

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 1 October 1981

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

PETITION: ANGLING RESERVE

A petition signed by 125 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to give consideration to the rededication of the aquatic reserve at Blanche Harbor to that of angling reserve was presented by Mr Keneally.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE BANK LOANS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I wish to further clarify the position with regard to eligibility criteria for concessional loans from the State Bank. During the Government's first three months in office the Minister of Housing, and I as Treasurer, reviewed the operations of the concessional housing loans scheme operated by the State Bank, and early in January 1980 the bank was authorised to proceed upon a programme of 55 loan approvals a week for 50 weeks a year. The previous scheme of part first mortgage at concession rates and part second mortgage at commercial rates was abandoned in favour of a single first mortgage loan wholly at concession rates. An increased maximum loan of \$33 000 was adopted and the maximum eligible income of the breadwinner equal to 90 per cent of average weekly earnings in Australia was confirmed. A lending target of more than \$80 000 000 a year or approaching \$7 000 000 a month was thereby adopted. This was at least 40 per cent higher than previously achieved.

In the 21 months from the beginning of 1980 just over 5 000 loan approvals have been given by the bank for a total of \$147 000 000. The approval quota has actually been exceeded by 110, as a result of a special allocation of \$3 000 000 of State funds in August 1980.

Notwithstanding the recent reductions in housing loan funds provided by the Commonwealth, the Government's tight budgetary position and problems encountered by the bank in supplementing its loanable funds from borrowings in the commercial market, the Government has reaffirmed a target of maintaining 55 approvals per week over the current financial year and for the next following two years. This is likely to involve about \$255 000 000 in new loans over the three years and, after taking into account funds in hand last July, will require a cash flow of about \$250 000 000.

Of this \$250 000 000 requirement the State Bank anticipates it will secure about 45 per cent or \$112 000 000 from its recirculating housing funds. These are mainly in excess of repayments from earlier borrowers over repayments which the bank itself must meet to its lenders. It is estimated that about \$45 000 000 or about 18 per cent of the requirements may be secured from the Commonwealth as new moneys under the Housing Agreement, whilst the State Treasury guidelines indicate about \$30 000 000 or 12 per cent of the requirement might be available from State Government provisions. This leaves about a further \$60 000 000 or nearly 25 per cent of requirements to be

obtained by the State Bank by borrowing from outside sources at commercial rates over the three years.

The bank has found it practicable to provide a proportion of the necessary funds by borrowing at commercial rates, notwithstanding that all original lending is at concessional rates. A measure of equalisation is possible as the interest rates required from home purchasers are gradually increased toward the normal Savings Bank home loans rate, as their incomes improve. However, the bank is presently experiencing great difficulty in securing the full amount of borrowings it needs to supplement Government-provided funds. It must, of course, make provision for repaying earlier borrowings as they mature as well as securing net new funds. At the moment, the bank has reported that it can foresee net new supplementary borrowings at acceptable rates and conditions of about half the \$60 000 000 required over the three years to June 1984.

At present, funds in sight are expected to permit the bank to maintain its programme of 55 loans a week until the end of 1981-82, but thereafter problems may arise. However, the Government believes it will be possible to assist the programme to cover the next year by arranging special advances from statutory authorities with investible funds to the extent that the bank may not be able to find other funds from outside sources. For the following year the prospect is more obscure. It is to be hoped that problems with available loan funds and with interest rates may be easier at that stage, but the Government will, of course, be prepared to use its good offices and best endeavours with a variety of institutions to assist the bank to borrow adequate supplementary funds to complete its home loans programme. The bank itself will continue to examine the possibilities of overseas borrowing, but presently this recourse is not practicable.

Whilst the bank has so far fully accomplished the target set to approve 55 concessional loans a week, it has latterly become concerned with the increased waiting times for loans brought about by the increasing volume of new applicants as interest rates have risen in the commercial field. The uncalled waiting lists are now three times as great as in January 1980, and waiting times have increased from some four to five months to an anticipated 13 to 14 months for persons currently listing. Whilst this waiting time may not be regarded as grossly unreasonable, any further substantial increase in waiting times would be most serious indeed. Long waiting times as a method of rationing inadequate funds is most inequitable as it generally impacts most heavily on those most in need. The bank, therefore, has felt bound to examine methods of tightening eligibility for loans in favour of the most needy against those less in need and who may have other financing alternatives.

Contrary to the practice in most other States, the State Bank has not restricted its lending only in families with dependent children, but has always been prepared to lend to young couples of limited means without children, so that they might secure their own home before commencing a family. Such a young couple can find itself in a 'Catch 22' situation if concessional loans are not available before the birth of their first child. Whilst they do not feel prepared to commence a family before they have a home, they would be precluded from securing a home before they have a family. The bank has met some criticism of its past policy, in that numbers of those young couples given concessional loans do not within the course of a few years actually have a family. Possibly in some cases they cannot produce a child, and undoubtedly in some cases they alter their intentions because of a reluctance to forgo dual incomes and the consequent good living standards. In some cases, too, notwithstanding their stated intention, they perhaps never really intended to have children. However, the bank has

always taken the attitude that it should not refuse to help the majority of genuine cases, because the minority might exploit the situation. After review, the bank recently determined, with my concurrence, that young couples without children should be charged a higher starting interest rate than that applied to families with children (which is presently a starting rate of 10½ per cent instead of the concessional rate of 6¾ per cent or 7½ per cent), but be granted a reduction to the lower scales if they should have a child within four years and still at that stage qualify for the lower rates. This increased starting rate is not inequitable, because hitherto the bank determined its concessional rates on the basis of the couple having to support at least one child on the one income of the breadwinner. Moreover, many of the applicant young couples without children have dual incomes at the time of the granting of a loan, though the wife's income is claimed to be temporary.

The higher starting interest rate for young couples without children may not greatly reduce the number of applicants to the bank, but the increased rates paid will facilitate equalisation of high interest rates which the bank pays in supplementary borrowing whilst lending at concession rates. Some further limitation of lending to young couples with dual incomes will be achieved by the bank's decision, again with my concurrence, not to lend to couples with dual incomes in excess of 145 per cent of average weekly earnings, and who are not already listed, even though the wife's income may be claimed to be temporary, pending the undertaking of home duties.

It is believed that such couples with a combined income of over \$425 a week could reasonably be expected to secure their home finance elsewhere. Immediately after the Government came into office two years ago it confirmed the State Bank income limit of eligibility based upon a breadwinner's income not exceeding 90 per cent of average weekly earnings, and that limitation has continued to apply to this time. Over the past two years, from June 1979 to June 1981, South Australian average weekly earnings have increased by about 28 per cent. However, over that same period the consumer price index has increased by about 20½ per cent so that, in effect, the maximum eligible income has been increased in real purchasing power. To adopt a maximum of 85 per cent of average weekly earnings today would be marginally more favourable than 90 per cent of average weekly earnings two years ago. Accordingly, the bank has felt bound to recommend, and I have agreed, that persons hereafter listing for concessional loans shall be eligible only if the breadwinner's income does not exceed 85 per cent of average weekly earnings. Those already listed will be treated on the old 90 per cent basis. Whilst it will not be easy for most families on an income of between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of average weekly earnings to secure a home loan from other sources, it is possible to do so from some institutions, particularly from the Savings Bank of South Australia after a reasonable waiting period of saving with the institution. This change is being made most reluctantly but is necessary to protect the interests of families in more needy circumstances.

All applicants to the bank are invariably advised when listing that it may be necessary to alter eligibility criteria and interest rates from time to time, and all sign an acknowledgement to that effect. I repeat that the new income limits both for breadwinners and for dual incomes will only apply to those not already listed. New applicants will be advised of these as they register and, of course, all on the waiting lists are being advised individually of those changes in eligibility announced in the recent newspaper advertisement.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling the honourable Leader, I indicate that any questions relative to the portfolios of the Chief Secretary will be taken this afternoon by the honourable Deputy Premier.

PETRO-CHEMICAL COMPLEX

Mr BANNON: Can the Premier say whether the Government supports the proposal that any major petro-chemical development should be located at Stony Point rather than Redcliff or any other site and, if so, what is the attitude of the two interested parties—Dow Chemical and Asahi Chemical—to such a proposal? I understand there was a meeting in Adelaide recently between the Government and senior executives of Dow Chemical, including Dow's United States President, Mr Orrefice. I understand that the Stony Point alternative was discussed with Mr Orrefice and that he and other senior executives inspected the Stony Point site. The Asahi Chemical Company is at present also in the process of conducting an evaluation, and it has been suggested that Stony Point substantially changes the economics of Redcliff.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was certainly a great pleasure to receive Mr Orrefice when he came to South Australia a few weeks ago. Indeed, he was very interested to see what South Australia had to offer. The development potential impressed him enormously. I must say I was very pleased indeed to be able to return his hospitality. We had some interesting discussions, not specifically on the matters which the Leader has raised, but on general issues. I am happy to say that we have left the situation very much as it was after I had visited Midland, Michigan, last year, and that is that Dow would be in a position to make some form of decision, as it undertook to do within two years of that date; that is, in something under 12 months from now.

As to the different proposals, and I have heard it said that with the liquids pipeline coming to Stony Point, it might be more economic, more satisfactory, and for a number of reasons better to consider the Stony Point rather than the originally planned Redcliff site. As to that, I am unable to make any comment. I doubt whether Mr Orrefice or any member of the Dow Chemical Company could make any comment, either. The fact is that at the present time Dow Chemical, Asahi Mitsui and, indeed, anyone interested in the possible establishment of a petro-chemical plant in that part of the world using Cooper Basin feedstock, is obviously going to be doing an economic study on the relative merits of the two sites, and I understand that is being undertaken now.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr OSWALD: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware that the Leader of the Opposition has made a series of statements to suggest that the Government is seeking the introduction of the Roxby Downs indenture legislation for political purposes, and can the Minister explain the full position to the House?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I am very well aware of the statements that the Leader of the Opposition has been making in his desperate attempts to mislead the public of South Australia. It was not a very clever speech and statements by the Leader of the Opposition in suggesting that the Government is forcing an indenture Bill into this House so that the Bill can become a public issue—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: He's trying to force an election on us, too.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: All the election talk has been generated by the meeting of the Democrats, I think in Brisbane, at the weekend. Certainly, there has been no speculation generated from Government circles in relation to an election. Let me put the facts before Parliament so that the Leader will not continue to mislead the public. The fact is that the Government has not in the first instance sought to bring an indenture Bill into this House. The Government is bringing an indenture Bill into this House because the joint venturers have specifically asked for it.

The reason for the timing of this indenture Bill and for the Government's making a specific request that it be brought into this House, if possible during this session, and before the end of the year, is simply that the exploration money committed by our predecessors, in the first instance by letters of intent given by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, will be expended by the end of this year. The \$50 000 000 committed in the first stage of expenditure will have been expended, and the plain fact is that, before the joint venturers are prepared to commit another great hunk of expenditure, which is of the order of \$150 000 000 to \$200 000 000, they need the security of an indenture. Speaking on *Nationwide*, the Leader stated:

I have suggested to those companies concerned that if they lend themselves—and I don't think they have: I think they're the unfortunate victims of the current Government trying to distract attention from its own poor performance—if they lend themselves to being made a political exercise around an indenture Bill, then that is going to jeopardise whatever prospects of development they have.

The plain fact is that they are not. The Leader does not seem capable of absorbing that fact. Last night he accused the Government of a 'rush to politicise uranium mining'. That is absolute nonsense. Let us get the record straight. I will quote from copious notes, which members of the Opposition do daily, because there are some quotes here that I think are worth putting on record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The debate this week about Roxby Downs was not prompted by any action of the Government; rather, it followed events, as I have said, as a result of deliberations of the Australian Democrats. The Government makes clear that this debate has nothing to do with elections: what it is all about is the economic future of the State. In relation to Roxby Downs, the Government has not sought the introduction of an indenture Bill at this time as the Leader has implied. Rather, the joint venturers have requested that it be finalised this year so that funds can be raised for further stages of their work.

The security that an indenture offers is vital because of the very high cost of the exploration programme. By way of comparison, the three feasibility studies on the North-West Shelf cost \$50 000 000, and the work at Roxby Downs has already cost that amount. The need of the joint venture partners for the indenture was indicated in a report in yesterday's *News* quoting comments by Sir Arvi Parbo, Chairman of Western Mining, in response to the Leader's allegations that we are manipulating them. Sir Arvi said:

We are negotiating an agreement with the State Government which would set out the conditions under which a productive operation would operate. At this stage we are right in the middle of this work, which will lead up to a final plan for Roxby Downs. The journalist who prepared the article then reported:

Sir Arvi makes no bones about the fact that his company needs a final agreement under which development at Roxby can continue. Sir Arvi is then quoted as saying:

We can't go ahead at Roxby without it.

These are direct quotes: that is the position. The intention of the Government is to produce an indenture that, while

meeting the joint venturers' requirements, will stand scrutiny from the widest of viewpoints. In other words, our emphasis is on producing something that will be acceptable to Parliament and provide real benefits for all South Australians.

It is to be regretted that the Opposition has attempted to misrepresent the Government's motives in this matter. This is especially so because of the Government's initiatives to place before Parliament and the public a great deal of factual information about uranium and associated matters, information that Parliament and the public were denied under the Labor Government. While in Opposition, the Labor Party has been responsible for a whole series of misrepresentations in relation to mining projects in general. One can conclude only that it does not want members of the public to know the facts so that they can make up their own minds about these very important matters.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You're hiding the facts.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are not hiding the facts. We are dealing in facts: we are putting the record straight. I am reading from copious notes so that the Opposition, when they read what I say, will not have any grounds for misrepresenting my statement. I conclude by saying that in all the countries I visited last year (and I presented to the House an excellent report from the Deputy Director-General) including Saskatchewan—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I visited the Province of Saskatchewan. The Opposition had to seize on trivia to distract attention from the main point. The Opposition must seize on trivia to try to belittle the major points I am making. France and other socialist States and countries have all heard of Roxby Downs, and the suggestion that anyone would seek to block that development was met with incredulity. Those countries believed that anyone who would seek to inhibit that world-class development would have to be absolutely out of his mind.

HYDRO THERMAL ENGINEERING

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government is prepared to provide a guarantee to assist loan finance or recommend some other form of assistance for Hydro Thermal Engineering and, if it is not, will he say why not? The Minister will be aware that Hydro Thermal Engineering has been researching low-energy air-conditioning for industrial purposes. I am informed that fairly recently there has been a major breakthrough in technology by this Adelaide company, and this has attracted interest both interstate and in the United States.

The previous Government was interested in the project, and Senrad funds were used to assist the development of the technology. The company, having fully developed a new project, is now in the position of not having the financial resources to manufacture it. I understand the company approached the Deputy Premier requesting a State Government guarantee so that they could raise loan finance for manufacturing. I am told the Deputy Premier said this might be possible, but subsequently nothing has occurred. I am told the position now is that a number of interstate companies want to buy the licence for the project and manufacture it elsewhere, despite three years of funding by the State Government and the loss of employment in South Australia that this move would entail.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The normal avenue for any financial assistance for any small business (and in this case it is a small business that requires what we would describe

as venture capital) is to go to the South Australian Development Corporation, an independent statutory authority in its own right. It gives out Loan funds and Government guarantees. If the guarantees are more than a certain figure, which I think is \$300 000, the application must be approved by the Industries Development Committee, a Parliamentary committee representing both sides of both Houses of this Parliament. I point that out to the honourable member because, if the company has not approached the South Australian Development Corporation, it should do so. If an application went to the South Australian Development Corporation, it would not automatically come to me for my perusal.

In addition, I offer the services of the Department of Trade and Industry to the company. I think I am right in saying, although I would need to check this, that there has been contact with the department. We, as a department, do not hand out finance, by way of either loans or guarantees, and that has always been the case. There is a small business consultancy grant but, from what I understand of the circumstances surrounding the matter, that is not what the company is looking for. It is looking for significant amounts of capital by which it can develop this piece of technology.

I take this opportunity to compliment the company, especially the people involved, on the piece of technology that has been developed. From the figures I have been shown, it is a unique piece of technology, extremely efficient, and one that would attract interstate and overseas interest. I can understand why we should try to maintain that industry here in South Australia. I think I am right in saying that it was under a specific direction from me, when I heard of this, that the Department of Trade and Industry approached the company. I am not sure of the results, and I think the honourable member would appreciate that, when there are literally hundreds of inquiries a month from companies, one cannot be expected to know all the details.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Will you take a personal interest again?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will certainly take the matter up. If we can assist in some way, even by helping with an application to the South Australian Development Corporation, we would do so. We use our small business consultancy grants often to help carry out the accounting assessment and investigations necessary to prepare the submission, which could cost \$3 000 or \$4 000. I would be willing to help the company in any way possible. Perhaps, if the company has approached him, the member would refer it to me, but I will take the matter up also and make sure that an officer from the Department of Trade and Industry contacts the company.

SCHOOL STAFFING

Dr BILLARD: Will the Minister of Education indicate whether the formulae by which minimum staffing levels are set in Education Department schools will be maintained at present levels during the 1982 school year? Members will be aware that schools are staffed on a formula basis that sets minimum staffing levels, and the formulae are based, directly or indirectly, on the number of students at each school. Statements have been made already by the Minister indicating overall trends of the total number of teachers in the department as they relate to trends in the total number of students. The standard of education that can be delivered within a school is very much affected by the numbers of teachers and school assistants who can be placed at the disposal of each school principal, hence the

formulae by which those staffing levels are set are most important.

The Hon. H. Allison: I thank the member for his question. Incidentally, other questions have been addressed to the Education Department over the past few weeks, suggesting that we would be varying the formulae, and it is possible that the member has heard the same incorrect rumour. In fact, we will be staffing the Education Department professionally, using the same staffing formulae as we used last year. This, of course, will mean that by attrition there will once again be some slight reduction in staff numbers. We had about 15 000 staff employed last year. The reduction will not be by dismissal of any staff members but rather by natural attrition. Whereas a few months ago I was anticipating that we may be so close to attrition and staff increases that there would not be any room for new staff members, in fact, we should be looking at about an additional 350 new teachers being brought into the system, the attrition rate still being higher than the replacement rate.

We will still be looking at employing additional teachers next year. There is a nexus between the number of students in schools and professional staff and once again between ancillary staff and professional staff. If there is an increase in numbers in schools (and some schools are certainly still gaining, particularly in the northern and southern suburbs), additional staff will be appointed to cope with the additional student population. If there are substantial declines, that, too, would be reflected in the schools, with a decrease in staff numbers.

The Education Department has had quite a problem over the past decade. One metropolitan high school alone had 500 students in 1970 and 1 500 in 1975, and this year it had gone back to 500, so obviously that school would have felt the impact of declining staff through the declining student numbers.

Industrially, I was interested to note that, in connection with the member's question, South Australia will once again unquestionably be very much in the vanguard of staffing in Australia. We will be close to leading the rest of Australia. That is reflected in a comment from New South Wales a few days ago, where once again industrial action was threatened because of the formula provision of one teacher to 30 students. South Australia's formula provision overall is one teacher to 25 students. There is no question but that we are substantially better off than New South Wales, for example.

I hope that those words will reassure the member and anyone else who has been hearing rumours that we will be changing the staff formula for the next year. We are, in fact, already asking schools to give projected numbers for the beginning of next year so that we can begin to allocate staff, and if any adjustments should be needed in the course of the year, then they will be made.

BROMPTON HOUSES

Mr HEMMINGS: Will the Premier say whether the Government will honour its promise made to 14 residents in Brompton, when their homes were sold by the Highways Department to Detmold Industries, that they would be rehoused by the South Australian Housing Trust in the same area? If the Government was genuine in making that promise, when will the rehousing take place?

This morning I received a letter from the Bowden-Brompton Community Group regarding 14 homes sold by the Highways Department to Detmold Industries at the end of June 1981. At that time, there were statements made by the Government assuring all of the residents that they

would be rehoused by the Housing Trust in the same area. With Housing Trust involvement in that area and efforts to rezone Brompton Park as residential, it was assumed at that time that it was quite possible for the trust to do so. However, at this stage it seems as though none of the residents has been rehoused.

The community group has been contacted because of health problems associated with the condition of the houses. There is one particular case where a young mother and her 3½-month-old baby are living in conditions that are nothing short of scandalous. There is mould and dampness throughout the house, no drainage in the bathroom, a totally inadequate hot water system, and disused cellars and open sewerage that encourages mice, rats and cockroaches. The people living in these houses cannot, because of their financial circumstances, move into the private rental market, and therefore their rehousing has become a matter of urgency.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased indeed that the Detmold expansion and the Gerard expansion now seem to be going ahead, because quite obviously the effect on the employment market is going to be quite considerable. A number of new jobs will ultimately be provided by these developments. I am very pleased that some common sense has prevailed in that area.

As to the particular matter the member raised, he probably was not in the House when the Minister of Industrial Affairs made a lengthy statement on those matters and read to the House a letter from one of the residents congratulating the Detmold Company on the very fine and considerate way in which it endeavoured to find (and I think it was successful in that case) alternative accommodation for one of the residents.

Mr Hemmings: They are pulling houses down now and no-one has been rehoused.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not quite sure what the member is worrying about but, if he wants an answer to the question, which I take seriously, and if he is prepared to give me details, names and addresses of the people concerned, which have not been forthcoming until now from the Opposition, I will be happy to look into the matter and see what can be done.

Mr Hemmings: Are you saying there is no concern down there?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Napier is denying an opportunity to other members to ask a question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am perfectly willing to accommodate the member for Napier, and will keep answering his original question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier would be out of order if he were to answer interjections.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, Sir, and I will not do that; I will continue to answer his original question. I know very well that people are concerned, but I suspect that there is a measure of concern built into the member's protestations that is of his own making and for his own purposes. If there are specific instances, I hope that, instead of speaking in generalities and ignoring the statement by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, previously in asking for details, the member would be prepared to give details to the Minister or me so that something positive can be done.

That is the least he can do. Unfortunately, we so often hear from the Opposition complaints in general terms and are never given an opportunity to look at individual cases, which we would be more than happy to examine, to give reassurance and do what we could to provide alternative accommodation. It goes without saying that, if people are in difficulties, obviously they need help, and we will do what we can to help them. I hope the member can now provide names, because then we can do something about it,

instead of making political points across the Chamber. I am now very grateful to him for giving me the document and I say that it is about time.

SALMONELLA OUTBREAK

Mr RANDALL: Can the Minister of Health assure the House that the recent outbreak of salmonella food poisoning, due to contamination of salami products, has been brought under control and terminated? Will she say what steps have been taken to ensure that there will be no recurrence of the outbreak? I find the word 'salmonella' somewhat difficult to pronounce, although I enjoy the salami products immensely. Concern has been expressed in my electorate by a number of consumers of salami products who want to know what the Government can do to prevent such an outbreak again. It could be considered that I have a vested interest in this question also, because I enjoy those products.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can give the member for Henley Beach the assurance he seeks that measures have been taken to ensure that such an outbreak does not recur. The outbreak began in July, reached its peak in August, and was terminated when the source of contamination was identified. The Food Hygiene Laboratory of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science has continued, since the outbreak, to test all batches of salami produced by the company concerned to ensure that they are safe for release for consumption and that the tests meet the standards laid down by the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee.

I think it is worth pointing out, and I am sure the House would be interested to know, that the standard of work carried out by the Food Hygiene Laboratory of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science is of such quality that the company concerned, Tibaldi Products, which also has a factory in Victoria, has chosen to send all its samples from the Victorian laboratory to the I.M.V.S. in Adelaide for testing. I think that is a great tribute to the quality of the work that is performed in the laboratory, and to the dedication of the officers who willingly worked extremely long hours during the course of the outbreak in order to ensure that the company was provided with the services that it required and that consumers were protected. The letter from the Manager of Tibaldi, a copy of which was sent to the Director of the Institute and one to me, dated 15 September, says:

We have already commenced to bring Victorian salamis to the I.M.V.S. (Adelaide) for salmonella testing mainly due to the efficiency with which the abovementioned departments and staff have carried out their operations.

That department, of course, was the Food Hygiene Laboratory and the Salmonella Reference Laboratory. The House also should be reminded of the fact that I.M.V.S. has a national and international responsibility in so far as it is designated by the World Health Organisation as the Salmonella Reference Laboratory for South-East Asia, including Australia. I think it is important that these facts go on the record, because in the past there have been criticisms of the I.M.V.S. I think that when praise is given it should be acknowledged, and the officers concerned can feel that their efforts are recognised.

SOUTH-EAST TOURISM

Mr SLATER: Has the Minister of Tourism seen the article in the *Weekend Australian* by Mr Max Harris on the subject of tourism in the South-East? In the article Mr Harris is somewhat critical of the Government's perform-

ance on tourism and claims that its emphasis has been on places rather than people. This is not the first time that Mr Harris has been critical of the Government's handling of tourism in the South-East, which I understand is Mr Harris's own territory. Several weeks ago he was heard on an A.B.C. talk programme on the same subject, and he took issue with a senior officer of the Minister's department. The article in the *Australian* is headed 'Tour's company—or 'tis better to travel than arrive', and states:

You can con the suckers into becoming tourists, but you can't make them enjoy it. There's a frenzy of feasibility studies, consultancy reports, tourist commission restructurings, sloganising, and saturation promotions going on. All the States have had the inspiration that the generation of tourist income can bolster deficit budgets and sluggish consumer demand.

The basis of the article is that the author, Mr Harris, is critical of tourist promotion in the South-East. He describes his experiences when visiting a number of places recently, and believes that the institutional thinking on the subject by characters he describes as Bert the bureaucrat and Maud the Tourism Minister has concentrated on the wrong end of tourist promotion. He says, 'Get the people on the road and they think they have a tourist industry in this State.' Will the Minister comment on this article?

The SPEAKER: I call upon the honourable Minister to answer the question and not to make comment.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Thank you, Sir. I will try to abide by those instructions. I read Mr Harris's article, as I try to read all his articles, which I enjoy reading, whether or not I agree with them. In this instance, obviously I do not agree with Mr Harris's approach. It has been pointed out to me by the Minister of Education, as the member for Mt Gambier, that Mr Harris is a somewhat disgruntled son of the South-East. I think it is fair to say that Mr Harris's article expresses a lot of the contempt which is bred by familiarity of South Australians for sections of their own State with which they are familiar. That would be the kindest interpretation I could put on it.

Mr Slater: Is that why you went interstate for a holiday?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I spent my holiday at Goolwa, for the information of the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Members of the House may or may not be interested in the fact that I visited my sister in Melbourne for 48 hours, but I spent my holiday at Goolwa.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, a woman's work is never done—beat that! With regard to Mr Harris and the South-East, the point that he was making seemed to be summed up in the statement that there was too much emphasis on places and not enough on people. I venture to say that, if we were to encourage South Australians to travel within their own State and to meet other wonderful South Australians, we would not receive an overwhelmingly positive response. We must first attract people to places and we must ensure that when they visit those places they receive warm hospitality, good service and a friendly approach. Indeed, it is worth noting from the international visitor surveys conducted by the Australian Tourist Commission that factors such as wide open spaces, cleanliness, and the scenery, rate very low in terms of visitor impact, in comparison with the warmth and friendliness of the people. As I recall, 27 per cent of the overseas visitors to Australia ranked the warmth and friendliness of the Australians as overwhelmingly the most important factor influencing their stay. However, that has been demonstrated, as it was during the VISA campaign, not to be an overwhelming marketing factor; it is a factor which is, if you like, a

residue factor after the stay, and it may indeed encourage people to come back.

I would deny absolutely Mr Harris's assertion that friendliness and service are not important elements of the tourism infrastructure in the South-East. I refer specifically to two locations which come to mind: the Big Lobster, I know, has put an enormous effort into staff development and training which places very great emphasis on courtesy, friendliness and service. The same thing can be found at other principal tourist establishments in the South-East. It crossed my mind that I would contact Mr Harris to draw his attention to what I regard as an extremely negative approach, which is not uncommon among some travel writers in South Australia, and which was demonstrated, I might say, by the *Advertiser's* travel writer, following a visit to Spilsby and Wedge Islands, where I was also a visitor, a couple of weeks ago. There we saw splendid island scenery which could be matched in very few other places, but all Mr Whiting could talk about was a plague of chinchilla rabbits. In fact, I doubt whether we saw one rabbit during the visit.

So, I think familiarity of South Australians for their own environment has blinded them to the assets of that environment. I would not expect that the Government would change its policy of selling places and destinations, because that is the only thing people can buy when they buy a ticket—they buy a ticket to a place. When they get there they hope, of course, to receive a warm reception and good service. I believe that the industry itself has a responsibility to upgrade the standards which, by and large across the State, are high.

PLANNING LEGISLATION

Mr OLSEN: Can the Minister of Environment and Planning advise the House what the current situation is regarding the new planning legislation and what the response has been to the proposed new planning legislation as a result of the consultation period and subsequent extension provided to interested parties to make submissions on the Bill?

When the Bill was introduced in the House in June this year, the Minister indicated that there would be a consultative period to enable his department to receive submissions on the Bill. The original closing date of 7 August was extended by the Minister to allow more time for submissions to be prepared and received by his department. Concern has been expressed that a further two months has elapsed without finalisation of the legislation.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It is my intention that the revised Planning Bill be introduced in the House in this current session. The member for Rocky River has referred to the consultation period for submissions on the draft Bill. That period has proved very successful. We have had over 120 submissions during that time and while there has perhaps been some ill-informed criticism of the draft Bill, most of the comments received have been thoughtful and very constructive. It has been pleasing to see that people and organisations have responded in that way.

Some time ago, I also set up a consultative committee made up of representatives from the development area, conservation and local government, and that committee has been meeting for some time to consider the proposed legislation. There also has been extensive dialogue with a wide range of interested groups, particularly the Local Government Association. I am currently looking at making appropriate amendments to the draft Bill. I point out that such amendments will be consistent with the original thrust of the Bill, which is to maintain a rational sharing of responsibility with local government and expedite planning deci-

sions in the State. That is the aim of this Bill, and we are working towards this end. The consultation period has proved very worth while, and it is the Government's intention to reintroduce legislation in the House this session.

TELEVISION CONTRACT

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport intervene in the current television contract in operation between the South Australian National Football League, Channel 9 and (indirectly) the A.B.C. on the basis of disallowing the South Australian National Football League to have within the contract the right to veto a direct television coverage of the Melbourne Australian rules grand final in 1982 as it has done this year? The league's attitude in this matter is akin to an ostrich with its head in the sand. All Australia, and seven different countries including Mexico and China, had the opportunity of seeing the Melbourne Australian rules grand final direct, but this did not apply to the majority of South Australians, although I am pleased that for once country viewers did have that coverage. The Victorian Australian rules grand final, to me anyway, is probably equal to the Melbourne Cup as the sporting event of the year in this country, and yet good sports-minded South Australians can be subject to such humbug by a very narrow-minded administration, namely,—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAX BROWN:—the South Australian National Football League.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am sure that the South Australian National Football League would not be glad that the member for Whyalla got those concluding remarks in, but I, along with many others, was disappointed that there was no direct telecast of the Melbourne football grand final, a very important event in the Australian sporting calendar. I do not hold to the view that it necessarily would affect attendances at Football Park, in this case at the preliminary final. I do not know what power I would have to intervene in such a contract as the honourable member mentions. I think I would have no power to intervene at all; it would be only by means of persuasion.

Mr Millhouse: Moral suasion.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Mitcham corrects me: moral suasion, I think, are the words he used. If I can depart from the honourable member's question for just a moment, the member for Baudin has drawn to my attention a like matter, where the World Youth Cup soccer finals are not to be broadcast direct. I would like to take this opportunity of saying that I believe that the South Australian public has not been made fully aware, mainly because of the lack of necessary media coverage, of the importance of the World Youth Cup, because there is no doubt that it is the second most important soccer event in the world, second only to the World Cup, which is played every four years.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There are 450 000 000 viewers.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As the honourable member says, there are 450 000 000 viewers. I am very pleased that this Government—and I pay credit to the former Government, which was also going to assist in this—has continued and in fact has increased the assistance to the South Australian Soccer Federation to have important matches in the World Youth Cup series here. I attended the Hindmarsh Stadium on Tuesday night, and it is a credit to everybody concerned, being one of the best soccer pitches in the world. That is even more reason why the finals, and especially the quarter finals, of the World Youth Cup soccer tournament should be broadcast direct, especially from the Eastern States. I understand that they are to be rebroadcast at

1 a.m. in some cases, and I think that is a great disappointment to soccer fans in the other States. I support the member for Baudin on that question as well. Once again, it is a question of trying to use moral suasion, as the member for Mitcham has called it, with a television network.

KINDERGARTEN FUNDING

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Education explain why cuts have occurred in the pre-school programme, and particularly why no warning was given to kindergartens that such cuts would be implemented this week? I have been approached by a number of kindergartens in my area this morning informing me that yesterday they received their cheques for their third term allocation and found them to be only about one-third of what they received last term or what they had expected to receive. Along with the cheque, there was very little explanation of why this reduction had occurred. When several people I know ran the responsible bodies, they were given rather an inadequate explanation of why the reduction in funding had occurred. Will the Minister explain what the reduction involves and why no warning of it was given?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The House will be aware that some three or four weeks ago a statement was made, either by way of a Ministerial statement or in response to a question asked in the House, when I said that the South Australian Government would be increasing expenditure on childhood services from some \$17 000 000 to more than \$19 000 000, and that this represented about 75 per cent of the total expenditure on childhood services. I pointed out that the Federal Government paid the remaining 25 per cent, and that this represented quite a substantial difference from the position five or six years ago, when the Federal Government paid 75 per cent and the South Australian Government paid 25 per cent. Of course, the Federal Government's contribution has been pegged over the last few years, and its proportion has decreased at quite an alarming rate. One of the decisions which the Government faced was whether to alter the staffing formulae, and it was decided to maintain staffing at last year's level, but as a result one of the decisions would be that we would have to reduce slightly the allocation for operating expenses in kindergartens.

Over the last 12 months I believe that parents have been paying an average \$1 a student a week. We estimated a couple of months ago that there would be a short-fall of about \$450 000; in fact, I think that it is now about \$330 000. The Childhood Services Council decided that it would allow the sponsors (the Kindergarten Union, the Education Department and the Catholic Education Services) to decide how best to raise the balance of the money for operating expenses. It would equate to about an additional \$1 a student a week that would have to be raised.

I understood that the Childhood Services Council had advised the sponsors and that the sponsors themselves would be telling their kindergartens, wherever they were, of the revised plan. That was several weeks ago. Recently, probably over the weekend, the Childhood Services Council sent out the first allocation of operating expenses. That, I believe, was somewhere about 30 per cent of last year's total, and those cheques are to be supplemented in the near future by a further 20 per cent. So, that will mean that about half the money allocated last year to kindergartens will have been paid out by the Childhood Services Council in those two payments.

Another provision made by the Childhood Services Council was that any kindergartens where the sponsors decided

that there was greater ability to pay might be asked to contribute towards operating expenses; other kindergartens in areas of need and individuals who could demonstrate need would receive further assistance from the Childhood Services Council.

So, there are potentially three payments. The first one has been already made and the second one, for which the kindergartens need not apply, will definitely be made. They will be about 50 per cent of last year's total. After that, supplementary grants will be available through the Childhood Services Council on demonstration of need on the part of a kindergarten or an individual. Compared with the rest of Australia that still means that South Australia is better provided for in pre-school services than is any other State. I do not think there is any fear of contradiction in that regard. We are asking parents, where they are capable of doing so, to contribute a little more each week to supplement the operating costs of the kindergarten, and in turn the Government will maintain the staffing at the overall same student/teacher ratio that applied last year.

The substantial increase in the cost of running the Childhood Services Council is once again substantially an increase in the cost of teachers. I repeat that we are not reducing the staffing this year; we are maintaining the teacher/student ratios. Of course, kindergarten teachers themselves will be aware of having received from the Institute of Teachers, I think last week a request for data on work value changes, which will have added to the burden of their teaching, with a view to applying for a further 12 per cent salary increase. These factors all have to be borne in mind when the allocation of funds is decided, and it is unquestionable that the human resource, the teacher, in childhood and general education is far and away the greatest single cost. We are asking parents to help bear the additional cost, just as the State is bearing an additional cost as the Federal Government reduces its input into childhood services.

LAND RIGHTS

Mr MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Energy, and—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Are you ever going to get it out?

Mr MILLHOUSE:—with your permission and the concurrence of the House to briefly explain the question. In answer to the Minister of Agriculture, this is the sort of question—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is required to ask the question before seeking to make any supplementary explanation.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Oh, am I? I see. I was merely saying that normally this question would go to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, but it is useless asking him questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! Any further transgression, and the honourable member will cease to have the opportunity to ask a question.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Oh, very well, Sir, I will go straight on with it. Will the Minister withdraw the proviso that he inserted in his Ministerial statement yesterday and require mining companies to deal directly with the Yalata community on all matters concerning the area known as the Maralinga lands? Yesterday, when he made his statement, the Minister said, in part:

The situation is that, provided conditions attached to exploration licences requiring consultation between mining companies and Aborigines are complied with, there is no objection to direct discussions between mining companies and Aborigines.

I was furnished, just before lunch, by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement with a copy of a press release. I do not know whether the Minister has had an opportunity to see it or not, but he should have, and, if his staff is on the ball, he will have.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment but to get on with the explanation.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. The relevant parts of that press release are as follows:

Mr Goldsworthy in his statement to Parliament yesterday missed the key point. The key point is that Government proposals for transfer of Maralinga lands deny to the traditional Aboriginal owners at Yalata the same protection for their culture and ritual as the Government has granted to other traditional owners. . .

Later, it states:

If the Government genuinely supports the Pitjantjatjara legislation passed earlier this year and really believes that the legislation represents an ideal reconciliation of Aboriginal and mining interests, the Government should require mining companies to deal directly with the Yalata community on all matters and accept the decision of an independent arbitrator if an agreement is not reached.

Why should Yalata traditional owners of land be discriminated against and be obliged to rely on the discretion of the Mines Minister and a requirement of consultation only?

The final part of the extract is as follows:

What the Yalata men worry about is the land itself and the secrets and ritual associated with it. The Yalata community seeks an adequate legal framework to protect this vital interest.

It is well known that the Minister, backed up by his department, will do his very best to make sure that mining interests prevail over Aboriginal rights and everything else in this part of the State, but I hope that that is not the view generally of the Government.

I remind the Minister (and I think I am right in this) that tomorrow the Premier, who I think is invited to go along, is meeting members of the Yalata community to discuss these particular matters. If that is wrong, I must have misunderstood that part of it. I thought that I was told that earlier in the week. Whether or not that is true, I suggest to the Government that if this proviso, which the Minister stuck into his statement yesterday and on which he is trying to insist, is withdrawn, it will make final and amicable agreement on these matters very much more likely and very much easier.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitcham is obviously not aware of the current position in relation to Maralinga lands.

Mr Millhouse: Neither is the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have not yet seen the press release from that community.

Mr Millhouse: Your staff has let you down.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I saw my staff just prior to Question Time. My press officer was with me and, if he had had that, he certainly would have brought it to my attention. I am not surprised, because on Friday—

Mr Millhouse: Don't go into all that again!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is relevant to the honourable member's question. The media had a copy of a letter that was sent to me.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Before I had a chance—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister of Mines and Energy resume his seat. I do not want to hear any further interjections from the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The letter had been given to the press late on Friday, before I had even read it. I did not get a chance to do that until later in the weekend, when I got hold of it. I have not seen the press release, so it would be unreasonable for the member to expect me to

comment on it. Exploration companies are currently on the Maralinga lands. In the first instance, an exploration licence was granted to the Aquitane company by the Hon. Hugh Hudson.

It is necessary, under the Mining Act, to see that conditions are attached to leases. The conditions that this Government has insisted on in relation to exploration activities in those lands are far more stringent. I will not take up the time of the House now, but I will make the conditions available to the member, any member of the press, or anyone else who wants to see them. They insist on there being discussions with Aborigines. Obviously, the Government would not be fulfilling its proper duty to the people if it were not satisfied that those conditions were being met. An officer of the Government is required, not only in these exploration activities but anywhere, to see that the licence conditions are scrupulously being observed, particularly when we are dealing with Aboriginal lands.

For the member to try to equate the situation within the Pitjantjatjara land, much of which was an Aboriginal reserve with restricted entry, to the Maralinga situation is quite false, because exploration companies are currently operating in these lands. The consultative arrangements that this Government negotiated were completely acceptable to the Yalata people. In fact, we have been negotiating with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Aboriginal Lands Trust, in whom land is to be vested, for the two years we have been in Government.

It is quite unrealistic for the member to jump on the band wagon when he is quite ignorant of the history of these events, and to ask me to comment on a press release I have not seen. Companies are operating there, conditions have to be observed, and it is incumbent upon the Government to see that they are being observed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government has this afternoon entered into an agreement with Henry Jones (I.X.L.) Ltd, a major food processing group, for the sale of South Australian Frozen Food Operations Ltd at Dudley Park. Henry Jones will pay a total of \$8 150 000 for the facility on a lease-purchase basis, \$1 512 000 within the next six months and the balance over 15 years. The Government will hold extensive securities from Henry Jones, including the right to repurchase the factory on advantageous terms should frozen food production ever be curtailed in that period. The purchaser was selected from a list of some 11 companies that have shown interest in the plant. The selection was made not only on the basis of purchase price but also on the demonstrated ability to increase production at the plant. The chairman of Henry Jones (I.X.L.) Ltd (Sir Ian McClellan) has written to me stating his company's plans to expand the work force and install new equipment to produce products for a much wider market.

The unions, who some months ago were consulted about the sale of S.A.F.F.O., were informed earlier this afternoon of the agreement before it was signed on behalf of the Government, and the people employed at the plant were also told of the sale this afternoon.

Long service leave, recreation leave, sick leave and other detailed safeguards for the work force have been negotiated with Henry Jones (I.X.L.) Ltd following the unions' sug-

gestions and are embodied in the agreement. The new operating company, Henry Jones Limited, is a fully owned subsidiary of the parent and is fully guaranteed with the total asset backing of Henry Jones (I.X.L.) Ltd. Safeguards for the continuing supply of frozen meals to hospitals and clinics are incorporated in the agreement, as is protection for the other customers of S.A.F.F.O. It is interesting, Mr Speaker, to recapitulate on the somewhat chequered history of S.A.F.F.O. so that the advantages accruing from the sale can be appreciated.

In 1974 the Public Works Standing Committee recommended the erection of a centralised frozen food facility at Dudley Park at an estimated cost of \$4 500 000. The factory was completed in 1977 at a final cost of \$9 200 000. I do not have to point out that that is slightly more than twice the estimated original cost.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I seem to recall a number of other interesting facts.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There was a number of other interesting facts. It was, in fact, at that stage very much a white elephant, being designed for 24 000 cartons of frozen food per month on a single-shift basis, whereas throughput in December 1980 was only 6 400 cartons per month. In other words, it was under-utilised by almost 75 per cent. The trading loss in the six months to 30 June 1978 was \$895 000 and, despite the sound management techniques that were applied when the S.A.D.C. took control, the factory has never been able to service the capital expended on it and there is no indication that it can ever do so under its present mode of operation. The loss in the year ended 30 June 1980 was \$1 144 408, at the unreal artificial rental of \$250 000 per annum. The real rental, based on servicing capital and depreciation, should have been well over \$1 000 000, and on today's figures the annual cost to the Government is close to \$1 400 000.

The money received from the sale of the plant will not equal the cost of its construction but it will reduce this heavy overhead of debt servicing by \$770 000 each year. Not only that, Mr Speaker, but the factory will, as I have already said, see an injection of new equipment and the expertise of a company with a national market. It is, in all the circumstances, a very good deal indeed for South Australia.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) be referred, as follows, to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by 20 October 1981:

Estimates Committee A

Legislative Council
House of Assembly
Parliamentary Library
Joint House Committee
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works
Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement
Legislature, Miscellaneous
State Governor's Establishment
Premier and Cabinet
Public Service Board
Premier, Minister of State Development and Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous
Treasury
Treasurer, Miscellaneous
Electoral
Attorney-General's
Courts
Attorney-General, Miscellaneous
Corporate Affairs Commission
Minister of Corporate Affairs, Miscellaneous

Engineering and Water Supply
 Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Irrigation, Miscellaneous
 Lands
 Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, Miscellaneous
 Local Government
 Minister of Local Government and Minister of Housing, Miscellaneous
 Arts
 Minister of Arts, Miscellaneous
 Education
 Further Education
 Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous
 Community Welfare
 Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous
 Public and Consumer Affairs
 Minister of Consumer Affairs, Miscellaneous
 Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature)
 State Bank of South Australia
 Treasury Department
 Engineering and Water Supply Department
 South-Eastern Drainage Board
 Department of Lands
 Department of Local Government
 Education Department
 Department of Further Education
 South Australian Teacher Housing Authority

Estimates Committee B

Transport
 Highways
 Minister of Transport and Minister of Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous
 Services and Supply
 Deputy Premier, Miscellaneous
 Mines and Energy
 Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous
 Industrial Affairs and Employment
 Trade and Industry
 Minister of Industrial Affairs, Miscellaneous
 Public Buildings
 Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous
 Agriculture
 Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous
 Environment and Planning
 Minister of Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous
 Minister of Health, Miscellaneous
 Tourism
 Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous
 Police
 Auditor-General's
 Correctional Services
 Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous
 Fisheries
 Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous
 Marine and Harbors
 Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous
 Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature)
 Department of Transport
 Highways Department
 Department of Services and Supply
 Department of Mines and Energy
 Public Buildings Department
 Department of Agriculture
 Woods and Forests Department
 Department of Environment and Planning
 North Haven Trust
 South Australian Health Commission
 Department of Fisheries
 Department of Marine and Harbors

Motion carried.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That the Estimates Committee A be appointed consisting of Messrs Bannon, Glazbrook, Mathwin, McRae, Olsen, Randall, Trainer, Wright, and the Chairman of Committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed consisting of Messrs Ashenden, Billard, Langley, O'Neill, Oswald, Russack, Schmidt, Slater, and Whitten.

In nominating those members, I point out that, pursuant to sessional orders, the Premier has nominated Mr Russack as Chairman of Estimates Committee B.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 20 October 1981 at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes the extension, for a further three years, of the powers conferred by the principal Act, to fix and declare the maximum or minimum price of certain goods and services. Section 19 of the principal Act empowers the Governor to proclaim specified goods and services as declared goods and services. Sections 21 and 24 empower the Minister of Consumer Affairs to fix and declare the maximum price at which, respectively, declared goods and services may be sold, while sections 22a and 22f empower the Minister to fix and declare the minimum prices respectively for which winemakers may purchase wine grapes and for the supply of liquor.

Section 53 of the Act provides that these powers, and the orders made in pursuance of them, expire on 31 December 1981. In December 1979 the Government approved the retention of formal price control in certain instances and the establishment of a system of price justification and price monitoring in other cases. Prior to 1978 section 53 of the principal Act was amended annually to extend for a further year the period for which declarations under sections 19, 21, 22a, 22f and 24 could be made and remain in force. In that year, however, section 53 was amended so that the expiry date was extended for three years. This proposal was supported by the present Government while in Opposition, as it was recognised that, while the price control powers should be reaffirmed regularly by Parliament rather than continuing indefinitely, it was both inconvenient and unnecessary that this be done annually.

It is the Government's policy to minimise interference in the operations of businesses and, in particular, to minimise restrictions upon the market pricing of goods and services. Nevertheless, the Government recognises the need in some circumstances to use price control as a legitimate tool for ensuring fair trading within the market place. This is particularly so in relation to prices for petroleum, liquor and wine grapes, which are some of the products in relation to which the price control powers under the Act relate. I believe that it is essential in these areas and other areas of public interest that a power should exist to regulate the prices of those goods. The present Bill accordingly extends the current expiry date by a further three years.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 alters the date fixed for the expiry of the price-fixing powers from 31 December 1981 to 31 December 1984.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on the motion of the **Hon. D. O. Tonkin:**

That the House note grievances.

(Continued from 30 September. Page 1330.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in this grievance debate, because there are two matters I want to discuss. The first matter is the cowardly attack made by the member for Ascot Park a few weeks ago on the Deputy Premier. The member for Ascot Park came into this Chamber under the privilege of Parliament and made a statement that was absolutely untrue. He is not even a gentleman. He has not had the good manners or the courage to stand up and admit he was wrong. If he wants to sink to those depths, let me give him a warning.

An honourable member: You mean a threat?

Mr GUNN: No threats. I am just telling him what the facts are. If he wants to stoop to those depths, we will just repay the compliment to him. If he wants to carry on in that manner, it is quite simple. Members on this side could inform the House of a number of issues if he wants to play it like that. He knows. If he has a fair conscience, he is a peculiar person. We know he is odd, because he is a socialist. However, he has entered this Chamber, and he followed a person who could hand out the rough stuff, but at least could take it and was fair, and did not sink to those depths. I would suggest that, if the honourable gentleman wants to have any credibility at all, he ought to stand in this place and apologise to the Deputy Premier.

Mr Trainer: You show me the reference in *Hansard* to what you are talking about.

Mr GUNN: I want now to turn to another matter.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It must have been important.

Mr GUNN: I am very pleased that the alternative Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Elizabeth, is in the Chamber.

An honourable member: The heir apparent.

Mr GUNN: I was going to describe him as the South Australian Anthony Wedgwood Benn, but I think, going on the indications, he is a little closer to success than Benn was. It is fairly obvious that, judging by his comments this week, he is still one of the major spokesmen for the A.L.P. When the controversy again raised its head in relation to the indenture Bill on Roxby Downs, who was the spokesman who came forth for the A.L.P.? It was not the Leader of the Opposition or the Deputy Leader, but it was the member for Elizabeth, who came over loud and clear with a very lengthy statement to say exactly what the A.L.P. was going to do. His Leader was not in a position to do that. He was bumbling and going on about what the shadow Cabinet had to say about the matter, but would not give a clear and precise answer. So it is fairly obvious who is the person who has authority in this State for the Australian Labor Party on this issue. It is going to be interesting to see what happens when the indenture Bill comes up. The reason why I raise this particular matter is that this particular project is situated in my electorate, and the people of South Australia—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Only during this Parliament.

Mr GUNN: The member has told me that on a number of occasions, and I can assure him that I will be in this House for as long as he is, or probably longer. The member has taken up a lot of time. He has got up a campaign against me. He also owes me an apology for comments he made a number of years ago in Leigh Creek.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I appreciate the confidence members opposite have in my ability to properly represent the people in

my electorate, and I thank them for it. I want briefly to make some comments in relation to the Olympic Dam proposals, because it is very clear from the attitudes that have been expressed that this matter will attract a great deal of attention over the next few years.

Mr Keneally: Is this your election speech?

Mr GUNN: It is going to be interesting to see where the member for Stuart stands on the issue. I am interested to know what he will tell the people of Port Pirie on this occasion, whether he is going to support the issues of his constituents in Port Pirie or follow the line adopted by the member for Elizabeth. His footwork will be interesting. However, they are prepared to stop the development of this State, prevent an enterprise which has attracted interest throughout the world from going ahead. It will be on their shoulders, and they will have to carry a heavy responsibility. It is all very well for the Leader to try and get out of it by talking about the Cooper Basin. This Government is following the Cooper Basin, unlike his colleagues. What we want to do with the Olympic Dam is secure a project of a long-term nature that will generate income in jobs and will help develop the northern parts of South Australia.

Those sentiments, which I believe have the overwhelming support of the people of this State, ought to be supported by all members of this House. I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the editorial that appeared in yesterday's *News* and also to the editorial in this morning's *Advertiser*. Instead of trying to get out of the predicament that he finds himself in, I would suggest that he face the current situation, because wherever one goes overseas and talks to people in the industry, one finds that they are all aware of Olympic Dam and of the benefits. Their real concern is that they believe that Australia, as a politically stable country, has a responsibility to supply those markets for uranium. I refer to those countries that have no alternative other than the development of their nuclear option.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues how those countries in Europe and Asia, which must supply tremendous electricity needs, will be able to meet the demand without continuing to develop their nuclear options? How do members opposite think that the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan, just to name a few countries, will meet their demands in the next 20 to 30 years if they do not continue to use the nuclear fuel cycle? Unfortunately, people can march and wave as many flags as they like, but if the lights go out it is a very different story, and all the political rhetoric in the world will not pacify those people who are short of electricity. I suggest to the Leader that it is about time he faced reality.

I refer now to the present situation in the Flinders Range, in my electorate, where for a considerable time there has been discussion about the extension of the electricity supply to Wilpena Pound and the Blinman area. I sincerely hope that the Electricity Trust can proceed with this project as soon as possible, because not only are people in those areas entitled to have electricity supplied to them but it will help develop the area and make life much easier.

Mr Keneally: Who's going to pay for it?

Mr GUNN: It will be on the same basis as that which applies to electricity supplied throughout the rest of the State. The Electricity Trust has its responsibility and those people involved with swer lines will meet the cost in the same way as applies throughout the rest of the State. I do not know whether the member for Stuart has had any experience in the reticulation of electricity in local government areas or those areas just outside local government boundaries, but I suggest that he examine the matter, because some people have been asked to make very heavy contributions. They are prepared to make a reasonable contribution, but they have been fooled around with long

enough, and the time has now arrived when they should be given electricity at a reasonable cost. The same situation applies to the people at Penong, a matter that is now under active consideration and discussion, and those people are entitled to have electricity connected to their homes at a reasonable cost. I hope that the Electricity Trust does not procrastinate any longer but that it proceed with these projects as a matter of urgency.

If I had sufficient time I would have liked to talk about a matter now under discussion involving high tension lines between Port Augusta and Adelaide passing through my district and that of the member for Rocky River. Unfortunately, however, time precludes me from doing so.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): In the precincts of this House at present there are five members of the Liberal Party who are in their first term of Parliamentary office, and it is interesting to speculate just how these honourable gentlemen will develop should they remain for any length of time in the seats that they occupy. As two of them have safe seats, so far as their Party is concerned, I guess it is fairly predictable what the result in their case will be. However, it does not always follow that the people who are the most promising in their contributions to this Chamber develop in that same way during the remainder of their Parliamentary career. We have just heard a speech from the member for Eyre, who in the first five minutes managed to trivialise the whole of this debate. In 1970 the member for Eyre was largely in the same position as those honourable members now occupying the Government back bench were in 1979. I shall leave it to the members concerned to determine the extent to which they believe the member for Eyre has developed in his Parliamentary capacity during his 11 years in this Chamber.

The main thrust of Government speakers in the Budget debate that we have just gone through, to the extent that they have addressed themselves to the general principle of the Budget (and that certainly does not apply to all of them), has been that this is a tough Budget, but that the Government has had no alternative, that factors outside the Government's influence have largely forced us to this pass. I think they have been a little bemused by the comments that have come from my colleagues. Government members have asked what would the Opposition have done and what are the alternatives available. In making that sort of response to the Opposition's remarks, they have completely missed the point, completely missed the thrust of the remarks that have come from the Labor benches.

If we confine our remarks largely to what has happened during the last three months, we would have to say that the Government had very little alternative in the Budget strategy, but the question that the Labor Party poses to members opposite is: who or what has created the conditions which have resulted in this budgetary response from the Treasurer of this State? Of course, the answer is that the 'who' or 'what' is Liberal philosophy or, should I say, conservative philosophy, and the Budget strategy of Liberal Governments, both this Government in its previous Budgets and in particular in legislation which it introduced in this Chamber soon after coming into office and, in particular, the Liberal Government in Canberra.

In searching through the *Hansard* record for the contributions from members opposite, I thought at one stage that I would be forced into the unusual position of having to congratulate the member for Eyre, not on his philosophy or on the ideas he was putting forward but on his consistency, because in contradistinction to his Premier, who blames the Federal Government for the \$50 000 000 loss of revenue to this State, and in contradistinction to his Minister of Education, who reiterates what I was saying in 1979 and before

about the way in which the Federal Government has reneged on its responsibilities to pre-school children in this country, the member for Eyre lays it on the line. He said:

I for one make it quite clear that I support the Budget strategy of the Premier and of the Prime Minister, and I make no apology for saying that.

What could be more consistent than that? The honourable member is saying that he believes in Budget cuts; he believes in smaller government. If the poor old Minister of Education has to cop the flak because the Federal Government has cut back on its allocation to pre-schools, if he has to get up and try to make some sort of response to the member for Mawson, who is under pressure from his constituents about that, then that is too bad. Indeed, to be consistent he would say that he applauds it, that it is great stuff, that it means smaller government and cutting back on the fat, puffy public sector, and that if it means that people must contribute more to facilities for pre-schools, if it means that there are alternative means whereby these services must be generated by the consumer paying directly, rather than being financed from taxes, then that is good stuff.

The trouble is that the member for Eyre did not only speak for 10 minutes: if it had been a grievance debate he probably would not have mentioned the things that I am now about to mention now. But he had half an hour up his sleeve, and it was a bit too long, because the member for Eyre started to slip back into his old ways. When the honourable member started talking about his own electorate, he was no longer prepared to cheer on the Federal Government and the State Treasurer so far as cost-cutting measures were concerned. The member for Eyre said that he applauded the fact that a new school was being built at Leigh Creek.

He talked about new hospitals in Coober Pedy and Streaky Bay. He talked about how much money had been spent on the Stuart Highway. He said that he looked forward to the new school at Miltaburra. He asked that more police be stationed in his district.

This is the double standard of people opposite. On the one hand they are prepared to applaud whatever measure can bring in 'smaller government' yet, on the other hand, they ask for expenditure here, there and elsewhere, particularly as it relates to their own districts.

I make no criticism of the question the member for Mawson asked this afternoon. He was properly representing the interests of his constituents. In the same situation I would have asked the same sort of question, but you cannot have it both ways. You cannot applaud the Federal Government, on the one hand, which is hell bent on reducing public expenditures, and you cannot come in here and cut taxes which, for the most part, only impinge on the better off in our society, and then turn around and say, 'Yes, but we want more money for pre-school education; we want more money for police in our district; we want new hospitals; we want an accelerated programme for the Stuart Highway'—or Morphett Road—or wherever else it might happen to be. You simply cannot have it both ways.

This is the sort of thing we are continuing to get from members opposite. It is the philosophy which is at fault. It is the philosophy which they preach yet which they negate every time they ask a question in the House requesting some additional facility to be put into their electorates. How much longer must this nightmare go on? How much longer do we have to hear about what Mrs Thatcher is doing in the United Kingdom and what Mr Reagan is doing in the United States? How much longer do we have to put up with this double standard from the people in Canberra? I heard recently from an international visitor who said that he had attended a prayer breakfast with President Reagan.

I thought that that was good. I share President Reagan's belief in a theistic attitude towards the world, but that in itself does not mean that I or anybody else who may share that general broad religious outlook would go along with the sort of things that that President is doing right now.

I regard as an obscenity the initiatives that President Reagan apparently now seems to be undertaking, not so much because of those many public servants who will lose their jobs (although that is serious enough), but because of the services which no longer will be available in the ghettos to people on social security, and so on. It is a travesty to be talking about smaller government because, while all this is going on, that Government, as a purchaser of goods, continues to wax fat. Of course, I am talking about defence expenditure. The same thing is happening in this country with less single-mindedness. Perhaps there is less courage or stubbornness in Canberra in relation to these matters. If so; we should give thanks. But we are in a pretty pass when we have to give thanks that the Fraser Government or, indeed, the Tonkin Government, which is less single-minded in these things than are some of the right-wing regimes overseas—their ideological confreres, President Reagan and Prime Minister Thatcher. That is the background to the sorts of comments that have been coming from members of the Labor Party in the Budget debate.

We now turn our attention to the detailed examination of the lines. That is another thing altogether.

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

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I am glad that the member for Baudin recognises that I am doing my work well in the area of Mawson. Indeed, I go around frequently and make it known to residents that I am working on their behalf. Obviously that message has got through because, although the honourable member is of a political persuasion different from mine, my message has become imprinted in his memory. Obviously he recognises the fact that this Government is looking after Mawson very well. I agree with a comment he made criticising the Federal Government's cut-backs on pre-school education. In reply to my question earlier this afternoon, the Minister stated that funding has changed from a 25 per cent State and 75 per cent Federal contribution to the exact reverse, the State being expected to find 75 per cent and the Federal Government 25 per cent of the funds. That being so, this Government has not shirked its responsibilities, even though we are philosophically obliged to reduce the size of Government because we cannot afford to pay the exorbitant interest rates that were perpetrated on us by the former Administration. This afternoon I was pleased to hear the Premier say that we had rid ourselves of one of those burdens put upon us, namely, the frozen food factory, which has now been sold to private enterprise. This will mean a reduction on taxes for the general populace in so far as we will not have to continue to cover the high debts that this factory was incurring in the past.

If the previous Government had been more astute in its administration, programmes such as the frozen food factory, Monarto and others that we have heard a lot about could well have been delayed and urgent funds channelled into the more needy areas that we often hear the member for Salisbury talking about. I refer, for example, to the prefabricated buildings accommodating many of our schoolchildren. Many of these buildings could well have been upgraded and we would have better accommodation for our students. That was not the previous Government's attitude; it wanted to put up great white elephants and, where white elephants were not sufficient, it put up the odd monolith to its glory. Many of these monoliths were built in the northern

areas but not many in the southern areas. Hopefully this situation will reverse itself in years to come.

This Government has not reneged in its recognition of needy areas. We have looked at this matter very closely. Contrary to what the member for Baudin said about not being able to have it both ways, in a pluralistic society such as ours it is our duty to represent as strongly as possible the needs within our own area. If we find certain categories that need support, we will give those categories the support they require. I am happy to say that this term a new kindergarten has opened in my area. On Monday I visited that kindergarten with a representative from the Childhood Services Council. It is a nice kindergarten, and the residents in that area are pleased with this new service they have received.

This kindergarten has overcome a problem that had been occurring in past years, when the number of young people in that area was swelling at such a rate that it was necessary to provide more kindergartens. The procrastination that occurred in the past has been overcome, and this need has been met. We get back to the pluralistic situation where we need to conserve the money wasted by the taxpayer on high interest rates and other projects, and spend it in areas where it is most needed. This Government has been addressing itself to that matter exactly.

I hark back now to some comments I made in the House sometime ago, when I said that we seem to see the Opposition using some rather strange tactics in their campaign style.

An honourable member: Devious.

Mr SCHMIDT: That is one way of putting it. I did not want to be too cruel to the Opposition. During the last Federal election we saw various groups spring up in the marginal areas, for instance, in the seat of Kingston, and we saw the Kingston Consumer Action group suddenly spring up, being most concerned about the price of food, etc.

Strangely enough, once the election was over we did not hear from that group at all, so it becomes blatantly obvious that the group called down its god, the Hon. Mr Hayden, and several other gods that they thought might do the trick for them, but found they were only mammon gods, and not divine gods; their power was limited, and they did not have the effect they were expected to create.

Another group that sprang to the fore was a group set up under the auspices of CANE, and we have referred to that previously, and the meeting at which the member for Baudin was invited to be a speaker. Again, they whipped up great fervor and emotion in the area, hoping that that would have some effect on the electorate, but there was very little effect, because the member for Kingston is still sitting there.

Strangely enough, this group that set itself up at that time reformed later, realising that another election was coming up, this time a council election. The group was set up as the Southern Districts Action Group, and it revamped the whole issue of the core farm at Lonsdale. Part of the thrust of the original campaign by CANE was to strike fear into the hearts of schools, especially those along Christie Creek. One of those was the O'Sullivan Beach Primary School, in the district of the member for Baudin. Initially, the authorities at the school had some concern about the whole issue, and went to great lengths to satisfy themselves that there was no danger in this site. We read in the *Southern Times* of 26 November 1980, under the heading, 'School reverses uranium position', we see the following statement:

O'Sullivan Beach Primary School has reversed its earlier decision to call for the removal of uranium samples from the Western Mining Corporation core farm at Lonsdale.

The move follows a recent inspection of the site by school principal Robin Day, members of the school council and an independent radiologist, Dr Brian Wilson, who is also Secretary of the S.A. Nature Conservation Society.

The school itself was quite prepared to accept the evidence put before it that there was no imminent danger on that site. Now, one of the chaps who is running for council got on the radio yesterday and blasted the hell out of me. I am nowhere near the ward he is representing, so obviously he does not know his own ward. He is going off at a tangent and making all sorts of aspersions about me.

I draw the attention of the House to this group, because I received a letter from its President, dated 21 May, asking whether I would join in a public meeting it was organising, at which they had invited Dr Hoppood, again, and Ms J. Haines to speak. I sent back a letter on 5 June stating that regrettably, due to other commitments, I could not attend that public meeting. On 11 June I received a letter from Mr D. D. Beager, of 19 Vincent Street, Christies Beach, President of the Southern Districts Residents' Action Group, thanking me very much for agreeing to take part in their forthcoming meeting on the nuclear industry. Either the fellow cannot read or he is deliberately trying to create mischief, because he, or some representative of his group, contacted the local paper saying that I would be a speaker, yet I had sent a letter saying that it was not possible for me to be there. In fact, I had telephoned on two occasions before sending the letter—

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr SCHMIDT: I rang Mr Naqui on two occasions, asking that the message be sent on that I could not make it that night, but the group has tried to create mischief by saying that I would be there to speak at this meeting. It will not acknowledge the fact that I had responded quite a considerable time before—

Mr Millhouse: I was there, so—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCHMIDT: The Opposition must have trouble in this respect, because the member for Baudin, in the *Southern Times* some time ago—

Mr Millhouse: He was there.

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

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I have never been able to understand why the Liberal Party has been regarded as a credible political force in Australia. Nevertheless, I do accept that it has been so regarded. I think that is in the past. I intend to discuss briefly three reasons why I believe that the credibility gap between the Liberal Party and the electorate has widened, as inevitably it is doing.

First, I would like to look at the question of uranium. Liberal politicians tell us that opposition to uranium mining is nothing short of a left-wing plot.

Mr Lewis: It is.

Mr KENEALLY: There we have confirmation of that. The member for Mallee says it is. Such a statement, apart from being offensive to the very many Liberal voters who oppose uranium, is patently absurd, and, to illustrate that absurdity, I would like to quote from the South Australian Chamber of Mines pamphlet that I have recently received. It is a collection of quotations that have been assembled and published by the Uranium Information Centre Limited. We must remember that opposition to uranium is a left-wing plot! Who is quoted on this pamphlet by the Chamber of Mines and the Liberal Party but the Soviet Chairman, Mr Brezhnev, who says that it is necessary to expand the nuclear power industry. Another authority is China, which says that nuclear power is the best long-term alternative energy source for energy-hungry regions. There we have

the Liberal Party hand in glove with the two communist giants in the world in their position on uranium. In Britain, we have quoted to us Mr Joe Gormley, President of the National Union of Mineworkers, who said that Britain must go for nuclear powered electricity at the turn of the century. In Italy, we have quoted for our benefit Bettino Craxi, the Socialist Party secretary, and also Gian Franco Borghini, Communist Party Director of Industrial Problems, 1981, all of whom support the development of uranium, as does the Liberal Party in Australia.

Not only those people I have quoted but also the Communist Party of Australia supports uranium mining. It is quite clear, therefore, that the fellow traveller of world communism on the subject of uranium is the Liberal Party of Australia, and we wonder why they are hand in glove on this issue.

The opponents of uranium mining are those who are genuinely concerned about the welfare of the citizens of the world, not only this generation but all succeeding generations. This opposition, which will last until acceptable safeguards have been developed for all phases of the nuclear fuel cycle, includes the A.L.P., the Democrats, many thousands of Liberal voters, and practically all those uncommitted people within this nation—a fact of life that the Liberal Party will find to its cost at the next election. The duplicity of the Liberals and their shared philosophy with the communists has not gone unnoticed, nor has Australia's increasing economic dependence on the trade that we now participate in with the communist giants. All this is quite incredible to someone who has been in this Parliament for 11 years, as I have, and who have heard the various contributions of Liberal members during that time.

Nor has the hypocritical argument that the nuclear industry is the El Dorado for the poor nations of the world gone unnoticed. The Liberal Party statement that we owe it to the depressed nations of the world to make our uranium available is a mere sham. First, poor nations cannot afford the cost of nuclear power, and nuclear technology serves only to widen the gap between the rich and the poor. Our uranium is not to be given to the poor nations to help them develop nuclear power generation; it is to be provided not at a subsidised price, but at the top commercial rate that only the rich and powerful nations can afford. The Liberal Party's cynicism in this area has not gone unnoticed, and that is one of the reasons why its credibility is falling within the electorate of Australia. We are also told by the Liberal Party that it is a strong supporter of free enterprise and a strong opponent of crime, shady business dealings, etc. How does it demonstrate these attributes? One need only look at the activities of some of these self-righteous gentlemen. Consider those knights of the realm: Sir Robert Askin, Sir Phillip Lynch and Sir Charles Court who have scandalised the nation at various times because of their doubtful commercial dealings. This hurts members opposite, I am well aware.

What about those other Liberal Party exponents of the free enterprise philosophy, Mr Dickie (the housing expert from Victoria); Mr McDonald, Leader of the Liberal Party in New South Wales (land, or should I say, water, salesman); Mr McLeay (our South Australian representative in the rogues gallery); Mr Sinclair (whose exploits I need not elaborate on) and then we have Mr Bjelke-Petersen and Mr Hinze (who grow rich in Government, as do many of their colleagues), and many other members of the Liberal Party that time prevents me from mentioning. The fact that members opposite have stopped interjecting is noticeable. These prominent Liberal and Country Party politicians have exploited their positions, the taxpayer and the community to enrich themselves. The electorate is entitled to expect better and will react accordingly. These things I am saying

are true and if any member of the Liberal Party wishes to stand and defend any of the gentlemen I have mentioned, he is free to do so. To date, there has been no defence in this Parliament or in any other Parliament in Australia, because what I am saying is true and the allegations are obviously true.

However, the most important reason for the loss of credibility of the Liberal Party is the disparity between promise and performance. The Tonkin Government adopted the Fraser tactic of promise the world, deliver nothing, and blame the Labor Party for your failures. The electorate prior to 1979 was promised less crime, less unemployment, less taxation, and better services. We now have more crimes, higher unemployment, the highest taxation in our history, and a reduction in services.

I want to make one or two brief comments on succession and gift duties which has been the only thing for which the Premier has been prepared to take credit during his period in office. Wherever those taxes have been abolished, it has been done by the irresponsible action of political Parties seeking electoral gain rather than sound economic management and a just taxation system. Abolition simply means that the tax burden is transferred on to that sector least able to pay. The massive increase in State charges that is a feature of this Government has brought with it an acute awareness amongst the electorate of the cost of Liberal Party handouts to its friends and a consequent drop in Liberal Party support. Let there be no mistake about that; the Liberal Party may feel that it can proudly go out and brag about abolishing succession and gift duties, but the overwhelming majority of South Australians who thought initially that they would benefit from these tax reductions are now well aware that they are being required to replace within our State Budget those taxes that have been taken off the wealthy sector of the community.

As I have said many times, at least 95 per cent of my constituents would not have been required to pay any gift or succession duties had the Labor Party policies been implemented. It is the Liberal Party and other Parties, I must confess, wishing to gain electoral benefit, that are prepared to abolish succession duties. The Liberal Party in Victoria, now under severe threat of losing office, is prepared to go to the electorate and say that it will abolish succession duties. It had not been prepared to do it until the Government was at threat. Immediately a Government is at threat, it hands out—

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

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I will have to deal with the honourable member. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): No doubt you could, Sir, but, showing your usual amount of discretion, you decided to call on me to make some comments.

Mr Millhouse: I notice the Leader is out of the room.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It would not be proper for me to comment on that particular interjection. I want to say something about the standard and the approach of the audits of the public accounts of South Australia, which matter has caused me some concern and I understand it is causing some considerable concern within the Auditor-General's office.

I was a member of the Government that appointed the present Attorney-General and I certainly agreed to the Government's doing that. Recently, I understand, there has been considerable concern within the Auditor-General's office in relation to the approach taken by the senior management of the Auditor-General's Department in relation

to the audit of the public accounts of South Australia. I understand that many of the field staff feel that they are lacking in the sort of management support that they would expect in applying themselves to their task. There is a general feeling of frustration at what many staff see as being a soft approach to the auditing of the public accounts at the present time.

I notice from looking at the Auditor-General's Reports for the past three or four years that one can discern a quite distinct change in approach or emphasis if you like over that period of time. The former Auditor-General did not pull any punches when he approached the questions of reporting on practices that he found to be unsatisfactory. However, I understand that the present Auditor-General prefers to report to client departments on any matters he finds to be unsatisfactory and, provided those departments correct the anomalies or other matters of complaint, the Auditor-General has then, in his view, satisfied himself, and reports of such matters do not in fact come to the Parliament. I do not believe that is a satisfactory approach for the Auditor-General to be taking. I believe that he has his responsibilities clearly set out in section 37 of the Audit Act, and he is required to report under section 39 of the Act to Parliament, quite clearly in relation to the matters set out in section 37.

I believe that the intention of that legislation is that we in the Parliament should be told fully of any matters of which the Auditor-General becomes aware during the previous 12 months. It seems that the current Auditor-General finds some reluctance to raise publicly contentious matters. I believe that that is causing grave concern in the Auditor-General's office itself. In fact, some officers with whom I have spoken have used the words 'lack of professionalism'.

Mr Millhouse: You are really getting stuck into the Auditor-General, aren't you?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The member for Mitcham has been here long enough to know that many of us from time to time, in the course of our public duties, are required to undertake what may be seen by some to be unusual courses.

Mr Millhouse: But that's what you are doing.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I make no apology for the fact that I am making here a public comment on what I see as the performance of the Auditor-General. Further to the matters to which I have just referred, we are about to embark on what is undoubtedly for this Parliament the most important period of the year for us in relation to the accounts of South Australia and the Budget, that being the Estimates Committees. There could be no argument about that. I would have thought that for the Auditor-General, a statutory officer of this Parliament and the Government, that would have been an important time for him to become appraised and aware of all matters that come to light as a result of questioning by members of those committees.

Unfortunately, the Auditor-General is proposing, as I understand he proposed last year, to go on holidays again. This is the second time I understand that he has been absent from duties during the time when this Parliament is, in effect, in most need of him. Certainly, I suppose in his defence, it can be said that the matters raised will be recorded in *Hansard*, and that if he is very dextrous in his duties he will be able to wade through the considerable amount of comment, questioning and answering that will be reported. That would be a very onerous task, which would not be undertaken by a senior officer of the Government, but would be given to a minor functionary in the department.

Mr Millhouse: A luckless clerk.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: A luckless clerk, if you like. Such luckless clerks, of course, to adopt the honourable member's term, are not the people made responsible under the Act for the conduct of audits and carrying out of important functions set out in section 37. For that reason, I believe that it is quite unsatisfactory that the Auditor-General should choose to take his holidays at this time of the year, from 5 October to 22 October.

Mr Keneally: Maybe it was not his choice.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: My friend suggests that perhaps it was not his choice. I suppose that the Auditor-General had been encouraged to go on holidays by this Government because of the fear that the fierce cross-examination of the Ministers would draw forth matters that would be better not put before him. Frankly, although I do not concur with the view that it is likely that the Government would have sent him on holidays, because, on reflection, probably given the report and the lack of teeth in it, it probably does not matter very much whether or not this Auditor-General is on holidays. However, in principle, I think that the Auditor-General ought, while the Estimates Committees are meeting, to be able to come down to the Parliament, sit in the gallery and listen to the debates, questioning and answering.

Mr Millhouse: What purgatory that would be for him!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: A lot of other highly paid public servants undertake that task. I am putting my belief, shared by a number of people in the Audit Office itself, that there should be a much firmer and more positive approach to the reporting that goes into the Auditor-General's annual report. We should be able to see this sort of firm approach in the report that comes before this Parliament, as it used to be under previous Auditors-General. The member for Mitcham, who I see showing some interest in this, would be well aware of what I am talking about. There is no doubt that the Auditor-General's Reports, compared with those of three or four years ago, are much softer.

Mr Millhouse: That is only because you are in Opposition, I think.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: One can take whatever view that one likes, but I suspect that the last year that the Labor Party was in Government the report was much softer than the previous reports. If the Auditor-General is wise, he will note my comments made this afternoon and take a firmer and more constructive approach to his auditing during the ensuing 12 months. I hope particularly that he takes note of my comments about his holidays and reorganises his next 12 months work pattern to ensure that he is around the place when he is jolly well needed.

Mr Millhouse: It's a bit late now.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I agree with the member that it is probably a bit late this time. Unfortunately, this matter has come to my attention in only the past few days. I was certainly unable to take any other steps.

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

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have been both mildly surprised and amused by the fuss this week over the Australian Democrats' policy on uranium mining, and the effect that the reiteration of that policy at the National Convention in Brisbane last weekend has had on the prophecies about the political activities in this State. I know that most people in South Australia are still finding it hard to realise that the old two-Party system is breaking down and turning into a three-Party system. Most people, particularly our friends in the media (the newspaper and television reporters), however they may pride themselves, are incurably conservative. They are so used to a two-Party system that

they are finding it hard to realise that it has changed. What the National Convention of the Democrats did last weekend was simply to reiterate what I said in our Party policy speech before the last election.

Mr Lewis: They signed their death warrant.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The poor little member for Murray says that they signed their death warrant, but I remind him that at that last election—

Mr Lewis: Wrong electorate, Robin: I am the member for Mallee.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Mallee is it? It does not make much difference. But, at the last election we doubled our representation in this Parliament and were given—

Mr Lewis: Three-fifths of five-eighths.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: The member for Stuart says that it would be difficult halving it, but he knows, as does his Party, that the Liberal Party had high hopes of wiping us out altogether by directing its preferences away to the Labor Party.

They hoped that we would not be here at all. But, in fact, there are two of us here. Our Party is now in a position of some influence in this State. That is why there has been this consternation in the past few days. But because everybody has forgotten, if they ever took any notice of what I said about our policies at the last election, I want to read it out again and make quite clear that this was the policy on which both Lance Milne and I were elected. We have no intention of departing from it. This is what I said:

I turn now to what should be the second issue in this campaign but about which Liberal and Labor have both been very quiet: Roxby Downs and the great mineral wealth which we are told is waiting there to be mined. The problem is that uranium is one of the minerals. The policy of the Australian Democrats on uranium is clear:

Uranium will not be exported until the problems of waste disposal, security (especially plutonium) and costing (which much include the cost of long-term waste disposal) are solved.

We therefore cannot agree to mining at Roxby Downs if uranium be included in that mining. We would rather see all the minerals stay in the ground than that. Yet there is a way out of the dilemma. We put it forward as part of our policy. One can be processed to extract copper or other minerals without extracting uranium. This has been done already in other places such as Chile.

I am told that I may have been wrong in using Chile as an example. Nevertheless, I continued:

If Roxby Downs went ahead on this basis, producing copper but not uranium, we certainly would have the problems of uranium mining—workers health and environmental problems of low-grade active tailings—but the Fox Report concluded that health and environmental problems of the mining process were not, of themselves, so grave as to make mining unacceptable. I emphasise, however, that we could not countenance the stock-piling of uranium concentrate above the ground: that would provide its own constant, silent but powerful pressure for export, particularly when in the 1980s we have to pay more for importing oil. A fundamental condition of mining must be an absolute undertaking to return as quickly as possible the residual ore as mine fill. I challenge the Government in this campaign to make it quite clear where they stand on this issue and to give an undertaking that they will not bow to the pressure of the consortium to mine uranium at Roxby Downs and export it whatever the consequences. There are many of us who suspect that this is what the Government wants to do.

That was the Labor Government, and of course one of its leading members at that time was Hugh Hudson, of unhappy memory in this place. But he has gone, and I do not believe that the influence of the pro-uranium people in the Labor Party is now quite as strong as it was. But that is the policy on which we were elected at the last election.

Mr Lewis: It is a ridiculous policy.

Mr MILLHOUSE: There is no equivocation about that policy whatever. It has stood ever since the election, and it still stands. I remind honourable members in this place and people outside, if they want the reminder, that Lance Milne and I are members of a Party. We are not two individuals

who make up our own minds on this. When he votes (although he has, as I have, the right to vote as his conscience directs), he votes as an Australian Democrat. As a rule, we are together on these matters, and I believe that we are together on this matter. So, when Mr Milne casts his vote he will be doing it not as an individual, but as a member of a Party of which I am also a member, and which is, as I have said, a very influential force in this State. I hope that people outside, and members of the Labor Party particularly, will know now what our policy is.

There is one other thing I want to talk about. It is disparate. It is nothing to do with that, that was the most important thing. I would have asked a question on it today if the Labor Party had been awake enough to ask, earlier in Question Time than I had the opportunity to do it, the question that I asked about Yalata. The question relates to this nutty O'Bahn system for the north-eastern transport corridor, or whatever it is.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for Todd makes a silly interjection. I have not been overseas, but I want to quote someone who has been overseas and who is pretty high in the counsels, I would hope, of the Government on these matters. I do not know how many members saw the reading list which Susanaga Weeraperuma of the library prepared and put out last week, but there was on that reading list an article headed 'Public transport in Sweden and Germany' prepared by Mr Ron Stewien, the Chief Engineer of the State Transport Authority. He went and looked at this O'Bahn.

An honourable member: He was most impressed.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The honourable member says that 'he was most impressed'. Let me tell the House just what Mr Stewien said. It contrasts rather starkly with the enormities that the Minister of Transport poured on it on Tuesday. This is what he said in his article:

Well, after being a little sceptical at home, I must confess that I am almost a convert to the system.

Here we have the Chief Engineer of the S.T.A., having been sent over and looked at the 1.2 kilometres of O'Bahn and the 2 kilometres which is about to be opened, saying that. How can the Government, or anyone else, match up what has been said about the O'Bahn, and the plans to extend it out to Tea Tree Plaza, or wherever it is, when the Chief Engineer of the S.T.A. says, after having looked at it, that he is almost a convert to the system? Does he not count at all? Does not the Government take any notice of what its professionals tell it? You can bet your bottom dollar that, if he writes that publicly in *Among Ourselves*, or whatever the publication is called, that is a pretty muted view, and that, if one spoke to him personally, he would be a good deal stronger about his reservations than he says there. All we have got from the Minister on this is that this is the most innovative system there is; that it is one of the best and newest systems, and that it will be absolutely marvellous for the State. In my view, for political reasons, the Government is being dishonest and irresponsible about this when its own Chief Engineer can say what he has said, namely, that he is almost a convert to the system.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I wish to refer to the contribution made by the member for Hanson on 23 September, in which he attacked the South Australian Film Corporation. The honourable member said that the corporation should be handed over to private enterprise and given a subsidy. It is quite obvious that the honourable member does not really understand the operations of the corporation. As I understand it, the corporation was set up with the

target of becoming completely self-sufficient and commercially viable (I believe that they were the words of the Premier of the day) within 10 years. I believe that that 10-year period will expire at the end of 1982. Projections indicate that there is a good possibility that by the end of 1982 the corporation will go very close to balancing its books in an operational sense and, in fact, it may even turn the corner and have an excess of revenue over expenditure. On 23 September, the member for Hanson told the Parliament:

We must have a very close look at the statutory authority.

One could excuse the honourable member's comments. What does the honourable member mean by 'we'? Does he mean the Parliament, the Government, or the Public Accounts Committee, of which he is the Chairman? The honourable member referred only to the deficit, but did not raise the question how the deficit arose, why it has existed, and what it has accomplished. From what I can understand of the honourable member's statement, he was saying that 'we' (and I still do not know to whom 'we' refers—perhaps the Public Accounts Committee) should disband the corporation and let private enterprise run it with a subsidy. I understand that the Public Accounts Committee has not considered this action or discussed matters with the South Australian Film Corporation.

From the honourable member's statement, I understand that it is all right to give a subsidy to private enterprise to let it run the South Australian Film Corporation without any concern for the corporation's objectives or achievements, which cannot be measured in terms of profit or loss alone. The honourable member should consider the objectives and achievements in the light of business created and jobs provided. The main functions of the corporation are the making of short films, feature films and television series. Every cent that the corporation obtains from the Premier's Department is directed in this way.

The corporation's activities are quite vigorous in raising commercial sponsorship, not only in South Australia but also in other places. I understand the corporation sends letters to other organisations both within South Australia and interstate seeking commissions to make films. It also receives money from the Commonwealth Government whenever it can. All these sponsorships and the money involved thus come into South Australia to be administered by the corporation and are directed straight to commercial enterprise.

I also understand that the only money that the corporation takes from this sum is that which is sufficient to pay for the services of the skeleton staff. In other words, all the money goes to independent film makers or to pay for the skeleton staff. The corporation does not charge a profit margin on any of this; it merely covers the cost of making films and the cost of staff.

In saying 'we', does the honourable member mean that the Public Accounts Committee wants the corporation to start making money? If that is the case, the corporation could simply employ a staff of four or five film makers on an annual salary. It could charge them enormous overheads and make profits on the films. However, it does not do that.

The South Australian Film Corporation does not regard that as its charter. It has always believed, and it is stated in the Act, that its job is to create a private enterprise and not to control the industry, but to make the industry happen. As far as the corporation's commercial activities are concerned, it was never given a proper establishment grant, and it was never given any capital income. The corporation borrows money to pay its rent and salaries. It first started borrowing at the rate of 8½ per cent, and I understand that the rate is now between 13 per cent and 15½ per cent. As

I understand it, in the early days of the establishment of the corporation it was necessary for it to borrow money to invest in projects because the corporation was chartered with the responsibility of making a film industry happen in South Australia.

In order to make movies like *Storm Boy* and *Breaker Morant* the South Australian Film Corporation had to borrow money to invest in those films. From what I understand of the situation, the corporation has never invested more than one-third in any feature film: two-thirds of the budget has always come from interstate. \$30 000 000 went through the corporation for the making of films in this State, up to the end of the end of the financial year. At least \$23 000 000 has been spent in South Australia in nine years. Of the \$30 000 000 that has gone through the South Australian Film Corporation in the nine-year period, the State Government has provided \$1 888 000 in grants. Of the \$30 000 000, \$4 764 000 has been made available by the State Government for production of documentary films.

In total, the State Government has provided only just over \$6 500 000 of the \$30 000 000. I understand that the balance of the money, \$24 000 000, has been borrowed, or has been earned by commercial earnings outside the State (throughout Australia and throughout many other countries) or it has come from a private enterprise.

So, the money spent in this State is not just going out to people in the film industry but is going out to plumbers, carpenters, and people who provide goods and services, particularly those in my electorate, who provide local content. The corporation also pays 5 per cent payroll tax to the State Government, and sales tax on many of the goods and services that it buys or hires. For every dollar spent by the South Australian Film Corporation it creates some jobs and other spending on a ratio of approximately four to one. If one multiplies \$30 000 000 by the rate of \$4 to \$1, it equals \$120 000 000. I understand that the South Australian Film Corporation currently owes the amount of only \$4 400 000. So, even if the corporation stopped operating tomorrow, all that it would have actually cost the Government (if the Government had to make good the South Australian Film Corporation's loan, the corporation has assets which it could sell for approximately \$1 500 000) over its nine years existence is \$4 400 000; that is discounting the benefits that the South Australian Film Corporation has brought into the State.

Films such as *Gallipoli* were brought into the State. I make the point here that, without the South Australian Film Corporation, *Gallipoli* would not have been made. The corporation has made it all happen.

The member for Hanson has forgotten what the South Australian Film Corporation is supposed to do. He has forgotten to compare with other States, corporations or Federal Corporations. The South Australian Film Corporation, is regarded as the most successful commercial film industry in Australia. The South Australian Film Corporation has also put South Australia on the map.

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

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I want to refer to that subject which I was unable to complete on the occasion of my last remarks to this House during the course of the debate on the Appropriation Bill on 24 September. The remarks I made then relevant to the topic I wish to speak about today are recorded on pages 1180 and 1181 of *Hansard*. The subject matter I want to speak about is the despicable campaign that is being planned by the A.M.I.E.U. (the meatworkers union) with the support of the A.C.T.U., in its determination to destroy, where possible, some 1 500 jobs (as it stands at the moment) in industries that may not

be covered by that narrow union. It has planned a campaign to oppose the export of live sheep during the forthcoming harvest period when farmers will be otherwise engaged with harvest operations. Previously, farmers were able to take matters into their own hands and save those poor animals the suffering of being penned, not just for hours but for days on end, while the meat workers picketed the export loading facilities. The farmers were able to redirect the stock to an alternative facility and get them loaded and away. This time the union plan is to attack when farmers are otherwise occupied and will be unable to do anything.

I call on honourable members opposite to do whatever they can through their good offices to encourage the A.M.I.E.U. to desist from this ridiculous course of action that it is proposing and to ask the A.C.T.U. to reverse its stated policy support, because this proposed action will not only cause a loss of jobs, but it will also destroy a substantial industry in South Australia. South Australia stands to lose far more than does any other State. I am indebted to the Economics and Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture for much of the material I bring to the attention of honourable members, and any members of the public may have an opportunity to peruse this information in due course. I have made the point that problems have arisen as a result of that ridiculous A.C.T.U. decision to support the A.M.I.E.U. The problems of unemployment of A.M.I.E.U. members are not related to live sheep exports but are largely due to the drop in cattle being slaughtered. The processing section of the meat industry is passing through a period of low utilisation and low finance returns for that reason.

Previously I quoted figures of slaughterings of cattle and sheep in Australia from 1975 to 1976. I also pointed out that there has been no change in the overall number of sheep and lambs slaughtered during the five-year period, and I incorporated a table which indicated this. I further showed that the slaughtering capacity for sheep and lambs had been largely unchanged, and I illustrated the point with a table of figures to indicate that. I showed, however, that there was a reduction in the number of cattle that had been slaughtered during the same period, and that the percentage of the sheep flock slaughtered annually had marginally increased from the first to last of those years.

I want to remark on the flock structure as it remains. It has been suggested that the live sheep trade has induced a change in the composition of the national flock. I have figures here which show that, comparing the periods between 1968-70 and 1978-80 the number of ewes mated as a percentage of the total sheep numbers for those comparable periods was marginally greater during the period of 1978-80, a decade after the first period. Both those periods were chosen because they represent two periods of flock build-up.

We are looking at comparable periods. The proportion of the flock that was mated, that is, the percentage of ewes in the flock to be put to rams in response to the increased profitability as a result of development of the live sheep export trade increased by 2.7 per cent. If we assume that there is a 75 per cent marking of the present sheep population of 132 000 000, a 2.7 per cent increase in ewes mated, represents an extra 2 700 000 lambs for eventual sale.

Therefore, the increase in the ewe proportion and the consequent greater turn-off would partially compensate for the live sheep exports. The definition of marking, for those honourable members who may not know what that entails, refers to those animals that have their tails docked and, in the case of males unwanted for mating purposes, have their testicles removed.

Let us look at sheep number increases where seasonal conditions have permitted. If sheep raising is profitable,

sheep numbers will increase. For example, the sheep industry suddenly became profitable in 1973 due to increased wool prices. In the subsequent two years, which were also good seasons, sheep numbers increased by 8.4 per cent in Australia and by 12.2 per cent in South Australia. The drought that hit the industry in 1975-77 reduced numbers but, since then, largely due to the profitability of the live sheep trade, sheep numbers have been again in a build-up phase. While the extent of this build-up due to the live sheep trade cannot be isolated, because of other factors in the rural sector, there is little doubt in my mind that there are more sheep in Australia due to the profitability of the live sheep trade. Whether the entire number is due to that I cannot say, but in my opinion there is no doubt that an increase in numbers has resulted.

Looking at the net effect of the live sheep trade on sheep numbers, we see that sheep numbers are higher now. The live sheep trade is therefore not detrimental to the processing sector or the chains which handle sheep, or the jobs of the meatworkers who slaughter them. This increase in the ewe portion would definitely increase the turn-off rate and reduce the effect of live sheep exports on the Australian processing industry. Overall, live sheep exports have a helpful effect in improving the stability of the number of people who can get jobs in the sheep killing meat trade.

Turning to the Australian situation and the employment implications of the live sheep trade, we can see that it is relevant to summarise that the only major study into the employment implications of live sheep export has been by the Bureau of Agriculture Economics; that was done in 1978. The report from that study looked at the employment implications in 1977, when 4 300 000 sheep were exported live. That is less than were exported last year, but it is still a substantial increase on the initial year about which I have been speaking, that is, 1975-76. The report looked basically at two aspects, that is, the employment changes and the employment creation effects. The report states:

It is clear any estimate of the direct employment effects of the live sheep trade on meatworkers' employment must be largely judgmental—

and can therefore be discounted—

It has been concluded that it is doubtful if as many as 100 additional people would have been employed full-time in the industry had there been no live sheep exports in 1977.

It further states:

Several submissions provided detailed estimates of the employment generated by the live sheep trade . . . It was concluded that the live sheep trade offered jobs for between 944 and 1 601 people in 1977 . . . It should also be stressed that they (these figures) are not directly comparable with figures on loss of employment in slaughtering and processing. This is because a number of activities have been included in the live sheep trading compilation that have not been accounted for in the case of slaughtering.

In due course I will take up this matter again. I will not lay it down or let it rest unless I am satisfied that the A.C.T.U. and the A.M.I.E.U. see the ridiculous and stupid policy that they are pursuing in opposing live sheep exports.

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

Motion carried.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER: The Legislative Council has given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin), the Minister

of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill), and the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), if they think fit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr TRAINER: About an hour ago the member for Eyre, in the course of a debate, made some remarks concerning me in which he accused me of having made a cowardly attack on the Deputy Premier, and demanded some sort of apology. In making a personal explanation in respect of the charges made by the member for Eyre, I cannot verify the exact words that he used. It has not been possible for me to check *Hansard* so soon after the comments were made in this Chamber. I did inquire of *Hansard* as to the availability of the yellow carbon drafts, but I was informed that it is their policy not to release these without the consent of the member whose words are recorded on the yellow carbon copies.

In view of the attitude expressed by the member for Eyre, I thought it was doubtful that such consent would be granted to me and I was rather loath to ask. Accordingly, my personal explanation will have to rely on my memory of the remarks made by the member for Eyre, and I informed *Hansard* that I would try to rely on my memory in this regard.

As I recall those allegations, the gist of them was as follows: the first was that I had made a cowardly attack on the Deputy Premier. I am puzzled why the member for Ascot Park should be singled out for this particular accusation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has sought leave to make a personal explanation. I ask him not to comment during the course of that personal explanation.

Mr TRAINER: Thank you, Sir. As part of that personal explanation—and if I start to diverge I am sure you will point it out to me—I was merely—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has had his divergence pointed out to him.

Mr TRAINER: I mean the remarks I am about to make, Sir, I am sure that I will only get a few words into them, and if I am incorrect in my approach you will point that out to me. I presume that the remarks attributed to me are those that appeared in a press report, and in that press report two members were referred to. I wish, as part of my personal explanation, to draw attention to that aspect of the issue.

Secondly, the member for Eyre made comparisons with the previous member for Ascot Park as someone who dished out rough stuff, and he implied that I dished out rough stuff in here. I say as part of my personal explanation I believe that is an unfair charge and that I am quite gentle with members of the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: The third point in respect of the personal explanation is that I believe the member for Eyre threatened me in so far as he implied that some revelations would be made by him concerning me. In the context of the press report to which I presume his remarks relate, I can only assume that he is trying to imply that I have a problem with alcohol. I refuse to be intimidated by any such threat, because I have no such problem, being by preference a teetotaler; a teetotaler who consumes any alcohol at all only when social obligations make it impossible for me to

avoid doing so. In any event, my colleagues could assure you, Sir, that if I am seen with a glass of alcoholic beverage in my hand, the same glass and the same beverage, or at least three-quarters of it, is still in my hand at the conclusion of the evening.

Finally, the member for Eyre demanded an apology from me on behalf of his colleague, the Deputy Premier. I promise that I will do so on one condition: that he point out the remark in *Hansard*. Until he points out that part of the debate on which he wants a withdrawal, I am completely unable to do so.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I did not intend to speak on the O'Bahn system again but, because of the inanities put forward by the member for Mitcham approximately half an hour ago, I feel that some of the points he made must be corrected. First, he referred to a report by Mr Stewein from the department and quoted one sentence from it, but not the full article. Had he quoted the full article, he would have found that that officer was well and truly convinced—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN:—which, as the Minister points out, the member knew full well, because it points out clearly that Mr Stewein, the officer to whom he referred, is wholly behind the O'Bahn system. Just like his superiors and those of us who have done anything at all to study the system, he is fully convinced that it is not only going to work, but it will work extremely well and will make available to Adelaide one of the most modern, rapid transport systems anywhere in the world.

I refer the member for Mitcham to comments I made in my Budget speech where I quoted from an L.R.T. Magazine *Modern Tramway and Light Rail Transit* which shows only too clearly that it is only those light rail people who bury their heads in the sand who will not appreciate that a guided busway system is a system which combines all the advantages of light rail at a cost approximately one half that of the light rail systems themselves.

That article, as I pointed out in my earlier speech, also made quite clear that the system is going to be an excellent replacement for those cities that cannot afford or do not wish to waste the exorbitant amount of money required for light rail, which can only be recouped if there are high population densities to be moved. Then, that system is the answer, but unless one has high densities to move, it is not.

I am also glad that the member for Ascot Park has remained here, because last evening I must have spoken too quickly for him. He said he could not understand the points I made in relation to the concern I have about abuse of union power. I have been critical of abuse of union power for some time. I have not referred to the right of unions to disagree with management. I have spoken only of the disagreements occurring between union and union, the demarcation disputes.

I can speak from my previous employment, where far more time was lost at that company because of demarcation disputes than because of disputes between management and unions. We have also seen Australian National completely brought to a halt. All passengers throughout Australia who want to travel across Australia by rail cannot not do so because two unions are arguing over membership of one person. I would be delighted to hear members opposite address this House and explain why demarcation disputes

are reasonable and why management and owners of companies should be forced to lose profits rightfully theirs because of those disputes. Would they point out why the population at large should be held to ransom only because union management cannot get on with union management?

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: If members will only contain themselves; it has been pointed out to me that when they interject it is because we are hitting a soft spot. They do not like the truth to be heard. We saw that on the steps of Parliament House last week. They want to drown out logical argument because they do not want people to know there is another side of the story. I am a strong advocate, and have been for some time, of union amalgamation—from trade unions into industry unions. That would immediately remove all the possibilities of demarcation disputes.

I would like to refer to an excellent article in the I.R.A. Review of April/June 1981. It sets out an extremely good argument as to a way in which some of the disputes which are occurring at the moment could be resolved.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Members opposite believe that, because they are controlled by the unions, they have to carry on so that they get their preselection next time, and they also realise that the union management has too much to lose if some of these ideas are brought in. As I have said before, the idea of union management is, 'To hell with the members as long as we have got power.' If they were concerned about the worker himself they would not be stopping this chap in Port Pirie, with five children from working and every other employee in Australian National from working. I would agree with members opposite that it is not so long ago that management definitely gave the orders, and the employees did as they were told; conditions were totally abominable and quite unsatisfactory. Discipline by management was severe, and the rights of the worker were virtually non-existent. The point is that right at this moment the unions are now doing to the bosses, or the management, what the bosses or management—or whatever one wants to call them—once did to the workers. In other words, the pendulum has gone too far. Whereas previously there was an imbalance of power for the management, or the owner of a company, there is now an imbalance of power where unions, in fact, are now far too powerful for the good of this country.

Mr Slater: What is the answer to it?

Mr ASHENDEN: I will be coming to that in a moment. At the moment there are very few employers (I know of none) who do not acknowledge the necessity of the union movement. But as I have said, the unions are now far too strong. Not only are they too strong for their bosses, but they are also too strong for the ordinary working man. Again I make the point, we see time after time in the *Advertiser* that the workers or the employees say, 'We want to get back to work.' Why is it that the union management does not listen to them?

Employers, especially in the private sector, are definitely, whenever an industrial dispute arises, fighting a rearguard action. They know they are most unlikely to win any dispute with a union, and therefore they do not want to get into dispute with a union. The only question, whenever there is a dispute, that management has is, 'How much are we going to lose?' Every time management and unions come into dispute, it is the management which suffers the greatest.

Another consequence of union power which passes unreported, unfortunately, and which is far more important, in my opinion, is the damage that that union power is doing to the country in which we live. They are most irresponsible

in their attitude towards wages. When you talk to the ordinary working man, they come and ask—

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Members opposite think this is hilarious. I would be most happy for them to be present in my office on a number of occasions when unionists come to me and say, 'You are a Government supposedly supporting management. Why is it that you do not force these unions to allow us to go back to work? We want to work.' These are union members coming to me and saying this. They say it in the paper. Why is it that members opposite will not accept the fact that far too often union management is not representing the interests of their members.

A third consequence of the power of unions is the fact that they are determined to level the performance of all of the workers. They work out with management an arrangement on a production rate and they will try to get that production rate as low as they possibly can, regardless of the fact that there are many workers who would be delighted to produce at a greater rate. But they are not allowed to do so. I could give members opposite many examples of the way in which intimidation was carried out in the place of my previous employment as soon as any worker started to produce any more than the union management felt that he should. This was particularly true when the Vietnamese were employed by that company. They were prepared to work hard, but they were pretty quickly pulled into line. In other words, the productivity of this country is again being damaged by the irresponsible union management.

A McNair Anderson survey interviewed five classes of people to ask which group, or groups, are mainly responsible for this country's productivity not being greater. The answers were that 94 per cent of executives said unions, 82 per cent of public servants said unions and 73 per cent of workers said unions.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I am glad that the Minister is present because I would like to draw a matter to his attention. When I speak on railway matters, as the Minister himself has said in this House on a number of occasions, I know what I am talking about. An issue that has been drawn to my attention this week on Monday, Wednesday, and even today, is that the Outer Harbor morning service that picks up G.M.H. employees and other workers via Port Adelaide and Dry Creek to Elizabeth has been running on a number of occasions up to 20 minutes late. From talking to these workers I understand that this is not unusual and it affects approximately 80 to 100 workers each morning. These services being late are effectively denying these workers something like \$3 in their pay packet each time they are late.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: It may not concern the member for Mallee as to the amount of money they lose but it certainly concerns me and the employees at General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth. By way of illustration, I was advised by an employee that they lose approximately \$3 each time from their pay packet because of the unreliability of these services which run to G.M.H. at Elizabeth.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: What has the unreliability got to do with it?

Mr HAMILTON: I will come to that in a moment. I was advised by one employee that he receives only \$177 per week clear in his pay packet, and he can ill afford to lose money each time the service is late. Moreover, he advised me that his budget is now stretched to the limit to buy and pay for such necessities as food, rent, water, electricity,

education, and rail travel for himself, his wife and three children without having this unnecessary impost placed on his family.

Finally, train staff and G.M.H. employees alike operating and using this service have advised me that they believe that the lack of maintenance of mechanical parts and the new time tabling on the Outer Harbor services are both contributing to these delays. I have confirmed this by speaking to a number of railway men who operate these services. I have also spoken to a gentleman some 15 minutes ago who is now in the Chamber about the delay in those services. He informed me that the 4.10 p.m. train ex G.M.H. today from Elizabeth had only two carriages instead of the normal three. He understands, from talking to railway employees who operate that service, that it was due to another breakdown.

I ask the Minister, as I have done twice since I have been in this House at six-monthly intervals, to ascertain the number of breakdowns and the reasons why the Outer Harbor-Port Adelaide-Dry Creek-Elizabeth service is unreliable. We have heard a lot from the Government asking and extolling people to use public transport in South Australia, but one could not blame people for not using it if they were arriving late for work. The illustration was given to me that the train should arrive at G.M.H. at Elizabeth at 7.28 a.m. On 23 September it arrived at 7.58 a.m. at G.M.H. Subsequently 80 to 100 employees lost \$3 out of their pay packets.

I now come to some of the inane and stupid remarks made by the member for Todd about industrial relations. I will give him a classic example of how his cohorts treat the working man in this country. Last Tuesday morning at 12.28 a.m., a railway employee at Bridgewater (and the honourable member may laugh about this, but it is certainly not a laughing matter) lost two fingers of his hand and a knuckle of his thumb. That was due to an error being made by the central traffic control operator of Australian National. The employee was taken to hospital, arriving there at about 2.20 a.m. His wife was not notified of the accident until 2 o'clock that afternoon. So much for the feeling of management towards the workers in this country!

This woman rang me at a quarter to seven that morning asking me how best to go about informing her three lads about the accident and the injuries suffered by their father. The responsibility quite clearly on management and the welfare officer was not carried out. They were not concerned about the welfare of that woman, the three children, or the husband in hospital. Also, it was only pure luck that the explosives in that van, which collided with a stationary train, did not go off. There were four boxes of explosives in a van attached to the back of the engine.

Mr Ashenden: I acknowledge that management makes mistakes; why don't you acknowledge that unions make mistakes?

Mr HAMILTON: It is about time you people did. When you talk of costs in industrial disputes you should know, being involved in industry, that more time is lost through industrial accidents in this country than is lost in industrial disputes. A sum of \$926 000 000 was lost in the 1979-80 financial year because of industrial accidents—five times more than was lost through industrial disputation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: There are many occasions when industrial disputes are caused through lack of safety procedures. From my experience in the trade union movement, I can give numerous examples of this happening and of employees losing arms, legs or life because of a lack of adequate provision of such things as footpaths that people can walk along. To take an example: after one person lost his life,

the very next day a grader appeared to put a footpath in. The employers were frightened that the workers could (and this was an emotional issue) and would walk off the job.

Let this Government and the Federal Government look at industrial accidents in this country and do more than just pay lip service to the problems created in the community. It is not just loss of money, the stress and the emotional aspect should be considered by this Government. It disgusts me when I see incidents, such as that concerning my constituent, ignored. I think it is worth while raising this matter in this Parliament, even though it is a Federal matter. That very morning, but for the good offices of members of the union to which I still belong (the Australian Railway Union) in going on to the job at Mile End and talking to the boys, they would have been ready to walk off, and I would not have blamed them if they had done, because the lads down there stick like glue. I know only too damned well that an injury to one is an injury to all. It disgusts me when I hear members such as the member for Todd tipping the bucket over union officials all the time. I can remember many occasions when full-time officials in the union to which I belonged, during State-wide stoppages, lost the same pay as those chaps out on the grass. When there was a State-wide stoppage the trade union officials lost the same amount of pay.

Mr Mathwin: That's rare.

Mr HAMILTON: It may well be rare. I can speak from experience, because they were sincere. It was on very rare occasions that I saw an unnecessary dispute whilst I was President of their union.

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

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Before pursuing the stupidity of the A.M.I.E.U. and the A.C.T.U. in banning the export of live sheep from this country, I wish to refer to some of the points made by the member for Albert Park who, having completed his grievance, is now leaving the Chamber. If management had not responded in the way he has suggested, by immediately installing a footpath which was felt necessary by the workers—and presumably they drew it to the attention of management at that time—the workers would have gone on strike. He accused the employers of not providing the footpath and then said that they should not have provided it when they did. He implied that it would have been better had management not done anything and allowed the boys to go on strike. I cannot see any logic in that argument whatsoever. It leaves management (if we can identify a group of people as such) in a no-win situation. I wonder whether referring to those people as 'management' makes them separate from anyone else. I would not mind betting that those people in management positions would be members of unions themselves.

I wonder to which unions those people who failed to tell other people that explosives were on that train belonged, and I wonder whether the member for Albert Park would ostracise that union because of that omission. Another ridiculous argument I have heard today in relation to this matter was that demarcation disputes should be permitted to destroy the service provided by what I consider to be honourable men engaged in an honourable occupation.

The demarcation dispute is not really between the member on the job but between the union officials. They would do well to get their act together.

Mr Hamilton: That shows your lack of knowledge—

Mr LEWIS: I understand the sociology of trade unions probably a great deal better than the member for Albert Park. I put to him, as I have put to this House before, that the present method used to attempt to settle industrial

disputes, which we have been using for many decades, is not the best method. Consultation should be the cornerstone of any policy, and not confrontation. We know that the existing system of industrial—

Mr Hamilton: What about the Essential Services Bill?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park has had his opportunity.

Mr LEWIS:—courts uses a system where the adversary advocates of parties to a dispute sit before a judge, be it male or female, who is trained to listen to opposing arguments. By definition, then, there must be opposition; there must be confrontation and not consultation. It needs only one, not two or three parties to say that it disputes that something is legitimate for there to be a dispute; that is the conventional wisdom of industrial law.

The next matter that I wish to deal with is relevant to the matter I have just discussed, and it relates to the export of live sheep from this country. Prior to the adjournment of the previous debate this afternoon, I concluded my remarks by quoting from a report entitled 'Examination of the Employment Implications of Live Sheep Exports—Findings of the Examination of Wool Technology and Sheep Breeding, by G. Miller. The report is dated December 1978, volume 26, number 4, at pages 9 to 15.

I will now consider what will happen if we ban live sheep exports in the way in which the A.M.I.E.U. and the A.C.T.U. have advocated. The qualifications I made during my contribution to the Budget debate should be noted. It is evident that the live sheep trade generates jobs. The situation is unlikely to have changed this year, because more live sheep have been exported this year.

Mr Slater: Who writes these speeches for you—Grant Andrews?

Mr LEWIS: Certainly not. If the honourable member had been paying attention to the remarks I have made on this subject recently, he would realise that I acknowledge, and always have acknowledged, the assistance of the Department of Agriculture and the marketing research unit. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it a purely statistical table of the origin of live sheep exported from South Australia for 1979-80 and 1980-81.

Leave granted.

ORIGIN OF SHEEP EXPORTED LIVE FROM SOUTH AUSTRALIA

	S.A.	Vic.	N.S.W.	Total
1979-80	884 814	642 788	333 244	1 860 901
1980-81	1 036 218	645 716	184 206	1 866 140

Mr LEWIS: From this table, one can see that sheep coming from other States amount to about the same number as the number of South Australian sheep. In the two years 1979-80 and 1980-81, there was a total of about 1 860 000 in each case. There was some variation in the proportion that came from South Australia and that which came from New South Wales and Victoria. However, South Australia benefits relatively more than do other States from the job creation effects of the live sheep trade not only in regard to providing transport and personnel who load the sheep on to the vessels but also in regard to the maintenance and preparation of those vessels before the live stock can be loaded. Indeed, I will detail the effects, the benefits and jobs.

The most important are in relation to the stock feed mills. Honourable members must recall that this State and this country enjoy the benefit of cheaper pet food as a result of the overheads in the stock food mills being met in no small way by the contribution to their costs by the sheep feed that is manufactured in the premises to feed the live

sheep during their transit voyage from Australia to their destination. Those companies include milling industries in Adelaide and Murray Bridge and De-hy Fodders of Meningie. Those industries take from my electorate a substantial proportion of the material that they use as does another company—although not to the same extent—J. T. Johnson & Sons of Kapunda. A new venture, Mount Acres, at Gurrui is also involved. For the benefit of honourable members who do not know where Gurrui is, I can tell them that it is somewhere between Alawoona in the north and Pinnaroo/Lameroo in the southern part of the Mallee. Some indifferent curious looks on the faces on members opposite indicate their ignorance of South Australian geography outside the metropolitan area.

Mr Slater: Be kind! That's a bit hard.

Mr LEWIS: There are only three Opposition members in the House, and they do not have the price of a wit between them. Lesser amounts of sheep pellets are produced in Victoria than elsewhere and are needed to service the sheep that are exported from those places.

I now refer to the quotas on live sheep exports, and I will indicate some of their effects. If the A.C.T.U. quota arrangement was accepted by the Government or imposed by the union, the effect on the live sheep trade would be disastrous. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical table showing the carcass equivalent of live sheep and sheep meat exports by destination for 1979-80.

Leave granted.

CARCASS EQUIVALENT OF LIVE SHEEP AND SHEEP MEAT EXPORTS BY DESTINATION 1979-80

Destination	Number of Sheep Carcass*	Number of Lamb Carcass*	Number of Live sheep**	Total
Iran	717 850	1 145 558	1 781 000	3 644 438
Kuwait	166 500	253 059	1 632 000	2 051 559
Oman	236 050	22 294	—	258 344
Qatar	28 950	7 529	189 000	225 479
Saudi Arabia	338 800	180 000	1 161 000	1 679 800
Abu Dh'abi	69 400	169 235	—	238 635
Dubai	171 150	362 294	—	533 444
Bahrain	42 450	22 588	112 000	177 038
Iraq	—	—	—	—
South Yemen	—	—	100 000	100 000
Jordan	—	2 941	—	2 941
Lebanon	3 900	2 941	—	6 841
Israel	1 450	18 118	—	19 568
Egypt	670 650	—	—	670 650
Libya	—	—	595 000	595 000
Sub Total				
Middle East	2 447 150	2 186 587	5 570 000	10 203 737

CARCASS EQUIVALENT OF LIVE SHEEP AND SHEEP MEAT EXPORTS BY DESTINATION 1979-80—continued

Destination	Number of Sheep Carcass*	Number of Lamb Carcass*	Number of Live sheep**	Total
Canada	183 550	65 529	—	249 079
Japan	3 357 950	162 294	—	3 520 244
UK	375 300	123 118	—	498 418
USSR	1 859 650	—	—	1 859 650
USA	31 950	290 176	—	322 126
Singapore	—	—	88 000	88 000
Malaysia	—	—	—	—
Mauritius	—	—	1 000	1 000
Others	823 800	216 235	—	1 040 035
Total	9 079 350	3 043 939	5 659 000	17 782 289

Source: A.M.L.C. and D.P.I.

* Estimated by dividing carcass weight by average weight of sheep and lambs slaughtered in Australia.

** Includes sheep for slaughter only.

Mr LEWIS: This table shows that in a good many instances no live sheep or carcasses could have been exported from this country if that kind of formula had been adhered to. When I speak next in this House, I will detail statistically how destinations of various kinds of meat products and live sheep illustrate that point.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ASHENDEN: I refer to a comment made by the member for Albert Park a short while ago when he was about to relate to the House a very serious incident involving an employee of Australian National, who evidently suffered quite serious injuries. I was not aware of the topic that the member was about to raise, but before he started his discussion he stated words to the effect that I found the situation humorous, or hilarious, or words to that effect. I want to assure the House that the amusement I showed was not in any way as the result of comments that the member had either made or was about to make. It was an incident being shared by myself and another member on this side of the House at which I was laughing. It had nothing to do with the comments either preceding or subsequent to the comments that the member for Albert Park made in relation to that serious accident, which obviously I regret very greatly.

Motion carried.

At 5.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 20 October at 2 p.m.