

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, December 2, 1976

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Food and Drugs Act Amendment,
Health Act Amendment,
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 2),
Police Offences Act Amendment (No. 2),
South Australian Health Commission,
Succession Duties Act Amendment,
The State Opera of South Australia,
Urban Land (Price Control) Act Amendment.

PETITION: FLAGSTAFF ROAD

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON presented a petition signed by 582 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to take all possible steps to ensure that the sealing of Flagstaff Road between the northern end of Bonneyview Road and Black Road be given the highest possible priority.

Petition received.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. CHAPMAN presented a petition signed by 45 electors of South Australia, praying that the House reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

TRADE AGENTS

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (November 3).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Further to the information which I gave the honourable member in the House on November 3, 1976, I now add that it has been past policy not to give specific details of the activities of the trade agents in order to preserve normal commercial confidentiality in trading operations. It is also not a true indication of the value of the trade agents to consider only the "tangible results", meaning the finalisation of contracts or sales, as much of their work is involved in offering advice to South Australian exporters on product marketing, arranging appointments and itineraries, reporting commercial intelligence, etc. or, as in a recent case in South-East Asia, the trade agent was involved in obtaining payment for goods exported from South Australia which were under dispute between the exporter and the importer. The trade agents are also involved in work of a more general nature in obtaining statistical information on market trends,

shipping in relation to the new container terminal, investment climate etc. On the commercial side of their operation, they have in recent times been directly involved with South Australian exporters in a wide range of products, including marine equipment and semi-precious stones, specialised stationery, fruit and sporting equipment.

SHEEP EXPORTS

In reply to Mr. GUNN (November 25).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Agriculture has advised me that the "Atlas Pioneer" was held up in Adelaide because of the failure of the ship's owners to comply with the Commonwealth quarantine regulations. The Minister spoke to the Secretary of the A.M.I.E.U., who assured him that there had been no interference with any shipment of live sheep from South Australia since the end of 1974. In 1974, a consultative committee was set up with representatives from the meat trade, the exporters, farmers organisations, A.M.I.E.U. officials, the Primary Industry Department and the South Australian Agriculture Department. The result of the meetings of that committee was that the shipment of live sheep would be unhindered if the Government and exporters gave the union an assurance that all efforts would be made to encourage Middle East countries to establish chilling facilities at their ports and at various other distribution points so that carcass meat could be shipped from Australia and so that the continuing employment of slaughtermen and meat workers in Australian abattoirs could be assured. The assurance has been given, and there has been no ban on live meat export from South Australia since that period.

PRAWN MANAGEMENT

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (November 10).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the recent annual general meeting of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Fishing Industries Council, the Minister of Fisheries announced the disbanding of the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee and the Prawn Fishing Industry Advisory Committee and asked the council to establish, as a matter of urgency, advisory committees for each of the State's fisheries, viz: rock lobster, prawn, abalone, scale and inland. It is envisaged that these committees will function in a purely advisory role, reporting through the executive of the Australian Fishing Industries Council on all aspects of their respective fisheries. They will not be involved in licensing recommendations which are considered the province of Government administration based on its fisheries management policies. These policies would, of course, be formulated in consultation with the council which can be expected to make important inputs from industry. Unresolved matters which were before the Prawn Fishing Industry Advisory Committee are now being decided by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, and I understand that all applicants for transfers of prawn authorities will be advised very soon of the situation.

PLASTIC BAGS

In reply to Mr. OLSON (November 4).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sale of potatoes and oranges in pink plastic or woven mesh bags is a marketing technique based on the convenience factor of

pre-packaging and the appeal of colour. However, the use of plastic bags can also cause greening of potatoes, an indication that they have been poorly stored and have been too long in the marketing chain. Greening of potatoes results from exposure of the potatoes to sunlight and is accompanied by development in the greened tissue of an alkaloid solanine, which if consumed in sufficient quantity would be toxic. Solanine is water soluble and broken down by heat, so is destroyed in the process of cooking potatoes. The concern over greened potatoes is probably a relic of problems encountered from the feeding of raw reject potatoes to pigs. Potatoes as marketed for human consumption do not present any health risk. The pink plastic bag was adopted specifically to reduce the rate of greening by providing some protection against light, and while clear plastic bags would allow greening to be seen by the customer, the process would occur more rapidly in clear bags. The industry would prefer that potatoes were marketed in opaque bags such as brown paper but this would not lend itself to customer self selection. The usual prepack container for oranges is a red plastic mesh bag which it is recognised, has a cosmetic effect on pale coloured fruit in particular. Like any prepack container it prevents the customer from examining individual fruit but since the internal quality of oranges is not clearly related to their external appearance, the use of prepacks for oranges should not seriously affect the exercise of the customers' judgment. Under the Fruit and Vegetables Grading Act, 1934, fruit and vegetables contained in packages of any description or size are required to be sound and of uniform grade while control of packages in which fruit is marketed is contained in the Sale of Fruit Act, 1915-1935. However, quantities of less than 9 kg. are exempted from the provisions of this Act, which means that there are no controls over packages now in common use by the retail fruit and vegetable trade.

PLUTONIUM WASTE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Premier aware of a claim made this morning that plutonium waste from British nuclear reactors was buried at Maralinga in the early 1960's and, if he is, can he say whether any action needs to be taken, or does he consider the claim to be false? A member of the Australian Conservation Council, Dr. John Coulter, claimed on the radio programme *A.M.* today, that Royal Air Force planes flew plutonium waste from nuclear reactors in the United Kingdom to Maralinga in South Australia, in the early 1960's, when little was known about the hazards associated with nuclear waste. Little concern was expressed about that question at the time. Dr. Coulter said that the plutonium waste was carried in large lead-lined boxes and was buried to a depth of 3.7 metres and covered with a 10 centimetre layer of concrete. He further says that the area is not guarded, that the waste is highly dangerous, and is easily accessible to terrorists and others.

About four years ago, a Federal Minister said, in reply to a question in the Commonwealth Parliament, that the waste buried at Maralinga was from the actual bomb tests carried out there many years ago, and was not from United Kingdom nuclear reactors. Because of Dr. Coulter's claim, and the recent publicity given to radioactive wastes at Port Pirie, can the Premier confirm or deny Dr. Coulter's claim and reassure the public of South Australia that no danger exists?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know nothing of the matter, but I will inquire.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Community Welfare information about the present position regarding women's shelters, including the extent and source of Government financial assistance, to what extent the shelters are being used, how many people can be accommodated, and whether the shelters are adequate? The Minister will recall that I told him yesterday that I would ask this question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have some information about the matters raised by the honourable member. Approved budgets this year for four existing women's shelters in the Adelaide metropolitan area total \$175 000, of which \$155 000 is being provided under the Commonwealth community health programme grants. Several groups trying to establish new shelters have applied to the Commonwealth Hostel and Health Services Commission, and have been told that all funds have been committed for this financial year. That is the funding position. At present, there are three women's shelters operating in the metropolitan area and one in Whyalla. Two more are on the point of opening in Elizabeth and Christies Beach, and another is planned for Port Adelaide. The four women's shelters operating claim to have accommodation for 50 women and 100 children, and the two new centres anticipate accommodation for a further 12 women and 36 children. Until now, the metropolitan women's shelters have had to turn people away, and the organisers say that more accommodation is required. The two new shelters will cater for some of the demand for extra accommodation. The report of a recent Federal survey on the needs for and funding of women's shelters is still to be made available. This, together with other inquiries now being carried out in this State, will clarify the need for any further accommodation.

RIVERLAND SPECIAL SCHOOL

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Education say whether consideration has been given to the request made by the council of the Riverland Special School for assistance in maintaining the grounds of the new school at Berri? Some time ago, I was present at a deputation, in Adelaide, made to officers of the Education Department with regard to the development of the new special school at Berri, at which deputation the question of assistance for ground maintenance was raised. As I believe that consideration has been given to this matter subsequently, can the Minister say whether any decision has been made about whether or not the department can assist at this stage?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No specific recommendation has yet been made to me. I will check with my departmental officers and see what is the current position. Most of the expansion built into this year's education budget has been for classroom teachers and, although as I have stated to the House previously it has been possible substantially to increase our staffing position, nonetheless that same expansion has not flowed on to ancillary staff and various other people we might employ. It is difficult to obtain any kind of additional assistance to schools for ground maintenance, however desirable that may be. I am aware of problems in some country schools. The member for Goyder has spoken to me several times about a new school in his district. Generally speaking, it would be difficult to be able to obtain details of any particular expansion over the whole of the State's schools for this

type of employment this financial year. However, as there may be a specific problem at the school to which the honourable member has referred, I will obtain the information for him.

JOB HUNTERS' CLUBS

Mr. WHITTEN: Is the Minister of Community Welfare satisfied with the functioning of job hunters' clubs set up by his department? The Minister's earlier statements about this project were optimistic, indicating that many young people were taking part in a range of useful and constructive activities. However, as it is now some time since he has given any information to the House about these clubs, I ask whether he is able to provide any additional information now.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I suppose the short answer would be that I am satisfied with the way in which job hunters' clubs are operating, but I am not satisfied that we must have them, and I suppose the honourable member would understand that. He may recall that, last January, these clubs were operating at 17 locations. The scheme is flexible, and the clubs are set up as and where the need is demonstrated, although there have been some changes. I believe they have been successful. About 1 500 young people have taken part in the activities provided by these clubs to the benefit of themselves and the communities in which they live. An appreciable number of those regularly taking part do obtain employment but it must be emphasised that that is not the main function of the clubs. The main function is to assist young people who unfortunately are unable to obtain employment through no fault of their own to either gain or enhance skills in an attempt to provide them with continued motivation so that they will not give up when they receive rebuffs and are unable to get employment, and generally to instil in them an interest in the community in which they live. This can be a difficult task because some of these young people believe that the community is not interested in them. I am sure it would be bad for society in Australia should young people in that position look in that way on the society around them.

Mr. Arnold: How does the Commonwealth youth scheme fit in?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I hope we will be able to succeed with what we are trying to do in these clubs. The honourable member asked how the youth scheme recently announced by the Commonwealth Government will fit in with our scheme. The Commonwealth did not consult the South Australian Government on that matter (certainly not through my department) and what I know about this scheme I have obtained from leaflets readily available to everyone. I have no quarrel with the scheme. Obviously it has got through to Canberra at last that many young people want jobs but cannot find them, and that Government is finally trying to do something about it, even if it is only in a small way. I hope it will help the situation. For that reason I was surprised at the remarks of Mr. Porter—

Mr. Venning: Answer the questions.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am answering the question. I always know when I am answering a question correctly, because the member for Rocky River gets upset, especially if it happens to concern his mates in Canberra. If the honourable member is going to run with the herd he will

have to wear what they are wearing. That is the position in which the honourable member is in at present. Everyone in Australia knows the Government in Canberra was elected on the basis of improving the economic climate and everyone knows it has not succeeded at all; in fact the situation is getting worse. One gets the impression that three years from now the present Commonwealth Government will still be trying to blame Gough Whitlam. It got away with that for a while but it will not get away with it much longer. It is blaming everyone but itself. I appreciate the interjection from the member for Chaffey who at least in this case is genuinely hoping that something will be done. Some recognition (that is about all we can say) of the problem has occurred, that the young people in this country are in dire straits, and it is not yet 1977. The honourable member knows as well as I do that next year the situation will be tragic unless something is done soon. As far as I can judge from the press, back-benches of the Liberal Party in Canberra are being a bit more honest about the matter (or perhaps they are just looking at their electoral prospects) and are managing to prevail on the powers that be in the Federal Government (Mr. Lynch and some others), and presumably something might be done to try to create more employment. The member for Price asked me about job hunters' clubs and how they are working. We have had 1 500 young people take part and the clubs are continuing to operate and do their best. The clubs are mainly operated by young people who themselves would not be employed if it had not been for the operations of the job hunters' clubs. They are doing their best to assist those of their fellows who through no fault of their own are in that position. I assure the member for Price that the State Government at least will continue to do what it can in this matter.

BUS SERVICE

Mr. MATHWIN: After that debate by the Minister of Community Welfare, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy whether the Government will take urgent action to provide public transport for people who need to attend, for many reasons, the Flinders Medical Centre at Bedford Park? I have raised this matter before in the House by way of a question and in a grievance debate. Until now no provision has been made although an inspection was made six or seven weeks ago. Many aged people, as the Minister will know, in Glenelg, Brighton and Warradale find it impossible to visit sick relatives, husbands or wives, because there is no public transport available. The minimum taxi fare from Warradale to the hospital is \$1.75. It is therefore virtually impossible for those people to visit relatives. People also have extreme difficulty attending the hospital for treatment as out-patients. The Minister will also be aware that a bus is provided for the students of Flinders University that stops at the university, but it stops far short of the medical centre. I suggest it would be of some advantage particularly to older people if that bus were allowed to take passengers to the hospital. At present, people who take that bus face a five or 10 minute walk to the hospital. Can some urgent action be taken?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will see that the honourable member's question is referred to the Minister of Transport, and I will ask him to consider the points the honourable member has raised with a view to bringing down a reply for him as soon as possible.

CANBERRA PARTY

Mr. SLATER: I have accepted an invitation to attend a Christmas function sponsored by the Ministry, and I am anxious to ascertain from the Premier whether a form of entertainment similar to that provided for Liberal Party members and ex-members in Canberra at the tenth anniversary party this week is likely to be provided.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

TOURIST DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say why the Tourist Development Advisory Council has not been reconstituted since December 31, 1974? Is it to be reconstituted as recommended by the Tattersall committee report. That report says that the T.D.A.C. was established in 1972. The report states:

T.D.A.C. presented its first interim report in September, 1973.

I am not allowed to refer to part of that paragraph, because of the confidentiality the Premier imposes on me. The report continues later:

The terms of office of T.D.A.C. expired on December 31, 1974, and no further appointments have been made.

The committee said that a tourists advisory council should be established with the following terms of reference:

To advise the Minister of Tourism on matters pertaining to tourism within the State. In particular to advise in those areas where factors affecting tourist development can be influenced by decisions of the Government. In performing this function to have regard to the basic objective of the Division of Tourism, viz. to encourage the balanced growth and development of tourism to and within the State consistent with the protection of the natural environment, both as a means of enabling the residents of the State to enjoy the natural and man-made assets of the State in their leisure time, and as a means of diversifying and consolidating the economy of the State and particular regions within it.

The committee then dealt with other matters in relation to the advisory council. I therefore ask the Premier why the committee has not operated since 1974 and whether it is to be reconstituted by the Government in the terms suggested by the Tattersall committee report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: After the action taken by members of the previous committee, it was decided to suspend further activity by the Tourist Development Advisory Council until such time as we could appraise the report of the investigation which we proposed to have and which is now taking place. The council will be reconstituted. The Minister intends to vary slightly from the recommendations of the Tattersall investigation. I think there will be an addition of one member to those recommended originally and a slight alteration in the terms of reference. Substantially it will be in accordance with the terms of reference, and I expect an announcement shortly.

Mr. Evans: You can't tell us what happened to the other one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

FOSTERS ROAD

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, say whether the upgrading of Fosters Road in my district could be urgently considered? In the past, I have asked that this situation be improved but, to date, I have been unsuccessful

in achieving anything. I realise that it is not the Highways Department's responsibility to upgrade the road but that of the Enfield council. Fosters Road from the North-East Road to Folland Avenue is in excellent condition, having been upgraded by Enfield council but, from Folland Avenue to Grand Junction Road, the portion of Fosters Road that runs past Hillcrest Hospital and the Agriculture Department property is in shocking condition. The road is potholed, the verges are only dirt and no footpath is provided. In addition, the lighting situation is shocking, and causing danger for Hillcrest Hospital patients and nursing staff. Only yesterday I received a complaint from a person working in the Agriculture Department that his daughter only narrowly escaped a serious accident when a motor vehicle went out of control whilst she was waiting for a bus, and the car slid into the dirt verge of this road. This is an extremely urgent matter, as I am concerned for the safety of my constituents and others who use that part of the road, I therefore ask the Government to consider, if it is necessary, assisting Enfield council to upgrade the road.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will see that the matter is referred to the Minister of Transport so that a suitable reply can be brought down for the honourable member as soon as possible.

INAUGURAL FLIGHT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether it is Government policy for the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport to accept an invitation for an inaugural flight to an oversea country, when normally such an invitation would be accepted by staff of the Tourist Bureau? My question is supplementary to a question that I asked on notice on Tuesday, when I was told that the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport will leave on December 4 to visit Greece as the guest of Olympic Airways. I understand that these inaugural flights are normally given to officers in the Tourist Bureau as a part of tourist promotion. I am surprised that the Minister would accept the invitation rather than an officer from the bureau's accepting it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is talking nonsense. It is not normal at all for these inaugural flights always to be offered to officers of the Tourist Bureau. The Arts Development Officer in my department has been on an inaugural flight, and so have I. This flight, in fact, was originally offered to me; the Manager of Olympic Airways came especially to Adelaide to ask me to take it, and I refused.

Mr. Becker: It's a tourism job.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not inevitably tourism at all. When I went on an inaugural flight with Alitalia some years ago, the Federal Minister who went was the present Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Peacock), who had nothing to do with tourism at that time.

Mr. Millhouse: It is in fact only a holiday, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no doubt that the Minister will be getting some information which is of use to him.

Mr. Millhouse: We all do that on a holiday, but that doesn't make it any less a holiday at someone else's expense.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What do you expect him to do—run over there?

Mr. Millhouse: I am not criticising; I am just asking the Premier to admit that this is what it is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Minister has some enjoyment on the trip—

Mr. Millhouse: Let's hope he does; it's not worth his going, otherwise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can assure the honourable member that when I went on an Alitalia trip I used it to do some work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provision of invitations for inaugural flights is in the hands not of the Government but of the airline. The airline chose, first, to ask me. It asked for my suggestions as to someone else who might take such a flight. I suggested a member of staff, as a matter of fact, but the airline was not prepared to issue an invitation to a member of staff and issued it to the Minister. The people going from other States are Ministers. The honourable member's statement that these inaugural flights are given only to members of the Tourist Bureau staff has no basis whatever.

PERPETUAL LEASES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works inform me (or will it be necessary to make an inquiry of the Minister of Lands) on Government policy in relation to the freeholding of perpetual lease land? Over a period of time, some parcels of land held under various lease arrangements have been freeholded. Sometimes members are informed by constituents that they have been denied the opportunity of obtaining the freehold of land in which they have held an interest or in which they desire to obtain an interest. Can the Minister state the present attitude of the Government towards freeholding perpetual lease land?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may be aware that, before 1965, the policy of the Government then was that no freeholding would be permitted. This was because the Crown Lands Act at that time contained a provision to the effect that any person holding a certain area of land was debarred from purchasing perpetual lease land to add to the extent of the holdings. That provision was removed from the Act by the Hall Government between 1968 and 1970, and therefore the Government considered that there was no purpose in following a policy of no further freeholding. I believe there are certain qualifications, but I shall obtain from my colleague a considered reply and bring it down as soon as possible.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Does the Premier agree with the comments of Sir Mark Oliphant, as reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, that South Australia is a high-cost area and that this State is on the way to becoming the poorest State, and with his other criticisms, and will the Government now change its industrial development strategy to enable South Australia to become again a competitive State? Sir Mark Oliphant has the respect of all South Australians, and has earned it as an independent and fair judge. Through his many years on Executive Council, he is in a position to assess how this State is progressing. He has no political allegiance whatever. He has earned a reputation as an astute observer and an honest critic, which is far more than can be said for the Premier. In

the article, he has made certain statements, including those I have mentioned, and he has also criticised State Government policy in its attempts to create employment through establishing industry contacts with Malaysia. He said on that issue:

However, it is a moot question whether such actions—that is, actions to establish industry with Malaysia—however successful, will provide any long-term answer to our problems.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you agree with—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister of Mines and Energy will have the courtesy to abide by Standing Orders, I shall finish explaining my question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The facts show that for the past 12 months South Australia had the greatest reduction in manufacturing employment of any State in Australia; it was a drop of 2.55 per cent. Facts have been revealed in this House to show that we have one of the highest taxation levels per capita of any Australian State. The worker participation policy of the State Government is failing to attract new industries to the State and, if anything, is driving them away. In addition, we have the workmen's compensation legislation which the Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is now debating the question. He is not asking it or explaining it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was simply explaining to the House that the Government is failing to change adequately the Workmen's Compensation Act. The industrial development policies of the State Government have failed, according to our past Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant. It is time the State Government realised that, and I ask the Premier whether he agrees with Sir Mark and what he will now do about the position.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not agree that the writings of Sir Mark Oliphant were a criticism of the State Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: Of course it is a criticism.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member a few moments ago retorted to members on this side of the House as to their discourtesy in interrupting. He might apply the same qualifications to himself. The honourable member cannot read glosses on to what Sir Mark Oliphant had to say. The State economy in South Australia is markedly better off than are the economies of other States. That is recognised by businessmen throughout the State. The honourable member has a great habit of endeavouring to knock the economy of South Australia for political purposes, and with no loyalty whatever to this State. In the course of his explanation, he suggested that State taxation per capita in this State was one of the highest in Australia. It exceeds only that of Tasmania. The figures have been carefully worked out by the Treasury, and they were published by me the other day. Taking the whole of the State taxation areas, with the sole exception of one area about which it is not possible to get any comparability (that is, the payments into the Highways Fund), and including all other areas of State taxation (including royalties, a form of State taxation), the State tax raising per capita in South Australia is lower than in any other State for this year, except Tasmania. That is taking into account the provisions that were made in each of the Budgets and the reports of Auditors-General in each State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Leave out the royalties.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Why should we: it is a form of taxation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It paints a distorted picture.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not, because if royalties are left out the remark made by the member for Davenport is not true, either.

Mr. Dean Brown: Yes it is, and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has had the opportunity to ask his question, and I ask him to give the same courtesy to others that he demands himself. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Far from South Australia's being in difficulty about our industry, we constantly get statements from senior executives of industry about the satisfactory relationship they have with the State Government and the satisfactory nature of the industrial climate and provisions in this State. For instance, last week I was present at the commissioning of a new plant for Monier Besser. I suggest that the honourable member should read what the Managing Director of that company, a company with Australia-wide investments and undertakings, had to say about the nature of undertakings in South Australia. I suggest to the honourable member that he read what Mr. John Egan, of Cullen Egan Dell Proprietary Limited, said, as quoted in the *Financial Review* of November 12 this year, as follows:

On a State basis, with costs being a major deterrent to business expansion and confidence, South Australia emerges as the most satisfactory base for manufacturing, with average wage levels representing only 82 per cent of New South Wales and Victorian levels.

That is what industry has to say, and I suggest that the honourable member should talk to it.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about Sir Mark?

The SPEAKER: Order!

SHACKS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands what is the Government's long-term policy concerning shack sites in both acceptable and non-acceptable areas? I believe that it is common knowledge that on acceptable areas people will be given a 20-year term and on non-acceptable areas they will be given a 10-year term, but many people would like to know what is the long-term policy of the Government after that period. It is being stated (and I believe it to be correct) that on July 1 next the Lands Department will take over many of these areas from councils, and people are concerned about the long-term situation, particularly in relation to non-acceptable areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that, some time ago, the honourable member would have received, with other members, a circular that set out the Government's policy. I do not intend to repeat those details and I doubt whether I could, from memory, quote the important parts of the policy. Generally, it would be fair to say that in acceptable areas there does not seem to be any problem. Non-acceptable areas have been determined on the basis that it may be necessary for some of the shacks located in those areas to be dismantled. That is not to say that they will go in 10 years or 20 years. However, I will try to ascertain details of the situation from my colleague and, apart from the fact that it may be necessary to treat individual cases on their merits, I will obtain details of the policy that will apply generally.

ADELAIDE HILLS

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether his department views with increasing concern the massive expansion of housing in bush-fire prone areas of the Adelaide Hills, and what specific action will be taken to reduce this danger? Mr. Ray Orr, the Chief Supervisor in the Adelaide Hills, in a report headed "Fire danger critical" and published this week, stated:

Any fires in the Hills this summer would cause considerably more damage and property loss than those in the past because of the expansion of housing in the Hills. This residential development is not confined to within established towns . . . People are seeking privacy in smaller groupings of houses and even in isolated areas. As part of this privacy, they are wanting to retain the natural surrounds of trees and bushland.

In the years since the horror of Black Sunday in 1955, the population of the Hills has increased by more than 63 per cent: that means 63 per cent more potential for fires and 63 per cent more houses to protect in this area.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Perhaps the question should have been directed to the Minister for Planning, whose responsibility it is to control this aspect. All I can say is that it is recognised generally that the increasing spread of houses in the Hills makes the fire danger even more acute, and I hope that landowners in the Hills will take the necessary action to protect themselves as much as possible. In my department, the National Parks and Wildlife Division is substantially increasing its fire-fighting and fire precaution capacity this year, and I hope we will be able to ensure that fires that start or are started in national parks will make no contribution towards the general risk of the area. The question of the spread of housing in the Hills comes properly within the province of my colleague.

RETREADED TYRES

Mr. ALLISON: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Transport, will the Minister of Mines and Energy ask his colleague to consider amending the new regulations controlling the use of retreaded passenger vehicle tyres, which were promulgated in the *Government Gazette* of November 18 this year, in order to permit existing stocks of retreaded tyres to be sold until December 31, 1977, or, if that cannot be done, would he show some leniency in operating the new regulations in order to give manufacturers and retailers time to get rid of existing stocks? It seems that in South Australia at present tyre firms, garages, and service stations would collectively be holding many thousands of passenger motor vehicle tyres, which were retreaded before the new regulations regarding retreaded tyres were published. Apparently, it is impossible for them to be sold before the end of this month by which time, according to the new regulations, stocks must be sold or otherwise disposed of. I understand that all other States are allowing such tyres to be sold until December 31, 1977. I do not think that the Minister would want South Australian industry to bear the substantial financial losses that could be incurred, and allowing the industry until December 31, 1977, to sell existing retreaded tyres would preclude the need of dumping them, stripping them and retreading them again, or trying to resell them to dealers in other States, all of which would be costly operations. Even if by a lucky chance existing stocks conform to the new Australian Standards Association

standard A.S. 1973, they would have to be remoulded in order to brand them in accordance with the new regulations. I appreciate that the regulations were introduced as a safety measure, but I call the Minister's attention to his reply to a question I asked a couple of months ago, in which he stated that no statistics are or have been available to his department to indicate that retreaded tyres are responsible for an unusual proportion of accidents.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up this matter with my colleague, draw his attention to the problem, and see what response he can make.

RADIOACTIVITY

Mr. VANDEPEER: Before the operation to eradicate any danger of radioactivity in the tailings dump at Port Pirie, did the Minister of Mines and Energy consider the possibility that the combining of two areas of radioactivity could possibly increase the radioactivity by interaction between the two combined areas? I have been unable to ascertain the procedure used by the Rare Earth Corporation, which operated the Port Pirie plant after the production of yellow cake was discontinued, but it has been brought to my notice that radioactive waste, when combined in a dump that has taken waste from different processes, can create and has created an active situation in which heat is generated. A recent report in the *Advertiser* claims that a large dump in Russia had generated heat, and had exploded, but I believe that this would have been enriched material. Did the Minister ascertain positively whether the combination of the two areas of low radioactivity at Port Pirie could produce an area of higher radioactivity than previously existed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the processes that went on at Port Pirie with respect to the collection of the so-called hot spots and their covering with slag, the Mines and Public Health Departments had the assistance of an officer (Mr. Fry) from the Atomic Energy Commission, and we consulted directly with those people in order to confirm that the action we proposed to take was appropriate and that the method of taking it was also appropriate. So far as those other reports are concerned, I will try to get some comment on them. I point out to the honourable member that, when he refers to enriched material, he may be referring to the waste products that come from the nuclear power plant.

Enriched uranium is not a radioactive substance: it is the use of that uranium, in producing by-products after the nuclear power plant processes, which creates the problem. If the case in Russia involved the tailings from a nuclear power plant, the problems of radioactivity would have been many times greater than those that would be experienced at Port Pirie: they are of a different order of magnitude, and the precautionary measures that must be taken are completely different. I will check out the question to ensure that, in the Port Pirie situation, the procedures that have been adopted to render the area safe will be effective in so doing.

BUSES

Mr. RUSSACK: In the absence of the Minister of Transport, I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy whether approval has been given for the design of the body frames for the new buses being built for the State Transport Authority for service in the metropolitan area

and whether any of these new buses will be commissioned for service before Christmas. On September 21, the Minister of Transport said that approval for the design of the body frames had not yet been given and, therefore, it was not possible to provide any information on the delivery of these buses. On October 6, the Minister said that there was hope that some buses would be commissioned for service this year, so I ask what progress has been made in providing the new buses.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My recollection is that the answer to the two questions is "Yes" on both counts. However, I had better make sure of that and, therefore, I will refer the questions to my colleague so that he can give the honourable member a reply.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister for the Environment say when it is expected that the Government will introduce legislation to control the use of trail bikes and other off-road vehicles? It is a considerable time since the report on off-road vehicles was made a public document, and there is much speculation in the community about when the necessary legislation will be introduced. As only one week of sittings remains before we adjourn, there seems little likelihood of the legislation being introduced before Christmas. We have an Appropriation Bill before us for discussion today, so it seems unlikely that we will be sitting until the latter months of 1977, so it seems that, on the best assessment of the situation, it is unlikely that this matter will be resolved before the end of 1977.

As councils are increasingly concerned at the depredations of off-road vehicles on environmentally fragile areas, they would like this legislation to see the light of day as early as possible. Subdivisions on freehold land along coastal areas are being made, and it is possible for trail bike associations to buy these areas (quite within the framework of the planning authority), and there is increasing concern about the control of these organisations in relation to the damage to our coastline. Can the Minister enlighten the House as to when this matter will be brought forward?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I share the concern of the honourable member and of his constituents at the absence of this legislation, which was not included in the Governor's Opening Speech for this session. Nevertheless, I have made clear many times that I hoped to introduce it in Parliament during this current session. I point out that the period for receiving public submissions was extended several times at the request of bodies associated with the sport. I think that the latest one was May 22. Following the receipt of these submissions, my departmental officers gave proper consideration to them, and the guidelines for the legislation have been approved by Cabinet and forwarded to the Parliamentary Counsel for drafting. However, the honourable member will know as well as I that the legislative programme for this session has been very heavy and that legislation is still coming before Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: That's just an excuse.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The member for Mitcham was not here last evening, although most of us were here until about midnight dealing with legislation on the Notice Paper. Parliament has been working steadily and hard. I think that December 9, when we will rise, is the latest date Parliament has risen in the six or seven years I have been here. Despite that, however, it looks unlikely that this legislation will get in this year.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you answer me one question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

Mr. Millhouse: I just wanted to know whether he was pleased or sorry I wasn't here.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am trying to answer the question asked by the member for Goyder.

Mr. Millhouse: Won't you answer? Come on!

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I hope that in this current session (which will not, unfortunately, mean this current year) the legislation to which the honourable member has referred will be introduced. I share his concern. Only two weeks ago I saw in Parliament House a constituent of his who owns land at the western side of the bottom of Yorke Peninsula. I think he has about 647 hectares, 242 hectares of which comprise sand dunes, which are spreading because of the activities of riders of trail bikes and sand buggies. He complained that these people sometimes cut his fences to get on to his property. He paid a tribute to the Coast Protection Board for sealing off the ends of this area, but these people are removing the signs the Coast Protection Board put up to warn them off. I shall be as glad as anyone when this legislation comes before Parliament, but I regret that it is unlikely that it will do so before Thursday next. I will do my best to see that it comes in during the current session of this Parliament.

DEEP CREEK LAND

Mr. CHAPMAN: When does the Minister for the Environment expect to have a report on the Government's current land acquisition policy as it applies to the multi-thousand hectare acquisition of rural property proposal in the Deep Creek area? A map was recently given to me by the Minister's department that indicated a large area of southern Fleurieu Peninsula apparently subject to acquisition. After looking at the map, it was found that a significant number of properties within the boundaries were developed properties (rural, fat lamb and meat producing properties) that would seem, on the surface anyway, to have no real benefit to the proposed extension of the conservation park. The action taken by the Minister's officers has created a climate of insecurity and uncertainty amongst my constituents, who are usually responsible, hardworking and placid people. I can only say that they are pretty rotten on the Government for its action. They are stirred up and I think the Minister's own officer, Dr. Inglis, when visiting the area on November 4 was given that message loud and clear.

Those people claim (and they have expressed this opinion not only to me but to Dr. Inglis) that their basic democratic rights are being eroded by this Government as a result of this proposed action. The action has also been described as being a blatant example of discrimination where the desires of those long-term rural producers are being denied in favour of the desires, apparently, of some environmental extremists. I call on the Minister to obtain a report as soon as possible about this. I have a great regard for these people, and I think I can keep them cool for a short time, but I can assure the House that when that section of the community or any responsible element in my district gets stirred up they know how to demonstrate their feeling. I have received a letter from the occupier of a property who incidentally is not practising rural pursuits

to the same commercial extent as his neighbours but who has been observing the conservation intent apparently behind this proposed acquisition. He said that he bought the land in late 1974 and settlement was effected in October. The letter states:

The land was a subdivision of Mr. W. Eitzen's property, and this was obviously an approved subdivision. Whilst I was aware that the Government was interested in the general area, I had no knowledge of any specific plans either from the previous owner, Mr. Eitzen, from the broker, Bennett & Fisher, nor the Yankalilla Council.

He went on to say:

I believe Mr. Eitzen explored every available avenue to get assurance from the State that subdivision was in no way contravening any plans. I believe Mr. Eitzen had a signed statement from the Minister at that time, and this gives tacit approval to this action. The purpose of my purchase was the realisation of a long-term desire of the family and myself to have some natural scrubland for future retirement and conservation and to observe the natural beauty of the area. It goes without saying that a great deal of pleasure would of course be derived by our family from this land. Plans to build a house have been approved by the Yankalilla council recently.

He said he was about to start laying the foundations when he heard from a neighbour, John Pitcher, that he had had "advice of acquisition". This was the first experience of the writer of any acquisition proposals at Deep Creek. The letter continues:

Page 80 of the State Planning Authority's book revised on March 20, 1975, and duly authorised by the Government's representative, states that in the Deep Creek area bushland adjacent to the creek may be left in private ownership under certain conditions. If the plan to acquire has been a long-term plan, I question why the subdivision was approved and why I was given approval to build a house on that land.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your patience in allowing me to explain my question in depth. It is an extremely important example of what is happening within the ambit of the Government's acquisition proposals, particularly in the rural parts of the State. They are quite destructive.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I know there is some concern in the honourable member's district about the proposed Deep Creek conservation park. The boundaries of this park were decided on well before I became Minister and I believe they were published before then in a local newspaper. I do not think it is any surprise to the local people that the park is to be created there. I think the matter is becoming more urgent now, because some of the people who took notice of the fact that the park was to comprise a certain area have offered their properties to the Government, and two of them are in the process of being acquired through negotiations at the present time. This has led to a situation in which we have considerable areas within the proposed boundaries already held by the Government, and that makes the acquisition of the remaining property more imminent.

Mr. Chapman: But they have had the pants scared off them: that is why they made the move.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The boundaries proposed for the park took into account several considerations which are important so far as national parks are concerned. The area had to be adequate for the conservation of specific plants and species: I think that goes without saying. Not only do specific plants have to be protected but also there has to be a sufficient area to ensure we do not lose the whole lot in the event of fire. It is desirable in an area such as Deep Creek, which includes not only Deep Creek but Boat Harbor Creek, that the

whole of the watershed should, if possible, be contained within the area of the park to ensure the purity of the waters going down those creeks.

It is necessary to have boundaries which are adequate from the point of view of management but which are as short as possible. I certainly have no desire to see the park include a greater area than is necessary to meet these criteria. An area bigger than necessary would mean an unnecessary expenditure for acquisition. I have currently on offer eight times as much land as I have money to pay for acquisition, so I do not intend to waste money if it is at all unnecessary. To take in more land than is necessary for a park would cause unnecessary disturbance to the existing occupation, and to have a park bigger than necessary would mean that the management problems, of which we have plenty in national parks given our resources, would be greater than necessary. As a result, when the honourable member spoke to me and told me that some of the landowners were meeting him in his office the following night I arranged for a representative of the department to attend and meet them. He is fully apprised of the attitude of the local landowners, and as a result I have asked the National Parks and Wildlife Division to have another look at the boundaries of the properties to make sure that the boundaries tentatively drawn up in the past are those really necessary. If it is possible to meet, with a smaller area, the criteria I earlier referred to, I will be only too pleased to have certain parts excised from the proposed park. I asked for that report after the Director went to Victor Harbor, I think on November 4. I have not received the report, but I will try to expedite it so that the honourable member will have it before him before December 9.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill amends the Valuation of Land Act in two significant respects. First, it seeks to deal with a problem arising from the judgment of the honourable Mr. Justice Wells in *Harry v. The Valuer-General*. In the judgment His Honour placed a rather restrictive interpretation upon section 16 of the principal Act which empowers the Valuer-General, in his discretion, to make separate valuations of any portion of any land, or to value land conjointly with other land. It is necessary for the Valuer-General to exercise his power to make a separate valuation of portion of a larger holding (a) where the land is under separate occupation and (b) in cases, such as those arising in the South-Eastern Drainage Act where the Valuer-General may have to make a valuation of a proportion of land notwithstanding that it does not form a separate holding.

The principal Act at the moment provides that all parts of the State outside local government areas constitute a single valuation area for the purposes of the Act. It is administratively difficult to value that area as a whole and accordingly the Bill provides that regulations may split up that portion of the State into separate valuation areas. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the regulations may divide so much of the State as lies outside local government areas into separate valuation areas. Clause 3 makes an amendment consequential upon a change of the name of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers. Clause 4 clarifies the power of the Valuer-General to value land that does not constitute a separate allotment or parcel of land.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

At 3.11 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

DEFECTIVE PREMISES BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 8 but insisted on its amendment No. 11, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

MOBIL LUBRICATING OIL REFINERY (INDENTURE) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act, 1971-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The present Mining Act came into effect on July 3 1972. Experience in the operation of that Act over a period of four years has shown that it is necessary to make a number of adjustments, principally to remove certain anomalies and to overcome legal problems. The only change in principle concerns the provision for exploration or mining of minerals other than opal which may be situated below the proclaimed precious stones fields, while at the same time preserving the top 50 metres of the ground as the exclusive preserve of the opal miner. It is germane to point out the recent discovery by drilling of copper by Western Mining Corporation in the vicinity of Andamooka, at 350 metres and that opal has never been discovered at a greater depth than about 35 metres. The individual clauses of the Bill and the reasons for the proposed amendments are as follows:

Clauses 1 and 2 are the usual introductory clauses. Clause 3 concerns definitions. "Authorised person" refers to persons authorised under clauses 20, 25 and 35. The definition of "minerals" is varied to ensure (1) that coal is included, and (2) that the Mining Act applies to the tailings discarded from treatment plants such as Government gold batteries or in other unusual circumstances where the tailings are not located on a mining tenement.

"Mining tenement" is amended to include miscellaneous purposes licences as there is nothing at present to prevent mining claims being pegged out over land comprised in such licences. The amendment to the definition "precious stones field" is necessary to permit exploration for other minerals below the opal levels. Clause 4 problems have arisen in that notices of entry have been served upon the former S.A. Railways Commissioner (now State Transport Authority). Consequently, clause 4 incorporates "railways and tramways" in the definition of exempt land. The present provisions of section 9 prohibit mining within 400 metres of a dwellinghouse. In the case of Andamooka and Coober Pedy the existence of houses and dugouts near the town boundaries can prevent access to potential fields close to the towns. In addition, a dugout outside the town areas can prevent legal access to a large area surrounding it. This is now corrected in clause 4. Clause 5 is designed to ensure that the maintenance of the various registers takes place under the control of the Registrar. Clause 6 prevents transferability of miners rights.

Clause 7 is necessary to ensure that applications for renewal of miners rights are *bona fide* made by the holder and not by someone else purporting to act on his behalf. Clause 8 deletes section 24 (2). The extension of the time for registration can be better dealt with as an application under section 27. Unfortunately there has been some abuse of section 25 (2) as a result of agreements between landowners and mining operators designed to avoid the payment of royalty and environmental

restraints. It is proposed by clause 9 to give the Director of Mines the power to authorise the removal of more than one tonne of material. Clause 10 is designed to close a loophole in section 27 whereby it is possible to hold a claim indefinitely by abandoning it a few days before it lapses and then repegging the same piece of ground as a new claim. Clause 11 removes section 28 (5) which is in conflict with section 80 (2). The latter is considered to be more effective. Clause 12 is designed to ensure that the original intent of section 30 is made effective. It can be argued that the enumeration of constraints prevents the Minister from taking into account any problems other than those specified. Clause 13 deals with the same problem as clause 12, but in relation to mining leases. Clause 14 is consequential upon clause 5.

The opinion of the Crown Solicitor is that the existing provisions of section 38 permit only one renewal of a mining lease. This was certainly not intended, as clearly a mining operator who complies with the conditions of his lease should be entitled to continuity of title. Clause 15 removes any doubts. Clause 16 is the same as clause 6 but refers to precious stones prospecting permits. A real problem exists on the opalfields in that people avoid the principle of one person-one claim by obtaining permits and pegging claims in the names of friends and relatives, who, other than giving their name to the enterprise, take no active part in the working of the claim. This results in a proliferation of claims which are difficult and time consuming to remove, and acts against the interests of the genuine miner who abides by the spirit of the Act.

Clause 17 is the same as clause 7 but refers to precious stones prospecting permits. Clause 18 makes it an offence for a person to attempt to hold more than one precious stones claim at any one time. It is an extension of the problem outlined in clause 16. Clause 19 is the same as clause 10, but refers to precious stones claims.

Clause 20 removes the power of a warden to authorise disposal of waste. Wardens are judicial officers and it is anomalous for them to have this power. Clause 21 provides the machinery to permit exploration for and the mining of any minerals which may be below the opalfields at Andamooka and Coober Pedy. The amendment will permit the Director of Mines to stipulate the conditions applicable to such operations, provided, of course, that these conditions give due cognisance of the interests of opal miners and are in accordance with prescribed regulations. These proposals have been discussed with representatives of the miners on the fields and are generally acceptable to them. Clause 22 is the same as clauses 12 and 13, but in this instance refers to miscellaneous purposes licences.

Clause 23 is to rectify the same problems of renewal of miscellaneous purposes licences as was referred to in clause 15. Legal authorities suggest that a person who fails to give notice of entry under section 58 and pegs out a tenement may merely be liable for a penalty, but his tenement will still be valid. Clause 24 is designed to rectify that situation. Clause 25 is designed to permit, where there is no inspector, on a precious stones field, as is the case in Andamooka, another officer of the Mines Department resident on the field to have authority to order backfilling of bulldozer cuts.

At present mining wardens have no authority to deal with a contempt of court in the same way as persons presiding in other jurisdictions. This is corrected in clauses 26 and 27. In a recent appeal case, the Full Bench of the Supreme Court expressed the opinion that the deletion of the phrase "in such manner as may be just" appearing in the repealed Act may have reduced the authority of

the Warden's Court to grant equitable relief. Clause 28 rectifies this situation.

Clause 29 is designed to ensure that breaches of the regulations under other Acts affecting mining, such as the Mines and Works Inspection Act or Pastoral Act are encompassed in the provisions of section 68. It is considered anomalous that at present the Director of Mines is unable to present to the Warden's Court, information he may have concerning a particular application. The first proposed amendment to section 69 under clause 30 rectifies this situation by creating a relationship between the court and the Director of Mines similar to that existing between the Superintendent of Licensed Premises and the Licensing Court. The second amendment to this section gives the Director the authority to institute and application for forfeiture of a claim. At present there are provisions for the Crown to terminate a lease for breach of conditions, but no similar provisions exist in respect of claims.

The provisions of section 74 which permit the Minister to make an order expelling a person from the opalfields have proved an effective way of overcoming some of the problems relating to violence on the opalfields. Some six persons have been expelled to date. Clause 31 proposes to continue this power indefinitely, but at the same time it is only reasonable that there be power to revoke such an order. That power does not exist at present.

Section 75 can be read to mean that it is in order to obtain extractive minerals for personal use from any land. Clause 32 rectifies this situation. Clause 33 is designed to prevent some of the malpractice which occurred in other States during the mining boom, and to ensure that valuable geological data is not lost.

The existing section 86 concerning the disposal of abandoned machinery does not apply if the mining tenement is forfeited or surrendered. Clause 34 covers this situation. Clause 35 is to ensure that authorised officers of the Mines Department have the authority to enter mining tenements to ascertain whether provisions of the Act are being complied with. Clause 36 corrects a drafting error.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PULP AND PAPER MILL (HUNDREDS OF MAYURRA AND HINDMARSH) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

That the report be noted.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CREDIT UNION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 2603.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Liberal Party will support this Bill, which it sees as a necessary piece of legislation. It sets up the registration of credit unions within South Australia and establishes standards of management for those unions. I appreciate the work carried out by credit unions, much of which is done on a voluntary basis to help the large number of members who use the

facilities available. Throughout Australia there are 738 credit unions serving about 900 000 people. In South Australia the credit unions play an important role serving employees of large organisations, or the community at large.

This Bill is a complex and lengthy piece of legislation. The Liberal Party is concerned about one or two minor areas. I do not think it is necessary to examine those areas, because it is intended to propose some minor amendments to this legislation in another place. I hope that those amendments are accepted. I understand that the legislation is necessary because of difficulties that credit unions may face at some time. It is not possible for such organisations always to have a sound basis on which to operate, and they may occasionally get into financial difficulty, as any large financial organisation can do. I see a great deal of credit in supporting these organisations. Incidentally, credit unions in South Australia account for, I believe, an investment of over \$50 000 000. Obviously, when such a large sum is involved it is essential that certain standards and conditions apply. Those standards and conditions are set out in the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, but that Act does not provide sufficient guidelines under which credit unions can operate. This measure has the full blessing of the credit unions that operate in South Australia.

They apparently first sought this legislation six years ago, and no doubt they are delighted to see it before the House. I compliment the officers of the South Australian Public Service who have put much thought, time and effort into preparing the legislation, which would not have been easy to prepare. They have done an excellent job, particularly when it is remembered that the credit unions themselves support the legislation. Consequently, the Liberal Party wishes to see the legislation pass through this House as quickly as possible. We understand that it is necessary legislation, especially as it establishes a protection fund to cover any credit unions that may face financial difficulty in the future. The Liberal Party will support the Bill in the second reading and Committee stages. As I said, we look forward to certain minor amendments being made in another place by the Hon. Mr. Burdett.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title".

The CHAIRMAN: I intend to make a clerical amendment to the short title, which should read "Credit Unions Act", and not "Credit Union Act".

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"A credit union must be registered under this Act."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I ask the Minister of Education as Minister in charge of the Bill, whether this clause is likely to catch any other organisation that is not a credit union. I suggest that small employee groups or even small family businesses could be caught under its provisions. Can the Minister therefore give an assurance that only credit unions will be involved? We have had several examples in the past few days of legislation which was designed to carry out a specific purpose but in which the definitions were too wide, and the Government admitted that it was at fault. I wonder whether the same mistake has been made in this clause.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I understand that the Attorney-General would be willing to consider an amendment that made it absolutely clear that family companies were not caught in the provisions

of this Bill. The honourable member indicated that amendments might be moved in another place; the Attorney would be willing to consider that amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As that procedure is acceptable to the Government and as there is apparently some doubt about the matter, maybe an amendment will be moved in another place to cover the anomaly.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 113 passed.

Clause 114—"Power to control advertising of a credit union or association."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This is an important clause, because it is necessary that credit unions should not have an unfair advantage in advertising over other organisations that supply credit. I ask whether the power to control advertising under this clause will exceed other powers in Federal legislation or whether it conflicts substantially with Federal legislation.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that this provision is the same as the provision in the Building Societies Act.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (115 to 122) passed.

First schedule.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Are there any other credit unions or similar bodies in South Australia which are not listed in this schedule but which operate in the State on a functional basis? In other words, is this a complete list of all such organisations?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that the list contained in the schedule was provided by the Registrar of Companies as being an exhaustive list up to this week.

Schedule passed.

Second schedule and title passed.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill, because the type of legislation involved has been necessary for some time, but certain aspects of it need closer scrutiny. One is suspicious of the Government in its handling of this type of legislation, bringing it on so quickly and putting it through as it has done. It is not possible to handle in this way complex legislation dealing with credit and the organisations involved in the financial situation, bearing in mind that credit unions in this State handle considerable sums of money and have large memberships, yet there is little protection for those who put their money into the fund. The way in which the legislation has been framed may be desirable, but it is not completely satisfactory. Certain clauses will mean that the control and management could be placed in the hands of those without a proven track record. I say that advisedly. The Government must be most careful in selecting people to be placed on the board, and many credit unions are not associated with the Credit Union League. The Government must not be taken in by that organisation or its representations.

The list is impressive, but many credit unions are outside the league, and they are in charge of and supervise great sums of money. One gets the feeling that one group has been pushing for this and has obviously placed itself in the position of being accepted to operate on the board. The board is Government orientated, and it will have much to do with the control and management of credit unions throughout the State. I give this warning to the Govern-

ment. I have several other suggestions in relation to the fund and the protection of money in the fund, but a note of caution should be sounded. The first schedule contains the names of many credit unions that no longer exist, and I wonder how closely the Government has examined the list it has placed before the Parliament. Some of those credit unions are now merged under the Greater Adelaide Credit Union. The Government should have done its homework and should have checked on why such credit unions have disappeared or been merged into the Greater Adelaide Credit Union, and whether it was because of inefficient operation, incompetent management, or because the system under which they were operating was not profitable.

Credit unions are not profit-making organisations. The shareholders are there only to provide the initial capital. Having been involved many years ago in forming a credit union in another State for stamp duty and registration purposes, I have some knowledge of the subject. I am sure that this legislation needed much more thought and consideration than the Opposition has been able to give it. I ask the Government to look at the list in the first schedule and at the credibility, management, expertise, and background of all the credit unions, and then to look at the structures outside the Credit Union League. I sound a note of warning and caution that we should not rush into this matter, as the Government has done with this legislation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I support the comments of the member for Hanson regarding the speed with which the Bill has had to go through the Lower House. It is especially disturbing, in the second to last week of the Parliamentary sittings, when we have processed many Bills and have sat so late, to see much major legislation introduced on a Tuesday afternoon and having to be debated on Thursday. The Bill is one of 44 pages, with a lengthy second reading explanation, and simply doing the necessary background research did not allow any opportunity to examine the Bill closely and to prepare the necessary amendments. That is why it has been necessary for us, as the Opposition in the Lower House, to say that we will put forward amendments in the Upper House. The Government seldom accepts our amendments in the Lower House, but it is forced to do so where we have the numbers in the Upper House.

I suggest one further amendment that I hope the Upper House will adopt. There should be an ability to withdraw funds from small accounts on the death of a person, without succession duties certificates and formal administration, as is done with banks and building societies. A couple may have vital savings in a credit union, and it is important that they should be allowed to withdraw small amounts from credit accounts, so that the moneys are liquid and can be used. I support the legislation, and look forward to minor amendments being made in another place.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 25. Page 2522.)

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Long service leave."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I ask the Committee to oppose this clause, which is a rather unusual course of action. The member for Mallee,

in the second reading debate, indicated that I had told him an amendment would be moved to the Bill in Committee granting to teachers unconditional pro rata long service leave after seven years. This would be in conformity with that clause which went into a Bill that passed this Chamber some short time ago in relation to the building industry, and also with our intention in relation to the Public Service Act. On further reflection, it is the opinion of the Government that this is a rather unsatisfactory way of looking at the matter and that it would be better for a Bill to be introduced later in this session, in the new year, which would amend this Act and the Public Service Act so that this provision would be made available to public servants and teachers at the same time.

The only other way to do it would be simply not to proclaim the clause of this Bill, as amended, until such time as the amendments to the Public Service Act were introduced. On reflection, it would seem that the better course of action would be to introduce that Bill in the next session.

Dr. Eastick: Will you be looking at retrospectivity?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, although the detail of that matter has not been clearly resolved. The other aspect is whether we should continue with the clause which is before the Committee or whether we should oppose it and take up this matter in the new Bill. I understand that the Premier wishes to consult further with the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association regarding the matter of the calculation being on completed years or months of service. Rather than altering this Act, we have been advised to leave the matter open until new legislation can be introduced next session. Therefore, I ask the Committee to reject the clause.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I expected the Bill to be amended to bring it into line with other legislation that has been passed. The private sector is obliged to consider pro rata long service leave after seven years, but that right does not apply in the Public Service until after 10 years. I accept the Minister's argument that it would not be satisfactory to amend this Act without bringing it into line with other legislation and, on his assurance that the Premier intends to introduce amendments to the Public Service long service leave provisions in order to conform with the private sector, it would be appropriate then to amend the Education Act so as to be able to proclaim uniform provisions at the same time. On that basis, I accept his explanation that we should not proceed with this clause. I am not sure why the provisions now become unnecessary, because they do not relate specifically to a period of 10 years. There is still a requirement to complete 10 years service, but provision is to be made for pro rata arrangements. Because we are not changing the 10-year provision, why cannot we proceed and not vote against clause 5?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It can be expected that something like this will be included in the Bill to amend the two Acts to which I have referred. If the Public Service Board has a different attitude regarding completed months of service, and would want that to be reflected in the legislation to be introduced by the Premier, perhaps that same change of emphasis should be reflected in the Education Act. We would not do much damage by leaving the clause in, but we believe that the matter should be dealt with in the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Unless retrospectivity is catered for we will deny people an entitlement, especially if we have to wait X months to include that provision, because some people may lose the advantage they may have expected as

a result of this amendment. Will the Minister give an assurance that this matter will be put into its proper perspective when other amendments are introduced?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot give an unqualified assurance, as that will be contingent on a Government decision that has not yet been made. If we proceed with the amendment I had in mind, teachers would have a marginal advantage over some public servants.

Mr. Nankivell: This clause is different from the proposed amendment.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, but it will pick up this clause. I will try to frame an amendment that will take care of this matter.

Dr. EASTICK: I recognise that there may be dangers and that it may not be possible to fulfil that promise in total. Opposition members have often spoken against the principle of retrospectivity, but I believe that in this instance retrospectivity should be considered, and it should be included in the legislation if at all possible.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Constitution of Teachers' Registration Board."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister say why he has decided to increase the number of members of this board? What is the rationale behind the increase?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Much attention has been given to this matter since it was raised with me by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The institute believes (and the Government accepts this opinion) that there should be parity of representation on the board between employer and employee representatives, and six members have been chosen with a Chairman to be appointed by the Government. It would be unfair to take off the board any employer representative, and the solution to obtaining parity without affecting the representation of employers was to increase the number of employee representatives. It was suggested to me that there should be some employee representation from the private sector. There is nothing in the Act to prevent all of the employee representatives from being practising teachers in private schools, but I guess that the numbers do not really suggest that that is likely to happen. This provision will ensure that at least one of the employee representatives is a teacher in a private school.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have always thought that the larger the board the more unwieldy it is, and the longer its meetings drag on. If the Minister is satisfied that this provision is warranted, I guess we must leave it at that. How often does the board meet, and what are its members paid?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As a full board, once a month. The Chairman's remuneration is \$1 900 a year, and I think that ordinary members receive \$1 200.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Qualifications for registration."

The CHAIRMAN: I inform the Committee of a clerical error. In subparagraph (iii), "Education Act Amendment Act, 1976," should read "Education Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1976". I propose to make that alteration.

Clause passed.

Clause 13—"Unregistered person not to hold certain appointments, etc."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I move:

Page 4, line 40—After "employment" insert ", after the expiration of two years from the commencement of the Education Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1976,".

If members refer back to clause 12, they will see subparagraph (iii), which is what we might call a saving clause because the two-year period laid down in the original Act has now elapsed, so that it would make the registration of pre-school teachers impossible unless the saving clause were written in. It has become obvious that a similar amendment to this clause is necessary for exactly the same reason as was necessary regarding clause 12.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CITY OF ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 2, 3 and 8, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed, that it had agreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly to words reinstated in clauses 7 and 17 by the said disagreement; and that it had agreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly to amendment No. 23 without amendment.

ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 2599.)

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I support this minor but necessary Bill. It proposes three amendments to the principal Act, the first being that it adds to the land comprising the Festival Centre by adding section 1183 of the hundred of Adelaide. This is the section of land bordered by King William Road, Parliament House proper, the curved roadway near the the railway station, and Festival Drive; in other words, it covers the area of what is known as the new plaza and new car park. Clause 5, which enacts a new section 29c in the principal Act, virtually formally conveys this section of land to the trust.

I was interested to see last Tuesday, I think, in answer to a question in the House that the estimated date of completion of the plaza is December 22, and that of the car park is March 4, 1977. I understand that progress has been in accordance with the original contractual programme, plus the authorised time extension. I am sure that all members are looking forward to the opening of the car park, which will be available to them, and I am sure that, likewise, Festival Centre patrons are looking forward to being able to park their cars, under cover, close to the centre.

The second amendment to the principal Act makes clear that the trust has the power to enter into contracts operating outside of this State. This matter is dealt with in clause 4, which amends section 20 of the principal Act and which

merely clarifies the situation regarding the trust's powers under the Act. It is becoming more and more important for the trust and other companies to act more in the role of entrepreneur. It is important for the trust to be able to take productions to other States. We all know of the expense involved in producing the successful productions the trust has put on in the Festival Centre. Many successful productions have been promoted and premiered in this State, and this amendment clarifies the position so that the trust is able to take to other States productions that are successful in this State so that the likely success of the production in the other States will help to recoup some of the heavy expenses involved in mounting such productions. It will also give more incentive to local producers and actors when they know that their productions may be taken to other States in this way. As South Australians we are proud of the many excellent productions that have been promoted by the trust, and it will be good to take the productions as business enterprises outside the State.

The third amendment to the principal Act rationalises the situation relating to parking motor vehicles around the Festival Centre. Clause 7 inserts new sections 36 and 37. New section 36 will allow the trust to collect expiation fees in amounts not exceeding \$10 for parking offences, and new section 37 vests in the Adelaide City Council power to regulate traffic movement, parking and associated matters in and about the centre. In other words, this third amendment allows the City Council to police the situation. Those of us who frequent the Festival Centre know of the need for the council to be able to police the parking area adequately. This assumption of power by the council has been proposed following discussions with the trust, and in all respects seems to be a most convenient arrangement. I support the Bill, which although minor is extremely important for the activities of the Adelaide Festival Centre.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I have consistently supported Bills regarding the Festival Centre Trust and I do so again. I echo what has been said by the member for Heysen. I am particularly interested in the expansion of the activities of the trust that will be permitted under the Bill. When I asked a question of the Premier about three months ago regarding the completion date of the car park facilities, I was told that the cost would be about \$5 000 000 and that the work would be completed by early December this year. The House was informed earlier this week that the date for the completion of the car park will be March 4, 1977. In the reply given to me earlier the Premier explained the method of entry for members of Parliament into that car park and into the House from the car park. I would like to know why the delay has occurred.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am intrigued by the activities going on at the back of the House. The Bill states that the trust has the oversight of parking around the theatre complex but the policing of traffic is in the hands of the police. I am interested in the structure that is at the back of the House. Who will control that area? What are the arrangements for members of Parliament who I believe will be able to park their cars in that car park? When we inspected the area recently I saw some massive gates at the entrance to the new car park. What will be the arrangements for moving in and out of the car park after hours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The reasons for the later date of completion for the car park are the sort of delays that can occur within building

contracts in South Australia. The Government has for some time in relation to buildings such as the Festival Centre not been prepared to put specific completion dates on projects simply because it sometimes makes negotiations about wage claims somewhat difficult. As far as I am aware there has not been any undue extension of the completion date that was not contemplated in the original contract.

A certain number of places have been set aside for car parking for members. I am not apprised of precisely what arrangements are made for out-of-hours activity. I know they will be covered; I will get details for the member for Kavel.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 2600.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is for consideration of Supplementary Estimates of \$4 000 000. It is a rather unusual step to take at this stage of the session, as was pointed out by the Deputy Premier when he introduced the Bill. In the normal course of events the authority to bring in the Supplementary Estimates would be sought later in that session, early in the coming year. There is a very real chance that we may not reconvene early in the new year, and it is because of that that we are considering the Supplementary Estimates now.

As the Deputy Premier has been kind enough (I presume on behalf of the Treasurer) to summarise the prospects of the Revenue Account, I wish to point to some interesting facts that emerge. The Government is still apparently confident that at least at the end of the 1976-77 financial year it will have a relatively small deficit. That is encouraging news. It means that the financial affairs of this State could be, in the Treasurer's estimation, running only at a small deficit by the end of the financial year. Receipts from stamp duties and pay-roll tax, in spite of the concessions made, will still be above estimate by about \$5 000 000 to \$7 000 000. This matter was referred to in a debate in this House last Tuesday. We have to remember that last year the Government collected in stamp duties about \$10 000 000 more than it expected and, generally speaking, the whole outlook for the State's economy is still surprisingly good, simply because we still have surplus funds. Those funds seem to be floating funds. I do not know what is the current total of those funds, and perhaps the Treasurer would be good enough to tell us. The Treasurer has a considerable sum up his sleeve.

Mr. Coumbe: Trust funds.

Dr. TONKIN: They are not trust funds, but they are held virtually in trust, and we are not told what the Government will use them for. I surmise that by the end of this financial year the income from State taxation will have gone up and that we will finish the year with another surplus, because the measures announced so far, the apparent concessions on pay-roll tax, stamp duties and succession duties, will in fact not make the impact on the overall Budget that the Treasurer appears to suggest when he says that we will have a small deficit at the end of the year.

There is a disappointing lack of detail in the explanation about the Revenue Account. I suppose that is inevitable with Supplementary Estimates, which are expected to go through without much debate, anyway. Higher payments are mentioned in the areas of education and health care but the reasons for the higher payments are not discussed. I imagine they are predominantly due to salary increases.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not only to salaries.

Dr. TONKIN: Perhaps the Treasurer will be kind enough to give us some details of that when he replies. The Supplementary Estimates we are considering involve only the one line, the "Miscellaneous" line of the Minister of Labour and Industry. The Deputy Premier said that the \$10 000 000 allocated last June would ensure employment for about 870 people until February, 1977. He went on to say that in October, Cabinet approved a further allocation of \$4 000 000 to continue the programme at about the same level until June, 1977, and that the estimates presented in August last did not include an amount for this purpose. The \$4 000 000 is for a new purpose and therefore will impact on the Governor's Appropriation Fund.

On October 27, the Minister of Labour and Industry announced this scheme, as I understand it, and a front page story in the *Advertiser* quoted the Minister as saying that it would increase the number of people working under the State unemployment relief scheme by more than 200 to a total of 1 150 people. Yet the statement made (and I am prepared to accept that it may have been a miscalculation or a slip) is that it will keep the scheme running at about the same level. Once again I would like the Treasurer to clarify that matter for me. If the Minister's claim in October that an extra 200 jobs would be provided by this allocation was in fact not true, I think that the story that appeared in the *Advertiser* ought to be corrected. I am concerned indeed, because it is a matter on which people do not deserve to have their hopes raised unnecessarily or falsely.

Regarding the establishment of job hunters' clubs, for which this line particularly provides (and the youth unemployment work unit is a significant factor in working the job hunters' club), all I can say is that we must do everything we can to support such schemes. The unemployment problem we are currently facing is extreme, and schemes that will help young people to escape from the frustration of not being able to find a job will significantly help the economy of this State by combating the degree of vandalism and other aspects of juvenile crime, and larrikinism that might otherwise come from a small proportion of these young people if they are unable to find employment and vent their frustration, dissatisfaction and alienation against society by acts against society. It makes good economic sense if we can do that.

One point which I shall raise later when the opportunity offers and which I ventilate now is that, because we have established job hunters' club, we must not think for a moment that they are all that is necessary. Two major thrusts are necessary. The job hunters' clubs must be designed in such a way that they not only provide somewhere for young unemployed people to go to be together, to be supported, and to feel that somebody is looking after them but they must also actively encourage young people to go out and seek jobs. In the main that is happening, but there is a disturbingly large number of reports now coming in that indicate that some young people are going to job hunters' clubs and using them as a club and nothing else. I suppose that is inevitable in this sort of climate

of unemployment, but if we are not careful we will be building up a generation of young people who have a tradition of not working.

They are joining, first, because jobs are not available and because they come to depend on unemployment relief, and secondly because they are not brought up (whether it is by the job hunters' club or any other supporting agency) and kept in a frame of mind that their major object is to keep on looking for a job. As I said, this refers to a relatively small proportion of young people, but that proportion, in my view, will grow if we do not keep that attitude to the forefront of our mind.

Mr. Whitten: Isn't that what the Federal Government is trying to do with its \$1.20 a day?

Dr. TONKIN: There is nothing I can find fault with in the overall project concept, but there are possible pitfalls if we are not careful; that is what I am trying to draw attention to. I heard only yesterday of a person offered a job in a delicatessen through the stimulus provided at a job hunters' club. That person reported to the delicatessen and said, "I won't take the job; I'm allergic to food." That is a ridiculous state of affairs. It will not happen often, but it is happening and we must watch carefully this group of young people in the community who, through no fault of their own, are drifting into a tradition of hand-outs and no work.

Another matter covered by the Supplementary Estimates is the unemployment relief scheme administered by the Labour and Industry Department and councils. This scheme is offensive in one sphere. I have no doubt that the requirement for people who take part in unemployment relief schemes in council areas to become members of a union (if they are not already members of a union) is totally against the fundamental universal principles of individual freedom. A furore was created recently by the resignation of a councillor on Meadows council who was unwilling to sit on the council and watch people being forced to join a union before they could take part in an unemployment relief scheme administered by that council. A few months ago I went to Tumby Bay where the same thing was happening and where, because a workman had been engaged on the scheme but preferred not to join a union, the local clerk, rather than dismiss the workman, stopped work and the council backed him up.

It is totally wrong and unethical for a Government to insist that councils should impose this condition before unemployed people can find work and obtain money with dignity. Everyone has the right to work but, unfortunately, not everyone can obtain work. By and large, to require people to become compulsory members of a union is totally wrong.

Mr. Whitten: Do you support free loaders?

Dr. TONKIN: I will not go into the arguments for and against that subject across the floor in response to interjections. The Australian Labor Party says that it subscribes to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which provides that no-one shall be compelled to join an association, yet, without any doubt, the same Party supports what it chooses to call absolute preference to unionists, which is compulsory unionism. It cannot be put any other way. That shows a total and absolute conflict, and nothing that has been said by members opposite or by any supporter of compulsory unionism has convinced me or the majority of people in Australia that that is a correct attitude. As usual, I support the Bill, which provides for the further running of the Labour and Industry Department to the extent of \$4 000 000. Because this is a financial measure, I support it with those reservations that I have already outlined.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I intend to say only a couple of things. I agree with most of what the Leader has said. Certainly I agree with what he said about compulsory unionism. It is interesting to hear the sort of defensive reaction (the member for Spence was trying to interject) because it shows that the Labor Party has no real argument to rebut complaints made by the Leader and by other members on this side of the House that Labor Party policy amounts to compulsory unionism. That policy is quite contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to all ideas of justice. Members of the Labor Party can do nothing about that situation, because it is a policy that is foisted on them, if they needed it to be foisted on them, by the unions, which are their great supporters. We can talk about this subject until we are blue in the face, but it will not make a jot or tittle of difference to the Labor Party.

I want to take up an implied criticism made by the Leader about the methods that the Government is using in job hunters' clubs. Of course, any scheme of this kind will be abused to some degree, but I certainly would not associate myself with any implied criticism of what the Government is trying to do about this matter. Thank heavens that I have never been unemployed or have ever faced the threat of unemployment. Recently a member of my family was in that position. It did not happen, thank goodness, but it brought home to all of us how dreadful this situation must be. It was a damn good lesson for me and for all of us. Anything that the Government tries to do to solve unemployment is welcome. I certainly support what has been attempted and what the Government has in mind.

I will make only two other points, one of which I hope you, Mr. Speaker, will allow me to make and I hope, too, that the Treasurer will reply to it when he speaks. Anyway, it relates to a financial matter. Much discussion has ensued and always will ensue regarding Adelaide's water, and the need to filter our water system. It was announced in the 1970 policy speech of my Party, and it has been announced by the present Government as its policy, that Adelaide's water will be filtered. I understand that the sum of \$21 000 000 was allocated by the Commonwealth for this purpose. In reply to this debate, will the Treasurer outline what is the present position regarding that allocation for filtration? The other matter to which I should like the Treasurer to reply arises from what is contained in the second reading explanation, as follows:

In 1976-77, however, it is possible that Parliament may not reconvene after the present sittings until the latter months of the financial year.

A few weeks ago I tried to ascertain just what are the Government's plans in this regard.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that nothing in the Bill relates to the matter into which the honourable member has drifted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is in the speech, though. I have taken a sentence from the second reading explanation of the Bill, and I will read the sentence if you wish, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I would be obliged to the honourable member if he would do so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I just did.

The SPEAKER: I was interrupted at the time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On this point I believe that I am in order. My former point was perhaps a bit wide of the Bill, but you allowed me to finish. Perhaps I had better read the sentence, in view of what you have said, Sir. The second reading explanation states:

In 1976-77, however, it is possible that Parliament may not reconvene after the present sittings until the latter months of the financial year.

I ask, arising out of that, when it is likely that Parliament will sit again. A firm decision must be reached no later than today week, as I understand it. A few weeks ago I tried to get an indication out of the Minister of Works, when he was in charge of the House, but I failed lamentably to do so; he would not give me any indication. Therefore, it looks as though it will be May or June before we meet again. I do not know whether that is correct, but it would be convenient for members to have an idea now of when Parliament is likely to sit again to complete this session. The question of trail bikes was asked today, and the Minister for the Environment said that he hoped to introduce the measure in the latter part of the session. It would not only be convenient for us to know but it is also a matter of some public interest when Parliament is likely to sit again. I therefore ask the Treasurer, when he replies, to say something about, first, water filtration and, secondly, the sittings of the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition has asked about the sums of money that the Government has paid to reserves from revenue. I cannot tell him exactly how much is in reserve at the moment, but it would be about \$25 000 000. That figure is being held as against the necessity for some further supplementation of the unemployment relief scheme in the latter part of this financial year, and as against the likelihood of our not getting very much carry-over effect from taxation next financial year, and therefore to avoid the necessity for increases in taxation in the next financial year.

Mr. Wardle: There will be some carry-over?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage, it is a bit early to say. What is happening now at the Treasury is that we are keeping constant graphs of expenditure. We have, with the new Treasury arrangements which I outlined to honourable members earlier this year, much greater notice of fluctuations in anticipated expenditures and revenue, but what is coming out of that information is that the situation is much more volatile than it has been in previous experience, and it is much less easy to forecast results than previously. If one examines the graphs, and compares them with graphs which have been now drawn for previous years, in fact, in the way the old graphs could have been drawn, the present graphs would tend to go off the paper. The fluctuations are much wider than we have previously experienced.

Mr. Wardle: Off the top or the bottom?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Both. It is remarkable that it is not nearly as easy to forecast, because economic conditions are disturbed and, in some greater degree, unpredictable. It is necessary for us to exercise caution at this time; frankly, as Treasurer, I have been cautious over the years. I hope that we are going to be in the position that, next financial year, I will be able to maintain the position that South Australia does not have marked increases in taxation and alteration in the taxation structures. The Leader has asked about the figure in the unemployment relief programme. That, too, necessarily fluctuates because of the nature of the jobs that can be created in an unemployment relief programme, and there is anticipated a build-up to the figure given by the Minister of Labour and Industry, but that final figure towards the end of the year would be a number around 870. That is why here the figure has been to maintain at least that figure for the whole year.

It may be that, later in the year, we will have to provide some additional moneys to give an additional boost in this area to employment, and that depends on what comes out of the intake from school-leavers and how far that conceivably could be taken up in the early months of next year. The prospect at the moment must be gloomy. The effect of devaluation will be to lead to a marked increase in inflation and that in itself is likely to have an adverse effect upon employment, and it will be compounded by the Commonwealth Government's proposals for a marked restriction in the money supply and in credit, which will mean that there is even less opportunity than previously to encourage investment and reinvestment. This, again, is likely to have a depressing effect on employment throughout Australia.

Whilst we have been able to maintain both the level of business activity and investment in South Australia rather better than in the rest of Australia, inevitably our companies will be affected by the marketplace of the State. If that marketplace is affected by higher inflation and greater unemployment, obviously enough by stimulating the market for 15 per cent of our total production, which is what is here in South Australia, we can only marginally affect locally what is the scene for the total of our companies, particularly in the manufacturing area. It is possible in those circumstances that we will have to give a considerable additional boost in the unemployment relief area, in which unhappily we can get no support for general schemes from the Commonwealth Government, although we have repeatedly sought that it should come in, and come in on some such basis as dollar for dollar, which would, in fact, save the Commonwealth money as against the unemployment relief it is having to pay people at the moment; nevertheless, Mr. Fraser has adamantly refused to be involved. The member for Mitcham has asked a question about water filtration.

The SPEAKER: Order! Obviously, my attention was directed elsewhere when the member for Mitcham asked that question. Had I been attentive, I would not have allowed that question, because it has nothing to do with the Bill. As I am now aware of it, I cannot allow the Treasurer to answer the question.

Mr. Millhouse: I spoke quite directly to you, so that you would know what I was going to say.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can appreciate your view, Mr. Speaker, because the amounts under water filtration are in fact not covered in the Revenue Budget at all. They are matters in the Loan Estimates, and do not come under this.

Dr. Tonkin: From the generosity of the Federal Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We cannot get any indication whether the generosity of the Federal Government will continue beyond this financial year, which is an extremely worrying situation.

Dr. Tonkin: You said that last year, and it turned out to be all right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope it is all right, because we have let the contracts for water filtration—I am sorry, I cannot expand on that.

Mr. Millhouse: You have given me an idea, anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked a question regarding sittings of the House. On that score, no specific date has been arrived at. The term "the latter months of the financial year" was used for the last quarter of the financial year.

Mr. Millhouse: That will be after March.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would not expect that we would sit in March, but honourable members could expect to be asked to meet at any time after the end of March.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I thank you, Sir, and the Leader for allowing me to speak first, although I am not taking the lead position and not claiming unlimited time. The subject on which I wish to grieve is uranium. I am sure everyone in the House will agree that one of the most vital issues facing the community at present and one that will face the community in the months and years to come will be whether or not we go nuclear. At the moment, we are concerned only with the decision to mine, but if we decide to mine there will be a decision at some time on whether or not we should go nuclear. We could not decide not to mine and then, at some future date, decide to go nuclear. That would be rather hypocritical, and such a change of decision would need deep consideration. After reading the Fox report I was disturbed about the consequences of uranium and of nuclear power. All members of this House and of the community should read and study that report, because if we decide to mine uranium or go nuclear we will understand what the consequences could be. To me some of them are almost frightening.

Today, I asked a question about radioactivity that occurred at Port Pirie recently, because, after reading the Fox report, I wondered whether the situation that I had described was possible. It brought home to me the dangers, and the care that must be taken. From what I have read, mistakes of this nature have been made in the United States during the past 20 years and also in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Recently, I read in the *Advertiser* of a supposed explosion of nuclear material that had been placed in a large dump in Russia. Further reports stated that it could have been a nuclear reactor that had exploded, because of the fall-out monitored in other parts of the world. The U.S.S.R. being what it is, we will probably never know the real answer to whether it was a dump or a nuclear power station that exploded. Uranium and plutonium are extremely dangerous materials, and when we bring together a situation of critical mass it is almost frightening.

Mr. Millhouse: It is more than "almost".

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, it is frightening. Even the mining of uranium increases, to a certain extent, dangers in the mining area, and it is the first step in an increasing radioactivity that is present.

Mr. Millhouse: It contributes to the dangers later.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, and the real dangers are apparent in the enrichment process. Today, technology is generally capable of handling these dangers. If we were conversant with technology used today in our oil refineries and chemical works, we might be disturbed about the dangers of this process, but none of them reaches the degree of danger that is apparent in the enrichment of uranium. The Fox report provides a good description of nuclear reactors and the different types involved, of the fusion power, and of thermo-nuclear fusion that could be generated in future. There is a gap between ordinary reactors used today and the thermo-nuclear reactors that

may be used in future. There is a great danger in the intervening period because of the production of material that can be used in atomic bombs.

I will not discuss the problems associated with that procedure, but I will refer to the mining of uranium and the implications of being involved from the first step. We are concerned about the shortage of power and what we will use in future. First, we should use more solar power for hot water systems and other equipment by which we could conserve much power. The developing nations such as India and Africa should consider closely the Western world system of generating and distributing power. Should electricity be generated at one major plant and then distributed, or should there be power developed in smaller packages without a colossal distribution system? We should encourage the developing nations to investigate this aspect through the United Nations, so that they could avoid the extreme need for large energy supplies from generating plants. This would come under the heading of diversification, which we follow to some extent in South Australia, having a major power plant in Adelaide and another at Leigh Creek, which was commenced and established by a previous Liberal Government.

Mr. Millhouse: There is a power station at Port Augusta.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, they are combined. It has been suggested that another power unit should be built at Mount Gambier to replace the previous power unit, developing energy from waste products from the timber forests, and such a process should be encouraged. What are we to do about the mining of uranium? What effect will it have on the world, if we do not mine it? I must agree with the concept that the Western world is committed to nuclear power. Will we be able to stop it? I fear that that would be difficult.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you think about the power of example?

Mr. VANDEPEER: That may be all right, but it may not have a great effect, and that is what we must consider. If we do not mine our uranium, I am sure that it will be obtained by the larger countries from other sources. From what was said on a recent *Monday Conference* programme, it seems that we hold 10 per cent of the world's cheaply available uranium supply and can mine it at a cost of \$30 a pound. Statistics in the Fox report show that 53 nuclear plants are operating in the United States; six in Canada; 11 in Japan; seven in the Federal Republic of Germany; 10 in France; 28 in the United Kingdom; 9 in other European countries; 10 in other Western European countries; five in developing countries; and 12 in the U.S.S.R. These countries are firmly committed to nuclear power, and cannot back out of using it.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think it's too late?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Not completely, and we could lead the world in an approach to the United Nations and say, "We will mine our uranium if the United Nations is prepared to take strong action in controlling the whole of the nuclear programme."

Mr. Millhouse: It is a complex and difficult problem.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I agree, but that approach may highlight the problem to the rest of the world, and it may have some effect. I suggest that we do something on these lines, because I think we are committed to uranium mining, although I am concerned about it.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that the policy of your Party?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Not necessarily: they are my views, but my Party allows its members to have personal views and to express them. We should take the lead in the question of uranium mining and offer something to the

world before it is too late. We may all be remembered in future (if there is a future) by going along with nuclear energy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing my colleague the member for Millicent the right to speak in the debate. He has a commitment that he must keep, and I am grateful for your courtesy.

There are two matters particularly which I will raise, one of which I will deal with briefly but which is nonetheless important. I believe that this matter was raised by the member for Light during a debate last evening on some Bill. There is an alarming number of reports coming to all members about people who apply for renewal of their builder's licence. The circumstances as outlined to me are horrifying. The latest was a builder who, having been licensed, sent in his application for renewal earlier this year. Having heard nothing from the department, he inquired, and was told more recently that his application had not been received and that, subsequently, he should reapply. He reapplied and was told, "No, it is not enough to apply for a renewal of your licence, because your original application has not been received." He was told that he would have to apply for a new licence, put in a new application, and go through all the fuss and bother of getting references and disclosing all the information necessary in order to get a new licence.

Mr. Slater: And he lost continuity.

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed. He was not happy about this, because he knew that he had sent in his application. He then heard from the department that his application for a new licence had been refused.

Mr. Slater: The same story as I've heard.

Dr. TONKIN: I have heard it from five or six sources involving five or six different people. It has happened to at least five people I know of. I think that the honourable member's example might coincide with one of mine, but I do not know. He was told not only that his licence was rejected but also that the best thing he could do was to enrol in a night course and spend 12 months studying part time so that he might be qualified to obtain a licence, which he had held until some fool lost many applications.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Do you think he lost them?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not know. All I know is that many applications for renewal have apparently been lost, mislaid or destroyed. I do not know where they have gone, nor does the department, yet it still persists, as far as I can see, in upholding the letter of the law and saying that a new application for a new licence must be applied for and then, adding insult to injury, rejecting the application and suggesting a further course in education. It would be laughable if it were not so serious for the people involved, because they are unable to earn a livelihood in the way in which they have become accustomed over the past several years.

Mr. Allison: There is an implication that, because he has no licence, he is a worse builder.

Dr. TONKIN: That is a fine point: there is the implication that he is unable to perform as well as he could in the past.

Mr. Slater: I know a man who was summonsed for operating without a licence.

Dr. TONKIN: It all goes to show that, instead of these cases being reported month after month, something ought to be done. The Minister should see in what way those people can be helped, because it seems to me that a ridiculous situation has developed in which, simply because of an error that has occurred in the department in the mislaying (I say that to be kind) of those applications for renewal, people are now being—

Mr. Allison: Mislaid, not mislaid.

Dr. TONKIN: Whatever term we use, the effect is the same. Some positive action must be taken by the Government to overcome the problem. The person from whom I have just heard certainly should not be penalised in this way for not holding a licence. I look forward with interest to what the Government intends to do about this matter, because it is not good enough as it stands. The Government is clearly in the wrong and should do something to rectify the situation.

I refer now to a subject which is dear to my heart and which is concerning me deeply, namely, the Royal Commission on drugs, which was announced by the Premier on November 16. He announced that Royal Commission, saying that things had come to such a pass in the community that only a Royal Commission was appropriate to determine what courses of action should be taken and how severe the problem was, and that it should investigate the entire situation. At the time, I thoroughly welcomed the announcement of the Commission, because I believed, with the Premier, that that was the appropriate course of action to follow. In the meantime, I have concluded that perhaps it is not the best course of action to follow. There is a tendency in the community, certainly among Parliamentarians, to believe that, when a Royal Commission has been appointed, something has been done. It seems to me that, by adopting that attitude (and it is an easy one to adopt) and falling into that state of mind, we are doing the whole community a grave disservice. This came to mind because I had adopted that attitude and, because I believed that something was being done, I felt better about it.

Nothing is being done, and nothing has changed. We are still awaiting the announcement of who will be the Commissioner or Commissioners and to hear what are the terms of reference, and we are as far away as we ever were from having an inquiry into the whole situation. Yet, in my view, the community attitude is "Yes, something is being done. An inquiry is being held." That is a dangerous situation indeed, because it gives us a false sense of security.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I thought that you agreed with it a while back.

Dr. TONKIN: I did at the time, but I have changed my attitude over the past two or three weeks: not towards the need for a Commission, but certainly regarding the way in which it has been applied, and what good it will do if we are not careful. I believe that something ought to be done to push things along. If the appointment of the Royal Commission lulls us into a sense of false security and a "Let's-wait-for-the-report" kind of attitude, we will let the drug problem get so far ahead of us that we will take several years to catch up.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There's another Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: There is, and I had almost forgotten it.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Had you forgotten it?

Dr. TONKIN: No, but it brings me to the point that that Bill has been sitting on the Notice Paper for some time.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Come on!

Dr. TONKIN: In terms of urgency it has. It has come from another place, which passed it three weeks ago.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We were worried. You complained about legislation being put through too quickly, so we thought we'd allow you to study this one for some time.

Dr. TONKIN: I believe that Bill could have gone through this House rapidly. We could have gone through its provisions within two or three days—there is no problem about that. I would like to know why the delay has occurred. It is about six years since I came back from North America and said that the situation particularly in South Australia and in Australia generally was about five years behind that of North America. Despite all the work that has been done in community health education programmes, in education projects in schools and in the work of the Public Health Department (it has been working hard as well), heroin and hard drugs are taking over more and more as a way of escape for young people. I do not intend to go into the reasons behind that at this stage. It is a progression that has been noted in oversea countries from which we could have learnt a lesson had we wished to do so.

It seems to me we have not learnt a lesson and, in common with almost every country in the world, we have adopted the attitude that it cannot happen here. I do not know why we think we are so special. It can happen here and people are now dying of hard drug abuse. If that is happening now we can be sure the next stage will occur and within 12 months few people in the community will be able to say they do not know first hand of at least one family that has been touched by the horror of drug dependence. I was impressed in North America by the fact that everyone knew a family in the same street, or club, or church, that had been involved with a drug dependent. It did not matter much what was the socio-economic group, the district or the suburb, it was a fact of life, and that horrified me. I believe we are reaching that stage in South Australia. So far this year only 13 deaths have been reported but nevertheless that is far more than we have had before and the figure is escalating at a rate that seems to suggest we are going to get many more deaths soon.

We must have the Royal Commission set up as soon as possible. The Treasurer has given assurances that that will be done. I would have liked to see it set up yesterday, along with the terms of reference. I would have liked to see the Commission meeting by now. If we have to wait to take specific action until that Royal Commission is constituted, has a preliminary meeting and goes through the procedure of meetings, which could well take about 12 months, the drug problem will then be 12 months behind.

Mr. Millhouse: You are being a bit unreasonable about this; he said it would be this month.

Dr. TONKIN: Nevertheless I am putting in a plea for it to be set up tomorrow, or as soon as possible because we are dealing with human lives. Drug dependence and drug abuse means human lives when it gets to the stage it has now reached in our community. The average life expectancy of a heroin addict is about six months; we must keep that before us at all times.

We must get that Royal Commission off the ground and it must have a provision that allows specific recommendations to be made by way of an interim report and acted on, if it is appropriate to do so, at the first opportunity. Unless we structure it that way the Royal Commission will inhibit action, criminal elements will move

into the scene more than they are doing now, and we will see a tremendous escalation in the use of heroin and other hard drugs of dependence. That is something that no-one can gainsay. The effect of drug dependence is one of the various manifestations of alienation caused by frustrations and pressures we put on young people. It seems to me that unemployment for young people is a tremendously important part of this problem. Unemployment has acted as an exacerbating factor in the whole question of alienation from society.

In recent years there has been an alarming increase in the percentage of young unemployed, and it is evident that if it is allowed to continue it will have devastating economic and social consequences. Obviously, I am not debating the question of the total number of unemployed, as we all have our own views on whether Federal and State Government policies are increasing or decreasing unemployment, and what should be done about it. I will deal with that later. I wish to concentrate now on a specific factor of unemployment, that is, the unemployment of young people. The latest employment figures for October from the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations show that 43 per cent of the State's 19 037 registered unemployed are under the age of 21. That is a high percentage.

This percentage has been steadily increasing for many years and it can be clearly seen by looking at October figures for the past four years: 1973, 35.3 per cent; 1974, 38.9 per cent; 1975, 41.1 per cent; and 1976, 42.9 per cent. This problem is not peculiar to South Australia as it is evident throughout all States. Research by the Employers' Central Industrial Secretariat demonstrates the trend in Australia for the past 25 years, as shown in August figures, as follows: 1950, 14 per cent; 1960, 22 per cent; 1970, 31 per cent; and 1976, 38 per cent.

With an estimated 250 000 school and college leavers seeking employment this Christmas, the present number of 100 000 young unemployed are expected to be joined by another 100 000 young unemployed. What this means is that by January, 1977, there will be 200 000 young unemployed in Australia assuming a reasonable number of school leavers get jobs. On present percentages it means that there will be about 16 000 to 17 000 young unemployed in South Australia in January, 1977. The magnitude of the problem is indisputable, but the reasons for its development are many and varied and are subject to some debate.

As the Melbourne *Age* pointed out last week, the most worrying feature of this problem was that it was not just the recession that had caused it. The *Age* went on to say that, while the numbers out of work have been magnified several times by the recession, the problem of young unemployed has been growing on us for a generation. They concluded that high young unemployment seemed here to stay. That is a sweeping, meaningful and alarming statement to make. The Central Industrial Secretariat has stated the following:

It is true that the present economic climate has had an impact on the level of unemployment among juniors. However, it is important to recognise that the blame for this increasing ratio of junior unemployment cannot be laid entirely at the door of the present recession. Changes are taking place in the structure of the labour force. These changes are having noticeable repercussions throughout the Australian economy, and are having a particularly adverse effect on some sectors of the labour market.

While it is true that these structural changes are being magnified by the current economic situation, they are not necessarily caused by the recession. As such it is not

reasonable to expect that they will disappear when and if the economy returns to a reasonable level of equilibrium and stability.

That, too, is an alarming fact, if it is true. It seems to indicate that there is a change in pattern, a change in the attitude amongst young people. This may well reflect a change in the attitude among the community as a whole. There appears to be a great need for a reassessment of the attitude of every member of the community towards the community, his neighbours, and himself and his role in the community. If we are to ensure that the standards of living, the quality of life, and the programme of community welfare of which we are so proud are to be maintained we must make sure that we all play a part. I believe it comes down to a matter of caring for other people. Certainly, drug dependence, juvenile delinquency and the problems of alienation come down to a lack of caring, a lack of obvious care by parents for their children and a lack of care by members of the community for other members of the community, for neighbours, in fact. In this community of ours there is a far greater tendency to selfishness and emphasis on material things, and we are all guilty of selfishness, either personal, domestic, corporate or community-based.

There seems to be (although we use the word very frequently nowadays) a total misunderstanding of the word "community", which means basically "common interest", "common concern" and "common responsibility". I think that one of the factors we will have to face as a Parliament (and the Liberal Party is well aware of the need to face up to this problem) is that our community spirit and concern is going off the rails. We are all to blame. It seems, too, that until we are all willing to work a little harder, and try to get away with a little less than we do now without working, and start working together for the common good, we are not going to get anywhere at all in the future; we are going to be letting down our young people who will become the leaders of tomorrow's society. This is a matter that concerns me deeply; I think that it concerns everyone in the community. We have seen the effects of alienation, and frustration, and the millions of dollars which vandalism, and arson particularly, cost the community each year.

We have a job to do, and the Government has a job not only to stimulate employment, to do something meaningful about pay-roll tax, worker's compensation, worker participation, compulsory unionism and all the other things keeping industrial development away from the State but also to set an example by which it can, as far as possible, reintroduce an element of responsibility to members of trade unions, employer groups and to every single person in the community. It comes down to self, and whether we are all prepared to face up to this challenge. I believe that Australia has reached a point where, unless we do face up to this challenge very soon, nothing can save us. As with so many other things, the responsibility for putting this country back on its feet, and the State back on its feet, lies with every individual. I have deliberately tried to avoid political philosophies in this instance because I believe this is a matter that is bipartisan and should affect every Australian. Unless we face up to this problem, I believe the future of this country is very grim.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I suppose it could be said that the Leader has laid a nice, convenient and appropriate basis for me to work from. It might only be the means of announcing a text in order to properly base a speech on the philosophy of the salvation of mankind. I will not do that, except to say that after one becomes a member of

Parliament it becomes clearer and clearer that politics will never ever change or save the world and that politics has not a great deal to offer on a human basis for man's needs. We do not make many laws that are of very direct assistance to individuals. I think the Leader has put his finger on the biggest problem in the world when he says that people have grown selfish. As I see it, the more affluent individuals are, the more selfish they become, and I think that that is probably the biggest problem that Australia has today—we virtually have too much money.

I think all of us here are of a sufficient vintage to recall our younger days when we certainly did not have the pocket money that our children have today, and when we lived very simply and our entertainment was very simple. We could not afford to go far for our entertainment, or pay very much for it and we derived much pleasure from the very simple things in life—in fact, one another's company. I do not think people seek each other's company so much today for pleasure and entertainment. They seek to be entertained, as they are able to pay for entertainment and are able to go to places to be entertained.

I find that young people in my area do not just visit the local dance hall; they get tired of that dance after an hour or so and go 70 or 80 kilometres to another dance and perhaps, before the night is out, to even another dance. They are able to travel those distances in a matter of minutes because of modern motor vehicles and modern roads. When it is all added up, how satisfactory has their night out been? I do not think it has been as pleasant, pleasurable and satisfactory as many of the distinct pleasures we enjoyed when those of us who are here were young and derived much pleasure from very simple things. I agree entirely with the Leader that we have lost our sense of real community spirit and dedication, and it is largely because we have lost our sense of responsibility to one another and because we have become prosperous as a country and as individuals; prosperity has taken from us much of that sense of obligation and duty.

I turn to the subject of licences to divert water from the Murray River. In 1968, when the Government of the day decided to introduce diverttees' licences, it was done hurriedly, and not much notice was given that licences would be issued. What came out of that was a somewhat mixed bag. Some people in the community were shrewd enough to know that probably that was an opportunity to get the maximum licence, and they quoted a figure of about 20 hectares, even though they had probably only developed about 2 ha and only ever intended to develop about 4 or 6 ha under irrigation. On the other hand, some people who had irrigated about 1 or 1½ ha over the years applied for about 1½ ha. They faced up honestly to the situation as it existed. Some thought, "We are irrigating 2 ha and we could in future need 4 ha," so they applied for 4 ha. What has happened is that since 1968 many areas have been licensed but are not irrigated.

In many instances people do not have sufficient finance to develop their licensed land, nor do they have the intention to do so, yet their neighbours who, in order to make their unit viable, could do with an additional 2 to 4 ha to irrigate, cannot get it. Throughout my time as a member I have had, almost weekly, people approaching me who have perhaps recently purchased properties that are right alongside the river but do not have an irrigation permit. They say to me, "Well, I have a particular situation, especially in a drought year like we have just had, and I could well do with 2 or 4 ha. My neighbour has a licence for 20 ha and is using only 4 ha so

that 16 ha is virtually standing idle. What can I do?" I have made every effort for my constituents to take these matters to the department, but the department has stood firm against these overtures.

Both political Parties when in Government have adopted the same attitude. These licences were introduced by a Liberal Government, and the Labor Government has maintained them. I am not for a moment suggesting that additional licences involving more than the present total volume of water committed should be issued; I am not saying that we should take more water from the river by increasing the number of licences. The Government knows that the volume of water available for use in this field caters for the total number of licences. Therefore, we are not drawing from the Murray River the total volume of water that the licences issued would allow us to draw. I am not suggesting that land that is not fully developed should be taken away completely from licence holders. If a person has 20 ha under his licence and has not used any of that land I am not necessarily saying that the entire area be taken from that diverttee; what I am suggesting is that portion of that licensed volume be taken from him and be allocated to one or two other people who need it to make their properties viable.

I referred in this place, first in 1969, to roadside hoardings. The policy then was to remove hoardings from roadsides outside the 35 m.p.h. limit. That policy was duly carried out from 1969 onwards and I hope that, throughout South Australia, no such hoardings exist. What I should like to see now is hoardings within that speed limit area removed, as some of them are ghastly and unsightly. They would not be quite so bad if they were reasonably sized, as most business signs are, but these signs are so large that they hide many wooded areas in towns alongside railway lines and spoil many views in township areas on railway property. I hope in the future the Government will consider this aspect of hoardings.

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

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I bring to the attention of the House matters relating to a part of my district that is near the metropolitan area, so near in fact that it is only about 300 metres on the Adelaide side of the Goyder boundary that speed restrictions are removed. The sign post indicating an unrestricted speed limit almost marks the boundary of the Goyder District and is an indication of just how close that area is to the metropolitan area. I refer especially to Virginia and surrounding areas and to the concern that the people in that area have that their needs and rights are being overlooked because of their location. They are most concerned that people from the metropolitan area who quite correctly do not want noxious sports, noxious industries or similar activities in the metropolitan area are trying to move them into rural areas. They do not wish to be worried by noise; they want to move it from near their homes, and realise that the nearest place to do it is the Virginia area.

Similarly, to the east, the developed areas of Salisbury, Elizabeth and Para Hills are urban developments. Virginia is peacefully rural, and people in those urban areas, too, want all raceways, speedways and gun clubs removed from their own backyard. The resultant effect of that desire of people in the more closely settled areas is that, when application is made to use land for raceways, speedways and gun clubs, if the local people object an appeal is heard and, almost always, they lose because of a lack of numbers to promote their cause. People in the

Virginia area are concerned that, because they are on the rural fringe of an otherwise urban council, their case is not heard adequately. What is happening to them now is the result of what for them was an unhappy accident in the first place: the establishment of the International Raceway before zoning regulations existed.

It now seems that all other similar enterprises wish to cluster themselves around that already established raceway which, to a degree, is understandable, but such a practice does not take into account that some people live nearby. Studs, dog kennels and all sorts of enterprises are pursued in what is zoned a rural area. To the dismay of these people, after all the appeals have been heard and the consent use provisions of the State Planning Act implemented, a speedway is being built in their midst. Residents at Hillbank, Wayville (because they can scream loudly enough) and other people in other areas, too, can avoid speedways being established in their areas. Although what I am saying seems to be negative I would be acting negatively on behalf of my constituents if I did not raise the matter, because they have the same right to peace and tranquility in their area as the people in the metropolitan area have. Virginia residents will watch with interest the effects of the Noise Control Bill when it is implemented.

Dr. Eastick: Particularly the volatile ones.

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes. Whilst there are provisions and regulations to control noise while speedway meetings are in progress, it is possible almost at any time during the week for people who are interested in motor sports to go to the raceway, remove their vehicle exhaust systems and roar around the track at a great rate to test the ultimate capacity of their vehicle, to the detriment of the eardrums of local people. For this reason, the planning authority should look again at what happens to this area. The Virginia area is vital to the welfare of the State for its rural pursuits. We must guard zealously this market garden of South Australia. The residents are pleased that the consultants have come down with a report that will allow the use of effluent water. They do not want encroachment on what is rural land.

It is appropriate to suggest that long ago firm plans should have been made for areas to be set aside, perhaps areas even closer to the metropolitan area, for gun clubs, speedways, and so on. As I drive into town, I am interested to notice that, to the east of Globe Derby, is an area of open space that would have been available for such use. It would be appropriate for all these activities to be grouped together in that area, and for Virginia to be left for the rural pursuits for which it was ordained. Unfortunately, that is not now possible. The International Raceway is a fact of life. All the provisions of the Planning and Development Act have been gone through, the people of the Virginia area have lost their appeal to the Planning Appeal Board, and the speedway will go ahead. So it is the future that is important.

Any plans for the outer metropolitan area should be made on the basis that the rural nature of the land is not further encroached upon, that where these utilities are established it must be done on a graduation basis: that there in an area of rural land between before there is any subdivision to create a buffer situation and not distress the local residents. The speedway is to be established right up against the backyards of some of the Virginia residents, and that is unfair. That is sufficient to indicate my concern on behalf of the Virginia people regarding the environmental aspects of what is happening through consent use of land in the area.

I am more concerned about the water situation there. I have been called to meetings regarding salinity rising in the bores along the Port Gawler Road. We are pleased that the consultants have recommended the use of Bolivar water, but the Minister of Works has indicated that we have some leeway before we need to implement the use of the water. I vehemently disagree. The sum of \$7 000 000 would allow for the immediate establishment of the first stage of Scheme A. If we do not act immediately, salinity will rise in the whole area and the cheap lettuces, potatoes, onions and tomatoes enjoyed by members opposite may not be available any longer. We may have to establish market gardens in the South-East. It is essential that every action be taken to ensure that we can grow our vegetables close at hand. Before there is further evidence of rising salinity in the Northern Adelaide Plains water basin, action must be taken to ensure the use of Bolivar effluent forthwith.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I was quite impressed to hear the member for Millicent speaking in this debate on the uranium issue, at least for the first half of what he had to say about it, because he showed that at least he has started to think about it and to take some interest in what is the most vital issue facing us all in the foreseeable future.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Perhaps he has learnt something from being associated with another Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that, but he has started to think about it. I thought he was going to come to what I would have considered a satisfactory conclusion, the conclusion that my Party has come to. We are the first Party in Australia, I think, to have come firmly to the conclusion that, until the problems of waste, proliferation, and terrorism can be solved, there should be no mining of uranium or development of sources of nuclear energy. I am proud to say that that is now the policy of the new L.M. The member for Millicent did not come to that conclusion, but came to a very wishy-washy one which is utterly impractical, and I was disappointed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What is the global solution?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know. In Australia we can do only so much. The only thing we can do is set an example to the rest of the world and hope that it is followed. It may be too late. There may not be any global solution. Sir Mark Oliphant may be right in saying that we have only to make one mistake and in anticipating that that mistake will be made. We can do something in this country so as not to add to what is going on in the rest of the world.

I got up to say something on another topic, also relating to Sir Mark Oliphant, the former Governor of this State. It would be churlish if not one of us were to say something about this matter. It may be that other members intend to do so, but I propose to say something about it. I refer to the criticism which he made at his final press conference and which he has repeated in articles (I am looking at the *Australian* of yesterday) about the two-Party system, and Parliamentary democracy and the way in which it is being worked. He said:

First of all, let us eliminate politics as a career.

I believe that what Sir Mark Oliphant has said in his remarks is merely articulating the general feeling in our community. Politicians are not well regarded in the community, and the community knows—as we know, if we are honest with ourselves—that all is not well with our system of Parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That is because some only make a part-time job of it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to deal particularly with that point. Sir Mark's solution to the problem is to allow members of Parliament a certain term—he says 10 years.

Mr. Keneally: He also wants scientists to be able to work for 50 years.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That is the interesting point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although nothing has been said about it, I can see that Sir Mark has raised the hackles of members on the other side. With respect to him, I do not believe that the solution he suggests is a workable one as long as the community is prepared to pay members of Parliament a salary upon which the average person could live quite handsomely. We cannot expect a person to give up some other job or career to come into Parliament for, say, 10 years, to live off the game during that time and then, in middle life or later, to have to get out and re-establish himself, perhaps at a lower income level. It just is not a workable solution to the problem. If we were prepared to turn the clock back 100 years and to say that we would not pay members of Parliament but would allow people who could afford the time to come in and give their services free as members for a certain period, then it would work. It may conceivably work if we go to the system used at least in some of the American States in which members are paid not annually but on the basis of sitting days.

Mr. Max Brown: Like Richard Nixon!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That problem does not necessarily spring out of the system used, because he was a different case. As our system has developed it is not practical to put a time limit on the period members are in the House. I am not disinterested in this. I would have been out 10 years or more ago, and so would the Premier. The member for Torrens cannot take comfort from that when facing pre-selection, because the suggestion from Sir Mark may well be used against him. What other solutions can there possibly be? There is one, and the member for Kavel was eager to break in on me, because he knows it is a solution that I am lucky enough to be able to use: that is, that Parliament is not for me, nor, I believe, should it be if it is at all possible for anyone, a full-time occupation.

I am one of the fortunate ones in the community (and I do not try to deny or conceal that for a moment), although that is no doing of mine but just good luck, because I have a profession to which I can turn when I am booted out of this place. That is a great comfort. I do not conceal that for one moment, but it also allows me to exercise a far more detached judgment on my political career than I could do if I were a full-time politician. I can say that with some confidence, because I was virtually dependent on the game of politics in the second half of the 1960's, but it is not a situation that I would like to return to. It is impossible to be otherwise if one is a Minister but, apart from that, I hope I would never go back to being a full-time politician. I am one of the lucky ones: it is not possible for a person, other than one who is self-employed, to be in that position. Most members here are not.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If you are in a marginal seat you might find it a different ball game.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. I am not putting it forward as a solution for most people, but the member for Gouger and I can do it, for one reason or another. It is not a complete answer to the problem. The solution which, because of my position and my experience in the past few years, I prefer is to see what Sir Mark has complained of so vehemently (that is, the two-Party system) broken up.

I believe there is room in our Parliamentary system for more than two Parties, and this of all the solutions is the most workable. If we break up this idiotic competition between one side and the other, by having as we have now four Parties, although alas the Country Party and the new L.M. each have one representative only as yet, I believe we are far more likely to get a system that has some common sense in it.

Mr. Evans: Ask your friends about that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We could go too far to the other extreme and have too many Parties, but I believe the best solution to the problem which Sir Mark propounded and which is so widely felt in the community is to break the hold of the two Parties on our system and have, say, three or four Parties.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I refer to the installation of traffic lights at the corner of Jetty and Brighton Roads, Glenelg. The Minister had promised that they would be operating in several different months, and the last date that they were to be completed and operating was by mid-November of this year. The traffic lights now have been installed but they are not operating, and problems are being caused to people in this district. The traffic flow has increased since Brighton Road has been reconstructed and median strips have been installed. As the Government had said several times, they are to be used as safety islands for people crossing the road. Elderly people have a problem: they reach the median strip, but then are marooned there for some time and are petrified by the heavy flow of fast traffic on either side of the road. No doubt many of them suffer mentally, and this situation has been brought about by this Government's policy that there should be no new freeways constructed in the State.

About three years ago the Minister of Transport said that no freeways or priority roads would be constructed for at least the next 10 years. This situation has caused vehicles to use many roads that were never built for such a high volume of traffic. Also, side roads are being closed or made one-way streets: I refer to Brighton Road where in some cases traffic will be unable to enter that road from side streets. I believe the new concept is traffic flow, a system incorporated by this Government with its ridiculous policy of no freeways. Several members and Ministers have been given the chance to study roads and highways in other parts of the world, and they must all realise that no country has stopped building freeways. Freeways are the answer to the traffic problems of the larger cities of the world, especially in the more densely populated cities. Freeways must be provided to enable traffic to by-pass city centres and allow heavy transport and other vehicles a free traffic flow with a minimum of delay.

A matter to which I have referred several times during the past 15 months is that of the Morphetville bus depot. At present it is about two-thirds completed, and it has to be seen to be believed. It has been constructed on what was the first vineyard in this State, and is a concrete jungle that reminded me of emergency air fields that were constructed by the Americans during the Second World War. It is a mass of concrete, and intellectuals have told us that this area of concrete will increase the temperature by 5 per cent. That alone is a great problem apart from the damage to the environment to the people concerned, despite the great wording of "livability" that seems to appear in much of our legislation. I asked a question recently about the bus depot. I asked how many trees and shrubs were to be planted in that area for beauti-

fication purposes and to lessen noise pollution, and other things. In the reply, I was told that 4 000 trees and shrubs would be planted. I challenge any member to go along there, study the site, and tell me where that large number of trees and shrubs will be planted, because there is little room left in which they could be planted. It would be impossible for the Government to carry out the promise it gave me in its reply to my question a few months ago. I shall be interested to see how many of those trees and shrubs are planted.

It was interesting to me to see in a Bill introduced recently that the Minister would be able to proclaim certain areas that would not be affected by the Noise Control Bill. I imagine that the first area he would proclaim would be the Morphetville bus depot, which will be a great thorn in the Government's side. They are the two main problems facing my area. It is a disgrace that the traffic lights are not operating, and it is a monument of disgrace to the Government that the bus depot is being established where it is being established, irrespective of the wishes of the people in the district.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Where should it have gone? Hanson, or Davenport?

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The Minister may well laugh about the prospect of the bus depot and say that it should have been established in the Hanson District. That was not on, and the decision was made a long time before it was released to the media.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about the employment it will create?

Mr. BECKER: The Minister is concerned about employment, and so am I, because nothing worries me more than seeing so many young people who are unable to obtain employment. They reach the end of their education and, unfortunately, some of them can no longer be educated. The problem with our whole education programme is that some people are pushed to a high degree of education (far higher than is necessary in some respects) and they, through no fault of their own, do not have the opportunity to improve their education and must leave school and take whatever jobs are offering. We have heard of the Government's efforts and of the money it is spending on job-hunters' clubs. I am somewhat suspicious of these clubs. I would rather have seen the money poured into the Public Service area or into some part of the framework of the service so that these people could be employed. The person who pays for these clubs is the taxpayer. Something has gone drastically wrong when we cannot offer these young people employment.

Let us go back a few years and accept the unfortunate cynical situation, as pointed out by the Leader this afternoon, that the employment of young people has gradually deteriorated over the years. We were probably living in a fool's paradise years ago when we had the national service programme, because that soaked up a few, unfortunately, on a forced basis, and when they came out of national service they were accepted in the community. We do not want to create that kind of situation again. That is not on. What I believe is on is that, whilst the Government is being criticised on occasions for a great increase in the Public Service, something must be done: If the service is not going to increase employment, and if the private sector does likewise, where will the young people go? I am afraid that we will have to accept the fact that Public Service numbers will have to be increased as a sop to unemployment.

I suggest to the Minister that members' electorate offices should offer temporary employment to young men and women as research officers and stenographers. I am certain that most electorate secretaries are competent enough to train young people while they look for employment. I could give a young person plenty of work to do, but I could not afford to pay. My secretary has sufficient ability to train young people whilst they are looking for work. That would do more good than having young people being told how they should apply for work. That would be practical experience in seeking employment, and it might be one small avenue in creating employment. I do not think it would be very costly, and it would give young people a chance. We must examine all aspects in the private sector of how we can create jobs, thus giving young people the opportunity which they deserve and to which they are entitled in obtaining work.

One issue that has worried me in my district for some time is continual pronouncements, first on February 12, 1973, regarding a \$1 000 000 playground for young and old at West Beach. The project was announced some time before the 1973 election. It was a continuing story. A report in the *Advertiser* of December 19, 1974, under the heading "\$1m. plan to boost recreation reserve", stated:

Development of the West Beach Recreation Reserve into what is claimed will be the biggest and best multi-purpose centre in Australia may begin in a few months. However, nothing has been done. About \$700 000 has been spent in the area in the past two years to prop up the ailing Marineland and to effect a few little improvements in the surrounding area. A committee has been appointed to examine the matter. This has been going on for some time, but nothing has been done. It was an election gimmick in 1973, whereas in 1974 it was a prop to be used in preparation for the 1975 election. It was used for that purpose, and it will be used again. That area could be developed without \$1 000 000 and, here again, additional employment would be created in getting rid of the grass, weeds and rubbish. The upper reaches of the Patawalonga are almost covered with algae. No care and attention has been given to the area. The grass could be cut, turf could be planted, thereby creating an ideal family picnic ground.

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

Mr. BECKER: Regarding the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust, now known as the West Beach Trust, various announcements have been made concerning \$1 000 000 plans to turn the area into a first-class recreation area. I refer now to the Paringa stalker and the second-floor flasher. I am perturbed about the impression that people must be getting of Parliament when they see reports like that in today's *News* of a statement by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (Mr. Snedden), who warned that people who organised strip parties in the Federal Parliament House building faced deportation to the colonies.

Actually, in our own building we can outstrip Canberra at any time. Last evening, quietly standing on the second floor of this building, I saw a certain member of Parliament who likes to do things by himself standing in what I thought was a red suit. I thought to myself, "That is strange; his suit needs pressing", but I suddenly realised he had nothing on. I found out from my colleagues about this. This person goes from his room to the men's room on the second floor but does not cover himself up. He did this last evening.

Mr. Langley: Who is it?

Mr. BECKER: I will not name him. I am concerned about this, because the member for Eyre yesterday had his two young boys visiting him on the second floor.

Mr. Gunn: I don't think it would worry them.

Mr. BECKER: They would ask questions if they saw this sort of thing going on. It makes one wonder what type of people we get into this place. He had nothing on at all. He made sure that I saw him. I do not think it is fair if people stand up here on moral issues but carry on like this.

Dr. Eastick: It sounds as though there's a degree of hypocrisy.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, he is a hypocrite because he has questioned the Premier on many occasions on certain issues, but he carries on with this sort of practice. When we read the Speaker's remarks in Canberra, we wonder what can be done in this Parliament to uphold proper standards.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Recently, during a grievance debate I commented on railway maintenance workers. Probably I gave some impression that the maintenance workers there were not doing their job properly; there was nothing further from the truth, in fact. I was under the impression that the maintenance workers had been part and parcel of the combined union meeting. In fact, they had not attended the union meeting, and they were aggrieved that there was some inference that they were not doing their job properly. My sympathy is with them. I have previously negotiated with the Minister on their behalf to get continuity of employment for them. I hope that, if the Minister encourages the repair and maintenance of railway houses in the South-East, these men will no longer have to make do by recycling used materials, as they have been doing, to keep their houses in good condition.

I have been informed from several sources that one Government member has been trekking around the South-East telling people that, unless business is done through him, it is unlikely that their complaints will be properly attended to by the Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr. ALLISON: He is a member of the Government, and is a regular attender down there.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He isn't a member of the Government; he may be a member of the Government Party.

Mr. ALLISON: He is a member of the other House, shall we say.

Mr. Langley: What's wrong with that? He represents the State.

Mr. ALLISON: He has said that, if complaints are not addressed through him, they will not be attended to properly. That is arrant nonsense, because there is an inbuilt inference that, if complaints do not go through members, they will not be attended to. Therefore, the Government would attend to complaints on source rather than on merit. I should like to place on record for anyone in the South-East who has been told that, that I am pleased with the service that I have received from Government Ministers, who have shown no discrimination whatsoever. They have attended to all matters that I have brought before them on the merits of the situation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's not what I'm hearing.

Mr. Langley: No, it's not what I'm hearing, either.

Mr. ALLISON: This is the service that I am getting from the Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I know the South-East fairly well. I've got many friends down there.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister is very lucky. I should certainly like to thank Ministers for the consideration they have given to the complaints that I have addressed through them. Decentralisation subsidies for the South-East have now been in operation for over a year, since November, 1975. Recently, amidst great fuss, these decentralisation incentives were extended to many other areas of the State, and it is certainly worthy of comment that in the South-East, although these incentives have been in operation for over a year, there has been no evidence of industry's taking advantage of decentralisation. It is obvious that the incentive system needs some rethinking.

I am still convinced that further remissions of pay-roll tax and freight relief are essential to remote country areas if their products are to hit the metropolitan area competitively. We have had multi-million dollar expansion in the South-East, but none of it has been the result of decentralisation incentives. It has involved expansion of existing industries, and has not meant that considerable extra staff has been employed. Whether in Government departments, or in the private sector, it has—

Mr. Langley: What about Fletcher Jones? Who helped them?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What about the Legal Services Department and the Consumer Affairs Branch?

Mr. ALLISON: I am talking about decentralisation incentives for industry.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You opposed the spending of money to set up those services in the South-East.

Mr. ALLISON: I did not.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You did: You criticised it as being a waste of money.

Mr. ALLISON: No. There is no evidence of that in *Hansard*.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. ALLISON: Government members can participate in the grievance debate themselves. If they quote the *Border Watch*, I will answer them. In any event, I am convinced that the further remissions of pay-roll tax are essential in remote country areas to get more industries to settle away from Adelaide. I am very much in sympathy with the principle of helping young people, and I should like to think that the job hunters in the South-East could work in happy collaboration with the scheme recently introduced by the Commonwealth Government. Here is a chance for young people who are already attending the job hunters' centre in the South-East to take advantage of Commonwealth Government funding for travelling expenses and, I hope, for different organisations—

Mr. Whitten: What Commonwealth funding are you talking about?

Mr. ALLISON: It is offering travelling expenses of so much a day so that people can band together with taxis, buses, or so on. This is a new scheme that was introduced by the Commonwealth Government, and we hope that regional organisations will take advantage of it. They will think positively rather than negatively, and they will organise schemes for job hunters so that young people can take advantage of any money offered. The Commonwealth Government is offering a sum of money to provide some materials. This

money is giving slightly more teeth to the job hunters' scheme than it has at present. If the honourable member is to be critical and treat this issue as a purely political issue rather than hope that the Commonwealth and State will get together to solve a common acute problem, I feel rather sorry for people in the honourable member's district who might avail themselves of Commonwealth funds as well as of State funds. Some money is available for materials for youngsters to do jobs in conjunction with any organisation. I hope that the Commonwealth and State Governments can get together to give a little more teeth to the scheme than it already has.

The only criticism I would make of the scheme is that the emblem, which depicts a youth sitting in almost absolute despair, is rather negative and is not the sort of emblem that a youngster would wish to wear. It gives them a backward rather than a forward look at life. They are job hunters, and vigour and enthusiasm is needed to get these young people out of that spirit of despondency that they could gain from this pitiful looking youth on the emblem.

The Federal Treasurer has been criticised over the devaluation issue for requiring the utmost secrecy. I am told that had there not been secrecy far more criticism would have been levelled at the Treasurer. Had the news of devaluation been leaked extensively it would have benefited only one class, the extremely wealthy, and they would have been able to trade on the International money market to make themselves even wealthier. One can only applaud the Treasurer for taking the action that he has taken. The Liberal Party is looking forward to the prospect of devaluation's encouraging people to buy Australian goods. It will encourage investment in Australia and will provide far more jobs for Australians over the next few months than have been available recently.

There is certainly a need to re-examine tariffs against which Australian industry is not competitive, but equally there is a need to retain tariffs where Australian industry is competitive. The Modulock factory in Mount Gambier seems to be a deadlock factory because nothing further has been entered into by the Government. An absolute stalemate seems to have been reached despite the promises that were made by the Government before the last general election. The sum of \$4 000 000 in this Bill is a substantial sum.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I do not believe that the question of whether or not rallies or demonstrations should be conducted in Rundle Mall has been raised before in the House, but I intend to give my views on it. The Minister of Transport and the Lord Mayor of Adelaide do not agree on this question. A report in last evening's *News* states, in part:

The Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, said today he knew of no reason why demonstrations should be disallowed in the Rundle Mall. But the Lord Mayor, Mr. Roche, today supported suggested moves to ban rallies in the mall. "If major demonstrations are to be held in prime shopping time, they should be held in another location," said the Lord Mayor. Mr. Virgo said he would be doing nothing to ban mall rallies. "I believe it would be contrary to the Government's policy of allowing freedom of speech and association to ban demonstrations, unless they endangered life and limb," he said. "Rundle Mall belongs to the people, not to the Rundle Mall traders."

It seems to me that the Minister of Transport is adopting a completely false approach to the question. Of course Rundle Mall belongs to the people: it belongs to the

people who wish to shop in the mall as much as it belongs to people who wish to demonstrate. What led to this recent criticism was a demonstration or a rally in connection with the Australian Broadcasting Commission. If the reports I have are correct, the mall was so full that people could not get through and some shops had to close their doors. It seems to be ludicrous, in these circumstances, for the Minister to suggest that this is an appropriate activity for the mall. It is not as though there is no other suitable venue for demonstrations: there is plenty of room in Victoria Square.

Mr. Slater: What if Mr. Fraser came to Adelaide?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If Mr. Fraser came here, he would not hold a meeting in the mall, because he would attract a crowd that the mall could not hold. If members of the Government have looked at current opinion polls, they will not get much comfort from the vote their Federal Leader is getting but, if they look at Mr. Fraser's vote, they will find that his support is holding up very well indeed.

Mr. Slater: It's 47 per cent to 45 per cent.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That must have been a poll commissioned by some friends of the Labor Party, because I have not seen that. The Minister of Local Government has a completely false view of the proper use of Rundle Mall, which is there for the convenience and enjoyment of the people. If people cannot move freely from one end of the mall to the other and cannot go about their normal business because of a demonstration which is so large that it completely blocks the mall, that demonstration or rally should be held elsewhere. I make no bones about supporting the Lord Mayor in his views. I do not know whom the Minister of Local Government thinks he is pleasing with that sort of nonsensical statement.

The next matter is one that should have been aired rather more lengthily in this House but, because there were one or two other pressing matters that intervened, including a vote of no confidence in the Attorney-General and one or two other things that took up Question Time, it did not get a proper airing, that is, the Government's part in the granting of a 37½-hour week at the Electricity Trust. The Government is trying to say that it had nothing to do with it but I find that hard to believe. Then there is the absurd statement made by the Premier that, of course, a 37½-hour week agreement with the Electricity Trust will have no implications anywhere else in industry in South Australia; there will be no pressure from other quarters for a 37½-hour week. He says also that a 35-hour week is a different matter. If we were to grant a 35-hour week, there would be tremendous pressure from other sections of industry for a 35-hour week. I cannot follow the logic of his statement.

Mr. Whitten: Do you believe that a 37½-hour week is being worked in much of the Electricity Trust?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe that a 37½-hour week has come at a most inappropriate time, and the fact that the Government goes along with the idea seems to me to be completely irresponsible.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: For the Premier to try to say that with the 35-hour week there would be all sorts of dire implications but, because it is a 37½-hour week it does not matter and there will be no flow-on, seems to me to lack any semblance of logic. It has been obvious that when one section of industry is granted some benefits, of course there are pressures from other sections of industry for them to flow on. We have seen an instance of this in the last week or two in relation to long service leave.

The Government brought in one of its pace-setting recommendations in relation to long service leave. It was pointed out that this did not obtain in the public sector, so members opposite said they would rectify that, and immediately we see a flow-on, and the Minister of Education this afternoon said legislation will be brought in early next year so that all public servants will have these so-called benefits.

It is completely inappropriate at this time for the Government to be launching into a campaign to give support to people who are pressing for fewer working hours. Members opposite talk about differentiation between white collar workers and blue collar workers, and they say there is some differentiation between these two sectors, but it seems ridiculous to suggest that there will be no pressure for a flow-on in other directions. That is nonsensical. We all know that people at the oil refineries are hoping to break this one and, once there is a break-through with one industry, all the pressure in the world is brought on other employers and other instrumentalities for the situation to spread.

Mr. Whitten: How many hours do schoolteachers put in?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If they are any good, they put in mighty long hours. The next matter to which I wish to refer relates to massage parlours, a subject dear to the heart of the member for Mitcham. I am disturbed that the Government seems powerless to do anything about these places. In the past week or two, one or two prosecutions have occurred. This is simply a hit-and-miss exercise. Apparently between 40 and 60 massage parlours are operating in metropolitan Adelaide. At least once a fortnight we see the odd prosecution. I should like to know whether the Government intends to mount a blitz on massage parlours or whether this is all a bit of show. There have been one or two prosecutions recently, and a report in this morning's *Advertiser* and last night's *News*—

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I want to deal with Government contracts, in particular that relating to the provision of part of the water system to be used on the new buses.

Several Questions on Notice have been asked regarding this matter, which is associated with contract No. 7/76 of the State Transport Authority. We have been able to elicit the information that the contract for the water pump units associated with the air-conditioning system of the new buses has been let to a New South Wales company. It has been pointed out, through questions to the Premier, that the Government has a policy in relation to South Australian firms that, where the price is correct, they will be given consideration.

Following an answer given in this House a few weeks ago, we know that it is possible, if a South Australian firm has tendered and if the price is above the external or interstate tender by up to 10 per cent (this was an interjection figure, not the Premier's figure), that in those circumstances the local firm will get the tender. The situation is that by arrangement and agreement a South Australian firm was asked to prepare a prototype of the water unit. Subsequent diagrams used for the purpose of receiving tenders on this item actually had marked in on the documents a plan developed by that South Australian company.

Persons seeking to tender for that contract were shown a prototype, which had been developed by the South Australian firm which was within the system functioning at the S.T.A. offices, to give interested persons an idea of

how the pump would look in its final form. In such circumstances a prototype is not necessarily in the form in which the unit will finally appear. It is a prototype which has cost a lot to prepare and which is used to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the unit.

Adaptations are made according to need. The unit, prepared by a South Australian firm from Elizabeth, was acquired by the S.T.A., was in use, was depicted on the diagrams used for tender, and was open for inspection by other tenderers. What has been the result of the letting of the tender? As I have said, the tender has been let to an interstate company at a cost of \$310 a unit or \$119 040 for the 384 units. The South Australian company which had prepared the prototype and which had held discussions with S.T.A. officers had offered new components to overcome minor deficiencies found in the prototype system. The company offered the South Australian Government two alternatives. The first involved a unit held together by four tie rods passing through the barrel of the pump. That unit was available at \$247·80 a unit, \$62·80 less than the accepted interstate tender or, on a batch basis for the 384 units, the total sum involved was \$95 155·20. The saving to the S.T.A., if that unit had been accepted, would have been \$23 884·80.

The second alternative involved a pump structure cylinder without tie rods constructed differently so that it did not have the aesthetic ugliness of the tie rod pump. It was offered at \$283·50 a unit, \$26·50 a unit less than the interstate pump price, and, on a total batch basis, it represented a contract of \$108 864, a saving to the Government of \$10 176. The position is that a South Australian company has co-operated totally with the authority in developing the unit to provide an essential link in the air-conditioning system of our buses, and now the work has been taken out of the hands of the local producers and given to an interstate company.

This meant a loss to a South Australian industry based in Elizabeth, which members will acknowledge has an unemployment problem, of a contract of either about \$95 000 or about \$109 000. In a different context that would be the cost of employing eight to 10 men for six months. Therefore, because of letting contract No. 7/76 the Government has denied South Australian industry work that could have produced equipment for a lesser sum and, in addition, could have employed people in an area that requires not so much stimulation as a continued effort so that the organisation can continue to provide employment and services for the community in future. These details have been extracted from the Government by way of Questions on Notice (two are reported in *Hansard* at pages 1798 and 2357), and members can check the reply given by the Premier that consideration is given to South Australian industries over industries in other States. This matter requires a serious answer by the Government because, obviously, it is not fulfilling its promises to industry in this State and is not assisting the continuance of industry, as a Government should that is genuinely interested in the future employment of South Australians.

The other matter to which I refer I must direct specifically to you, Mr. Speaker. In a recent debate I asked you, on a point of order, whether you would advise the House of how you saw the future interpretation of Standing Orders. You gave me an undertaking that you would reply after considering the matter. It is now more than two weeks since I took that point of order, but there has been no attempt to reply for the benefit of the House. I should like to believe that a reply will be forthcoming.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): In drawing the attention of the House to a matter to which I have previously referred concerning an application for financial assistance to the Rural Industry Assistance Committee for farm build-up, I am not criticising that committee. However, I cannot understand its logic in relation to this matter. The committee seems to persist in an interpretation that has the approbation of the Government. It is a Federal Act, and possibly each State has a different interpretation. One of my constituents believes he is qualified in every respect for this assistance, except that he purchased a property at public auction and this action has disqualified him from receiving financial assistance. On November 16, I asked the following Question on Notice:

1. What is the policy of the Government concerning the availability, or otherwise, of finance under the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act, 1971-1972, to effect a farm build-up proposal where the property in question is offered at public auction?

The reply was that there were three conditions under which a person's application could be considered, as follows:

- (1) That the intending purchaser/applicant approach the auctioneers prior to sale and arrange to have his bids accepted, subject to the availability of finance.
- (2) That the property be offered at auction and passed in. The applicant then approach the vendor and negotiate private contract subject to the availability of finance, or
- (3) Arrange bridging finance. Attend the auction as a prudent bidder and if successful lodge application for Rural Industry Assistance finance. Intending applicants would be impressed that under no circumstances could any guarantee be given *re* the availability or otherwise of Rural Industry Assistance finance.

Options (1) and (3) were deleted by committee subsequent to October 12, 1976.

The next question I asked was as follows:

2. Are persons, satisfying all other requirements of the States Grants (Rural Reconstruction) Act, 1971, who intend to purchase additional property at public auction, precluded from the benefit of rural industry assistance?

The answer was as follows:

Yes. They are precluded if the property is actually purchased at auction. Present policy of the Rural Industry Assistance Committee specifically precludes farm build-up assistance where the property in question is actually purchased by the intending applicant at public auction. The committee interprets the relevant clause, part III (2) (d) of the States Grants (Rural Reconstruction) Act, 1971, viz. ". . . there is a possibility of sale of the property to another adjoining owner who does not require assistance under the scheme . . ." to mean that in public auction there is always a runner-up who may not have required the benefit of rural industry assistance.

Apparently the eligibility criteria of economic results derives scant attention regarding properties purchased at public auction. The committee apparently considers the bidder at public auction ineligible for farm build-up assistance from the point that the runner-up may have been precluded from the benefit of purchase. To my mind, a direct parallel exists in purchase by private contract, namely, that a dozen or more persons may be interested in purchasing a property subject to certain funding arrangements. Immediately one signs a contract agreement to purchase, regardless of whatever financial arrangements he may or may not have made, that property is no longer available to any other party during the currency of the agreement. The intending purchaser might then approach the committee and, given compliance with the other requirements of the States Grants (Rural Reconstruction) Act, 1971, receive the benefit of financial assistance. In other words, one applicant will be assisted, whereas another applicant will not be assisted. I challenge the Minister of

Works, representing the Minister of Lands, whether at some time a clear statement will come from the committee in explanation of the apparent discrepancy that I see. I intend writing to the Minister and pointing out this situation, and I hope that subsequently some consideration will be given to this constituent. The property that he has purchased is quite close and within the prescribed distance from his present farm to enable him to have an economic area. He has met all the requirements in every other direction. The only thing that is wrong is that he purchased it at auction.

Dr. Eastick: A fairly usual method of purchase.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes. The property he has purchased was the old homestead belonging to his family. I am given to understand that the arrangements were that it had to be auctioned. He had certain options open to him prior to the auction, one of which was that he would go along and make certain provisions. He met all those, but the committee has seen fit to say that, because it was purchased at auction, the financial arrangements cannot be made available. I have mentioned this matter three times—during a grievance debate, by way of a question, and again this evening. There is an inconsistency here. Whether a property is purchased by auction or through a private agreement, there is always that other person or persons who could have purchased it. It is hard to understand the thinking of the committee that, because it is purchased at auction, someone, the runner-up, is deprived of opportunity. I am not raising this matter for the purpose of criticising the committee. The scheme, which has been operating for some time, has done much good, but the committee's policy would have the Government's approbation, and I therefore appeal to the Minister to reconsider this matter, particularly as it relates to my constituent.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): State taxation is not a very popular subject but one that perturbs me, as it perturbs more and more people day by day. When one does his homework, one is staggered by this Government's ravages on the people of South Australia. I do not think Government back-benchers realise the enormous impost placed on their constituents. I refer to State capital taxes. In the last Budget of the Hall Liberal Government, State taxes accounted for \$56 000 000 of a total Revenue Budget of \$326 000 000. The next Budget was for the year beginning July 1, 1970—a little less than a month after the Labor Government had taken office. So, that figure could well have been almost the figure that the outgoing Liberal Government might have levied, except that the new Government would have introduced some of its own policies. Its figure was \$61 000 000 for State taxation out of a total of \$371 000 000. Let us consider the documents on file for the current year. It can be seen under the heading "State taxation" that the figure of \$61 000 000 to which I have just referred and which obtained at July 1, 1970, will have risen, to the end of this financial year, to \$271 000 000 out of a total revenue Budget of \$1 171 000 000. That is a fair slice of money, and is certainly not peanuts in anyone's estimation.

Let us examine what this means as a percentage increase. It means that, since the Labor Government came to office in this State, State taxes have increased by a staggering 340 per cent. That is a shocking increase, especially when one realises that the increase in wages and in the cost of living generally since that time has been lower than the three-figure mark. This represents a considerable increase for every man, woman and child in this State. So, let

us not run away with the idea that we have a progressive Government which is concerned about not taxing the people. That Government has increased State taxes by 340 per cent in six years, and that is not a record of which it can be proud. I should now like to give an example of a commodity which is probably the cheapest available in our community, which everyone uses, and which is delivered at our homes. I refer, of course, to water. About 95 per cent of South Australia's population—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You be careful. You're an engineering person who understands these matters. You should talk about the price per tonne delivered.

Mr. COUMBE: Certainly.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Good on you.

Mr. COUMBE: South Australia leads the rest of Australia in its reticulation system, and 95 per cent of this State's population can get water delivered at its door. No other commodity can be delivered in that way nor to such an extent.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Nor at that cost per tonne, either.

Mr. COUMBE: It is one of the cheapest commodities. For the Minister's benefit, I point out that when this Government came into office water cost 6d. a ton. I cannot give the conversion figure, as I have not had time to work it out. However, water then cost 6d. a ton delivered at one's house.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There are 2 240 lbs. in a ton.

Mr. COUMBE: There are 2 240 lbs. in a long ton, and 2 000 lbs. in a short ton. I merely want to ensure that the Minister is on the right rails.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He is.

Mr. COUMBE: When the Labor Government came into office, the price of water was 7c a kilolitre. The figures to which I am referring were given to me by the Minister of Works as a result of my asking a Question on Notice. However, we are now paying 16c a kilolitre for water, which represents a 130 per cent increase.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In six years?

Mr. COUMBE: That is so. I see that the Minister and I are still on the same wave length. The Minister is not disputing my figures, as they are official figures. The crunch comes because this increase is greater by far than the increase in the cost of living, as people are paying much more for their water because of the increased valuation. The amount of water to which people are entitled as a result of their four quarterly payments is being exceeded, and more and more people will receive a fifth bill. People will actually be paying more.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have they been told about it?

Mr. COUMBE: They have been told about it now, and I have said it before, but I am a lone voice crying in the wilderness. I commend the Minister of Works for saying what he has said to the people, but the Government has not told the people that it has increased the price of water in six years by 130 per cent or that it has increased State taxes by 340 per cent.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Yes, we have.

Mr. COUMBE: Likewise the Government has not told the people about how water rates, land tax and succession duties and, through the valuation system, council rates have increased, but some quick cosmetic surgery has been done in the past few days on those matters. However, the Government has not got to the heart of the matter, and people will suffer.

A constituent has raised with me the question of shack sites. I know that several members opposite own shacks. What happened to this constituent was rather bureaucratic. He has a shack on Crown land along the Murray River. In the normal way, he is in a planning zone. Because of recent flooding, his garage collapsed. He applied in the correct manner to get the garage—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's a damn long way home if he garages his car on the Murray and he lives in your district.

Mr. CUMBE: The Minister's remark is rather inane. The member for Salisbury has a shack and he must drive to it, as does this constituent. When my constituent applied in the correct manner to replace his garage he was told that he could not replace it because a bureaucratic rule prohibited him from building a new structure in that zone. How silly can one get! The garage was completely damaged by floods, it started to fall down and, as a matter of safety, this man had to demolish it. He applied in the normal way to replace it but was told that he could not do so. The Minister should not treat this matter with such levity, because it is a serious matter. If the Government will not do something to overcome this problem, I have advised my constituent to go to the Ombudsman, where he can obtain rudimentary justice, democracy having run mad.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The honourable member and I today had a chance to show our great fortitude in our moment of trial, but I am certain that the member for Torrens is capable of facing pre-selection. However, I will say nothing more about that. The honourable member referred to shack sites. Many people in this State enjoy the privilege of owning shacks, but they are extremely concerned about the Government's not outlining its policy—not that it has a policy.

Mr. Keneally: Have you got a policy on shacks?

Mr. RODDA: Members opposite have the commission to govern: it is not the role of members opposite to ask me what is my policy. The Liberal Party will tell the people of South Australia at the appropriate time what is our policy on shack sites. We have had a taste of the Labor Party's borrowing our policies—not that we mind the Government doing that and putting them into practice, because those policies are good for South Australia. The member for Torrens, the member for Eyre and I at Port Lincoln today were told that people with shack sites were on the skids. Those people just hate the guts of members opposite regarding the question of shack sites. Today a couple of people took me to task about this issue and asked, "What is the Government doing?" It is not my province to ask that question. Those people voted for the Government. South Australians put members opposite into Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: The people of South Australia have the Government that they deserve. About 40 000 people enjoy the 4 800 kilometres of coastline that stretches around South Australia. We will tell members opposite our policy in due course.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: When?

Mr. RODDA: When you go to the people.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: When?

Mr. RODDA: If it were not for Jimmy Gilbertson, with all his money, going to the Privy Council I dare say that you and I, Mr. Speaker, would be preparing our election campaigns.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You might be yet, don't worry!
Mr. Chapman: Is that a threat or a promise?

Mr. RODDA: If it were not for little Jimmy Gilbertson's going to the Privy Council you, Sir, I and the Minister, who knows where he is going—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I know where I'm going; I'll be in Government again.

Mr. RODDA: In Port Lincoln, as two shack owners told me today, the Government will not let people put up garages for their motor cars on shack sites. As the member for Torrens pointed out, some poor soul up on the Murray River who has had the misfortune—

Mr. Keneally: They knew that. If they had a shack in what is regarded as a—

Mr. Gunn: Non-acceptable area!

Mr. RODDA: The people from Port Lincoln were saying to me today that not one—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member for Victoria has the floor.

Mr. Gunn: On the Government side—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre is out of order.

Mr. RODDA: There is not one shack site that is acceptable to the Government. The Government wants to move them back a quarter of a mile in some cases from the high-water mark. This policy of the Government is higgledy-piggledy.

Mr. Keneally: What is your policy?

Mr. RODDA: We will release our policy in good time.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You can't print something that doesn't exist.

Mr. RODDA: The junior Minister kids himself. I have never heard such poppycock.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Tell us!

Mr. RODDA: We will tell you our policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the member for Victoria that "you" is not a Parliamentary term.

Mr. RODDA: When the Minister wants to take his people to the country we will tell them, in due course, and the Leader of this Party will lay on the line our policy in relation to shack sites. There are 40 000 disgruntled people in this State who are most unhappy about how they spend their weekends, with their Holdens rusting—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Rubbish!

Mr. RODDA: It is not rubbish; it is fact.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There are seven in your district.

Mr. Chapman: Listen to a statesman! He's interested in the area!

Mr. RODDA: There are no shack sites in the District of Victoria. On the Murray River one sees the high-water mark, the 1954 flood level, and the 1957 flood level. As a blanket move, sites will be taken 400 metres from the river. The Government policy is ruining tourism on the Murray River, and many people are most upset. I commend the member for Torrens on touching the Government on this soft spot. If it were not for our well-heeled elector from the South-East, I venture to suggest that we would not be speaking in this debate tonight. We might be vigorously campaigning at Crystal Brook. It is only a matter of time.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Your Party had better—

Mr. RODDA: The junior Minister has had nasty things to say about insurance companies and others who have done much for humanity in this State. Regarding leisure time, with the Government's encouragement, we will see

a 37½ hour week for Electricity Trust employees. How will they spend their leisure time? Employees will go off to their shacks, but the Minister will not allow a shack owner to build a garage over his car. There is trouble all over the place, at Aldinga, Kangaroo Island and Port Lincoln, although there are no shack sites at Naracoorte, where freedom of the individual prevails. I would like to announce the Liberal Party policy on shack sites. The people of South Australia are ashamed of the Government's policy on shacks.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I wish to draw the Government's attention to the situation existing at Oodnadatta. I visited that township last week, and the people there are upset because they cannot get any response from the Government regarding facilities and amenities for the town. Townspeople claim that the Government's stock reply is that, because of the uncertainty of the town's future, it cannot allocate funds to the town. The townspeople recently received the same stock reply from the Minister after applying for funds to provide toilet facilities for tourists.

The narrow gauge railway running through Oodnadatta will close when the new Tarcoola to Alice Springs standard gauge line is completed. Although many people believe that the town will die as a result of the railway's closure, local people refute this and, after having listened to the local people last week, I agree that this will not be the case. With the closure of the railway there will be a loss of eight men from Oodnadatta, but the local carrier presently operating two road trains believes he will have to put on a third road train to cater for additional stock carrying, and will have to employ three additional men. Therefore, the town's work force will hardly drop at all. The general store includes the post office and telephone exchange.

A new school residence is badly needed. At present there is the Principal's residence and single staff quarters but, as the school has a teaching staff of five, another residence is urgently needed. I have recently taken up this matter with the Minister of Education, and we sincerely hope that this matter will be under control soon. The town has an excellent air-conditioned Samcon school with about 75 children attending, 50 of whom are Aborigines. An Aboriginal hostel erected some years ago by the Federal Government has 24 children as boarders who attend the Aboriginal school. The Police Department is upgrading its building, so the department has confidence in the town: it is erecting a new residence, upgrading a building, and has installed a telex at the police station.

The Highways Department depot in the town caters for all roads for a considerable distance from the town. As most members know, the work force works continually for 17 days and then has a 10-day break. The men live in the town and, even if the railways and road goes through to Alice Springs, it is suggested that it will not affect this work force, which will remain in Oodnadatta. A community welfare centre caters for the Aborigines living in the town, and has a staff of three. This area is an Aboriginal tribal ground, and it is claimed that Aborigines will not leave the area even when the railway and road services are constructed west of the township. Apparently, local Aborigines are of a different tribe from those living at Indulkana and other reserves in the North-West of the State. They do not agree, and local Aborigines seldom leave the district. If they are taken to a hospital in an

adjoining area and die, they are brought back and buried at Oodnadatta. I believe that for several generations there will be a large Aboriginal population in this district.

Tourism has increased considerably in recent years. In a submission I made to Pak-Poy and Associates concerning the route of the Stuart Highway, I pointed out that it was necessary to have a road system in the Far North of the State by which tourists could journey to the centre of Australia by one road and return by another. At present, this is happening, even though the Stuart Highway has not been sealed. Tourists travel up the Stuart Highway and return by the Oodnadatta-Marree road. Last year the hotel had a record tourist season, and for the coming season I understand about 500 tourists have already booked accommodation at the hotel. Oodnadatta has an excellent airport that caters for large aeroplanes, and the Flying Doctor Service visits this area regularly. The town has an up-to-date hospital.

As this Government is always preaching decentralisation, here is one opportunity where the Government can practise what it preaches, because this is a town which the local people and I say will survive, although apparently the Government has no confidence in it. The Government should try to help this town, which needs assistance and grants. As it is outside local government areas, it must battle for every cent. I go so far as to suggest that the Premier send one of his investigators to Oodnadatta to verify what I have said this evening. I am sure that the local people would appreciate any officer from a Government Department going there to investigate and see whether what I have said is correct. I appeal to the Government to help this town, not only in the town's own interests but also in the interests of decentralisation.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I speak once again on the urgent need for the Government to looking into the preservation of the Adelaide Hills. I have been talking about this matter ever since becoming a member, and other people have talked about it since long before that. Until the Government acts, I will find it necessary to continue to speak on this subject. I suggest that the Government, particularly the Attorney-General, take notice of the pleas of the recently retired Governor (Sir Mark Oliphant), one of whose last wishes on leaving the State was that this Government do something about preserving the Hills.

I believe that it is about time the Government did something, instead of sitting on its backside and merely talking about it. Unless it does something soon, there will be nothing left there for anyone to enjoy. Last July, it was announced that the Monarto Development Commission would undertake a major study of ways in which to preserve the Hills. The Minister for Planning said that the State Government had hired the Commission, as an independent consultant, to undertake the study, and I am aware that it has already started the job. It has visited Strathalbyn, which is in my district, and I understand from the council there that it found the exercise worth while. The matter that concerns me is the Minister's statement that the study will take about 18 months to complete. The terms of reference of the study are to ascertain whether a special body is needed to administer the Hills, to do a study of the relationship between rural land values and the retention of prime agricultural land, and an examination of the issues involving hobby farmers. As regards the need for special administration, I believe that, unless action is taken quickly, any work done on this matter will be of little value. With this in mind, I urge the Government, through the State Planning Authority or the Monarto Development

Commission, to impose a freeze on subdivision of all land in the Hills until the overall plan is drawn up.

Mr. Rodda: Including Southern Vales.

Mr. WOTTON: I suggest that that is probably a good idea, but I am talking particularly about the Adelaide Hills. I urge the Government to take that action and to use this measure in an effort to keep what we have left of the Hills until an overall plan is introduced. On this issue, I join support with people in local government in my district who are particularly concerned about the preservation of the Hills, particularly the Chairman of Meadows council (Mr. L. A. Hughes). The Meadows council has also called on the State Planning Authority to impose a freeze on the subdivision of all land in the Hills until such a plan is drawn up for the area. Mr. Hughes is quoted as saying:

On several occasions, the Meadows council has refused subdivisions which it felt to be unsuitable, only to have them approved by the State Planning Authority under Interim Development Control.

There are sometimes conflicting policies between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the State Planning Authority, and these policies need to be sorted out. Mr. Hughes continues:

With the present system of planning procedures, the council had virtually no control over subdivision in its area, Mr. Hughes stated. It was most important, he stressed, that a comprehensive overall plan should be prepared for the Hills, specifying the prime agricultural areas, bushland, etc., that should be preserved, and the land which could be set aside for housing, hobby farms, or other uses.

It is vitally important to have an overall plan, because the lack of viability and incentive within rural industries in many cases has meant a serious fragmentation of the Adelaide Hills through the wholesale cutting up of the land. As a result, a very haphazard approach to development in the Hills has been experienced. There is a necessity to plan for future development in the Hills, and it is important that an overall plan should be introduced as soon as possible. Any delay will only make the overall object more difficult to achieve.

The complexity of formulating an overall plan is recognised, particularly in regard to the many and varied problems experienced in the area between producers engaged in intensive farming and those engaged in broad-acre farming. It is extremely important, particularly in the Hills but also in all primary producing areas, that rates and taxes be tied to productivity. It is generally accepted that there needs to be a form of control in the Hills over land use if open space is to be preserved, and most people in the State and in the Hills believe that open space should be preserved.

Zoning is seen as an approach to the regulation in progress of competition between rural industry and residential development. Zones for preferred use should be drawn up as a guide to assist local government, but should be left as flexible as possible. Individual cases within a zone should be treated on their merits. As far as possible, the day-to-day decisions should be left to local government, because the local people know best, particularly in that area, with the State Planning Authority acting in an advisory capacity. However, the authority should have the power to stop a change of land use when and if it sees the overall plan or regional plan not being followed in the best interests of the local community. I am concerned about zoning, in that the authority could remove (and I believe already has removed) the power of local government, in certain areas, as has happened in parts of the Flinders Range, the Riverland, and Kangaroo Island,

The land should be valued on its use value, not on its potential value. This subject has been raised several times. This tends to force people into subdividing and selling land. It is time enough to value and tax the land when a price has been paid for it for a new use. Regulations should not stop the assembly of properties to a size to suit individual needs or a land use considered suitable.

People who have purchased land in recent years with the intention of building a house on it should not be prevented from doing so by these zoning regulations, especially if it can be shown that the disallowance to build would cause them a loss on their original investment, plus bank interest, or the rate of inflation, whichever is the greater. Any restrictions or regulations that are placed on the area by implementing zones should avoid, as far as possible, the disadvantaging of people who have invested in the area in good faith, believing that their plans were suitable for the area at the time of purchase before zoning was implemented.

There should not be any need for such things as a roll-back tax, or participation in capital gain by the Government as a means of controlling subdivision and land use once the zones are established. These capital gains are needed by the individual or family to re-establish his or their type of land use in another area, or as a superannuation fund for one's retirement. To recapitulate, I urge the Government, the State Planning authority and the Monarto Development Commission seriously to consider imposing a freeze on any further subdivision of all land in the Hills until an overall plan for the area has been drawn up. This is something that the Government must seriously consider.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to refer to two matters, the first of which is the one just raised by the member who has just resumed his seat. The other matter is one on which I believe the Government has double standards. Not long ago in the Parliament, the Attorney-General made a strong attack on an insurance company for having its agent sell an insurance policy that gave immediate benefit for accidental death, but with the company opting out, as it was entitled to, in case of death from natural causes. The Government argued that, because the insurance company's agent took the money and the customer was given to understand, according to the Attorney, that he was immediately covered for death from natural causes, and because only six weeks' premium had been paid, the company should have paid out on the death of the insured because of its moral obligation to do so.

I wish to refer to a young couple who are battling their way through life and trying to build their own house. I refer to Mr. G. B. and Mrs. K. D. Hampton of Stirling, who own a block of land at Oakdale Drive, Heathfield. The block of land is lot 1, section 415, hundred of Noarlunga. Mr. Hampton went to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and applied to have an indirect water supply connected to his property. He went first to the Stirling District Council and complied with its requirements. Subsequently, he received an acceptance from the council as follows:

Your application to lay a water main extension along and across Oakdale Drive, Heathfield, has been considered by council and approved.

Mr. Hampton paid \$90 at the E. & W.S. Department office, for which he was given a receipt on January 20, 1976. He subsequently received a letter. We must realise that Mr. Hampton bought the allotment upon which to build his house, using his life savings. This man was a carpenter, who had not many years before graduated from his apprenticeship. Having a young wife and two children, he

wanted to build a house and to have a reticulated water supply. His neighbour had such a service and, although there was no other allotment on his side of the road that needed a service, there was one on the opposite side, alongside which was an area of land comprising 10 hectares, which cannot be subdivided under the present regulations. On the same day that the gentleman in question received the receipt to which I have referred, someone wrote a letter to him stating:

I have to advise that the fee for \$90 for a 20 millimetre indirect water service to supply allotment 1, Oakdale Drive, Heathfield, was accepted in this office on January 19, 1976, in error.

Mr. Abbott: That has nothing to do with insurance policies.

Mr. EVANS: I am talking about the agent for a Government department accepting money for a service and saying that the service would be available to a young chap within 14 days. That person bought the block of land believing that that service would be available because it was available to his neighbour. The department told him that he was entitled to the service. He received information from an agent of the Minister in exactly the same circumstances. How can anyone say that they are not the same? The Minister's agent said that he would take the money so that the service could be provided. It is the same situation as the one involving the insurance agent who it is claimed took money in payment for a policy to insure a life. A person's home is important to him, as is having a reticulated water supply for that home.

I wrote to the Minister explaining that he was not setting a precedent that would snowball throughout the Hills area, adding, however, that even if he was, no more than 100 allotments in the area would fall into this category. With all the thousands of houses in the water catchment area (and that was the reason for not providing this service), what difference would another 100 houses make to pollution in the catchment area? This is a double standard; no-one who is honest could deny that. The department made an error.

Mr. Slater: It admitted it.

Mr. EVANS: Yes. However, in the other case, the company does not admit that it made an error, nor could it be proved that it made an error. The member for Heysen referred to the need for Hills preservation, a matter that has concerned many people for a long time. If the Government introduces legislation to control land use in the Hills, both he and I, if we continue in politics in this area, must realise that the only people who will foot the bill are the people whom we represent. Because the land outside the township areas will be classified for conservation purposes as scrub land or for rural pursuits, or hobby farming or broad acre farming, the rates and taxes in those areas must, in the long term, decrease in comparison with today's rates. On the other hand, rates in the township areas must increase substantially. People living in Mount Barker, Woodside, Stirling, Aldgate, Bridgewater, Uraidla and even Strathalbyn and Meadows, and down to Aberfoyle Park will face substantially increased rates unless members of Parliament are willing to say that the Government should pay a form of subsidy to those councils to carry the rate burden. Otherwise, the councils concerned cannot continue to provide the necessary fire protection services and maintain roads and the necessary supervision to control weeds and pests.

The member for Heysen can be sure that the Government will bring in the control for the benefit mainly of people who do not live in the area. What will happen

when we declare rural an area that is scrub land? We will put an obligation on the owner of that scrub land to clear his scrub land, unless this Government and future Governments are willing to meet the financial commitments of council rates. Under present day primary production methods, a person can not obtain a living from an area less than 200 hectares, and this applies to about 60 per cent of the Adelaide Hills area. I am not talking about the rich Onkaparinga valley, or the good areas around Strathalbyn or Meadows or the beautiful market garden valley of Piccadilly or Uraidla, or the gardening areas of Ashton, Norton Summit and Cherry Gardens. I am speaking of other areas of the Adelaide Hills. The member for Heysen must be watchful of what is happening. The Monarto Commission will not be concerned, in the main, with people living on the land in the broad hectares of that area, nor is this Government concerned. It has not even allowed the rural land tax rebate to property holders in the area unless they derive 50 per cent of their income from rural pursuits. Many of them have about 121 hectares of scrubland.

Mr. Gunn: Get the D8's in.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, and clear it off. That is what the Government is saying. That is what we are saying with the policies we are putting into practice at the moment. If we are to attempt to preserve the Adelaide Hills for the benefit of the State (and we should), the Government and the people of Adelaide must accept the responsibility and they must contribute, too. The member for Heysen will face a difficult situation, as will I, in fighting the cause of the people in the Hills.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The member for Fisher has often raised the problems surrounding his area in the Adelaide Hills, and I believe there is some merit in the concern he has expressed. If we in South Australia are to enjoy the attention of a responsible Government we may well take a lesson from the political climate prevailing in New Zealand. In that country, whether under a socialist or a Liberal Government, the Government and the people recognise the priority position the rural sector should hold. They do this because about 85 per cent of their export return is derived from rural products. New Zealand rural producers do not face the problems faced by South Australian rural producers.

In South Australia, the voice of representation from the rural community in recent times has been reduced to a whisper, and indeed even with the support of the other Opposition members (which usually is forthcoming) with a Government of the complexion of the present one there is no recognition of the true value of rural production and what it means to the whole of the State. It takes second place, behind artificial factors, behind aesthetic, environmental and immeasurable features of life and not true basic principles which we on this side continually strive to represent. I have some sympathy with the member for Fisher, who has a valuable asset in the Adelaide Hills and is in the midst of the pressure, on the one hand, to make the best use of the producing section of the community in the Hills and, on the other, to observe the areas that are not highly productive of food and seek the preservation of them.

I take up a point introduced by the member for Mount Gambier. He entered this House a short time ago and, on many occasions, has demonstrated his qualities in the field

of understanding, both politically and generally, in the community. He has demonstrated this understanding in his remarks on a wide range of subjects and tonight, I believe in order to express his genuine attention to the interests of the community and his genuine attitude to the Commonwealth Government, as well, he raised a matter involving assistance to unemployed youth. Hardly had the honourable member begun speaking on the Community Youth Support Scheme when he met with a barrage of interjections from the other side, first, from the Deputy Premier, who seems intent on destroying the member for Mount Gambier. He interjected several times, as did the member for Stuart, and the Minister for Community Welfare. They tried to sidetrack the honourable member from revealing the benefits of the Federal scheme, which was introduced recently to complement State Government attempts to assist the unemployed generally and youth specifically.

Therefore, it is with some pride that I advise the House that the Federal member for Barker has gone out of his way to bring to the attention of local government and other community groups information concerning the extended benefits provided by the Commonwealth Government. For example, at a meeting to introduce the Community Youth Support Scheme at Kingscote, the member for Barker (Mr. Porter) outlined the role of this new assistance scheme by explaining that its aim is to provide financial assistance to community groups, including recognised youth organisations, as well as providing support programmes and services to young people currently unemployed.

Mr. Porter spoke at Kingscote to a small group, who accepted the challenge of forming a committee and carrying out the recommendations relating to that scheme. The committee included the local major, Eric Beinke, Miss Deborah Sleeman, an officer of the Community Welfare Department, the local police sergeant, the President of the Lions Club and Mr. and Mrs. Tony Boye, all interested people who were willing to assist. The criticism made by Government members implied that the State Government was the only body interested in assisting the Job Hunters' Club in its attempt to assist the youth of our community. However, I point out that Jim Porter and his recently-elected colleagues, the member for Kingston (Grant Chapman), are working hard in this State during their few days of absence from Canberra to promote this sort of scheme and other schemes introduced by the Federal Government.

This scheme is designed not only to provide \$6 a week fare allowance to the unemployed, but it is also available over and above unemployment benefits. The key to this newly introduced scheme is to get the unemployed off their backsides and get them out working in order to cultivate their enthusiasm and at the same time to do something useful in the community. This scheme provides a great opportunity for community or other project work to be undertaken while at the same time keeping people occupied.

I have no other specific matters to bring to the House at this ungodly hour tonight when, indeed, it is a night when we would ordinarily be in our respective houses, or at least, out of this place. I have risen in support of the member for Mount Gambier because of the unreasonable attack made from the other side of the House when the honourable member promoted a responsible scheme introduced by the Federal Government for circulation and promotion at State level by the responsible members like the members for Barker and Kingston have so well demonstrated.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I have been reading a book by Alan Reid that is an interesting record of the disastrous reign of the Whitlam Government. However, in this debate I refer to uranium. I do not have any knowledge of the alleged dumping of nuclear waste in this State at Maralinga. This area is situated in my district and I have visited it several times. I was aware that vehicles and other equipment used during the atomic tests conducted by the British Government in the 1950's have been buried in that area, but I do not know about the accusations that were made this evening on television. I hope that speedy action will be taken to ascertain the true position, and that the Minister of Mines and Energy will have the matter examined.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: By the Commonwealth Minister for Defence?

Mr. GUNN: By whoever is the responsible authority. I am most perturbed if nuclear waste has been dumped, especially if it is unsafe, because people regularly visit that area.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I shall be happy if Mr. Killen provides us with information.

Mr. GUNN: I want to know the facts, and now that the matter has received publicity it should be clarified. A restricted area is located near Maralinga but, if what the honourable gentleman said on television is true, action should be taken to ensure that the area is safe. We have seen the musical chairs in Canberra within the ranks of the Federal Labor Party shadow Ministry in which Caucus overruled a decision. The stage has been reached when the Government of this State, and every other Government, should tell the people its policies and what action should be taken about, the mining of uranium.

If it can be proved beyond doubt that uranium can be successfully mined and processed with no danger to the environment, or to people living near the mine, we should go ahead. I will accept the advice of competent people who have made recommendations: I accept the recommendations of the Fox report and of the State Energy Committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What would you do about other people who have expert knowledge?

Mr. GUNN: Unfortunately, when discussing this matter people tend to allow emotion to blind their better judgment. If the Minister has read the recommendation—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I have.

Mr. GUNN: I have, too. If he has read chapter 16, headed, "Conclusions" on page 173, he would know that the Fox committee stated that some of the statements made were irresponsible. That was the tenor of the comments. Mr. Justice Fox was basically referring to people who were violently opposed to the mining and milling of uranium in Australia. Only a fool would say that we should fall into the trap of having uranium mines and processing plants, without taking proper precautions. Having studied the report and the Minister's report, it is clear from the Minister's committee that reported to him that the State must decide soon what policy it will adopt on this matter. Obviously, there will be an increasing demand for electricity, and it would appear that uranium is one source that could probably provide us with the cheapest form of power.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That creates an extra problem of the waste product.

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That creates the main waste problem.

Mr. GUNN: I realise that. The Minister would be aware that our supplies of fossil fuel are running out and that we must plan for the future. It would appear from the evidence available at this stage that uranium is probably the only alternative source of fuel in the foreseeable future that will fulfil some of that demand. If the Minister knows of other forms of fuel that can provide sources of energy more cheaply than can uranium, I should be pleased to hear about them and about the course of action the Government has in mind.

Mr. Keneally: What is your Party's policy?

Mr. GUNN: Every member of the Party makes his own decision. If the honourable member would like to talk to the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy, he would tell him what our policy is. I know what it is and, at the appropriate time, when given the opportunity, I shall be pleased to state it. We know that there is a division of opinion in the ranks of the Labor Party. We have the Attorney-General saying, "No go", and Foster saying, "We won't have it at any price. Leave it in the ground." I heard him say that at a public meeting. We know the attitude of the left-wing unions, but the Government and the people must decide, and the Government should give a lead. I have stated my opinions openly in the House this evening and I have chosen my words most carefully.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a change.

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting that the Minister had the report printed and tabled in the House, but he has made no decision. I challenge the Minister to bring up this matter for public discussion in the House when we resume next year. I hope that he will start the debate by making a considered Ministerial statement so that Parliament can debate it and so that everyone will know where each side of the House stands.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you like an extension of time?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister has clearly indicated to the House that he does not want to make a statement. I challenged him the other evening to make one.

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

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I want to examine the Government's policy, not the Liberal Party's policy. I want to deal with the manner in which the Government is implementing its policies in South Australia, particularly school dental services.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We are in advance of other States, aren't we?

Mr. ARNOLD: I shall deal with South Australia, not other States. On two or three occasions in the last few months I have endeavoured to obtain information from the Government on this matter. Only 33 per cent of South Australian schoolchildren are at present being serviced by the school dental care programme. I am particularly concerned about primary schoolchildren in this respect. The only reply I have received from the Government is that it will be between eight years and 10 years before all primary schoolchildren in South Australia are catered for. I have suggested that all South Australian schoolchildren could be catered for soon if the Government was willing to use dentists in private practice until the overall programme of training therapists and providing static clinics was completed.

Mr. Keneally: You must be joking.

Mr. ARNOLD: In a programme of this nature, all children must be catered for, not just those in selected areas.

Mr. Keneally: The dentists in the school system—

Mr. ARNOLD: I am certain that dentists in private practice would co-operate. Is the member for Stuart saying that he wishes to deny some schoolchildren this service? Under my suggestion, all primary schoolchildren would receive that initial dental care and training which is so essential in their formative years. Unfortunately, the Government has made no progress in adopting this type of approach. Many dentists in private practice have the time to co-operate in such a programme.

Mr. Whitten: They won't go to the country, will they?

Mr. ARNOLD: I believe that the Dental Association has made this offer to the Government. The dentist in private practice at Barmera would co-operate and ensure that primary schoolchildren at Barmera and Cobdogla and surrounding areas received the necessary service, which he believes is essential. He has ample work to keep him going, but he believes this service is necessary. Most other dentists would co-operate too. I am sure this approach is well known to Government members, but unfortunately the Government seems to have a complete dislike of using dentists in private practice. The Government does not like contract work of any nature. Any work to be carried out for and on behalf of the Government must be done by a Government department. I accept that that is the Government's philosophy. Unfortunately, however, we are dealing with children, and they are the ones who are suffering from the consequences of this philosophy.

Mr. Whitten: They must have suffered a lot before 1973, then.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes, and they suffered much more in the 1700's and 1800's, too. However, we are talking about the position in 1976 and the future. It is no good our worrying about health care services that have existed before this.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will you take up with Mr. Hunt the reduction of funding in the school dental service?

Mr. ARNOLD: We are talking about South Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about your Federal colleagues, who have cut funds all over the place?

Mr. ARNOLD: I have not said that the Government can create forthwith a dental clinic in every town in South Australia. However, I have said it could make use of dentists in private practice.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: For buckshee?

Mr. ARNOLD: What does the Minister do for nothing? That is precisely it. The Government is implementing its programme on a sectional basis. It concerns not only primary schoolchildren but also pensioner patients, particularly those in country areas who are forced to travel to Adelaide, in many instances from a considerable distance away. All members know that there is a three-year waiting time for pensioners at the Adelaide Dental Hospital. In many instances, pensioners need urgent dental care, and in three years the person concerned might not still be living. Because of the Government's attitude, these people are being denied this care, which could be provided in their own home town by their local dentist.

In many instances, local dentists would be more than pleased to provide this service, and to force elderly people to travel often hundreds of miles to Adelaide to obtain this attention is totally unwarranted, as is the cost of getting them to Adelaide, especially when it can be done on a

contract basis by dentists in their own areas. Two or three years ago, I heard of an urgent case involving an elderly person.

Mr. Keneally: You had better speak to your Federal colleagues.

Mr. ARNOLD: I am speaking about South Australia. It is up to the South Australian Government to examine this problem. The instance to which I referred involved an elderly lady. It was essential that she be treated and provided with new dentures. She was sent to Adelaide, but the Dental Hospital was unable to do anything for her for three years. I brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Health, who arranged for that lady to be cared for within three months. However, this does not solve the problem. Indeed, it merely compounds the problem, as it moves everyone else on the list down an extra position. Therefore, the overall waiting period remains at three years.

This problem could be solved by the Government's making use of dentists in private practice. It would solve the problem for primary school children, by ensuring that they received essential care in their younger years when they got their permanent teeth and that they received the necessary instructions from dentists on how to care for their teeth. It would also solve the problem so far as pensioners are concerned because this is a real problem for elderly people. I think that the Government will recognise that a trip to Adelaide is often—

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

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I raise a matter that disturbs many primary producers when transporting field bins on public roads, because a problem seems to have developed under the Road Traffic Act whereby it is illegal to follow this practice. The Road Traffic Act defines "field bin" as a bin that is used for the transportation of grain, whereas that is not the case. In fact, it is a bin that is used for the bulk storage of grain in fields: it is a receptacle that is used to store grain that is taken directly from a header and thence to a store until such time as the grain can be transported by road. Regrettably, the Motor Registration Division of the Transport Department has not viewed a field bin in this manner and has classified it as a road vehicle. Some farmers have been prosecuted for taking a field bin on to a road when it has not been registered, or they have been prosecuted because the bin is overweight. The member for Unley would today have witnessed—

Mr. Langley: I know that you're filibustering.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BLACKER: —a bulk bin on a public road. The practice is essential for any farmer who operates between properties or who must go on to a public road to get from one section of his property to another. In normal circumstances a field bin is classified as an implement of farm machinery.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you reckon that the Liberal Party financed Gilbertson?

Mr. BLACKER: I fail to see how that relates to field bins.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's an interesting question, though.

Mr. BLACKER: True.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders has the floor.

Mr. BLACKER: It is a problem of grave concern because I know personally of several farmers who have gone to the police stations at Cleve and Port Lincoln and have asked for a permit to transport a field bin on a public

road. These farmers wished to comply with the law but were told that there was nothing from the police point of view to say they could not use—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BLACKER: These problems are disturbing. If a farmer inquires at a police station about his eligibility to take this implement on the road, only to be told that he cannot have a permit because a permit does not exist, where does he stand? These people have been told repeatedly that permits are not available. Apparently, under the provisions of the Road Traffic Act a field bin is not classified as a farm implement, so prosecutions have resulted. I raise this matter because it is serious to any primary producer who wishes to go about his normal farming enterprise but is prevented from taking farm implements on the road, implements in the category of a field bin. I point out that the field bin is not an implement or a piece of equipment used for the transport of grain. Few, if any of them, could be used in that way; they would break up. They are simply storage bins which may be set down and filled with grain to capacities far beyond their carrying capacity. It is this point which comes into question.

I understand that attempts have been made on many occasions to have legislation amended so that bulk bins can be used. A number of people have been inconvenienced in this way. Similarly, the farm welder is not classified as a farm implement and cannot be transported on a road without going through the full registration procedure. That is not possible with the field bin, because of the over-width requirements. I hope that amending legislation will be introduced in due course to enable this anomaly within the laws of South Australia to be overcome.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to grieve on a number of subjects. I am delighted that members have used this occasion to grieve; we have had few such opportunities lately because the sittings of the House have gone past 10 p.m. The first matter to which I wish to refer is a letter I have received from Mr. Gavin W. Bailey, and I shall read it out because Mr. Bailey is still unhappy about one matter and where he stands in relation to certain facts relating to the House. The House will recall that Mr. Bailey's case has been related by a number of members, but I should like to read the letter which I think settles the matter. It states:

Mr. Dean Brown,
Member for Davenport,
375 Greenhill Road,
Toorak Gardens,
South Australia 5065.

Dear, Mr. Brown, after reading *Hansard* concerning my employment by Mr. R. H. Angas, there are a number of impressions created, especially in the case put on behalf of Mr. Angas, that give entirely the wrong conclusions. Please would you read this out in Parliament so that the record can at least stand corrected.

The wages book and diary referred to were never signed by me as the employee and therefore are meaningless documents for evidence. I did work long hours at times up to 16 hours a day (never eight). I received no overtime pay as a farm manager, receiving a fixed salary only. I deny emphatically the outrageous and untrue accusations made about me in a letter given to me by Mr. Angas dated July 14, 1976. This letter was read out in Parliament, without my consent and without any attempt to check the facts. I am currently seeking legal opinion on the contents of this letter from Mr. Angas. Acceptance of the offer made in the letter does not infer my acceptance of the wild accusations.

Rent was paid for the house we lived in, and this can be established by examining my taxation group certificates. My official position on the property was that of manager; however, at no time was I given the responsibility or authority of a manager. My wife and I suffered and were controlled by intimidation over the years. I am disgusted at the way members of Parliament have used this issue without checking the accuracy of their claims. It is a shameful reflection on how our State is led. In July, my wife and I came to Parliament seeking help to establish an award for farm managers. Since then our reputations have been destroyed by misuse of the information we supplied, or by incorrect statements. I again state that the accusations made against me are incorrect.

Thank you again for your assistance in clarifying the situation and for reading to Parliament my previous letter. Yours faithfully, Gavin W. Bailey.

That letter speaks for itself and clearly puts the case on behalf of Mr. Bailey, who at no stage had the opportunity to reply to some of the accusations made against him.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Angas made the accusations against him. It was Goldsworthy who stood up and said that Bailey was crook, isn't that true?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The second issue I want—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Isn't that right: you only want to get it in the record and clear your own name?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Works is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I do not want to raise the matter again. Mr. Bailey did not use names in his letter, but it is Government members who are responsible. I refer to a letter sent through the post that has probably been received by many people. At least two people in Adelaide in the last 24 hours have received this letter, which I believe is of concern to the community at large, especially people owning motor vehicles. The letter is sent from Concrow Enterprises Proprietary Limited and refers to breakthrough products and services for the business world.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What has Kavel got to say about what you say about Bailey.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Works is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister cannot contain himself, I suggest he removes himself.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You answer me then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport will be seated. I must ask the honourable Minister of Works not to interject in this manner. The honourable member for Davenport will continue with the debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The letter relates to the sale of Easy-Key products. I am concerned about the use of this product, which is a system or device sent out by this company to break into motor vehicles. From telephoning the company this morning I understand that the device is suitable to break into virtually any motor vehicle with the normal car lock, whether a lock on the door or a flick switch immediately above the handle. The product

can be purchased for \$8.65 plus 85 cents for certified postage and handling, and one can buy up to five of these items for \$30. I would appreciate it if the Premier took note of this matter and discussed it with the Attorney-General. I believe the Attorney should look at the product's being sold and at the company to see whether there is any way that the product can be stopped from being sold in South Australia and, if this is not possible, to issue a statement warning people that, if the product is sold, they should realise that the contents of their locked motor vehicles will not longer be protected. The letter states:

Here are the facts: Opens locked car doors with a flick of the wrist; so simple anyone can use it; so effective it can only be sold to bona-fide business officials and law enforcement officers; costs less than a two chain or the minimum charged by a serviceman's call; serves a lifetime; stores on keyboards; businesslike, ends the use of coat-hangers and other makeshifts; not a pick or a prying device; the first and only simple, sure answer to the locked-car problem.

This instrument is sold at \$8.65, and to obtain one the mail order form is completed, placed in a stamped self-addressed envelope, and returned to the company "Easy-Key" at 22 Woonga Street, Woodridge, Queensland, 4114.

Mr. Whitten: You're crook giving it this publicity.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am asking that the Government examine this product: I am not giving it any more publicity than has been openly circulated around the State. The contents of any locked car will be unsafe if this product is sold freely throughout the State, as little effort is required to obtain one of these keys. I urge the Government to warn people immediately that locked cars are not safe or (and this would be better) to ensure that this product is removed from the market. It endangers the security of every person's locked motor vehicle.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1 and 2 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 7, at 2 p.m.