

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 18 August 1981

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ADELAIDE TRUNK SEWER

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Adelaide Trunk Sewer—War Memorial Drive to Torrens Road (Relocation and Replacement).

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (The Hon. K. T. Griffin)—
Pursuant to Statute—

Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Salisbury. Stop Lamps and Road Trains.
State Transport Authority—Schedule of Land Disposed of, 1980-81.

By the Attorney-General for the Minister of Local Government (The Hon. C. M. Hill)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980—Section 5 (f): Statement of Land Resumed.
Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Teachers Registration Fees.
Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Rock Lobster Pot Fees.
Sewerage Act, 1929-1977—Regulations—Plumbing Advisory Board.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (The Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board—Report, 1979-80.
Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—Fees.
Glazed Pottery and Methapyrilene.
Forestry Act, 1950-1974—Section 2b: Part of Forest Reserve Resumed—Proclamation.
National Parks and Wildlife Service—Report, 1978-79—Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (The Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Credit Union Stabilization Board—Report, 1980-81.

QUESTIONS

DEBTS REPAYMENT SCHEME

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about debts repayment legislation.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: Last year I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs whether his Government intended to proceed with the setting up of the debts repayment scheme, legislation for which was passed in 1978 in this Parliament following a Select Committee report with which the Minister was involved. Initially, the Minister advised that the Government was considering the matter, and said in this Council:

We are also waiting on changes that were being considered at the Federal level in relation to the Bankruptcy Act.

That was one of the reasons given by the Minister for the fact that no decision was made last year on whether to proceed with that legislative scheme. On 27 November last

year, the Minister confirmed that the Government did not intend to proclaim and bring into operation the Debts Repayment Act and related legislation. Can the Minister say what were the changes to the Bankruptcy Act referred to by him? How have these changes lessened the need for debts repayment legislation? If changes to the Federal bankruptcy legislation are not relevant to the decision not to implement the scheme, why did the Government not proceed with its implementation?

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: Any changes to the Federal bankruptcy legislation and the changes that were being considered related to small bankruptcies and to something very similar to the Debts Repayment Act on a Federal basis. The Government does not intend to proceed with the proposed debts repayment legislation at this time.

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister answer my question? Why has the Government decided not to proceed with the scheme? Were the amendments to the Federal Bankruptcy Act referred to by the Minister in fact implemented?

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I do not think that it is appropriate to state for what reason something is not proceeded with.

GROWERS MARKETS

The **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about growers markets.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON**: I think all honourable members are aware of the pressure from growers in the Virginia-Angle Vale area for a growers market. They have been seeking this growers market as an alternative to the present marketing system in the hope that they will be able to sell some of their surplus produce in that way. In answer to a question in another place, the Minister of Agriculture indicated that he was very involved in this whole matter; that he had helped the growers to obtain a piece of land from the State Transport Authority, and that he hoped that this would resolve their problems. Last night the Salisbury council refused the growers committee permission to use the State Transport Authority land for a growers market, even on a temporary basis. Has the Minister of Agriculture any alternative plan to assist the growers, or will he let the whole matter drop now that the Salisbury council has refused permission in that way?

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

DEBTS REPAYMENT SCHEME

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about debts repayment legislation.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: As I said in my earlier explanation, in 1978 this Parliament passed a scheme of legislation to provide particularly for the payment of small debts. The legislation was passed after considerable debate in this Parliament and after this Council had set up a Select Committee to investigate it, with the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr DeGaris participating on that Select Committee.

Following the report of that committee the legislation was passed. Before the 1979 election, the Labor Govern-

ment was investigating the administrative requirements that would be necessary to enable the legislation to be introduced. A report was prepared just before the election by the departments concerned—the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs and the Department of Community Welfare—and that report was made available at the time to the Minister.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: At a substantial cost.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That may be, but now we have a situation in which a law has been passed by this Parliament and this Government has decided not to proceed with it. The Minister has attempted to confuse the issue by stating that the failure to proceed is related somehow to Federal legislation. What I find intolerable is that, when the Minister was asked directly why the Government had decided not to proceed with the scheme, his answer to the Parliament, which has passed the law, is that he does not think it is appropriate for Parliament to know why the Government has not proceeded with legislation passed by the Parliament. I find that quite unacceptable, and so should other members of this Council. Accordingly, I now ask the Minister whether he will outline to this Council the reasons for the Government's deciding not to proceed with this law passed by the Parliament.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not prepared to outline that to the Council. I point out that it was a different Parliament and a different Government.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, or possibly in his own capacity, and as a man of compassion, regarding pensioner hospital beds.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: This morning I was approached by a constituent from the Unley area concerning section 34 beds. For honourable members who are not aware of what section 34 beds are, I point out that they are pensioner beds, beds funded by the Commonwealth for pensioners, holding a pensioner health benefit card, in community hospitals. This was an initiative of the Whitlam Government, but until 31 August, that is, until the end of this month, the funding for these beds has been continued by the Fraser Government. There are 109 such beds available in community hospitals in the Adelaide area altogether but, at midnight on 31 August, they will cease to exist. This will cause enormous distress in the community not only for those people who happen to be occupying them at that time but also for the many pensioners who have been put in those beds from time to time, for a whole variety of reasons, by their general practitioners.

My constituent is a lady who cares for a frail 81-year-old mother at home, and she also has a 22-year-old intellectually handicapped son living with her at home. Both of these persons require 24-hour care, seven days a week. All three persons are pensioners and are quite unable to afford any medical or hospital insurance. From 1 September the frail aged mother will not have access any longer to the respite section 34 beds which were previously available to her at Ashford Community Hospital.

I might say that this is not in any way a contrived story. I have the constituent's name and address, and I should be very pleased to supply it to the Minister. Indeed, I am quite happy to show it to the press, provided that I have an undertaking that it is not published in any way. The lady concerned has made quite clear to me that she does not

wish to go public, and the reason that she gave for this is that she wants to retain what little dignity she has left.

I thought that this might perhaps be one of the worst cases that has come to my attention under the new arrangements but, on making inquiries this morning of social workers around Adelaide, I learnt that this was only one case in hundreds. It is virtually impossible for these sorts of people to get into respite beds in Government hospitals.

This lady has previously been able, with the assistance of her local general practitioner, to put her 81-year-old frail mother into one of the pensioner beds at the Ashford Community Hospital and to get away for what she considers to be a short break to enable her to retain her sanity. That break involves her spending a short time out of Adelaide, with her intellectually handicapped son, with relatives. To her, that is a break, a treat and a luxury. Even that will be denied her under the arrangements made for after 31 August.

I should be perfectly happy for the Minister of Community Welfare to respond to this question, or for the Minister of Health to reply thereto if that is considered to be more appropriate. Has the Minister made any alternative arrangements for pensioner patients in community hospitals after 31 August? If so, when does he or she intend to announce them? If not, what advice does the Minister of Community Welfare or the Minister of Health suggest that I give to my constituent?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The question is clearly one for my colleague, the Minister of Health, in another place. I will therefore refer it to her and bring back a reply.

DEBTS REPAYMENT SCHEME

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In view of the failure of the Minister of Consumer Affairs to provide the Parliament with the Government's reasons for not proceeding with the debts repayment legislation passed by this Parliament, will the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Council (this having been a Government decision), outline to the Council those reasons?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Minister of Community Welfare has not failed to do anything. Indeed, the Minister gave some answers last year in relation to the debts repayment legislation. They were clear.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: You've got to be joking.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: They were clear last year, and on this occasion the Minister has again given answers to the questions that the Leader has asked. I will seek information and, if it is appropriate, bring back a reply.

REMARK THEATRE COMPLEX

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Education, a question regarding the Renmark theatre complex.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Some four years ago there was a project, which was the subject of investigation by the Public Works Standing Committee, to build a theatre complex at Renmark. Of all the witnesses who appeared before the committee, no voice was raised in opposition to the building of this theatre, which was to be situated on the same site as the Riverland Community College, high school and primary school, the students of which, as well as a great many members of the community, were to have access to it. In fact, it was intended that the complex would be used from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m. each week day, and it was

believed that the theatre would have very heavy weekend use. It was to cost \$1 150 000, and was to serve an area comprising at least 26 000 people. Of course, there are not very many people in that area. As its building was recommended by the PWSC and no doubt all the departmental planning paperwork was finalised, will the Minister say why the project has not been commenced? Will the theatre be built within the foreseeable future?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague, the Minister of Education, in another place and bring back a reply.

FIRE BRIGADE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister representing the Chief Secretary say how many firemen or officers have retired from the South Australian Fire Brigade in the past five years? What were the periods of service of those firemen or officers? Were any superannuation lump sum payments made to those retiring and, if so, what amounts of money were so paid?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare provide information to the Council on the scheme for a friend or mentor to be used in cases of juvenile offenders? How many juveniles have been placed under the care of such a mentor or friend?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not sure of the number. A very small number of youths so far have been placed under the supervision of such a mentor. The procedure is that the young offender is placed on a bond and it is a condition of the bond that he consult with the mentor and co-operate with him. Briefly, the scheme is that the mentor is someone of some prominence in the community—a trade union official, a businessman, or someone of that kind—to whom the young offender can relate, someone whom he himself has nominated as being a person he could relate to and look up to. The scheme is still being developed, and I can ascertain for the Leader the numbers involved. However, I know that it is a very small number.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How long has it been in operation?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I can let the Leader know. It has been operating for only a short time—I believe a few months. It has to be carefully worked out to ensure that it will work. It is not desirable that it be put into operation if it will not work. I do not know the length of time or the numbers involved, but I will ascertain that information for the Leader. The scheme in broad outline is perfectly clear and has commenced its operation.

ELECTRONIC CHECK-OUT SYSTEMS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On 4 November 1980, in response to a question from my colleague, the Hon. B. A. Chatterton, with regard to electronic check-out systems, the Minister of Consumer Affairs said that the matter was to be discussed again by the Standing Committee of Consumer Affairs Ministers. What are the results of the discussions on electronic check-out systems? Does the Government approve of their introduction in South Australia and, if so, on what terms and conditions?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: At the meeting of the Standing Committee of Consumer Affairs Ministers referred to, I raised the matter. I moved a resolution to the effect that the operation of such systems should be considered by a working party of officers from the various States. The States, as I recall, were South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, and I think the Commonwealth and the Standards Association were also involved.

The working party was set up and, as I had moved the resolution, it was convened by a South Australian officer. It has met on a number of occasions and has concluded that so far it cannot see the need for legislation in this area. However, it has called on the industries concerned to set up a code of conduct, a code of ethics, that those industries consider appropriate. That has not yet been done; the industries have not reported back. They were asked to do this only recently, and the matter is still very much alive.

Regarding the question whether the Government approves or disapproves, I do not think there is any question whether it does or does not. If the Government does not propose to take action and if it will allow such a system to be introduced into South Australia, it will be subject to what the working party is considering, namely, a code of conduct. This Government, along with all Australian Governments, will have to consider the code of conduct when it is brought back.

I believe that only one such system is operating in South Australia; that is at one metropolitan outlet, and it is not fully operative. This outlet does not use the bar coding system but a manual coding system that is fed in by the operator when she operates a checkout. The system is not yet fully operating in South Australia.

It seems to me that it is highly desirable that the checkout slip indicate the price of each item, and that can be done fairly easily. In such cases, the consumer obtains a much better and more comprehensive list of the goods and their prices than he does under the present manual system, where a list of figures only is obtained. These systems can be operated and subject to what the working party comes up with. I believe they should be operated on the basis that, say, 4 kilogrammes of potatoes is shown at a certain price and a packet of cereal is shown at a certain price, so that the consumer ends up with a more comprehensive list of the items than he receives at present.

The big question mark is whether there should be item pricing—whether the price should be marked on each item or whether it is sufficient for the price to be marked on the shelf only. Obviously, it would be better, if it could be economically achieved, that each item be marked, but that takes away the point of the system and is very expensive. The problem is how the consumer can be sure that the price that appears on the checkout slip, the price the consumer is charged, is the price marked on the shelf. I have seen these units operating and they have been demonstrated to me: the price can be very quickly changed at the checkout point. Admittedly, on the checkout slip that the consumer obtains is shown not only the date but also the time of purchase, so this can be nailed down fairly closely. The cost of item pricing is very high. One large New South Wales chain estimated that item pricing would cost it \$1 000 000 a year.

An approach which has been taken in the United States and which is doubtless being considered by the industries in regard to the code they adopt is to make it compulsory for stores to provide, free of charge to the consumer, a marking pencil so that the consumer, if he wishes, can mark the price on the items. He can then ensure that the price matches up with the price charged. To summarise: the matter is still being considered by the working party. We

are waiting for the answer of industry as to a code of conduct.

NOISE CONTROL

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. An article in the *Advertiser* of 8 April this year stated that a report of a working party into noise contained recommendations about action that could be taken to reduce noise in various areas. The Minister's department was involved in this working party, and 20 recommendations were made. What action, if any, does the Government intend to take on this working party report?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: And will he tell us.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, and will the Minister tell us what the Government intends?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not mind stating facts or proposed courses of action, but when I am asked reasons why a Government has or has not done something, I do not believe it is necessarily always even practicable to reply, because it is not known how reasons were weighed in the balance and by how many different members of the Government. Among other things, the working party inquired into noise from licensed premises. The input into the working party was from the Department of Environment and Planning, the Chief Secretary's department, which involved the police, and from my department, which is responsible for licensed premises.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: From the Adelaide City Council?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It was an observer. All three departments are now considering the implementation of those recommendations, but they have not come up with a final answer. I cannot say what action is intended; the department has not yet worked out the implementation. The recommendations are being considered and the Government is most concerned to try to resolve this matter.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about women's shelters.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The recent tragic axe death case illustrated, if illustration was needed, the great need for women's shelters in our community. The women's shelters that currently exist are always full and, in fact, on occasions have to turn women away because they do not have room to accommodate them. There are currently seven women's shelters in the metropolitan area and four in country areas, but I understand that the suggestion of a new women's shelter in the country was knocked back recently.

In this morning's newspaper the Minister is reported as saying that his department has great concern for ethnic communities in understanding their cultural values and providing help for them. Yet I understand that his department recently turned down a firm proposal for a women's shelter to cater specifically for women of ethnic communities, providing them with help in understanding the cultural background from which these women came. We hear continual talk about a further cutback of \$22 000 000 that this Government is to implement across the board, and we have been told that this will certainly apply in the areas of education and health. The implied threat is that it will apply also across the welfare field.

Can the Minister assure us that the existing women's shelters will continue to be funded to the same or an

improved level in the coming State Budget? Will he reconsider supporting a new shelter for women from ethnic communities, because it is badly needed?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I think that the honourable member who asked this question will know the actions of the Federal Government in relation to women's shelters.

The Hon. Anne Levy: That's why I am asking you.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: All right; I just said that you would know that. What applied previously was that the Federal Government provided 75 per cent of the on-going funding and the State Government 25 per cent. In relation to capital funding it was a 50-50 arrangement. The Federal Government announced that it was no longer going to have that direct involvement in women's shelters but that it had included in the payment into general revenue of the South Australian Government the amount paid to women's shelters in South Australia last year plus 10 per cent. The South Australian Government will honour that and pick up its own 25 per cent and 50 per cent respectively.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Plus 10 per cent.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, of the 10 per cent increase. The total State and Federal funding will be at last year's level plus 10 per cent. I think that has been made clear to the shelters themselves. We are not in a position to undertake any considerable increase at the present time. In relation to the matter raised by the honourable member in relation to the proposed ethnic shelter, that has not been turned down. In the first place, the department has suggested some alternatives to the people proposing to set up that shelter. In the second place, it is still being considered whether or not it may be possible to fund that shelter. It has not been turned down.

I think the principal answer to the honourable member's question is that funding will be maintained for the total women's shelter movement on the same basis as last year plus 10 per cent. The allocation of that total funding will be decided by the department on the basis of the claims that are made by the women's shelters and after discussion with the Women's Shelters Advisory Committee. Some may get that or more and some may get that or less. The total funding to women's shelters in South Australia in this financial year will be at last year's level plus 10 per cent.

MOTOR REGISTRATION BRANCHES

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: Does the Attorney-General have a reply to a question I asked about political material on 16 July?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: On checking the allegation it was found that the offending material had already been removed from the typewriter. The staff of the office have been advised that it is not appropriate to display such material.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Does the Attorney-General have a reply to a question I asked about motor registration branches on 16 July?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member has not stated the days or times of day he attended the Motor Registration Division's Prospect branch office at North Park Shopping Centre. However, Fridays and the 12-2 p.m. period on any day are particularly busy in the division's offices. The Prospect office has sufficient staff to cope with expected normal work loads but some delay can occur during peak periods.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Does the Attorney-General

have a reply to a question I asked on 22 July about foreign ownership?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: As foreign investment is a Federal matter, I suggest that the honourable member approach the Federal Government.

SOCIAL WORKERS

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about social workers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The committee for the review of commonwealth functions, commonly known as 'The Razor Gang', has recommended wide ranging reductions in Commonwealth activities. In the Department of Social Security a review team has been established to examine the role and responsibilities of social workers with a view to scaling down the department's Social Welfare Division. In fact, the Chairman of the Commonwealth Public Service Board is reported to have said on 6 May 1981:

... retrenchments, if any, were most likely to affect specialised staff in regional areas and might include such staff as social workers in the country.

The Commonwealth Professional Officers' Association believes that the social welfare staff in regional offices may be cut in half.

The review team—chaired by Alan Usher of the Commonwealth Public Service Board—is charged with reporting by 31 August 1981. It is believed that it will report to Cabinet to allow any reductions in staff to be effected this financial year. The Minister for Social Security, Senator Chaney, in a letter to the *Financial Review* on 24 July 1981 seemed to extend the inquiry by referring to the roles of State and local government and their responsibility, implying that those levels of Government should perhaps be contemplating helping the Commonwealth out.

In view of the very narrow nature of the inquiry, which in no way takes into account the pressures on staff in the Commonwealth Department of Social Security, I ask the following questions. Has the Minister or his department received any notification of the inquiry from Senator Chaney? Has the Minister or his department made a submission to the inquiry, particularly on the capacity of the department to take up the extra demand that would be placed on community welfare resources if the Department of Social Security reduced its social work staff in South Australia. Will he inform the Council of its contents?

Did the Minister or the Director-General of his department meet with the review team when they were in Adelaide on either a formal or an informal basis? What, if any, assurances or undertakings were given to the inquiry team if such a meeting did take place and is it within the capacity of the department for those assurances to be met? Will the Minister endeavour to find out how many social work positions are involved in the review team's enquiry in South Australia and what functions are performed by those social workers?

Does the Minister regard the positions under review as being State responsibilities? As the major social work activities of the Department of Social Security are related to the income maintenance functions of the Commonwealth and to helping staff deal with a larger number of clients, would there be any scope for accepting social work responsibilities from the Commonwealth?

Does the Department for Community Welfare have a policy of preference for families in need of social worker counselling and the like, and would this mean that, if the Commonwealth reduced its social work staff by half, such

people as single persons, the elderly, supporting parents, and others who constitute a large part of the Commonwealth work load, would be put on the end of the very long community welfare queue?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: First, I remind the honourable member that supporting parents and their problems are very much a family problem. They are not something separated from the family. The honourable member has asked a large number of very pertinent and detailed questions. The only way that I can provide her with an adequate reply is to investigate the matters, consult the department and bring down a reply, which I undertake to do.

TRAIN LIGHTING

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about lighting on trains.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: From time to time there have been requests for better illumination on trains, and examples have been quoted of accidents or near-misses involving trains that have not been sufficiently illuminated. Last weekend my attention was drawn to an accident which may well have been fatal and which resulted, so I am informed, from inadequate lighting on a train operated by Australian National. Will the Attorney discuss this matter with the Minister of Transport and ask him to seek from Australian National an assurance that more adequate lighting will be provided on trains operated by them?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

LETTERS OF INTRODUCTION

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question that I asked on 22 July concerning letters of introduction?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the question is 'Yes'.

RIVERLAND CANNERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 4 August about the Riverland cannery?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Department of Agriculture will advise growers to remove trees of unwanted varieties such as those with red centres for which no payable market exists for the canned product. Receiver/managers, grower industry groups, and the Department of Agriculture agree that production of desirable varieties must be maintained for the time being despite the fact that between 40 per cent and 50 per cent of the fruit may not be required this season. This is necessary because, first, the vagaries of the season at harvest time can cause severe losses and therefore there is a need to produce more than projected intake; secondly, if substantial areas of trees are removed the volume of fruit available in future will, in itself, determine the fate of the Riverland Fruit Products Cannery; thirdly, the canned fruit market has always shown marked changes in sales volume over short periods; and, fourthly, the future ownership/marketing arrangements of the cannery may require increased production.

Once growers are informed of their quota, the Department of Agriculture can give advice as to 'least cost' means

of managing those trees with production surplus to requirements. The feasibility of a green drop approach is under discussion. Obviously, many growers will suffer financial hardship as a result of the quotas. Considerable work has already been done in developing measures whereby such hardship can be effectively and equitably alleviated. Now that the likely quota levels are known, these proposed measures will be finalised and recommendations placed before the Director-General and Minister as a matter of urgency.

BUILDERS TRIBUNAL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On 25 June 1981 the Government appointed to the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal 12 part-time members. Previously, there had only been a panel of four who were called upon to sit with the chairman of the tribunal, a Local and District Criminal Court judge. This will undoubtedly weaken the board's professionalism and expertise. I understand that one of those appointees has had a case before the Builders Licensing Board and been adversely reported on. Further, I understand that one of the appointees currently is involved in proceedings before the Builders Licensing Board or the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal. First, why has the number of part-time members been increased? Secondly, have any of the appointees or companies with which they are involved been the subject of proceedings before the Builders Licensing Board or the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal and, if so, what was the outcome of the proceedings? Finally, if so, why did the Minister not ascertain this information before making the appointments?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The reason why the number was increased was to widen the total expertise available to the tribunal. I am not aware of the particular matters which the honourable member has raised. He properly has not indicated names, but I will ascertain from him the names of the persons to whom he alludes and obtain details as to whether those builders or their companies have been involved in proceedings before the board and bring down a reply.

KANGAROO ISLAND SOLDIER SETTLERS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Lands, a question regarding Kangaroo Island soldier settlers' debts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I ask this question because I have asked similar questions in the past but have not received any answers. Briefly, the background to the question is that, during the term of office of the Hon. Tom Casey as Minister of Lands, when an announcement was made regarding the writing-off of soldier settlers' debts, it was stated that those settlers who could not continue economically to farm their properties would have their leases terminated and their debts written off. That public statement was made by the Minister. It was very interesting looking through *Hansard*, as the member for Alexandra, in a speech in another place, also confirmed that that was the situation.

In reply to a previous question that I asked, the Minister of Lands stated that there was, in fact, a secret clause to

that situation and that the termination of the debts would apply only if the settlers left their properties voluntarily. It was never stated publicly that this was a requirement. Rather, it was meant that the settlers should make a voluntary response, and that they would then have their debts cancelled.

I followed up the matter with another question, in which I read a letter which has been referred to on the island as the 'jack boots' letter and which was sent to the settlers demanding that they leave their properties. That letter, which stated that the soldier settlers' stock would be mustered and sold, did not seem to leave much room for a voluntary or involuntary response.

I therefore ask again what the Minister of Lands considers to be a voluntary response by soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island, and how do they qualify to have their debts cancelled.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Lands and bring back a reply.

HANSARD

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Deputy Premier, a question regarding the printing of *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: A number of people who regularly receive *Hansard* have complained to me that the South Australian *Hansard*, unlike the Federal *Hansard*, is posted tightly rolled and in a wrapping that is difficult to remove without one's tearing the *Hansard* at the same time. The Federal *Hansard* is posted flat, so that no such difficulties are experienced. Furthermore, because of this, the Federal *Hansard* is very much easier to read, as one does not have to try to back-roll the copies which have been rolled in one direction.

It has also been suggested to me that our *Hansard* could well follow the Federal example in publishing proceedings of the Legislative Council separately from those of the House of Assembly, as the Senate *Hansard* is printed in a different volume from that of the House of Representatives.

Would the Minister consider seeing that South Australian *Hansard* is posted flat rather than rolled? Also, would he consider publishing the *Hansard* report of the proceedings of our two Houses of Parliament in separate volumes?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Deputy Premier and bring back a reply.

WOMEN PRISONERS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. Do any women in gaol in South Australia have children less than 12 months old?
2. Are any of these mothers allowed to have their children in gaol with them, as happens in New South Wales?
3. Is there any Government policy of encouraging mothers of young children to have their children in gaol with them, and, if so, what criteria are used for individual cases?
4. If there is no such Government policy, will the Government consider instituting such a policy in recognition of the principle that it is a young child's right, rather than privilege, to have access to its mother's care?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (for Hon. C. M. Hill): The reply is as follows:

1. Yes, one only.
2. Child born during the term of imprisonment and in centre with mother.
3. Women are permitted to have their children in gaol with them. There have been instances where the child was born whilst the mother was under sentence and has been permitted to look after the child at the institution.
Generally, the Department of Correctional Services prefers not to have children over nine months in the institution because of the dangers of the child becoming institutionalised. Further, the Department of Correctional Services prefers that women serving very short sentences make other arrangements for people to look after their children unless the mother is nursing the child. Women with small children are also permitted daily visits to ensure regular contact is maintained.
4. Not applicable.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 6 August. Page 342.)

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): In the past few weeks, there has been some public comment regarding the value of the Address in Reply debate. I think all honourable members will recognise that it is an opportunity for them to speak on matters that are of interest to them and on matters that honourable members discern to be of interest to the community. Although some honourable members will take the opportunity to praise Governments, others will take the opportunity to criticise Governments. Notwithstanding that, I believe that the Address in Reply debate is an important part of the proceedings of this Parliament, and particularly of this Council. However, it is appropriate, in the light of some of the matters that have been raised during the course of the debate, at least to provide some answers to those various matters.

Although some people might believe that that is inappropriate, nevertheless if those who speak want to raise certain issues and even to criticise, they must expect that some other honourable members will take the opportunity to respond and to put on the comments a different complexion from that which members sought to give to those matters.

Before dealing with the specific matters that were raised by various members during the course of the debate, it is appropriate for me to record my personal congratulations to the Hon. Ren DeGaris on the honour that has been bestowed upon him, and to indicate my view that such an award was one of considerable merit.

At the commencement of this session, on the occasion of recording in this Council our resolution of sympathy on the death of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and our recognition of his service to the South Australian community, I made a number of remarks about Sir Thomas's long and distinguished period of service.

The first question of substance to which I want to address attention relates to the performance of the Government upon which the Leader of the Opposition and other members have cast some reflection.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I did not even mention the performance—turn it up!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Opposition has criticised the performance of the Government during the course of this debate.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I talked about committees, the Legislative Council and all sorts of things.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will clarify it by putting it into the general context of the Opposition, if that will make the Leader happier. The Opposition did make some criticism of the Government's performance which needs to be commented upon. It is important for this Council and the community at large to recognise that the Government has honoured a significant majority of its election promises. The Government tackled the depressed state of South Australia when it came into office with a great sense of purpose and energy and is in fact honouring the commitment which it gave at the last election to get South Australia moving again.

We are getting South Australia moving again in spite of, amongst other things, the costly white elephants of the previous Labor Government. They encompass Samcor, the frozen food factory, Monarto, the Land Commission, loans to enterprises which were being propped up without success at a cost of tens of millions of dollars and, more recently, the very significant difficulties that we have had with the Riverland cannery. That, of course, does not set out comprehensively the depressed state of the South Australian economy at the time this Government came to office. But it does indicate, amongst other things, that we were saddled with a number of problem areas which we have diligently attempted to resolve and in which we are making some progress. I think the most significant area which requires comment is the area of resource development and, coupled with that, the new investment that has occurred within South Australia since the election in September 1979.

I will deal first with Roxby Downs, about which quite a deal has already been said in Parliament and in the wider community. People need to recognise that, if Roxby Downs is developed to the extent that it will be, it will be a bigger operation than even Mount Isa in Queensland. Many people believe that it will be a much larger operation than Mount Isa. It will directly employ between 3 000 and 4 000 people and support a township ultimately with more than 20 000 people. It is important to know that presently at Roxby Downs 200 people are employed, about 100 having been employed in the past 12 months.

Preliminary indications are that the area of Roxby Downs has one of the largest concentrations of copper in the world. Grades of mineable proportions could average more than 1.5 per cent copper and about .05 per cent uranium oxide. It ought to be recognised that there are significant other zones of higher grade ores in that area. Progress at the mine site by the companies involved with Roxby Downs, Western Mining Corporation in particular, is continuing steadily. A major exploration shaft is now being constructed. It is planned that that shaft will reach a depth of over 500 metres and will remove samples for testing. These tests will indicate the best way to mine the ore that is available at Roxby Downs. At the same time 13 diamond drills are operating with a view to determining the exact extent of the huge deposit. All this work is costing the joint venture partners over \$1 000 000 a month, and expenditures, by the time the evaluation is completed, are expected to amount to over \$60 000 000. According to an Adelaide mining engineer and stockbroker, Mr Shierlaw, even at this early stage of exploration, Roxby Downs can be fairly classified as the world's single richest concentration of minerals discovered in 50 years. At 1979 prices, Mr Shierlaw has estimated that these minerals have a total in-ground value of about \$50 000 000 000. It has already been indicated by the Minister of Mines and Energy that a mining operation on the scale envisaged could ultimately yield South Australia up to \$50 000 000 a year in royalties and major industrial expansions involving the creation of 5 000

permanent new jobs at the mine and many more in-service industries.

There a number of other projects in the resources development area. Exploration licences approved in South Australia have almost trebled since mid-1979. At the end of 1980 there were 361 mineral exploration licences current, compared with 123 licences current at the end of June 1979. These figures reflect the tremendous upsurge in exploration activity since this Government took office. During 1980 about \$21 000 000 was spent on mineral exploration in South Australia—double the expenditure of the previous year. One would have noticed articles appearing in the daily newspapers within the last few days in regard to the extensive off-shore area now under exploration and the plans to drill once more off-shore in South Australia.

The Cooper Basin producers are pursuing with considerable vigor their plans for a liquids pipeline from the Cooper Basin. It is not always realised that the Cooper Basin, as well as supplying natural gas to Adelaide and Sydney and some country towns and cities along the way, contains considerable reserves of crude oil. These are presently put at 5 per cent of Australia's total reserves, and development of them is desirable. An environmental impact statement for a pipeline, terminal and shipping facilities has been released for public comment and examination by the Federal and State Environment Departments. The producers intend that the pipeline will flow by the beginning of 1983. To this end the Government is providing assistance, as appropriate, for their design and cost studies. On present indications, facilities to store and process the liquids are likely to cost \$800 000 000 spent over the next three years, and the pipeline could cost between \$100 000 000 and \$150 000 000. It is important in that context to note that Santos, in June of this year, announced the signing of contracts for 600 kilometres of pipeline for that development.

Linked with the resources development in South Australia is the new investment which has occurred in South Australia. The Deputy Premier in another place, in June of this year, outlined some of the new investment that was taking place in South Australia. I think it is important that a more comprehensive list of significant investment, covering both 1980 and 1981, is placed on record. Accordingly, I want to indicate to the Council some of the significant investment decisions that have been taken by companies during 1980 and 1981 in South Australia. I will deal first with 1980. In that year, Australian Bacon Limited indicated that it would move its headquarters to Adelaide and undertake certain renovations at Mount Barker. As a result of the company's additional activities, a further 200 jobs were expected to be created for South Australians. Fasson Proprietary Limited announced a \$4 000 000 expansion to its pressure sensitive paper plant at Elizabeth and, as a result, some 40 new jobs will be created over 12 to 18 months from the date of announcement.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Were those two projects as a result of the Liberal Government's coming to office in September 1979?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That is correct. The investments were made as a result of the Liberal Government coming to office in this State. If the Leader of the Opposition does not want to listen, that is up to him: he can read the proofs.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I wanted to check. You said that these investments were made as a result of the Liberal Government's coming to office in September 1979?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: There is no doubt about it. Seeley Bros won a \$5 000 000 export order for air coolers and took on an additional 70 to 80 employees at its St Marys factory. John Shearer Ltd won a \$3 000 000 export

order and simultaneously decided to close the Queensland operation and relocate in South Australia at a cost of \$5 000 000. Over 100 new jobs were expected to be created in South Australia as a direct result of that decision. I.C.I. Australia announced a \$10 000 000 expansion of its Light Beach salt fields, and as a result 100 new jobs will be created during the construction phase and additional jobs will be created at the company's Osborne factory.

During 1980, B.H.P. announced plans to spend \$90 000 000 to \$100 000 000 on its Whyalla steelworks, including \$38 000 000 for upgrading of blast furnaces and \$33 000 000 for the production of steel railway lines. That investment was additional to the \$30 000 000 invested by B.H.P. in new coke ovens, which resulted in the employment of an extra 30 workers. G.M.H. announced its intention to build an \$8 000 000 plastics factory at its Elizabeth plant, and that decision was made in the face of strong competition from New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Were all those projects you have just mentioned decided as a direct result of the Liberal Government's coming to office in September 1979?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I expect the Leader of the Opposition finds listening to this list rather painful.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: No, I just want you to tell me.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have already indicated that there have been substantial new investments in South Australia which will create jobs and which are a result of the Liberal Government coming to office and giving to South Australia a new air of confidence, which it did not have under the previous Labor Government. Let me continue. Adelaide Brighton Cement Ltd announced in May 1980 the expenditure of \$20 000 000 to expand its facilities to cope with export orders equal to South Australia's consumption. Transfield (Adelaide) Pty Ltd won a \$7 000 000 contract for the supply, fabrication and erection of structural steel for use in the new northern power station. That contract was expected to increase the Whyalla work force by about 50 workers and by an extra 120 workers in the construction phase, which would continue for about two years.

There was a \$1 300 000 expansion by Dairyvale Metropolitan Co-operative at its Jervois factory. Noske Flour Mills expanded its Murray Bridge piggery, which cost \$1 300 000 and increased employment by about 10. Alulite Pty Ltd invested a further \$200 000 and announced plans to increase staff by 80 over two years from the date of announcement last year. Safcol opened a fish finger plant at Millicent at a cost of \$1 100 000, and will employ an additional 48 staff in that project.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: When was that opened?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It was opened in 1980. Tatiara Meat Company—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Was it opened as a result of a decision taken after September 1979?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Tatiara Meat Company opened a new boning room and freezing facility in June 1980 at a cost of \$700 000, with an employment impact of 25 jobs. Rubery Owen Holdings Ltd announced in March 1980 its intention to expand its facilities, which would require \$1 500 000 additional expenditure with 30 extra jobs being created. The Kingston Lobster Tourist complex was opened after the expenditure of \$500 000, with the creation of 17 new jobs.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: When was that?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Last year. I am talking about 1980: I will get on to 1981 in a minute. Mobil Refinery extended at a cost of \$20 000 000. Mitsubishi is upgrading at a cost of \$50 000 000 over the six years from 1980. It

is important to recognise also that the Hilton Hotel in Victoria Square was commenced only after some very considerable activity by the present Government to rescue what was, at the time of this Government's coming to office, a floundering operation. Bridgestone acquired an interest in Uniroyal, and thus consolidated employment and future production. Mitsui/Asahi commenced a feasibility study into the petro-chemical industry. South Australian Brewing—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What did Dow do?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: You are the one who should talk about Dow: you have trundled out Dow Petro-chemical at every election since 1970, and each time it was announced as a new venture. It was something that the Labor Government did not have the capacity to get off the ground. The Leader of the Opposition is wriggling.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the Attorney has answered the Leader.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: In a few cases mentioned the decision was taken before 1979. You'll be embarrassed when I check this.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: South Australian Brewing Company has undertaken a \$21 000 000 rationalisation of its Thebarton plant. William Angliss and Company transferred its smallgoods operation from Melbourne to Adelaide with an employment impact of 30 jobs. Onkaparinga Woolen Company announced a \$750 000 expansion which will provide between 20 and 25 additional jobs at Thebarton and Lobethal. Southern Farmers Holdings Limited announced a \$4 200 000 expansion at its Mile End factory.

I will now refer to 1981. O. R. Beddison Pty Ltd announced that it intended to build a plywood factory at Nangwarry with an employment impact of 50 to 60 jobs. I.C.I. Australia announced a \$2 000 000 expansion of its Osborne bicarbonate of soda plant, with an additional 24 jobs during construction. Abbott Australasia Ltd announced the establishment of an intravenous solution manufacturing plant at Elizabeth at an estimated cost of \$2 000 000 and with an employment impact of 17 jobs. Kimberly-Clark Australia indicated that it would spend \$15 000 000 upgrading its Apcel pulp and paper-making factory at Millicent. Tradigrain Pty Limited, which provides bagged grain to countries without bulk facilities, shifted its entire Sydney operations to Adelaide, with 30 jobs being created as a result. In February 1981 there was an announcement by Hoteliers International that it planned to construct Chateau Adelaide, a 10-storey, 260-bed hotel at a cost of \$18 200 000.

In March 1981 the opening of the \$2 500 000 Craigmere Foodland Village complex created a considerable number of full and part-time jobs. Again, in March, A.N.Z. Meat Exports and Murray Bridge food manufacturer Freesia won a contract to export icecream overseas. Those contracts were in excess of \$1 200 000. Panapac Proprietary Limited of Tranmere was awarded a \$1 000 000 contract to construct office and warehouse facilities at Alcoa's plant in Portland, Victoria. Simpson announced earlier this year a new \$6 000 000 dishwasher factory at Regency Park, which will create 150 new jobs. Clyde Industries Limited of Rosewater announced a \$12 000 000 contract had been gained to build 10 locomotives for Australian National. Port Lincoln Ship Construction Proprietary Limited was established at a cost of \$1 000 000 with three tuna vessels under construction and another two on order. Unico Securities Limited was established in March of this year by a South Australian businessman to provide a range of merchant banking facilities principally in this State.

Steeley Industries Limited acquired Australian Barytes and indicated that it planned to expand and consolidate employment in both the mining and crushing of baryte ore.

Sapfor announced a \$3 000 000 development at Tarpeena which would create 80 new jobs. Codan Proprietary Limited, which is a local manufacturer of specialist high frequency communications equipment, announced that it would expand its satellite communications manufacturing facility. There was a \$52 000 000 proposal submitted by Australian Paper Manufacturers Limited in relation to a prospective wood pulp plant at Snuggery that would create 110 new jobs. Aunger Plastics of Elizabeth announced that it would spend \$750 000 in expansion that would create an additional 25 new jobs over an 18-month period. A. G. Petzetakis, a leading world supplier of plastic pipe, has indicated that it will launch its Australian and Asian development programme from a manufacturing base in Adelaide.

Eglo Engineering has commenced work on its \$10 000 000 plant at Port Adelaide to produce hardware for the mining and chemical industry and for a petroleum refinery. That will create 300 jobs. There has been a merger by Safcol—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: In view of all this how come unemployment—

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will come to that.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: —has gone up since you took office?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Safcol has raised \$5 000 000 through its merger with Cold Storage Holdings Limited to finance further expansion in South Australia and elsewhere. Omak Australia Limited in Whyalla has employed a further 12 people and installed a new plant at a cost of \$750 000 to manufacture steel sleepers for Mount Newman. Chemline Proprietary Limited opened a new \$1 500 000 complex at Dry Creek and secured a \$1 000 000 contract to supply products to Western Australia. Softwood Holdings Limited announced a \$4 400 000 expansion programme and will install the first texpan thinboard system in Australia. Again in April, Malco Industries at Croydon Park indicated that it was investing \$10 000 000 in self-discharging equipment for vessels. Grundfos Pumps from Denmark is establishing a new factory at Regency Park to employ 50 extra people. The Adelaide to Port Pirie rail project was announced in May and is expected to create 300 jobs directly and a further 450 jobs in support activities.

Raytheon International Data Systems chose Adelaide in preference to other States to establish its manufacturing and servicing facilities to provide 75 extra jobs in the early stages, and 200 new jobs. Australian Oilseed Industries Limited is spending more than \$500 000 in expanding its plant at Nairne which will create 30 to 50 jobs. C.S.R. Limited is spending \$1 500 000 in upgrading its South Australian sugar refining operations at Glanville. The Chamber of Shipping in South Australia has indicated that South Australian ports recorded an increase in both the number of visiting vessels and total cargo handled in the last financial year in this State and is upgrading a wharf area at Wallaroo to cope with the extra demand.

Since June this year there have been many other announcements indicating that there is new confidence in South Australia and in the Government of this State. They are only a few of the new developments and new industries and indicate the expansion which is taking place as a result of this Government's being in office and implementing its election policy of getting South Australia moving again.

Earlier, the Leader of the Opposition interjected to ask about employment figures in South Australia. In August 1979, 547 400 people were employed in South Australia. That was about 20 600 fewer in employment in relation to August 1977, so that in the last two years of the previous Government 20 600 job opportunities were lost in South Australia. In July 1981, there were 561 200 people employed in South Australia. That is a net increase in jobs of 13 800 since the election. One can see that as a result

of the confidence which the Government is generating there has been, instead of a run-down of job opportunities, a substantial increase in something less than two years.

Youth unemployment, whilst not at what one would regard as an acceptable level, again has fallen substantially since the State election, because in August 1979 the number of young unemployed people in South Australia was 16 900. Since the election, and at the present time, it has fallen by some 3 400 people. The employment position in this State is undoubtedly improving and, with the projected expansion in the mining and resource industry as well as in commerce and industry generally, it will undoubtedly continue to improve as this Government continues in office.

I now turn to one or two other important issues relating to employment. I think it needs to be seen in its proper context that, if the Opposition is seeking to decry the list of significant investments, which I have now recorded in *Hansard*—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I am not decrying the investment, as you well know.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It is just patently untrue to say that all of those investments have resulted—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. J. Sumner:—since the election in September 1979.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Leader does not come to order when called, I will take the appropriate action immediately. I make the point that whether or not he agrees with the Attorney-General is not my affair. I want whoever is speaking to be heard.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The wider context in which I want to put the question of employment is to make some comment about recent announcements by the Opposition and its followers, because from some of those utterances one would wonder whether the Opposition is behind the Government in endeavouring to increase employment opportunities.

The two matters which are the most recent relate, first, to the attempts to have the pipeline from the Cooper Basin to Stony Point rerouted and that, in itself, is an indication of an obstruction to a proposed development which will have substantial advantage to South Australians. I am sure the community must be concerned about this matter. The second matter concerns the difficulties confronting Australian National, where unions are refusing the transport of quicklime in South Australia on Australian National lines to Jabiru, such action involving an estimated loss of revenue of \$1 500 000 a year. Australian National has indicated that it is the equivalent of 100 jobs in that organisation. One would hope that the problem will be resolved quickly at the end of this week. It is important to recognise that action of that sort will destroy job opportunities within the community.

We also have illustrations of some fairly short-sighted propositions which would, far from creating job opportunities, reflect adversely on the capacity of commerce and industry to develop, to expand and create the jobs which are needed within this State and throughout Australia.

The first is talk of the 35-hour week, a proposal which this Government and the Federal Government are resisting as vigorously as possible, although it is important to note that the Opposition seeks to give support to moves for a 35-hour week without apparently recognising the serious implications for commerce and industry if that were finally achieved. I suppose that, prior to the wage indexation guidelines being removed in the past week or two, a suggestion by the Opposition for full quarterly indexation on

the basis of c.p.i. increases would have been particularly topical, but again that would have had some significant cost disadvantages for commerce and industry in being able to expand and provide job opportunities.

Other proposals by the Opposition in relation to expanded redundancy policies, which it has been supporting and seeking, and long service leave entitlement after five years service rather than the present seven years, would again add significant burdens to commerce and industry. If any of those proposals were achieved in this State it would place a severe burden on South Australia compared with other States, and would make us less competitive than we have been becoming in our move to get this State moving again.

The other area upon which I need to make some comment concerns the talk of a wealth tax. This was referred to specifically by several honourable members, namely, the Hon. Mr Foster and, I think, one or two other members. Certainly, the Hon. Mr Blevins has also supported the imposition of a wealth tax in recent weeks. It is interesting to note that, in the area of State taxes, which could be compared with the policy of Opposition members who have spoken in favour of a wealth tax, since coming into office this Government has implemented quickly its policy for reducing substantially State taxes.

Succession duties and gift duty were abolished within just over a month of this Government's coming into office. In the area of land tax the burden has been considerably eased for home owners and the rural community in South Australia, particularly since the last election. The principal place of residence has now been exempted from the imposition of State land tax. The Government has produced significant concessions for the purpose of a first home, as well as significant pay-roll tax exemptions and incentives to encourage employment expansion in this State.

This Government has made significant progress in honouring its commitments in the taxation area by reducing significantly, and in two cases abolishing altogether, certain State taxes. If we were to turn to the imposition of a wealth tax, it would have serious implications for the whole community in South Australia. I am not sure that the community is really aware of the impact of such a proposal or that it really understands what a wealth tax is about. It is important, also, to record that the Opposition at its last convention re-endorsed the policy of pursuing a capital gains tax or wealth tax. I suppose that one should presume a wealth tax of, say, 4½ per cent, and that certainly was the proposal of Mr Duncan in 1978 in Brisbane when he indicated clearly that he was in favour of a wealth tax of 4½ per cent on personal wealth exceeding \$70 000.

On that occasion he indicated that it was intended that that tax should replace existing taxation systems and that it should be combined with a realistic tax on minerals. At that stage he was attempting to give some budgetary advice to the Commonwealth Government by speaking publicly on his commitment to a personal wealth tax and his commitment to a democratic extension of public ownership within the Australian community. Members of the community who perhaps have glossed over the likely impact of a wealth tax must recognise that it will have serious implications for South Australians if implemented here, and it will have significant consequences for all Australians if it is ever implemented at a national level.

In the brief time that I have had available, I have wanted to put clearly on record initiatives that the Government has taken and to record once again, because I think it needed recording after some of the various speeches made to this Council, the progress which the Government has been mak-

ing in reducing unemployment in this State, the initiatives that have resulted in new industries coming to South Australia, the new developments occurring in industry in the resources area, and expansions which are being undertaken by industry in South Australia. Far from the future outlook being gloomy, as the Opposition would perhaps want to paint it periodically, the future for South Australia is bright, with tremendous potential—a potential which this Government is endeavouring to tap and develop. It is a potential that will have benefits for all members of the community in South Australia. I believe that we should be looking forward with great optimism and confidence to the South Australia of the 1980s under the Liberal Government.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I remind the Council that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive the President and honourable members at 4.30 this afternoon for the presentation of the Address in Reply. I therefore ask all honourable members to accompany me at 4.15 p.m. to Government House.

[Sitting suspended from 4.4 to 4.59 p.m.]

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that, accompanied by the mover, seconder and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech adopted today by this Council, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the third session of the Forty-Fourth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 19 August at 2.15 p.m.