

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 August 1981

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

PETITION: TRAFFIC SIGNALS

A petition signed by 1 332 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide adequate funding for the erection of traffic signals at the corner of Frederick Road and Trimmer Parade, Seaton, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: GAS FRACTIONATING PLANT

A petition signed by 1 056 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to call for an independent inquiry into the social effects of further development of the Upper Spencer Gulf and reject the site of Stony Point and surrounding coastal areas as unsuitable for the proposed gas fractionating plant was presented by Mr Max Brown.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon D. O. TONKIN**: As members know, the Federal Budget was brought down by the Treasurer, Mr Howard, in the House of Representatives last night. A number of matters outlined in the Budget clearly affect South Australia, and it is appropriate that I take this opportunity to comment on them.

In blunt terms, the position outlined in the Budget confirms the need for continued tight financial stringency in the coming State Budget. Nothing released by Mr Howard has eased this State's present financial situation. The Federal Government's financial position appears to be strong, but at least in part this has been achieved at the expense of the States. The Budget paper showed Commonwealth spending would increase by 15 per cent in the current financial year, but the money it has made available to the States is less than 8 per cent.

In South Australia's case the position appears on the surface to be even worse. Our increase in Federal funding, including loans, is only 5.6 per cent. The reasons are several. Hospital cost sharing has been discontinued in all States but South Australia and Tasmania, which still have hospital cost sharing agreements. In other States, the Commonwealth has included an allowance for the ending of these agreements in general revenue funds. Queensland has had an additional health grant of \$16 000 000. South Australia's grants for hospitals are included in the form of specific purpose grants.

A second factor is the extra tax sharing grants of \$69 000 000 made to New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland at the June Premiers' Conference, pending further review of the Grants Commission Relativities Report.

Another important factor is that the formula for general revenue funding is based on population and State relativities, as agreed to by the previous Dunstan Labor Government in 1976. There is nothing we can do about that. This

was an agreement which we inherited from the Dunstan Government, and which cannot be changed. South Australia's population growth is a key factor in the Federal Government's allocations. In recent years there has been a small annual reduction in South Australia's population, due largely to interstate migration. This trend began as far back as 1975. The increased movement of people out of South Australia from 1975 coincided with a dramatic rise in unemployment. There is a clear correlation between job opportunities and the tendency of people to move to other States.

Our population growth for a number of years has been unsatisfactory, and we have gradually fallen behind in comparison with other States. States such as Western Australia and Queensland, which have been developing largely because of mineral projects, have reaped the benefits of attracting population through the present formula. This is one reason why it is so important that all South Australians must assist in promoting and fulfilling our development potential. There is simply no excuse for negative or destructive criticism, and all South Australians should be aware of the damage which can be done to the State's prospects by unwarranted pessimism and expressions of doom and despair. In plain terms, each extra person permanently attracted to this State will mean an extra \$570 from the Commonwealth available for spending in this State on facilities and services such as education, health and community welfare.

The drain of population which began in the mid-70s is a drain on the prosperity of this State. That is why the Government's determination to develop rich mineral resources is so vital to future generations. One of the predictions of doom and disaster has been a suggestion that South Australia has been singled out for especially harsh treatment in the Budget. This is demonstrably false. The additional 2½ per cent sales tax on a wide range of goods will have no greater adverse effect on South Australia's key motor vehicle and whitegoods industries than it will on any other State's industrial or manufacturing sectors. The tax applies across the board, across Australia. It will not be a specific disadvantage to South Australian manufacturers, and it is irresponsible to say so. There could be a slight dampening of demand generally because of increased prices, but this will be felt by interstate manufacturers as much as it will be felt by South Australian industry. Obviously, there will be an adverse effect on employment, and this is to be greatly regretted. But, generally, these are the considered views of industry leaders, who have assured me today that the effect of the increased sales tax will be nowhere near as great as has been predicted by some people in the last 24 hours.

While there were, of course, some disappointments in the Budget, there were also some positive benefits for the people of this State. The best news was that the widely predicted tax on wine did not materialise. My Government persistently argued to the Federal Government the enormous potential damage a wine tax would do to the wine industry, in particular, and to the South Australian economy, generally. We were well supported by members of Federal and State Parliaments from all Parties and every sector of the industry itself. I take this opportunity to record my thanks for their efforts in helping to persuade the Federal Government not to impose a tax on wine.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I ask the honourable Premier to resume his seat, please. Leave was sought by him to make a Ministerial statement. That leave was granted without any dissentient voice. I ask all members to please be silent while the statement is given.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order. I desire to point out that the Premier is on page four of an eight-page statement, which is really only political guff. It is not a Ministerial statement at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Mitcham will be aware that a Minister, in seeking leave to make a Ministerial statement, can then proceed to make a statement based on that leave. The only restriction that will be placed on such a move by the Chair is that which was highlighted in the week before last, that there may be no attack upon a member in another place, nor can it be used as a guise for answering a question from another place. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Another major and positive advantage to South Australia was the Federal Government's commitment to spend more than \$7 000 000 on upgrading the Adelaide Airport to accept international flights.

This will prove of tremendous benefit to the tourist industry and help boost the State's development of trade and industry. It will not be too long before overseas flights will be able to come direct to Adelaide on a limited basis, and South Australians will be able to fly overseas without the inconvenience and expense of making costly and time-consuming stop-overs in interstate terminals. In addition, extensions to the runway and terminal facilities will provide employment for the construction industry and, when completed, the upgraded airport will require increased staff in areas like customs, baggage handling, and security.

The Budget also pledges finance for work on the standard gauge rail spur line to Outer Harbor, a significant aid to the movement of South Australian produced goods to interstate markets, and overseas. There were genuine incentives in the Budget for heavy industry in this State, too. The Federal Government has decided to allow the accelerated depreciation of capital expenditure on plant and equipment used in the production of iron and steel. Members will be aware of the vital role played in the South Australian economy by the iron and steel industry. The new depreciation concessions will be of great benefit to the Iron Triangle region and will further promote the upgrading of this important industry.

I was greatly disappointed that last night's Budget contained no direct relief for home buyers, farmers and business people struggling to manage rising loan interest repayments. As I outlined to the House yesterday, I have made persistent approaches to the Federal Government seeking some form of relief, possibly through a system of tax deductibility, for people facing difficulty in repaying loans. I am again writing to the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, urging him to take a fresh look at this question.

While the large domestic surplus outlined in the Federal Budget will relieve pressure on interest rates, the effects are unlikely to be reflected before the end of the year. What is needed is short-term action to relieve the plight of people who are risking the loss of their life savings because of high interest rates. In the meantime, in spite of our financial difficulties, I have asked our Treasury officers to examine possible measures to provide relief for people in extreme difficulties.

Another area of concern to the Government is possible abuse of the new pricing resulting from increased sales tax on a wide range of goods. I have asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to instruct officers of his department to make spot checks in the retail industry to ensure that there is no unfair profiteering as prices inevitably rise. The additional 2½ per cent sales tax to be applied to building materials will have a further adverse effect on the building industry, and on home builders. This impost could add something like \$500 to the construction cost of a modest home at a time when the industry is going through a period

of severe difficulty. I have written to the Prime Minister today urging him to exempt building materials from sales tax to prevent further difficulties for the building industry. By abandoning the tax on building materials, the Government would not lose a great deal in revenue but would provide genuine assistance to the building industry.

While there were positive points in the Federal Budget for South Australia, I must again stress that South Australia's financial position is still unchanged. Every State Government is facing the same sort of Budget problems as those which are concerning my Government, as the Premier of New South Wales made clear last night in warning of severe and stringent cuts. Only yesterday the Victorian Government increased electricity charges by 20 per cent, an indication of the difficulties being experienced in that State.

Spending reductions which we have implemented since coming to office have gone some way to easing the budgetary position in South Australia, but I must again emphasise that, because of savage cuts by the Commonwealth in State funding, the Budget I will be introducing in this House shortly will be one of the toughest for many years.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling questions, I indicate that any questions normally directed to the Minister of Industrial Affairs will be taken by the Minister of Transport.

SALES TAX

Mr BANNON: Does the Premier agree that Treasurer Howard's new 2½ per cent sales tax on a range of previously untaxed items is the forerunner of a heavier, across-the-board general retail tax, and would such a tax be consistent with the broadly based consumer tax that the Premier has advocated on a number of occasions? It has been reported that the Federal Treasurer's levy of 2½ per cent sales tax on previously exempt items involves the establishment of machinery that could provide for comprehensive sales tax collections at later dates.

On a number of occasions the Premier has advocated an across-the-board consumer tax: in December 1979, he said that it could well be that we have to consider a State sales tax; in January last year, he was reported to be considering a sales turnover tax; in the United Kingdom in April 1980, he spoke approvingly of the general principles of value added tax; in August last year he was quoted as saying that the States could introduce a broadly based turnover tax or even a sales tax; and, earlier this year, particularly in February, he was reported as being in support of States sharing an increased consumer tax to be levied by the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition stopped there, because, really, he is going on with the most absurd rubbish.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The great hilarity and relief that is apparent in the rather disgraceful behaviour of the Opposition this afternoon is probably due to the absence of the member for Elizabeth from the Chamber. I can think of no other reason for the relief and the hilarity that is so obviously coming forward. The Leader of the Opposition totally and absolutely misrepresented the situation in everything he said. I could understand one omission, two omissions I could forgive, but a series of omissions must be deliberate. The Leader deliberately at all times has refrained from saying 'as an alternative to pay-roll tax'.

There is no doubt that there is every need to find an alternative to pay-roll tax.

I have said many times, and I believe that the Leader has expressed the same opinion from time to time, that pay-roll tax is an iniquitous tax. It is a tax on employment; unfortunately, it makes up a major part of the State's revenue. If we can find some alternative (and I am pleased to see that the Leader is signifying his agreement), I am quite certain that everyone in South Australia will be very pleased indeed. On every occasion on which the matter of a broadly based consumer tax or any other form of tax comes forward, the whole question is put as an alternative to pay-roll tax. I am quite certain that the Leader would lend his support to anything we could do in that direction.

The Leader said I first proposed a broadly based consumer tax some time ago, early last year, and that is quite right. I did do that, as a possible alternative to pay-roll tax. I had already expressed that view on other occasions. In London I certainly said that, in some ways, I would prefer value added tax if it were a workable alternative to pay-roll tax, but that does not mean that I support a value added tax. I do not, but almost anything would be better than inflicting a tax on employment. The Leader of the Opposition knows that perfectly well. His question was whether I agree that the present imposition of a 2½ per cent sales tax on a range of items not previously taxed is a forerunner of some general retail tax.

I am not privy to the thoughts of the Federal Treasurer, nor am I able to see into the future any more than he can. It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition's guess is just as good as anyone else's on that one. It is in line with what I have been advocating. I must admit to being slightly disappointed. I would have thought if we could replace pay-roll tax, as States, it would be because we could institute our own broadly based consumer tax on a State basis. The action by the Federal Government in taking over the sales tax area takes away any opportunity that the States may have had for devising a scheme based on a broadly based consumer tax to replace pay-roll tax. That removes one of the options that we have. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would regret that as much as I would. It is my view that, with this increase in sales tax which is coming forward, it is very likely that the Federal Government is considering some reduction in income tax. When it is going to do that, or, indeed, if it is going to do that, is entirely in the hands of the Federal Government and the Federal Treasurer. I can only say that I would welcome such a move.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE

Mr OLSEN: Is the Minister of Health aware that contradictory statements have been made in relation to the need for medical and/or hospital insurance cover as it affects country people in South Australia? Does the Minister support the statement issued by the South Australian Health Commission? Following the issue of the South Australian Health Commission's statement, several hospital board chairmen have publicly refuted the suggestion that hospital insurance only is necessary to cover outpatient services at their hospitals. Concern has been expressed at the confusion generated by those statements.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I certainly do support the Health Commission's statement, and, in so far as the word 'statement' is used, I take it the member for Rocky River is referring to a pamphlet prepared by the South Australian Health Commission in order to assist those low income earners who just miss out for eligibility for free hospital and medical treatment. The Government

is very concerned indeed to ensure that those people are taken care of, that they have access to medical as well as hospital care, and that the burden of insurance does not fall too heavily upon them.

As a result of trying to achieve that object, the Health Commission is recommending, as an option for those people only (not as a general option for everyone, but as an option for low income earners), that hospital only insurance is taken out. This insurance will entitle anyone who seeks it to have access to outpatient medical services of the kind which have been traditionally provided and which are freely available from metropolitan hospitals. Under the present system, people who want that kind of medical service can go to their local general practitioner, who will bulk bill to pay for that service. After 1 September this will not apply. The options available will be for people to go to their doctor and incur a bad debt; for people to avoid going to their doctor because they fear incurring a bad debt; or for those people to seek medical service from the outpatients department of a country or city hospital, as the case may be.

In the country, the system, we believe, can be suitably dealt with by an arrangement which the Health Commission has proposed to the A.M.A., which is that the doctors will be paid 75 per cent of the scheduled fee for providing those services to country people from the hospitals. Obviously, they would not be able to be provided at any hour of the day or night in the same way as casualty services are at present provided, but we believe that arrangements can be made for them to be provided at pre-appointed times. The A.M.A. has indicated that at this stage it is not prepared to accept that proposal.

An honourable member: Disgraceful!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That seems to me not so much disgraceful as surprising, because, at the same time that the President of the A.M.A. indicated that the association was not willing at that stage to support that proposal, he indicated that he felt confident that doctors would provide services to the disadvantaged and to those in need. In other words, we have an assurance that charges will not be proceeded against these people. It seems to me that it would be preferable for doctors to provide the medical services from country hospitals for 75 per cent of the scheduled fee, rather than run the risk of a bad debt or not making a charge at all. Therefore, I feel confident that the majority of doctors in the country ultimately will adopt the proposal that the Health Commission has put to them. This morning I discussed this matter with recognised South Australian country hospitals at their annual conference. Obviously, the situation will have to be monitored, because country hospitals, apart from those very large ones, are not geared to provide an outpatient service, but in law they are obliged to do so after 1 September. I feel confident that arrangements can be made which will not cause undue disruption and which will ensure that country people are not at any disadvantage as a result of living in the country and that they will be entitled to the same kind of services that city people have grown to expect.

FRASER GOVERNMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier continue to urge South Australians, in the terms of his press advertisement last October, to support Malcolm Fraser's strong leadership, to represent his Government and that of Mr Fraser as a strong and united partnership, or will the Premier continue to say this at or before election times and at other embarrassing times try to distance himself from his Federal colleagues, thus attempting to get the best of both worlds?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has raised a very good question. I must say that there have been times, particularly after Premiers' Conferences and other days, when I have wondered very much about the policies of the Federal Government. Then, I go a little further and I think of what the alternative would be, and I think back to the days of the Whitlam Government. I look back to the record inflation and record levels of unemployment which began in those days. I think of the record levels of interest rates which came up at that stage and which have been surpassed only now. I think back to days when the former Premier of this State, Mr Dunstan, used to get very cross indeed publicly with Mr Whitlam on some occasions, but at other times acquiesced in every single thing he was asked to do. One has only to look at the Land Commission fiasco, at the acquiescence in the Monarto disaster, at the tragic levels of inflation which were fast sending this State and this country into a position from which I think the present Government has done a remarkable job to recover. In other words, I believe that the Federal Government, in general terms, by controlling inflation and by doing everything it has done, has done the very best job possible for Australia. The fact that the States have been made very uncomfortable in managing their own financial affairs is a price that one must live with for not having a democratic socialist spendthrift expansionary and tax-increasing Government in Canberra.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will consistently support the Federal Liberal Government for its general policies and its management of the Australian economy, and there is no way that I would go along with the profligate and irresponsible days of Whitlam, repeated either under Mr Hayden's leadership or under Mr Hawke's leadership, although I must admit that Mr Hawke was quite notable by his absence from any form of comment or publicity yesterday. I think that he, like the member for Elizabeth, has no faith in the leadership of the Federal Labor Party, any more than the member for Elizabeth, and, I suspect, a large number of his colleagues who are as yet afraid to declare themselves have in the present leadership of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SHIPWRECKS

Mr RUSSACK: Is the Minister of Environment and Planning aware of recent media coverage given to the shipwrecks off the South Australian coast, and can he say what steps are being taken to stop the indiscriminate pilfering and salvaging of these shipwrecks? I refer to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 9 August on the exploits of a Mr Robinson, from Western Australia, who is a diver and shipwreck hunter. The report states:

Mr Robinson is a great advocate of a change in the law to provide some reward for the finder of historic wrecks containing treasure and other valuable cargo. He said, 'There are plenty of wrecks around South Australia. All that is needed is the right incentive for divers to look for them.'

Representing the district of Goyder, I know that there are numerous wrecks in the waters at the foot of Yorke Peninsula, particularly in the waters surrounding Kangaroo Island, which is in the district of Alexandra, represented in this House by the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I have already announced in this House that the Government intends to introduce during this session legislation to protect shipwrecks. I am glad the member for Goyder has referred to the article in the *Sunday*

Mail, because it needs clarifying. It contained some inaccuracies which need to be cleared up.

The Heritage Conservation Branch of my department will be responsible for powers under the Commonwealth Act when they are delegated, probably later this year. Also, the department will be responsible for the State Act, which will mirror the Commonwealth legislation. The legislation will encourage and seek the support of the public and divers, historians, and so on. Under the Act, people locating wrecks will be responsible for notifying the Heritage Conservation Branch of their finds. They will then be entitled to a reward if the wreck is seen to be significant. The amount of the reward is not predetermined, for obvious reasons. Each case will need to be looked at individually, and the reward given will depend on the circumstances.

The legislation will therefore provide adequate reward for divers who are really serious and who have a serious interest in reporting shipwrecks in South Australian waters so that they can be protected. Unfortunately, some divers do not see this as an adequate reward and are interested only in gaining more reward not only in money terms but also in artifacts from the shipwrecks themselves. The wrecks are extremely important to South Australians, and are very much part of this State's heritage, but at present they are being salvaged for artifacts that will be lost and probably destroyed.

Artifacts raised from shipwrecks need special and lengthy conservation to stabilise them in their new environment. If this is not done, they will gradually corrode and fall apart. So, the Heritage Conservation Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning is undertaking a programme of recording and protecting of our maritime heritage, and will help and advise the public on any matter in this area. It is important that the member for Goyder and other members of this House should recognise that the State is anxious to act in this regard, and that we will be introducing legislation in this Parliamentary session to protect shipwrecks in South Australian waters.

MAN BUSES

Mr O'NEILL: Can the Minister of Transport tell the House the reason or reasons for the delay in the construction of MAN buses for the State Transport Authority? Does he intend to do anything to avoid redundancies of workers employed to fulfil that contract? It has been brought to my attention that, as a direct result of delays on MAN components, already nine people have been retrenched, and unless something is done to expedite delivery further retrenchments will occur.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have not been informed whether there are any retrenchments. If there are I will be extremely concerned, because one of the reasons that we insist in this State that construction of bus bodies is carried out by P.M.C. is to provide work for South Australians. I shall be extremely concerned if there are any retrenchments, and I will get a report for the honourable member on the matter.

CYS SCHEME

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, say whether he is concerned that the federally funded Community Youth Support Scheme will be abolished on 31 October 1981, and can he say what alternatives will be used to replace this scheme? A report in today's *Advertiser*, following the Fed-

eral Treasurer's announcement last night, under the heading 'Boost for programmes to help the hunt for jobs', states:

The Federal Government will spend \$203 000 000 in 1981-82 on programmes designed to expand the supply of skilled labour and to assist young people looking for jobs.

The final paragraph states:

Because of the increases in these programmes, the Government will end the Community Youth Support Scheme on 31 October 1981.

The Minister and most members would be aware of the excellent work carried out by Community Youth Support Schemes in the metropolitan area, referring particularly to those at Henley Beach and Plympton. I am also concerned that the new programme will help 17 to 18-year-old technically minded people, but may not provide employment and training opportunities for the 18 to 25-year-olds who do not seek those technical skills.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I appreciate the honourable member's concern about this very important matter which my colleague, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, has been considering for the past few weeks. It was mentioned in July in this House, and if the concern of members on this side is anything to go by, that the discontinuance of such a scheme is very much to be regretted. Certainly, when I was in Opposition I had something to do with Community Youth Support Schemes in the northern suburbs. I thought the work done by those people and the schemes were admirable. I will discuss the matter with my colleague when he returns tomorrow. He will, no doubt, make an announcement at the appropriate time.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport say when it is expected that traffic control signal lights will be installed and operating at the junction of Trimmer Parade and Frederick Road, Seaton, and what is the anticipated cost? Can he say what is the basis of the financial responsibility of the cost-sharing agreement with the Highways Department and the Woodville City Council?

On 11 August I received correspondence from the Secretary of the Seaton High School Council, which enclosed a copy of a letter directed to the Town Clerk of the City of Woodville, as follows:

The Seaton High School Council is still concerned about the very bad condition of Frederick Road from the Grange railway line to Trimmer Parade and also the lack of traffic lights on the intersection of Trimmer Parade and Frederick Road. We consider this is a highly dangerous situation for those of our students who travel to and from school by bicycle.

These matters have been the subject of a good deal of correspondence between the Woodville Corporation and this school council in the past, to date with no satisfactory results. In view of the potential danger to our students that now exists, we ask that money for Frederick Road and the Trimmer Parade/Frederick Road intersection be included in the works committee programme of your next budget. We also feel that bicycle tracks in this area could be considered.

Today I presented a petition from more than 1 300 constituents in my district and the Henley Beach district, those from Henley Beach being gathered by the A.L.P. candidate for that area, complaining about the need for funding by the State Government in this matter. To support that view, I refer now to a letter which was sent by the Corporation of the City of Woodville to me which was dated 20 May 1980, and which in part states:

In reply to your letter of 2 January 1980, you are advised that council has been discussing the reconstruction of Frederick Road from the railway to Trimmer Parade and the Frederick Road/Trimmer Parade intersection with representatives of the Highways Department for some time. . .

The letter also states:

Recently, council made application to the Commissioner of Highways for such a grant, and a copy of the letter is enclosed for your information. Any assistance you are able to give towards the granting of these funds would be greatly appreciated.

I understand that the Woodville council estimates the cost of upgrading this intersection and the lead-up to these roads to be in the vicinity of \$70 000. I am led to believe, further, that an application has been made to the State Government for a grant of some \$50 000, because this road comes under the eligible funding area of the Highways Department through the urban arterial roads grants. In light of the concern expressed by this school, and the petition presented today, will the Minister advise when a start is to be made on this very dangerous intersection?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I should make quite plain at the outset that applications for school crossings and the installation of traffic lights constitute an area of construction which is extremely sensitive to the community. Also, there are hundreds of them. The only way that they can be installed is on a priority basis. I would be the last person to say that the intersection of Trimmer Parade and Frederick Road is not a situation worthy of the installation of signals. There is no doubt that the installation will take place. I am not prepared to tell the honourable member when, because at this stage—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If the honourable member wants to hear the answer to the question, he should keep quiet. The intersection is under the care and control of the Corporation of the City of Woodville, but Frederick Road is designated as an arterial road, whereas Trimmer Parade is a local road. I would be the last person to want to see a difference of opinion about whose responsibility the intersection is; because that would hold up the installation. The installation should take place in priority order, and so it shall. However, we are reviewing the responsibilities in the area, and when that review is completed the honourable member will get his answer.

WATER STORAGE

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Water Resources say what is the present holding of water in the metropolitan reservoirs and how—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN:—it compares with holdings of previous years? With your permission, Mr Speaker, and with the permission of members opposite, who are in drought at present, I point out that the Minister would realise that, for many reasons, this question is important to the State and to its finances. I understand that the cost of pumping water is about \$2 000 000 a year: the member for Hartley may be able to say whether that is right.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: There are two important aspects to this question—the quality of the water and, as the member for Hartley has indicated, the saving to the taxpayers of South Australia. The reduction in the cost of pumping water this financial year as compared with last financial year is estimated to be about \$1 500 000. The current holding of the reservoirs is 97 per cent: in fact, it is not possible to keep all of the reservoirs at full capacity, no matter what the intake, because a certain capacity must remain unutilised as a flood mitigation potential.

Total storage at present is 97 per cent, and it has been at that level for some weeks. A certain amount of water must be spilled to enable the margin of 3 per cent to be

maintained in the critical reservoirs for flood protection. The important thing is that not only will we save \$1 500 000 in direct electricity charges but also the water quality in the metropolitan area of Adelaide will be better because of the lower salinity level than would apply if the water was pumped from the Murray River.

COTTAGE HOMES

Mr HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Lands reconsider his decision to put an exorbitant price of \$15 000 on a small parcel of Crown land on which the Loxton council wishes to build aged cottage homes? During the recent successful shadow Cabinet meeting in the Riverland, I was informed that an area of Crown land had been vested in the Loxton council as a recreation area. The council, recognising the need for supplying aged cottage accommodation, approached the Department of Lands for a small parcel of that land on which to build a cluster of pensioner homes. The area is ideal because it is close to the local hospital, and existing services run past the land. The council requested that the land be made available, but the Department of Lands placed an exorbitant value of \$15 000 on it.

The Loxton council, in an attempt to reach a compromise, offered to pay \$7 500, but that offer has been ignored. I have been given to understand by the council that the Minister, despite his being the local member, will not meet with the council to discuss the matter and, subsequently, the Loxton council has been forced to appeal to the Minister of Local Government for his support in this matter.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The explanation given by the honourable member is quite misleading and dishonest. I have met with the Loxton council not only in regard to this matter but also on a number of occasions in regard to many matters that concern that area. The honourable member is probably not aware that it is the responsibility of the Department of Lands to place a value on that land: that value has been determined by the Valuer-General.

It is not an exorbitant value: many people in the community would be very happy to purchase land at that price. I suggested that council should approach the Minister of Local Government, because that is the valuation that was placed on that piece of land. If any subsidy is to be provided, the approach should be made to the Government through the Minister of Local Government. The explanation given by the honourable member is quite misleading and dishonest.

WATER QUALITY

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy investigate whether any undesirable consequences on the groundwater quality used for irrigation and stock are likely to result in those aquifers intersected by drilling contractors obtaining core samples for mining companies, from their exploration leases, on farms in my electorate in particular and anywhere in South Australia in general?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Sir.

BLOOD LEAD LEVELS

Mr KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Health initiate a comprehensive test of lead-in-blood levels of Port Pirie citizens who are not already part of a testing programme and provide the necessary assistance to the city council for its testing of schoolchildren's lead-in-blood levels? The B.H.A.S. company currently runs a lead-in-blood testing

programme for its employees, and the Health Commission is carrying out a similar programme on pregnant women in Port Pirie. According to today's *Advertiser*, the Port Pirie local board of health will be testing all schoolchildren for lead absorption. Nevertheless, the majority of Port Pirie citizens are still without any testing of their lead-in-blood levels. To demonstrate the concern of just two citizens of Port Pirie, I will quote from two letters written to the local press by mothers who have high lead-in-blood levels themselves and whose children have higher levels. One lady says:

There is, in certain areas of Port Pirie, a larger percentage of children with co-ordination problems, ability to concentrate impaired, increased distractibility and insurmountable behavioural problems.

Another lady says:

I don't know how the Minister of Health, Mrs Adamson, can say it cannot harm any child when my son had to have lead taken out. I was also told by a leading specialist what it can do if lead in the body goes over the danger level.

There is considerable consternation in Port Pirie concerning lead-in-blood levels. I think all citizens ought to be adequately tested and I believe the Government is the responsible body to carry out that testing.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As the honourable member has mentioned, a comprehensive epidemiological study is being conducted in Port Pirie of a selected group of the population, namely, children virtually from conception and throughout childhood. That involves the testing of expectant mothers. This study is being conducted with the co-operation of local residents. My advice from the Health Commission is that this study, which has been specially designed to achieve certain objectives, is the most effective study that could be undertaken and that it is the only real way of determining the level of lead and the effects of that level of lead upon residents of Port Pirie. I feel sure that, if the Health Commission believed that an extension of the study to embrace all sections of the population would achieve a worthwhile result, it would have made such a recommendation to me. I have had no such recommendation. I am happy to seek advice from the Commission in response to the honourable member's question. However, I am confident, on the basis of the advice I have received, that the present study has been designed for a specific purpose and there would be no point in expanding it.

LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

Mr BLACKER: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that livestock producers on Kangaroo Island have been pressing for the Samcor works at Port Lincoln to be upgraded to United States Department of Agriculture export standards and, if so, what support is the Minister giving to those requests and those of the industry on Eyre Peninsula? Yesterday, I received a letter from Mr D. H. Kelly, Senior Executive Officer of the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Inc., as follows:

Dear Mr Blacker,

As you will know, livestock producers on Kangaroo Island have been pressing for the Samcor works at Port Lincoln to be upgraded to enable it to obtain a United States Department of Agriculture export licence.

This proposal has had the strong support of U.F.S. Zones 1, 2 and 3 on Eyre Peninsula, and I was asked to submit for your attention the following resolution carried by the Extraordinary General Meeting of our Wool and Meat Section on 20 July 1981:

That Parliamentarians, Messrs P. D. Blacker and A. M. Whyte, be approached to give full publicity and support in the plan to have Samcor works at Port Lincoln upgraded to U.S.D.A. standards.

No doubt you have had other approaches in regard to this matter and any assistance you may be able to give in bringing about the desired outcome would be much appreciated.

I also would assume that the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Eyre, who represent the areas in question, have received similar letters.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: There is no question about the desirability of maximising the throughput of the Port Lincoln works. It has been suggested that one of the ways in which that can be done is to upgrade those works so that the processed meat has access to the widest possible market available. One of the market areas which is currently unavailable, as was indicated by the member for Flinders, is the United States market. There are several ways by which those premises can be funded for the purposes of upgrading to U.S.D.A. licence standard, and those options are being considered by the Government. I have no doubt that a method of financing that upgrading will be found and that details will be made available to the member for Flinders and to the community in the near future.

With respect to the other part of the honourable member's question concerning the expressed desire of Kangaroo Island farmers to have the upgrading work done, that is a matter about which I am not directly aware. I know that the proprietors of Lincoln Bacon, who are operators within the Port Lincoln Samcor works, have publicly expressed their desire for upgrading to occur. I appreciate the commercial background to the statement that was made. Of course, it is in the commercial interests of the Lincoln Bacon proprietors, Freezepak and others which might operate at the Port Lincoln works, to maximise the throughput and to attract as much livestock into the works as possible.

It is true that the vehicular ferry space rates that apply on the *M.V. Troubridge* are precisely the same between the Kingscote port and Port Lincoln as they are between the Kingscote port and, unfortunately, the upper reaches of the Port River (not Outer Harbor). The situation at this stage is that the rural community on Kangaroo Island has access via the vehicular ferry to either works. If the livestock is the type that they are proposing to sell for slaughter and despatch to the United States markets, then, of course, they will explore the avenues open to them to transport stock to Samcor at Gepps Cross, but at this stage they do not have two strings to their bow.

There are, of course, other avenues by which the Port Lincoln works management, and hopefully stock agents, can attract more livestock into that works to increase its operation, and indeed to improve its viability. I refer particularly to livestock that may be attracted to the works from the northern region now that the Whyalla works (if it is not already closed) is to be closed in the very near future. It would seem that the Port Lincoln premises should further attract livestock from the upper reaches of Eyre Peninsula, and beyond to the north, so that, collectively, the increasing throughput of the works will enhance its opportunity to remain as a facility for Eyre Peninsula, which I believe should be the case.

HOSPITAL ACCOUNTS

Mr CRAFTER: Can the Minister of Health state what steps the Government will take to prevent people, who have been suffering ill health requiring hospitalisation or medical treatment in the private or public sectors and who are not insured, from going to gaol as a result of their inability to pay the accounts rendered?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I believe I answered that question effectively in responding earlier to a question from the member for Rocky River, but I will certainly amplify what I said then. I indicated that the President of the A.M.A. has already given a public assurance that services will be provided by doctors and that patients who are

in difficulties are encouraged to explain those financial difficulties to their doctors. So, I think it is most unlikely, and it would certainly be untenable if any member of the medical profession were to turn away a patient and refuse that patient care on the grounds that the patient could not afford to pay.

I also said that the Government is concerned to ensure not only that everyone has access to quality medical and hospital care but also that any level of bad debt can if possible be avoided. That is why we are doing our best to encourage people to take out appropriate levels of health insurance.

It has always been a concern, even under the Medibank system, that bad debts are incurred in relation to hospitals. In each case it is the responsibility of the hospital board to determine whether the debt should be pursued. I am confident that boards have always fulfilled that responsibility with sensitivity and compassion, and I feel sure that those qualities will continue to be exercised in future.

SNORKELS

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Health ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs what action can be taken in relation to the safety and use of the snorkel tubes used particularly by children in diving and underwater swimming activities? I ask this question following the tragic death of an eight-year-old child of a constituent of mine at the Brighton beach last summer.

The grandparents of this child bought a set of flippers, goggles and air tube and with the mother, who is a lone parent, ensured that the child knew how to use this equipment. On 17 January last, in only 0.75 metres of water and in view of the family, the child just went under. By the time the family had reached where the child had been they could not find him. The water was murky and by the time they located him half an hour later he was dead. The cause of death was shown on the Coroner's report as drowning. The family believes that he just fell asleep, because there was no sign of distress, no splashing of water, just silence. Of course, we will never know.

Many children use the same type of equipment, and a number of parents have been worried over their safety, even under supervision. I therefore ask the Minister to ensure that there is an adequate warning to parents and instructions on how to operate these devices, and maybe it could be specified that they should not be sold to or used by people under a certain age.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Brighton was good enough to give me notice of this question, as it had been raised with my colleague in another place, the Minister for Consumer Affairs. It is indeed a matter which involves Consumer Affairs, Recreation and Sport, and Health Departments in interdependent roles of responsibility. The Minister of Consumer Affairs has advised me that water safety committees, and associations active in swimming, scuba diving, and related recreational activities, have been instrumental in removing from sale snorkel tubes which are 'S' shaped, too long, and which used to incorporate ping pong balls in the top bend. It has been known for quite a few years that such snorkel tubes were actually more dangerous than are the present open-ended tubes. I think it is timely that this matter of water safety regarding snorkel tubes was brought to public attention so that the necessary publicity can be given prior to the summer season and so that parents can ensure that their children are properly instructed in the use of this equipment.

Two potential hazards have been indicated to investigating officers by the organisations or individuals concerned

with water safety. First, hyperventilation (overbreathing) is a practice used by underwater swimmers to increase the time which they can stay underwater. The net effect is to increase the oxygen level in the bloodstream, but in doing this the carbon dioxide level is reduced. Since the mechanical action of breathing is triggered chemically by CO_2 , if the level is reduced too low, breathing will stop, the swimmer will become unconscious, and unless assistance is at hand he is liable to drown. That appears to be what happened in the tragic case of the son of the honourable member's constituent. The second hazard is that lack of oxygen can occur if the swimmer does not or cannot clear the exhausted air from the snorkel tube. Excessive length, bends in the tube, and ping pong balls or other valves at the outlet end all increase the difficulty of clearing. It is important that children who attend swimming classes organised by the Education Department receive instruction in the use of snorkel tubes, because these devices are very popular as gifts from parents and grandparents, especially at Christmas time. The information conveyed to children must also be conveyed to parents, who must see that children are properly supervised and fully understand the instructions they have been given.

The Minister of Consumer Affairs has told me that the Chairman of the Water Safety Committee of the National Safety Council of Australia (South Australian Branch) has agreed to raise the issue with his committee, with a view to a publicity campaign early in the swimming season.

As a result of the question and the resultant investigation, the matter has been referred to the Trade Standards Advisory Council with a recommendation to consider the need for an information standard under the Trade Standards Act, 1979. I think that the action that has been taken so far demonstrates that an event like this, if pursued properly, as the member for Brighton has done, can result in lives being saved, and I hope that, as a result of his initiative, that is what will happen.

YATALA MEDICAL ORDERLIES

Mr PETERSON: Is the Chief Secretary aware of, and what action does he intend to take to remedy, the situation at Yatala gaol, where tomorrow normal medical services will not be available to prisoners? I had a phone call late this morning from a very concerned person who explained to me the situation as he believed it to be.

I believe that normally three medical orderlies are on duty each day shift in the gaol. At the moment one is away sick and one is retiring tomorrow from medical orderly duties to take up general duties, a position for which I believe someone has volunteered but has not been appointed yet. Another person who has tomorrow rostered as a day off has volunteered to work so that one man will be available.

Even during the recent industrial dispute the union allowed the medical centre to be manned. Three men were on duty throughout the dispute, but it seems that tomorrow only one person will be on duty. Usually there are 350 prisoners in the gaol, 60 of whom have to receive regular medical treatment. This treatment will be denied them tomorrow if urgent action is not taken.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am not aware of that report, but I am meeting the Director of Correctional Services at 5.15 p.m. today, and, no doubt, that and other matters will be discussed. I am sure that the department has met these emergencies before. We are not without some practice in this. However, I will take up the matter with the Director.

SUPERPHOSPHATE STORAGE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Agriculture investigate whether it is feasible to establish bulk superphosphate distribution and storage facilities at major country centres in South Australia? Jamestown, like Booleroo Centre, has been established as a distribution point. However, due to lack of storage, it has been brought to my attention that protracted delays occur as a result of the turn around times of rail trucks, which require bogie exchange for the journey between Jamestown and the superphosphate distribution point. Whilst the plant has facilitated the quick return of rail trucks, the number available has been limited, causing shortage of superphosphate at peak periods.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It was part of our Party's policy, leading up to the last election, to encourage the establishment of superphosphate depots in appropriate country centres in South Australia, as it was also part of our policy to encourage greater storage of liquid fuel on properties throughout South Australia. The reason for both these things, basically, was that, in the event of industrial disruption, which tends to occur from time to time, we believe that the rural sector ought not to be without those essential items.

It is also a fact that, of the 34 rural policy items put forward by the Party prior to the last election, some 29 have been effected. Of the balance of five, these two issues that I raise are still to be fully implemented. Since coming into Government, however, we have contacted Fertiliser Sales Division, Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilisers Ltd, with respect to establishing bulk super facilities in country areas. They recognise that there is a need for this, and as and when finances and facilities are available, they are prepared to implement their storage houses, consistent with our policy, I am proud to say.

At Booleroo Centre the loading hopper installation at the railway siding can carry about 70 tonnes of super and, as indicated by the member for Rocky River, this is grossly inadequate for the continuous needs of that rural community, as is the position at Jamestown. The basis of the question was whether I would investigate further the chances of having these storage facilities upgraded. Yes, I will.

Whilst we have mentioned only two areas, Booleroo Centre and Jamestown, there are other regional centres in South Australia where superphosphate storage facilities should be installed. I know personally the kind of comfort that a rural community can enjoy as a result of having such stocks readily available within their own farm trucking reach, to draw as required, particularly at seeding time and during other seasons of the year. I was involved with the Fertiliser Sales Division in South Australia in effecting an installation of that kind in my community, and I know what a great asset it is to rural producers in South Australia to have those facilities.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Does the Minister of Lands intend to answer my Question on Notice No. 29, which appears on page 5 of today's Notice Paper, before the House recesses for the show break?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Yes.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

**COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT
BILL, 1981**

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That the Community Welfare Act Amendment Bill, 1981, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1980.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of the Consolidated Account the sum of \$310 000 000 for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As is usual at this time of the year, this Bill provides a sum to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$260 000 000 and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is for \$310 000 000, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Clause 1 is formal; clause 2 provides for the issue on application of up to \$310 000 000; clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. W. A. Rodda:
That the report be noted.

(Continued from 6 August. Page 355.)

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): When I sought leave to continue my remarks on 6 August, I commented that the Select Committee recommendations were sound and what the operational staff of the Fire Brigade was seeking. I believe that, as a public service, the brigade should operate as a Government corporation, that in the long term other States in Australia will be looking towards the same method of administration, and that, generally speaking, the recommendations provide long-term solutions to the problems facing the brigade, and are workable.

I wish to clarify one point in respect of the payment of Fire Brigade levies. The committee, on page 4 of its report, referring to evidence that it had received, spoke of the evasion of Fire Brigade levies. The point made by the Select Committee, which was of concern to it, was that some insurance companies are not collecting fire levies and, therefore, are not paying them. This is what the committee meant by the evasion of Fire Brigade levies, and what it meant when it referred to loopholes existing in the current method of payment of Fire Brigade levies. In no way did the Select Committee mean to give the impression that some insurance companies are misappropriating moneys.

It is not a question at all of insurance companies collecting the levy and not passing it on. The matter at issue is that some companies are not collecting the levy at all and, therefore, not passing it on; therefore, they are not

paying their fair share. This point was made by witnesses appearing before the Select Committee, and is clearly demonstrated in the evidence taken by the committee.

To make this point clear to the House, I will quote some extracts from the evidence, so that honourable members are aware of why the committee saw fit to comment on this matter. To this end, I have received a letter from the Executive Officer of the Insurance Council of Australia, which is based in Melbourne. On page 335 of the evidence we see the following question (asked by me) and answer:

The **CHAIRMAN:** Are they honouring their liability?—Yes, but they are not charging their client the fire services levy.

Another witness said:

They do not pay it and they do not charge it. That is one of the tricks. This practice has become widespread.

And, later:

In this State [S.A.] it is officially Rafferty's rules . . . We are very concerned. If we are not quickly to be relieved of this funding commitment, then as an urgent measure we will have to come to the Government to ask it to amend the Act in relation to these insurance provisions to make it close the loopholes.

At page 336:

Another problem has been that brokers and clients throughout Australia for years have attempted to take advantage of various differences between the laws in different States in regard to stamp duty and Fire Brigade dues and the like in order to get a better deal. They will place insurances there instead of in their home State.

At page 337 of the evidence, a witness was asked this question:

If a person insured in another State, would he have to pay the fire levy for that State, or would he not pay it at all? Would he have to pay it in the A.C.T.?

His reply was as follows:

No. It is dictated by whether the property is situated in the locality to which the Act applies. If the property is outside the State, it is not within that locality.

At page 333 of the evidence a witness stated:

Our market has become so competitive that everyone is looking for ways and means of beating the system—clients, brokers, the insurers themselves. I do not pretend to omit saying that insurers themselves have been looking for ways of beating the system. This means that those who try to beat the system are paying less than their just dues towards the total Fire Brigade cost to be borne by insurers which imposes an added burden on those who try to play the game properly.

At page 334, a witness stated:

With all the delay that has taken place, the scallywags in the market (clients, brokers, and insurance companies) have had a ball, because they have continued to get up to all sorts of practices to pay less than their proper share.

I have read those quotations to inform honourable members of the manner in which the committee reported in its report on page 4.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the Select Committee for their dedication and for the time they spent in preparing the report. I mention particularly the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Hartley, the Government Whip, and the member for Henley Beach. As well as attending 43 meetings, much additional time was spent in private research and follow up decisions. I would also like to thank Mr Geoff Wilson, Secretary of that Select Committee, for giving us his expert advice on technical matters, and the committee's Research Officer, Mrs Penny Stevens. The committee worked hard and gave diligent attention to the matters in hand. Members of the committee were most co-operative. It was not an easy task to sift through the many pages of evidence received, but I am pleased to commend the report to the House.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As one of the Opposition members elected by my

Party to represent it on this Select Committee, I wish to express my support for and commendation of the report. I must confess that when I was asked to take a seat on this committee I did so with some trepidation; it was not that I did not think it was an important committee, because I thought it was a very significant and a very important one, but I knew that it would be a long and arduous inquiry. How right I was! The committee had some 43 meetings, which sometimes lasted for three or four hours. With my other responsibilities, I knew that it was going to increase my work load to such an extent that I did not know whether or not I could serve that committee in full force.

However, we were able to work as a team, along with the officers, Geoff Wilson, and, as the Minister has mentioned, Mrs Penny Stevens, whose work was also invaluable. I include all members of the committee in that remark. We were able, finally, after some concern, to reach what I consider to be a fairly good report. I believe that that is indicative of the acceptance, to the best of my knowledge, within the community. Most people who will be affected by it or will have anything to do with the Fire Brigade have expressed their viewpoints, which in the main support the recommendations of the committee. The Minister referred to a couple of matters about which I believe people are under a misapprehension.

I want to deal briefly with the terms of reference. I think it is reasonable to report to the House that the committee, on examination of the terms of reference, agreed unanimously when the Bill came before it that the Government ought to be requested to reconsider its position in relation to the terms of reference and, more explicitly, in relation to the funding operations of the Fire Brigade Board. It was considered by the committee that it could reach its conclusions (and I think that every member was alert to this from the first) much more quickly and effectively with a change in the terms of reference, particularly in respect of funding operations. The Government, in its wisdom (and as is its right), refused to accede to that request, even though it was a unanimous request from the committee, so the committee had to continue its examination within the terms of reference allocated to it by the Parliament in the first place.

I sincerely believe that that was a mistake on the part of the Government, although I realise that the Government has a responsibility in this matter and I make no condemnation of it for this. I make the observation that I believe it was a mistake and I think that the whole matter would have been much cleaner and we could have reached almost a perfect report had the circumstances been different.

I want to place on record my appreciation to the 85 or so witnesses who came before the committee. They were many and varied. Some of the witnesses concerned us greatly; others gave explicit and useful evidence. I must commend both of the union representatives who came before the committee, as their evidence was invaluable, as was the evidence given by the Chairman and members of the board. In fact, all the people who participated gave evidence of some value, which allowed the committee to reach the conclusions it reached.

The final and most important conclusion is the abolition of the board and the brigade's reverting to a Government corporation, to be called the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. This will be much more effective. It was indicated right from the beginning that the trade union representatives and the great majority of the fire service people who came before the committee were adamant and agreed consistently that the board had outlived its usefulness, and that it was preventing decisions and affecting industrial relations.

As a consequence, it was noticeable that those people who are involved in the processes of the Fire Brigade

believed that the board had served its useful purpose and was no longer needed. The Minister has referred to the advisory council, so I will not take up the time of the House in that regard. I am a great believer in consensus and consultation, and I hope that the consultative committee, when it is established, will be successful. I know that the Minister and the members of the workforce are anxious to set up that consultative committee as soon as possible. Because of the abolition of the board, there will be no direct employee representative, but I believe that the consultative committee will overcome that situation. It is interesting to note that there have been no objections from anyone in relation to the establishment of that consultative committee. The committee can, will, and should work. All organisations should have a consultative committee in the work environment.

The Minister also referred to control of fires, so I will not deal with that area. The reference in the report to accident rescue is self-evident. I have already mentioned funding; the committee asked the Government to set up a committee to examine the funding of the Fire Brigade. It is essential that that be done, and I know that the Minister will ensure that that inquiry occurs.

I believe I can speak for all members of the committee when I say that the committee was shocked at the very bad state of industrial relations to which the situation had deteriorated over a period of years. The report (on page 4) draws attention to the fact that many of the disputes could have been avoided. However, these disputes were escalating into the courts. The Chairman of the board, in his evidence (and his evidence was corroborated by others), told the committee that he spent 70 per cent of his time not administering fire services but in being deeply involved in industrial relations.

I for one do not believe that that is the responsibility of the Chairman of the board. Where there is power of delegation (and in these circumstances there was that power), it should be delegated to an industrial officer or someone of such standing so that industrial relations could proceed without involving the administrative officer, as occurred in this case. The committee has recommended that the disputes settlement area should be examined. I know that the union is anxious to proceed in that direction, and the person who is finally appointed to be in charge of the fire services will no doubt take a lot of notice of the recommendations in the report.

The committee unanimously agreed that employee participation is desirable and should be developed by agreement between management and employee bodies. Finally, I believe that the Minister now has the responsibility to see that the recommendations are carried out as quickly as possible. When that occurs, South Australia's fire services will become the envy not only of Australia but also of the world. Mr Cox half dared the committee to go as far as it has to set up such an instrument to run the fire services. I have received no comment from Mr Cox, and I am not sure whether the Minister has received comment, but Mr Cox told us that, if the South Australian Parliament could see its way clear to making certain recommendations, and I think we have gone very close to making them, our fire service would be the envy of other services in the world.

I want to see the South Australian fire service become the most efficient service possible, if it is not efficient already (and I do not say it is not). The facilities are there for the service to become more efficient. I want to see the industrial relations area improve, and I want to ensure that the consultative committees and the worker participation committees work well in the interests of the Fire Brigade and its employees.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the report of the committee, and I thank the Parliament and members of my Party for giving me the opportunity to serve on the committee. I also thank staff members Mrs Penny Stevens, Mr Geoff Wilson and others who helped the committee to reach its conclusions. In that, I include those people who gave evidence either as individuals or on behalf of organisations. I support the comment of the Deputy Leader that the committee had some difficulty in the initial stages operating within the guidelines that were available to it. It is true that the committee recommended that the Government give it the opportunity through Parliament to widen the terms of reference. However, the Government, in its wisdom, considered that unnecessary.

The eventual outcome of the Cox Report brought to the Government's notice several areas that we, as a committee, or a future committee, could consider. I am grateful that the Government made the Cox Report available to the community and the committee before we brought down our final report, although it is fair to say that our report was virtually completed before the Cox Report became available. The general trend of the committee report at that stage was virtually along the lines of its present form, even though our argument was strengthened through the Cox Report.

Funding is still an area of concern. It could be argued that the present system could still operate for a long while, and there is no doubt that in the future this will be considered. I am sure that a specialist committee will be set up to consider the matter when the time is appropriate. I believe the committee report contained enough for the Minister to implement, to gain the support of the two unions as well as the fire services, and to establish a corporate body. One could argue that that is the first step to the brigade's becoming a department in the long term. When that part of the deal has been settled, the provisions contained in the report have been put into operation and some of the points which were not able to be incorporated in the committee report but which were incorporated in the Cox Report have been achieved, such as rationalisation of stations throughout the metropolitan area, the Government of the time should consider the funding situation.

The Minister has received some comment in regard to some people and companies insuring from outside the State, even though their property is situated in the State. Some insurance brokers were encouraging this practice. However, the committee report does not reflect on all insurance companies. The evidence given by the insurance industry was quite strong in criticism of this practice. There is no doubt that people were deliberately avoiding paying what Parliament intended as the proper dues for fire insurance. The committee report attempts to pick up that point, and I believe it succeeded, even though some people who read the report in a different light may interpret it to say that the committee is reflecting on most insurance companies. That was not the intention. We picked up the areas of concern indicated to us by the industry through its representatives.

Although the Deputy Leader said he had some doubts about going on the committee initially, when my name appeared as one of those to sit on the committee a letter was passed around and in particular directed to me, suggesting that I was the last person on earth who should serve on a committee that had anything to do with the Fire Brigade. I did not respond to that. I accepted it and smiled and thought that people had a right to make that sort of comment. In the past I was concerned about the Fire Brigade intrusion by a gradual method into C.F.S. areas where volunteer people were giving a satisfactory service to

the communities which they served. At times that brought some strong criticism from other quarters, so I retaliated.

After the report was tabled, the person who wrote the letter came to me and said, 'Well, all is forgotten'. The person concerned did not realise that I had something to contribute to the argument, and regretted that that letter ever floated around. I accept that. There have never been any hard feelings by me, because I laughed right from the beginning. If anybody reads the evidence taken before the committee, my questioning in one area related to people having two jobs. I did not want to condemn people belonging to the South Australian Fire Brigade: we found that in every State it was the practice of a number of the people concerned to have two jobs. Some people ran businesses. In one State the head of the brigade told us openly that they preferred to have some people in the brigade who had jobs as subcontractors in the building industry, because they had a better knowledge of the type of materials used and the structure of buildings. He said it was an advantage in fire fighting to know the type of structure, so it was an advantage to have these people as officers. I accept that.

We know that right through the Public Service this is the case. The reason why it originally happened was that wages were very low, and the Fire Brigade was no exception. The wages people in that organisation received a few years ago were very low. Presently, firemen receive a reasonable wage. We were told that there was a decreasing number of personnel who are carrying out this practice. The more it decreases, the more job opportunities are created, and this results in a better distribution of wealth. I wanted to make this point because of my special interest and attitude in question. In every State evidence was given that the worst time for absenteeism was public holidays and Saturday nights. One can understand that. This causes concern to brigade management. The Chief Officer who will be in charge of the brigade and will answer to a Minister will have to look at that situation very closely.

The committee could not pick up the area regarding the type of materials used in buildings. This is very difficult. From the evidence given to us, it was clear that, in many cases, when people are adversely affected by fire and very often killed, the injuries are caused not by the actual burning and heat of the fire, but by the poisonous gases from the types of materials used in either the construction of the building or in the furnishings. This is an area that the Government and local government will have to look at, in co-operation with the brigade.

A difficult area of concern has always been in relation to where the C.F.S. and brigade boundaries meet. Who has the responsibility? I believe this can be overcome by discussion and negotiation between the two bodies. In the long term, we may have to look at having essential services all under the one Minister, as it would then be easier to achieve that objective. Perhaps we need to get to the point where the C.F.S., Fire Brigade, Police Force, and ambulance and emergency services are all under the one Minister. This is something we should be considering. However, the committee did not take up this point.

In relation to the C.F.S., there is one problem: in section 28 there is provision to set up an advisory committee to advise the Minister on fire fighting in C.F.S. areas. I hope that provision is taken from that Act. It has never been implemented. In our committee report we suggest that there be a State advisory committee to cover the whole of the State. There would be no need to have the C.F.S. separate, and they should all work together as one advisory council. I hope that Parliament and the Government will see the benefit of that. In many fires, there is a joint responsibility and the need to use each force's resources in a joint effort against major fires. In the metropolitan area, which the

brigade mainly covers, there are not only houses and buildings; there is still bushland and grassland, and there is sometimes a need for the C.F.S. Outside that area, in the C.F.S. area, there are some buildings, so the expertise of the South Australian Fire Brigade is needed.

The consultative committee, to which the Deputy Leader referred, I support quite strongly. I believe it is important that employees have the opportunity to consult with management, and it is also important to have a committee that can make representations and negotiate to save some of the conflict which has occurred in the past. The Deputy's comments that the industrial relations were poor is true. The blame does not lie in any one particular area—it happens to fall in many areas.

I support the report very strongly. I know this is a radical change from what has existed in the past. I know that local government and insurance companies still are the people that have to collect the money by whatever means, either through extra charges under the policies or through council rates, apart from the amount the Government contributes, to run the Fire Brigade. I do not believe this is a bad practice, even though there are some parts which are not fair, but to change the system is not simple. I hope the two groups see the benefit of at least letting the Minister get the present recommendations, and most of those in the Cox Report, into operation. Like the Deputy Leader, I am strongly of the view that what I wish to see is not just an efficient Fire Brigade in South Australia, but a cost-efficient one, so that we keep the charges as low as possible and at the same time have a first-class service to the community. I support the report.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): I indicate my support for the report brought down by the Select Committee. At the outset, I thank the Chairman, the Chief Secretary, for his conduct of the committee. I am certain that his patience, tolerance and understanding led to the committee being one of the best on which I have served in my experience in Parliament, from the point of view of getting a job done. I think something that weighed heavily was that I do not think that any member of the committee had preconceived ideas about what should happen, although it was inevitable that the Minister, having studied the Bill (because he introduced it), would have had some. The other members of the committee did not. We faced it with an open mind and, as the Deputy Leader has already explained, we unanimously agreed very early in the piece that the funding was vital if we were to change the structure of the board dramatically. Even though the Government did not accept the recommendation that we unanimously made on that occasion, I am certain that that question of funding was in the back of our minds the whole time.

I am also certain that, having taken the decision that we have taken in relation to the abolition of the board, that will make it much easier for the expert committee that is to be set up to look at the question of funding. I think this is the first step. We could have said we had the cart before the horse, that we had to settle funding before we settled the question of the board, but in another way we have been able to chalk that question by the abolition of the board itself.

One would not want in any way to condemn the board that has operated for so long in South Australia, and the many prominent and very worthwhile people on such boards. However, it is not so much the personnel on the board itself, but the way in which, in these modern times (and I stress that), the board had found itself bogged down with trivia that it could possibly not avoid, mainly in the industrial affairs area. In such a situation it was fair and proper that the committee members face up to the fact that we had to bring the Fire Brigade into the twentieth

century, because a tremendously long period of time has gone by since the brigade was looked at objectively. I spoke of other members of the committee having open minds. Other things that were of great benefit to us were the Deputy Leader's experience in industrial affairs, the experience of the member for Henley Beach in communications and electronics and, of course, the practical hardheadedness of the member for—

Mr Keneally: Hartley?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Fisher. No, I was just carried along, I think. Indeed, I was very pleased to serve on the committee, and I want to express my deep gratitude to Penny Stevens, who looked after us all so well, and who put up with all sorts of difficult demands (none from me, of course, but from other members of the committee). In fact, she was always ready, willing and available to give us the material that we needed to help us in our deliberations and decisions about the Bill. Also, let us not forget the *Hansard* reporters, who sat there and pegged out about 1 400 foolscap pages of evidence. As the Deputy leader of the Opposition said, the evidence was wide and varied. Indeed, I think if people take the trouble to look through it (many members will not, of course), they will be shocked about some of the things that were revealed during the taking of evidence of this committee. Some things, of course, we just ignored; other things we took very serious note of indeed.

I think the report is as good as we could have got with the terms of reference placed before us. I would dearly like to have had broader terms of reference, although I am the first to admit that I think we need an expert committee to look at the question of funding. That will be an extremely difficult problem and such a committee will need the sort of expertise of a Valuer-General, an economist, and people with this type of qualification in order to come down with an equitable system of funding and one that will not ruffle too many feathers.

If the task is faced up to fairly and squarely, without having to look at interests as they were represented on the board previously, I think the job can be done, and done properly. We have had the experience of Tasmania. Already, where that State changed the method of funding, it has had troubles, but I think it can be clearly seen why those problems occurred. In fact, if it is not careful, Tasmania will be back to the very system that it tried to get away from. That is the opinion that we gained from the evidence taken while we were there; it caused me to think that it could be getting back into trouble again.

The question of funding is very important, and I know that the Government will give that question due attention and get cracking with that problem as quickly as possible, as I know the Minister will do with the consultative committee, which is absolutely vital to industrial harmony within the brigade itself. I am certain that every officer and every fireman in the brigade is now looking forward to a new era and a new relationship. With their chief being the chief officer, the chief executive, every fireman and every officer can now see the opportunity to be in such a position one day himself, and the very great pride that the men already have in their organisation, indeed, will swell.

Nowhere in evidence given at any stage did the committee receive any criticism of the operational side of the brigade. Witnesses talked about industrial relations, about lack of communications, and things of that nature, but there was no criticism of the performance of the people involved in the actual fire-fighting operation. There were a few differences between the administration and the people on the operational side, but that is inevitable in an organisation of this nature. Indeed, I think as we looked at the report and at the difficulties of who were to employ these

people under the corporation, we could have taken the step of recommending that the administrative people in the brigade (and I think there are only about 22 of them) could, in fact, have been transferred to the Public Service. I believe that, whilst we did not take that step at this point, the Government should look seriously at that because there would be an advantage to the brigade, in that it would have a very much broader spectrum to choose from, and there would be an advantage to the employees, because they would have a far greater scope for promotion.

One difficulty that we had, of course, concerned the problem of superannuation, because evidently those people employed by the old board, or the present board of the brigade are employed under a private scheme. We did not want to fool around with that at this time, so we have recommended that the corporation be set up in such a way that all those people can be employed under what would be termed, I suppose, fire service regulations, and would be employed under that in the very same manner and under the very same conditions as they were previously employed by the board. The *status quo* will be retained, and it is extremely important to all the people in the brigade to know that that is the case. If, at some time in the future, the administrative side of the brigade can see some advantage in going back into the Public Service, then such a step should be taken.

Let me also support the remarks of the member for Fisher in relation to the responsibility of the two fire services being under the control of two different Ministers: the Country Fire Services under the Minister of Agriculture, and the Metropolitan Fire Brigade under the Chief Secretary. This is something that obtained under previous Governments, and I am not critical of the present Government for the situation, but having become involved in this matter, and having looked at all the questions that surround it, I think it is absolutely ludicrous that this situation should continue in the future. The sooner the Government can be convinced that it is better for each of the services, as well as for the State as a whole, for them to be under the direction of one Minister, the better. I strongly urge the Government to look at that matter. Ministers should not look at their own selfish interests in relation to this. Whilst some people living in the country might say that the country service is part of the country scene, part of the agriculture scene, that it grew out of such a system, I think that they could be convinced of the advantages of having the services under one Minister who would be responsible for all fire services throughout the State.

This brings me again to the point made about the advisory committee, which could be a valuable committee. We have not nominated such a committee as a metropolitan fire service advisory committee: we have called it a State advisory committee, to advise Government of all things relating to fire over the whole State. There is no need for an advisory committee under section 28 of the Country Fire Services Act. One committee can serve both purposes. That is consistent surely with Government policy in relation to cutting down on the number of committees we have, just as the abolition of the board is consistent with Government policy at the moment of doing away with boards that are not absolutely necessary. I would urge the Government to look at this question seriously.

The other thing that must happen eventually, and probably as soon as we can make it happen, is that we ought to be looking at every service, that is, the State Emergency Service, the ambulance service, the police and the fire services in this State, to see whether or not they are performing the role that they were designed to perform, to see that there is no overlapping, to see that there is no waste of resources, either physical or material. Such an investi-

gation would be the subject of a fairly long inquiry, but one that would be very worth while. However, I would suggest that the first step to be taken before that happens would be to look at the question of having only one Minister in charge, because there would be little point in looking at that question and trying to solve the problems when there are two Ministers, with directors of each service going to different Ministers. It is only natural that they will vie with each other, with empire building going on—Parkinson's Law, or whatever we want to call it. It will continue to happen.

I would suggest as a first step that one Minister should be responsible for all services. Then, I suggest a good close hard look should be given at where the services are going, so that their roles can be tied in, co-ordinated, there is no lack of resources, and we have the best possible and most efficient organisation.

Those things are important, and they are outside the scope of the committee; nevertheless they come to mind. They could not help but come to mind after reading the evidence in relation to the rescue. We heard of the overlapping of the responsibilities of Country Fire Services and we realise that the ambulance service has a part to play, and those services are absolutely vital to the well-being of this community.

I commend this report to the House. The best thing the House can do is to get the Bill through as quickly as possible, so that the long wait which has been so destructive to the morale of the Fire Brigade can be cut as short as possible, and they can get on with the job of setting up this new organisation and building up the pride about which I have already spoken.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): It has been a privilege for me, as a new and junior back-bencher, to serve on a Select Committee, particularly one which has been apparently somewhat abnormal. It has been abnormal in two ways. First, it has sat for longer than is normal for a Select Committee. I think that was necessary in order to get all the information required and to give the many witnesses an opportunity to present their submission to the committee. Secondly, I believe the Select Committee was in no way political. From what I have heard of some Select Committees of this House, some of them have tended to be political—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Very!

Mr RANDALL: Yes. The member for Fisher has also told me that he has served on many Select Committees, and that this one was the best yet. I hope this sets the trend for the future, when we can set up in this House Select Committees which are issue oriented, which forget politics, get stuck into the issue, sort out the problems, and come back with a recommendation which is acceptable to both sides of this House. As a back-bencher on the Government side, I have found it has been an interesting experience to serve on this Select Committee.

It is not my job or my intention to tell the House the number of incidents of mirth in which the committee shared, but they strengthened bonds of friendship, regardless of political affiliation. During evenings spent in Western Australia and New South Wales, I got to know members opposite a little better and also got to know members from *Hansard* and the Ministerial assistant, as we sat down over many hours of communication and discussion.

It is not my intention today to elaborate any further on the areas already covered, but to be specific about one area in which I was interested, mainly because of my trade background, and that is the area of communications. The member for Hartley rightly spoke about his concern for the state of emergency services in this State. The view that

they should all come under one Minister for Ministerial control is strongly held, I believe, by all members of the committee. As a member of Parliament, it is my undertaking that I will continue to follow through those issues. Having served on the Select Committee, and having heard the evidence, I have been able to formulate an opinion, and I must follow it through.

In the area of communications it became obvious to me that there is much duplication of resources and services. I believe that radio transmission or control for the emergency services should be housed in one central control point; in other words, the ambulance control officers should be on site in the same room and in the same building as those controlling the Fire Brigade, the police, and the State Emergency Service. The benefits of such a situation would be that the technical expertise needed to maintain the equipment would be in one place, instead of each of the four areas having its own engineering department and technical and back-up test equipment. This would mean that back-up equipment would be available in a centralised area. Services could share in the benefit of having good test equipment, good technical expertise, to back up such equipment. That is one area. I am sure that, if we had one Minister looking at these things, he could ask for direction and guidance in that area and ask for a survey of resources.

Another area which came to my attention was that of training. Apparently in South Australia, the South Australian Fire Brigade is looking at setting up its own training centre with its own training instructors and its own courses. I understand that Country Fire Services is going to have a similar system. I believe there should be a lot more interrelation between these two services. Professional training officers could hold courses to train the volunteers. They could provide the expertise. We could have the facilities. We could have a smoke tunnel on which Fire Brigade officers and firemen are trained, and I believe the Country Fire officers and firemen could be trained in the same way. That facility could be shared and that would save money. Such a joint facility would be of benefit to Country Fire Services and to the Fire Brigade.

The communications equipment available to the Fire Brigade is way behind the times. We have a tremendous potential in the personnel and firefighting equipment areas, but in the area of communications we are found wanting. When I went into the South Australian Fire Brigade control room, and looked at the equipment room, I found equipment similar to that on which I had learned when I was a trainee at Telecom 15 years ago. I refer to the uniselector type switches. During those 15 years Telecom has phased out that equipment. So, the equipment used by the Fire Brigade today does not meet Telecom specifications.

The need for the development of new headquarters is quite rightly pointed out. On page 25 of his report, under the heading 'Communications', Mr Cox said:

The need for conservative planning for the headquarters fire station project is highlighted by the need for capital expenditure on several facets of communications systems.

Mr Cox then lists them in order of priority. I would prefer the order of priority as listed in the Select Committee report. The first would be for automatic alarm signalling. Today we have an area of new technology which can allow computers to be fed with information from every building in Adelaide about the status of that building and the fire alarms in it. For instance, if there is a fire alarm signalled from the thirteenth floor of a building in Adelaide, information can be relayed quickly and efficiently back to the computer in the central headquarters, and information can be given to that control room which would enable it to turn out the machines in an efficient manner to service that fire.

The problem is that from time to time and for a number of reasons fire appliances are turned out from central headquarters because of false alarms, and these false alarms can occur for various reasons, such as the standard of mechanical equipment held in those stations being inadequate and having failed.

Somebody may have been repairing a line and unfortunately set off an alarm, or there may be an open circuit in the line. The good thing about a computer is that it can test that line every 15 seconds. For instance, if there was a line failure, a short circuit or an open circuit, the computer immediately would notify the control room and remedial action could be taken, instead of waiting for the daily or weekly alarm test done in some buildings. Unfortunately, if the daily alarm test is done at 9 a.m., and if, for some unknown reason, a fault occurs in Telecom cables later in the day, that fault may not be detected until the next day, if the test is done.

Sometimes tests are not done on a daily basis, but on a weekly basis, so there are problems, but with a computer data system a lot of information can be gathered, depending on the system. I encourage the committee looking at the computer and data link to spend some time on it before making a recommendation. When it does that, it should recommend a system that is functioning and working now, that does not have to be developed.

It was obvious to the committee when it looked into some State systems that they had launched into the latest computer system, but two years later they were still developing the system. It was not functioning. The programme was still being modified and updated to cope with the problems. If we go to computer control and data links we should buy a functioning system, from the alarm point to the output. Even if it means buying something from overseas, we need a system which is working now, not one which the Government or the South Australian Fire Brigade has to spend a lot of time getting going. This needs to be looked at now, whilst planning new headquarters.

Perhaps we need to make some modification in the money spent on the building, hoping to get a good and adequate data link system. Not only would it provide a good back-up and solid indication of fire alarms, but it could also provide information. One of the problems when a fire engine turns out from a metropolitan fire station is that it is committed to that fire. If the Woodville unit turns out to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and has to have the associated back-up unit as well, and another fire occurs in the Woodville area, there is then the option of turning out another unit from North Adelaide or Port Adelaide. If the Port Adelaide unit is turned out to Hart Street, Semaphore, and the unit operators are unfamiliar with the surroundings, they need all the information on how to get to the building and what it contains. Unfortunately, the cards for that are held at the Woodville station. Therefore, radio communication must take place to get information about the building. If the Port Adelaide unit had to go to Warburton Franki, in the Woodville area, the officers would like to know what sort of chemicals are stored and what the problems are, and would have to communicate verbally to find out.

If all this information were held on a central computer it could be fed to that fire unit on its way to the station. It could be printed out on a small printer. Detailed information would be available for the chief fire officer when he got on site at the fire. He would know where his central board was, the areas of alarm, and where there were chemicals and other hazards. The information could be easily stored and kept. Today, all information is stored on a card system, which is usually held in the central area where the fire brigade unit is based. That is another advantage of computer control, and there are many more. I do not wish

to say more about that, except to say that I would be happy to talk with members of the committee at any stage about this.

The other area of priority is the point that the committee rightly made in its report about radio communications. It is evident to me that fighting fires is hazardous. When a fireman goes into a smoke-filled building today he has attached to him a line attached to the breathing apparatus unit. In that unit there is an officer recording the time that the fireman is in the building. That safety line, the line of communication, is the physical rope. There is no verbal communication with the breathing apparatus tender. That is a technical possibility which should be achieved urgently to increase the safety of firemen fighting fires perhaps in multi-storey buildings that are smoke-filled. He must have direct voice communication to the tender. For quick and efficient communication that equipment is available. I strongly recommend that the committee and the Fire Brigade should give such information to the Minister as soon as possible, thus making their job that much safer.

The other area of communications, mentioned earlier, is in relation to overall emergency services. It appears that a South Australian Fire Brigade unit possibly fighting a common fire with Country Fire Services cannot communicate on a common radio channel. That is an unfortunate situation. The South Australian Fire Brigade has possibly one or two channels, and Country Fire Services has one or two channels, but there is no common channel on which equipment being used to fight one fire can switch to, therefore having voice communication common to all units, and to the common command post. That needs to be looked at.

The other area of radio communication that needs looking at is in the South Australian Fire Brigade. The units are limited by having only two channels. When a unit is turned out to a fire it should have a radio channel assigned to it also, so that the unit can use only that channel to communicate with headquarters to pass detailed information to and from the location. That should be an exclusive channel for that unit. Also, a general communications channel is needed at the Fire Brigade, where all administration units can be linked, and day-to-day running of the brigade and communication throughout the metropolitan area can be maintained. We should have two or three extra exclusive communication channels for proficient operation of fire units and tenders in the metropolitan area.

There is a common interest in the Cox Report and the committee's report in relation to communications. I stress that the Minister needs a consultative committee working to get information there. As a member and an employee of Telecom, I can say that consultative committees were set up as a management tool. Having participated in them, and having seen their value, I endorse what the committee has recommended to the Minister, that it be a form of administrative help in keeping the Minister in contact with his employees, and keeping employees in contact with their Minister, through their chief officer.

The chief officer needs to know what the employees' problems are. One of these areas is that of consultative committees. We heard evidence on the committee about the industrial conflict and the uniform problem, where the heavy uniforms should be worn in summer. That matter almost had to go to the industrial conciliation and arbitration system to be resolved. Obviously, there are problems. Certainly, a consultative committee can help in that area. As members of the committee, the firemen and officers can sit down and go through a problem, and then make a recommendation to the chief officer and consult him. Does it need to go to the Minister? It may need Ministerial approval if expenditure is involved, but it should not have to be a conflict situation. Ground work should be done

before it gets to top-level management: give the employees an opportunity to express their concern to management, and to tell the Minister that they believe cost savings at the South Australian Fire Brigade could be made in a certain way. That increases employee participation and employee satisfaction. Employees feel, as taxpayers, that they are helping the Government to save some dollars and to reduce taxes. That is a participation concept.

It certainly gives employees recognition for the role that they play in that area. I can only endorse, as all committee members have done, the concept of consultative committees. I see those committees being set up along the lines of having representatives elected from each area, such as St Marys, Woodville, etc., each having its own elected representative. They might meet on a Monday once a month, bringing together their ideas, pooling their resources and problems, and communicating so that they can begin to solve some of their problems. I am sure we all got the message that industrial problems in the Fire Brigade were many. One area I would like to touch on quickly is that it appeared to me that, if union members got together, they could have one union looking after the South Australian Fire Brigade. I believe that having two unions in this small area of responsibility creates a certain competitiveness which, in the long run, is detrimental to the group. I think that, if the firemen and officers got together, an amalgamated union could be formed to the benefit of all concerned.

In summing up, I want to reiterate a thank-you to the Ministerial assistant, Penny Stevens, for the help she gave to all members. I am sure she learnt a lot from the member for Hartley in many discussions. I could elaborate on some quite interesting activities that took place. We all learnt a lot and it was not restricted to Fire Brigade activity. While in Sydney we had an opportunity to look at some other areas.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member confine his remarks to the matter before the House and does not speak to matters not contained in the motion.

Mr RANDALL: I was just talking about the Select Committee. As a Select Committee we were able to view other areas which to me, as a member of Parliament, were of interest. For instance, in Tasmania we had a close look at the casino, so I now know what a casino looks like inside. I saw the casino for the first time, having heard a lot about it.

Mr Peterson: Did you like it?

Mr RANDALL: No, I lost. Having the report before us, and having had experiences which I am sure are of benefit to me and my fellow members, I can only endorse the recommendations of the report. Like the member for Hartley, I hope to see a speedy passage of this legislation so that we can finally set up a public service in South Australia which is efficient and a reflection on the pride of the officers and firemen in the brigade. I endorse the report.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): It is pleasing to speak in this debate after hearing the comments by all those who participated, indicating that the committee was as successful as it was. It indicates that Party politics can and must be left out of these matters so that an effective result can come out of them. An important thing that has come from this successful committee is the response it has evoked from those who participated. The member for Hartley put forward the premise of combining the services, which was utterly sound. It is all there (that is what makes sense), making the system work properly.

Mr Randall: And logically.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, absolute logic. I support everything he said. I was interested to hear the comments of the

members of the Government Party who participated. It shows the range of expertise, knowledge and skill which is within the ranks of the Parliament. This is where those skills should be used, where they can be effective. I was also interested to hear the member for Fisher speaking about the Fire Brigade and the conditions that used to exist with firemen having two jobs. I was once a fireman and know what it was like. It was a two-job situation, because one could not survive on the wage and had to have a second job to get enough money to live on. That is a matter of history, and people are well aware of it; ask anybody who has served in the brigade for some years. I want to speak briefly about one aspect of the report which disturbs me greatly and which concerns my district, particularly the area of Port Adelaide: that is, the Cox Report, which mentioned the rationalisation of stations.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It has nothing to do with this report. This committee has not done anything about that.

Mr PETERSON: I accept that, but it is a reference document that was commissioned by the Government regarding fire services in this State. I am extremely concerned about the rationalisation of fire services in the Port Adelaide area. Currently, there are stations at Semaphore, Port Adelaide, Rosewater and Woodville. I notice in that report that the fire float is counted as a fire service at Port Adelaide. It is a fire service, but it certainly is not of any use for anything 100 yards from the river. It would not be of much use in the average fire.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: These matters will be looked at in due course.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, but I want to draw the Minister's attention to this fact to let him know that we want a fire station on the peninsula. The Port redevelopment highlighted some of the problems that we already have on the peninsula with fire services. I have corresponded with several Ministers, including the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Environment and Planning, on those problems. The answers I have received have not given me any joy and have not solved the problem. On the peninsula, we have some major industries including I.C.I., a large complex, and Dulux, which is a volatile, paint-producing plant. There are also other small industries. However, the significant thing is the petrol installations on the peninsula.

Mr Randall: They have their own units.

Mr PETERSON: Of course they have their own units, and they are very efficient, too, and I do not denigrate them in any way, but I am talking about a major blaze for which a stand pipe and a length of hose will not be of much use. It worries me that these industries and the people living on the peninsula could be denied adequate fire services. The residential area is expanding and is a new area. There are many older areas, and a percentage of the older buildings are weatherboard or timber and iron, which would burn quickly. Any delay in getting services to that area could, in some cases, prove fatal for people in those premises.

It was drawn to my attention 12 months ago that it was planned to put a new fire station on the corner of Strathfield Terrace and Victoria Road, half way along the peninsula. I believe the brigade has owned that property for some time in anticipation of putting a station there. As a matter of fact, I received a letter from the Chief Secretary earlier this year telling me that that station would be built. However, since then the Cox Report has been published. I have written since then to the Minister, but could get no joy out of the report. It merely said that things were at a standstill. With the Cox Report and the rationalisation of stations, the Semaphore station is at risk if that report is followed in detail. If the Semaphore station is removed, there is a plan to relocate the Port Adelaide station in the vicinity of the

wool stores and the Colac Hotel. It would be totally unacceptable if there was no fire station on the peninsula. There is no way that a fire appliance could get to that area at around 5 p.m. in time to be effective; it is impossible to get through.

If the bridge was open, the appliance would have to go the other way, and it would be impossible for it to get through the Black Diamond corner in time, even with 100 sirens blaring. I know that members of the brigade will support what I am saying not necessarily because they want to retain the station because of manning levels but because it is not practical to do away with that station. I again congratulate the committee for its well produced report. I am happy that the committee members worked well together and on an apolitical basis produced an effective document, which I support.

Motion carried.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Bill be amended *pro forma*.

The carrying of this motion will mean that there will be no further proceedings on the Bill in the present Committee. The Bill will be reprinted to incorporate the Select Committee's amendments, and the reprinted Bill will be re-committed at a future date and considered in Committee as if it had been committed for the first time. The Bill will be subject to the usual scrutiny and the admission of further amendments. It is believed that this procedure will be most helpful to all members of the Committee.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 18 August. Page 422.)

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I have only a few minutes in which to conclude the comments I was making last night. During the past week, we have heard comments by an Opposition member who described his Leader as being someone who lacks propriety. I would like to reaffirm the comments made by the member for Elizabeth. During this debate, not once has the Leader supported the advance of South Australia and asked the unions to consider carefully their wage claims, as the Premier of New South Wales did at the A.L.P. conference. Mr Wran came out strongly and told the unions to be very careful in their demands because, if they were too outrageous, they could affect the future A.L.P. vote. As we know, the A.L.P. vote is very closely linked with the trade union movement. Mr Wran had no compunction about rapping the unions on the knuckles; however, our erstwhile opponents have not done that because they have been too scared.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: We're still your opponents. 'Erstwhile' is the wrong word.

Mr SCHMIDT: Of course you are: you will remain our opponents forever. That is what you purport to be. Members opposite hide behind shields, because they are not game to come out and attack the trade union movement. They do nothing at all. They merely belt South Australia around the ears and we hear nothing but gloom from them. I would like to recap one area in which the effect of the left wing has been evident, particularly in the 1970s. The succession of reports of the Department of Mines and Energy highlights this point. The 1974-75 report stated:

Pending clarification of Australian Government policy on uranium development, there has been a marked decline in exploration for this metal.

That was the time of the Whitlam Government, and we saw selling off of the farm in that time. Reports in the

years thereafter have commented on the fact that the Government has not endeavoured to encourage mining in this place. The 1975-76 report stated:

It is clearly in the State interest to encourage investigation of all mineral resources, particularly energy resources.

That did not occur in the time of the previous Administration. The 1976-77 report stated:

It should be noted that, if annual exploration expenditures are adjusted by the c.p.i. index for 1967, the intensity of company activity has been falling since 1970.

The 1977-78 report stated:

South Australia, which ranks fourth amongst the States in terms of both area and population, now has the lowest ex-mine value of mineral production in Australia.

All this occurred during the reign of the previous Labor Government in South Australia. The 1978-79 report stated:

If this State is to realise its mineral potential with the attendant economic and human benefits that this would bring, it is essential that the overall exploration activity be substantially increased and actively promoted.

Again, nothing was done by the previous Government. The 1979-80 report stated:

The most significant development with regard to the mineral industry in the year under review has been the change in the South Australian Government uranium policy, following election of the Liberal Government in September.

Since then, we have been only too well aware that there has been a tremendous upsurge in investment in South Australia in the mining industry. In 1980, \$31 100 000 was expended, three times the expenditure of 1979. Obviously, the removal of the left wing element as represented in the Labor Government has had a tremendous effect in allowing proper development to go ahead in South Australia to encourage the mining and exploration that we so drastically need to bring us on a par with other States.

I refer now to education: last night I challenged the member for Salisbury to publicly reaffirm the comments he made in the Port Pirie newspaper. He said that he would make cuts in education funding but not in the ancillary line. I challenge him to say in which area he would make the cuts. The honourable member sits there with his mouth zipped: he is afraid to comment. This was exemplified at the State A.L.P. convention. Two motions were put, one moved by Mr Treneleman and seconded by Dr Hopgood, as follows:

That this convention deplores the Liberal Party's repudiation of its 1979 election commitment to education, that significantly more public resources be put into education and that, as a first step, staffing levels in the Education Department be restored to their 1979 level.

This motion was very quickly amended, and the following motion was moved by Mr L. Arnold, M.P.:

That this convention condemns both the State and Federal Liberal Governments for their attacks on the education system and calls on future Labor Governments to restore education as a priority of Government policy.

That was a non-statement, merely bland words with no meaning behind them, and should be taken in line with what the Tasmanian Labor Minister of Education said recently. He said his Government would have to look very seriously at cutting education expenditure, but this did not mean that his Government would put any less value on the quality of education.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech by the Governor, in accordance with the regulations and traditions of this House. I am not greatly impressed with the actual tradition of the Address in Reply remaining part of the proceedings of the House, but nevertheless it is here, and while it is we can all take advantage of using our time to talk about those things that we think

are important within the community. The time could be much better devoted to legislation. We could be allowed to make three 10-minute adjournment speeches or speeches on some other matter. I believe this is being looked at, so wisdom will be obtained at some stage.

Before turning to the subjects I intend to talk about, I wish to place on record my sympathy and condolences in relation to three people who have passed away recently. I refer first to a former Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, who no doubt played a very important part in the development of this State. I sincerely offer my condolences and sympathy to his family and friends. I also extend my condolences and sympathy to two Port Pirie families, namely, the family of Mr Claude Brine, who passed away last Friday. Claude was a long time executive officer of the Australian Workers Union who served the people of Port Pirie in almost all capacities within the union movement in that town. Claude, unfortunately, had an untimely death at the age of 64 years. I send my condolences to his family and friends.

I also want to place on record my condolences and sadness at the passing of Mr Bert Mounce, who died 10 days ago in Port Pirie, at the age of 76 years. Bert was a well known identity in that city. He worked in the smelters almost all his working life and had grown to be respected and loved by everybody in Port Pirie. His untimely death occurred some 10 days ago. I forward my sympathy and condolences to the Mounce family and friends, and express great regret at the passing of all those people I have mentioned.

I have chosen to devote the greater part of my speech today to the plight of small business in this State. I am doing so because my repeated efforts to move for a Select Committee inquiry into small business problems have been frustrated. This Government places small business policies so low on its list of priorities that it will not even consider a genuine bipartisan attempt to tackle some of the problems faced by small business. Instead of seeking solutions, this Government prefers to gag debate.

It is quite clear that many hundreds of small businesses in South Australia are facing a crisis. Small business people to whom I have spoken believe, quite rightly, that they are the forgotten sector of the South Australian economy. The high number of bankruptcies is proof enough that many small businesses are desperately struggling for survival, yet that struggle is being waged in a business environment where the Federal and South Australian Governments are neither supporters nor impartial umpires. Instead, both Governments are committed protagonists for big business, monopoly interests to whom the Liberal Party must owe great debts.

The Party that masquerades as the champion of free enterprise, open markets and competition is in fact the fiercest supporter of the heavy hand of monopoly where the small entrepreneur has no place and where competition is dead (and nowhere is that shown more starkly than in the grocery wholesale trade in South Australia at this moment). But, for the benefit of the members opposite who so frequently shrug off the plight of small business, let us first define what I mean by the small business entrepreneur. I am talking about those businesses where one or two people are required to make all of the critical management decisions. To me, a small business is one which is independently owned and managed, and where those owner/managers contribute most, if not all, of the operating capital.

A small business, rather than having its market 'all sewn up', in fact usually enjoys a relatively small share of the total potential market. Usually, a central feature of small business—where manufacturers employ less than 100 workers and other entrepreneurs less than 20—is the close

staff/management relationship which exists in those companies.

Small business provides a range of products and specialist services, catering for a discerning public rather than a mass market that has little or no choice but to buy a brand name. As a result, the Opposition believes that small business makes an enormous contribution to our quality of life, as well as to decentralisation and regional development.

On a conservative definition, the 372 000 small businesses in Australia now employ nearly 40 per cent of the private workforce, or 1 600 000 workers. Broader definitions than mine claim that small business employs nearly 2 500 000 people, or 60 per cent of the private sector workforce. Whatever definition of small business you use, these workers are found in all sections of industry and commerce.

The small business sector is an especially important employer in the wholesale and retail industries. Of paramount importance is the fact that small business is the sector of our economy that creates jobs, because there is a greater emphasis on labour, rather than machines. Unfortunately, the Government of this State and the Government in Canberra fail to realise that, unless small business is encouraged to grow, employment growth will fall behind and high levels of unemployment will be maintained. I do not think anybody can dispute that fact.

Nationally, the Fraser Government's policies have utterly failed to develop the full job creation potential of small business. They have failed in two fundamental ways. First of all, the recession policies pursued by the Federal Government since December 1975 have been disastrous for small business. They have borne much of the brunt of the Fraser Government's anti-inflation strategy.

Bankruptcies during the 1979-1980 financial year were the highest since the depression and represent an increase of 162 per cent over the level in 1975-1976. The main reason why small businesses have been going to the wall is not competition or management incompetence: small businesses have been dying because of the fiscal and monetary noose tied by the Federal Government.

Last night that noose remained tight for the seventh financial year in succession because the Treasurer, Mr Howard, wanted his Budget to continue to depress demand. Last year's Budget, however, was particularly disastrous for small business because company tax collections increased by \$1 000 000 000, or 32 per cent, and interest rates on overdrafts increased. Not a murmur of protest was heard from the Premier or his Government on this matter. Likewise, there was no sign of a campaign by the South Australian Government to press the Federal Treasurer for relief in last night's Budget, but that is not surprising.

This Government, unlike the Playford, Dunstan and Corcoran Governments, will not stand up for South Australia by taking on Canberra. Like the Fraser Government, this Government is committed to the interests of big business, particularly if they have foreign names and foreign shareholders, and it has done little and cares less for small business. The Fraser Government, like its State counterpart, has continually delayed or botched vital trade practice reforms, such as protection for service station operators from price discrimination and unfair leases, and programmes to assist small business management have been downgraded.

One of the key functions of the Select Committee I am proposing and did propose last year and will be proposing again shortly would be to inquire into and make recommendations on the problems encountered by small businesses in raising finance and the possibility of easier access to equity and debt finance. Shortage of working capital is reported as a major cause of retarded growth and failures in the small business sector. Small businesses cannot expand

their output and provide more jobs without adequate finance. Innovation and modernisation have been increasingly recognised as vital to Australia's long-term economic future, but our financial institutions have not adequately provided for this.

The Crawford study group, for example, found that '... more expansive arrangements for finance are needed if greater development and adjustment in industry, particularly in smaller businesses, is to occur.' The needs of small business for improved access to finance has become acute in recent years, due to the credit needs imposed by higher levels of inflation and by the impact that heavy use of stringent monetary policy has had on small business finance. The most common sources of short-term finance are the trading banks. Yet, a succession of interest rate rises, under the Federal Treasurer, Mr Howard, has contributed to the growing number of small businesses being forced to the wall. Strong competition for finance from the resource based industries means that this pressure is likely to be maintained for many years.

Let us face facts. If small business is not to suffer further in the future, policies must be developed to maintain and extend the provision of finance. In particular, a larger volume of funds in the form of long-term loans and, also, in the form of equity participation, is needed, and needed urgently. Many small businesses and industry organisations support the need for this finance, but believe that it should be provided by a new institution set up by the private trading banks. However, the bankers themselves have shown virtually no inclination to do so, and the Federal Government has decided to take no action. The Australian Labor Party's view is that the Government should take the initiative by expanding the charter of the Commonwealth Development Bank to ensure that it is able to lend or provide equity finance for any small business development for expansion purposes.

At the moment, of course, the Commonwealth Development Bank is constrained by a severe shortage of funds and has not entered into equity or working capital arrangements. The capital base of the Commonwealth Development Bank needs to be expanded, and so does the borrowing power of the bank, which is presently restricted to the semi-government loans market only. Combined with a stronger capital base, this increased borrowing power will enable a substantial expansion of lending to small business.

The Commonwealth Government should also encourage initiatives by the private sector banks towards the improved provision of finance for small business. Unfortunately, the provision of debt finance to small businesses is in short supply because of the greater administrative costs of lending small amounts to small businesses. The committee for small business financing and development estimates that the gap in the supply of development capital for 'advanced small business' in Australia is \$30 000 000 per annum. This implies a shortfall of finance in South Australia of between \$2 000 000 and \$3 000 000 per annum. The State Government is aware of that shortfall, but no attempt has been made to fill the gap. I believe that a Select Committee of this House should examine whether the State Government can act, through the State Bank or S.G.I.C., to make more loan finance available. We should also examine whether, through State Government initiatives, we can minimise the problems of security involved in financing small businesses and increase the opportunity to obtain venture capital. There are a number of ways in which this could be done. Small businesses, as the Minister should realise, are substantial contributors to the State Government Insurance Commission through the payment of workers compensation and other premiums. Our Select Committee should examine whether the Government can intervene to channel some of

these funds back to small businesses in the form of loan or venture capital. The A.L.P. is currently examining whether or not arrangements could be made for the State Bank to acquire block finance from the S.G.I.C. and to retail this finance to small businesses. Perhaps an expanded and upgraded small business advisory agency in this State could assist the State Bank in assessing organisations applying for such loans.

Mr Olsen: Would that be at preferred rates or normal commercial rates?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Normal commercial rates. But there are other strategies that should be examined by a Select Committee of this House. One alternative, for instance, could involve the South Australian Development Corporation being expanded into a fully-fledged business finance agency. At the moment, the S.A.D.C. is very much a 'last resort' source of finance, but there is no reason why this should continue to be the case. We should review the roles of the Development Corporation, the State and Savings Banks, and the State Government Insurance Commission, as well as Government incentives such as the Establishment Payments Scheme, to make sure that we are doing all that we can to get behind small business. The challenge for a State Government is not to prop up small business, but to remove unnecessary obstacles and provide proper assistance to those people requiring it. Unfortunately, the Government's response is to dither and to fail to make decisions. I am repeatedly told of wrangling between the Department of Trade and Industry and the Premier's Department office of State Development. The Government has failed to define the specific tasks and responsibilities of each department and there is overlap and confusion, as well as intrigues and jealousies within those departments. Senior officers have told me about interdepartmental wrangling that is as much a part of a long-standing friction between the Premier and the Minister of Trade and Industry as anything else. Certainly, the Minister's senior departmental officers complain about their lack of access to the Minister.

Mr Ashenden: You should have started with 'Once upon a time'.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Even the permanent head can get an audience only once a week. I am told that Mr Tiddy has much greater access to the Premier, and the Premier's Department Budget submission shows that his area will be expanding. For the benefit of the member for Todd, my speech will be going out to his district, so he will be able to read it in the local paper.

The Department of Trade and Industry's Budget submission has also been leaked to the Opposition. In part, this document shows that one initiative planned is an expansion of the role of the Small Business Advisory Unit. Naturally, I am glad the Minister is once again following my advice and is at least prepared to recognise the importance of this Dunstan Government initiative. But the changes planned are pretty cosmetic and do not go far enough.

I would like to see the Small Business Advisory Unit restructured and made into an independent statutory corporation. The Minister will be well aware that Victoria has a small business development corporation, and I understand the New South Wales Government is examining whether its agency should be made into a corporation.

Mr Olsen: Why did you allow it to run down whilst you were in Government?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Maybe because I was not the Minister—I do not know. I am not convinced that it was run down. If the honourable member is making that allegation, I cannot be held responsible if I was not the Minister responsible. I have now been given the responsibility for this area, and I am trying to do some work in this field. The advantages should be obvious. Apart from greater

flexibility and independence, many small businesses might prefer to deal with an independent body rather than a section of a department. At present, the Small Business Advisory Unit provides counselling and other advice to prospective and established small business. This role should be expanded. A small business corporation could, for instance, assist the State Bank or the S.G.I.C. in assessing small business applications for loans. The activities of a small business development corporation in this State should be directed at increasing the number of small businesses operating in South Australia, the rate of expansion of existing small businesses, and reducing the rate of small business failures. Indeed, a major responsibility of such a corporation would be to identify the major problems facing small businesses and to recommend policies to minimise these problems.

One of my concerns is that many new enterprises do not acquire the services of financial consultants to assist in establishing a new business. This is the time when financial advice and expertise may be of great benefit to any small business commencing operation. A small business corporation could arrange for consultants to assist new enterprises when it feels its own advisory service does not have the specialist expertise required. I believe such a consultancy service should be made available to selected new businesses at a subsidised rate for initial consultations. The New South Wales Small Business Agency offers such a service, and it has been both highly successful and inexpensive. If the Premier is at all sincere in his claim to be backing South Australia's small, as well as big business, then he will place the matter of small business financing on the agenda of the next Premiers' Conference. I doubt if he will, however. The Premier has shown repeatedly that he is not prepared to take on the Prime Minister, even when his State's interests are at issue, but I have laid down the challenge and I hope he accepts it.

We should also examine how we can improve training facilities for people who are either already involved in running a small business or who are contemplating going into business. The Department of Further Education offers first-class courses; however, these are generally held in evenings over a considerable period of time. Unfortunately many people, particularly those not living in Adelaide or working long or difficult hours, cannot get to these classes. The New South Wales Business Agency offers special intensive courses. These include three-hour evening seminars held twice a week over two consecutive weeks, and two-day weekend workshops. The latter are particularly popular with people living in country areas.

The New South Wales Business Agency also offers a new venture workshop every alternate Thursday afternoon for people thinking of starting in business, to help them sort out their thinking prior to seeing a counsellor at that agency; these have proven to be extremely popular and they save a lot of time for agency staff. I do not see why similar flexibility cannot be introduced for small business planning in South Australia.

Last year I spoke of the plight of small retailers, particularly grocers and deli owners, who are under threat from the monopoly pricing practices of Associated Co-operative Wholesalers and the large supermart chains. The Government did not heed my call, the squeeze still continues and, in the last few months, many more small retailers have been forced out of business. I detailed to this House a range of practices, such as differential pricing policies, discount wholesaling and examples of gross discrimination, kick-backs and gifts, which can only politely be described as shonky, in my view. However, the South Australian Government would neither act nor call for an inquiry into this

matter. Perhaps that has something to do with who paid into the Government's election coffers in 1979.

In the same way the Fraser Government has for six years neglected the area of the trade practices law as it relates to small business. The most substantial and tragic example of this neglect has been that of the law relating to service station operators. The Fraser Government promised action in this area in 1977, but legislation was not introduced until the final weeks of last year's Budget session of Parliament. Because the legislation was not retrospective, as promised, dozens of small business people have lost their livelihood in the intervening years. Finally, weaknesses of the Trade Practices Act have also not been remedied, despite the long history of studies and cases which indicate the need for change.

In relation to small business, the main deficiencies are in the areas of abuse of market power by large corporations and price discrimination. There has been considerable growth in the practice of franchising in recent years. Unfortunately, the relationship between the franchiser and the franchisee is seldom without tension, and the small business is often at a disadvantage. Disputes involving franchising have been a particular problem with lessee shopkeepers and with petrol resellers. Before the last Federal election the Australian Labor Party promised to introduce franchise laws to protect small business men from larger corporations which had excessive bargaining powers. It is time for the Minister to think seriously about intervening to ensure fair practices in South Australia as well. My view, quite simply, is that we should not allow small business people to suffer undue hardship from unfair practices, in the same way that we will not allow employees to so suffer.

The legislation to outlaw price discrimination should be strengthened to ensure that any practice which unfairly discriminates against a business and so damages competition will be prohibited. Locally, however, there has been no action from the Government and that is why a Select Committee should inquire into the effects of the current pricing structure and pricing practices within the retail industry and the extent to which such practices cause or may cause loss to small business.

We should establish how consumer protection legislation could be better applied to protect small business operators. We should also examine the problems encountered by small businesses in retail development and the proliferation of retail shopping centres. It is quite clear that indiscriminate and unnecessary shopping developments have been and are penalising small businesses. For instance, last year the General Manager of the A.M.P. warned the community about major retail groups which have caused an oversupply of shopping outlets, often ill-planned and shoddily erected, at the expense of the small specialist shops which have been charged damagingly high rentals.

A Select Committee should examine how the profitability and viability of shopping centre proposals can be better assessed. That assessment should take into account the effects of new developments on the viability of existing small businesses and the fairness of leasing agreements. I think that the State Superannuation Fund should be asked to stop adding to the shopping centre proliferation. A Select Committee could also look at reducing the red tape that so often unnecessarily frustrates small businesses.

This Government has been quite open in its contempt for small business. Early last year we saw the Minister of Industrial Affairs attempt to introduce trading hours legislation that would have benefited the large retailers and forced many small shopkeepers out of business. The Minister has repeatedly demonstrated that he regards his role as being the champion of big business and big development.

We in the Labor Opposition regard the small business as a vital part of our economy. Over the next year we will be releasing details and policies of how we believe the State Government can assist small business. In the meantime, I want to take this opportunity to invite small business people to write to me about their problems and with their ideas. However, I can assure them that the pressure being placed on small business by this Government will be resisted by the State Opposition, and we will work closely with small business groups to make sure that the general public is aware of the increasing plight of the small entrepreneur. I believe that the establishment of a special Select Committee will demonstrate to small business people that the South Australian Parliament is concerned with their survival.

I want to turn to a subject dear to my heart, one that has caused me some heartaches over the years and some criticism and, in some cases, some condemnation. However, I believe that, since 1975, the people who criticised my activities in relation to the wage indexation system have rethought the matter, particularly with its abolition a couple of weeks ago, and are now wondering what the wages policies in this nation will be. I am wondering what the State and national Government policies will be. I have always been and will remain a very firm supporter of the wage indexation system. It is a proper system to give relief to everybody in the community, irrespective of whether one has the political or union muscle to ensure that one can put sufficient pressure on the employer.

Dr Billard: Do you agree with Cameron?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes, I do. The fate of wage indexation was sealed from the very moment that the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission decided to index the total wage and to throw a fence of guidelines around that decision to prevent what was called 'double counting'. It was a fatal departure from the form of wage indexation that operated from 1921 to 1953. However, it was not called indexation in those years; it was known simply as automatic quarterly cost-of-living adjustments.

The old system worked, with notable success, for 32 years. It was the envy of the industrial world. Articles and books were written about it in America, where we hear a lot about collective bargaining. In the United Kingdom, also—

Mr Mathwin: They've got collective bargaining there.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes, in the United Kingdom, and books were written about it in those days, about the system that was in operation, as they were in Scandinavian countries and other Western European countries. It operated in this way: the minimum wage, then known as the basic wage, was fully indexed automatically every quarter, with wage adjustment operating from the first pay period commencing after the consumer price index for the quarter became known.

There were no long-drawn out commission hearings, as was the case under the system that has recently collapsed. There was no discounting of the c.p.i. for factors such as indirect taxation. The effect of exchange rates, or any other decisions of Government, whatever move was reflected in the c.p.i. each quarter, was automatically applied at once to every worker in Australia, regardless of whether his salary was high or low.

The concept of quarterly cost of living adjustments was to guarantee that the shopping basket portion of each worker's pay-packet or, if we like his total wage, would be insulated against increased prices. It meant that if there was an increase of 2 per cent in the c.p.i. for a particular quarter, everyone would receive that sum of money equal to 2 per cent of the minimum wage. I believe it was the fairest system that I can recall. It guaranteed that the family man on a low income had that portion of his total

wage represented by the minimum wage safeguarded from erosion due to price movements. In those years it was possible, and in my union it was the common practice, to enter into term agreements with employers and to know that price movements would not create circumstances that would cause the agreements to collapse.

In my union, not one of those agreements was ever repudiated by the membership. I think that is something to be very proud of. The union and its members would enter into two-year contracts, sometimes three-year contracts in those days, and because of the very fact that c.p.i. increases were adjusted automatically every three months, the workers never ever repudiated an agreement, because the lost ground that they were quite obviously losing through the c.p.i. movements was being made up for them automatically. There was an orderly and processed way of dealing with their margins and any other case that needed to be taken over the two-year period, and it was a sensible approach to the whole matter.

It was possible to honour those agreements because the major portion of the total wage was guaranteed against erosion from price movements. In return for a guarantee of peace in industry, the union had been able to persuade employers to go behind whatever might have been the current standard for factors like margins, sick leave, overtime penalties, annual leave, paid public holidays, and so on.

I repeat: that old concept worked magnificently. It was possible under that system to enter into long-term agreements and to guarantee peace in industry. A return to that old system, subject to some modifications, could produce the same results again. In periods of rapidly rising inflation it is not easy to enter into long-term agreements, even though the minimum wage portion of the total wage is fully indexed against inflation. This is especially true of occupations in which the portion of the wage which we may, for convenience sake, describe as the margin for skill and other factors, bears a high ratio to the minimum wage. But even that difference could be overcome in the kind of agreements I am describing, because there were escalation clauses in some of our agreements in respect of margins that were likely to be affected by the need to maintain comparative wage justice against the likelihood of sharp movements in other States or other comparable industries. I believe that this, too, could be done again.

That is the tragedy of what is happening at the moment. For the benefit of members opposite, no-one in Government is coming forward, except Premier Wran. I have seen a statement from Premier Wran which runs parallel to the remarks that I am making today. It is very similar thinking by the New South Wales Government. The Federal Government and this State Government should come forward and declare their policy. We have not heard this Government's policy, but I would very much like to know what it is. I am aware that tomorrow the Minister of Industrial Affairs will be amending the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I do not know what that is about, because I have not been privileged to see what it contains.

Mr Max Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am very doubtful that it will assist. I will be concerned to see what he is doing with that Act tomorrow. I do not have much doubt that it relates to the current matter before the court. However, I hope that there is some lead, even if I disagree with that lead—and I probably will, because I do not think the Minister will be agreeing with me. Nevertheless, there is no lead from me—

Mr Mathwin: That is supposition; you might support it fully.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will see when it comes in. I am very doubtful that the Minister would agree with the

concepts that I am putting forward at the moment. Nevertheless, we must wait and see what that legislation brings forward tomorrow. One of the great injustices of the system that has just collapsed is that it led to the commission feeling obliged to adopt guidelines that prevented just compensation for changed circumstances. By using a system that gave very high income groups more than they would have been entitled to under the old system of indexation, the commission found itself faced with a total wages bill that appeared to be biting into the share of the gross national product going to profits to an extent that prompted the commission to: (a) discount movements in the c.p.i. and/or (b) give only partial indexation for other reasons.

Once both of those things occurred, or either of those things occurred, in my view that spelt the end of wage indexation. Wage indexation could no longer survive once we started to discount or give partial increases. That is what was being done, because of the guidelines and the factors that I just mentioned. The result of partial indexation meant that those on very high incomes got much more than they would have received under the old system, and those on low incomes received less. That is just totally incompatible.

In other words, it gave most to those whose needs were least, and least to those whose needs were most. Over the past six years it has escalated the salaries of the highly paid to a point far beyond the level they could have received from a work value case while, at the same time, it has reduced the manual, technical and professional grades to a relativity that was greatly below the figure they would have been able to claim under a proper work value system. Unless something is done quickly, and I say this advisedly to members opposite, to develop a wage fixation system that will guarantee to those who lack industrial muscle a fair and reasonable wage adjustment, many hundreds of thousands of families in this country, I am afraid, are going to be left stranded and in some cases forced to levels that will be little above the Henderson poverty bench-mark.

I am sure that you would agree and that most members would also agree, if they searched their consciences properly, that that would be a very bad thing. That is why this country is lacking leadership at the moment, and that is why it needs leadership desperately. The A.C.T.U. itself is now on record as saying that it would like to keep wage indexation in a modified form. I am sure that, if the correct and proper leadership is given, wage indexation can be restored in this nation and we can return to an orderly system of obtaining wages. Nothing will now prevent powerful unions and unions in key industries from using their industrial muscle to force employers to pay the maximum the market can yield. And why not? If it is proper for monopolies and multi-national companies to be free to extract the maximum that the market will bear, why should not the sellers of labour be free to do likewise? It is their perfect right when a system has collapsed.

One has only to glance through the financial pages of any daily newspaper in this country to find evidence of exorbitant and ever-rising levels of profit being made by those who are exploiting the market place in the sale of goods and services big corporations are able to effect. One would imagine that it is only the cost of labour that affects inflation and that exorbitant profits have nothing to do with prices.

While the Prime Minister continues to blame wages for rising prices, both this Government and the Commonwealth Government are loud in their praise for the high profits made by their wealthy corporate friends. They cannot have it both ways. It is time we put an end to this double-talk. If this Government has any principles at all, it is time it addressed itself to the effect outrageously high profits have

upon prices. A first step should be the reintroduction of price control. I want to say this: it is a great tragedy to this country, and particularly to the workers of this country, whether they be manual, technical, professional or clerical workers, that the case put to the Arbitration Commission in 1975 by Clyde Cameron was not adopted. I was asked whether I support Clyde Cameron—I do.

His case was for the reintroduction of the old system of wage indexation with unions being free to bargain for wage adjustment to that portion of the total wage not covered by automatic indexation. He was asking for a return to the system that had worked so magnificently from 1921 to 1953. Cameron looked at the A.L.P. Federal platform and saw that our Party had been advocating the reintroduction of quarterly cost of living adjustments ever since its discontinuance in 1953. He saw, too, that the A.C.T.U. policy had been aimed at the reintroduction of the basic minimum wage.

The Whitlam Cabinet, I am informed, endorsed his proposal to ask for the reintroduction of indexation to the minimum wage. However, to his surprise, the A.C.T.U. application was for something different. The A.C.T.U. was asking for the adoption of an entirely new concept. It asked that the commission index up to a plateau equivalent to average award rates. The A.C.T.U.'s repudiation of its 20-year-old policy created confusion in the minds of the commission and, with a Federal election already in progress, the commission decided to play it safe by postponing a decision on the matter pending a special wage indexation conference.

That conference only compounded the chaos, because the A.C.T.U. then shifted ground again. It decided to shift from indexation of a plateau equivalent to average award rates to full indexation of the total wage, even though the total wage might be \$1 000 a week. This meant that if the consumer price index over a 12-month period reflected an increase of, say, 10 per cent in the price of onions, potatoes, bread, butter, meat and the other factors that go to constitute the c.p.i., then the man on \$1 000 a week would receive an increase of \$100, while the man on only \$200 would have to be content with \$20. This aberration could be justified only if it could be shown that the man on \$1 000 a week ate five times as much potatoes, onions, meat, bread and butter and paid five times as much for his fares going to work as was paid by the man on \$200 a week. That is the futility of that proposition. Such a proposition, of course, is absurd.

One has only to examine that argument to see how ridiculous it is to suggest that it is a proper yardstick for measuring factors such as beach-houses, Mercedes motor cars, mink coats and holiday trips abroad or, for that matter, measuring any of the other ways that a man on \$1 000 a week might choose to spend his surplus money. The c.p.i., in my view, was never intended as a yardstick for measuring anything except the needs wage; that was the whole purpose of the c.p.i. Until we come back to first principles and recognise the fundamentals of wage justice, this country will continue the current confrontation between labour and capital.

Before I leave this subject, I want to say that it gives me a great deal of pleasure to know that Mr Bob Hawke has publicly acknowledged the mistake which the A.C.T.U. made in the 1975 wage indexation hearing. He is now urging that we return to the old two-tier system of wage indexation, that is, an automatic and fully indexed minimum wage each quarter, payable from the first pay period commencing after the c.p.i. is announced, and the second tier being subject to negotiations free of the restrictive guidelines fixed by the commission in 1975.

The member for Newland earlier asked me whether I supported Clyde Cameron's philosophy in this area. I think, if he has followed the philosophy of Cameron closely over the years, he would now concede that I have followed it and believe in what Cameron has been putting forward and am very consistent with what he has put forward. I stress that I am in good company in this area because Bob Hawke, who would probably be recognised as the best advocate before the Federal Industrial Court to be seen in my time, has also now recognised that the propositions I am putting forward are in fact the correct propositions. So three people now, who I believe all know something about this subject—Cameron, Hawke and Wright—are all on the same plane.

We have yet to hear the South Australian Government's position, if it has one. We might hear it tomorrow. There is some chance we might get some gleaning of what the policy of this Government is, when the legislation announced today is introduced tomorrow. I was pleased to hear that the Labor Premier of New South Wales is advocating a return to the old system of quarterly automatic cost of living adjustments with the second tier of the total wage being subject to sensible negotiations.

Let me conclude on the note on which I commenced by saying that if this were done it would be possible once again to return to the kind of industrial agreements which unions were able to negotiate and to honour in the 1940s. Until this is done neither employees nor management will be free of the costly and damaging polarisation which now characterises labour relations in this country. I hope that someone heeds what I am saying.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I am pleased to support the motion. In so doing, I join with the comments made by other speakers with respect to the death of Sir Thomas Playford. I wish to raise a number of matters this afternoon relating to small business activity in our community. In so doing, I endorse the remarks made by the Deputy Leader in his address to the House as Opposition spokesman on small business. I have watched with interest the Government's actions in relation to assisting small business in our community. I have many such businesses in my district and not infrequently their owners come to me seeking assistance in one form or another.

This Government came to office saying that it would provide substantial assistance to that sector in our community. To date, it has failed to do that. That failure has resulted in a great deal of anxiety, depression and harm in our community. In the economic sense, of course, we know that the profitability of small business is declining and that a number of these businesses have gone to the wall. However, the effect on the community is hard to estimate fully in economic and social terms, but one can assume that the cost to the community is substantial and is increasing at a time when the community needs all the support it can get. As the Deputy Leader said, action with respect to planning laws and large retail developments, changes in trading hours and other projected moves by the Government have been harmful indeed to the small businessman. There is still much anxiety in that sector of the community as to the real intentions of the Government.

To back up that theory, I refer to the report of the South Australian Working Party on Shopping Centre Leases. When I received a copy of that report from the Minister I thought that at long last the Government was going to try to do something about this very real problem that is evident in the business community, that is, the leasing arrangements that small businessmen suffer, as we know they do in respect of shopping centres. Almost every major chain store development has, associated with it, a cluster

of small retail shops. I was soon to realise, having read the report, that the Government was not serious at all about attending to this problem. It came down squarely in favour of the proprietors of the large shopping centres and, in fact, offered very little substantive support for the small trader.

The report is quite an alarming one to read, and I think it will rest on a shelf in some Government department and gather dust to eternity. However, it may be that the Government decides to reject the recommendations of the committee and to do something about the matter, because the working party, in its report, really suggested no substantive action at all. The disappointing thing, initially, was that the working party was made up of Government officers and that there was no attempt to involve the parties with which the report was concerned on the committee in its deliberations.

I would have thought that there should be a representative of small businessmen and a representative of landlords on that committee, so that it would have had the advantage of having people actually involved in this real problem in the community. As I said, the report brings down a number of quite negative recommendations. It made these recommendations after looking at the situation in other States and, I would have thought, the substantial evidence that there was a real need for intervention by the Government in this area. The committee consulted with Government departments and with other relevant authorities in other States, and similar problems were experienced in other States.

I understand that the Queensland Government intends to legislate in this area in the near future. Given the philosophy of the Queensland Government with respect to business, I would have thought that this Government would at least be ahead of the Queensland Government in providing some relief for small businessmen in this State. The leases that are the problem in the subject of this report are nationally relevant, and they are the same leases that apply generally around Australia. This area could perhaps have been referred to the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General or one of the other Ministerial councils to bring about some degree of uniformity. However, there seems to have been no attempt to consider that and to bring about some national link-up to relieve the problem. Throughout the report there appears to be considerable sympathy for some resolution of this problem by the landlords themselves. However, the committee in its wisdom did not recommend that that be so. I now refer to some of the specific areas of concern, the first being the disclosure of information in these leases. The report states:

Such information is available within the lease documents but the technical nature of the language used and the extent of the paper work militate against the average minor tenant becoming fully informed as to his obligations and restrictions under the contract.

The report went on to say:

On the other hand, the landlords of shopping centres had the legal, administrative and other resources to enable full comprehension of the leases they enter.

Such is the story. There could be a small trader investing his life savings in a business. No doubt both he and his family are involved. They might work incredibly long hours and take great commercial risks in getting into the business. They often do not understand the technical nature of the language in the lease, and they do not understand their obligations under it. They are often not in a position to get accurate explanations from lawyers and from others to ascertain really what they are entering into. There is an imbalance. Leases are always drawn up by the landlord and thrust in front of a tenant to sign. Often there is a degree of haste in negotiating these leases, and the tenant finds

many months later that he is bound head and foot by an incredibly complicated and imbalanced contract.

The specific problems dealt with in the report in this area of disclosure of information were the method by which rental increases were determined and the frequency of such increases, the matter of goodwill, joint advertising expenditure, relocation and assignment of leases, and subletting. All of these matters can involve great anxiety, hardship and often litigation, as many members would know from constituent inquiries.

Mr Gunn: Don't you think that a person investing a large sum is entitled to a reasonable return?

Mr CRAFTER: The report comes out clearly on that: it says that the return is often quite exorbitant, and that the intervention of the law is required to bring about some fairness and justice in the market place. After all, the landlord realises that it is in his long-term investment interest to have satisfied and permanent long-term tenants in such a centre. One of the undesirable features of retail shopping centres is rapid transfer of tenancies and often the number of vacant shops.

I referred earlier to the social effect of this matter, and the report touches on it when it states:

It should also be directly advantageous to landlords, because failed retail businesses within their centre will be a cost to the landlords, and also because it should help to dispel some of the negative feeling against landlords and that that exists among other minor tenants at present and thus prevent further polarisation.

That answers precisely the question that the honourable member raised. In one of the submissions about a lack of information by two tenants entering into these arrangements, a landlord suggested that section 90 provisions of the Land and Business Agents Act should apply. That is a very wise suggestion indeed, because there is statutory disclosure in regard to the purchase of houses before people purchase them, and similarly with the provisions for the cooling-off period. Such provisions have been welcomed by consumers throughout the State, and they have been of great benefit to both vendors and purchasers of the family home. Such a purchase is the largest purchase that most consumers make. Similarly in this area a small businessman generally makes very few transactions of this nature, and he requires some protection, I would suggest, of the law in ensuring that there is fair play and that he is primarily aware of what he is entering into and the obligations that follow.

The working party believed that there was some merit in the mandatory disclosure of that information, and it went on to talk about the sort of things that ought to be disclosed. Its recommendation was most disappointing. It recommended that landlords be encouraged to increase communication with prospective minor retail tenants and to ensure that they are informed of and, as far as is reasonable, that they comprehend the provisions of the lease. This includes allowing tenants sufficient time to examine the lease. That recommendation really amounts to nothing. It says that landlords and tenants ought to think a little more about this matter before they enter into the contractual relationship.

Clearly, one can only conclude that that recommendation favours big business men: the landlord against small business men. It is precisely the sort of recommendation that justifies the fear of the small business man that this Government is not interested at all in the problems that he is facing.

The working party next considered model lease arrangements to try to bring about some uniformity of leases, ensuring that in those leases basic protections are contained. It went on once again to consider some of the factual information put before it. One of the authors of a model lease commented in the report that it is in contrast to those

leases in use currently which in the main are confusing, unclear in their intent and difficult to follow, and seemingly illogical. For a small business man who is a greengrocer or running a fish and chip shop, or who is in some other business, such a long involved lease could well fulfil that criteria in their mind and be a daunting thing indeed for them to sort out. Indeed, they often believe that the landlords view is gospel and they believe that the landlord is acting in their interests. They believe he is a person who would not let them down, they shake on such a contract, and sign. Later, they unfortunately find out that they have signed away many of their basic rights.

The investigations undertaken by the working party clearly reveal that some tenants are subject to lease provisions and associated practices that do not seem to the working party to be wholly reasonable, either because they are inequitable or because they seem to make demands well beyond a shopping centre's viability.

We well know the problems that have existed in this State in recent years with respect to an over-supply of shopping centres, so much so that the Government has had to bring down a supplementary development plan in this regard, albeit a very inadequate plan. The Government has taken that action too late. The evening before the last by-election in Norwood, the Minister of Planning spoke to a meeting of Norwood business men: he told them very clearly that the Government did not intend to interfere in the planning process of the development of shopping centres. The Government has modified that view to some extent since then, but it is now almost too late, because there has been an over-provision of regional shopping centres in the metropolitan area. No doubt some pressures have been too great for the Government to withstand.

There has been a substantial flow of funds from super-annuation funds, insurance companies and other major investors into this area. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon, there is a substantial intervention into this area by the State Superannuation Fund, and the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund owns several major shopping centres in the Adelaide metropolitan area. This has caused substantial damage to the small business man. Within a few miles of the Norwood Parade there are about nine major shopping centres: this continually causes a fluid situation in commerce, in the employment potential, in permanency of employment, and in the commitment of business men to the community in that area. A point often overlooked is that small business men play a role in community life: they are members of service clubs and local government, and are involved in the charitable works of the community, but they are often taken for granted. That sort of person is being replaced by, say, a very young manager of a supermarket, who may live many miles away from the district in which he works and who has no real commitment to that district except in regard to maximising the profit of the shopping centre where he is employed, to the benefit of his employer and the shareholders.

There have been a number of instances where funds have been sought from such shopping centres for community works, but they have been refused. People who have approached the supermarkets have been told that funds are not available for those purposes. That is one of the spinoffs of the change that the Government is clearly facilitating. The Government is unwilling to intervene to bring about some balance in these developments.

Regarding the model lease to which I referred, the working party concluded that none of the provisions and practices, albeit they are substantial, warrant Government intervention at this stage. The working party came down in favour of the landlord. A number of areas were mentioned that caused concern, although the working party was not

drawn to attend to these matters. I refer the House to this. It indicates some of the techniques that are being used in the market place that are clearly of concern. These techniques are as follows:

First, the practice of attracting tenants to a shopping centre with a low initial rental and then imposing an unexpectedly heavy increase once the tenants are established;

secondly, a requirement to pay a proportion of goodwill to the landlord which is far in excess of the amount which reflects the landlord's contribution to the building up of that goodwill;

thirdly, lease provisions nominating specifically the media to be used for individual advertising by tenants . . .

So much for free enterprise! Further techniques are as follows:

fourthly, lease provisions making tenants liable for the total cost of relocation in situations where the tenants relocate as part of a centre management plan;

fifthly, lease provisions giving landlords the right of access to tenants' trading results in excess of those required to protect the landlords' reasonable interests; . . .

Here, we have had amazing examples that have been made public in recent years of such requirements in leases as the tenant's making available to the landlord his taxation return within a week of its being lodged with the Commissioner of Taxation, and the rent being based for the next year on that taxable income. In some shopping centres, a day's takings are connected by the cash register to a central computer and the rental is calculated on the day's takings, as recorded on the cash register. So much for the philosophy espoused so often and so confidently by members opposite in regard to the fruits of free enterprise being based upon hard work, enterprise and entrepreneurialism. There is a disincentive to work hard, to maximise profits, and to build up a business where any such efforts are creamed off to the landlord.

The final point made in the report in regard to undesirable practices is the unreasonable refusal by landlords to approve the assignment of a lease. This often involves litigation and a great deal of hardship, in particular to families, who, because of illness or for some other reason, want to leave a business, often quite hurriedly. They may find great difficulty in assigning the lease to a person who seeks to take over the business. I believe that the working party's recommendation in this direction is quite acceptable to the Government: it provides that landlords as a group be encouraged to formulate a voluntary code of practice in respect of shopping centre leases in consultation with a body representing the interest of minor tenants.

That is clearly an unsatisfactory resolution, and I suggest that the Government should represent the interests of minor retail tenants, because they are in a subordinate and weak position, as the report clearly shows. The Government should step in to provide fair play in the market place, particularly in view of the intimidation by the landlords that they would welcome some code of ethics. The recommendation made by one major landlord was that section 90 of the Land and Business Agents Act be implemented for the benefit of small business men.

The working party considered business and financial advice to tenants. One of the fundamental problems that the small business man is facing is the availability of finance. Because he is at the bottom of the economic strata, as far as lending institutions are concerned, particularly banks, at the time of calling up of funds for, say, the payment of provisional tax, the squeeze is put on the small business man, with disastrous effects. He must either put

off staff, either permanent or casual, take less profit, or hunt around to find alternative and often expensive finance. The result is either increased prices or a decrease in services to the community. The report does not consider any recommendation in regard to funding, and I notice that the Government has been silent about the provision of funding for small business. The matter has become of pressing concern, especially because of the most recent rises in interest rates.

We will find that this will indeed bring to the brink many more small business men in our community. The Minister of Industrial Affairs, under whose portfolio this matter comes, has made many statements about his concern for small business and has indicated that he intends to increase the staff of that section so that they may provide further advice to small business men. The report points out the need for further advice to be given to small business men with respect to finance. From my experience of businesses that are in need of cash inflow, having liquidity problems, and with the need for cheaper finance, they do not want to be told that by someone. They do not need advice; they just need the money. They have orders waiting to be filled, clients waiting to be served, and staff waiting to be paid. That is the simple fact of the matter. The Government has avoided this vital issue.

As the Premier said earlier today, there are some discussions with the banks on this matter but, as he said, there is limited finance available. I believe we need to establish some component of the State banking structure to provide finance to small business men, particularly where there is a large employment component, especially of women and, more particularly, migrant girls who comprise an extremely high proportion of those persons unemployed in our community. Unfortunately, this report does not face up to this real need in our community.

We have heard it said so many times that this is the largest employment sector in our work force, with over 60 per cent of persons in employment in South Australia being employed in the small business sector. Yet, it is a sector which has been very much cast aside by the policies of this Government. The recommendation of the working party with respect to the Small Business Advisory Bureau was that it be expanded to ensure that special needs of minor retail tenants are met. This expansion should be accompanied by an education campaign to advise of the availability, scope and services of that section. No recommendations were made with respect to funding—just further advice.

With respect to the consultancies that the bureau allocates, in the Budget Estimates Committees last year it was revealed by the Minister that of the \$130 000 which would be available for consultancies, almost \$100 000 of that money was not allocated—simply not spent. That, indeed, is a great indictment on the Government and on its attitude to small business: that it did not see fit to ensure that many small businesses that are experiencing financial difficulties did not receive that financial and professional assistance that it was the duty of the Government to provide.

One area of the report that does make a positive recommendation is in the voluntary arbitration of disputes. The report states:

It is recommended that section 24a of the Arbitration Act, 1891-1974, be amended to provide that an agreement to submit to arbitration disputes concerning the provisions of leases and ancillary agreements for premises in shopping centres as a condition precedent to any court action shall not be void. Landlords should be encouraged to include an arbitration provision in leases.

That is indeed a very minor consideration in favour of tenants—the only one of the recommendations to provide such support for the embattled tenants in shopping centres.

Indeed, that provision, as I understand it, can be contracted out of and is not in itself entirely satisfactory to resolve the disputes that are arising quite frequently. However, it is of some assistance to persons finding themselves in disputes with landlords with respect to their leases. Quite amazingly, under this heading, the report states:

It is probable that in more cases than not landlords will agree to include provision for arbitration in leases to do the right thing by a tenant.

To me, that is probably one of the sloppiest expressions I have seen in an official Government report. It is entirely unsatisfactory that a group of Government officers, advising the Government on a matter so important as this, should use words such as 'It is probable that in more cases than not landlords will agree to include a provision for arbitration in leases to do the right thing by a tenant.' That is probably an indication of the worth of the whole report. I would be interested indeed to see what recommendations, if any, the Government brings down.

Of course, there is only one recommendation of substance, and that is with respect to amendments to the Arbitration Act. I would think that it simply was not a matter of high priority that the Government would bring down an amendment for that purpose. Indeed, what is needed is a comprehensive piece of legislation, and I suggest to the House that that legislation would be welcomed by both landlords and tenants so that some of the costs, hardships and disruptions, not only to the tenants and landlords themselves—to those persons who have vested interests in their viability—but also to users of shopping centres (that is, the consumers) and to the community at large, will be sorted out. If this matter is not attended to, as I suggest that it will be, it is a further indication that this Government is not really concerned about the problems of that sector of our community.

I add to that the Government's attitude, when in Opposition, to a Bill that was introduced on a number of occasions in this House to bring about relief for consumers who enter into contracts. I refer to the Contracts Review Bill. The Bill was very strongly opposed by the Opposition on the grounds that it was trying to meddle in the market place, and it was rejected. By attrition, the Government tried to wear down the Opposition's rejection of it. Eventually in the Legislative Council the Bill was referred to the Law Reform Committee of this State. That committee considered the Contracts Review Bill and brought down its report in 1979. It is interesting to read in the report of the Law Reform Committee the need for legislation to intervene in the market place to bring about fair play and justice. The report states:

The passing of the Bill by the House of Assembly following the report of a Select Committee of the House and the terms of the resolution of the Legislative Council indicate, we suppose, that the objects of the Bill were acceptable to both Houses of Parliament. Certainly, the committee takes the view that the law should be altered to enable the courts to reform contracts which are unjust and to modify the application to particular situations of unjust contractual terms so as to avoid the injustice which would otherwise ensue. Judges in the past have done their best to avoid or at any rate mitigate the harsh consequences of unjust contracts and have resorted to interpretations and distinctions which, we fear, at times have been little better than subterfuges in order to avert injustice. That judges should feel impelled to resort to such devices is no credit to the law. All too often, in spite of all efforts, courts have been compelled by existing law to enforce contracts in the knowledge that the result was manifest injustice. In our view this is a reproach to the law and ought to be remedied.

I would suggest that those words apply to the subject that I have just referred to as well, where courts are being asked to do the impossible in the absence of law with respect to tenancies between the proprietors of shopping centres and the small business man who is the tenant.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr CRAFTER: Before the adjournment I was talking about the difficulties that small businesses are facing in our community. In recent weeks I have made some public statements and spoken in this House on the advent of B.P. Food Plus stores in our community. I am concerned indeed that these stores should be sanctioned by the Government. We have seen conflicting statements in the explanations given to the House by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. When the Minister returns to the House, I would appreciate an explanation that he has not misled it. There are conflicting statements by the Minister recorded in *Hansard* in his replies given to the member for Brighton on 16 July this year, and then to a question that I asked in the House last week. I find it most unsatisfactory that the Government has clearly changed its attitude towards the implementation of these stores.

It appears, in the first instance, that the Minister or some officers of his department, or the Government, have given the go-ahead to the B.P. organisation to establish these stores in petrol station outlets that it no longer requires as such outlets in the metropolitan area. It is no less than a ruse used by that company to trade after hours when other similar stores, namely, supermarkets, are not allowed to trade. By getting around the trading hours legislation, these stores can trade up to 24 hours as exempt stores and during the normal trading hours for petrol selling. The petrol outlets can in that way be maintained.

I believe this is a way in which the oil companies will try to circumvent the Federal Petroleum Marketing Franchise Act and the Petroleum Marketing Sites Act, both of which became law last year, as a result of some very heated and excited negotiations between petrol resellers, oil companies and the Federal Government, prior to the last Federal election. This is a way in which there can be a policy of divorcement brought about between the owners of the basic product, the petroleum, and those who sell it. There are undesirable features abroad for consumers and society because those two aspects of the marketing of this essential item are inextricably linked. What we have now is a very elaborate plan by not only B.P., but I understand Caltex has also recently been given approval by the Foreign Investment Review Board to set up food retailing outlets in service stations for which they have no longer a use, and other companies are similarly interested.

The aspect that I was raising earlier, that is, the leases that are entered into between large corporations and small tenants, applies to B.P. Food Plus stores as well. I have been provided with some information from lobby groups in this area about the nature of the franchise agreements that the B.P. organisation is attempting to enter into with franchise holders. It is disturbing to see the detail of that franchise agreement. It contains some of the provisions I referred to earlier which were considered by the working party and after which the working party recommended no action be taken, and no doubt the Government will not take action in this area. What is happening becomes clearer when one sees the conflicting statements made by the Minister with respect to the establishment of these stores in our community and his willingness to wash his hands of this whole issue, leaving it to local government, the traders themselves, or any authority other than his own, to try to resolve this complex issue.

I understand that the Food Plus organisation provides its franchise holders with a manual which is a highly confidential document setting out all the do's and don'ts for a person who runs such a store. The franchise agreement enables Food Plus to up-date the manual as it sees fit, and this appears to empower the company to introduce any new rules and regulations in addition to those already imposed

under the franchise agreement. The relevant clause requires the operator to comply with all the rules, regulations and directives contained in the manual as amended from time to time, and to vigorously, energetically and continuously adopt and carry out to the best of the franchisee's ability the recommendations and procedures in the manual. One can see here many of the problems arising which have been a great problem in the petrol reselling industry in the past few generations and which have brought about changes in the Federal law and the various refinements of the Five package that we have debated in this House ourselves.

In terms of the franchise agreement for the stores, the operator must provide a balance sheet and statement of earnings at four-weekly intervals. This was one of the evils that was seen in the previous discussion that I raised in this debate on the problems of privacy in respect of running a business, and the attack that it is on the concept of free enterprise to which members opposite are so endeared.

The franchise owners provide financial assistance to the operator in terms expressed in a separate agreement. The agreement also puts advertising entirely in the hands of Food Plus; the small businessman has no say in that at all. In another clause, the operator agrees to permit the franchiser's representatives from time to time at all reasonable hours to enter and remain in the franchisee's store for the purpose of conducting an audit and for inspecting the franchisee's operations. The company reserves the right to negotiate discounts and rebates on stock, and states that these will normally appear in improved net prices, but it may retain all promotional allowances and co-operative advertising payments.

Food Plus is given the right to shop for equipment on behalf of the operator, which leaves it in the position to reap the benefit of any deals. Before starting business the operator is expected to undergo five weeks training without pay. If he fails to complete the course the money he has put up will be returned, less an unspecified amount to cover reasonable expenses. The agreement bans drinking, drug taking and over-familiarisation with the same or opposite sex on the premises. There are daily and weekly reports to be made by the operator, backed with receipts, bank deposit slips, cash register tapes, and the like. The store operator is expected to bear the cost of a third party insurance policy for \$1 000 000 covering himself and Food Plus against claims arising out of the conduct of the store.

The franchise agreement also requires the operator to pay Food Plus a percentage of gross sales to cover the use of the Food Plus name, and bookkeeping and management services, and the percentage is fixed at the time the agreement is made. The penalties for cheating the store are severe. One clause spells out what happens if a Food Plus agent comes to the conclusion that the operator has reported lower gross sales than he actually achieved. He must immediately pay the amount owing, plus inspection, accounting and legal fees, as well as interest calculated at the maximum rate permitted by law. So it goes on.

We can see that this is quite an elaborate way of running a business. It is a pseudo contract or franchise arrangement that is being entered into, but it really is the head firm running its own business as such. This is another example that is currently aboard in the community of why we need to have some intervention by the Government in such leases as these to try to bring about some justice and fair play in the market place in the interests of small business men.

As I have said, the Minister, as I read it, has misled this House in the explanations he has given about the attitudes of his department and the attitudes he has taken over the period that negotiations have been conducted between the B.P. organisation and the Government. As I understand, what the Minister is now saying is that it is impossible,

under State law, for these stores to be established and the consequence of that is that money that has been put up by local residents, local traders, and local government to fight the introduction of these stores before the Planning Appeal Board and at local government level has been a waste of money and time, because they cannot be established, under State law.

I think B.P. has been misled by the Government. The distressing thing (and I have spoken to the management of B.P.) is that the company has told me that it intended to invest more than \$4 000 000 in this State. It is a tragedy, first, that that sort of investment is being directed into this area, where I do not think it is needed in this aspect of retailing. Secondly, the company was not advised of the possibility of its investing successfully in this way and it was not encouraged to invest in some other aspect of the commercial life of this State. I think that that is a sad chapter in the company's relations with this Government, where small business men, indeed, have been alarmed and harmed by the Government's inconsistency and its outright support for big business against small business.

Now that the community has rebelled in such a clear way against the introduction of these stores, the Government has backed off and left everyone in the lurch, including a major investor, not only in this way in this State but as a company that now has substantial interests in mining in South Australia. I was interested further to note, regarding the Government's attitude towards small business, in the supplement that appeared in the daily press of Thursday, 9 July, in the Liberal Party advertising campaign, which was paid for by the taxpayers of this State, that there was no special section on small business. The only mention of small business specifically that I can see is the report on small business licensing, and the recommendations of that report to eliminate some red tape and licence fees.

I think that most small business men to whom I talk would see that what the Government has done is far from that and, in fact, it has increased many licence fees and other charges that affect small business, and in recent days, with its Federal colleagues, has been a counterpart to this massive increase in interest rates, which will have disastrous effects on small business in our community.

I make one other point about the Government's policies with respect to support for business. I refer to the much vaunted pay-roll tax rebate scheme, which, as members would know, has collapsed as a major unsuccessful effort by the Government to involve itself in a job-creation programme. That scheme in itself is of little use to the great majority of people of whom I have been talking, the small business people, because the exemption level requires a fairly substantial staff and salary component for that business. Many of the businesses to which I have been referring do not pay pay-roll tax, and therefore miss out on the subsidy. That is another indication that the Government is more concerned about the bigger business men in our community than about the small business man.

I want to briefly touch on the subject of housing, particularly low-income housing, which is a subject on which I have spoken many times in this House. It is a matter of great concern to me and many other people in the community, particularly in regard to the Government's response to this problem. We have, in the past five years, received steadily but surely less and less money from the Commonwealth Government for low-income housing, and we have not heard one protest by the Minister of Housing in this State against that policy of the Federal Government.

His counterpart in Victoria has been an outspoken critic of the Federal Government's housing policy, yet this Government has acquiesced in that programme. By its silence, one can only assume that it concurs in the Federal Govern-

ment's policies. Slowly the Federal Government will no doubt move out of the funding of housing and leave it as a State Government responsibility. In this State we are faced with a parlous situation, with record levels of people who are waiting for rental housing and who have their names recorded with the Housing Trust.

More than 22 000 of these people are waiting, some for up to five years, for rental accommodation. Of those people, many are age pensioners, and the waiting period for a pensioner cottage in the metropolitan area is five years, a position that is totally unsatisfactory. There are 10 000 men and women living in men's and women's shelters and other emergency accommodation each year in this State, and it has been estimated that between 3 000 and 6 000 young people are homeless in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

In my district, I have one of the two homes in the metropolitan area of Adelaide that provide emergency accommodation for family units. That source of accommodation receives no funding from the Commonwealth Government, the State Government, or local government. I have written to the Minister of Community Welfare on a number of occasions asking why that place does not receive funding. I was told originally that it did not come within the guidelines of the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee, yet the other home, which is at Mansfield Park, does receive Government support.

The Minister has acknowledged this anomaly. He has accepted an application, but I have been advised that higher priority will be given to other community welfare works in the country in the coming year, so it is unlikely that funding for this home can be anticipated. This is a church-run organisation that housed 525 persons in family units in the past year. Many of those persons were referred by Government agencies to that home, and the Superintendent, Reverend Fischer, of the Lutheran City Mission Hostel, in College Park, has shown me some correspondence that he had written to the General Manager of the Housing Trust with respect to one family that he had housed at the hostel. I will read that correspondence to the House, because it raises a matter of great importance, in my view. He said:

In the past week, two families had taken up residence in the Lutheran City Mission Hostel who had been asked to leave the Afton Private Hostel on short notice.

I will quote one of those cases. It is a family consisting of the husband, wife and five children and they arrived in Adelaide a couple of weeks ago. The Superintendent states:

Because our hostel was closed for repairs and cleaning, and as we are the only shelter in Adelaide that can accommodate all the members of such a large family, they were staying at the Afton. Accommodation there was costing them \$30 per night, or \$210 per week. [The husband] is unemployed since arriving in Adelaide, and has just made application for unemployment benefits which he will receive about 14 July.

[The family] contacted the Housing Trust and an application for priority housing was made. When the lessee found out that they had been to the Housing Trust, he offered to reduce the weekly rate at the Afton to \$100, but could allow them to stay only one week at that rate. They had paid their rent until Monday, 29 June, and on Tuesday, 30 June, after he had received a phone call from the trust, the Afton manager asked them to leave on Wednesday, 1 July. His reason for asking them to leave was the number of children in the family and that he would have to cut his losses. I have this information in writing from the family. On Wednesday, 1 July, this family sought accommodation at our hostel, after being referred by the Emergency Housing Office. I have been able to provide them with two rooms at the cost of \$21 per week.

That is some \$190 less than was being charged at the Afton Private Hostel. The letter continues:

This service is provided to the . . . and other families solely by the Lutheran Church's support without any assistance from Federal, State or local government. The facts are that due to their high accommodation cost at the Afton, the . . . family have not been able to pay any rent at this hostel to date, despite low rental charge. They have also required assistance from the Department for Community Welfare with a hardship relief grant so the family

may eat. When or if they will pay their rent here is an unknown factor.

The letter continues about that subject. Eventually the Housing Trust was able to offer the family a house. However, the fact is that the Afton Private Hotel is owned by the South Australian Housing Trust. It seems to me to be a scandalous situation indeed when the Housing Trust owns a hotel and charges families in a dire condition \$210 a week, and then plays around with that rent when protest is made to the authorities. It seems to me that, if we have a housing authority whose charter is to house families in need, then we should not ever allow such a situation to occur. The manager of the Housing Trust replied to my constituent as follows:

The matters raised in your letter have been investigated by officers of the trust, and while I feel it would be improper for me to discuss the circumstances of individual tenants, I am satisfied on the facts available at present that the manager of the Afton Hotel has acted in conformity with the terms of the lease, within his responsibilities as manager, and with full consideration for other guests and his staff.

He went on in his letter to outline the maximum rents set down by the Housing Trust in granting this lease for the management of the hotel. It is a 125-bed hotel and the per person tariff for employed families and singles is \$37 a week per person; the special rate for pensioners is \$33 a week; the special rate for unemployed persons is \$31 a week; and the casual rate is \$9 a night.

Mr Mathwin: Have you taken it up with the Minister?

Mr CRAFTER: Actually I am about to write a detailed letter to the Minister on this matter. With regard to the family I referred to, the maximum rental to be applied by the trust in these circumstances was \$148 a week for a family of two parents and five children. Even at \$148 a week that is simply not a satisfactory situation. I can only suggest to the Minister in the strongest terms possible that this hotel revise its management, its priorities and its costing structure so that, in fact, it can meet the needs of the community and be in conformity with the charter of the Housing Trust itself. It is distressing indeed to find that there are so few funds available from the Government to support people who are in dire straits in order that they find adequate housing for themselves and their families.

One of the most disastrous decisions that the Government has taken is the abolition of the function of the Housing Trust to care for substandard housing. This responsibility has been transferred to local government. There are some 5 000 houses in this State that are substandard, many of which have rental orders on them, meaning that a high rental cannot be charged until repairs are carried out. The legislation has been very effective since the Second World War. In fact, some 60 000 houses have been brought under the legislation, and many of those houses have been repaired and restored and today they are fine family homes as a result of the work of the housing improvement section of the Housing Trust. My inquiries indicate that local government does not want to accept this function. It does not have the staff or the expertise or the ability to research these matters and cannot spend the amount of time necessary with landlords and tenants sorting out the problems of substandard housing. It is my fear that much of this policing work, supervision work, concerned with bringing down rent orders will now disappear. Besides all of that, local government does not have the power itself to impose rent controls. This must be done by the Housing Trust itself. It is unclear how this will be done when the trust no longer has officers working in this sphere. I am most gratified to see the many people in the community at local government level and those in welfare organisations—

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

Mr MATHWIN (Glennelg): I support the motion. In doing so I also would like to endorse the remarks made by the Governor in relation to the late Sir Thomas Playford and his services to this State over his 27-year term as Premier. It was a marvellous thing for this State, and Sir Thomas Playford will go down in history as being the best Premier that this State has ever had and is ever likely to have. As a migrant I well remember Thomas Playford, as he was then known, visiting the Gepps Cross migrant hostel where I spent some 2½ years.

Mr Hemmings: Is that why they pulled it down?

Mr MATHWIN: Thomas Playford visited the migrant hostel and I was more than delighted to be introduced to him. Subsequently I had occasions to see him, and he was always willing to give me some friendly words of advice and encouragement, which one needs from time to time—even the member for Napier would need encouragement from time to time.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MATHWIN: It is as well to see the member for Napier living up to his name as the misguided maestro. I understand he was named jingle bells Terry, because he likes to hear the bells all the time. As I was saying, I join with the sentiments of His Excellency extended to Lady Playford and the family. I believe that Sir Thomas Playford's death is certainly a sad loss not only to his family but also to South Australia generally, and certainly it is a sad loss as far as the Liberal Party is concerned. The Governor brought many things to our notice. He stated on page 2 of his Speech:

Progress is being made with regard to the development of the petroleum liquids in the Cooper Basin, of uranium mining and processing, of the Olympic Dam-Roxby Downs copper/uranium/gold project, and of future energy resources, including assessment of the potential of coal.

Recently, with five other members of this House, I visited Roxby Downs and we saw just what is in operation in that area. I draw the attention of the members of the House to some of the matters concerning Roxby Downs and to some of the statements made by the Leader of the Labor Party and by some other members of his Party. On 21 February 1981 the Leader of the Opposition is reported in the *Advertiser* as saying:

... uranium could be placed in the safe category.

On that same day (21 February) when referring to Roxby Downs itself, he said:

We still see it [Roxby Downs] as a major and possibly vital project for South Australia.

That is also a quote from the *Advertiser* of 21 February. That same gentleman also said a few weeks later, on 5 March:

I believe that uranium mining at the moment hasn't been proved safe.

He had changed his story entirely in a matter of days. The article continues:

... waste disposal hasn't been established; that international safeguards are no way in a state that would allow Australia to embark on the nuclear fuel cycle. It's reckless to do so. It's just not on.

He made that statement only a few days after saying that it was safe as far as he was concerned. We all know what recently occurred in France for the first time: the Socialist Party has formed a Government. Following that election result the Leader of the socialist Party in South Australia then expected a complete about face by the French Government in relation to the use of nuclear energy at the

many power stations that have been in operation in France for many years. However, in fact that did not happen. In the *Advertiser* of 15 May, when speaking about the impact of the French elections, Mr Bannon said:

In Roxby Downs in South Australia, we are looking at a project which will not be coming on stream for another 10 years or so. The French nuclear programme will have been scaled down by then and we might find there will be no market for any uranium from Roxby Downs. This will virtually leave Japan as the only market for uranium. The implications for Roxby Downs are enormous.

That was in anticipation of what he thought was about to happen under the new socialist Government in France. We all know that that did not happen at all. In fact, the French have gone even further and they are building even more nuclear power stations. Indeed, they are talking about exploding bombs, and all the rest of it, throughout the world. So much for the socialist Party of France, on which the Leader of the Opposition placed so much reliance.

If we look at the situation in relation to the now infamous State convention that was held some time ago by the State Labor Party, we find that the motion adopted states:

That State convention approved the establishment of a nuclear hazards committee consisting of eight persons whose task it will be to undertake all activities necessary to promote Labor's policy on uranium and nuclear power; such activities to include the conduct of community education programmes to offset the propaganda of the Liberal Party and mining corporations on this issue. The committee will report to State convention; that nominations open forthwith and close with the State Secretary at 12 noon one week before the July State council and a ballot if necessary will be conducted at the July State council. The committee shall have the power to co-opt and seek the advice and support of people of scientific and technological expertise.

The convention adopted this motion and called for an election and a ballot. We all know now what happens to ballots at Labor Party conventions.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MATHWIN: It is a pity that the member for Napier's parents did not drown him when he was a pup. I was discussing the ballots and the elections conducted at Labor Party conventions. We all know what happens when a ballot is taken at Labor Party conventions. We know—

Mr Slater: You tell us what happens.

Mr MATHWIN: The union representative—one person—can put up his hand and register thousands of votes. Of course, we all know that the tellers cannot count. The newspapers have told us that they cannot count. The newspapers have also told us that a candidate at that convention is not allowed to have a scrutineer to see that a ballot is conducted fairly. We also know that it is supposed to be a secret ballot, and we know the way in which the Labor Party works—one vote, one value. However, when things are different they are not the same, because at a Labor Party convention a representative can raise his hand and vote for 4 000, 8 000, 10 000 or 14 000 people. The more people that one votes for, the more difficult it is for the tellers. That was proved through the episode and saga of Mr Bannon and Mr Duncan and their struggle for power. I will deal with that matter a little later.

I now turn to the Premier of New South Wales and his comments about nuclear power. In a letter from Mr Wran asking the South Australian Government to approve of the disposal of uranium tailings at Radium Hill, Mr Wran referred to his recognition that it was safe to dispose of uranium tailings by burial in the way that waste from Amdel was recently disposed of at Radium Hill. In his letter Mr Wran stated:

Consequently, in view of your Government's decision regarding Radium Hill, I am writing to ask if consideration could be given to the relocation of the Hunters Hill material at Radium Hill,

together with the material your Government is taking there. It would seem that both lots of material are of a similar nature and that the site at Radium Hill would already have a considerable amount of tailings associated with it.

Therefore, the Premier of New South Wales is another socialist Premier who thinks that everything is fine and dandy. He thinks that uranium is okay in relation to its safety. I will now move closer to home for the benefit of the comedian from Napier, and I refer to a British Prime Minister now removed—'Big Jim'—James Callaghan. James himself has said that as far as he is concerned nuclear power is the thing for the future. In relation to the United Kingdom he was quoted as saying that it will be dependent on nuclear power throughout the 1990s. There is proof for the member for Napier. One of his fellow countrymen, a man who is also to the left of centre, Big Jim, said that everything in the garden was great.

If the member for Napier does not agree with that, and does not wish to talk about Mr Callaghan, let us talk about someone nearer to his heart; let us talk about the Hon. Tony Benn, a prominent left-wing politician in the British Labour Party, who was responsible for certain remarks under the heading 'Britain's reliance on nuclear power' in his recent book *Arguments for Socialism*.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MATHWIN: On safety issues, Mr Benn has written the following in his book:

... it is not only nuclear energy that could prove dangerous. From 1947 to 1976, 8 001 miners were killed underground and 49 971 seriously injured in the U.K., while in the nuclear industry there has been nothing like the same number. Another example is that over the same period 200 000 people have been killed by the motor car and 9 000 000 injured. Had there been a Select Committee to consider whether a new piece of technology known as the motor car was to be approved and someone had been able to predict confidently that in the next 30 years it would kill 200 000 people and injure 9 000 000, Parliament might not have approved it.

Those remarks come from a prominent left-winger in the Labour Party in Great Britain—Tony Benn. The same gentleman the following:

Current British planning for nuclear power is to increase the proportion of electricity served by nuclear power from 13 per cent to 30 per cent by the end of the century. From 1982, there is a commitment to begin construction of one nuclear reactor of 1 000-megawatt capacity each year until the turn of the century.

So much for the fear that members on the other side appear to have. I say 'appear' quite earnestly, because at the moment they are in Opposition, and are likely to stay there for many years to come. If members opposite are going to attempt to get to this side of the House they will have to lift their game considerably to achieve a distance even half-way across the floor. The only chance that members opposite have of getting on this side of the House is calling a division and winning that division.

I turn now to the journal issued by Australia Post, *Johnny Green's Journal*, which deals with a lot of these matters. On page 14 of the July issue it states, under the heading 'Growing Nuclear':

According to the 1979-80 Annual Report of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, 32 nations are counting on nuclear power to help generate electricity. Since that report was published, Egypt has announced plans to build eight 1 000 MW nuclear power stations; more reactors are operating and planned in other countries;

This will interest my friends on the other side of the House (it will even interest some of the people who are not my friends—the member for Napier, for instance). The member for Napier went to the U.S.S.R. recently and was given a badge of honour written in funny language with the alphabet upside down and around and about. The badge states, 'Workers of the world unite. Thank you, Terry, come in and keep ringing the bells when you get back.'

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MATHWIN: The report continues:

... the U.S.S.R. has stepped up production of nuclear reactors whilst making overtures to export them to Pakistan; Bangladesh is negotiating with France for nuclear power to help irrigation and provide 68 000 villages with electricity and China is planning to go nuclear. France may slow her nuclear programme however. The scene changes frequently and the following figures have already been exceeded.

In Canada, 10 nuclear power units are operating, 10 are to be built, and four new ones are on order, a total of 24. In France there are 15 already built, they are building an extra 31, and they have ordered eight more, a total of 54. In West Germany there are 11 already built, 11 to be built and four are on order, a total of 26. In Japan there are 22 operating, seven being built, and two on order, an overall figure of 31. In the United Kingdom there are 33 already built and they are building six, so there will be 39 in all. In the United States of America there are 71 already built, they are building 74 and have ordered another 26, a total of 171. I refer now to the U.S.S.R., so dear to the heart of Terence, the honourable member for Napier, past removed Mayor of Elizabeth, who sacked his Town Clerk and let him take the responsibilities on his shoulders. He sacked his Town Clerk and black-balled him for the rest of his life so he could not get a decent job.

Mr Hemmings: You know that is not true. That is a lie!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier has just used a word which is not permitted in this House. I ask him to withdraw it without any conditions.

Mr HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I do withdraw. I will get my own back later.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr ASHENDEN: Mr Speaker, I object to a comment just made by the honourable member for Napier and ask that he withdraw that comment.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member for Todd please identify the comment?

Mr ASHENDEN: He said, 'Oh, shut up' directly to me.

The SPEAKER: In conformity with the ruling of this House, the honourable member is requested by a member offended by a statement to withdraw certain words.

Mr HEMMINGS: If 'Oh, shut up' is unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN: I was referring to the number of nuclear power units operating in the U.S.S.R. There are 26, a further 22 are being built, three are ordered, making a total of 51. This publication also indicates that the total population of the countries involved is about two billion people. Surely, these are the people one would expect to be affected by nuclear energy. So much for the ravings of members from the other side of the House.

In relation to other press statements made by a number of people on this matter, the situation has been made clear by the Deputy Premier on a number of occasions, and I understand that he will be making further statements, so I will leave it to the Deputy Premier to bring it forward. In His Speech the Governor stated:

... my Government has initiated a comprehensive review of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

I wish now to say something about industrial relations. First, it is recognised that it takes a few years for Australia to catch up with certain developments, that a catch-up time must be allowed. However, sometimes I believe that we are

rapidly catching up, and I am concerned that we are inheriting what is well known through the world as the English sickness, that is, the situation where we have the action of militant trade union bosses pretending to help the poor workers, yet this is one of the main causes of the many problems existing in the United Kingdom at the present time. One problem is the complete collapse of the car industry in the United Kingdom.

The situation confronting British Steel is that last year it was losing \$2 000 000 a week, yet that is a nationalised industry, and that in turn means that the taxpayers have to foot the bill. Such a loss is a direct cost on taxpayers, it being a nationalised industry. That is the case with British Steel, which was throttled by lightning strikes, wildcat strikes and picketing. Most of the picketing was illegal, and the situation even arose recently where many industrial problems have developed behind the Iron Curtain, in Poland. Poland is under the control of the Communist Party, and is no doubt directed by its Russian masters. The Poles were not allowed to form a free trade union. I admire the Poles greatly, and I visited Poland last year. Poland is a nation comprised of people who are determined and honest people seeking to do something about the shocking problem that they are in.

Mr Hemmings: Perhaps that is why—

Mr MATHWIN: If the member for Napier kept quiet he might learn something to his advantage. Poland produces much wheat, it has a large primary industry, and it produces much food and meat, yet the Poles were queuing for meat last year when I visited them. Poland must send much of its produce out of the country, and it goes mainly to Russia. Certainly, for a country which is so rich in food and meat production to be on its knees is shocking. Yet, when the Poles wanted to form their own free trade unions, they were opposed by the socialist Party in that country.

Mr Hamilton: What are you doing for England?

Mr MATHWIN: Why does not the honourable member go home and play with his train sets. It is unfortunate that the member for Albert Park was not as effective as a union secretary as he is at home playing with his electric train set.

Mr Hemmings: Get on to the more serious stuff.

Mr MATHWIN: Is not the way the communists are treating the Polish people a serious matter?

Mr Hemmings: Get on to unemployment.

Mr MATHWIN: If the honourable member continues in that vein he will soon be unemployed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg will resume his seat. The honourable member for Napier is running a serious risk of being dispensed with from the service of this House for frivolousness and also for embarking on a course of action on which yesterday he took a point of order in relation to the manner in which members addressed one another across the floor of the House. I suggest to the honourable member for Napier that he does not test the Chair any further.

Mr MATHWIN: I am sorry to say that we are in a situation in Australia where in recent weeks the local papers have been running an index about which unions are on strike, where they are, who they are and for how long they have been on strike. The unions, of course, revel in the fact that they have the right to strike. There is nothing wrong with that—that is fair enough so far as I am concerned. However, most union rights were given to them because, whether it be in Australia or West Germany, the major part of union principles was laid down many years ago in the United Kingdom. Most of the rights of the union movement were given by the right-of-centre Parties, mainly the Tories. They reduced the hours of work for various areas over various periods. The Tories even gave the British public

the original right to form trade unions. There is no doubt about that.

Recently in this State we have been confronted by the problems of pickets. I have here a petition that was presented to me by some ladies who were petitioning about the right of people striking in one of the factories in which they were working. The petition states:

We the undersigned do not agree with the trade union picket lines which are destroying the livelihood of the community at large. Each individual has the right to work and to support their own livelihood, and it should not be affected by those individuals who do not wish to do so.

This petition is signed by 273 women in the work force. I was going to present the petition to Parliament but, as it did not have the appropriate prayer, I was not able to do so. I believe that people should have the right to strike and the right to picket. I also believe that a picket should be a legal picket. We should not get to the stage, as in the United Kingdom, where there are illegal pickets—indeed, they have professional picketers who travel the country. One can hire a mob; one can even hire a picket; one can hire anything, and that is what is happening in the United Kingdom at the present time.

If we are not careful about the way we proceed in this country, we will follow their lead. That ought to frighten the public into doing something about it. In America, 19 States have legislation which provides workers with the right to work. Indeed, I hope that when we are reviewing the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act we or perhaps some great democrat from the other side of the House will seek to move an amendment to provide that workers, who members opposite profess to protect, are given the right to work. That would only be fair. I am sure that the member for Gilles would support such a move. As a former member of the boot trade, I am sure he would support it. I can see by the honourable member's enlightened features that he would only be too happy to do that.

Let me compare the conditions in South Australia to overseas conditions. Problems are experienced in this country in regard to the conditions of workers, leave entitlements and so on, but perhaps one should consider the standard working conditions in other countries. There has been a 40-hour week in Belgium since 1975, with the standard hours being from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. Provision is made by relevant Act for those who normally work outside those hours, such as employees of tourist offices or those who work in shift jobs, and so on. The operators have a limit of an 8-hour day or a 45-hour week. They are paid at not less than time and a quarter for more than two hours overtime. After that, they get time and a half. Sundays and holidays are paid at double time. Since 1975, employees generally have had four weeks paid vacation and 10 public holidays.

In Japan, the minimum legal working requirement is eight hours for six days—a 48-hour week. However, in the private sector in Japan, the average weekly working hours in 1979 were 41.83.

Mr Hamilton: I have been over there. I know.

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member will be over there again if he is not careful. The average number of hours worked for 1979 was 2 131. There is no legal limit to the amount of overtime that can be worked in Japan: the exception is underground workers, who can work for only two hours overtime a day. The minimum length of paid annual vacation is six days for those with one year's service and attendance or 80 per cent of the year's working days. Leave entitlements increase by one day for each year of service to a maximum of 20 days. There are 12 national holidays, which are not legally binding, although most offices and factories give them.

Collective agreements almost always define the normal daily working hours in America. Most common is the five-day, 40-hour week. Saturdays are paid at time and a half and Sundays and holidays are paid at double time. Leave is granted at the rate of one week for one year's service, two weeks for two years, three weeks for 10 years, and four weeks for 17 years.

Collective bargaining also applies in the United Kingdom. The distinctive feature of the United Kingdom labour law is that the length of the working day and the number of rest days and holidays are regulated almost entirely by collective bargaining. No general legislation lays down minimum standards for all employees; however, the 40-hour, five-day week, with four or more weeks annual holiday, is common in most industries. That is the situation in other countries.

Mr Slater: What are you trying to prove by that?

Mr MATHWIN: If the honourable member holds his breath long enough, he will prove one thing. The basic 40-hour week, recommended by the E.E.C. Council of Ministers in June 1975 is enshrined in the laws of only three of the existing member states (Belgium, France and Luxembourg). Elsewhere statutory orders or centrally agreed basic principles guarantee a 40-hour week for some workers (the United Kingdom and Denmark, respectively); or legislation prescribes a higher basic norm of 45 hours (Greece) or 48 hours (West Germany, Ireland, Italy and the Netherlands). In Western Germany, Ireland, Italy and the Netherlands, a 48-hour week applies.

Some time ago a referendum was taken in Switzerland (and that often occurs in that country, because of its political system) on whether the people wanted a 40-hour week or a 48-hour week. The people voted to work a 48-hour week. In Greece, the basic hours of work are 45 for a five or six-day week basis. The 45-hour norm generally excludes lunch periods and other non-productive working periods. There are exceptions to the above rule and provisions may be made for certain groups of workers, such as home workers, piece workers, and workers in the merchant navy, the docks, agriculture and, I suppose, tourism. Overtime hours in excess of the basic hours require prior authorisation from the labour inspectorate if more than three hours overtime per week is to be worked. This applies to a number of countries in Europe. A special organisation has been set up so that the workers are not forced to work overtime or for too long. This area is covered by a labour inspectorate in most countries.

In Italy, basic hours of work are 48 a week, eight hours a day, six days a week. That is a set-up similar to that in some other countries. The basic hours of work in the Netherlands are a 48-hour week, on an 8½-hour day basis. The 48-hour norm generally excludes lunch periods and so on. The Dutch law does not deal with compensation for overtime, either in terms of financial benefits or time off in lieu, but collective agreements contain differing provisions in this regard. That is the general situation applying in some European countries.

There are differences between the South Australian situation and the situation in other countries. The 40-hour week is general in South Australia, with the exception of the Public Service, which works a 37½-hour week. South Australian workers have four weeks annual leave, 10 days sick leave, and 10 public holidays. Leave loading, which is rather unique in the world, is at the rate of 17½ per cent of salary. The loading was implemented to take into account the overtime payments that would not be paid while a worker is on holiday. Because of that situation, Australian workers receive a 17½ per cent leave loading, which applies in many areas, even in professional areas, such as teachers. The standard overtime rate is time and a half for the first

three hours and double time thereafter, whether it is a Friday, a Saturday, a Monday or a Tuesday: after the three hours, workers are immediately paid double time for additional overtime. Long service leave is granted at the rate of 13 weeks after 10 years, and *pro rata* after seven years.

I have referred to the recent infamous Labor Party conference and the saga of the Bannon-Duncan power struggle. I must make some reference to the two people who are joining together in a new union—Mr Duncan, as a solicitor, and the incoming candidate for Hartley, Mr Groom. We have the union of two solicitors, which no doubt will be a great thing for the member for Elizabeth when Mr Groom gets into the Party room, because they will become buddies and it will help him with the numbers.

Mr Becker: Who says Groom will win?

Mr MATHWIN: Mr Groom takes it for granted that he will come in. He joined forces as a solicitor with the member for Elizabeth and he believes that he has that security and the power behind him to help him on the road to becoming a member of Parliament. He is the recently removed member for Morphet.

Mr Becker: He won it by a hair's breadth.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, he won it by a hair's breadth, as my friend, colleague and neighbour, the member for Hanson has said. He has made his name as a moderate member for Morphet. It will be a different story now that he has his association with the member for Elizabeth.

Mr Slater: You know you are never much of a challenge to Albert Einstein. You know that, don't you?

Mr MATHWIN: Is he standing for your Party? I was always very interested in what happened with the problems at the recent Labor Party convention. It intrigued me, because so many members in this place scream and have screamed for the 10 or 11 years that I have been in this place about one vote one value. To get to the bottom of this and to really know what goes on, one must find out how this one vote one value works in the very centre of the Labor Party, as members opposite claim that it is the only way to operate. If that is the only fair and honest way to operate in voting by the general public, then it is only right that the example should be set by members opposite.

We then heard about the argument at the conference in which one of the members claimed that he was done out of some votes. In a secret ballot, it was stated that they lost 1 500 votes. How in the name of goodness they can lose 1 500 or 1 600 votes in a secret ballot and know where they should have gone in a one vote one value situation in a secret ballot intrigues me. With that worry on my head and with the concern that I have for the situation I decided that I would forage around.

Mr Slater: Why didn't you come—

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member would not give me a ticket to come in. I would gladly have joined in. I have been invited to go to Trades Hall on Saturday night for a communist rally. I believe that they have brought in a special container of Russian beer. I am looking forward to going down there. If I thought the member for Gilles would be there—

Mr Slater: I didn't have an invitation.

Mr MATHWIN: Buy me a beer and I will come along! I have a copy of the *Bulletin*, on page 24 of which it has a smart picture of the Hon. Peter. I do not know whether he is clapping his hands, but he is clapping his fingers together.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the comment that I made recently to the honourable member for Napier, when I said that in discussing members in this place the honourable member will do so by referring to the honourable member's full electorate.

Mr MATHWIN: I apologise, Mr Speaker. I was led on by the member for Gilles, who made me forget myself for a moment. I have here a picture of the member for Elizabeth clapping his hands, and there is delight on the honourable member's face. The report states:

Peter Duncan: elected as a South Australian Federal representative to Federal Executive caused shock waves.

The report continues:

The same State conference also elected former South Australian Attorney-General Peter Duncan, and Labor Federal frontbencher Mick Young, as the State's representatives to the Federal Executive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: The article continues:

The election sent shock waves through the top echelons of the Labor Movement because Duncan is regarded as being one of the leading members of the young militant left. As it turns out, his election was due to an administrative foul-up which gave the Builders' Labourers' Federation 2 250 votes instead of the 750 to which they were entitled. When the error was discovered (due to some indiscreet bar-room remarks by B.L.F. people) it was agreed that Duncan would retain his seat on the Federal Executive and to the Federal conference until August. That covers this weeks executive meeting and next weeks conference.

It really intrigued me and got me in. I thought that I must find out more. It is like a little novel—it is exciting indeed. I then picked up the paper.

Mr Hemmings: Which one?

Mr MATHWIN: The *Advertiser* of 14 August. A report headed 'Duncan attack causes turmoil' states:

Labor M.P., Mr Duncan, threw the A.L.P. into turmoil yesterday when he accused the Labor Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon of treachery and impropriety.

They are hard words. The article continues:

Mr Duncan's shock attack on Mr Bannon and the A.L.P. 'machine' followed his resignation on Monday from the Party's shadow Cabinet . . . Mr O'Neill, the former State Secretary of the A.L.P., was elected to the shadow Cabinet to replace Mr Duncan.

That surprised me, until I foraged into my drawer and found an article in a copy of the *Advertiser* dated 5 June 1978 headed 'Clashes over unions role' which states:

The A.L.P. State Secretary, Mr H. H. O'Neill, and the Attorney-General, Mr Duncan, clashed over the role of trade unions in the Labor Party at the A.L.P.'s State convention at the weekend.

So, it took three years to level the score. The member for Florey has left the back-bench situation and has come over to the seat formerly held by the member for Elizabeth.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The honourable member for Playford will resume his seat.

Mr MATHWIN: It took the present member for Florey three years to even the score. Not only did he change places with the member for Elizabeth but also he got his job. The knives were in and twisted in the back for three long years. We were worried for 10 long years about socialism, but three years with a knife in the back must have hurt. Finally, I was going to read what the member for Elizabeth said, but I might upset members opposite. I do not want to spoil their evening. The *Advertiser* report of 14 August continues:

The ballot was conducted and Mick Young and myself were elected as national executive delegates. Subsequently, it was reported to the State executive by the returning officer that 1 500 votes out of the total of about 130 000 had been wrongly included in all ballots.

This shows they cannot even count; you would think they would have a computer or two. However, apparently the Party machine sources leaked. We not only have leaks that get streamed across from the other side, but the Labor Party has them itself. Its members are the superb leakers of all time, the most superb gallery of leaks that I have ever seen; there are more leaks in that Party than there are leaks in the Welsh Army. So the position is that the Party

machine has leaked the details and the alleged irregularities. Mr Duncan added that the A.L.P. rules do not allow for a candidate to appoint scrutineers. Scrutineers are not allowed.

Mr Lewis: Who needs them?

Mr MATHWIN: That is right; who needs them? If you are to be a good scrutineer you have to be able to count. Mr Duncan also said:

What some reports did state was that the 1 500 alleged additional votes had been cast in my favour, this, in what was supposedly a secret ballot.

Then the honourable member went on to say:

I was about to be politically ambushed.

By whom was he going to be politically ambushed? I thought he was ambushed by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Deputy Leader, but it is quite obvious now that the man who now has his previous position, the member for Florey, the previous Secretary who has had it in for him for three long years, has got his own back, and he is the man that politically ambushed the member for Elizabeth.

I wanted to say a lot more about the 35-hour week but unfortunately I will not have time to do so. While looking for that piece of paper about the member for Elizabeth and his little clash some three years ago with the now member for Florey, I found a statement in the *Advertiser* of Monday 5 June 1978, where the Minister of Labour and Industry at that time, Mr Jack Wright, said that we were not bound in relation to the 35-hour week. He said that the South Australian Government was not obliged to implement a call from the A.L.P. State convention for a 35-hour working week. He went on to state his concern about the effect of the 35-hour week. How the honourable gentleman's tune has changed!

The member for Price made a good contribution the other day, to which I wanted to refer, but unfortunately the clock seems to have gone a little faster than I have. He said that he supported the 35-hour week, as did all the members of the Labor Party. What about the effects of such a proposal on businesses, including small businesses? Before I spoke two members of the Labor Party expressed their concern for the small businesses of this State. What concern do they really have if they fully support the 35-hour week? I suggest they are under enormous pressure. The noose is around their neck, strangling them. Their bosses, the trade unions, supply the finance for the Labor Party. Without the trade union money provided in sustenance fees and political levies, the Labor Party would have no money at all, so those members rely on and are beholden as a Party to the trade union movement. Many members of the community, some of whom are good, honest Liberals, are forced to pay the sustenance fee, which is given to the Labor Party. And then when the vote is taken, there is a mistake of 1 500 votes. I support the motion.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): At a time when South Australia is on the threshold of major developments in mining, mineral processing and use of the State's energy resources, it is appropriate that these developments should be considered in their full historical context. It has become popular in recent years and in some quarters to criticise the mining industry in general and to dismiss any benefits which development of our mineral and petroleum resources can bring to a community—to a State, a country, or for that matter, to the world as a whole. Such criticism has not been confined to South Australia, of course, but where it has applied in recent years to projects being evaluated or advocated for development in our State, it has tended to completely ignore the extent to which South Australia has always relied to a

significant degree on the development of its mineral resources as a foundation for economic growth.

As well, this criticism has overlooked the manner in which such developments have been pursued, particularly in the earlier years of our history, when the proponents of development had to overcome enormous problems, including extremes of climate, and distance, lack of water and other essentials, and particular resources of a quality or location which required considerable investment and ingenuity to mine or to process before they could be considered a commercial proposition.

In every sense of the word, the history of South Australia's mining industry has been a pioneering one. Its beginning was the beginning of Australia's first metal mining era. Mining of galena, discovered at Glen Osmond in 1838, two years after the foundation of the colony of South Australia, began in 1841. Two years later, copper was discovered at Kapunda, and two years after that, at Burra. Between 1845 and 1851, a period when South Australia possessed virtually all of Australia's metal mines, the mining and smelting industry employed directly or indirectly most of the colony's adult population. It was a population which grew rapidly because of the nation's first mining boom—from 15 485 in 1841 to 66 538 in 1851—the fastest population growth rate in South Australia's history.

The growth in the value of mining production was equally significant—from £390 (the first recorded figure in 1841) to £366 779 in 1850. It meant the difference between bankruptcy and some degree of financial stability for a colony susceptible to cyclical droughts. The Kapunda and Burra discoveries were also the first causes of major decentralisation away from the city of Adelaide, and the construction of a railway to Kapunda, primarily to transport the copper ore, helped to open up the land in the Lower North for agriculture.

It can be appreciated from the history I have related so far that mining was indeed a vital ingredient in the survival of South Australia in its formative colonial years. The Victorian gold rush in the early 1850s led to some mass migration of South Australians across to the east, and a lull in local mining, but the discovery of more copper at Wallaroo and Moonta in 1860 put the industry back on its feet and indeed, for a period, pushed South Australia into the forefront of world production. In value of production terms, South Australia's mining industry of the nineteenth century peaked in 1866. Value of production in that year was recorded at £828 651. To give this figure some perspective, it was only a little less than the total amount received by the South Australian Government from all its revenue sources in the 1865-66 financial year.

Copper production continued to lead the way in South Australia's mining industry until the early 1920s. Its importance is highlighted in figures which show that of a value of total mining production in South Australia between 1840 and 1924 of £42 123 211 copper accounted for £32 988 957, or just over 78 per cent of the total. Other commodities contributing to production included iron ore, salt, gold, silver and lead, gypsum, limestone, phosphate rock, manganese and opal.

In this period, the town of Port Pirie had also owed its growth to mining. A highlight of the State's industrial development in the nineteenth century had been the establishment of smelters at Port Pirie in 1889 to process silver lead ore mined at Broken Hill. The smelters were primarily responsible for building up Port Pirie's population from about 900 at the 1881 census to 8 000 at the turn of the century, making the town, at the time, the State's largest country centre.

In the context of the extent to which mining can benefit the whole community, it is relevant now to consider how

these developments of a century and more ago benefited South Australians at that time in areas other than ensuring the continued growth and development of their State.

One person who shared with the community the proceeds of the mining boom was Mr Walter Watson Hughes, who was one of the leaseholders of land on which copper was discovered at Wallaroo. Mr Hughes became a principal shareholder in the mining industry and he also provided an endowment of £20 000 in 1872, which led to the establishment of the University of Adelaide.

Another extension of the State's educational facilities based on mining was the establishment in 1889 of the South Australian School of Mines and Industries, which contributed greatly to the availability of technical skills and expertise, especially through co-operation with the University of Adelaide in engineering courses. In 1960, of course, the school was renamed the South Australian Institute of Technology.

I turn now to government involvement in the mining industry last century. This did not occur in any major way until 1893, when the South Australian Parliament was asked to consider a comprehensive Mining Bill. This Bill created a Ministry of Mines and a Department of Mines, and provided for a miner's right and the machinery to ensure proper and orderly exploration for a wide range of minerals and petroleum. The legislation was introduced by last century's longest serving Premier, Charles Cameron Kingston, who explained the details of his Mining Bill in prophetic terms on 5 October 1893. I quote the following extract from the *Hansard* report of Kingston's speech on that day:

... the mode in which the present Government proposed to approach the question was this—that they were determined to do whatever they could for the purpose of encouraging mining. They had hopes—and he thought these hopes were justified from the experience of the past—that much might be done in the future for the good of South Australia as the result of mining, and they thought it was the duty of any Government to earnestly address themselves to placing our mining legislation on a satisfactory footing and doing what they could for the purpose of encouraging those who were prepared to develop our mineral resources.

Kingston was speaking, of course, in the knowledge that copper mining had already brought significant benefits to South Australia. Copper continued to provide those benefits until 1923, when the onset of world depression forced the closure of the Wallaroo and Moonta mines. By then, however, South Australia had moved into its second major phase of mining, revolving around the mining of iron ore from the Middleback Ranges, west of Whyalla, which had begun in 1900.

Initially, this mining provided flux to the lead smelters at Port Pirie but, by 1915, it was being developed as a source of iron ore for blast furnaces at Newcastle, in New South Wales, and thus as the foundation for Australia's iron, steel and associated industries as we know them today. For 50 years, these deposits provided the bulk of high grade iron ore for Australia until the development of deposits in Western Australia in more recent years.

The developments I have mentioned so far provided South Australia, essentially, with income from their sale to other States and countries. However, history has shown us that if the commercial and industrial activities of a country, based on its own underground resources, are to attain, within a reasonable period, a high level of development, then these resources must generally be exploited in the following order: first, an indigenous source of fuel for power generation so that further industrial expansion can be supported; secondly, iron ore for steel making; and thirdly, other minerals, such as copper, primarily for export.

In South Australia's case, of course, the development of these resources has occurred in the reverse order, and a

conclusion we can draw from this is that the relatively slow progress South Australia made in development of its secondary industries before the Second World War was due to the fact that, until that time, it had been forced to depend for supply of fuel for power generation on coal mined in New South Wales and shipped at significant cost to Adelaide. These were the circumstances which made Sir Thomas Playford so determined to develop an indigenous supply of coal.

Matters had come to a head during the Second World War, with the lack of shipping availability and strikes in the New South Wales coal mines causing recurring crises in the supply of coal to South Australia. Sir Thomas responded to this challenge by pursuing and ultimately ensuring, by legislative action, the development of the Leigh Creek coal deposits. The magnitude of this achievement was all the more significant because of the distant location of these reserves and their low-grade quality.

Sir Thomas was not to be daunted, and initial exploration in the early 1940s by the Department of Mines progressed to the point at which the deposits could be taken over by the Electricity Trust of South Australia to help to make South Australia self-sufficient in fuel for power generation. No-one today would question the success of the single-minded attitude of Sir Thomas towards development of those deposits, and the benefits this has brought to all South Australians. The availability of an indigenous and economic fuel supply for power generation was a vital ingredient in the rapid industrial development which followed the Second World War. South Australians will for ever remain in the debt of Sir Thomas for the manner in which he initiated the development of Leigh Creek and the establishment of the trust.

But the breadth of his vision did not stop there. At the time of its initial development, Leigh Creek offered the prospect of a fuel supply for power generation in South Australia only until the late 1950s. Even as the trust was being established, Sir Thomas was looking beyond Leigh Creek to the next source of power generation. Towards the end of the Second World War, and at the request of Professor, later Sir Mark, Oliphant, the British Government asked Australia to undertake exploration for sources of uranium which would have the potential for use in an atomic bomb.

It must be remembered that at that time, the allies feared that the enemy may develop such a bomb first and, thus, the search was most urgent. In the early 1940s Australia's only known resources of uranium were at Radium Hill, discovered in 1906, and Mount Painter, discovered shortly afterwards. With the assistance of defence personnel, the South Australian Government undertook evaluation of these deposits in response to the British request, relayed through the Curtin Labor Government. This evaluation did not produce any results which were of material assistance to the allies in producing the atomic bomb which eventually ended the war with Japan, despite the clear implication that this was the case in a film which has recently been produced and shown in South Australia.

However, the results of the war time search were sufficiently encouraging to prompt Sir Thomas Playford to direct the Department of Mines to undertake extensive exploration of the two deposits immediately after the war. As a result, the South Australian Government was able to meet the requirements of the United Kingdom and the United States Governments in the 1950s for their western defence programmes. Supplies of uranium from Radium Hill were considered by the major Australian political Parties, in a bi-partisan manner, to be vital in the 'cold war' situation, as it was described, then prevailing. While Sir Thomas fully co-operated with these defence needs, at the

same time he saw in South Australia's involvement in uranium mining the potential for future progression to atomic power generation as an adjunct and subsequent replacement for the Leigh Creek coal. Such an objective was pursued throughout the 1950s as international developments suggested that atomic power would become economic by the 1960s for a state facing South Australia's somewhat precarious situation with regard to power supply. Officers of the Electricity Trust and the Department of Mines made frequent overseas visits to keep up to date with the latest international developments.

Eventually, the economics of atomic power had not advanced to the stage originally envisaged, but by then South Australia had another source of indigenous fuel—natural gas from the Cooper Basin. Exploration, begun in the middle 1950s and with the aim of finding oil, led to the discovery of significant reserves of natural gas at Gidgealpa in 1963 and Moomba in 1966. These fields, and others in the Cooper Basin, now supply natural gas to Adelaide and Sydney, and in the near future, petroleum liquids associated with some of the fields will be developed to provide extremely important supplies of crude oil, condensate and l.p.g. At the same time, it must be appreciated that, as with many of South Australia's ventures into exploration and production, these resources would not have been discovered and developed without the initiative and ingenuity of a select group of people who were prepared to overcome harsh extremes of climate and distance and to risk considerable sums of money in the search for petroleum.

This week I attended, together with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, a function to honour one of the gentlemen, the now retired Chairman of Santos, who was intimately involved with others in this very early exploration work. I believe that every member of this Parliament, and indeed, every citizen of this State, owes an enormous debt of gratitude to the tenacity of people like Mr John Bonython and others associated with him in those discouraging times in the search for hydro-carbons, and it was as a result of that tenacity that we now have these resources.

Before I finish speaking about this second era of South Australia's exploration, mining and petroleum history, I would like to refer to some criticism which continues to be voiced about South Australia's past involvement in the testing of atomic weapons and the mining of uranium at Radium Hill, and its treatment at Port Pirie. It has been suggested, in particular, that proper regard was not given to the health of workers involved in the ventures at Radium Hill and Port Pirie. In fact, health and safety standards as they then applied, and the technology then available, were all adopted to ensure there was no danger to the health of miners and people at Radium Hill and Port Pirie. Successive annual reports of the then Department of Public Health covering this period outlined action taken to give workers pre-employment and annual medical examinations, chest X-rays and blood tests. The reports indicated that several hundred such examinations were carried out each year. After operations at the two sites had ceased, the Department of Public Health's report for 1962 commented that 'no evidence of disease attributable to exposure to radiation was found'.

Follow-up survey work has been undertaken in recent years by the Health Commission to determine any long-term impact on the health of those workers. It has been suggested in a recent film which covered this subject (which in fact was shown in this House the week before last) that miners who worked at Radium Hill have cancer rates three times higher than normal. In fact, the Health Commission has stated that preliminary results of its work are based on small numbers, and the method of analysis does not permit

the calculation of absolute death rates within the group. The commission has also stated that studies of this type do not permit the cause of elevated death rates to be determined, since information on such factors as smoking habits and other occupational and environmental hazards is not known. Of course, the film sought to support the anti-uranium campaign and therefore did not mention these facts. Today I have sent invitations to all members of the House (and to members of the media who may care to attend) for the showing of two more films concerned with the energy question and the uranium question. The films are to be shown at 6.45 next Tuesday evening at the same venue. The films are being shown so that we can give some further perspective to the uranium debate.

Mr McRae: Was that the commercial break?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not a commercial break. I was referring to a film which some of us witnessed a fortnight ago.

Mr McRae: But you are giving your own commercial in reply.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am suggesting that in the interests of further informed debate it is a very good film with an interview with a prominent trade unionist from the Old Country.

Mr McRae: I have seen that one.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: You may not have seen this one. Also, there is to be another film shown on the energy question in general. The film that we have already seen, called *Backs to the Blast*, implied criticism of the use of ballast materials obtained from Radium Hill for use on the Winnininnie-Cockburn section of the standard gauge railway. A radiation survey of the railway was recently conducted by the Health Commission, and the readings obtained approximated background for a granite area. The use of tailings for ballast in this case, therefore, did not constitute a health hazard. The film I have referred to also made a number of allegations about lack of control exercised over atomic bomb tests carried out at Maralinga during the 1950s.

To appreciate all of these matters in their proper historical perspective, it is important to understand the following points which the film did not acknowledge or failed to explore: the operations at Radium Hill and Port Pirie, and the atom bomb tests in South Australia, received bi-partisan political support at the time because of the prevailing international political climate. In fact, these activities were undertaken in a cold war situation in which South Australia and Australia recognised their obligations to contribute to the defence of the Commonwealth and the free world. Also, health and safety standards were set in the light of knowledge available at the time.

In the case of Radium Hill mining, this was pursued with bi-partisan support from the major political Parties in South Australia as a means of contributing to defence needs in the short term, but with a view, again supported in a bi-partisan manner, to the eventual introduction of nuclear power for industrial purposes in South Australia. This was the vision, in particular, of Sir Thomas Playford, and indeed, it is interesting to read the *Hansard* of the period and to see the extent to which A.L.P. members of Parliament advocated the introduction of nuclear power and competed amongst themselves to have an atomic reactor sited in particular electorates. This lobbying continued, in fact, throughout the 1960s and early 1970s. It is interesting to recall, for instance, that the present member for Hartley (the Hon. Mr Corcoran) drew the attention of the House on 11 February 1969 to the suitability of the Lower South-East as a possible site for a reactor. In particular, he mentioned Eight Mile Creek, near Port MacDonnell, where he said there was abundant water, and, also, Lake Leake,

and he sought research, as a matter of urgency, to determine whether the establishment of a reactor in the South-East was indeed feasible.

Mr Lewis: Incredible!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Factual. The following day, the then Labor member for Frome, Mr Casey, referred to studies he had made into nuclear power in the United States and pointed out that he had drawn the attention of the Electricity Trust to those studies. Not to be outdone, the labor member for Stuart, Mr Riches, who had long been a proponent of nuclear power during the Playford era, and particularly for the siting of a reactor in his electorate, asked the Government of the day to consider the use of nuclear energy for the desalination of water. It is also interesting to recall that soon after he returned to the Government benches in 1970, the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, made the following statement about nuclear power in this House on 18 August 1970:

The Government is keeping a constant watch on this matter, and the Commonwealth Government has been asked to see whether, in nuclear power development, there should not be agreement amongst the States for a national grid in electricity. Without our getting into a national grid, it would be difficult to justify the erection in South Australia of a nuclear power station having a capacity well beyond the foreseeable economic demand in this State. On the other hand, with foreseeable developments in the nuclear generation area, South Australia would be the most obvious and natural place to erect a power plant that would feed into a national grid. This matter has been kept before the Commonwealth.

Indeed, it has been brought to my attention that, later in the life of the former Government, there were further suggestions that the matter of nuclear power for South Australia should be raised with the Federal Government. My main purpose, however, in bringing these facts to the attention of the House, is to point out that, because of the proper and bipartisan manner in which these developments and proposals were pursued at the time, there is no justification now for us to regret or to condemn South Australia's history of involvement in uranium mining. Rather, it has provided a basis of experience and expertise, and a recognition in the United Kingdom in particular, which were very helpful to the Dunstan Government's pursuit of uranium developments, and remain very helpful to this Government.

I also point out that as well South Australia gained the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, which developed from the original involvement of the Department of Mines in uranium mining, and today this organisation provides services to a wide range of industries, and Governments, in Australia and overseas. I now turn to the current era of mineral exploration in South Australia, which really had its origins in the rekindling of interest in uranium exploration throughout Australia in 1967. This followed a decision by the Holt Federal Government to encourage further exploration for uranium in the light of international developments in the use of nuclear power. Nationally, this stepped-up exploration for uranium resulted in decisions to develop the vast Northern Territory deposits in the Alligator Rivers province, and the Yeelirrie deposit in Western Australia.

South Australian developments in the discovery of deposits at Beverley, Honeymoon and Roxby Downs are still fresh in the memory of members. However, the exploration and development effort in South Australia has not occurred without some significant obstacles imposed by Government. I refer, first, to the down-turn in exploration from 1972 prompted by policies of the Whitlam Federal Government relating to removal of taxation incentives and control on foreign investment. These difficulties were compounded by uncertainty with regard to policies being pursued by the South Australian Labor Government. In this respect, I refer

to the Address in Reply speech by the Leader of the Opposition, in which he claimed that the former Government was solely responsible for what mineral and resources development did occur during the 1970s.

However, the facts suggest that this development occurred despite the policies of the former Government, rather than as the result of specific assistance from the former Government, and that such development would have occurred in a more orderly and widespread manner, if the former Whitlam and Dunstan Governments had pursued more realistic policies. To support my contention, I now quote successive reports of the South Australian Department of Mines covering this period. The report for 1972-73 referred to the initial impact of the policies of the Whitlam Government as follows:

Company exploration activity has reduced somewhat from the previous year, reflecting a period of adjustment to the new Australian Government policies in regard to mineral and energy resources, particularly with respect to constraints on joint ventures involving foreign companies.

The report for the following year, 1973-74, referred to problems being experienced in the search for petroleum, as the result of policies of the Whitlam Government. It stated in part:

Petroleum exploration expenditure during 1973 amounted to only \$2 800 000 and was significantly down, both for onshore and offshore tenements, on the previous year's record total of \$14 800 000. The down-turn offshore related essentially to uncertainty in the industry with regard to implementation of Australian Government policies, particularly as they relate to participation by overseas based companies.

Federal policies also posed problems with regard to development of the Cooper Basin, as the department's report for 1974-75 commented, as follows:

Progress has been delayed by a number of factors, including renegotiation of the price of field gas arising out of tax changes in the August 1974 Budget, protracted negotiations regarding the eventual sale by Delhi International Oil Corporation of portion of its interest to the Commonwealth Petroleum Minerals Authority and the problem of inflation which has continued to affect all aspects of the producer companies' planning and financing.

So we see there the effect of inflation which by that stage had been fuelled by that Government through its policies. The report continues:

The resulting delays and uncertainties have meant that the increased level of exploration, which was expected to flow from the field gate price increase to 24c agreed in May 1974, has not materialised. No exploration drilling was carried out in the Cooper Basin during the period under review, and only limited seismic work was completed. Important development drilling and field construction have been delayed also.

The 1974-75 report also referred to the impact of Federal Labor policies on uranium exploration, commenting as follows:

Pending clarification of Australian Government policy on uranium development, there has been a marked decline in exploration for this metal.

Members will recall, from these references, that the attitude of the Whitlam Government had a significant impact on mineral and petroleum exploration and development projects, because of ideological opposition to foreign investment and the desire to secure increased Government involvement in the industry in particular.

Following the defeat of the Whitlam Government, the Department of Mines turned its attention to particular policies of the State Labor Government which caused uncertainty and disincentive for investment in the industry. The report for 1975-1976 stated, in part:

A matter of serious concern for the industry and which affects the future discovery of minerals in the State interest is the greatly expanded area over which there are constraints on exploration activity. It is not generally realised that over 90 000 square kilometres or some 9 per cent of the area of the State are now Aboriginal lands, and proposed extensions will increase this to 14 per cent. As a policy of the South Australian Government, the

approval of the Aboriginal people concerned to the work proposed is needed, and only when it is a matter of national importance would Cabinet consider making an overriding decision if such consent cannot be obtained. The practical effect of these policies has been to discourage exploration work in these relatively large and prospective areas. A further 36 000 square kilometres, or 4 per cent of the area of the State, comprises national or conservation parks, and further extensions are contemplated.

Access to these areas for mineral exploration purposes is generally not permitted unless approval is given by both Houses of Parliament. If the existing Woomera prohibited area is included, the total area under restricted access for mineral exploration represents approximately 30 per cent of the area of the State.

Factors such as those mentioned in this report by the Department of Mines and Energy were a significant disincentive to companies looking to invest in exploration in South Australia. The extent of this disincentive was referred to in the department's report for 1976-1977 in the following terms:

Company exploration expenditure recorded a nominal increase over the previous year from \$3 900 000 to \$4 000 000 but because of escalation of costs this represents a decline in real terms in the value of the work done. It should be noted that, if annual exploration expenditures are adjusted by the c.p.i. to 1967, the intensity of company activity has been falling since 1970.

Government policies at this time also had an adverse impact on the value of mineral production in South Australia, and therefore on the return to the State through payment of royalties, as the Department of Mines and Energy commented in its report for 1977-1978 when it referred to declining production figures in South Australia which 'contrast unfavourably with the dramatic upturn in the value of mineral developments in most other States'. The department's comments continued as follows:

South Australia, which ranks fourth amongst the States in terms of both area and population, now has the lowest ex-mine value of mineral production in Australia. When it is realised that \$30 000 000 of this production relates to an estimate for raw opal, for which no reliable figures are available as no production returns are made and no royalty is payable, the seriousness of this diminution is even more apparent.

The last report which the department made to the former Government confirmed all I have said so far in this address about the extent to which South Australia has benefited already from the mining industry, and about the need to encourage future developments. It stated the following:

If this State is to realise its mineral potential, with the attendant economic and human benefits that this would bring, it is essential that the overall exploration activity be substantially increased and actively promoted.

Mr Slater: Who wrote this for you—Rex Jory?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No. Whoever wrote it, it is excellent material, and I hope the honourable member is listening to it.

Mr Slater: I don't agree.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member is suggesting that the reports of the Department of Mines during the life of the Labor Government (and he was a back bencher in that Labor Government for over 10 years) painted an untrue picture. To the credit of the then Ministers of Mines, whoever they may have been, at least they did not censor the report, and at least it had their concurrence or it would not have found its way into print, so obviously the Ministers of Mines during the life of the previous Labor Governments had a more realistic view than the honourable member had. The quote continues:

It is relevant in this context to recall that it was the mining industry that originally placed this State on a sound economic basis and led directly to the establishment not only of manufacturing industries and skills but also of educational and training facilities, including the University of Adelaide. During the year under review, the South Australian Government policy with regard to mining and development of uranium has naturally been regarded by the industry as a major disincentive to exploration. The demonstrated occurrence of what would otherwise be regarded as economic uranium ore bodies in the Lake Frome areas would ordinarily have

been expected to promote vigorous search for that commodity in the several differing and favourable geological environments known to exist in this State.

I emphasise that the comments I have referred to are not mine but those of a Public Service department required to assist in and to actively promote exploration for and development of our mineral and petroleum resources. They reflect a degree of frustration with policies which were a major disincentive to activities which previously had allowed this State to develop and to prosper.

It is patently obvious that, during the last decade in South Australia, there was a complete failure by Government at the State level, and for a period at the Federal level, to engender an atmosphere in which major developments could proceed in a proper and cohesive manner. Rather, the atmosphere was one of a stop-go nature, because Government was seen to be susceptible to the forces and arguments of pressure groups within and without the Australian Labor party. Leadership was totally lacking. There was no attempt to strike a proper balance between the genuine interests of particular groups or individuals and the desirability for, and benefits of, mineral and petroleum exploration and development.

Certainly, some grand announcements were made during the last decade and, in this respect, all members would recall the colourful reports about a uranium enrichment plant and a petro-chemical plant, but, at the time such announcements were made, little or no thought had been given to their impact or how they might be opposed by some and therefore the extent to which Government should inform and reassure the public. This placed Government always in the position of making the announcement, then responding to the pressure which, in the case of uranium, forced a change in policy for totally unsound reasons because of reaction to arguments which, while often illogical, were being pressed by forces which had the ability to undermine Cabinet and Government solidarity. In other words, there was a complete absence of even the elementary principles of good management and there was no direction to the development process. It was totally *ad hoc* and pursued by a Government which became increasingly desperate as its policies in other areas further retarded economic growth.

In exploration and mining, the figures are full confirmation of a decade of lost opportunity. They show South Australia slipping behind Tasmania and Victoria to be the State with the lowest royalty receipts per head of population, and they show a decline from about 6 per cent to just over 3 per cent in our State's share of the total value of mineral production in Australia. In the past two years, such trends have begun to be reversed. For example, in 1980 the expenditure on mineral exploration was more than the total amount spent in the previous five years. We have record mineral exploration and more than \$300 000 000 in commitments to onshore and offshore petroleum exploration programmes. Again, this is at a record level.

We have the prospect of major uranium mining developments at Honeymoon and Beverley, and in Roxby Downs not only uranium but copper, gold and rare earths give this a potential for mining on a scale which few, if any, countries in the world have seen before. By 1983, petroleum liquids will be flowing from the Cooper Basin. In total, the last two years have seen opportunities open up which, if they are taken up, will mean that South Australia will be a much changed State by the end of this decade—a State recognised as being much more important to national and international economic well-being, but, above all, a State in which all its people will have come to appreciate and to share in the benefits which resource developments can bring. Some of the founders of this State, and some of our

forefathers, took up this challenge with great success and lasting benefit, as I have recorded earlier. The challenge we face today is to follow their example and to have the will to see that the potential of the State is realised to the full.

I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I join with other members of this House in thanking the Governor for his services to this State over many years. There is no doubt that his service and the way he has moved around South Australia have made his popularity high. I would say that he is one of the most popular Governors who has ever held that office. I would go further and say he has been a great South Australian. I wish him and his wife every good health in the future. As honourable members know, one cannot buy good health, but I am sure he will move around among the people as he has always done, in the same pleasant manner, and will be held in high esteem everywhere he goes.

I am sure all members of the Opposition extend to Mr and Mrs Seaman every good wish for the future. I can assure members that, in regard to a position I formerly held, the Governor was most helpful and convivial in more ways than one, and it was always a pleasure to talk with him. He held his high office with the great respect of most South Australians. I cannot say any more than that. I am sure that the Governor will enjoy his retirement.

I could not speak in this debate without referring to Sir Thomas Playford, who recently passed away. Sir Thomas was a great South Australian. I had the honour to sit on both sides of his House during his time. I admired his ability, his wit, and the way in which he conducted himself in his contacts with me as both an Opposition and a Government member. I am sure that the people of South Australia owe much to Sir Thomas for his efforts and the way he carried out his duties as a South Australian citizen. Throughout Australia, he was held in high esteem, although he did not have as many trips as people have these days. Throughout his career, he had the respect of each and every member of the Government and the Opposition. True, Sir Thomas did not delve much into sport, but I can remember his playing in the Parliamentary bowling club. I extend my condolences to the members of his family. As a true South Australian, Sir Thomas will always be remembered.

It is my opportunity to speak on several matters tonight. I will most likely refer to the Premier, but before going any further, I must indicate that one of the worst things that I have seen in my life concerned the opening in Mount Gambier of the arts centre, a project in which Don Dunstan played an important part. I was horrified that the Premier of this State could speak and yet not recognise other people involved in the matter. That action showed what the Premier's politics are about. However, it was wonderful that the Prince of Wales did not forget to refer to the former Premier and to one of the council members. The Premier did not want to say anything about them. This is part and parcel of the way in which he carries on. It is about time that the Premier realised that there is an Opposition.

The other night on television the Premier said, 'The Leader of the Opposition would not know,' but the Premier has not been round much, and he is getting to the stage where he is not well known in any way; his stocks are falling quickly down the drain. Whatever members opposite say, I know that they move around their districts. However, the aspiring Liberal candidate for Unley does not go around much—he just works in the Premier's office, and also gets

information from Ministers (and I will talk about that shortly). I am pleased that the Minister of Education is present in the Chamber, because I intend to give him a little bit of a burst about the way in which he carries on in regard to his district. I also refer to the Hon. Murray Hill and a report that appeared in the *Courier*. As the Minister of Education is present in the Chamber now, I will deal with him straight away.

Mr Ashenden: We are all trembling.

Mr LANGLEY: You should be trembling; I will not have to tremble much more.

The Hon. H. Allison: Tell us about Mayesey?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not know whether he is Mayesey, but he is not crazy like the Minister of Education. I door-knocked where his father lived. They will get only 35 per cent of the votes in that area. The Liberal candidate for Unley has not done any door-knocking. True, he sends out nice letters saying, 'Tell me what we should do.' That is really good stuff! Recently, with the member for Mitcham, I attended a function and the Liberal candidate for Unley, Mr Nicholls, and Mr Mayes were present. I subsequently wrote to the Minister, who immediately did the right thing and replied to me. He spoke to Mr Nicholls, who was a member of the Premier's staff (another job for the boys), but he will not win. The *Courier* of June 8 or June 10 (I stand to be corrected on that date) stated that the Minister had decided to give an extra four hours for school assistants. However, on the same day as I received the Minister's reply, the same information appeared in the *Courier*, but it was incorrect. I can do better than the aspiring Liberal candidate by telling the Minister to his face now that I am the member for Unley and that, if that is how the Minister wants to work, let him do so. I received a reply from the Minister on the same day as the information was published in the *Courier*. The Minister can operate like that, but that is not what I would have done. When I was an aspiring Labor candidate for Unley, Mr Colin Dunnage was the member for Unley, and I did not infringe upon that at any stage. I treated him as the member for Unley. If that is how the Minister wants to carry on, let him do so.

Mr McRae: It's very poor.

Mr LANGLEY: It is poor. The Liberal candidate for Unley does not have anything to do with the local member. I will always remember how gutsy the Minister is. I have never treated a sitting member in that way, and I do not care what other members have done. When I was door-knocking before I became the member for Unley, I did not interfere in any way with the Government of the day. If the Minister wants to behave—

Mr McRae: I hope he apologises.

Mr LANGLEY: He is doing such a good job that he should resign.

The Hon. H. Allison: Tell us how much door-knocking you did at the Mount, and show me where to go.

Mr LANGLEY: I think I door-knocked down there twice. We won once and lost once, but the Minister is looking down the barrel this time. He has one great thing in his favour—he would not get a kick in a street fight; that is how he is going. Perhaps he will transfer to Unley when I leave. The honourable member would already know how well he is going. One of the Senators has moved his office to that area. If ever a member should be frightened about what will happen at the next election, the way the honourable member is going, he should be. If the Minister visited his schools, he would find that he is not held in high esteem: he has not hit rock bottom, but he is well below 50 per cent. The Minister has one thing in his favour: he has not got time to recover. I know the feeling in the schools: I have visited the schools in my district, and I know the set-up in Unley. The Minister is not going too well, and he will

have a crisis on his hands pretty soon, when he makes education cuts. His credibility will be further down the drain.

The Hon. H. Allison: Talk about the salary increases.

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister is a member of the Liberal Party. He is a beauty. He should look at some of his fellows in the Federal House. What did they say? What gain did they want? The Minister should compare schoolteachers' salaries and the work that they do. Three members of my family are schoolteachers.

The Hon. H. Allison: Just remember—

Mr LANGLEY: I do not want to remember: the Minister is the one who should remember. I must admit that the Minister is under great provocation. He knows how he is going, and he will know that better if he goes around among the people, which he probably does. He has door-knocked every house in Mount Gambier, and he needs to. He will have to door-knock every house twice. If the Minister continues in this way, I will say in this House what happened to me, as the local member. A letter to the Editor killed off what the Minister had said. The Minister was willing to help without involving the local member. I assure him that that kind of thing has never happened to me, as long as I have been a member, and I have been in Government as well as in Opposition. If the Minister wants to use that crude method, good luck to him. It does not go down well with my people. I have received many letters telling me the right thing, but the member concerned did not say the right thing in the newspaper. I am available to go to Mount Gambier, and I assure the Minister I will go.

The Hon. H. Allison: I would love you to.

Mr Randall interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I will have to sneak down to a couple of houses in the Henley Beach area. I have one thing in my favour. During the course of every election I have door-knocked every house in my district, and that is more than I can say about members opposite. The day will come when they will do that. The Premier stood up in this House with all the gusto that he could possibly muster. I doubt whether he has door-knocked 10 houses in his district. I can assure honourable members of one thing: the Premier could not beat Don Dunstan when he stood against him. I tell honourable members now that they can run a duck in the area.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: You did that in Unley, but I am going out undefeated. Someone asked me if I was young enough to stand again: my goodness, I would love to be here again, but my position would be a little different. I would be on the Government benches. There is no doubt that Unley will be held again by the Labor Party. Kym Mayes will win in Unley. There is no need to worry about that.

Mr Hemmings: He will be there for 20 years.

Mr LANGLEY: I am not sure about that, but once he gets in, he will be like me—hard to get out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members not to be incited.

Mr LANGLEY: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I must admit I am really enjoying myself. The Minister of Industrial Affairs recently made one of those big statements of which we hear so many in this House. Over the past months two things have happened: there has been an increase in Dorothy Dix questions, which are so paramount. I read recently that Sir Billy Snedden had commented on this subject; he would know about it, because he has been the Speaker of the House of Representatives for quite some time. Even though he is a Liberal Speaker, he was shocked at the number of Dorothy Dix questions asked in the House. Since I have been in this place, I have never heard as many Dorothy Dix questions as I have heard recently, and that

is one of the reasons why the Government wants to get out of trouble.

Mr Olsen: There wasn't one today.

Mr LANGLEY: I am not so sure about that, but I will give the honourable member the benefit of the doubt, as I always do. The member for Rocky River must know that the number of Dorothy Dix questions asked in this House has been terrific.

Mr Olsen: There wasn't one today.

Mr LANGLEY: I have given the honourable member the benefit of the doubt: what more can I do? The Premier recently made a statement, which was followed by a statement from the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I have the permission of the member for Spence to use this information. The Premier, on 6 May 1981, made a statement under the heading 'New jobs, housing—Tonkin'. I was quite happy about that: I believe everyone in this State will be happy about that, but new jobs are not forthcoming. The Premier is reported as follows:

Within two years Gerard Industries will employ another 200 people and Detmolds another 100. He said the two companies would acquire land next to their present properties. The Housing Trust had guaranteed that any tenant who had to be rehoused as a direct result of the proposals would be assisted with alternative accommodation in the same area. The trust would use other land in the area to provide rental homes in a programme to build more housing in conjunction with the Hindmarsh council. It also would acquire and renovate surplus Highways Department housing and those not occupied would become available for renting.

The member for Spence asked the following question in the House:

Will the Premier say why the Government has broken the promise it made on 6 May that any tenant who has to be rehoused would be assisted with alternative accommodation in the same area, as a direct result of the proposal to sell houses and properties no longer required for transport corridors through Bowden and Brompton to C. P. Detmold Pty Ltd and Gerard Industries Pty Ltd? Also, why have some residents been given seven days notice to vacate their homes when other residents have been given three months to quit without any offer of assistance with alternative accommodation as was guaranteed?

The Premier replied as follows:

I am interested to hear that the honourable member has received such a large number of complaints, and I would certainly be more than happy to investigate them. It is possible, of course, that assistance can be given, as the honourable member has so rightly said.

The member for Spence interjected, 'It was promised.' Yesterday in this House the Minister for Industrial Affairs made a statement, in which he said:

The first point I would like to make is that the member for Spence has himself been 'conned', as the expansion of Gerard Industries Pty Ltd and C.P. Detmold Pty Ltd in the Hindmarsh City Council area will create some 300 new jobs, and the South Australian Housing Trust is actively engaged in the necessary action to develop and refurbish homes in the area.

The Minister then continued:

Finally, regarding notices served on existing tenants, it is clear that they and councillors are aware of the offer of assistance made by the Government to seek alternative suitable accommodation in the area, and I suggest they contact the South Australian Housing Trust in this regard. Furthermore, I am advised that action taken regarding notices to relinquish the properties has been proper and in accordance with the Residential Tenancies Act.

There is no doubt that the Premier in that statement promised to guarantee these people lodgings or another house in a similar area. I do not say that it would be necessarily a similar house, as some of the houses are very old. Now we have the Minister of Industrial Affairs refuting it. How do we work with people when they give notice to get out in seven days? What type of Government have we got? How can people get out of their homes in seven days? Under the Residential Tenancies Act, they have 120 days to get out. The Government has brushed these people aside, and the member for Spence did not make an error because he did

mention 300 jobs. The Premier cannot be in contact with the Minister of Industrial Affairs in this case. I hope that the Minister of Industrial Affairs will have a word with the Premier. It appears that, on the front bench, if the Minister of Education is asked the question he has to ask the Deputy Premier whether he can answer. The Minister of Fisheries has to ask the Minister of Agriculture what is going on. These are frightful things for the people concerned.

I have referred to what the Premier said in a press statement. He has let the people down again. It is about time something was done about this type of business. There are no votes in that area for me or for the member for Henley Beach.

It is only rarely that we have an opportunity to speak on a variety of subjects in this House, and that is why I am reiterating tonight that there is misunderstanding between the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and it is time that someone put these matters to rest.

Mr Randall interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: What would happen if someone came to the member for Henley Beach? Some people in his area may have been there for years and it may have taken them many years to buy their homes, especially through the depression years. Suddenly, they have to get out in seven days.

An honourable member: The Premier was seeking publicity.

Mr LANGLEY: I am not seeking publicity. I do not want the press to print this. They do not speak to me, anyway. Do honourable members know what I think of the press? Hopeless! They have one of the greatest acts of all time. Whenever someone writes a letter to the Editor they must be game to sign their name, regardless of whether they are right or wrong. I think they must under the Act but there is often a statement to the effect that an address is available. They are entitled to their opinion, and I have nothing against them.

However, we have the greatest fellow of all time writing in the newspapers now. In the newspaper game if one is not a member of the Liberal Party there is something wrong. Journalists say that they are Labor oriented and then they go to the *News* and completely change because the boss tells them what to do. That is one great thing about the Premier—he is under the control of Mr Murdoch. A column headed 'On the Inside' claims to be the best informed political column, written by 'Onlooker'. However, that journalist has not got the guts to put his name to the article. The member for Elizabeth wrote to him, and his letter contained something unfavourable, so it was not printed, as it was a little bit against the press.

I believe that this journalist, although I will not use names, has got something to do with the Premier's press people. If one wants to get a good run from Mr Murdoch one must keep on side. They leave the Premier and go back to the *News* or the *Sunday Mail*. This paper, without speaking to the member for Hartley, stated that there may be an early election and that the member for Hartley was going to resign through illness. We all know that the honourable member for Hartley is not in the best of health, but he attends and he has got a ton of guts, more guts than this fellow has got.

Mr Olsen: He made a good speech today.

Mr LANGLEY: I agree, and all honourable members will recall it. However, this gentleman was not game to ask the member for Hartley whether or not he was going to resign. The honourable member has told people in this House and told his Party he is staying to the end of this term.

Mr Olsen: Who is 'Onlooker'?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not know; he has not got the guts to name himself. It is all right for the member for Rocky

River to talk like that. Why should this journalist spread such stories? Being a good mate of his, many people have contacted me and said, 'Is Des Corcoran going to resign?' The poor member for Hartley has to go around answering telephone calls when there is no need for it. He will make his decision when he wants to go. That story was oriented by the Liberal Party, but I will not mention names.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I will not mention any names, but I have a fair idea who it was, as I have good information. If a fellow has not got the guts to put his name on something he writes, he is not a Liberal; he is a gutless wonder.

Mr Lewis: Have you got the guts to name him?

Mr LANGLEY: I know it is Liberal oriented. I do not use names or coward's castle in this House, as other members do occasionally. I am not sure who he is, but I hope to know in the future. He knows everything about other members in this House, and it is about time the people woke up to themselves.

Mr Becker: What about Middleton?

Mr LANGLEY: Mr Middleton is a champion bloke. Just as Mr Fraser has got the No. 1 ticket to the Sturt Football Club, Mr Middleton has got the No. 1 ticket to the Liberal Party.

Whatever I may say, I can assure members that I am game to say it in this House, and I do not use names. When the member for Mallee first came into the Parliamentary game, like the Premier, he was, as they say, knocked off. The Premier did not win his seat when he first moved in. As I said before, he was beaten by the then Premier of South Australia, Mr Don Dunstan. The member for Mallee happened to misfire when he stood against the member for Hartley at one stage. Who would have thought the member for Mallee would win the pre-selection? I do not know who was the scrutineer, but it must have been close. I have to congratulate the honourable member for Mallee—he won.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The only mis-cast ballots the member for Mallee would know about would be when he tried to stop people at Point McLeay from voting. That was one of his great achievements—stopping people from voting. Kym Mayes would win the next election, but there are other troubles amongst the pigeons. I know that members opposite are often vocal, but they have not been so vocal recently concerning the unemployment in this State. The Government promised to create, within a short time, many new jobs. The Premier can say there are new jobs.

Mr Oswald: Right.

Mr LANGLEY: I am pleased to hear the member for Morphett say that. I can assure the honourable member that he does not trick me at all, for the simple reason that although there may be new jobs they do not show up in the figures, because people have been put off, and the increase is not therefore 8 000, 10 000, or 12 000 people. There are new jobs, but that number of unemployed has increased. We have the worst unemployment level in Australia. I can assure members opposite that with strikes and industrial disputes more working hours are being lost under the Liberal Government than were ever lost under a Labor Government.

I keep in close touch with the people, and I can assure members that the Premier's esteem in this State is very low. The other day the Premier said there was no doubt that he would win an election. I will refer to a public opinion poll, but I point out that such polls are not always authentic. I remember on one occasion a poll was conducted on the question 'Who would you vote for in Unley?', when there was a knock on my door. I was honest enough to tell them for whom my household would vote, so that was two votes for me. The poll showed that Labor would win by 62

per cent in the district, and that was correct. Thus, those polls are not always as impartial as one may think.

The Premier had a very dull face as a result of another poll taken not so long ago. The percentage figures in 1979 were: Liberals, 47.9; N.C.P., 1.9; A.L.P., 40.9; Australian Democrats, 8.3; and other 1.0. In January-February 1980, the figures were: Liberals 44; N.C.P., 1.0 (the member for Flinders had a bit of trouble); A.L.P., 46; Australian Democrats, 5.0; and others, 4.0. But in May-June 1980, there could have been a bit of a slump. The figures were: Liberals, 39; N.C.P., 2.0; A.L.P., 47; Australian Democrats, 8.0; and others, 4.0. Thus, the Liberals lost a lot of support, and now this has happened once again. I refer to a poll report in the *Advertiser* of 3 June 1981. The *Advertiser* report states:

Election would decimate South Australian Liberals. The A.L.P. claims a poll conducted several weeks ago for the Liberal Party shows the Tonkin Government would be decimated had a State election been held last month.

I do not want to go further than that. All I want to say is when you go out among the people you find out exactly what the position is. The two Government Ministers who are doing no good, according to the people, are the Premier and the Minister of Health. Someone like Onlooker might put in the paper to frighten the Minister of Health that Des Corcoran will stand for Coles, and that would be goodnight Minister. However, that will not happen, but that is what Onlooker could say. It is the Minister of Health I am very worried about. The Minister is going the same way as the Premier in the way she uses this House, but she has a fair chance of retaining Coles. I am not going to take that away from her.

An honourable member: She was worried, Gil.

Mr LANGLEY: If the member for Hartley stood out there, she would not only be worried; she would have to go back to dressmaking. I have had my say on that score, although I could go a little further. I could most probably fall into the ranks of being the next governor, according to Onlooker. I would have to have K.C.M.G. after my name, which would mean kindly call me Governor.

I was in the building trade for quite a number of years. I have heard the Premier state in this House that he had done his best to help as far as home buyers were concerned.

Mr O'Neill: That is probably very true; it shows how bad he is.

Mr LANGLEY: Well, I do not know how bad the Premier is, but his figures at the moment are not very good. Interest rates have gone up and, what is more, the average householder now has to pay 2½ per cent increase in sales tax on bricks.

The Prime Minister and the Premier of a State should know that building costs have increased and that there are 50 000 people in this State who cannot afford to buy a home. Do not think that the matter finishes there. Members opposite must know about the problem, because they amended the Residential Tenancies Act to give almost nothing to the tenants. What will happen? Everyone knows that, with all these charges increasing, soon in my district a person will not be able to rent anything but a hovel for \$50 a week. The other day I was at an ordinary house for which the rent was \$75 a week, and there were two children in the family.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I am talking about South Australia. I know that prices are different in Sydney. However, a transport driver in this State came to my place and told me that, after working five days, he takes home \$143 a week.

Mr Becker: Nearly as much as an electrician.

Mr LANGLEY: I am not up to date on the rates for electricians. If the honourable member's Government was game enough to have price control, we would not have the

trouble that we do have. The honourable member's Party has, whenever in Government, always taken off price control. I am willing to say that electricians are getting too much, but without control people can charge almost what they like. I think some charges are about \$16 an hour, and the average person would get just over \$200 a week working as a tradesman.

The Government of the day has taken off price control, and created these problems. The average weekly earnings figure is nowhere near what the average worker gets, and I hope that something will be done about this matter. One thing that helps my argument is that a report that I have states: 'Premier prepares for 1983 election' and 'Liberals told to maintain policies'. That means, in no uncertain manner, that the Tonkin Government and all members opposite are willing to follow Mr Fraser. Mr Fraser will do everything nice in 1983. That will be after the election here, as far as I know, but I could be wrong.

The Premier makes Ministerial statements about matters that have already been in the newspaper, and wastes the time of Parliament, but he is doing nothing about the position. The people are incensed and the Liberals will find it very awkward to win next time, because what is happening is hitting the pockets of the people. Many charges have been increased, some by 100 per cent. Whatever one may say, the people know their politics. We notice the number of people who come to Parliament when it is sitting and bring children along. I admit that there are not many people here tonight, but knowing about Parliament is provided for in the school curriculum and people now know a lot more. I was not taught about Parliament at school. I was lucky not to have holes in my pants, because my mother and father could not afford anything.

We know that there is more trouble to come and it will not be long before members opposite strangle themselves, and that will be the end of the Liberal Government. I have dealt with unemployment, and there is no doubt about what the figures show.

Mr Oswald: What about the 35-hour week?

Mr LANGLEY: I did not hear the member for Morphett. What he said would be innocuous, anyway. He did not win by much last time. At the next election, the swing will be in the opposite direction from that in which it went last time. The Premier must know that, if what went on at the latest Federal election continued at a State election, many Liberal seats would be lost and the result in the District of Unley would be like that in the district of Port Adelaide. Whatever the member for Morphett may say, I think he has been to the people only once, and that is not enough. He did not win by all that much. The swing in his district against the Labor Party was the lowest swing against us. I wish that Mr Groom would stand again; he would win.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: If the member for Glenelg is in trouble, he will get out of it. He will do what he did before and challenge the candidature.

Mr Mathwin: I was talking about one vote one value.

Mr LANGLEY: The member can talk as he likes. He lodged a protest when he lost the plebiscite, and that is what I am talking about. Anyone who reads the speech he made tonight will see that the member was talking out of context. There are two sides to any argument, and the member was wrong tonight.

Mr Mathwin: Tell us what happens in your Party.

Mr LANGLEY: I assure the honourable member that, whatever we may say in this House, I have been in this game for a number of years and there has never been such a united Labor Party in this State as there is now.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: One great thing in our favour is the Minister of Environment. We have never heard so much quarrelling among the Government people and some Ministers are not going too well, as I have mentioned about the Minister of Environment. If members opposite want to go on, good luck to them. The *Advertiser* contained a three-page report about the row. Look at the Hon. Mr DeGaris in the Upper House:

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The member for Elizabeth is not here tonight.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley has the call.

Mr LANGLEY: Maybe I did get a little bit ruffled, Sir. I shall get back to what I was speaking about before, concerning the unemployment situation in this State.

Mr Oswald: And the 35-hour week.

Mr LANGLEY: I am pleased with the interjection from the member for Morphett. I want to let him know that I read in the paper only the other day (contrary to what the Minister of Industrial Affairs said) that Alcoa had tried to agree to reduce working hours and the manager, or whoever is the employment officer, stated in the press article that with a 35-hour week the company could employ another 130 people.

Mr Oswald: What is it going to do with the costs?

Mr LANGLEY: That is what that gentleman said. In other words, the honourable member wants everyone to be unemployed. I am glad that the honourable member said that; it is exactly what was said by Alcoa.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: Many people are working under 40 hours a week these days. I used to work for 12 shillings a day for 48 hours.

Mr Lewis: How much was a pasty?

Mr LANGLEY: The only thing I can say was that there was a bit of meat in it; there is no meat in the interjection

of the member for Mallee. My mother and father are pensioners and I can assure the honourable member that they do not talk about 'the good old days'. Who would want to live in those times? They had no washing machines and no amenities at all. I am trying to remember what the honourable member said just recently concerning work. The honourable member thinks of only one thing, namely, get out and work and do not have any relaxation—work 24 hours a day and get nothing.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He said that workers have only one right, and that is to work.

Mr LANGLEY: That is exactly what the honourable member said; I remember him saying it. What an angle, what an attitude to life. The honourable member would have them working all the time and give them nothing. I point out to members opposite that during the course of the Labor Government there were nowhere near as many strikes as there are now, because members of the Liberal Government will not get down and talk things out. What the Minister of Industrial Affairs wants to do is kill everybody. However, the other day he got caught with the rise, and he knows it. He tried to over-estimate the judge of a court. It is the same position that applies with an umpire of a cricket match. If one gets out, one cannot do much about it. If one goes past the umpire and says that he was not out, the umpire would say, 'Look at the score book tomorrow morning and you will find out.' I refer again to unemployment. I have a document which I have obtained from the Library. I think all members must commend the people who work in the research service here, who do their best and who are very helpful. In this case I have been supplied with some figures which are purely statistical and I ask leave to have them inserted in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member assure me they are purely statistical?

Mr LANGLEY: Yes, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

S.A.: Unemployed Persons (Total Number) and Unemployed Rate (%): A.B.S. Estimates

	Number	%		Number	%	Change During Year	
						Number	%
1979			1978				
September	45 900	7.6	September	46 900	7.8	-1 000	-0.2
October	44 000	7.4	October	45 700	7.6	-1 700	-0.2
November	38 600	6.6	November	44 200	7.4	-5 600	-0.8
December	44 600	7.4	December	46 900	7.6	-2 300	-0.2
1980			1979				
January	47 900	8.0	January	45 900	7.7	+2 000	+0.3
February	48 900	8.1	February	49 600	8.2	-700	-0.1
March	44 500	7.4	March	48 200	7.9	-3 700	-0.5
April	46 000	7.7	April	41 400	7.0	+4 600	+0.7
May	50 600	8.4	May	44 500	7.5	+6 100	+0.9
June	48 200	8.0	June	44 600	7.5	+3 600	+0.5
July	45 000	7.5	July	39 400	6.6	+5 600	+0.9
August	47 700	8.0	August	45 300	7.6	+2 400	+0.4
September	50 100	8.3	September	45 900	7.6	+4 200	+0.7
October	46 600	7.8	October	44 000	7.4	+2 600	+0.4
November	43 700	7.3	November	38 600	6.6	+5 100	+0.7
December	46 200	7.6	December	44 600	7.4	+1 600	+0.2
1981			1980				
January	50 300	8.4	January	47 900	8.0	+2 400	+0.4
February	46 300	7.6	February	48 900	8.1	-3 900	-0.5
March	45 000	7.3	March	44 500	7.4	+500	-0.1
April (P)	46 200 (P)	7.5 (P)	April	46 000	7.7	+200 (P)	-0.2 (P)

SOURCE: A.B.S. monthly publication *Unemployment—Australia—Preliminary estimates* (Cat. No. 6201.0), various issues, table 2. Note that only the latest month's figures are preliminary: they are marked (P). Revised figures sometimes differ markedly from the preliminary figures.

Australia: Unemployed Persons (Total Number) and Unemployment Rate (%): A.B.S. Estimates

	Number	%	Number	%	Change During Year		
					Number	%	
1979			1978				
September	396 500	6.1	September	384 500	6.0	+12 000	+0.1
October	387 800	6.0	October	367 500	5.8	+20 300	+0.2
November	360 600	5.5	November	369 700	5.8	- 9 100	-0.3
December	426 900	6.4	December	441 200	6.7	-14 300	-0.3
1980			1979				
January	437 800	6.7	January	446 200	7.0	- 8 400	-0.3
February	444 500	6.7	February	453 900	7.0	- 9 400	-0.3
March	412 400	6.2	March	425 000	6.6	-12 600	-0.4
April	404 500	6.1	April	416 800	6.4	-12 300	-0.3
May	413 600	6.2	May	396 600	6.2	+17 000	NIL
June	406 100	6.1	June	389 300	6.0	+16 800	+0.1
July	385 400	5.8	July	382 500	5.9	+ 2 900	-0.1
August	392 300	5.9	August	373 800	5.8	+18 500	+0.1
September	405 500	6.0	September	396 500	6.1	+ 9 000	-0.1
October	375 700	5.6	October	387 800	6.0	-12 100	-0.4
November	357 000	5.4	November	360 600	5.5	- 3 600	-0.1
December	432 000	6.3	December	426 900	6.4	+ 5 100	-0.1
1981			1980				
January	430 400	6.5	January	437 800	6.7	- 7 400	-0.2
February	424 100	6.3	February	444 500	6.7	-20 400	-0.4
March	409 900	6.0	March	412 400	6.2	- 2 500	-0.2
April (P)	377 500 (P)	5.6 (P)	April	404 500	6.1	-27 000 (P)	-0.5 (P)

SOURCE: A.B.S. monthly publication *Unemployment—Australia—Preliminary Estimates* (Cat. No. 6201.0), various issues, table 1. Note that only the latest month's figures are preliminary: they are marked (P); when revised, they may differ noticeably.

S.A.: Unemployment (Total Number) and Proportion of Labour Force unemployed (%) at End of Month: C.E.S. Figures

	Number	%	Number	%	Change During Year		
					Number	%	
1979			1978				
September	42 999	7.2	September	42 724	7.1	+ 275	+0.1
October	42 621	7.2	October	42 049	7.0	+ 572	+0.2
November	43 062	7.3	November	42 877	7.1	+ 185	+0.2
December	46 976	7.7	December	47 612	7.7	- 636	NIL
1980			1979				
January	49 531	8.3	January	51 617	8.6	-2 086	-0.3
February	48 496	8.1	February	49 254	8.1	- 758	NIL
March	46 240	7.6	March	46 941	7.7	- 701	-0.1
April	46 676	7.7	April	45 115	7.4	+1 561	+0.3
May	46 835	7.8	May	44 413	7.5	+2 422	+0.3
June	46 221	7.7	June	43 265	7.2	+2 956	+0.5
July	46 356	7.7	July	44 137	7.4	+2 219	+0.3
August	45 917	7.7	August	43 693	7.3	+2 224	+0.4
September	45 090	7.5	September	42 999	7.2	+2 091	+0.3
October	44 977	7.5	October	42 621	7.2	+2 356	+0.3
November	45 501	7.6	November	43 062	7.3	+2 439	+0.3
December	50 880	8.5	December	46 976	7.7	+3 904	+0.8
1981			1980				
January	53 941	8.8	January	49 531	8.3	+4 410	+0.5
February	51 598	8.6	February	48 496	8.1	+3 102	+0.5
March	49 737	8.2	March	46 240	7.6	+3 497	+0.6

SOURCE: Department of Employment and Youth Affairs *Monthly review of the employment situation*: various issues, relevant tables.

Australia: Unemployed (Total Number) and Proportion of Labour Force Unemployed (%) at End of Month: C.E.S. Figures

	Number	%		Number	%	Change During Year	
						Number	%
1979			1978				
September	390 034	6.1	September	382 661	6.0	+ 7 373	+0.1
October	383 878	5.9	October	380 158	6.0	+ 3 720	-0.1
November	397 429	6.1	November	399 212	6.3	- 1 783	-0.2
December	440 754	6.7	December	451 493	7.1	-10 739	-0.4
1980			1979				
January	478 301	7.2	January	493 516	7.7	-15 215	-0.5
February	462 821	7.0	February	481 707	7.4	-18 886	-0.4
March	444 549	6.7	March	447 703	6.9	- 3 154	-0.2
April	*	*	April	436 977	6.7	*	*
May	430 789	6.5	May	424 578	6.6	+ 6 211	-0.1
June	427 429	6.4	June	*	*	*	*
July	423 720	6.4	July	410 194	6.4	+13 526	NIL
August	413 574	6.2	August	396 967	6.2	+16 607	NIL
September	*	*	September	390 034	6.1	*	*
October	*	*	October	383 878	5.9	*	*
November	*	*	November	397 429	6.1	*	*
December	*	*	December	440 754	6.7	*	*
1981			1980				
January	*	*	January	478 301	7.2	*	*
February	482 366	7.3	February	462 821	7.0	+19 545	+0.3
March	457 101	6.8	March	444 549	6.7	+12 552	+0.1

* Figure unavailable because of Industrial Dispute.

SOURCE: Department of Employment and Youth Affairs *Monthly review of the employment situation*: various issues; relevant tables.

Comparison of Unemployment Rates (%)—S.A. and Australia: A.B.S. and C.E.S. Figures

	A.B.S. Estimates			C.E.S. Figures		
	S.A.	Aust.	Comparison: 'S.A.' less 'Aust.'	S.A.	Comparison: Aust.	'S.A.' less 'Aust.'
1978						
September	7.8	6.0	+1.8	7.1	6.0	+1.1
October	7.6	5.8	+1.8	7.0	6.0	+1.0
November	7.4	5.8	+1.6	7.1	6.3	+0.8
December	7.6	6.7	+0.9	7.7	7.1	+0.6
1979						
January	7.7	7.0	+0.7	8.6	7.7	+0.9
February	8.2	7.0	+1.2	8.1	7.4	+0.7
March	7.9	6.6	+1.3	7.7	6.9	+0.8
April	7.0	6.4	+0.6	7.4	6.7	+0.7
May	7.5	6.2	+1.3	7.5	6.6	+0.9
June	7.5	6.0	+1.5	7.2	*	*
July	6.6	5.9	+0.7	7.4	6.4	+1.0
August	7.6	5.8	+1.8	7.3	6.2	+1.1
September	7.6	6.1	+1.5	7.2	6.1	+1.1
October	7.4	6.0	+1.4	7.2	5.9	+1.3
November	6.6	5.5	+1.1	7.3	6.1	+1.2
December	7.4	6.4	+1.0	7.7	6.7	+1.0
1980						
January	8.0	6.7	+1.3	8.3	7.2	+1.1
February	8.1	6.7	+1.4	8.1	7.0	+1.1
March	7.4	6.2	+1.2	7.6	6.7	+0.9
April	7.7	6.1	+1.6	7.7	*	*
May	8.4	6.2	+2.2	7.8	6.5	+1.3
June	8.0	6.1	+1.9	7.7	6.4	+1.3
July	7.5	5.8	+1.7	7.7	6.4	+1.3
August	8.0	5.9	+2.1	7.7	6.2	+1.5
September	8.3	6.0	+2.3	7.5	*	*
October	7.8	5.6	+2.2	7.5	*	*
November	7.3	5.4	+1.9	7.6	*	*
December	7.6	6.3	+1.3	8.5	*	*
1981						
January	8.4	6.5	+1.9	8.8	*	*
February	7.6	6.3	+1.3	8.6	7.3	+1.3
March	7.3	6.0	+1.3	8.2	6.8	+1.4
April	7.5 (P)	5.6 (P)	+1.9 (P)			

(P) = Preliminary figures.

* = Not available owing to industrial dispute.

Source: Previous tables herewith.

Mr Mathwin: What are they about? Are they cricket scores?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not think any true Australian should say too much about cricket just at the moment, but we will most likely improve.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I do not know for whom the Minister of Education barracks.

Mr Trainer: He has split loyalists, like his—

Mr LANGLEY: I do not think that is very kind. I refer now to a subject about which I have had a little bit to say, as honourable members would well know, and it concerns 'The Onlooker'. I do not move away from the things that I have said about press over a number of years. I have made comments in this House before, and on this occasion I do not intend to have anything to say about Mr Murdoch, although I must say one thing: he has been a very successful man in business, and I cannot do very much about that. I say to members opposite that it is obvious that the Government of the day has made sure of one thing, namely, that almost every press man, including the press secretary to the Premier, has come from the Murdoch press.

Mr Trainer: And then they go back.

Mr LANGLEY: They go further than that. They stay here for a certain amount of time; they do not get sacked, but they go back to the Murdoch press. I am not so sure that Mr Murdoch wants to be Prime Minister or to be Premier of this State, but he wants to do one great thing—he wants to control Australia if he possibly can.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: There is no need to worry. It was stated in the *Advertiser* of 28 March 1980: 'News to quit Press Council'. This was done. He does not care what he says and does not care about the ethics of anything. Also, it was stated in the *Advertiser* of 26 February 1980 'Press freedom threatened, says AJA leader'. Mr Apap was open to something which has never happened before in his life. The member for Glenelg can laugh. Mr Apap is a member of the Party; he got defeated, but I want to go further with my comments.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: But what about the scurrilous campaign. I want to get a fellow's name into *Hansard*.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley does not need the assistance of the member for Glenelg.

Mr LANGLEY: I want to place on record that Mr Roy Martin's episode in one of the papers at Glenelg was one of the most scurrilous things I have ever seen in my life. I only hope that in future that does not occur. I do not need to hide behind anyone—it is not a case of coward's castle. Mr Buick and some of those people were scurrilous and were nowhere near the truth, and the *News* was willing to print those stories. No average person would ever do things like that. Those people were scurrilous, and the advertisements before the last election were scurrilous. The Minister of Education does not understand. He should have a look at the papers which were printed before the last election, and he should have a look at some of the advertisements. A better idea would be for the Minister to have a look at the letters that he received when the education dispute was on.

The Hon. H. Allison: I have a file on them.

Mr LANGLEY: I am glad that you added that. You will have more than a file before long.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The honourable member has just said that he does not worry about it. I will remember what the honourable member said. I can assure him that he will be worrying, and the Government will be worrying, too. I do not have bad ears; I used to catch the snicks.

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

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I support the motion and, before I continue with the reasons for doing so, let me say at the outset that I intend to support the substance of the remarks made by the member for Brighton during the course of his Address in Reply speech, in so far as they implicate the Labor Party in what I consider to be either gross incompetence or clandestine plotting—members can choose whichever they please.

Before making those remarks I want to say how much I regarded and respected the late Sir Thomas Playford, who had a great deal of influence on me, which perhaps was unbeknown to him at the time. Through his direct intervention at my mother's request he ensured that an adequate education was available at that time.

Mr Trainer: What went wrong?

Mr LEWIS: Listen, and you might learn that nothing went wrong. He was the member for the district in which I was born and grew up—Gumeracha and the Adelaide Hills area. During the course of my primary school education my family circumstances required some assistance with books and so on. As a direct result of his advice to my mother it was possible for me to enjoy the benefit of that education. I was grateful to him then for that kind of advice and assistance and have been so ever since.

Over the years there have been a number of occasions in different ways when I have had contact with him and his family: not only because he represented the area in which my family lived, but also because he was a fruitgrower, and that is the occupation in which my father was engaged. When I joined the Department of Agriculture I came into direct contact with him in the preparation and presentation of his apple crop for export. I always found him to be utterly honourable and probably in every sense conscionable to a fault. He even advised me against his own best interest on one occasion in relation to work that I was doing. Publicly, I offer my condolences to the family of the late Sir Thomas Playford, who was an outstanding South Australian.

I have said that I intend to refer to the remarks made by the member for Brighton. Indeed, I will also refer to remarks made by other colleagues on this side of the Chamber. In the first instance, one might well ask why I choose to refer to the remarks made by the member for Brighton. It is simply that the matters raised by him were of great concern to the people associated with schools in my electorate, and they drew those matters to my attention shortly after I was elected. In conversation I found, coincidentally, that the research being done by the member for Brighton covered the same ground as the material presented to me by the concerned parents associated with the schools in Mallee. Naturally enough, I took up the matter with the member for Brighton and continued to determine as far as possible whatever—

Mr Trainer: Why didn't you take it up with the Minister?

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, I took it up with more than one Minister. Having then given an undertaking to the member for Brighton, I left the matter entirely in his hands. He has now exposed what I want to summarise and, if it was not crystal clear before, it should be now. First, I will quote exactly the nub of the argument that I am putting, and I refer to a quote from Cleon Skousen.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: If members opposite do not know of it or were not aware of it, it shows their banal ignorance. If they were aware of it, why was it permitted? Why were the kinds of things referred to by the member for Brighton and demonstrated by him allowed to be introduced into our schools? Skousen said:

Let's take control of the schools and use them as transmission belts for socialism and current Marxist propaganda. Let us soften the curriculum, get control of the teachers' associations—

all one has to do is consider the kinds of people in high positions in S.A.I.T. right now to determine the truth of that or not—

and control of student newspapers, [consider *Empire Times*, to wit].

He then continued as follows:

Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them censorship and the violation of free speech and free press. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I point out to members opposite that up until the delivery of the member for Brighton's speech in this House neither he nor I have had any conversation or contact with any such organisation—whether the League of Rights or the Festival of Light—at any time in relation to this matter. Skousen continues:

Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio and T.V. Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity as normal, natural and healthy behaviour.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That is a fact—

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must take objection, because the Deputy Premier referred to the member for Ascot Park in a phrase that was totally objectionable, and I think that he should withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not able to uphold the point of order. The ruling that has been given to the House very clearly is that a member who is aggrieved by the statement reflecting upon himself may take a point of order, but it is not competent for another member to take a point of order on behalf of the third party.

Mr TRAINER: I think in the circumstances, Mr Speaker, I would wish to raise objection to the phrase that was used by the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: What was it?

Mr TRAINER: The Deputy Premier referred to me as a 'smart arse'. I think that shows a lot more about the person using the phrase than it does about me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I can accept the sense of sensitivity of the matter to the member for Ascot Park. I point out to all honourable members that a point of order needs to be taken at the time that it occurs by the member who has the right of the point of order. By virtue of the circumstances, the honourable member for Ascot Park has lost the opportunity to raise the point of order. His only redress in these circumstances would be for a personal explanation at a later stage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is a serious business and I recognise that there is a splitting of hairs in some part. However, Standing Orders are quite clear on the sequence of events that need to take place. On reflection, I believe that the honourable member for Ascot Park will appreciate the ruling that I have just given. The honourable member for Mallee.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will substitute—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Premier not to compound the problem. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Immediately following the Address in Reply speech given by the member for Brighton, I heard an outcry from members opposite. Indeed, during the course of that speech, and I was present in the House, they were very vocal and interrupted the speech several times in an attempt to break the thread of the argument and destroy its validity. They were embarrassed. I put it to them that, inasmuch as

they claimed that the terminology used was unfit for their ears and unfit for *Hansard*, it is also unfit to be made available to schools. Yet it was freely available. It was also available from the Women's Resource Centre and it was available as a direct result of Government finance being made available through that medium for its publication, purchase and distribution from a number of different sources. Nonetheless, it was Government money—taxpayers' money. The people of South Australia paid for that stuff to be put together and made available to teachers. It was put together under the protective banner of educational material so that it was not subject to the scrutiny of the classifications board.

I make the point to all honourable members of this House and to members of the general public in South Australia as well—

Mr O'Neill interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Hon. member for Florey would be fully appreciative that this is not Question Time.

Mr LEWIS: If members opposite knew that such material was available in the way that it was made available, why was it not stopped if members opposite are so ashamed of it?

Mr Trainer: You still haven't told us how, where, when or to whom it was made available.

Mr LEWIS: Government Ministers are either accountable for the money they allocate to such outfits as the Women's Resource Centre, and know what it is spent on, or they act irresponsibly and ought not to take an oath accepting that responsibility.

Mr Trainer: What did the Minister tell you when you asked him?

Mr LEWIS: Do not worry; listen and you will learn. He not only gave me an undertaking but also contacted individual schools.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What did they say?

Mr LEWIS: Including schools in the district of the honourable member who just interjected: central to the whole position, if it can be called that. If you did not know, you were acting irresponsibly in Government. Either way, words come cheap from members of the Labor Party. Labor Party members, it seems to me, behave like a bunch of cut-price commos. They were aiding and abetting the Marxist cause and the proliferation of those values as determined by that man and others who would destroy the kind of society we believe to be desirable. As I have said, words come cheaply, and that is the kind of cheapness to which I refer—cut-price commos, bargain basement bolsheviks.

The official education course, as far as it is possible for me to determine, if it were followed in the schools (and it was prepared by a committee of which the honourable member for Salisbury was a member), was quite commendable where it is relevant to health, but it is what was not official that I complain about. However, the member for Salisbury knew that in the material in those booklets provided by his committee to the schools it was suggested that other material was available elsewhere and that teachers should feel free to use it. The material to which I refer, from the Women's Resource Centre, was published under the guise of being educational and accepted as that by the former Government. It was to be expected that teachers would take that material and use it. I think I have made the point I wanted to make.

Since the Liberal Government came into office up until now has been almost two years. We have gone just past the half-way mark in our first term. To help members in their understanding of the commitments made by the Government, let us review the directions in which we are going and how successful the Government has been in accom-

plishing its goals. We can be confident of victory in 1983, because we are making this State great again.

Although there are divisions in the Labor Party at the present time, the Liberal Party is united. A cursory glance at the speeches made by speakers on this side of the House in this debate reveals a good deal of understanding among fellow members. Remember, the Government undertook, above all else, to promote South Australia's economic recovery. Without a doubt, that is the principal measure by which this Government's performance will be judged at the next election.

If we reflect upon September 1979 we can see just how bad the position really was and how things have happened since then. In reply to some of the inane assertions that I have heard in Address in Reply speeches from members opposite, let me state that at that time 20 600 jobs had disappeared from the State in just over two years prior to the September 1979 election. Our share of national job vacancies had fallen by 32 per cent in the previous five years. Our share of the nation's major mining and manufacturing investment had fallen to a dismal 2 per cent of the national level, without any prospect of recovery. At the same time, that same enterprising area of mining and manufacturing investment was booming in Western Australia and Queensland.

Let us look back at the past horror decade of the 1970s. We had the highest levels of individual State taxation; offshore exploration had disappeared entirely; and onshore prospects were threatened by the Labor Party's policy, contrary to what the member for Mitchell said last night.

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: I went out on two offshore rigs when I was Minister.

Mr LEWIS: They were probably just passing the port. Consumer confidence disappeared as South Australia's share of national retail sales fell by 6 per cent in those two years. There is more about Labor that is equally bleak, but it is sufficient at this stage to refresh our memories about the dismal, destructive, deplorable, morally despicable decadence of the Dunstan decade. In fact, that ran down the South Australian economy past the despondency doldrums to the depths of despair and the overwhelming debt of the public.

Let us now look into the 1980s and at some of the improvements we have made since coming to office. In the crucial area of employment we had created 21 000 new jobs up until the end of April. Those are private sector jobs, real jobs, not pretend jobs, in the first 18 months. Job vacancies have increased in the past year by almost half—47 per cent. These job vacancies will continue.

Mr Langley: Can you tell me how many have lost their jobs?

Mr LEWIS: If jobs have increased, how could they have lost them? Across the board, the number of people in work in this State is greater than it was when we came to office. If the hon. member does not understand that, he does not understand arithmetic. These job vacancies will continue to increase as new investment decisions begin to bite as we move into the 1980's. Consumer confidence has returned forcibly, and retail sales growth in South Australia is equal to that of the top State of Queensland. That is remarkable in view of South Australia's population growth rate, which does not in any way equal that of Queensland. It means that individual confidence in individual retail spending in South Australia is now higher than in any other State. That is the simple implication.

As honourable members know from statements made by the Premier in recent times, more than 50 companies have publicly announced new or expanded investment decisions in the State, most of which will have considerable impact on employment. Clippings from daily newspapers since we

came to office show a list of investment decisions already made which amount to \$1.1 billion and more. Those investments include that made by B.H.P., \$100 000 000 (for those members who do not remember); Mitsubishi, \$150 000 000; I.C.I., \$100 000 000; Adelaide-Brighton Cement, \$20 000 000; Mobil Oil, \$20 000 000; South Australian Brewing Company, \$20 000 000; Outback Oil, \$30 000 000; Cooper Basin Producers, \$150 000 000; Haematite, \$35 000 000; Kimberley Clarke, \$15 000 000; Hoteliers International, \$18 000 000; and A.P.M., \$52 000 000.

The decisions are already made and involve projects on which expenditure has already commenced. Money is already being spent, but it was not being spent at the time of the election in 1979, and decisions to spend that money had not been taken at that time. In the long term, we know from submissions that have been made and approved by the Foreign Investment Review Board that even greater volumes of funds have been proposed for investment in this State's future under a Liberal Government. That, of course, will always and only be provided that the current Liberal policies of our Government are retained.

Taxation exemptions, of which I have already spoken at length in other places and at other times, and about which I now comment, have formed a vital part of the Government's recovery package.

Nearly 3 000 jobs have been created under the youth employment provisions of our pay-roll tax package, and \$2 500 000 has been returned to decentralised industries to offset higher regional costs and provide employment in those more remote situations. I see that the member for Unley is leaving the Chamber; it is unfortunate that he cannot cope with that kind of information. Under our home purchase policy, contrary to the kind of nonsense we heard earlier today from members opposite, 13 400 first-home buyers have qualified for a total stamp duty remission of \$6 500 000, an average exemption for each home buyer of \$490. That is a South Australian advantage for first-home buyers not matched elsewhere.

Mr Langley: The honourable member should—

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member is back again—what is his problem?

Mr Langley: Tell me how many homes—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the member for Mallee needs the assistance of the member for Unley.

Mr LEWIS: Succession duties have been abolished so that the honourable member's family will retain the assets which he leaves behind, for which he has worked and on which he has paid taxes all his life, without any fear of the long hand of Government reaching into their pockets. That has cost the State more than \$16 000 000. Every farmer and home owner has profited from the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence. South Australians are no longer paying the highest State Taxes in the Commonwealth, which was the case under Labor.

Mr O'Neill: Only the highest State charges.

Mr LEWIS: The 'consumer pays' principal is a fair thing. The honourable member would not want to get his beer on welfare. The public must understand the necessity of retaining a Liberal Government if the recovery is to be continued, even if members opposite cannot understand that. The new employment which we have created and which is about to be created in the mineral, industrial and commercial developments is now intensifying, and I urge honourable members, if they did not notice at the time, to read the speeches made by the member for Morphett and the member for Rocky River, who had plenty to say about those matters.

The new employment which we have created and which is about to be created in the mineral, industrial and com-

mercial developments is what I am referring to in those speeches. There are enormous benefits that this fundamental investment can bring, especially in the mining industry, through the multiplier effect, quite contrary to the popular belief of the Labor Party, which has its own misconception of the multiplier effect. Members opposite cannot tell me that everyone who lives in Mt Isa works in the mine. Opposition members should work out the ratio between the mine workers and the rest of the population and determine for themselves what the multiplier benefit is in that community.

The Hon D. J. Hopgood: You listen to the Federal Treasurer and see what he says.

Mr LEWIS: To put it in another way, people often fail to realise, like the honourable member who has just interjected, that the dump truck must not only be manufactured and sold but also serviced and driven in shifts around the clock. The truck alone creates jobs right along the line, with everyone in the line requiring housing and community facilities, and that generates even more jobs. I stress and emphasise for the benefit of members opposite and for anyone else that they should look at the speeches made earlier by my colleagues. The A.L.P. deliberately plays down the multiplier effect. I know that. The member for Florey likes to think that it is of no consequence.

Mr Ashenden: The member for Mitchell had it all mixed up last night, too.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, he did. I thought, when the honourable member was speaking, that if we went back far enough in history before the year dot into AD we would find that there was a big enough population which more than equalled the number of Christians that there have been since, which means that Christianity is invalid. Certainly, that is the kind of logic he was using last night.

The Cooper Basin producers are running to schedule in regard to the construction of the liquids pipeline, which should be built and operating by early 1983.

It will be interesting to see how many smiles there are on the faces of members opposite when we come to debate the indenture Bills that will have to be presented to this Parliament in respect of agreements with the Cooper Basin producers and Roxby Down developers. We will then see how big are the smiles on the faces of Opposition members, especially in relation to the number of jobs that will be involved.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Will it go through the Flinders Range?

Mr LEWIS: It will go where the environmental impact statement, along with the cost benefit analysis factors projected by economists, determine that it will go—and it will go nowhere else.

The other thing that we have to ensure, which members opposite and members of the public elsewhere should understand, is that if people vote, as indeed they voted, for smaller Government and lower taxation, they will have to accept, as indeed all members on this side accept, the need for subsequent restraint in Government spending.

We have found that 10 years of conditioned thinking has reinforced two bad basic beliefs. For their own sake and those of others, members opposite should make no mistake about these beliefs. The first is the misconception that Government performance is to be measured solely in terms of increased Government spending and, secondly, that the Government is entitled (and this is the socialist view, the view of members opposite) to intrude into the market place, or is obliged to support financially through the Government, that is, in their socialist philosophies, shaky enterprises. They are both quite wrong beliefs—those beliefs are not valid. The Government and the Liberal Party to which all

members on this side of the Chamber belong regard both those views as being profoundly mistaken.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: The Budget is yet to come. In view of the budgetary restraints to be faced in the future, we will be fair and reasonable to all sections of the community. We will be firm and we will be consistent, and I will be happy if members opposite tell everyone in my electorate of Mallee that that is going to be our policy. We will have smaller Government and, therefore, lower cost Government. Within such an economy there is a vital role in the community for individual initiative and private enterprise. It encourages people to do what they are best at.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been most tolerant in relation to the comments that have been coming from my left. The honourable member for Mallee has the call, and I suggest that members allow him to continue without undue interruption.

Mr LEWIS: They did not speak loudly enough, Mr Deputy Speaker, for me to hear them. I say that there is a vital need for Government to vacate those areas where it has no business to be. Government Budgets are a direct expression of Government interference and control, and the bigger they are, invariably the greater is the Government's direct involvement in private activity.

Assessment of the changed needs will continue. The effect of, say, declining student enrolments will have to be faced in education finance. How does that relate to our responsibility to consider the equally or even more important needs as members of this place of other services provided at public expense such as health, prisons, community protection, public transport, and agricultural research and extension? The financial legacy of irresponsible management inherited from Labor has severely restricted our policy funding options.

We have had to spend the money at our disposal to clean up that mess. Millions of dollars were needed to wind up Monarto and restructure Samcor. Millions of dollars were involved in payments and guarantees to maintain Riverland Fruit Products, and millions of dollars were involved to support the unprofitable operations of the Frozen Food Factory, the State clothing factory and swollen departmental day labour forces not constrained by any particular ceiling on the price of work they are doing or were doing.

That is where our South Australian money has gone—towards rectifying Labor's blunders. However, finance for a Liberal future will come from mining royalties, increased stamp duties and pay-roll tax revenues that will flow from the industrial and commercial developments, not, as honourable members opposite would like to imply, from increased charges in that area that are well within the State's grasp under a Liberal Government. What is the Labor alternative? We must consider that. We must ask this obvious question in the light of tight restrictions on Commonwealth funding, a ban on State mining (and this is the Labor Party I am talking about), and policies designed to increase costs and drive away potential investment. Where would a Labor Government generate anything like the same level of revenue without raising taxes considerably? Where?

Mr Keneally: You can't hear us even when we do interject, so we are wasting our time.

Mr LEWIS: The Labor Party has no policies that could in any way answer that. Members opposite will be called to account in those terms at the next election. It will be interesting to see the way they squirm when the indenture Bills are presented to this place for the development of those mining ventures that will bring prosperity to this

State under a Liberal Government. Clearly, the Liberal Party is a Party of forward thinkers, preparing policy options as far as possible in advance of social change, ensuring that our contingent plans are flexible.

Mr O'Neill: For whom is all this garbage intended?

Mr LEWIS: For the benefit of the honourable member and other honourable members opposite. Our central priorities will not change. I remain, as do my colleagues, committed to individual enterprise, State development and smaller, more efficient, and more accountable government.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Stuart, if he wishes to carry on a conversation, should retire from the Chamber.

Mr LEWIS: If we consider that the total mineral production in South Australia in 1979 amounted to \$201 700 000, we will see that \$55 200 000 of that sum resulted from the sale of natural gas to Sydney and Adelaide, \$23 200 000 resulted from iron ore mined by B.H.P., \$19 900 000 resulted from copper production, and \$15 100 000 resulted from coal production by ETSA for electricity generation. We must then consider that in 1979-80, the State received only \$5 200 000 in royalties compared with more than \$50 000 000 for each of Queensland and Western Australia. We can see how devastating the decade of the Dunstan Government was in regard to that kind of development in South Australia. It follows from the foregoing that employment and the general level of economic activity in the State stand to benefit if the value of mineral production can be increased.

I refer all honourable members to the remarks made in this regard by the Minister of Mines and Energy earlier today, so that they can better understand the prospects in this area in the immediate future. The Cooper Basin producers have a plan for bringing liquids on stream by early 1983, as I said earlier. Any unnecessary delay will result in the economic value of the liquids being lost, and I would not put it past colleagues opposite (if we can call them that) to try to delay this project.

In regard to uranium enrichment and conversion, the work of the U.E.C., which was established in 1974 by the former Government and to which the Minister referred earlier this evening, has continued. We did not stop that work: we allowed it to continue. We saw the good sense of the work, but members opposite are pretty touchy about that point. They are a bit ashamed of it.

Mr Keneally: No, we are not.

Mr LEWIS: It is a bit incongruous with the present policy of the Labor Party. Perhaps members opposite will admit that their Party has some duplicity.

Mr Keneally: Any political Party that remains stagnant remains stagnant.

Mr LEWIS: I note that the honourable member acknowledges the stagnant situation of his Party's policy in regard to uranium mining. An agreement between the State and Urenco-Centec, the Anglo-Dutch-West German consortium established by the treaty of Almelo, has been signed, which gives the State access to financial and technical details of Urenco's enrichment process.

Because the constraints of time preclude me from doing otherwise, I must refer to the position in regard to agriculture and forests in relation to what this Government undertook to do and has accomplished. The present Minister is noted for his ability to consult with people, contrary to the kinds of fibs that were told about our Ministers, particularly this Minister, by members opposite. This Minister has always consulted with all facets of industry before making any decision, and all undertakings given by the Liberal Party in its policy document at the last election have now

been met where they are the direct responsibility of that Minister.

Mr O'Neill: Are you saying he's fascist?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Florey.

Mr LEWIS: To provide assistance in cases of natural disaster was item 8 in our policy. That has been an ongoing commitment and has been met speedily when natural disasters have occurred. There was the wind and hail storm on the Adelaide Plains and elsewhere in my district near Goondooloo, Copeville and Port Broughton in November 1979, and bush fires in 1980.

I would like to stress the success that that Minister had in consultation with industry as part of the Government's rural policy, allowing the relevant sector of the industry (i.e. agriculture, horticulture, and so on) an opportunity to comment on all legislative proposals before the presentation of those proposals to the Parliament. The effectiveness of this policy is illustrated by the fact that twelve Bills concerning agriculture passed this Parliament in the first session after this Government's coming to office. The speedy passage of these Bills would not have been possible without the support of industry.

Similarly, the re-organisation of the red meat industry resulted from the findings of a Select Committee, at which both producers and processors gave evidence, and extensive consultation during the teething period occurred with those involved. The Meat Hygiene Authority regulations were based largely on the suggestions of the Local Government Association in its evidence to the Select Committee.

The Advisory Board of Agriculture has been given a more active role as an additional source of advice and feedback to complement the input received from producer organisations such as the United Farmers and Stockowners and other industry groups. Standardisation of farming equipment and some other measures undertaken as part of the Liberal Party's policy have had some attention in recent times. They cannot be consummated by this Minister alone, and will require consultation beyond the borders of this State to be effective.

The establishment of superphosphate depots at major country centres, on-farm storage of liquid fuel, and agricultural education are the issues yet to be resolved. In addition to policy commitments, the Government has undertaken initiatives to assist the rural community, and they include (and I note that the member for Salisbury is not here) assistance to market gardeners to obtain land in the Salisbury area for a producers' market. I understand that land has been made available through the Minister of Transport for a trial period of 12 months. Whether or not that can happen and what the consequences will be is entirely up to forces beyond the control of the Minister at this point. He has done his bit. This Government has done its bit to let things take their course. We do not believe in excessive interference.

In addition, we have established a tomato marketing committee to assist growers who have lost their share of the Melbourne market to Queensland and New South Wales producers.

An office has been established to service the Northern Adelaide Plains, and a vegetable adviser will soon be appointed.

We have successfully introduced classification of pig carcasses in the meat marketing area, and the South Australian method is under consideration by other States, particularly in New South Wales (that is, by the Wran Government). It is a tribute to the things that this Government is capable of producing. The introduction of a beef carcass classification scheme is no easy matter and sections of the industry are opposed to any sort of scheme.

I repeat that our policy is to get an industry-based scheme, not legislatively compulsory. Let us look at the figures for 1979-1980 released by the A.B.S., and we will see that the value of South Australian primary production exceeded \$1 350 000 000 for the first time in that year. Of that amount, agricultural produce and allied items valued at \$995 000 000 were exported out of the \$1 603 000 000 of all goods exported from South Australia. We put agriculture's share of South Australia's total export income at 62 per cent in 1979-1980, and that is a significant increase over the previous year of 54 per cent and 50 per cent over the 1977-1978 figure. On 1979-1980 production values cereals were \$562 000 000 and livestock was \$283 000 000, and both outstripped quarrying and mining at \$224 000 000, while wool was not far behind at \$210 000 000.

So, the rankings of agricultural production values for 1979-1980 (the most recent year for which figures were available) for cereals, grain, livestock production, wool, agriculture, horticulture and grapes was \$175 500 000; dairying was \$42 500 000; eggs \$20 500 000; and honey about \$4 000 000. In retail sales, food, farm produce and products directly derived from agriculture, such as beer and wine, accounted for 47 per cent of the just over \$2 500 000 000 spent in 1979-1980, with the market share of farm derived products up 1 per cent on the previous year.

Members may be interested to learn that legislation will be introduced into Parliament in the current session to abolish nine statutory authorities in primary industry, and I applaud that. It is the sunset legislation concept about which I spoke in an earlier Address in Reply debate. An examination of the authorities' charters had shown that there is no longer any need for them.

Industry is now and will continue to be an important source of funding for the Department of Agriculture's activities. Industry finance is a major ingredient in the financial structure. Right across the whole spectrum of primary production in South Australia we find various sectors of industry involved in providing those funds, as a consequence, directly lifting their production levels.

Though it may somewhat annoy honourable members opposite, the Samcor operation at Gepps Cross has been successfully restructured, so that it can survive on a commercial basis, and for the first time in its history it has made a profit. At the time the Minister of Agriculture announced the financial restructuring it was predicted that the Gepps Cross works would make an operating profit by the end of June. They have and it was better than expected. I believe it has been achieved as a direct result of the way in which the Government handled the matter. I think we can look forward to hearing the precise details from the Minister of Agriculture fairly soon.

The Department of Agriculture is actively researching fuel efficiency in another area and cost efficiency for the various equipment and tillage methods to assist farmers to become aware of the high cost of fuel and other production aspects. The Farm Mechanisation Unit of the Economics Division of the department was formed in March 1980, and a pilot study on tractor performances on the Upper Eyre Peninsula has just been published. This is just one of the projects in which the department has been engaged. It is also investigating the cost benefits of herbicides used in tillage systems or non-tillage systems.

Farmers need to know whether the costs of herbicides used are more a saving than the fuel used so they can make proper management decisions. The department has applied to the Wheat Industry Research Council for a grant of \$41 000 to investigate this. The council has also agreed to provide travel, accommodation and printing for a national research workshop on tillage systems at Roseworthy, to be conducted shortly. This workshop is being organised by the

South Australian Department of Agriculture to examine all tillage technology, including trash farming, minimum and reduced tillage systems, mechanisation and herbicides. It will review the current systems, and define areas of research needs providing a forum to facilitate the co-ordination for tillage in the next decade, into the 1980s in agriculture.

The Liberal Party is aware of the special needs of the industry and, in consultation with the industry, will appoint regional advisory officers in areas of those special needs, as we stated at the time of the last election. That is being achieved right now. The central region based in Adelaide was established in 1980. The industry has been consulted, and it has led to the establishment of the Tomato Marketing Committee. Shortly, in response to producer requests and as a result of departmental examination, an adviser will be stationed in the southern hills area. I am hopeful that it will be in Strathalbyn. The department is also stationing an animal health adviser at Streaky Bay to cope with the demand for advisory services on Eyre Peninsula.

We said during the last election in our policy that we would maintain the existing schemes for the eradication of T.B. and brucellosis, and the State has now been declared provisionally free of brucellosis. Segregated markets at Gepps Cross and the South-East have been established to provide market facilities for the sale of cattle from quarantine herds.

Let us look at forestry. That department is often quite overlooked and not well understood. However, there are 74 000 hectares of softwood forests in South Australia, and that is the largest, as far as I am aware, in the Southern Hemisphere—certainly it is the largest in Australia. In 1979-1980 that department, operating on a commercial basis, made \$6 000 000 profit, and in 1980-1981 made a profit of \$9 000 000—a 50 per cent increase.

It may be interesting for members to know that of that \$52 000 000 turnover that was the profit, which is a pretty good percentage on turnover for any afforestation industry. That figure has been calculated after allowing for operating costs, depreciation and insurance. About 1 300 people are employed in that industry all told. We said that we would endeavour continually to improve the productivity and usage of the plantation resource towards maximum yield of wood as a primary aim, but within the context of such multiple uses as may be consistent with it, and we have done that. Only today, if members refer to *Hansard*, they will find a very interesting answer given by the Minister of Agriculture.

I wish to refer to some specific facts in that answer. There is to be constructed at Snuggery a thermo-mechanical pulp plant by A.P.M. Limited, and it will use about 230 000 cubic metres of round wood per annum. It will employ 70 to 80 people at the plant, and there will be additional people in the Woods and Forests Department employed to supply it. It must be noted that no deliberate thinning to supply that material is intended, and saw-log production will not be prejudiced.

The Liberal Party respects the high standard of self-regulation within other industries under the charge, care and control of the Minister of Agriculture, such as the dairy, wool and beef industries, and will not legislate to interfere with those pursuits unless the need and desire to do so are clearly expressed within that industry.

If we look then at yet another area relevant to the electors that I represent, namely, that of the responsibilities of the Minister of Fisheries, and consider the significant management activities that have been undertaken since 1979, there are now seven additional field officers, so that all country stations can be staffed by two officers.

We have amended the Fisheries Act to allow for licences to be specified in much greater detail.

There has been an introduction of policy allowing transfer of scale fishing licences within fishing families.

We have extended patrol and surveillance capacity by patrol helicopter.

There has been a provision of scholarships for fishermen's families to acquire better training and specific vessel handling qualifications. Hopefully, these courses will be made available not only within, but also outside, the crayfishing season so that operators of those vessels will have the opportunity of obtaining that additional instruction and education.

There has been a completion of the review of the processing and marketing sector and an adoption of the recommendations of the review committee for effective management of this sector of the industry.

There has been a creation of a number of new aquatic reserves to protect the scale fish stocks.

In particular, in fisheries the following management action has been carried out: in relation to the abalone fishery, we have created abalone authorities which can be transferred at a market value between fishermen.

Regarding the prawn fishery, refined management measures in both gulfs will produce better economic yields. Reduction in effort in Investigator Strait has been accomplished in an attempt to rejuvenate stocks in that area.

In the southern rock lobster fishery, there has been the establishment of two management liaison committees for industry input into commercial management. We have further refined the closures of the southern zone to reduce unnecessary efforts.

The scale fishery has seen the introduction of closed nursery areas and effective transfer of effort to class A commercial fishermen.

There has been a reduction in the total netting effort by all groups of fishermen.

In relation to the salmon fishery, there has been an introduction of total catch quotas for conservation of that fish stock. We have extended research programmes on calamari and oceanic squid.

We have revised control measures to improve protection for brood stock. The department's highly successful information workshop has been conducted in the shark fishery to consider the state of that fishery.

In the lakes and Coorong negotiations on future management proposals are at the point where the Government awaits a proposal now from the fishermen.

Management liaison committees have been established for each of the major fisheries to which I have just referred, and those committees are providing a positive forum in which the problems of the industry can be discussed and resolutions put to the Government which will incorporate industry views. The Government has proclaimed a number of areas as closed to any kind of fishing in order to protect nursery grounds. This may not have been popular, but we did it.

Following a thorough review of existing fisheries legislation and consultation with those interested parties, including AFIC, SARFAC and aquarium fish interests, a Bill has been drafted and is soon to be introduced. Further consultation is taking place. It is expected that the Bill will cover major areas under review, and these areas are as follows: first, the incorporation of joint State-Commonwealth legislation to provide effectively for State management of State-based fisheries that extend into Commonwealth waters; secondly, increased penalties, with closure of existing loopholes; thirdly, modified provisions in the fish processing sector; fourthly, updated provisions for aquarium fish, noxious species and fish farming operations; fifthly, revised licensed categories; sixthly, simplified recreational gear registration procedures; and seventhly, the incorporation of the provision of the Fibre and Sponges Act, 1909-1973, into

the Fisheries Act—a sensible place for it to be. Throughout the exercise, to which the Department of Fisheries officers have devoted a substantial amount of time, attention has always been given to the Government's policy of de-regulation.

If we look at the Lands Department as another department that has a great deal of relevance to the electorate of Mallee, we can see that valuation since the elections in September 1979 has been reviewed, and we now use a more realistic method, based on 'actual' rather than 'potential' value, in both urban and rural situations, where valuations based on 'potential' resulted in inequitable property taxation. I note with some pleasure the accord I received from the honourable member for Stuart in that respect. We have urged the procedure of freeholding, and made that opportunity available to most perpetual leasehold landholders, and I consider that this opportunity ought to be realistically taken up while it is there.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: If the Minister of Lands does that in respect of the pastoral areas you are in a lot of trouble.

Mr LEWIS: It may interest the honourable member to get some figures; I do not mind how short the time is, I will give them. Before the increase, to September last year there were 658 applications. After we rearranged the method of valuation, the old system being quite inequitable. To the end of July, last month, just over 1 302 applications had been received and 1 138 of those applications have been given the offer to freehold, and we expect them to be accepted. The latest figures show more than 65 per cent of applicants accept the Lands Department freeholding offer.

War service irrigation perpetual leases now have a situation in which the lessees can retain their homes on the lease when they retain and sell the land which was used for horticultural production. Formerly, they had to sell the house, their home, to get it. We have now made it possible for them to subdivide that from the original lease and go on living there.

Mr Gunn: Very enlightened.

Mr LEWIS: My word it is. It gives men who fought for this country the opportunity to continue to live out their years in retirement in the home which they built and in which they raised their families, without the dislocation and disruption of having to move. War service perpetual lessees can borrow on two mortgages from private sources, and that was not possible under the Labor Government.

In the area of water resources, \$3 000 000 was approved by the Government for the design of two water filtration plants for Northern towns. That should interest the member for Stuart also, quite apart from the member for Whyalla who is not here. The Government approved a detailed programme for a comprehensive laboratory investigation of trihalomethanes in South Australia's water supply. The study has been undertaken by the E & WS and involves investigation into trihalomethane formation and the methods available for their removal. It is not a problem confined to South Australia; it is world-wide.

In another area in which South Australia leads the world, early in July this year, two of South Australia's experts in amoebic meningitis went overseas to exchange information with other experts. They are due back next month. They will be visiting all those countries in which amoebic meningitis is endemic.

The Torrens River project is something I must not pass over because it will have such a substantial effect on the enhancement of the river as a resource available for the entire population of urban Adelaide. It is estimated to cost over \$20 000 000. The Government has recently announced its commitment to \$21 700 000.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I suppose—

Mr LEWIS: I said over \$20 000 000; do not try to make fun of it. This will be a joint venture between the State Government and local riparian councils. It will be a major contribution to the State's sesquicentenary celebrations. The Government will acquire land to do the major earth work necessary. It will include also—

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

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.40 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 20 August at 2 p.m.