels that it is quite reasonable and certainly, as members of the House, we can see the value of it and why the Minister would like to have such information on behalf of the State.

Clause 7 repeals section 55 of the principal Act wherein previously matters on which records may be kept had been attempted to be specified. We all know the problem that that can cause in legislation. As soon as something is specified in legislation another requirement arises, and it cannot be done because it is not in the Act. I think it is a sensible way to approach the matter to require it by regulation. I do find it slightly ironic to see that the Government is putting forward this measure, because when it was in Opposition it was bitterly and utterly opposed to government by regulation, as it always termed it.

When we were in Government and brought in a sensible amendment of this nature we were told it was an attempt to govern by stealth, keeping from the Parliament that which was rightfully its own prerogative. We never really believed that the then Opposition members were fair dinkum about that, and they have proved that. Now that they are in Government they see the logic in respect of matters such as the one before us. We are being consistent by saying that we do not oppose such action and acknowledging the sense in this proposal. In those circumstances, the Opposition is happy to support the Bill and to allow it to proceed with reasonable expedition.

The Minister has given no direct reasons for the urgency about the matter. No doubt he will mention the reason in any remarks he makes later, but in view of the fact that I have been able to discuss it, albeit somewhat briefly, with one of the major producers who would be vitally concerned with the matter and found that they have a degree of reservation about the proposal but are not utterly opposed to it, and because of the examination we have made of it, we give the Bill our support.

I ask the Minister to give me the assurance I asked for earlier, namely, that, in putting in the Statutes the requirement for a development plan to be lodged with the Minister, it will be done in a sensible manner. I think the Minister would be aware from correspondence received from Santos that it will not be the Minister dotting the "i's" and crossing the "t's" as to the exact location of every hole that will be drilled in a given licence area, and so on. I am sure the Minister understands the kind of assurance I am seeking. I conclude my remarks by saying that the Opposition supports the Bill.

**Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart):** I support the Bill but in doing so, because of my keen interest in the development of our natural gas and oil resources in South Australia (a keen interest that is shared by all members of the Opposition), I must voice my disappointment in the manner in which the House has been asked to debate this Bill. Only a few minutes ago a copy of the Bill was placed on my table.

I had access to the Minister's second reading

explanation, and I also was able to see a copy of the Bill that was provided to the Opposition spokesman on the subject, but this is a measure that could have far-reaching implications within the mining, particularly the oil, industry in South Australia. It is of such importance that I believe it would have been reasonable if all Opposition members could have been given sufficient time to study the measure and discuss it with those people who are concerned so that our comments in this debate could be completely relevant. I do not believe we have been given that time. Some members may be sufficiently aware of developments within the oil industry to be able to understand immediately the clauses of this Bill, but I am not one of those members. I need time to be able to study what we are asked to support, and unfortunately we have not been given that time.

The Minister's second reading explanation causes me no concern whatsoever. This State does depend highly on natural gas as a fuel for our State electricity needs, and because we are so dependent upon natural gas, in my view it is reasonable that the Government ought to be able to have accurate records about what the industry is doing. In that regard, the Government has my support, but I ask the Minister to say whether or not he has discussed this measure at length with APEA and what the members of APEA feel about the measure.

I believe that by and large this is a good measure but there may be difficulties in it of which I am not aware. Over the years when legislation is treated hastily in this House there have been occasions when matters of some magnitude have slipped through which were not apparent when the debate was taking place. Fortunately, on this occasion if such problems become apparent they can be looked at in the Legislative Council, not that I believe members of this House should have to depend upon another House to rectify matters that might have been missed in this place unintentionally.

I agree with the Bill, and I am merely indicating my concern at the haste with which this measure is being pushed through the House. I can recall when a back-bencher of the then Opposition complained bitterly many times about the then Government requiring that matters of great importance be discussed in a limited time. Of course, that was true, but it seems to me that the people who complained at that time ought not to be guilty of the same offence. In this case, I would have wished for more time. I am not sure that I am fully aware of all of the implications of this legislation, although as a lay person it does appear to be acceptable to me. I am prepared to accept the advice of our spokesman, who has considerable knowledge in this area, that the Bill will achieve what the Minister has said it will achieve. I trust that that will be the case, and I support the Bill.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I thank members opposite for their support for this Bill. The member for Stuart has complained that he saw a copy of the legislation only today. I am told by officers of the House that this Bill was distributed to all members yesterday when it was introduced. If the honourable member was so interested, there is no reason why he could not have taken the Bill away and examined it yesterday. The member for Stuart also complains that the Bill is being rushed through the House. I would like to refresh the memories of members opposite. A similar Bill was introduced on 26 March 1980. I did not proceed with the Bill at that time: the Bill stayed on the Notice Paper and was available for perusal from March onwards. I would have thought that if the members were so vitally interested in the Bill, as they now profess to be, they would have ample opportunity to make the inquiries which they now deem necessary.

**Mr. Keneally:** It's not on the file; it wasn't distributed. Where have the copies gone?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Loose copies of the Bill were handed out on everybody's desk yesterday. Sometimes officers of the House do not have time to catch up with a Bill file. If a member was going home last night to study the Bill, he would take home a loose copy. To suggest that the honourable member could not get a copy of the Bill until five minutes before the debate is nonsense.

**Mr. Keneally:** I said I had access to a copy provided by our spokesman. I was not provided with a copy by the House until two minutes ago.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** A copy was provided to the honourable member yesterday when the Bill was introduced. I repeat that a very similar Bill, not precisely the same, because we made some modifications to it as a result of discussion, was introduced into the House on 26 March 1980. That was available for nine months of last year. Without making a big deal at this point, I think that members opposite should have a reasonable idea of what the Bill is about. I was then asked by the member for Stuart whether I had discussed the matter lately. I have not, but we discussed the Bill before March last year with Santos and other companies operating in South Australia that will be affected by it. This legislation is not dissimilar, I was told last year before March, to that which operates in relation to off-shore oil exploration legislation in Western Australia. It is not new to political Parties of either persuasion.

I agree with the member for Mitchell's remarks. He underlined some important statements I made in introducing this Bill. It is essential that we find more gas, or alternative sources of gas supply, if the Cooper Basin reserves are not proved up. One of the worrying things about the Cooper Basin in recent years is that the reserves, if anything, have been downgraded. South Australian Oil and Gas is spending money to find gas to satisfy Sydney contracts. About 600 to 700 billion cubic feet is involved after 1987.

**Mr. Payne:** There were a couple of holes that turned out to be oil reserves.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Our problems in relation to electricity generation are not solved by finding oil. The State will do very well out of the oil flow by way of royalties, but we have a pressing problem, as everyone in this House acknowledges, in relation to electricity generation. The fact is that oil is prohibitively expensive for power generation, and the Torrens Island power station runs on either oil or gas. Torrens Island could be converted to burning coal, but it would be expensive and make it less efficient.

**Mr. Keneally:** Do you have any idea of the cost?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The cost of conversion would run into hundreds of millions of dollars. It would have to go from a base-load station to a peak-load station. There would be downgrading of efficiency. The most suitable coal to use would be from New South Wales, which would have to be imported. The immediately available alternatives are not too palatable. Provision of more gas at a price which will not make our electricity costs completely uncompetitive is a high priority. Some reference was made to the fact that it looked as though we were pursuing a policy similar to that of Mr. Connor.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** I didn't say that. I referred to his dream.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is my opinion that we will, over a period, have interstate connections with the

gas supplies. We have an interstate connection to Sydney, to our cost. We have had discussions with people from the Northern Territory, with the Queensland Premier and Minister for Mines. We have had discussions with companies operating in Bass Strait, and with Senator Carrick.

**Mr. Keneally:** You are dealing with some rugged people.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Members opposite complain that I am too tough, on occasions. I always take that as a compliment. They complain that I am too vigorous in making comments in this place.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** You're really a nice guy.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is not my birthday today; I do not know what has gone wrong with them. We are having discussions with all those people, with a view to securing the future of this State in relation to our gas supply. I am not surprised that when the honourable member rang Santos it said it was not particularly happy with the legislation. It told me that in March last year, and requested a fortnight to tighten it up. I agreed. Complaints about the legislation were quite minor, and I thought we could fix them then, but the more Santos thought about it the more it thought it did not like it. The Mines Department (and I say this without exaggeration) has been described to me as the best in Australia.

**Mr. Keneally:** You inherited it.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I inherited it, as did the Labor Government in 1970. The department has always enjoyed a high reputation. My officers complained that they were not satisfied with the degree of co-operation from the companies in providing information. Those companies can either like it or lump it; it is a fact. I am told by my officers that this legislation is necessary. It is perfectly obvious to everyone that the companies have a vested interest in getting the maximum price for gas.

Without going into any great detail, under those conditions maybe the degree of co-operation we would like to see forthcoming is not always apparent. At the personal level, we get on very well with company representatives, but when it comes to hard business dealings and the provision of information, which we believe is essential for accurately establishing reserves, which have been downgraded over the years, to our cost, I make no apology for introducing this legislation. As I say, I have been told that it is essential. In view of my officers' high reputation and the high regard I have for them, I concur in that view.

*Mr. Keneally interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Moomba has been significantly downgraded; Gidgealpa I think is another. In my mind, overall, the appraisal wells have been rather disappointing in some respects. The Liberal Party is a private enterprise Party that believes in private ownership, but it also believes there is such a thing as State interest in all these matters, and it is of vital interest to the State that its interests are not neglected.

*Mr. Keneally interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Socialism is anathema to me. My Party does not believe in taking over enterprises because they are successful, but I believe that we have to be the watchdogs of the public interest. There is such a thing as public interest and State interest, which should be very much to the fore when dealing in a basic commodity such as this, when we are so dependent on gas for the generation of electricity. We have inherited that situation. I will not go into the touchy subject of the gas contracts.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** It is advisable that you do not, or I will give you a response.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! We have had enough cross-debate.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I would be quite happy to debate this subject with the member for Mitchell. However, I do not intend to enter into that discussion at the moment. Perhaps we could initiate it privately and sort a few things out. We are in one hell of a jam in relation to our gas supplies unless we do something soon, and I believe that this legislation may help us in that regard. I thank members opposite for their support of the Bill.

My officers had lengthy discussions with the companies. We could not reach final agreement, but took a year off to try to accommodate them. In the initial approach, there were only one or two complaints, which I thought were fairly minor and I fixed up one on the spot. With the history of events in this matter, I believe that this legislation is essential, and for that reason I commend it to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Insertion of new section 35a".

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Clause 4 proposes a new requirement for a development plan to be lodged within six months of the granting of a licence. As I understand it a production licence is usually granted for 21 years. Those people with a production licence at present, as a result of the passage of this Bill, I take it will be required within six months, or some reasonable time, to lodge a development plan with the Minister. That being so, it seems that it could be awkward, if a company were in the second year of a 21-year lease, to set out the development plan for such a long period. Will the Minister say what might be involved in the degree of complexity of the development plan that would need to be lodged?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The total recovery of gas from the reservoir can depend upon how people go about getting that gas in the first instance, so it is necessary to ascertain how companies intend to go about that. A consultant has come out from Canada to advise us on the best way for the plan to be developed. Petroleum engineers are like hen's teeth in the world scale, so we have to get overseas expertise from time to time. How a company goes about its exploitation of the resources can have a vital impact in the long term, on the recovery of the maximum amount of gas from the resource. The reason for an initial plan is so that we can see that this is being done most efficiently from the point of view of recovery of the reserves. The second point is that it is not immutable. Amendments to the plan can be discussed with me or my officers from time to time. That is not ruled out by this provision.

There is a necessity for a development plan to be apparent and to be approved, and that needs to happen before the plan really gets under way. However, that does not preclude revision of that plan as a result of consultation with responsible officers.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I take it that, if a licensee who holds a petroleum production licence does not submit a development plan within the prescribed period, he would lose his licence?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That would be the ultimate sanction. A person would need to have some reason for not submitting the plan. Without the benefit of this legislation, getting information when it was wanted has been one of the problems, and information has not been forthcoming when it has been wanted. One of the reasons for this legislation is to remedy that situation.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** What other sanctions are available to

the Minister to encourage the licensee to fulfil the requirement of providing the Government with a development plan within six months? If they are not to lose their licence, will they be subject to fines? Just what power does the Minister have to encourage the company to fulfil its requirement if it is not to lose its licence—some harsh words or a rap on the knuckles? The Committee should be informed what the Minister has in mind.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member has answered his own question. The ultimate sanction is the removal of a licence. If there is a history of non-co-operation, that is what will happen.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Records to be kept by licensee."

**Mr. KENEALLY:** New section 55 (2) provides:

> The licensee shall deliver to the Minister copies of all records kept pursuant to this section at such times, or at such periodic intervals—
> *(a)* as may be required by the regulations; or
> *(b)* as the Minister may, by notice in writing served personally or by post upon the licensee require.

This is contrary to all your rhetoric, Sir, and your colleagues when in Opposition, namely, that the Government has seen fit to adopt the method of Government by regulation. I would have thought that this would be abhorrent to Government members, something similar to retrospectivity. However, these things seem to be forgotten when members have the responsibility of Government, and I am thankful for it.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member must have his little bit of fun. The fact is that there are some mechanical requirements which obviously are more easily dealt with by regulation than by Statute.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** As mentioned in the second reading debate, I seek an assurance from the Minister that the regulations would normally be drawn up in consultation with producers and licence holders.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I acknowledged that in the second reading explanation, I think towards the end, when I said that we had been consulting with producers since before March last year, before this Bill came in, and the resistance seems to have increased over that period rather than diminished.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** There is a subtle difference between the statement "It would be expected that the regulations to be made under these amendments would be discussed with parties likely to be affected," which are the words of the Minister in the second reading explanation, and the statement that there would be a clear undertaking that there would be discussion with the parties affected before the regulations were introduced. I ask the Minister to clarify the difference between "it would be expected" and "a clear undertaking that these discussions will take place".

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** We were proceeding so well, yet quite suddenly the Minister apparently wishes to become churlish in response to a very ordinary request. The member for Stuart pointed out the words contained in the explanation relating to that clause. Surely, it is not asking too much of the Minister to give the assurance that we seek: that that sentence means that they will be drawn up by way of mutual discussion and agreement between the parties concerned.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** You have that assurance.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## RECREATION GROUNDS RATES AND TAXES EXEMPTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 2754.)

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** The Opposition recognises that this is one of those 40 important Bills to be discussed and passed in a four-week period. We on this side will give our co-operation and support it right down the hill, clause by clause. Also, we believe that it is only correct and proper that this Bill should replace an archaic Bill presented in 1910, which is not clearly drafted and which suffers from some completely outdated terminology. We also support the new thinking of this Government that private enterprise should have no lever over some of its competitors, as is the case with the three restaurants situated in the park lands in the city of Adelaide. It is true, as the Minister of Water Resources said, that every business in this State should pay its fair share of charges to both the State Government and local government.

Clause 4 causes me some concern. It deals with the exemptions from rates and taxes. In Committee, I should seek clarification from the Minister. I noticed that, in the second reading explanation, the Minister said that the amendments would not lead to any new or additional charges being made against occupiers, because charges for water used and services provided had always been made in the past. That is a very hollow claim because, since September 1979, we have seen new and additional charges being made against occupiers throughout the State. Perhaps in this case the Government might be honest in its claim that there will be no new or additional charges. This is a very minor Bill. We do give it full support. When we go into Committee, the Minister may be able to explain the problems that I have been having with clause 4. The Opposition supports the Bill.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I thank the Opposition for its ready support of this Bill. The Bill is not new to the House: I recall that a similar measure was introduced some years ago. There was some trouble in regard to the Adelaide City Council which obviously was sorted out. The Bill has been presented in a similar form, and I believe that we can proceed confidently to the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Exemption of certain land from payment of rates."

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** The Opposition is concerned about this clause. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, stated:

> Clause 4 provides for exemption from rates and taxes. Broadly, exempt land falls into two categories. It is either land owned or controlled by a local council or land owned privately but intended for use by the public for sport and recreation. The first category is dealt with in clause 4 (1) *(a)* and (1) *(c)*, the second in clause 4 (1) *(b)*.

Clause (4) (1) *(b)* states:

> the land is vested in trustees or in an association and the public is entitled, in pursuance of rights granted in perpetuity, to access to the land for the purpose of sport or recreation;

That is all right in regard to land vested in trustees or an association, but if a private individual who owns land wants to make it available to members of the public for sport or recreation, and if he is perfectly prepared to maintain, care for and control that land, would the land be exempt under clause (4) (1) *(b)*?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It would not. If it was, there could be abuse. If a private individual controls land, with the amount of public control by a body that is recognised in the category stated, such as a district council or a trustee, and with the land in perpetuity for the purpose of sport, that situation would not be covered. A private individual would not be able to claim this exemption simply by saying, "I use my property for trail bike riding".

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I have spoken to officers of the department and that was the view they put forward. I accept that, in that case, that would be an abuse, but I believe that there are people who are honest enough to want to make land available for the general public and who have no wish to abuse this clause by, at some future date, subdividing and getting away with paying minimal water charges. They may want to make land availale to the public. I believe that there are still some people in the world with ideals.

**Mr. Hamilton:** Like the member for Albert Park!

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Yes. I would like to think that, if this occurred, the provision would be interpreted so that a person making land available to the public would be granted an exemption.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The mechanism by which he could achieve his end is quite simple. He could, for instance, lease that land to the council. He still owns it but he can lease it to a public body, such as a district council, and it can be used for that purpose and it will attract exemption. He can enter into an arrangement whereby the land is vested in trustees, where the sole purpose is spelt out as a purpose such as we are contemplating in this legislation. That safeguard is there.

It would be a simple matter for him still to own the land but to enter into a lease arrangment for a period of time to suit him, such as the period of his life or anything of his choosing, which would overcome the objection and give vent to his charitable instincts quite satisfactorily.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE LAND REVESTMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 2754.)

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** The Opposition supports the Bill. We are prepared to co-operate in the swift passage of the measure, which was introduced only last evening. Because of the Government's so-called heavy legislative programme, we are prepared to assist, despite the comments made by the member for Fisher about me the other evening.

The Bill seeks to revest certain parcels of land in the Crown so that they can be dedicated for the purpose of extension of the Port Pirie Community College. There is also an area of land for development of a tennis complex in conjunction with the Port Pirie and District Tennis Association, and a further area of land is proposed for development as a baseball park. We believe that all those projects are worthy and that they will be of benefit to the residents of Port Pirie, so we support them accordingly.

I understand that the history of the land is that in 1946 it was vested in the Port Pirie Racing and Trotting Club Incorporated for the establishment of a racecourse. In 1960 and 1965 certain parcels of that land were excised for the extension of the Port Pirie High School sporting ground. The Port Pirie Racing and Trotting Club Incorporated has agreed to relinquish these further sections of land that are the subject of this Bill. I am advised that the club has co-operated to the fullest in the proposals regarding the land.

My colleague the member for Stuart, in whose district the land is situated, has contacted the respective parties concerned and he is assured that there are no objections regarding the land being used for the purposes proposed. Consequently, the Opposition supports the Bill.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I thank the Opposition for its support.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

## PRIMARY PRODUCERS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 2751.)

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** The Opposition supports this Bill, which effects certain necessary changes to the legislation to enable payments to be made and to enable certain alterations concerning interest rates when advances are made to primary producers under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. However, the Opposition has one or two brief comments. The initial payments were due from the Farmers Assistance Fund on 30 June 1980, which is some eight months ago, and the Opposition is intrigued as to why it has taken so long for this legislation to come before the House to enable that money to be paid.

The Opposition believes that it would have been possible for such minor technical legislation to come before the House late last year. It appears that the Minister has not been able to shape his act in a proper form and respond as quickly as might have been the case. I suppose, inevitably, eight months late is better than never, and we accept the fact that this legislation is now before us. In future, if other anomalies appear, we hope that there will not be a similar delay.

Of course, retrospectivity in the Bill is necessary to enable the payment that was made from general revenue last June to be covered so that funds can be transferred from the Farmers Assistance Fund to balance that payment. Various issues arise when we consider this whole matter. The question of primary producers emergency assistance was tackled by members of this House following the very bad hailstorms which affected large parts of the State some time ago. The question of whether Loan funds, grants or advances should be made available was an issue that aroused some discussion within the community. At that time, while acknowledging that he has the power to make grants under the Act, the Minister said that in fact that was not going to be Government policy. We still await, I am sure with eager anticipation, any future developments in this regard because I continue to believe that there are certain expenses for losses sustained in natural disasters that deserve to be met by grants rather than advances.

As I have stated previously, it seems appropriate for advances to be made where future income will be derived, for example, for the purchase of new seed, fertilizer and other equipment involved in the growing of new crops. However, it would also seem appropriate that grants be made where living expenses for the intervening period, when no income is being received, were paid. The same situation should apply in regard to the reconstruction of any capital equipment that may have been damaged, as in

the case to which I referred earlier concerning the reconstruction of glasshouses. I will continue to press that point on numerous occasions when opportunity offers, because I believe that the Government must realise that there should be a duality in payments under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, that is, grants and advances, depending upon the direction to which the money should go.

It is timely that we recognise why the Act, which this Bill seeks to amend, is in the South Australian Statutes. In 1967, the principal Act was passed by this Parliament after being introduced by a Labor Government. The Labor Government then introduced to this House a Bill which was accepted by all sides. Certainly, credit should go to all sides, and similarly the Opposition is now accepting a Government initiative, but a Labor Party introduced the original Bill.

Another important point that we should be reminded of regarding the Labor Government which introduced the legislation is that the then Government gave notice of what it was doing without requiring the Commonwealth Government to come to the party with matching funds or some subsidy funding. The Government said clearly then that the money would be paid into the fund and that advances would be made from that fund and that certainly the Government would make an approach to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in funding at that stage, but that the payments or advances from the fund were not contingent upon Commonwealth support. That is just another example of how far Labor Governments in this State have been prepared to go to help the people in this State in whatever distress they may happen to face.

I am sorry that I do not have the opportunity to elaborate in greater detail on another important aspect, the question of insurance levies that might be levied on primary producers to finance partly any farmers assistance fund, so that payments can be made as grants rather than as advances.

I am well aware that in many overseas countries this system already applies. For example, primary producers in the United States and Canada have access to funds that provide grants and, in part, this is because they are treated as insurance schemes whereby insurance premiums are paid, levied in some way upon the production capacity of the farmers and, with the small payments that they make each year, they are able to fund the necessary grants that have to be paid when natural disasters strike certain areas. It is understandable that such a scheme would probably have to be a Federal one rather than a State scheme, inasmuch as disasters affect perhaps only a few States at a time and other States can help cushion the effect by their premium receipts.

There is one other point I want to make. I am sorry that I am so short of time to debate this matter, because there are other points that I wish to make. I may have to find another vehicle at another time for this purpose, but I am concerned about the proclamation of the Bill. I hope that the Minister will ensure that the Bill is proclaimed as soon as possible. The Opposition moved speedily in regard to the meat hygiene legislation because the Minister informed us that it needed to be proclaimed urgently to help the meat industry in this State.

The Opposition is dismayed that it has taken so long for certain provisions to be proclaimed. We hope that this Bill will be proclaimed immediately. The Opposition supports the Bill and hopes for its speedy passage.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I recognise the support that this measure has been given by the Opposition, and I will return later to several points on the matters raised by the member for Salisbury. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: AMDEL TESTING

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** During Question Time this afternoon, in response to a question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I provided to the House information about testing at Amdel. In the course of the provision of that information, I detailed dates and tests. Those dates and tests did not, I now discover, relate to tests conducted at Amdel but related to dates of acquisition of equipment by the South Australian Health Commission. So, I should correct the record by saying that in August 1980 high sensitivity gamma radiation equipment was acquired. In September 1980, alpha radiation counters for radon daughters and long-lived alpha emitting dusts were acquired. In February 1981, a radon gas detector for measuring radon in air was acquired, and in December 1980 surface contamination monitors for alpha and beta radiation were acquired.

In respect of the tests, the information is as follows. In August 1980, Amdel conducted routine monitoring programmes for gamma radiation, radon daughters and dust levels.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** That was in August, was it?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Which is exactly what I said yesterday.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, it is in keeping with what the Deputy Premier said. In November 1980, Amdel acquired equipment for surface testing. Information regarding the frequency of the testing would have to come from Amdel, as the Health Commission would not have that information. However, the South Australian Health Commission took samples of dust at Amdel in August 1980.

In September, these dust samples were tested. There is no reason why dust samples must be tested immediately: the tests are as valid if they are conducted after the collection. In November 1980, the dust and radon daughters were tested. I hope that that sets the record straight, and that this provides the Deputy Leader with the information that he sought at Question Time.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** The matter to which I wish to refer in this afternoon's adjournment debate relates to petrol prices and the way in which they have varied in this State. The variation that we have seen has tended to be of an upward nature. Every time that the Government does something, the prices go up again. Very often, this has happened because the Government's actions have in large part begged the question.

The problem that the petrol retailing industry faces is largely derived from the fact that much of the ownership of the retail distribution outlets is, in fact, in oil company hands and not in the hands of the actual people who run the places themselves.

The evidence has been quite clear for some time that even those people who operate outlets under licence agreements from oil companies are, in fact, as much under their control, if not more so, than those who actually only work for the oil companies directly. One of the points which motivated me to rise on this matter tonight was a letter I received from a constituent who travelled on his holidays in four States around Australia. He went over a distance of some 4 000 miles during the period 18 December to 27 January, travelling through our own State, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. As honourable members would imagine, during 4 000 miles he used a fair amount of petrol and had to stop at quite a few service stations. In fact, he stopped at some 35 outlets.

The point that concerned him was that he kept a record of all the moneys he paid, the prices he paid at each of the outlets. He was disturbed at the final information that that produced. He has made available to me the list of purchases that he made. I seek leave to have these figures inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure me that it is of a purely statistical nature?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes.

Leave granted.

**PETROL PURCHASES**

| Date | Town | State | Price per Litre | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19/12/80 | Elizabeth | S.A. | 36·5 | |
| 20/12/80 | Boronga | N.S.W. | 32·7 | |
| 20/12/80 | Balranald | N.S.W. | 34·6 | |
| 20/12/80 | Hay | N.S.W. | 34·7 | |
| 20/12/80 | West Wyalong | N.S.W. | 34·6 | |
| 21/12/80 | Parkes | N.S.W. | 35·1 | |
| 21/12/80 | Gilgandra | N.S.W. | 34·6 | |
| 21/12/80 | Coonabarabran | N.S.W. | 34·8 | |
| 22/12/80 | Narabri | N.S.W. | 34·6 | |
| 28/12/80 | Moree | N.S.W. | 35·8 | Average Price N.S.W. 34·6c |
| 22/12/80 | Goondawindi | Queensland | 38·9 | |
| 22/12/80 | Inglewood | Queensland | 37·8 | |
| 23/12/80 | Ipswich | Queensland | 36·0 | |
| 23/12/80 | Landsborough | Queensland | 31·9 | |
| 24/12/80 | Maroochydore | Queensland | 31·9 | |
| 28/12/80 | Nambour | Queensland | 31·9 | |
| 6/1/81 | Nambour | Queensland | 31·9 | |
| 8/1/81 | Nerang | Queensland | 37·1 | |
| 8/1/81 | Surfer's Paradise | Queensland | 30·9 | |
| 10/1/81 | Ballina | Queensland | 32·5 | Average Price Queensland 34·08c |
| 11/1/81 | Coff's Harbour | N.S.W. | 31·5 | |
| 12/1/81 | Port Macquarie | N.S.W. | 33·7 | |
| 12/1/81 | Newcastle | N.S.W. | 34·9 | |
| 13/1/81 | Peat's Ridge | N.S.W. | 34·8 | —(a tiny, tiny place in the mountains.) |
| 16/1/81 | Parramatta | N.S.W. | 31·5 | |
| 17/1/81 | Katoomba | N.S.W. | 34·4 | |
| 19/1/81 | Bargo | N.S.W. | 33·5 | |
| 19/1/81 | Gundagai | N.S.W. | 34·9 | |
| 20/1/81 | Holbrook | N.S.W. | 35·0 | |
| 20/1/81 | Albury | N.S.W. | 31·6 | Average Price N.S.W. 33·58c |
| 21/1/81 | Echuca | Victoria | 34·9 | |
| 22/1/81 | Swan Hill | Victoria | 33·5 | |
| 22/1/81 | Ouyen | Victoria | 37·9 | Average Price upper Victoria 35·43 |
| 22/1/81 | Pinnaroo | S.A. | 39·2 | |
| 23/1/81 | Strathalbyn | S.A. | 36·8 | Average Price S.A. 37·5c |

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The points that come from the figures which he made available and which list, as I have said, 35 separate prices, can be summarised as follows. He found that the average price he paid in New South Wales on his outward-bound journey was 34·6 cents a litre. On his return journey it was 33·58 cents a litre. In Queensland he paid an average of 34·08 cents a litre, and in Victoria he paid 35·43 cents a litre. The very telling figure is what he paid when he was in South Australia, both prior to leaving and on returning. The figure in this State was an average price of 37·5 cents a litre, the highest price that he paid anywhere. Of course, he was let off quite lightly when comparing the price he paid then with the present price that we are having to pay in South Australia, which is well over 39 cents a litre, so I suppose he can thank his lucky stars that he chose to go on holiday when he did.

One of the other points he noted was that the most expensive place of all was the South Australian town of Pinnaroo, where at that time he paid 39·2 cents a litre. He went to a great many outback country towns in his travels, and at no other point did he pay anywhere near that amount. One of the points he made to me in the letter he wrote was that he could understand that, while petrol at places like Hay or Balranald in the west of New South Wales would be expensive, because those towns are a great distance from the petrol distribution outlets, the price he found himself paying at those places was substantially less (34·7 cents and 34·6 cents a litre respectively), in each case than the price in metropolitan Adelaide. I think the point that we have to make here is that the Government has attempted various initiatives to control petrol pricing and distribution in this State. I

believe that the effectiveness of that can be best summed up in the words of a columnist who wrote for the *Age* on 7 February and who, when looking at the South Australian petrol situation, said:

> The people of South Australia have a heads I win tails you lose situation.

The Government reduced the wholesale price before Christmas by 3 cents a litre. We all paid 3 cents a litre more. The Government removed price control recently and we, yet again, pay up to 5 cents a litre more. It seems that whatever the Government does is bringing nothing else but increases in the price of petrol. This brings me to my next point: how significant is expensive petrol to the people of this State?

At the last election the Federal Government was making the point that we in Australia should count ourselves lucky that petrol here is cheaper than in many other parts of the world, and that, indeed, petrol here is cheaper now in terms of the earning capacity of Australians than it was 20 years ago. However, again, I suggest that that begs the question on quite a number of levels. The first point that I think ought to be mentioned is that, had the Federal Government followed the world parity pricing policy for petrol that it had initially stated it would, perhaps that might have been fair to bring Australia up by stages to world parity pricing over an extended period of time to cushion the effect on the petrol consuming public of this country. But, no, once the Government saw that lucrative sums of money were within its reach, it decided to grab for as much as it could as early as it could, the effect being that the price of petrol leapt far in excess of the inflation rate of this country. It has fuelled the inflation rate of this country and, more importantly, has put tremendous pressure on the wage and salary earners of this country, because they have had to face petrol price increases way out of the ordinary compared to that which they expected would take place. This is particularly relevant to people in my electorate and other outer suburban electorates who must travel great distances to get to work and who rely heavily on a car to get to work in many cases. They are finding that the petrol bill is eating into their budgets more and more.

One of the points that was made by the Federal Government is that petrol is cheaper here than in other countries. Again, we need to look at a few other facts to get the picture into its entire context. One of those facts is that, indeed, Adelaide (and most Australian cities) is more motorised than any other city in the world. We rely more on the private car than do most other big cities anywhere in the world. Public transport is well entrenched in most European cities and if one looks at the useage figures one can see, in fact, how many people use public transport in those cities. To us the car is more important, and therefore by consequence the price of petrol is more significant.

The other feature to which we must pay attention is the density of population. If one looks at the maps of the cities of Paris, London, Madrid or Rome, one finds that in an area similar to the metropolitan area of the city of Adelaide, those cities have a population many times greater than the population of Adelaide. In an area where we house 900 000 people, one finds that those great metropolises of the world house upwards of 5 000 000 to 12 000 000 people. Naturally, that means that the average distance people have to travel to work in those cities will be less than the average distance that people in Adelaide have to travel to work. Naturally, that reduces the significance of the price of petrol to those people, and I think that is a fact that the Federal Government cynically chose to ignore.

Similarly, by virtue of the production patterns in the automobile industry over the years, we have been used to buying larger cars, of greater consumption capacities. It is all very well to say that people should be driving four-cylinder cars, and I certainly support that, but we have a large stock of automobiles purchased over the years of six-cylinder or V8 capacity, which have been bought by average people of this country and which they cannot afford to turn over at this stage. Therefore, they are stuck with maintaining those vehicles, stuck with the high petrol consumption patterns of those vehicles for some time, and especially, given the way in which the second-hand price of four-cylinder vehicles has risen, they find that they cannot enter the second-hand market reasonably, because the resale value of their vehicles has plummeted.

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

**Dr. BILLARD (Newland):** I wish to address myself to a problem which is of concern to electors in my electorate, and I refer to the question of what use should be made of the Salisbury East open space area. This is a problem which was brought to my attention soon after I was elected to this House. It is an area of 288 hectares, and it lies to the east of the alignment of Bridge Road, to the north of the alignment of Smith Road, and to the south of the alignment of Golden Grove Road at Salisbury East.

It covers a part of the Para scarp which is a very attractive natural area. Land was purchased during the 1960's for the purpose of regional open space, and the land had not been developed and has still not been developed properly for the purpose for which it was intended. Until a few years ago local residents could at least walk through this area. A lot of residents, particularly from Salisbury Heights, did make use of it for this purpose. However, a few years ago fences and "No trespassing" signs were erected around the area, thus denying that use of this land to local residents thereafter.

So, upon my election as the member for Newland in 1979, I received representations from people in this area asking that some use be made of the land. They suggested many possible uses, for example, passive uses such as walking, horseriding, and so on. A golf course, ovals, barbecue and picnic areas were also suggested. As a result of these representations I wrote to the Minister of Planning, who subsequently established, through the State Planning Authority, a committee to investigate the use that could be made of the land. In his reply to me, dated 17 October 1979, he stated, in part:

> Salisbury East Reserve has been considered for high priority recreational development as a regional open space.

I will refer to that again later. Subsequently, late last year, I was approached by representatives of the Royal Zoological Society seeking my support for the creation of an open-range zoo on this land, and we had an interesting discussion. These people were able to clear up certain fears that I had about just what an open-range zoo was, and I was able to raise for them what I saw as a lot of problems to be solved.

As a result of that discussion, it was obvious that they had not considered a lot of the points which needed to be considered when the use of that Salisbury East land was determined. So, to be fair to them I said that I would withhold any judgment on their proposal until I had had a chance to see and digest a more detailed submission from them on the subject. I did not make any further statements on the subject until early this year. Nevertheless, I did point out to them what I could see as four conditions which would need to be satisfied before any submission for an open-range zoo could be supported on my part.

First, the land in question had been acquired by the State Planning Authority for the purpose of meeting district and regional recreation needs. I note that this was reinforced in the letter I received from the Minister the previous year. An open-range zoo is not really in this category. It is a State resource and not simply a district or regional resource. As a State resource it would draw people from right across the State and would be a resource for the whole State and possibly for people beyond if we could draw tourists from outside this State.

An open-range zoo is not in that category and it was therefore imperative as the first condition that all district and regional recreational needs were met first. The natural consequence was that, if the Zoological Society needed all of the land, it would not have my support. Some well defined regional recreation uses already had to be met.

Secondly, any proposal for an open range zoo that was so close to urban development would have to establish beyond doubt that its operation would not give rise to harmful environmental effects, such as dust, noise, smell, water run-off and security, and the Zoological Society would need to institute an environmental impact statement to establish beyond doubt that there would be no adverse effects on the neighbouring urban areas as a result of the zoo's being located there.

Thirdly, the society would need to establish how it would tackle the transport problem that would arise as a result of the placement of the zoo in that location. I have referred on previous occasions to the traffic problems that are already being experienced in that area and to the lack of arterial connectors between the Salisbury-Elizabeth region and the Tea Tree Gully region. It is obvious that the placement of a tourist drawcard in this locality, right in the centre of this traffic problem area, would attract even more traffic. Therefore, it was imperative that the society explain how extra traffic problems would be met.

Finally, I believed that, since this scheme involved such an unusual use for the land and such a radical change of land use, it must have the clear support of the majority of local residents. I have now read the three-page submission that has been put by the Zoological Society, and I believe that it does not answer any of those four conditions. Accordingly, I have declared that I will oppose the submission and I have petitioned the Minister of Planning likewise to oppose this submission. The society's submission asks, first, for all of the land. Secondly, it does not show how the society will manage that land. Thirdly, it does not show how the traffic will be managed. The submission simply states that most of the traffic to the zoo will occur at off-peak hours, and therefore there will be no problem. Fourthly, I believe that there has been a clear demonstration, with a petition of about 700 signatures presented to the local council, that there is significant opposition to the placement of the zoo in this location.

I stress, however, that in all of the dealings I have had on this subject, I have found no-one who is opposed to the concept of an open-range zoo. It was put to me by the society that the zoo must be located on this site so as to be close to the Adelaide-Barossa tourist corridor, but the submission pointed out that the Dubbo open-range zoo, on which this zoo would be based, is 410 kilometres from Sydney.

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

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** I wish to bring to the attention of the House some aspects of the plight of those in our community who are seeking adequate housing. The Opposition has been concerned about this matter for some time, and the member for Gilles has raised it on many occasions. It is interesting that the recent conference of Young Liberals, in its vote of no confidence in the Prime Minister, stated that the main objection to the Prime Minister and to the policies he espoused was that he did not appear to show concern for the disadvantaged in the Australian community.

It is now becoming clear, as reports come out, that there is indeed in this country a growing disparity between the rich and the poor that has never been experienced before. The reports that have been produced by the Brotherhood of St. Lawrence in Melbourne, and by the Victorian Council of Social Services in particular, have highlighted these great problems that face the future of our society. The statistics are nothing less than frightening and I will refer to one. That is the fact that there are 900 000 pensioners in Australia who receive the $4 a week rental allowance. That is a very heavily means tested allowance and it is an indication that there are 900 000 people in this country who have virtually nothing other than the fortnightly pension to support them.

There are at the moment almost 20 000 South Australians awating rental housing. The requirements to be put on the Housing Trust waiting list have been made more stringent in the period of office of this Government and it is very difficult indeed if an applicant for rental housing does not keep in touch to have his or her name or the name of the family maintained on that list.

The recent report on homeless youths in this State shows that 9 000 young people in South Australia lack adequate shelter. What does that report suggest be done to assist those 9 000 young people? It suggests that the Emergency Housing Office be given additional responsibility in helping those young people, but my experience in recent weeks shows that that office is in a hopeless position itself.

A lady constituent who had been living in rental accommodation in Norwood for 22 years came to see me. Because her tenancy agreement did not fall within the Residential Tenancies Act, she was given a fortnight's notice, and that was quite legal. In order to receive assistance from the Emergency Housing Office she had to wait nine days to get an appointment, nine days to get even preliminary advice, and she had 14 days notice, so it just was not practical for her to sit back to wait to get that advice.

I had a similar experience with a family that had separated. They were both recipients of pensions and had children. They were living in most unsatisfactory conditions. They had received counselling advice and decided to reunite. It was important to find housing so that that could be facilitated. Once again, the period they had to wait to get preliminary help to find emergency housing, not permanent housing, was so great that that reconciliation was jeopardised. Statistics show that the emergency housing service is becoming an ineffective service in the community, unless it is given more staff and funds, a greater priority in Government budgeting provision, and a greater priority in the Government's attitude towards those in need.

I have in my district one of the only two emergency hostels that provide accommodation for families. It is well known that Government assistance over the years for homeless persons has been limited to single-sex institutions. We hear much from the Government about the importance of the family in our community. Where families are homeless, I believe they should be housed together, not sent off to separate institutions according to their sex. Only two institutions provide such facilities. The institution in my district housed 330 individuals last year and, in a little over a year, the other institution, which I

understand is at Mansfield Park, housed some 396 individuals. The estimate of the number of persons who received shelter through the various women's shelters and men's homes in 1980 was approximately 10 000.

Therefore, we can see that a vast number of people require emergency housing just to provide a roof over their heads from night to night. The institution in my electorate which provides this very valuable service sought assistance from the Minister of Community Welfare late last year, and the Minister was very sympathetic to the financial problems it was experiencing. As it is a church institution, the church decided that the institution should be closed down, because it could no longer support it financially. However, the church was urged to continue because some funding would be provided in the future. Despite the fact that the Community Welfare Grants Committee had found that the institution was ineligible for grants under its guidelines, the Minister said that he would be prepared to seek other funding.

The church then agreed to continue this service to the community. However, many months have passed and there has been no indication of funding, which is most disturbing indeed. I have made representations to the Minister to remind him of his concern, and undoubtedly he has a genuine concern, but it must be backed up with action if people are to be housed when there is this pressing need. One hopes that the Government will provide some funds to this church institution.

I understand that the institution has many families referred to it by the emergency housing office. In fact, some 22 per cent of the people referred to it come from that source, while 32 per cent come from the Department of Community Welfare itself. Therefore, some 54 per cent of the people requiring this service come directly from Government sources, and undoubtedly there is an obligation on the Government to assist in the running of this service. Hopefully, the Government will see fit to expand the service and provide other institutions in the community where emergency housing for families could be provided.

Members of the institution in my electorate told me that in December and January they had referred back to the emergency housing office for further advice on long-term housing for some 17 families needing help. Of those, 10 families had to wait a week or more for an interview, and four of those families were unable to get appointments at all. It is a most unsatisfactory situation that on the one hand the institution is assisting a Government office in providing short-term emergency housing, but when it seeks assistance itself it cannot get it.

I have no qualms about the diligence, concern and the expertise of the officers in the emergency housing office. I sympathise with them for the enormous work load they must have and the hopeless task before them in trying to find housing that does not exist in the community. This is an indication that the Government itself does not place the provision of housing very high in its programme. The House has been told many times before of the tremendous cutback in Commonwealth funds to the States for housing. In fact, in real terms, this State receives some 12 per cent of the funds that it received in 1975 for the provision of low-income housing, yet we hear no protests from the Government or the Minister of Housing about this disastrous financial situation facing the State in providing this presumably basic obligation of the Government to the community.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 17 February at 2 p.m.