HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 August 1978

The SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: MINORS BILL

Mr. RUSSACK presented a petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation which deprived parents of their rights and responsibilities in respect of the total health and welfare of their children.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

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

Leave granted.

The HON. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition made allegations concerning the cost of products from the Frozen Food Factory of the Government. I have a report from the Chief Secretary concerning this matter.

Inquiries about the vegetable products available for the prices quoted in the table of food price comparisons have revealed that like products are not being compared. All food products from the Frozen Food Factory are ready for consumption immediately after reconstitution in an oven, and require no further cooking or processing. Vegetable products are either double blanched or, in the case of chip potatoes, broccoli, and cauliflower, they undergo a cooking process within the factory prior to freezing. The prices quoted in the food price comparison table cited are believed to be vegetable products in the frozen state only, and require further cooking and expense before they are ready for consumption.

Meat for the Frozen Food Factory products is purchased to a specified quality. Comparisons with other manufacturers' products would need to take into account the quantity of fat, gristle, spices, and liquid per kilogram of meat. The quality of the meat products for which prices have been quoted in competition to the Frozen Food Factory has not been stated. However, having regard to the misleading comparisons drawn for the vegetable products, the validity of the comparisons for the meat products contained in the table is questionable. Before it is possible to draw any meaningful comparisons between products of the Frozen Food Factory and other sources, it would be necessary for the individual products to be produced for direct comparison with Frozen Food Service products.

There is a range of about 100 products being developed at the Frozen Food Service, and the prices that have currently been advised to hospitals are based on limited production runs in the development phase of plant commissioning. The Frozen Food Service provides pre-cooked, snap-frozen foods in bulk, but based on average meal quantities a plate: an average of the existing hospital menus would calculate out at an average of $1·18 a meal. Some cuts of meat and pre-cooked vegetables are obviously dearer than others: a roast pork dish is dearer than sausages. Allowing for an estimated 7 per cent or 8 per cent possible variation in price during 1978-79, all hospitals receiving Frozen Food Service have been asked to budget on the basis of $1·25 a meal.

At this stage, although the Frozen Food Service supplies pre-cooked food in bulk, hospitals have to work from a demand expressed in meals and, for this purpose, a meal is regarded as being a main course of a meat serve plus three different vegetables and a sweets course of any description. At this stage the Frozen Food Service is developing a wide range of dishes to meet hospital demands, and there are 57 meat dishes, 18 vegetables, 25 sweets, and 63 minced and vitamised dishes for special requirements of patients.

The Government believes that the frozen food operation is operating efficiently. In order to set it up, technologists of the highest level and competence operating in the private sector were brought in to operate this service. We believe that the service is operating efficiently, and that the Leader's statements have been a deliberate misrepresentation in relation to the Frozen Food Factory.

QUESTIONS

URANIUM REPORT

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier now release the original third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, dated February 1977, so that taxpayers of South Australia can assess for themselves the effects of their Government's present stand opposing uranium mining and enrichment? The report was suppressed last year because the Premier said it was contrary to Government policy. The committee is in favour of uranium development, and preliminary plans for an enrichment plant without waste disposal problems have been prepared. The Mines and Energy Department and the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department are keeping up to date with uranium technology. Exploration licences were issued as recently as last month; for example, No. 412 to Sedimentary Uranium until 3 July 1979 and No. 415 to Uranerz Australia until 11 July 1979, while Adelaide Hills licence No. 349 for Uranerz has been renewed, and No. 350 is due for renewal in 12 days time. The Mayor of Whyalla has today supported an enrichment plant. Up to 5 000 short-term and 2 000 long-term jobs would be provided by such a plant, and wider benefits would flow to the entire community from both mining and enrichment. The Liberal Party has made quite clear it supports mining and enrichment of uranium, subject to stated safeguards.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now commenting. If he continues to do so I will withdraw leave to ask the question.

Mr. TONKIN: With great respect, Sir, it is a fact.

The SPEAKER: I want the honourable Leader to stop commenting and to get on with the question.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is widely recognised that South Australia's economy is in a critical situation. The South Australian Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader knows as well as anyone else that when the Speaker is standing he must resume his seat. The Leader is still commenting, and I will withdraw leave if he continues in that way.

Mr. TONKIN: The results of the facts that I have read out make quite clear that the benefits that stand to come to the people of South Australia from this project are such that the South Australian Government has no right to suppress this report from the people.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is talking about a decidedly out-of-date interim report of a committee of the Government, the interim report having been sent back to the committee for further work by it.

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't you let the people know that?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government will release reports for which it is responsible when it believes it can take responsibility for those reports. It will not release reports with which it is not satisfied—

Mr. Mathwin: Because they don't toe the Party line.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of toeing any Party line. It is a question of the Government taking responsibility for material which it releases. If we are not satisifed with material, we do not then take responsibility for releasing it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did you make that clear?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When an officer sends me material with which the Government is not satisfied, I do not propose to say that, although I am not satisifed with it, I will give it out to the public nevertheless.

Mr. Millhouse: But that is a matter of public interest.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to matters of public interest, no doubt the honourable member is interested in anything that he can get of any kind, but the Government will take responsibility for the reports it releases. A series of interim reports have been made in relation to this matter and there have been a series of papers since that time. When the Government believes that the committee has completed work and has provided a report to Government that can properly be released, the Government will release a report, but we do not propose to publish interim working papers when we are not satisfied with them.

Mr. Millhouse: Even though the press has got it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not responsible for someone having thieved interim documents in some way.

Mr. Millhouse: That is what has happened, is it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I don't know if it has happened. If the honourable member says the press has got it, that is what must have happened.

Mr. Millhouse: It's in today's paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham and, if he continues in this way, I will take action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know how it got there.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you claiming theft?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Davenport to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I wish to make clear that the Government will release reports, for which it is prepared to take responsibility, when it believes those reports are in such a condition that the Government can take responsibility for their publication. It does not release reports otherwise, nor has any previous Government in this State of any political persuasion done so. We have released more reports of internal matters to Government than has any previous Government in the history of this State.

Mr. Evans: You have withheld more, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Fisher to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh no, we have not. While we are keeping up with uranium technology, the last time anything was said about that in this House the Leader was putting on a tremendous performance to the effect that we had had secret meetings in this House with Urenco.

Mr. Tonkin: In this House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I presume the honourable member was referring to meetings in this House, because the only meetings I ever had with Urenco were here. There was a great carry-on about that when I had publicly stated that we would keep up with uranium technology and consult with people who had it. The fact is that, at this stage of proceedings, there is no yet viable proposition for the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, even should the Government's policy be different from what it is.

The Government's policy is, of course, based on a unanimous resolution of this House. The gas centrifuge system of uranium enrichment has been under investigation for a considerable time, but finality on it has not yet been reached, and to suggest that we could tomorrow go out and let a contract for the establishment of a gas centrifuge plant to be established at Redcliff is nonsense.

Mr. Tonkin: The third report seems to suggest that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader knows all about the third report, I am blessed if I know why he wants me to release it. All I can say is that that is not what the third report says; it is an interim report as to the stage that has been reached in the investigation, and that is all. When we have a report for which the Government can take responsibility and which can be released, we will release one. At this stage of proceedings we are not going to proceed to release a report with which we were not satisfied and which was given to the Government in February of last year.

NOISE CONTROL

Mr. SLATER: I understand that certain hours have been determined under the new noise control regulations for the use of lawn motor-mowers, the period extending, I believe, until 8 p.m. Will the Minister for the Environment consider further extending that time to 9 p.m. during periods of daylight saving?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is no guarantee that daylight saving will be a continuous feature. The noise control regulations were drawn on the basis that, from experience, that was a reasonable hour up to which lawnmowers could be used. I point out to the honourable member that unless a complaint is made people are still free to operate their lawnmowers after that hour but, if it is outside the stipulated hours and a complaint is made, they could be in some bother. I will examine the proposition put forward by the honourable member (I will not cast it aside out of hand) to see whether or not it is a practical proposition, or whether it would create any difficulty, not just in the area of lawnmowers but in respect of noises from other machines as well.

URANIUM MINING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say on what evidence the Government persists in its opposition to uranium mining and enrichment when the Fox Report recommends mining, the Government's own expert

committee believes an enrichment plant is desirable, safeguards have been approved, and waste disposal is not involved? The second report by the Uranium Enrichment Committee which was not suppressed by the Government, states:

> The decision as to whether to proceed with the project should be made with all speed to ensure that export sales of uranium are made subject to refining and enrichment in Australia.

The report which has been suppressed by the Government is similar to the report from which I have quoted, and in view of those comments it would seem that the Government must have evidence which is not available to that expert committee as to the undesirability of mining and refining uranium.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The committee on the uranium enrichment plant was not in any way concerned with the question of supply of enriched or other uranium to customer countries. As I pointed out to this House at the time of the original motion in this House which set the policy followed by the Government, there is no question that a uranium enrichment plant could be established without environmental difficulty in the immediate area.

That is, a uranium enrichment plant itself would not create an environmental hazard. There is no problem of waste from a uranium enrichment plant, a centrifuge system would require not a great deal of water, and it is within the power capacity of the State. But the question before this House at the time of the resolution, for which all Opposition members voted, including the honourable member who is now sniggering—

Mr. Goldsworthy: A bit of water has gone under the bridge since then.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: A bit of water would have—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy and the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The supply of uranium to customer countries is still a grave danger to the future of mankind. There is no safe system operating of disposal of high-level atomic wastes. The statements that have been made in the past few days from the National University do not introduce a new system of waste disposal of any adequacy, and were immediately called into question by Professor Titterton. There are no international arrangements that could enforce the use of technologies which might be developed for safe waste disposal or which could monitor them for the time necessary to ensure that the toxic life of the high level of atomic wastes was covered. The agreement made by the Federal Government with Finland is so inadequate that one could drive a horse and cart through its clauses. The fact remains that it is not safe for Australia to provide uranium to a customer country and, while that position remains and until it changes, there will be no mining or enrichment of uranium in this State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Opposition has been told that consistently. The position has not changed one bit since members opposite voted for exactly that position in the House.

INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs obtain a copy of a list of insurance companies considered to be a risk by the Corporation of Insurance Brokers? I refer to a report that the Corporation of Insurance Brokers of Australia has compiled a list of about 50 small insurance companies, which it considers are at risk, and to the reported statement of the corporation's South Australian Chairman (Mr. Bruce Brooks) that some of these companies are in trouble now and may go to the wall within a year or so. As small policy-holders are always the people worst hit by any collapse, will the Minister confer with the corporation with a view to requiring some form of indemnity regarding insurance undertaken by some of those companies?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Now that this matter has been raised, I will certainly look into the matter further. I, too, read the press report, which I presume was the basis of the honourable member's question and which, no doubt, other honourable members read, and I thought at the time that the Insurance Brokers of Australia were sailing fairly close to the wind in legal terms, in that, I believe, that, if they published such a list, they would need to have a large bank account in order to be able to meet the claims for defamation that would inevitably be made against them. I think we ought to see this claim in the commercial context in which I believe the original statement was made.

It seems, if one looks into the insurance industry, that the brokers have their arrangements with various companies, and it has been the case recently that some of the smaller and newer insurance companies, with possibly more aggressive marketing techniques, have been less enthusiastic about using brokers than some of the more old established and larger companies have been. The effect of that has been that the brokers are not particularly enthusiastic about some of those smaller and newer insurance companies. So, I imagine that there was that sort of commercial interest behind the statement the brokers made on this matter. However, now that the matter has been raised, I think it should be looked into.

In making my comments to the House concerning the fairly obvious self-interest that the brokers would have in this matter, I do not want it to be thought by members in this place or by the public at large that this Government is not very much concerned to ensure adequate and proper protection for policy-holders in this State. Of course, we are concerned to ensure that they are well protected, and to that extent the Government would counsel people who are taking out policies to take them out with reputable and well-established firms. We believe that there is some need for a tightening of legislation. However, in the present situation the Government does not believe that it should act unilaterally, as the matter is being considered by the Australian Law Reform Commission, a reference having come from the Federal Government on this subject.

It is anticipated that the work of the Australian Law Reform Commission will take some little time yet. When the report of the commission is available, it having taken evidence in all States and from all interested people, the Government will look closely at the report with a view to introducing legislation in South Australia to take account of the matters recommended by the commission.

Honourable members will recall that it was a policy undertaking of this Government at the recent election that it would introduce legislation dealing with insurance contracts specifically, because that is an area about which I, as Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, have had reason to be concerned in the past. We intend to honour that undertaking as soon as possible, but it would not be in the best interests of South Australians if we were to act unilaterally at this stage. We believe we should await the report of the Australian Law Reform Commission.

I imagine that the commission, in its report, will deal with the matters raised by the honourable member today, and at that stage no doubt the House will have an opportunity to debate the subject. In the meantime, I shall

undertake to contact the Insurance Brokers of Australia and to ask for this list of about 50 small insurance companies. However, I am extremely doubtful that I will have any success in obtaining such a list, the production and publication of which would almost certainly amount to a defamation of the insurance companies concerned, so I imagine the brokers will not be particularly anxious to produce it.

MR. R. LYONS

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister for the Environment say why Mr. Lyons was transferred from the position of Director of the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service to the office of Forestry Adviser, Woods and Forests Department; was he appointed to this position under section 57 of the Public Service Act; was a new position created at a salary of more than $24 000 and, if so, when, and on whose recommendation; and, in view of the freeze on Public Service positions, will the Minister tell the House the justification for this new position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I wonder whether the honourable member could throw in a couple more questions; however, I will see whether I can handle them one by one. I will deal first with the last one. The recommendation to create the position was made by the Chairman of the Public Service Board, and that recommendation was relayed to me. In turn, I relayed it to Cabinet, which approved it, and it then went to Executive Council. Those are the steps taken in connection with the recommendation. The Chairman of the Public Service Board made the recommendation to me. The proposition to transfer Mr. Lyons to the Woods and Forests Department as a Forestry Adviser was made by the Chairman of the Public Service Board to Mr. Lyons who accepted that offer.

Mr. Wotton: He had no option.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member should be careful about the statements he makes. Mr. Lyons accepted that proposition and was not under any pressure to do so. He has told me that I can say publicly that, if anyone wants to know his reasons for accepting the proposition, they are his own, and that is his right. I hope that the honourable member will not question that. The honourable member asks how the new position has been created when the Government has announced a freeze on Public Service positions in South Australia. If the honourable member will keep his eyes and ears open during the course of the next 12 months, he will learn or hear of many new positions being created in the Public Service. He probably does not understand that, because he may not know much about the situation yet.

It is competent for new positions to be created in the Public Service, the qualification being that somewhere, not necessarily in the same department or at the same level, another position must be wasted. Can the honourable member see any difficulty in that? Therefore, a position will have to be wasted somewhere in the Public Service because of the creation of this new position. If the honourable member thinks that Mr. Lyons has been railroaded out of his position, let me tell him that Mr. Lyons will not effectively be leaving the Environment Department until the end of October. If he was being railroaded out of the department, he would have been gone today. Mr. Lyons will have adequate time to complete the fair amount of outstanding work he has to do, and he will attend a course in New South Wales before going to the Woods and Forests Department.

Mr. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member can attempt to build as much as he likes into this; he loves a bit of scandal. However, since he has been the shadow Minister for the Environment he has done nothing to assist the department. He had done nothing but denigrate the department and its senior officers. He complains about the morale of the department, but he should examine his own conscience and his own efforts. Frankly, the part the honourable member has played has certainly not helped with the morale of this department.

Mr. Wotton: You're guilty of the same thing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will answer for my own sins if I have any, but I do not have any.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

Mr. Chapman: I get the blame for the lot.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Education has helped me out by saying I have no sins at all, and that he can vouch for that. I agree with him.

Mr. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Murray to order. He has interjected five times already, and I hope he will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Murray has raved on inside and outside the House about the spate of resignations of senior officers from this department. Let me define senior officers in the department, looking at branch heads. Within the National Parks and Wildlife Service the four senior officers are the Director; the Superintendent of Field Operations; Dr. Sue Barker (head of the Projects Section); and the Administrative Officer, Mr. D. Cordez. The only resignation from amongst those four senior officers has been that of Mr. Gobby, and that took effect late last month. Mr. Gobby's reasons for resigning are as follows:

> I wish to advise that I intend to leave my present position as Superintendent of Field Operations with the National Parks and Wildlife Service in the near future and move to Western Australia to form my own business there.
>
> The timing of this move is dependent upon the sale of my house in Adelaide, and I shall tender my formal resignation when settlement of that sale has been arranged. I have had plans to take this step for some years, and I am making the move at this time because of personal arrangements I have made in Western Australia.
>
> My intention to resign is therefore to realise a long-term objective and is not related to any aspects of my employment in the present position. I wish to assure you of my continued support and that I will endeavour to promote the work of the division in any way possible.

Comments were made when Mr. Gobby indicated that his resignation was imminent that he was disenchanted—

Mr. Wotton: I did not do that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, you didn't. I said that comments were made. You learned your lesson a little earlier. I give the lie to statements made by the honourable member in relation to this department. I took out a few figures to satisfy myself that there was nothing untoward about the rate of resignations, movements in, or retirements from, this division, and compared them to other departments.

During 1977-78 the number of people who left the Engineering and Water Supply Department made up 8·16 per cent of the total officers employed under the Public Service Act; the number who left the Public Buildings Department made up 9·92 per cent of the total; and the number who left the National Parks and Wildlife Division made up 10 per cent of the total. I am sure the honourable member will see nothing outstanding about that figure.

If the honourable member had done his homework, which he does not seem to have done, he would have realised that the things he has uttered about this department are basely incorrect and, although designed to damage me, as Minister, and the Government, are causing damage to people who are dedicating themselves diligently to their work and who are doing the best they possibly can under fairly difficult circumstances. I hope the honourable member will turn over a new leaf and be more responsible in his attitude in the future.

NORTHERN RAILWAYS

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport say what action he proposes to take in relation to recent reports that two of our northern railway services are likely to be closed? Recent reports indicate that the Federal Government intends to close the Gladstone to Wilmington and the Peterborough to Quorn railway lines. As both these services serve a substantial rural community, I ask the Minister whether the State Government is able to resist this move.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In accordance with the terms of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act the Commonwealth Minister is prevented from closing down any railway or reducing any effectively demanded service without first obtaining approval of the State Minister and, in the event of that approval not being forthcoming, the matter can then be resolved by arbitration.

For some time the Federal Minister has been attempting, despite public and local outcry from the people concerned, to close both of these lines. He sent me a formal letter when I was overseas, an act that I did not appreciate because he knew I was going overseas as I had informed him of the date. He waited until I was overseas, and then served notice that he was about to order the closure of the lines. Fortunately, he did not persist with his attitude when I protested, and he agreed to defer action until I returned.

I have discussed this matter with Cabinet and it has unanimously resolved that we will not permit Mr. Nixon to take away the rail services in these two areas, because we believe firmly that they are very important to the people of those areas and, indeed, to the economy of the State. I have written to him on that basis today, and asked him not to proceed with his intention to close the lines. If he does not agree with that point of view, then he must initiate arbitration in accordance with the legislation. We, as a State, will fight to retain those lines, and I have already put forward the nomination of a person whom we regard as suitable to act as arbitrator if Mr. Nixon wishes to persist in his intention to close the lines.

COUNCIL RATES

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Local Government say, because the Elizabeth City Council has made a mistake in declaring a too high rate in the dollar for the 1978-79 year, and because the Local Government Act does not provide for the council's decision to be changed, what action he will take to stop the residents being unfairly taxed? I quote from a statement issued this morning from the office of His Worship the Mayor of Elizabeth, as follows:

> The Mayor of Elizabeth, Mr. T. H. H. Hemmings, said today that, after exploring every legal avenue, which included consulting with both council's solicitor and the Crown Solicitor, he wished to advise ratepayers of Elizabeth that the Local Government Act has no providion to rescind council's decision in declaring its 13·8c in the dollar at the budget meeting of 5 July 1978.
>
> The Mayor said that council felt it was necessary that ratepayers should be made aware of the circumstances which resulted in the ratepayers having to pay increases of up to 80 per cent more than last year.
>
> In September 1977 council employed an independent valuer to prepare a new assessment in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act. In March 1978 certain patterns emerged showing wide differences between the commercial and residential properties. It was also apparent that the valuations of the residential properties were being affected by their geographical locations.
>
> The Mayor said that at this point of time a legal opinion was sought by the administration for legal advice as to whether differential rating could be introduced and, if so, how it could be implemented. However, the existence of the correspondence to the legal adviser and the subsequent reply was not made available to council for its consideration.
>
> The Mayor said that council feels that had the contents been made known at the budget meeting, or earlier, a more realistic appraisal could have been made of the financial obligation of the city. The Mayor further stated that council regretted the situation in which ratepayers had been placed. He urged all residents to appeal against the assessment, if they considered their property valuation too excessive. However, under section 267 (*b*) of the Local Government Act, it is possible that individual ratepayers could apply for a remission of portion of their rates where payment of their rates imposes hardship.
>
> Council regrets the situation where ratepayers face an increase way above that which was intended as a result of the recent decision of council. The Mayor added that senior council staff would be directed to investigate ways and means of pruning the 1978-79 budget, so that savings can take place to enable council to bring forward into next financial year a reasonable surplus for the purpose of providing relief of the rate burden during that financial year.

Because of the unenviable situation in which the Elizabeth council finds itself, and because of the possibility of other councils finding themselves in a similar position, what does the Minister intend to do?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In keeping with everyone else, I am bound by the terms of the legislation. What the Elizabeth council did was in accordance with the Act and, under the terms of the Act, there is nothing I am permitted to do.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me an up-to-date report on the Highways Department's plans to reconstruct and widen Grand Junction Road from the intersection of North-East Road, Holden Hill, to Anstey Hill? I have raised this matter before, because this road is no longer wide enough to serve present-day traffic generated by the increasing population in the area. This work would also result in the construction of footpaths and water tables, which would be in the interests of pedestrian safety, particularly that of children. Because of my

explanation, a high priority is needed for this road.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

MINING

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether preliminary planning is proceeding for the development of the infra-structure necessary to service a future mining operation at Roxby Downs and, if it is, what progress has been made? Also, if preliminary planning is not proceeding, why not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There must be significant additional work in proving-up the size and quality of the ore body before any detailed economic feasibility study can be undertaken at Roxby Downs. That work, plus some preliminary work on feasibility, is being undertaken by Western Mining Corporation at present. I imagine that there would be a further period of 18 months or two years before any final decision can be taken on economic feasibility as regards Roxby Downs. At this preliminary stage, the work that the Government has undertaken has related to the question of whether any process water could be made available to that area, because, if the Roxby Downs operation got off the ground, it would be planned to process the ore on site.

The Mines and Energy Department, having undertaken groundwater investigations in that area, believes that process water of reasonable quality could be pumped to the site from the Great Artesian Basin. Some discussions will have to take place soon with the Commonwealth Government with respect to possible partial use of Woomera township. Under the present Joint Defence Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia, the British Government, and the Government of the United States of America, anyone who, from outside those Governments, comes in to rent property in Woomera must pay a contribution towards infra-structure in Woomera. The contribution that is required towards infra-structure is so harsh as virtually to prevent any outside body from ever being able to contemplate rental accommodation or the hiring of any premises in Woomera.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you give an example?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mount Gunson Mines negotiated at one stage with the Commonwealth Defence Department, and I think the rental would have been double, by the time the infra-structure payment had been made, the normal rentals that would apply in a city such as Adelaide. This is not a tolerable position. Of course, much accommodation in Woomera is now vacant, because of the nature of the agreement that exists between Australia, Britain, and the United States, and the Australian Government will have to give some attention to that. Otherwise, if some projects get off the ground in that area, we will have the ridiculous position where additional accommodation is provided, even though there is some spare accommodation in Woomera. In addition to that, in relation to the infra-structure, there is a water pipeline that the Commonwealth has constructed from Port Augusta to Woomera, with the pumping station at Hesso on the way.

Mr. Gunn: What's that—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I point out to the member for Eyre that if the whole Woomera operation is being run down, the availability of some capacity from that water pipeline is relevant. No doubt there may be requirements for a further pipeline. All those things have to be investigated, and the amount of work involved in all of that is large indeed. The kind of finance that would have to be available for the Roxby Downs operation, if it were an open-cut operation, would be huge. A 1 000-ft. open cut would be the biggest in the world, and the front-end money before any return was available would be extremely large.

The problem Western Mining Corporation has, first, in determining the extent of the ore body; secondly, in determining the economic feasibility; thirdly, in making all the appropriate arrangements regarding infra-structure; and finally, in arranging finance for such a project, means that there is much work and much time still to go before any final decision can be made regarding Roxby Downs.

SURREY DOWNS PRE-SCHOOL

Mr. KLUNDER: Has the Minister of Education details of the time table for the construction of a pre-school centre at the Surrey Downs Primary School? The Surrey Downs pre-school centre proposal was not able to be funded through the Childhood Services Council last year, even though the need is pressing. Since then, there has been a rapid and continued growth in the suburbs of Surrey Downs, Wynne Vale, and the northern half of Redwood Park, making the construction of such a centre now most urgent.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This is a priority area for the Childhood Services Council. We are hoping that, as soon as some developmental money is available, we may be able to proceed with the project that is dear to the honourable member's heart. In terms of what I said in answer to another question in the House earlier this week, I do not know when we will be able to do that, because of the virtual absence of any finance available to the council for new services in the coming financial year. I shall take up the specific matter raised and bring back a reply.

TRAWLING INDUSTRY

Mr. BLACKER: I shall direct my question to the Premier, although I may be incorrect in asking it of him. Can he say what incentives are being offered to the South Australian fishing industry to attract greater South Australian participation in the pending off-shore trawling industry? The declaration of the 200-mile limit of Australian waters opens up the possibility of a new type of fishery and associated industries in South Australia, based on the deep-sea trawling industry. I have been informed that there are 14 deep-sea trawlers operating in South Australian waters, and using Portland as a base. The trawling grounds in the Great Australian Bight are about midway between Albany and Port Lincoln and, with the Western Australian Government offering considerable incentives to the fishing industry, it could be that potential South Australian trawler fishermen will be enticed out of this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I could give the honourable member some answer at this stage, but I think it would be better to get a full report from my colleague, which I shall do.

STATE HOUSING

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister for Planning, as Minister in charge of housing, inform the House whether the Federal Government has given any attention or greater priority to State housing needs? There is great

concern within the community at the downgrading of public housing as a Commonwealth priority, as it has led to hundreds of skilled workers in this State being lost to the building industry. I am aware that, at a recent conference of State Housing Ministers, the Federal Government was urged to provide matching funds, and I should like to know with what success.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think honourable members would be aware that, despite the great song and dance that was associated with the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, despite the expectations of all State Housing Ministers, generated by the Commonwealth Ministers for Housing who negotiated that agreement, that the new agreement would lead to expanded funds for housing, the Fraser Government substantially reduced the support that it was giving to housing throughout Australia. The reduction in the case of South Australia is about $11 000 000, and for Australia as a whole it is $60 000 000, in circumstances where the housing and construction industry generally was in trouble in every State in varying degrees. I believe that the States were misled by the Commonwealth, and that the Commonwealth negotiated in bad faith when the new agreement, which later in this session will have to be ratified by this Parliament, was being negotiated.

Nothing was said at any stage during the negotiations that could have led any Minister to believe that the Commonwealth would reduce the amount provided under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, nor was anything said during the negotiations that would have led any State Minister to believe that the Commonwealth was proposing to introduce matching arrangements, as was announced by the Treasurer at the Premier's Conference a few weeks ago. The Commonwealth Government has commented at various times about its desire to promote home ownership. What it has done, since it has been in Government, has been, in the initial year, to refuse to provide any increase for housing money at all, even with building costs in the year going up by 20 per cent. In the second year of its government, it provided a 3 per cent increase, even though building costs went up by 15 per cent, and in the third year of its government it provided a reduction of about 20 per cent, even though building costs had gone up by some 7 per cent or 8 per cent over the previous year.

This Federal Government has acted in reverse in relation to helping the younger generation, either with home ownership or with home rental. It is deliberately penalising young people not only in relation to employment, but now it is making it much more difficult for them to own their own homes. I believe the action of the Fraser Government on this matter at the Premiers' Conference was absolutely disgraceful. We were told at the conference that the matching arrangements would mean that the actual money for housing would increase.

We pointed out to the Prime Minister that in South Australia's case that was not so and that we would make matching money available on our normal operations, and that in the past financial year we had provided about $5 000 000 or $6 000 000 in excess of what would have been required for matching.

Our position is that our only chance to get additional money out of the Commonwealth for housing would be if other States were unable to match to the full extent and, as a consequence, some Commonwealth money was left unallocated that might be available to us because we were able to provide more than the matching sum that was required. The Commonwealth is virtually saying to this State, "You shall accept a 20 per cent cut in housing money and you won't get any more in any circumstances unless another State gets into dreadful trouble and cannot meet the requirements that we put on it," so South Australia will be put in the position of accepting a cut of 20 per cent or getting a bit more as a result of a "beggar-my-neighbour" policy in respect of another State.

I asked the Commonwealth Minister for a meeting of Housing Ministers to discuss these new arrangements because, under the new federalism, there is supposed to be full and free consultation. We have been told about it by successive Commonwealth Housing Ministers. What happened on this occasion? The Commonwealth Minister for Housing refuses to meet with the State Ministers: he said, "There's nothing to discuss." Even though the Commonwealth has negotiated in bad faith and has imposed matching requirements without discussion at Ministerial level, the Commonwealth Minister for Housing refuses to meet with State Ministers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Henley Beach to order.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I believe that the Minister is going outside answering the question in normal circumstances. He is now debating the issue quite openly and forcefully. I think his reply is outside the realms of a normal reply.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order but, when a Minister is replying, I have no real control over him. I would ask the Minister to shorten his remarks. However, I must add that it surprises me that members of the Opposition, who complain about the length of time Ministers take in replying to questions, take a considerable time in explaining their questions. I can assure members of the Opposition that they are just as much to blame as is anyone else.

Mr. Mathwin: It looks as though—

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was informed by letter from Mr. Groom that there was no cause for a meeting of Ministers of Housing, even though the Commonwealth has imposed a whole set of new conditions and has cut funds to the States by 20 per cent, in circumstances in which Mr. Newman and then Mr. Groom, as Commonwealth Ministers for Housing, created the impression with the States that, in negotiating the new agreement, this is the new millenium and that we would get a much better system.

I will be much happier when I discover that we are starting to get some backing on housing and other matters from members of the Opposition. I am sick of the situation arising where this State is being screwed by the Commonwealth and all that Opposition members do is to take a point of order.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries to take a more positive attitude towards the promotion and expansion of the South Australian fishing industry, rather than taking the negative and unenterprising policy line that he has taken during the alleged depleted fish resource period? The Government's biological investigation into the State's fish resources was commissioned some years ago and is likely to collate its findings in a report to the Minister some time next year. In the meantime, as reports drawn to our attention indicate, the Minister is squeezing professional fishermen out of the industry as fast as he can. A report in the *News* of 2 August 1978 indicates that yet another study is underway, this

time on the fish processing industry. Among other things, the report states:

> Depending on its findings, the working party may make recommendations to prevent further expansion in the industry.

When will the Minister direct all available efforts and funds towards finding more fish in South Australia's 200-mile limit rather than funding negative studies which, by their design, will result in an ever-diminishing industry, which is evident by the negative studies so far, including the Copes Report that was tabled recently?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the comments made by the honourable member to the Minister of Fisheries, and bring down a report for him soon. We will not miss any of the allegations or anything else; we will have them all considered.

INDO-CHINESE REFUGEES

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare outline the work of his department in relation to Indo-Chinese refugees who have settled in South Australia in recent years? Many of those refugees are living in mine and neighbouring districts, and many children are attending primary and secondary schools within reach of Pennington Hostel. I refer to Pennington Primary and Junior Primary Schools, Woodville High School, and Port Adelaide High School. Any information that the Minister can provide will contribute to an understanding in the community of the problems these new settlers are facing and may be the help they require.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for raising the matter. I have recently received a report that, I think, will provide interesting information both for the public of South Australia and members. Between February 1977 and 30 June this year a total of 821 Indo-Chinese refugees has arrived in South Australia. The Community Welfare Department's role has mainly concerned the 111 unattached children who arrived with the refugees. These children have been placed in my care within the provisions of the Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act, and the main emphasis of my department has been on providing them with the care that they might otherwise receive from a family. The main way of achieving this has been through foster care and, to the end of June, 56 of the 111 children have been placed with foster families in various parts of the metropolitan area. Three children have been placed with families in country towns. These foster placements have been largely successful. During 1977 only three of the placements failed and, in each of those cases, the children chose to leave their placements and live with Indo-Chinese families or friends.

At 3.9 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Art Gallery Act, 1939-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: 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 object of this Bill is to ensure that the Board of the Art Gallery is empowered to lend works of art of which the Board has care or control to any person, body or corporation. The present provisions enable the board to lend works of art to any institution, or with the consent of the Minister, to any person. However, the board is of the view that the term "institution" may not include private or commercial galleries or other commercial organisations. These amendments put the position beyond doubt. The requirement of Ministerial consent to certain loans is removed and replaced by a general Ministerial power to establish policies governing the exercise of these powers by the board.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 18 of the principal Act which sets out the power to lend exhibits, by deleting the passage "any institution or with the consent of the Minister to any person" and substituting the passage "any person or body of persons". By virtue of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1975, "person" includes any body corporate. A new subsection (1a) is also inserted requiring the board to observe any policy or direction given by the Minister relating to the board's powers to lend works of art. This effectively extends the Minister's power of direction over all loans.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

OLD ANGASTON CEMETERY (VESTING) BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to vest certain land in the District Council of Angaston; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: 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

This is a Bill to vest in the District Council of Angaston the fee simple in the old cemetery at Angaston, in which the last burial took place in 1869. The title to the land is in trustees, all of whom have long since died, and the cemetery is in a very dilapidated condition with few headstones left. It is the intention of the Council to restore the area, which has a close connection with the early history of the town and district, and to use it as a park in a way consistent with its former use. Land at Angaston was conveyed to trustees for use as a cemetery in 1848. Only a portion of that land was so used and that portion is the subject of this Bill. There was power in the original trust deed to appoint new trustees when the number of trustees fell below five, but this does not appear to have been used. At a meeting of trustees called in 1865 only three attended and no trustee attended a meeting called in 1866.

The cemetery land was brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act in 1954 and a limited certificate of title was issued in the names of the trustees. Statutory authority is needed to vest the land in the council as there is no one who could execute a conveyance. A survey is desirable because there is some doubt as to the accuracy of the boundaries described on the certificate of title and a

new certificate, while no longer limited as to title, would have to be limited as to description.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is the interpretation clause. Clause 3 vests the land in the council, provides for Ministerial control of the development of the land and provides for the issue of a new certificate of title by the Registrar-General.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: 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 object of this Bill is to simplify the procedures whereby officers of the bank are appointed or dismissed. As the principal Act now stands, the majority of such appointments and dismissals must be approved by the Governor. This requirement has imposed a burdensome volume of paperwork upon Executive Council, and is seen by both the bank and my Government as an unnecessary procedural step. However, the bank's trustees feel that it is desirable that a number of senior administrative positions ought still to be subject to consideration by the Governor, and so the Bill accordingly provides machinery for the designation of such positions.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the approval of the Governor need only be sought for the appointment or dismissal of officers in relation to positions that have been designated by the Treasurer upon consultation with the trustees of the bank.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Bank Act, 1925-1975; and to repeal the Advances for Homes Act, 1928-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: 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

This Bill has two objects. First, an amendment is proposed that is similar to the proposed amendment of the Savings Bank of South Australia Act with respect to the appointment and dismissal of bank officers. As the principal Act now stands, all officers of the bank are appointed by the Governor upon the recommendation of the board of the bank. It is proposed to simplify the appointment procedure by providing that all appointments and dismissals will be made by the bank, with the exception of certain senior positions which will continue to require approval by the Governor.

The second object of this Bill is to effect a transfer to the bank of the entire Advances for Homes programme, which is currently administered by the bank as the agent for the Government under the provisions of the Advances for Homes Act. Since the advent of the Housing Agreements between this State and the Commonwealth, the funds available under the Advances for Homes programme have been advanced principally to previous borrowers for the purpose of home additions or alterations. As at 30 June 1977, approximately the sum of $10 000 000 was out on loan under the programme. In addition, several reserves are kept at Treasury and the bank pursuant to the provisions of the Advances for Homes Act for bad debts, losses on sales and insurance, and as at 30 June 1977, these funds totalled approximately $1 100 000. All assets transferred to the bank will be absorbed into its general housing programme, and the bank will repay to the Treasury an agreed amount upon terms and conditions agreed between the two parties. The main advantage of the proposal is that the bank may be able to use the funds more effectively for welfare housing purposes if they are all held by the bank in its general housing funds. Administrative costs to both parties will be reduced and the bank will be able to use a high proportion of the reserve funds in making further home loans available. It is proposed that the Advances for Homes Act be repealed.

Clause 1 is formal Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 effects the proposed change to the staff appointment procedures. The board of the bank will appoint and dismiss its officers. The Governor's approval will be required for appointments and dismissals to offices designated by the Treasurer upon consultation with the board. The transfer of an officer from one position to another in the bank will be effected by the board without reference to the Governor. Clause 4 provides for the transfer by the Treasurer to the bank of all his undertaking under the Advances for Homes Act. All assets so transferred to the bank, and all funds held by it pursuant to the Advances for Homes Act must be applied by the bank for housing purposes. The bank will be entitled to the benefit of all existing agreements. Subclause (4) sets out the liability of the bank to repay to the Treasurer the amount of the loan moneys outstanding at the date of the transfer. Clause 5 repeals the Advances fo Homes Act.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Fence Act, 1946-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: 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

This short Bill is designed to bring provisions in the principal Act, the Dog Fence Act, 1946-1975, providing for the payment and recovery of rates and special rates

into line with the corresponding provisions in the Vertebrate Pests Act, 1975-1977. As rates are imposed under both Acts on the same lands, this amendment should enable the rates to be notifed and recovered jointly and thereby reduce administrative cost. In addition, the Bill includes a minor amendment requested by the Auditor-General.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends the definition of "occupier" so that it corresponds to the definitions in the Vertebrate Pests Act, 1975-1977. Clause 4 inserts a new section 27 in the principal Act which corresponds to the provision providing for the payment and recovery of rates under the Vertebrate Pests Act, 1975-1977. Clause 5 repeals the present provisions dealing with the payment and recovery of rates. Clause 6 amends section 34 of the principal Act which requires the Dog Fence Board to prepare an annual "balance-sheet" by requiring it instead to prepare an annual "statement of receipts and payments".

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: 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

This Bill amends the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927-1975, by raising the monetary limit that determines whether a public work must be referred to the Parliamentary Committee on Public Works before moneys are appropriated for the purpose of carrying it into execution. In 1974 the limit was increased to $500 000. Since that time there have, of course, been substantial increases in building costs. Moreover, the cost estimates for school building projects—which of course constitute a very major part of the work of the committee—now cover the cost of furniture. Previously separate provision was made for the purchase of furniture. These factors justify some increase in the present limit and the Government feels that, in all the circumstances, a figure of $1 000 000 would be a reasonable limit to set.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 25 of the principal Act to provide that public works with an estimated cost of $1 000 000 or more must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. Clause 3 repeals section 25a of the principal Act. This is an old war-time provision that is now redundant.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: 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

This Bill has two functions. These are to enable the Australian Barley Board to make early payments to growers of barley and oats for grain delivered to the board, and to extend the Governor's powers to make regulations under the Act so that regulations may be made governing the eligibility of growers to vote for representation on the board. Under the present legislation, the board is unable to pay growers until it becomes aware of the expenditure which it has incurred in relation to the transport, storage and marketing of the grain in question. The Act does not permit the board to make payments pursuant to an estimation of these outgoings. This restriction is capable of causing considerable delay, and financial inconvenience to growers. The Australian Wheat Board, which operates under a different Act, is not fettered in this manner, and consequently is able to make more prompt payments. Both the Government and the Australian Barley Board believe that the prevailing restrictions in the Barley Marketing Act ought to be removed. This Bill, therefore, will provide for minor amendments to the Act which will enable the Board to make payments on the basis of estimated expenditure for transport, storage and marketing.

Turning now to the second matter which is the subject of this Bill, the Board has experienced certain difficultues in the past in identifying persons who are eligible to vote for representative board members. Investigations have shown that the most efficient means of identification would be through the board's own register of deliveries, with the stipulation that growers must have lodged a certain minimum tonnage of grain with the board in the previous season to be eligible. The most satisfactory method of introducing such a scheme would be by regulation, but this is precluded by the existing terms of the Act. Consequently, the Bill seeks to modify the regulation-making power so that suitable measures can be introduced.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 19 of the principal Act, which sets out the manner in which the price to be paid by the board for barley is determined. The amendments enable the board to estimate the costs of transport, storage and marketing in order to finalise its calculations. Clause 3 provides for a corresponding amendment to section 19a of the principal Act, which deals with payments for oats. Clause 4 repeals section 21 of the principal Act, which contains the regulation-making power, and enacts a new section in its place. This restates the existing powers and introduces a new authority to prescribe the manner in which elections contemplated by the Act are to be held, and the eligibility of persons to vote in those elections.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act, 1965-1966. 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

This Bill makes very minor amendments to the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act. The Act, which is administered by the Electricity Trust of South Australia, provided for the constitution of an Advisory Committee. The functions of the Committee are to investigate and report to the trust on matters affecting the administration of the Act, and to exercise any powers and functions delegated under the Act. At present subsection (3) of section 11 provides that the membership of the Advisory Committee is to include two Ministerial representatives, one nominated by the Minister of Works and one by the Minister of Education. Ministerial responsibility of the Electricity Trust has now been transferred to the Minister of Mines and Energy. It is therefore now appropriate to substitute a reference to that Minister for the previous reference to the Minister of Works.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 deletes the definition of "Minister". Clause 3 substitutes a reference to the Minister of Mines and Energy for the previous reference to the Minister of Works. Subsection (4) of section 11, which contains some obsolete material, is also updated by the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mines and Works Inspection Act, 1920-1974. 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

This Bill results from a review of the operation of the principal Act since 1970 when it was last substantially amended and proposes a number of disparate amendments. The major amendments provide for considerable increases to the penalties for offences under the principal Act and regulations. Although these increases may appear very substantial, it should be pointed out to honourable members that these penalties have not been increased since 1920. The Bill also includes amendments which are intended to clarify and in minor ways extend the ambit of operation of the principal Act and regulations. In this regard amendments to the interpretation section of the principal Act put beyond dispute the application of that Act to mining for clay, shale, other earthy substances and off-shore mining and to all machinery used in mining operations. A further amendment to that section includes within the scope of the principal Act ancillary mining operations involving the blending or mixing of the products of any mining operation, such as are carried out at pre-mix concrete plants. Amendments proposed to the second schedule of the principal Act specifically empower the making of regulations relating to medical certification of employees and certification of persons in charge of certain classes of mining equipment; and the disposal of overburden or other waste from mining operations.

The Bill finally includes a provision removing the limit on the power of the Governor to extend the period of operation of a proclamation applying the provisions of the principal Act to operations analogous to mining operations. It is now envisaged that the maximum period of operation of three years may not be sufficient if, for example, a major tunnelling project was undertaken or a mine was developed for tourist purposes.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends the interpretation section, section 4 of the principal Act. It substitutes a new definition of "machinery" which is expressed in general terms but related to mining operations or undertakings. It also substitutes new definitions of "mining" and "works" which may be varied by proclamation. Mining for clay, shale and earthy substances, together with off-shore mining, is expressly included within the definition of "mining", while pre-mix concrete plants are expressly included within the definition of "works". Clause 4 provides for the repeal of section 5a of the principal Act which is now unnecessary in view of the amendments to the definition of "mining" which enable the ambit of that definition to be extended by proclamation.

Clause 5 amends section 7 of the principal Act which empowers officers to enter mines and exercise the powers of inspectors. The amendment removes references to wardens having these powers since this is no longer appropriate given their quasi-judicial functions. Clause 6 amends section 8 of the principal Act so that it provides that an inspector is disqualified from acting as such for the reason that he holds an interest in a mine only if he knows of such interest. This clause also increases the penalty for an offence against the section from $200 to $1 000. Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act in order to remove any doubts that may exist as to whether reports of accidents prepared by inspectors may be made publicly available. This clause also increases the penalty for an offence against the section from $200 to $1 000.

Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act so that it is made clear that an inspector may exercise his powers of inspection in respect of any accident causing loss of life or personal injury. That section is also amended so that where an order of an inspector requiring any work to be carried out in order to render a mining operation safe is not complied with, the inspector, with the approval of the Minister, may cause the work to be carried out and recover the costs involved. The clause also increases the penalty for an offence against the section to a maximum for a first offence of $2 000 and for a subsequent offence of $4 000 and, in addition, provides for a default penalty for continuing offences. Clause 9 provides for the repeal of section 11 which is unnecessary in view of the amendments to section 10. Clause 10 amends section 12 of the principal Act so that inspections by members of the work force of any mining operation as to the safety of the operation may be carried out without any loss of earnings.

Clause 11 increases the maximum penalty provided by section 13 for obstructing an inspector from $100 to $1 000. Clause 12 substitutes a new section for section 17 whereby persons who are under the age of 18 may not be employed underground in a mine except with the consent of the Minister. Clause 13 increases the maximum penalty for an offence against a regulation to $1 000 and provides

for a default penalty for continuing offences. Clause 14 inserts a new section 24a providing for default penalties for continuing offences. Clause 15 adds to the matters that may be the subject of regulations, the medical certification of employees, the certification of persons in charge of certain declared types of machinery, and the disposal of overburden and other waste from mining operations. Clause 16 repeals the third schedule to the principal Act which has now served its purpose.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

URBAN LAND (PRICE CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Urban Land (Price Control) Act, 1973-1976. 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 principal purpose of this Bill is to provide a flexible basis upon which to implement land price control. Under the Act at present all land which constitutes a vacant allotment of residential land (and fulfils the other requirements specified by the Act) is subject to price control if it is in the areas set out under the definition of "controlled area" in the Act. Because of fluctuating conditions affecting the market for residential land, it is desirable to provide the means for lifting price control in one area and imposing it in another and varying the area of control from time to time as the prevailing conditions may require. To achieve this the Bill removes from the Act the stated areas in which control now applies and empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to declare that any specified part of the State is subject to control. The Governor will be able to vary or revoke proclamations, as necessary, from time to time.

Section 30 provides that the principal Act will expire on 31 December 1978. This section is repealed. Thus, the effect of the Bill is that the Act will remain in force indefinitely, but will have application only in those areas that are, from time to time, brought within its provisions by proclamation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act. Paragraph 2 *(a)* strikes out the definition of "controlled area" which presently sets out the specific areas of the State which are subject to control and redefines the phrase to mean a part of the State declared by proclamation to be subject to control. Paragraph *(b)* redefines "the control period" to mean in respect of a controlled area, the period during which the controlled area is constituted under the Act. Paragraph *(c)* gives power to the Governor to make proclamations declaring controlled areas.

Clause 3 adds a subsection to section 25. Section 25 requires that a legal practitioner or landbroker make a certificate on each instrument as to the application of the Act to the land dealt with by that instrument. The section also requires statutory declarations to be made in certain cases. The amendment allows the Registrar-General to waive a requirement of the section. This will be useful during times that no part of the State is subject to price control or where a solicitor or broker is not acting in the transactions and the Commissioner of Land Price Control has indicated that the Act has been complied with. Clause 4 repeals section 30 which provides that the Act will expire at the end of this year.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LEVI PARK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Levi Park Act, 1948-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 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 objects of this Bill are to reconstitute the Levi Park Trust, to remove certain provisions in the existing Act which have become obsolete and to recast other provisions in forms more appropriate to the new concept of the trust.

The Levi Park Trust was set up in 1948 to administer the newly created public park from which it took its name. This park was established at Vale Park on land which Adelaide Constance Belt, a member of the Levi family, had offered to the Walkerville council for that purpose. In fact, the council did not accept Mrs. Belt's proposal, which is the reason why the trust came into existence. Nonetheless, the Walkerville council has played an active role in the administration of Levi Park since 1948.

Until the present time the trust has consisted of five members: a chairman and one other both appointed by the Governor, two appointed by the Walkerville council and one by the Enfield council. A representative of the Enfield council was included because, until 1975, Levi Park was situated within that council area. However, it is now within the area of the Walkerville council.

At present, Levi Park contains various facilities and several buildings of historical interest. Foremost among the latter is Vale House, the old Levi home. This is currently leased as a kiosk, and the lessee occupies it as a residence. A coach house and stables are also situated within the grounds. In addition, the area contains a public park incorporating an oval and tennis courts, and a caravan park of some 150 sites. The caravan park is well patronised by interstate visitors and constitutes a most valuable source of revenue for Levi Park.

The National Trust of South Australia regards Vale House as a building of considerable historical importance. Consequently, the trust now proposes to initiate restoration work, and to transfer the kiosk to the old coach house and stables. It also proposes to improve the caravan park.

Administrative matters associated with these projects make it desirable to bring the trust more directly under the control of the Minister. A complement of five members will be retained, all of whom will be appointed by the Governor, two on the nomination of the Walkerville council. Enfield council representation will be discontinued, as it is no longer appropriate.

The Bill will excise obsolete references to the date on which the original trust came into existence together with certain financial provisions dealing with contributions formerly made to the trust by the Councils of Walkerville

and Enfield, and related matters. It will recast substantial portions of the existing Act in order to make the Act somewhat more comprehensive and up-to-date. Provisions to be modified in this regard include those relating to procedure at meetings, the appointment of deputies for trust members, the remuneration of trust members, the accounts and other financial affairs of the trust, and exemptions of the trust from certain rates and taxes.

The Bill will also remove the present power of the trust to make by-laws, replacing it with a regulation-making power vested in the Governor. In accordance with prevailing practices in legislation of this kind, new sections will be enacted compelling trust members to disclose personal interests in contracts under consideration by the trust, and also obliging the trust to submit an annual report of its affairs to the Minister.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 removes an obsolete portion of the preamble to the principal Act. Clause 4 strikes out the definition of "Enfield council" in section 2 of the principal Act. Clause 5 enacts a new subsection (3) to section 3 of the principal Act, providing that the trust shall be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister.

Clause 6 repeals sections 4 and 5 of the principal Act and enacts a new section 4. The old sections dealt with membership of the trust and terms of office. The new section combines these, providing that at the commencement of the proposed Act, all offices of the trust shall become vacant, and that thereafter the trust shall consist of five members appointed by the Governor, two on the nomination of the Walkerville council. Members shall be appointed for a term of five years, and the clause makes provision for the appointment both of a chairman and members' deputies.

Clause 7 repeals sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of the principal Act, and enacts new sections numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 in their place. The old sections were concerned with the date of creation of the trust, quorums and decisions at meetings, the appointment of members' deputies, procedure at meetings and validity of proceedings, remuneration of trust members, and the accounts of the trust. The new sections deal with substantially the same matters. Section 7 provides that trust members shall receive such fees and allowances as are determined by the Governor, and section 8 sets out the procedure to be followed at meetings of the trust.

Section 9 provides that acts of the trust shall not be invalid by reason of a vacancy in the membership of the trust or a defect in a member's appointment. Section 10 enacts the new requirements for members to disclose interests which they might have in any contract contemplated by the trust. A member with such an interest is prohibited from taking part in deliberations of the trust relating to the contract in question. Section 11 provides for the form of execution of trust documents.

Clause 8 repeals sections 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 of the principal Act and enacts new sections numbered 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 in their place. The old section 16 dealt with a sum of £5 000 which Mrs. Belt gave to the Walkerville council before the trust was established, and which was later paid over to the trust. This provision has clearly become obsolete. The remaining sections were concerned with contributions to the trust by the Walkerville and Enfield councils, the trust's power to borrow, the application of trust moneys, the exemption of the trust from certain rates and taxes, the refund of stamp duty and costs incurred by the Walkerville council and the trust's ability to accept gifts.

Here again, the provisions relating to the two councils will become unnecessary in the light of the proposed amendments.

New section 16 sets out the trust's power to borrow, and provides that repayment may be guaranteed by the Treasurer. Section 17 stipulates that trust moneys shall be applied for the purposes of the Act and may be invested in any manner approved by the Treasurer. Section 18 provides that the trust may accept gifts of property, and section 19 sets out in specific terms the rates and taxes from which the trust is exempt. These include land tax, rates and taxes payable under the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, pay-roll tax, water and sewerage rates, and any other rates, taxes, charges, levies, or imposts as are prescribed. Section 20 deals with the accounts of the trust, and provides for their auditing by the Auditor-General.

Clause 9 removes an obsolete portion of section 23 of the principal Act, which is concerned with the vesting of Levi Park in the trust. Clause 10 repeals section 28 of the principal Act, which deals with by-laws, and enacts new sections in its place numbered 28, 29 and 30. The new section 28 requires the trust to submit an annual report of its affairs to the Minister, and section 29 provides that proceedings for offences against the Act shall be disposed of summarily. Section 30 empowers the Governor to make regulations which are necessary or expedient for the purposes of the Act, and provides, in addition, that by-laws in force immediately before the commencement of the proposed amending Act shall be deemed to be regulations.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Transport Authority Act, 1974-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 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 object of this Bill is to provide for the appointment of a deputy chairman of the State Transport Authority from the membership of the authority. Under the existing provisions of section 7 of the principal Act, it is possible for the Governor to appoint an outsider to be the deputy of any member of the authority, including the chairman. However, the section does not permit such an appointment to be made from the membership of the authority. The chairman's duties frequently take him away from Adelaide, and on these occasions it becomes necessary to appoint a deputy. The Government believes that it may well be preferable for the deputy chairman to be appointed from amongst the existing membership of the authority. This Bill makes such an appointment possible.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 7 of the principal Act which deals *inter alia* with the appointment of deputies of members of the authority. A new subsection (1a) makes it possible for the Governor to appoint a deputy chairman either from the membership of the authority or from outside. A new subsection (3), containing provisions which are essentially consequential on subsection (1a), is also enacted and substituted for the

existing subsection. This deals with the appointment of deputies for members other than the chairman.

Clause 3 effects consequential amendments to section 9 of the principal Act, which relates to the procedure to be followed at meetings of the authority. The amendments correct an error in the existing provisions of this section, and provide that the deputy chairman is to preside at meetings of the Authority in the absence of the chairman.

Mr. CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY COMPANY'S STEEL WORKS INDENTURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Steel Works Indenture Act, 1958. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 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

Some time ago, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company raised with the Government the possibility of including within the City of Whyalla certain land referred to in the indenture made between the company and the Government in 1958. The obstacle that presently prevents that proposal from being carried into effect lies in clause 26 of the indenture which provides that the relevant land is not to be incorporated within "the area of the Whyalla Town Commission" until it has been disposed of by the company and is actually being used for residential purposes.

The Crown Solicitor has advised that the limitations placed on the power of amendment by section 6 of the indenture Act would not permit the parties to the indenture to remove this obstacle by an appropriate amendment. This Bill therefore removes the restriction upon variation of the terms of the indenture. At present, section 6 of the Act provides that the indenture can only be amended "so far as may be necessary for the purpose of more effectively carrying out the intention of the indenture but for no other purpose". The Bill removes these words from section 6. Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 amends section 6 in the manner outlined above.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shearers Accommodation Act, 1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: 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

This short Bill seeks to remedy two defects in the parent Act which have been revealed by practical experience since the Act came into operation on 1 December 1976. Section 8 of the Act sets out the powers and duties of an inspector appointed under the Act with respect to the inspection of shearing sheds or buildings used for the accommodation of shearers. While the Act provides that obstructing an inspector in the exercise of his powers and duties under the Act is an offence, there is no provision in the Act to require a person on a property to which the Act applies to answer questions concerning shearers accommodation put to him by an inspector.

The absence of any such express provision in the Act and its associated difficulties was brought to my attention when, in September 1977 a prosecution for breach of the Shearers Accommodation Act was dismissed by the magistrate for lack of evidence. In that case, the apparent manager of the property on which the defective buildings were situated refused to give information to the Inspector of Shearers Accommodation. This deficiency in the Act places an inspector in an invidious position as he has no authority to require the necessary information to support an allegation as to a breach of the Act. Accordingly, the Bill proposes that a similar provision to that included in the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1978, be inserted in the Shearers Accommodation Act to remedy the position. The particular section empowers an inspector to require any person to answer questions put to him by the inspector or an interpreter for the purposes of determining compliance with the Act and places an obligation on that person not to refuse or fail to answer those questions to the best of his knowledge, information and belief. These powers in the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act have been formulated over a considerable period of time in order to ensure that occupiers of industrial premises cannot evade their responsibilities under the Act by refusing to co-operate with an inspector in the course of his duties.

The opportunity has also been taken to include a provision in the Act to enable an inspector to have an assistant (e.g. an interpreter) with him and also to take photographs of buildings covered by the Shearers Accommodation Act to support his assessment of their condition. Difficulties have arisen in the past when an inspector has been forbidden to take photographs to substantiate his claims. A provision similar to that in the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act is included in the Bill to cover that situation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides the new powers of an inspector, expands the provision relating to obstruction, makes it an offence to refuse to answer an inspector's questions, but provides that a person is not obliged to answer an incriminating question.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

SIR JOHN BARNARD'S ACT (EXCLUSION OF APPLICATION) BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to exclude the application in this State of the Imperial Act 7 George II Chapter 8 (knows as "Sir John Barnard's Act") as perpetuated by the Imperial Act 10 George II Chapter 8. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It excludes the operation in this State of the Imperial Act 7

Geo II Chapter 8, commonly known as the "Sir John Barnard's Act". The Act, which was repealed in the United Kingdom in 1860 and has been repealed in most, if not all, Australian States, prohibits and makes void contracts for the taking of options in respect of dealings in shares, and I am sure it will be of great interest to members opposite. The practice of dealing in options is, of course, quite common and is recognised as a perfectly proper type of transaction. At the time the Act was passed, 14 years after the bursting of the "South Sea Bubble", it was regarded as a dangerous form of gambling which diverted people, in the words of the preamble to the Act, from "pursuing and exercising their lawful trades and vocations, to the utter ruin of themselves and families which they support, to the great discouragement of industry, and to the manifest detriment of trade and commerce".

In 1968, in the case of *Garrett v. Overy* (1968), 69 S.R. N.S.W. 281, the Supreme Court of New South Wales held that the Act was, in fact, in force in that State, having come to Australia with the colonists. As a result the plaintiff, a stockbroker, was unable to recover an alleged debt of over $70 000 owed to him in respect of dealings in stock options. It seems that the Act would apply in this State and that its operation should be excluded to prevent possible unmeritorious use in the courts.

Having made those significant points and having made the point to the Opposition that this Government certainly is not into business-bashing and is as anxious as everybody else to protect the business community, I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The Act also prohibits the short "selling of" stock, a practice which is prohibited by the rules of the Stock Exchange of Adelaide, and requires that sharebrokers keep a record book. Brokers are required to keep such books under the provisions of the Sharebrokers Act, 1945. Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 excludes the operation in this State of Sir John Barnard's Act and has retrospective operation.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADMINISTRATION OF ACTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Administration of Acts Act, 1920-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: 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

This Bill amends the Administration of Acts Act on three separate subjects. First, it provides that the Governor may commit the administration of an Act to a Minister specified by proclamation, or transfer the administration of an Act, or any statutory Ministerial function, from one Minister to another. At present the power to commit an Act to the administration of a particular Minister exists by implication rather than by any express legislative enactment. The definition of "Minister" in the Acts Interpretation Act certainly implies that the power exists. However, it is thought that the matter should be placed upon an explicit and unequivocal foundation. Secondly, the Bill empowers a Minister to delegate statutory powers and functions to another Minister.

At present this power can be exercised by a Minister in whom the administration of an Act is vested. However, certain Ministers, for example, the Attorney-General and the Treasurer, are frequently vested with statutory powers and functions under Acts that they do not in fact administer. The power of delegation is therefore extended by the present Bill to allow any Minister, whether he is responsible for the administration of the relevant Act or not, to delegate statutory powers and functions.

Thirdly, the Bill provides a simple means of establishing for the purpose of court proceedings which Minister is responsible for the administration of a particular Act or vested with a particular statutory power or function.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 replaces section 3 of the principal Act enabling the Governor by proclamation to commit the administration of an Act to a Minister or to transfer the administration of an Act, or Ministerial powers or functions, from one Minister to another. Clause 3, by amending section 6 of the principal Act, will enable a Minister who does not have the administration of an Act but does have powers and functions under that Act to delegate those powers and functions to another Minister. Clause 4 enacts new sections 7 and 8. New section 7 will facilitate proof in court of the Minister who has administration of an Act or who has powers or functions under an Act. New section 8 is self-explanatory.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

SPICER COTTAGES TRUST BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Spicer Cottages Trust Act, 1934-1938; to reconstitute the Spicer Cottages Trust; to prescribe its powers and functions; and for the purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: 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 object of this Bill is to reconstitute the Spicer Cottages Trust, and to prescribe its powers and functions. The Spicer Cottages Trust was incorporated by the Spicer Cottages Trust Act of 1934. Its objects were the provision and maintenance of homes for retired ministers of the former Methodist Church of Australasia and their widows. For some 35 years before incorporation, a body of trustees nominated in a series of three registered declarations of trust had carried out these objects. The principal benefactor of the undertaking was Edward Spicer, who was also one of the original trustees.

Prior to the Spicer Cottages Trust Act, 1934, the powers, functions and procedures of the trust were all set out in the declarations. But, after incorporation, a more

comprehensive statement came into operation. This was set out partly in the declarations, the terms of which the new Spicer Cottages Trust adopted in full and partly in the incorporating Act itself. With the addition of a minor amendment ot the Spicer Cottages Trust Act in 1938, this situation has remained unchanged up to the present time.

The Spicer Cottages Trust now wishes to extend its powers to ensure, in particular, that it can administer moneys made available by the South Australian Synod of the Uniting Church in Australia and demolish old buildings which it owns and replace them with modern structures. In addition, the trust feels that it is desirable to have all its powers, functions and procedures stated in a single document, rather than two, as at present, and that certain obsolete provisions in the declarations should be removed.

The trust therefore takes the view that a recasting of its incorporating legislation has become necessary, in the manner presented by this Bill. The Bill repeals the present legislation and revokes the existing declarations of trust. The Spicer Cottages Trust is to continue in existence as a body corporate and the names of its present members are listed in the first schedule to the Bill. The trust is to have the powers, authorities, functions, duties and obligations prescribed in a revised declaration of trust set out in the second schedule to the Bill. This is an updated and somewhat expanded amalgamation of the old declarations and some provisions of the existing Act. It includes a power authorising the trust to amend the declaration, which will enable the trust to modify its powers as changing circumstances require.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals the Spicer Cottages Trust Act, 1934-1938. Clause 3 defines certain expressions used in the proposed Act. Clause 4 revokes the former declarations of trust and provides that the Spicer Cottages Trust shall continue in existence as a body corporate. This clause further provides that the trust shall consist of the eight members whose names are set out in the second schedule, and their duly appointed successors. In addition, the trust is granted all the powers, authorities, functions, duties and obligations set out in the declaration of trust appearing in the second schedule.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 2 August. Page 288.)

Mrs. BYRNE (Todd): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and in doing so I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion.

I, too, join with other members of this House in expressing sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Frank Potter, M.L.C. During my term of office I got to know Mr. Potter quite well as a fellow member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and he was a person for whom I had every respect.

With about 80 measures proposed to be introduced, one can expect this to be a busy session. An examination of the Governor's Speech shows that the legislation covers a wide field, which will be of benefit to the people of this State. In addition, the Budget will be brought down and the Loan and Revenue Estimates introduced. I am hoping that we will not have many late night sittings, but it seems that we may.

Mr. Wotton: We haven't so far.

Mrs. BYRNE: We have just had a number of Bills introduced today, so I think things will change. Referring to the statistics showing the number of Bills introduced during the previous session, I found that 79 were Bills introduced in this House and 11 in the Legislative Council, a total of 90. In the House of Assembly 65 Bills received assent and 10 in the Legislative Council, a total of 75. Private members introduced 11 of those Bills. Because a State election was held on 17 September 1977, the previous session was not as long as usual. The House reassembled on 6 October and, nevertheless, sat for 45 days. Therefore, it can be seen that in spite of the Government's majority of seven seats resulting from the 1977 State election, the Party affiliations now being A.L.P. 27, L.P.A. 18, N.C.P. 1, and A.D. 1, of which all members would be aware, the Government has remained active and alive, and it will continue to do so.

It is also very progressive, reformist, and sensitive to the needs and aspirations of the people of South Australia. It has a deep commitment to social justice and civil liberties. It is also rational and stable, and this is most obviously the opinion of the majority of people in this State because of its continuation in office over a period of years.

Ever since the end of the previous session on 22 March, the Government has continued to work, and I will now give some examples of what has taken place in that period. The last remaining area of uncleared native vegetation of any significant size in the northern Mount Lofty Range was acquired by the State Government as part of its nature conservation programme, and this purchase was announced by the Minister for the Environment on 17 July. This acquisition would not have been possible without the co-operation of the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia and a $30 000 contribution, toward the total purchase price of $140 140, from the Leo Wakem Nicholls bequest held by the Field Naturalists Society of South Australia; obviously, these organisations supported the purchase of this property. The balance of the purchase price was met equally by the Environment Department and the State Planning Authority. The land, covering 382 hectares, is near Angaston.

The Government, through the Waste Disposal Committee, is constantly investigating the means of disposing of rubbish, and on 6 July the Minister for the Environment said that the special committee was drafting legislation to provide for an authority to co-ordinate all waste disposal in South Australia.

Regulations under the Noise Control Act, 1976-1977, were also approved by Executive Council on 6 July. I was not surprised to learn that the Environment Department's Noise Control Unit had been inundated with queries from the public about those regulations. I had inquiries myself at the time, but I expect that this matter will settle down.

An announcement was made on 25 May by the Minister of Mines and Energy on the establishment of a top-level South Australian Energy Council, which will play an important role in developing a concerted and effective Government policy in the vital energy field. The functions of the council will be to develop policies and to advise the Government on the following matters: all areas of energy conservation; the development and co-ordination of existing energy supplies, the development of necessary exploration; the rationalisation of final uses of energy and the development and organisation of research into alternative energy sources, particularly solar energy. The question of energy is one of the most important issues now facing Australia and the world.

State Cabinet has released its decision on the NEAPTR study into a new public transport system for the north-eastern suburbs, and environmental impact assessments

are now being carried out. As the area I represent will benefit from the proposal of a high-speed tramway system, I point out that the outer north-east area is one among those of the most rapidly growing areas in metropolitan Adelaide: its overall population is expected to increase by 20 per cent by 1996, the roads linking the north-east with the city already showing signs of congestion, and this will worsen. Because of this expansion, it is vital that a modern rapid transport system be developed to serve this area. Since returning to Adelaide from a recent overseas visit, the Minister of Transport has stated that a close inspection of overseas tramway systems had shown that South Australia was definitely making the right choice in opting for a high-speed tramway for the proposed north-eastern suburbs public transport system.

Recently, a women's switchboard was established to provide information and assistance directed primarily to the problems of women in the community. By promoting projects of this kind, the Government hopes further to overcome the disadvantages suffered by women in various areas of activity. There are many other matters to which I could refer, but those examples will show how the Government has remained active between sessions.

I believe that unemployment is at present our most critical social problem. This Government has shown its concern in this regard by creating job opportunities under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, which commenced in November 1975 and from which metropolitan and country councils, Government departments and community bodies have benefited. In the past financial year, $22 000 000 was appropriated for the scheme to provide employment for those thrown out of work by the economic situation. As a result, 9 000 people who would otherwise have been unemployed obtained employment for varying periods, and many local projects throughout the State received support. Regrettably, in the face of a persistent refusal by the Commonwealth Government to assist this State with its unemployment relief schemes, and as a result of a restriction in funding generally, the programme must be reduced to a level of $7 000 000 in this financial year.

There are different categories of unemployment; there is structural unemployment, and these are people unable to adjust to the existing patterns of demand for labour (an example would be young people who lack experience and skills); technological unemployment, involving people who have been put off because of changes in productive processes, and for whom retraining is required; and seasonal unemployment, involving people who work at shearing or fruit picking. There are other types as well; there is frictional unemployment, consisting of people who move from job to job and who now find that it is not easy to get the next job; and hard-core unemployment, consisting of people who even at times of high employment regrettably find it difficult to obtain and stay in employment.

The exact number of people unemployed in Australia is not known, although official figures show that 393 842 persons in Australia were registered as unemployed at the end of June last, whilst the South Australian figure was 40 491. However, the figures record only those registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service. Some people do not register, hoping to find work quickly. Others who would like to be employed but who are not do not appear in the statistics. These include older men, who decide to retire early because they cannot find work; young people who have left school but cannot find work and return to school; other young people who are still at school and who want to leave but who cannot because they cannot find any work; adults who have returned to secondary or tertiary education to improve their chances of getting permanent employment; women who are not able to claim benefits when put off, because their husbands are employed; married women who wish to work but who cannot find employment; and married women who work part-time but who desire to work full-time. There are simply not enough jobs to go around, and we have to look at new ways of dealing with unemployment.

If the quality of life which we value and which is usually determined by certain components (material, health, environment and social) is to be retained, we must respect the needs of others and help solve this social problem. The high rate of unemployment has promoted discussion on ways and means of reducing it without a fall in living standards. These ways and means include a shorter working week, retraining, gradual retirement, early retirement, superannuation, reductions in overtime, tandem and work-sharing schemes, breaking down the nexus between work and leisure, the use of leisure, and other ideas which have been aired.

More emphasis and discussion seem to be centred on retirement, and I shall address my remarks to this question. As people retiring from full-time employment will have less chance of obtaining part-time employment, therefore having more time on their hands, it is important for this leisure time to be a period of fulfilment and happiness. Fortunately, people retiring compulsorily today enjoy better physical health than their predecessors did, and usually have a better opportunity of enjoying their retirement and, fortunately, for a longer period. It is important that people should plan for their retirement, but it is hard to assess how many do that. The differences among people and their backgrounds need consideration, as there are different expectations on retirement from different people.

Regrettably, in spite of having sufficient money, some people retire unsuccessfully. For example, up to the point of retirement their lives revolved around their full-time employment, and they had no other interests, or perhaps no time for them. Other persons may have some status in the community through employment, but lose identity on retirement. Others change their lifestyle and opt to live in a new area. This does not always bring the happiness they expect, as it takes time to make new friends, and sometimes they wish they had never left the locality with which they were familiar. In purchasing a new residence, size and shape are important, in order to reduce housework, minimise hazards, and avoid over-exertion in advanced years.

I do not wish to give the impression that all retired people are unhappy, as that is not so. Many retire successfully. However, I am sure we have all met people who could be happier. There are various degrees of unhappiness among some retired people, and this could be caused through boredom, loneliness, ill-health, loss of identity, and so on. I am sure members can think of other reasons. To ensure that retirement is fulfilling and contented, pre-retirement counselling on certain aspects may help. These include physical and mental health, social life, money (including the discontinuance of a higher income), making constructive use of leisure (and that could include crafts and hobbies, appreciation of music and literature, gardening, and so on), the dangers of a passive existence, further education, community involvement, outdoor recreational activities—and no doubt there are others I have not thought of.

Some courses preparing for retirement can be taken before retirement, helping to dispel the fear of it. Courses are also taken after retirement, but more encouragement could be given to people to take courses, preferably before

retirement, although it must be done voluntarily. Even if only the husband is retiring from full-time employment, the wife has adjustments to make, so she should not be excluded from the retirement courses.

Some figures on the South Australian population structure are worth noting. I am indebted to the June 1978 edition of *Look Ahead at South Australia* (published by the Economic Development Department) in which at page 3 the following table appears:

South Australian Population Structure

Age (years)	1976	1981
0-4	102 600	101 000
5-14	231 200	217 600
15-19	119 400	117 700
20-64	694 000	756 500
65+	114 400	132 800
Total	1 261 600	1 325 400

It can be seen that, in 1976, 114 400 people over the age of 65 years were resident in South Australia. It is estimated that 99 per cent of the population of South Australia lives south of the 32nd parallel, and that 73 per cent live in the capital city of Adelaide. With a total area of 984 375 square kilometres, or one-eighth of the Australian continent, South Australia has about 9 per cent of the Australian population. Summing up, the problem of reducing unemployment must be thought through in depth and all aspects must be examined; otherwise, one social problem could be replaced by another.

On a wider note, peace and security can be attained only by total disarmament, and this must be achieved to make meaningful the quality of life we all desire. The funds used on the astronomical expenditure for arms should be diverted to relieve poverty, ill-health and illiteracy, and to provide for sound development. Despite different political philosophies, this surely should be a matter for common concern and one for solidarity.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In supporting the motion, I should like to extend my sympathy to the family of the late Frank Potter.

It has been interesting to listen to the debate thus far, particularly to the contributions of the members on the Government side, most of whom, with the exception of the member for Todd, have launched attacks upon the Federal Government.

I think it is unfortunate; it has been ill-informed and not based on fact or logic. The Government has indicated clearly to the people of this State that it has no understanding of the problems facing this nation. It certainly has no remedy, and is living in a bygone generation by still discussing policies that may have been applicable in the 18th or 19th centuries but not in the 20th century.

It was unfortunate that His Excellency the Governor had to read such a diatribe of nonsense at the opening of Parliament. If, in the Speech that he delivered, all reference to the Commonwealth Government had been deleted, the Speech would have been about as long as the previous Speech that was delivered when opening Parliament. It is unfortunate that this Government must continually refer to the Commonwealth Government in the disparaging terms that it does.

Early in the Governor's Speech reference was made to the disastrous drought that we have had in South Australia. We all are aware of the problems that have flowed in some areas for three successive droughts and in others for two successive droughts. This unfortunate situation has wrought havoc on those country areas, has had a detrimental effect on the economy of South Australia, and has put many primary producers in a difficult situation. It has also greatly affected the economy of this State.

I believe that more than $150 000 000 or $200 000 000 has been denied to South Australians because of a lack of wheat payments. That unfortunate happening has affected Eyre Peninsula and other parts of South Australia by way of employment in machinery, garages and that type of enterprise. It will take some time before those enterprises can re-employ people, because many of the people who have been affected by the drought will probably not have an income until Christmas, and people on bank overdrafts or who have been assisted by the Rural Industries Assistance Branch will have most of their money committed for at least 12 months, and it will probably be two years before they can commit any money for their own use.

I hope the Government will continue that assistance for some time, because I believe there will be people who will need assistance next year, although there have been excellent rains across South Australia. At some stage there has been a little too much rain, but it will soon dry out and the State will benefit.

I have considered the problems that have flowed from the drought. In my district people have had to apply for assistance. I understand that about 1 400 people have been assisted by the Rural Industries Assistance Branch of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. I was perturbed earlier in the year that a new head was appointed to that department. It was an unfortunate appointment, and smelt of political patronage. It certainly was a decision that would not have helped morale in the department, when people who had demonstrated clearly that they were capable of operating the department and had done so for a considerable time were overlooked when a friend of the Minister of Agriculture was brought in as head.

The only reason that that person was brought in to the department was that he shared the group farming ideas of the Minister of Agriculture. I recall that, about 12 or 15 months ago, when I spoke at a farm management symposium, that same gentleman also addressed the symposium and gave us the benefit of his limited experience in group farming, which any person with any practical experience in agriculture would know is not an effective method of operating an agricultural enterprise.

If this sort of advice is to be passed on to rural industries in South Australia, I fear for the future. We know that the Minister supports that concept as well as, I understand, supporting small commune-type enterprises. I fear for the future if the Government of the day ever adopts the Minister's aims. I also fear the sort of advice that could be given by the new head of the Rural Industries Assistance Branch.

I was perturbed about the appointment because some time ago a constituent of mine put in a farm build-up application. The property was assessed by the new head of the department, and I understand that he could not even add up correctly the average for the district. One of the officers he is now supposed to be in charge of had to examine the application after this person had made his assessment. Furthermore, I had personal knowledge of the area and the property involved, and I was prepared to recommend it to the department. I think I wrote a letter to the Minister about it.

However, when this gentleman made his analysis and recommendation, he failed to support the application. I made my views known to the Minister about that, and I

said:

> The person, whoever it was, who made the recommendation obviously knew nothing about Eyre Peninsula, little about South Australia, and virtually nothing of a practical nature about agriculture.

Unfortunately, this person now administers the department.

In order to demonstrate the involvement of the rural industry and the sort of funds that are required I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table of figures prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and which appeared in July 1977. They date from July 1971 to December 1976 and relate to a distribution of applications for rural reconstruction assistance of rural holdings, State by State. I also seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table relating to applications for rural reconstruction assistance.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): The honourable member assures me that they are of a purely statistical nature?

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

Leave granted.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATIONS FOR RURAL RECONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE AND OF RURAL HOLDINGS, BY STATE

(July 1971 to December 1976)

Item	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	No.	%
Applications for debt reconstruction assistance	27·3	25·5	22·1	7·7	13·7	3·7	13 841	100
Applications for farm build-up assistance	30·3	26·2	14·7	12·2	12·7	3·9	7 083	100
Total applications *(a)*	28·2	25·8	19·6	9·2	13·4	3·8	20 924	100
Rural holdings *(b)*	31·1	27·2	17·2	12·0	8·6	3·9	240 024	100

(a) Does not include applications for rehabilitation. *(b)* The total number of rural holdings for the year 1973-74, excluding holdings situated in the Northern Territory and Australian Capital Territory.

Source: Data supplied by RRAs to the Department of Primary Industry and Australian Bureau of Statistics (Ref. No. 10.59).

APPLICATIONS FOR RURAL RECONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE

(July 1971 to December 1976)

Item	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.	Total
Applications for debt reconstruction assistance	3 771	3 535	3 060	1 067	1 896	512	13 841
No. approved	1 297	979	1 641	361	657	166	5 101
% approved	34	28	54	34	35	32	37
Assistance per case ($'000)	32·2	25·8	16·9	21·7	25·8	18·6	24·3
Applications for farm build-up assistance	2 147	1 854	1 043	862	900	277	7 083
No. approved	828	951	509	430	432	111	3 261
% approved	39	51	49	50	48	40	46
Assistance per case ($'000)	33·3	27·5	30·5	40·2	36·9	18·5	32·1
Total applications for rural reconstruction assistance *(a)*	5 918	5 389	4 103	1 929	2 796	789	20 924
No. approved	2 125	1 930	2 150	791	1 089	277	8 362
% approved	36	36	52	41	39	35	40

(a) Does not include applications for rehabilitation.

Source: Data supplied by State authorities to the Department of Primary Industry.

Mr. GUNN: I now turn to what I regard as the worst aspect of the State Government's policy. The Governor's Speech contains continual criticism of the Commonwealth Government. Nowhere in that Speech has the Government demonstrated an alternative, constructive policy. It seems to have one thing in mind: it wants the Commonwealth Government to raise more and more taxation by taking more and more money from the pockets of the taxpayers of this country by increasing charges, so that that money can be handed over by the bucketful to this and other State Governments for a spending spree.

It is obvious to anyone with a limited knowledge of economics that that policy can no longer be tolerated or be accepted by the average citizen. The State Government must clearly demonstrate to the people of this State whence the Commonwealth Government will obtain all the money this State demands. Daily we hear Minister after Minister, led by the Premier, demand more and more money from the Commonwealth Government. Whenever Ministers go around South Australia, they demand more and more money, but they rarely inform the people of this State or the Commonwealth Government whence all this money should come.

Mr. Nankivell: They're knockers of the Commonwealth.

Mr. GUNN: There is no doubt about that. Fortunately, I believe that the people of Australia support this Commonwealth Government; they have shown it twice.

Mr. Whitten: Do you?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, and I make no apology for doing so. I am proud to belong to the same political Party as the Prime Minister, and I support his economic policies. I believe he is the best Prime Minister this country has had since Sir Robert Menzies, and he will go down in history as such. The people of this country appreciate it when they have a firm and capable person at the helm, and not

someone who flies off at tangents. He clearly knows in which direction he is taking the country. What he is doing will even benefit the member for Morphett and the member for Henley Beach.

I do not want to be distracted by honourable members who have been making these sorts of attack throughout this debate. I should like the Premier and the Ministers to clearly say in this House in which areas they believe the Commonwealth should increase taxation and whence all this extra money is to come.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: From the wealthy.

Mr. GUNN: I should like the honourable member to be a bit more specific.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: In the last taxation assessment you were $25 a week better off but the workers got 60c. That is not good enough.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased the honourable member has put that on record because that same tired policy brought ruin to this country. The ex-Minister has clearly demonstrated he is a member of a Party that is for high taxation, but this policy is driving people out of this State.

Mr. Nankivell: They tell me the member for Napier is going to be the new Treasurer: he has all the answers.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Napier is going to be the new Treasurer! He has all the answers! I know only too well the problems the member for Napier is facing, and we will look with interest at his future.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! My rulings have been relaxed, because honourable members seem to be enjoying the debate, but I ask members to get back a little more to Standing Orders.

Mr. GUNN: I should like to draw to the attention of the Premier that the Canadian Government has recently slashed taxes and Government spending, and the West German Government has taken a similar course. This Federal Government has reduced taxation, and it should reduce taxes further and it should reduce Government expenditure. This State Government has always increased taxation, and it wonders why industry is not coming to South Australia and why people are leaving it. The following statements would deter people from investing in or coming to this State to live. Page 7 of the Labor Party platform states:

> Labor believes that democratic socialisation is the utilisation of the economic assets of the State in the interests of its citizens.

That is really good stuff. It continues:

> Labor believes that scientific and technological advancement should serve the interests of all and not be the exclusive right of the few.

That sounds all right when it is written down but, unfortunately, a country of this nature needs people to come from overseas not only with their knowledge but also with their money. If they bring their money, they will want a return on it. The nonsense written in that document would clearly frighten people away from this State. When we were discussing a new Companies Act to bring our legislation in line with that of the other States, on 2 November 1971 the Chief Secretary said:

> This country would be better served by a socialist economic system. I make no apology for saying that.

I wonder whether Government members agree with that, and whether the Chief Secretary still holds that sentiment. His speech continued:

> There are weaknesses inherent in capitalism that I think do grave harm to our society. However, I recognise . . .

The Chief Secretary is a fine ambassador to send overseas. If anyone thinking of investing in this country reads that statement, he will not look towards South Australia. I am explaining to the House some of the impediments to investing in this State. In his maiden speech, the Hon. F. T. Blevins said the following:

> I wish to make only one more point, Mr. President, and it relates to the word "socialist". It is obvious that the honourable members opposite see red every time they hear the word. I am afraid that, unless they get a little more rational about it, they will be upset quite a lot over the next few years as I am a dedicated socialist who takes every opportunity to promote the principles and ideals of democratic socialism. The reason I am a socialist is simple: I do not believe that any person has the right to exploit the labour of any other human being for his own gain or personal well-being. To me the making of profit through exploitation is immoral and, although I make no claims to be a Christian myself, I am sure the misery and poverty the capitalist system brings to the people of the world also makes it unchristian. Like this Chamber, the sooner capitalism is relegated to the history books the better off mankind will be.

I understand this gentleman is high on the list of persons to be made a Minister when Mr. Casey and others are pushed aside. This particular gentleman will do much to attract industry to this State if he holds views like that! The member for Ross Smith has spoken great words of wisdom: he has clearly demonstrated to the House that he has no practical understanding of business. He has never been involved in industry himself and he has never had to stand on his own efforts and initiatives. This is the whole trouble with members of the Labor Party. They have never had to stand on their own feet because, if they happened to fail, they have had Governments to back them up. I would suggest that honourable members ought to reflect on the nonsense spoken by the member for Ross Smith.

Mr. Groom: Do you think that the S.G.I.C. should be abolished?

Mr. GUNN: I would not like to make a judgment on the honourable member who made that comment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not reflect on any honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member who interjected reflected on me. I will not name him, because I do not want to particularly embarrass him. I have given a few reasons why this State is going backwards. During my recent trips around my large district—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You would be a good judge of backwardness.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the Attorney-General has now come into the Chamber. During the recent election campaign he made some uncharitable comments about me. This is the third time I challenge him to justify the statements he made about me at Leigh Creek. On this side of the House we are waiting for him to honour the undertaking he gave to the people there. The Attorney-General cannot justify the untruthful statements he made about me then. Fortunately, I have them on tape, so you cannot say you did not say them.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will refrain from using the expression "you" and give the honourable member his title.

Mr. GUNN: I am sorry, Sir, if I in any way reflected on Her Majesty's chief law officer and I will refer to him by his title. I now say a few words about what the Government should do to attract and promote industry.

It is interesting that the Government and its followers have taken some action that has certainly not been in the interests of the people of South Australia. I was pleased the other day to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that he supports the exporting of Merino rams. That is about the first time for many years that he has made a positive public statement with which I could agree, and I am

pleased that he supports that action. In my district I have some of the best-known Merino studs in the world, and I believe that much can be achieved for Australia and the wool industry if those rams are exported.

I refer now to the export of uranium, another matter that affects my district. It is unfortunate, to say the least, that this Government is still not prepared to support the mining, treatment, and export of uranium. There is no logical reason why we in this State should not benefit from the export and sale of uranium.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You just mean profits, that's all you're interested in. You couldn't give a damn about the future of the human race.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: It is obvious, if one examines statements made by members of both the Whitlam Government and the Dunstan Government that those Governments started by supporting the mining and export of uranium. One can see that, in this State, as the Attorney-General and his followers infiltrated the Australian Labor Party and as the left wing led by the Attorney-General took charge, the policy gradually changed. I ought to remind the House of some statements that have been made by Government members about uranium. In an article that appeared in the *News* on 24 October 1974, the Premier is reported as follows:

> We will press for the establishment of the plant in South Australia, if we have the conditions required. There is some concern about being able to supply enough water.

Another article appeared in the *News* on 4 November 1974, as follows:

> Talks between the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, and the Japanese Prime Minister are believed to have enhanced the State's chances of getting the project. State Mines Minister, Mr. Hopgood, said today he was more confident than ever South Australia would get the massive plant.

Another article appeared in the *News* on 13 May 1974, as follows:

> Mr. Connor announced a feasibility study into the possible establishment of a major uranium enrichment plant in the Northern Spencer Gulf region of South Australia.

We all know that the Port Pirie council supports the establishment of a plant in that area. I understand that the Mayor of Whyalla today supported the building of a treatment plant in Whyalla. I would support the building of a treatment plant in that area, because it would certainly help that city. I wonder whether the member for Whyalla would support that plant.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You wouldn't want it in your backyard though!

Mr. GUNN: For the benefit of the Attorney-General, mining took place in my district at Radium Hill, and I have been on a station close by: no-one has been affected by that. The old atomic weapons site is in my district. I am pleased that the Attorney-General is present because I can remind him of the power struggle in the A.L.P. about this matter. On 17 October 1974 the Premier was reported as follows:

> The Premier said yesterday that overseas interests had been told they could achieve significant economies in establishing a plant in South Australia.

Then, on 5 November 1974 Mr. Hopgood was reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

> Mr. Connor is awfully keen on letting us have Redcliff as well. He has made that pretty clear to most people I have talked to.

Then when the big change came and the Attorney-General's influence was shown, the following report appeared in the *Australian*:

> Mr. Dunstan said despite compelling economic reasons for the export of uranium especially to Japan, his Government had a moral duty to mankind to ensure that it did not create a monster by providing uranium to customer countries.

One would think that the decision we took in South Australia was going to stop nuclear power plants being built and uranium from being used around the world. All that will happen is that we will penalise the people of this State: we are not to share in the great benefits and we are not to share in the increase in employment. No-one has yet been able to clearly demonstrate that, if nuclear plants are properly built, managed, and run, there will be any detrimental effect to humans from these plants. I challenge the Attorney-General to say how many people have been affected who have worked in nuclear plants.

I have a constituent who worked for several years in a nuclear plant in England. He has been amazed at the attitude of this Government. He supports, and I make no apology for saying that I support, the establishment of a nuclear power plant and a treatment plant in this State, because it is in the interests of the people of Australia. He supports our involvement and the policy of the Fraser Government on this matter.

We can all remember when Mr. Hudson went overseas about 12 months ago and hawked this report I am holding around the world. The report has a photograph of the Redcliff area with diagrams marked on it of where the uranium enrichment plant ought to be built. I think we might examine some comments in the report. The report was well prepared: it is still selling at the Government Printer's for $10 a copy, I understand.

The report was hawked around the world by the Minister, and one can imagine the sort of headlines there would have been if he had been able to attract someone to it. It would have been a goer! He was a poor salesman. He came back to South Australia, and was rolled in Caucus. He wants to mine and export uranium (as do some of his colleagues), but they under the influence of the Attorney-General. Recommendation No. 1 in this report, which was issued by the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department, states:

> The establishment of the uranium processing centre at Redcliff, as presented in conceptual form, is recommended, comprising initially an uranium hexaflouride plant of 5 000 tonnes uranium capacity per annum, to be operational concurrently with the availability of yellowcake from Australian uranium mines. Estimated cost: $A50 000 000 at 1975 values.

It is interesting to note that the Minister has had little to say about this report over the past few weeks. I turn now to what the Federal Australian Labor Party (and, in particular, Mr. Hurford) had to say about the report. Mr. Hurford is well known in this State. The member for Torrens has to put up with him sometimes, but I do not think the people of Australia will have to put up with him in a Ministerial capacity. On 4 April 1972 Mr. Hurford said:

> Uranium exports, in whatever form, could be highly profitable for this country. With the proper taxation policies there could be enormous economic benefits for everyone who lives here.

Then, in February 1975, Mr. Whitlam had the following to say in Brussels, London, The Hague, Paris, Rome, Bonn, as well as in Moscow:

> I consistently asserted Australia's wish to develop her own enrichment capabilities so that as much uranium as possible should be exported in an enriched form.

Interesting! Then, of course, we had Mr. Uren and company move in. In 1975 Mr. Keating had the following to say:

> Since we have taken over the administration of the policy in this area, particularly in respect of uranium, we have said that we intended to export as much of it as we can.

There are three statements made by Federal Labor members, two of whom are still shadow Ministers. I believe that the Labor Party has adopted its present policy because it does not want the people of this country to benefit. It does not want the Fraser Government to be able to assist the Australian nation with the benefits that would flow from uranium mining and export. I believe that that is a spiteful policy. If the Labor Party were to take office federally, it would not stop the export, mining, and treatment of uranium: it would continue with it. I believe that not even the Labor Party would be stupid enough to stop it. I believe it would realise that it is in the interests not only of Australia but also of all those countries demanding energy, and I believe it would do a complete reversal in relation to that policy. Not even a person such as the Attorney-General would be prepared to stand up and say that Australia should be denied the great economic benefits that would flow from the export of uranium.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Australia should be denied the great economic benefits.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! That interjection is totally out of order, and I call the honourable Attorney-General to order. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir. The House is indebted to the Attorney-General for putting that remark on record, and I believe that he will see that interjection quoted throughout Australia. I thank him for his indulgence on this occasion.

Mr. Groom: Are you running for Leader?

Mr. GUNN: While talking about leadership, I refresh members' memories, because I referred earlier to the involvement and the influence of the Attorney-General and his colleagues. An interesting report, appearing in the *News* of 18 March 1978 (written by Mike Quirke) under the heading, "Duncan won't back off in power fight", states:

> South Australia's young Attorney-General Peter Duncan is flexing his muscles in a power-play within the Labor Party. The thrust for confirmation of his strength is centred on Party pre-selection due to go before the annual convention in June.

I have not seen it denied anywhere.

Mr. Slater: Do you believe it?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, knowing the Attorney-General, and it has not been denied. It is interesting to read the report, which indicates that Mr. Duncan had the numbers to toss the present Deputy Premier (Mr. Corcoran). We are all wondering when the actual show-down will come.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You'll be waiting a very long time.

Mr. GUNN: The *News* editorial advised Mr. Corcoran that he could do better than support our involvement in North Malaysia. I remind members of the Attorney-General's bid for power and of the influence he wields. If he has the numbers to become the Deputy Leader, heaven help the State, because it is in bad enough hands now as it is.

I continue talking about uranium, because of its great benefits to the people of Australia. I do not know whether the Attorney-General has read at any length the kit issued by the Commonwealth Government. I believe that it is well worth reading, because it gives a clear, precise, and fair assessment of the situation in relation to the advantages, and demonstrates any potential dangers. The decision that was made was not only correct but was just and in the best interests of the nation. I hope that many people will obtain a copy of the kit and read the report.

Mr. Nankivell: Is it worth $10?

Mr. GUNN: It is worth $10, but Federal colleagues might be able to supply copies. I now refer to the Minister of Transport, who is responsible in South Australia for allocating the considerable funds made available to him by the Commonwealth Government. This year, South Australia will have $97 000 000 to spend on road construction. South Australia will receive about $43 000 000 from the Federal Government, of which $16 500 000 is to be spent on national highway construction and $2 000 000 on the maintenance of national highways. Unfortunately, the State Minister has seen fit to spend only about $240 000 on the Stuart Highway. I believe that this decision warrants strong condemnation of the Minister, because he has clearly demonstrated that he has little or no regard for improving that road. As he has more than $16 000 000, why could he not spend at least $1 000 000 on the road? All he has done is to blame the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's where the fault lies.

Mr. GUNN: That is nonsense, and the Minister knows it. I believe that, if South Australia committed an appropriate sum towards this project, the Commonwealth Government might be able to make a further contribution.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What does that mean?

Mr. GUNN: I have received a letter from Mr. Nixon, from which I will quote.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It probably says, "Dear Comrade".

Mr. GUNN: That is the kind of language used in the Labor Party. The letter states, in part:

> In his 1978-79 national highways programme Mr. Virgo has included construction works on the Stuart Highway estimated to cost $330 000. I am not satisfied, however, that this represents a sufficient level of effort in view of the priority which the Government attaches to develop the Stuart Highway. I am therefore pressing Mr Virgo to spend at least $1 000 000 in national highway funds on Stuart Highway construction this year.

If the Minister accepted the advice of Mr. Nixon, he would be able to put forward a case for extra assistance.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: Government members may read the letter if they want to. Interestingly, the State Government says that it does not have enough money to make any sort of effort in relation to the Stuart Highway, but it can find $53 000 000 to provide a link to Modbury.

Mr. Wilson: Probably more than that.

Mr. GUNN: Why can't it not find a few more dollars for the Stuart Highway? It is a matter of setting priorities and the Minister is not concerned about the Stuart Highway. A report in the *Advertiser* (written by Greg Kelton) states that $53 000 000 will be provided for a high-speed tram service down the Modbury corridor. The Government can find that money, whereas it cannot find any money for the Stuart Highway. Whence will the $53 000 000 come? I give that as a clear example of the Minister's hypocrisy: he sheds crocodile tears around the country and makes abusive statements about me and my colleagues regarding this matter, but he cannot find $1 000 000 for this vital road.

If he can find $53 000 000, he ought to be able to find at least $2 000 000 for the Stuart Highway. The Minister should get his priorities right, and he is wasting his time and that of the Federal Government by shedding crocodile tears. That is not good enough, and the Minister ought to accept his responsibility or resign. People in the North are sick of the Minister's statements: they want action from him but, hitherto, they have not had any. The Minister has done nothing to improve the road in any way. If any

member has traversed it lately, he must agree that it is in a shocking condition during most of the year, and the heavy rain in the area over the past few months has made it even worse.

This situation is costing the State millions of dollars. Unfortunately, for every year the road is not sealed, more business is going to Queensland. I have been told that about $75 000 000 worth of trade which used to go from South Australia to the Northern Territory now goes from Queensland.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who told you that?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member should speak to the Mayor of Alice Springs, and get his facts straight. If he is not interested in what is happening in South Australia, he should be. Having been a Minister for about five years, he should have known the facts.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But who told you that?

Mr. GUNN: I thought I had explained. If the honourable member is not capable of understanding, it is not my fault. I shall leave him in ignorant bliss and continue.

In all its various criticisms, the Government has never clearly explained to the people why it wasted $25 000 000 on Monarto. A few weeks ago the member for Stuart was writing letters to the Whyalla newspaper and speaking in this House criticising the Liberal Party for not being interested in the development of this State. Let me remind members opposite that some of the facilities that will be required if the petro-chemical complex is built (and I hope it is) could have been provided with the money that was wasted at Monarto. That was the first white elephant. We do not hear much nowadays about the dial-a -bus system. We were to have had some cheap homes built in Malaysia, but we have not heard much about that enterprise lately. We have seen the Government's failure to stand up to its real masters, the extreme trade unions. The Premier has had much to say about what is taking place in Sweden, but he has never told us much about West Germany, in which the inflation rate is about 3 per cent. I was interested to read in the *Bulletin* a few weeks ago an article by Peter Samuel—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I've never had much time for D.L.P. sympathisers.

Mr. GUNN: Perhaps the Attorney-General could confer with him. Mr. Samuel states:

> The entire wage system is free market, without any Government arbitration or any minimum wage laws. That may be part of the reason why Germany has no special youth unemployment problem. There is no political intervention to try to have particular categories of people paid more than they are worth as measured in the labour market.

Recently, in my district, an inspector from the office of the Minister of Labour and Industry went to one small shop in Ceduna, close to my office, and questioned the young lady who was employed there about what she was being paid. When she told him, he said that she was being underpaid. She said that she was quite happy with the arrangement, that she worked one day a week for seven hours, she lived on a farm, and that she worked under a family arrangement in a small business. The owner was informed that he had 30 days to make up the payment or he would have court action taken against him.

When I rang the department, I was informed that the department was aware that, when inspectors went out on a similar basis, they would cost people their jobs. In enforcing an award which an industry could not afford to pay, they were costing people their jobs, but were not concerned about it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: We hear much about unemployment. Every member on this side is concerned about it, and members opposite should be concerned about it, because their Party in Government has had the highest record of unemployment of any period. In December 1972, 136 000 people were registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service. In December 1975, the number had increased by 191 000 to 328 000. Between January 1974 and January 1975, in one dark year of Labor, unemployment rose by 157 per cent—a fine effort. We are still suffering from the policies that caused the problem.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Samuel continued:

> The unions are very big and powerful, but constitutional law prevents them enforcing closed shops, so they have to be careful not to force wages above market rates. They are basically pro-capitalist, like American unions, because they are not run by socialist ideologues.

They are also pro-capitalist because they are prepared to put some funds into the industry. If unions in this country adopted a similar attitude, it would benefit their members, as well as the country. The Labor Party wants to enforce compulsory unionism so it has a built-in membership collecting system. It does not have to openly solicit members; it lets the unions do that. Not only is that undemocratic, but it is totally wrong, and no-one could morally support that system. I hope it will not be long before it is changed, in the interests of the nation. The member for Spence should read Mr. Samuel's article, and he might learn something.

This is in complete contradiction to the attitude of the A.C.T.U., which has been trying to take over and control firms. The Premier talks about democracy in every facet of life, and the first group that should be made to comply with democratic principles is the trade unions: that is one of the most undemocratic organisations in this State.

Mr. Slater: How do you say that?

Mr. GUNN: Look at the way they are run! They are not prepared to implement compulsory ballots. Members opposite believe in compulsory voting for election to Parliament, but not for the election of union officials or for strikes. What percentage did Mr. Scott get? It was about 5 per cent of the vote, being charitable.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It's the first time you've ever been charitable.

Mr. GUNN: I am sorry the Attorney-General thinks that way.

Mr. Mathwin: He's the pretender to the throne.

Mr. GUNN: He is the pretender to the Deputy's throne at present. He is working towards becoming Deputy Leader, we understand. I should think the coup would take place after the next State election.

Mr. Mathwin: When he gets the numbers.

Mr. GUNN: When he brings in more of his union colleagues. When they are on this side of the House the axe will come out.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's what you believe, isn't it: your inherent right to govern, along with Ren DeGaris?

Mr. GUNN: That is not only untrue, but unworthy—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: "The permanent will of the people", a quote from your Leader in the Upper House.

Mr. GUNN: That is unworthy for someone who holds the office of Attorney-General, making such a reflection on another member. That sort of thinking is retarding this State and leaving uranium in the ground. That sort of thinking caused the Government not to move to help the farmers load the sheep, and such thinking will make South Australia the industrial backwater of this country.

I have referred the House to the untruthful remarks the Attorney has made about me in the past, but he has not had the courage to stand up in the House or outside and

justify them. I challenge him again to justify the remarks he made about me at Leigh Creek if he is a man of honour and if he upholds the oath he took as a Minister. I again challenge him to do so and to produce the documents he said he was going to produce. What he said was totally untrue, and the people of Leigh Creek know it.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: The people of Leigh Creek know the degree to which you lack principles and moral fibre.

Mr. GUNN: I have a good relationship with the people up there in my short time in the area. I enjoy going to the town, and I look forward for a long time to come to visiting the town. Nothing the Attorney or his colleagues can do will change that situation, because they will be on this side of the House.

I sincerely hope that the Government will change its tack of continually attacking the Commonwealth Government and will put forward constructive and positive policies that will assist the people of the State. It is unfortunate that, for the past few years (and I do not blame only Labor Premiers), Premiers from all States have continually gone to Canberra and have continued to attack the Commonwealth Government of the day about its policies. It is unfortunate that this Government has not put forward any constructive points that will assist the economic situation now. We have had a difficult economic time in this country, but I believe that things are looking better.

When uranium is mined and other policies are brought into effect, things will improve greatly. I appeal to the Attorney and his colleagues for once in their lives to be constructive and to put forward a few suggestions. When the Government demands millions of dollars from the Commonwealth, it should inform the people of South Australia whence the Commonwealth should get that money.

The Labor Government admitted today that it is a Party of high taxation. Where will the money come from, and what charges will be increased? The member for Price hates rural industry, and, therefore, hates farmers, so he would tax farmers. The Labor Party's taxing policies are not normally based on an ability to pay; instead, the Government just inflicts taxes on the people, and those who cannot pay go to the wall, and the Government loses no sleep.

I suppose we will be treated to a similar speech as that made by His Excellency when the Loan Estimates and the Budget are introduced. Those speeches will be about as constructive as the measures contained in the Governor's Speech and will do nothing for the people. We have had a continual spiel of attacks made by the Government on the Commonwealth Government.

I support the motion, and look forward to my colleagues bringing forward, on a continuing basis, constructive policies that will be of lasting benefit to the people of this State.

Mr. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to speak about the purchase of shares in Allied Rubber Mills Limited by the South Australian Government through the South Australian Development Corporation. In May it was announced that the South Australian Government, through the South Australian Development Corporation, had purchased 735 000 shares in Allied Rubber Mills Limited. This represented 28 per cent of the company's shares. The purchase price whas 60c a share, and the total cost was $441 000. Since that purchase there has been considerable criticism of the South Australian Government for involving itself in such a purchase, and for its failure since to justify such a purchase.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Principally by you.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have not commented publicly on the matter so far, but I now intend to do so. The facts of the purchase and subsequent events are as follows:

1. The South Australian Development Corporation purchased the shares from the estate of the late C. P. Tilley and associated Tilley family interests.
2. The price paid, 60c a share, was well above the recent sales of those shares on the Stock Exchange. Recent sales had been at 42c, and at no stage during the year had the price risen above 60c.
3. The Stock Exchange of Adelaide has sought particulars about possible changes in directorship of the company. No statement has been made yet on the appointment of new directors.
4. The $441 000 for the purchase came from Treasury funds, although the South Australian Development Corporation is a statutory authority.
5. The company had not paid a dividend for more than a year.
6. Allied Rubber Mills Limited had three main areas of operation, which were the manufacture of rubber products in Malaysia, the manufacture of rubber products at a plant at Mile End, South Australia, and the manufacture and sale of prefabricated garages under the name Easybuilt.
7. The company has an issued capital of 2 625 000 50c ordinary shares and 150 000 $1 preference shares.
8. The Malaysian operation was subject to a takeover bid in 1977 by Sime Derby Eastern International, but that fell through because of problems.
9. The company employs about 300 people in Australia, mostly in South Australia.
10. The banking of the company has been transferred since the purchase from the National Bank to the State Bank of South Australia.

The crucial question arises: why did the South Australian Government, through the South Australian Development Corporation, spend $441 000 of taxpayers' funds on buying shares in a public company? Furthermore, why did the Government pay 60c a share when the shares could have been purchased through the Stock Exchange for about 42c a share?

I understand that a large parcel of shares from this company had been open for purchase (and it was well known around Adelaide that they had been open for purchase) well before the Government purchased its shares. In such circumstances, where such a large parcel of shares has been available and has not been purchased, one would expect them to be purchased at a price below market value rather than a price significantly above market value. One would normally have expected them to have been bought below 42c and certainly not at 60c a share.

The only answer to these questions was a claim by the Deputy Premier, Mr. Corcoran, that "the company's abilities to obtain funds from banking sources will now be strengthened". Why did not the company use other more conventional means of raising the extra funds by a share issue or the sale of certain assets? Issued shares not taken up by the Tilley family could have been sold on the open market. The simple exchange of shares from one shareholder to another shareholder does not inject

additional funds into the company.

This means very little, as 57 of the 90 companies listed in the non-mining section of the Adelaide Stock Exchange have shares selling well below their current asset backing. The justification used by the Government is that the shares were purchased because additional funds had to be raised by the company. That is because (and I think this is a reasonable conclusion to reach) the company was having liquidity problems. If that is the reason, why did not the S.A.D.C. use its powers to either lend funds to the company or act as guarantor for the company to an outside lender? These two alternatives are the normal practice and they have been applied frequently in the past. This different practice suggests other motives behind the Government's purchase.

The Attorney-General recently agreed with other Attorneys-General to support a national securities scheme for Australia. Under that agreement, the offer to purchase large blocks of shares above market value had to be made to all shareholders. Why is the South Australian Government not prepared to abide by the same conditions it is about to impose on the rest of the community?

An examination of the role of some persons involved in the entire affair could suggest serious conflicts of interest. However, that is a matter for other people to raise and should not be the concern of this Parliament. I think some other questions should be answered by the Premier. I put them forward in the hope that the Premier will bring down an answer as soon as possible.

(1) Had the company approached the S.A.D.C.for funds prior to the share transaction and, if so, when, and why were loan funds or a guarantee not granted?

(2) Was there any side agreement between the company and the S.A.D.C. and, if so, what was the agreement?

(3) Did the S.A.D.C. buy 28 per cent of the shares to ensure that more than 25 per cent was held so that special resolutions to sell off assets could not be passed without the support of the S.A.D.C.? (In other words, it would prevent someone liquidating the assets of the company.)

(4) Were the shares purchased by the S.A.D.C. to allow certain shareholders to have immediate liquidity and, if so, is this an extension of the role and scope of the S.A.D.C. beyond that laid down in the Industries Assistance Act under which the S.A.D.C. operates?

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable member is reading his speech. I will allow it this time but I hope in future he will read page 430 of Erskine May.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I shall certainly do that. I am referring to copious notes.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to challenge the honourable member. If he can prove to me he has copious notes I will listen to him but I consider that they are not copious notes. I will be reading *Hansard,* and if the honourable member will forward the notes to me I shall be pleased to look at them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The next question I put to the Premier is:

(5) The Deputy Premier has indicated that the S.A.D.C. will be represented on the board of the company: when will the new directors be announced? Will the new directors include community directors and directors elected by the employees?

(6) What is the intention of the Government concerning the holding of these shares? Does the Government intend to sell the shares as soon as possible; is it the intention to hold on to them indefinitely; or is the Government considering selling the shares through an employee share ownership trust?

(7) Is it the intention of the Government to adopt its industrial democracy policy within the company?

I believe the Premier needs to answer these questions fully and frankly before this Parliament can be assured that public funds and the S.A.D.C. are not being used primarily for purposes other than those of financially assisting industry as laid down under the Act, under which the S.A.D.C. has the role of lender of the last resort. One hopes that is the principal purpose for which it is used, rather than for other reasons.

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): The matter I wish to raise this afternoon concerns the workings of the Family Court. It is no secret that the growing backlog of disputed cases is causing severe hardship. Delays in completing the hearing of disputed ancillary matters, such as property maintenance and custody, cause hardship, particularly for women who are virtually left in limbo after their divorces. Divorces themselves can be automatically and quickly granted after a year's separation, but this is not the case with disputed ancillary matters. Under the old Matrimonial Causes Act, the delays normally experienced in disputed divorce matters were about two years. One of the objectives of the Family Court was that it would reduce delay and reduce the frustrations that litigants experienced in the Supreme Court.

In ordinary ancillary applications, that is, for maintenance, custody or access, I understand that an application is lodged together with a supporting affidavit and then the litigant is required to wait about six weeks before that application can be heard. For a woman without maintenance that represents a severe gap. The case then comes on in the Family Court and invariably the other party (the husband) has a solicitor and they want to put their documents on file, so the case is adjourned for, say, another four weeks. All in all, some 10 weeks can pass before the maintenance application is considered. Quite often in disputed matters these maintenance applications are then referred to the defended list. An interim order may be made but quite often if an interim order is made it is usually at a sustenance level, and the applicant has to wait until the case comes up in the defended list. That is for an ordinary application. True, the court will list matters of urgency as quickly as possible, usually within several days. That does present a problem because a person has to satisfy the Registrar that that particular matter is urgent and, because of the large number of cases that come before the Family Court, not every case can be considered urgent.

Delays of 12 to 15 months are being experienced before cases are finally determined, that is, in relation to property settlements, and often that is tied up with a permanent maintenance application and custody disputes as well. It is certainly true that there are pre-trial procedures such as welfare officers' reports, and reports and inquiries, but generally speaking the increasing number of defended cases on the defended list often means that a disputed property settlement will not be finalised for about 2½ years after a separation, because an application cannot be made for a property settlement until the couple has been separated one year, and that application can be made only in conjunction with an application for dissolution. With a 12 to 15 month delay in the resolution of that property dispute, some 2½ years can pass.

A situation has developed that is no different from the length of time it took to dispose of these matters in the Supreme Court. This situation is completely unacceptable and distressing to people whose marriages have broken down. Women with children can be left virtually penniless during these agonising delays, and they are dependent on the charity of their parents because the pension is

inadequate in most cases. The delay can be accentuated by a husband who simply refuses to comply with a maintenance order, because that means that that maintenance order has to be enforced.

I do not want my comments to imply criticism of the present judges of the court or of the court staff who I believe are doing a tremendous job and the best they can do in the circumstances. The cause of the traumas can be attributed to the Federal Government, which is starving the court of funds. That is part of the problem.

The present hearing procedures and regulations are inefficient and expensive. In South Australia, before the Family Law Act was passed we had a system in the Magistrates' Court whereby a wife could make an application for maintenance on complaint which did not have to be supported by an affidavit. The complaint, which was given a hearing date within three weeks, was then served on the husband, and the matter would then come before the court. What the court usually did in that situation, when the woman was without means and without maintenance, was list that matter for an oral hearing, usually during the following week or two weeks, so that even if an interim order was made it was made on oral evidence. That is the best possible evidence, because it is easy to cover up a financial position in an affidavit that is not tested.

When the Family Law Act came into operation the Magistates' Court procedure went out of the window and we were left with judges dealing with maintenance applications. I believe that part of the solution, apart from the fact that the Federal Government is starving the Family Court of funds, is not necessarily to increase the number of judges but to appoint more registrars. There are at present five judges in the Family Court in Adelaide, and a registrar and a deputy registrar who hear reports and inquiries.

There is nothing complicated about maintenance applications, which could be quite easily resolved by a less senior person in the Family Court—a registrar. What is happening in the Family Court is that, because of the regulations and procedures with affidavits, the affidavits are often out of date by the time the case comes before the court, and fresh documents have to be put on file. Again, one cannot really test what a person has said in an affidavit as opposed to oral evidence. What really happens is that people are engaged for long periods in what is little more than affidavit warfare, which largely results in their loathing each other because of the things they have said about one another in those affidavits. This, again, makes settlements more difficult.

The court is hampered by much bureaucratic red tape, and even for a person to be able to see his own file he must get permission. A solicitor who has lodged documents, lost a copy and wants to get an extra copy of, say, a marriage certificate or an affidavit must go through some bureaucratic red tape. This flows from a situation created by the press not having free access to the court. I think it is quite disturbing that the press does not have free access to the court.

I believe that the press ought to be able to report judgments without using names or information that would identify the parties. I do not believe that the court should be open to the public because, essentially, marital breakdowns are private matters and should be kept private as far as possible. However, the public is entitled to know what is going on in the courts and what sorts of order and judgment are being made. It is mainly through the press that the public can be informed. The only place where selective judgments are reported is in the Law Reports, which are for the use of lawyers, and the public does not have ready access to them.

I suppose it creates quite a strong reservoir of knowledge in the hands of lawyers when members of the public cannot see what is going on in the Family Court in the sense of judgments that are reported in the press. It is certainly true that the Family Court is not a closed court for all purposes. The press is excluded and can report only, say, a matter where a judge grants leave, such as a custody case where a husband or wife may have snatched a child and tried to take it overseas, and it might be in the public interest that publicity is given to that case. Unless the court orders otherwise, relatives and friends of each party, marriage counsellors, welfare officers and legal practitioners may be present in the court. So court proceedings are not entirely secret, but publicity is restricted because the court is closed and because no-one can print or publish any statement or report that family law proceedings have been instituted, or any account of any evidence or particulars of family law proceedings. The only exceptions are the Law Reports and when a judge grants leave in a particular matter.

I think that the press ought to have access to the Family Court. It ought not to be able to print matters of evidence, but it ought to be able to print judgments without using names or information that would identify the parties. I think that is in the public interest. In a *National Times* report of the week ending 20 May 1978—

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I take this opportunity to correct an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 21 July 1978, headed "Report delayed: Liberals blamed", and which concerned a statement made by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The report states:

> Two Liberal members of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee were blamed yesterday for a delay in the committee's report on Hospitals Department waste.

Unfortunately, it did not report the whole of the statement made by the Chairman. I want to quote from the answer given to Mr. Russack, and reported in that article as follows:

> "The position is that a report was nearing completion. I informed the new members of the committee that I would be required to sign the report," Mr. Wells said.
>
> "As they were new members and had progressed along the line for two or three meetings I advised them, I think when I signed the report, that they were a party to the contents of the report."
>
> They had both objected . . .

That is correct, because I believe that with a committee such as the Public Accounts Committee the reports should be unanimous and not decided on a Party basis. I believe that members of the committee have a responsibility to make sure that they are properly briefed on the contents of the report and fully aware of the evidence that has been taken. In relation to this particular inquiry, much work had been done before the member for Hanson and I were appointed to the committee. I was most concerned that I was fully aware and could account for any statements appearing in that report. I believe it would have been irresponsible for anyone to sign the report unless he was fully aware of its contents.

I also believe that the Public Accounts Committee has an important role to play in scrutinising Government activities and administration of departments. I further believe that a great deal more work could be done in the area of committees. Unfortunately, one of the problems with a committee such as the Public Accounts Committee is that members do not have enough time to do the work

that has to be done, because we all have electorates and some of us have to travel a long way.

However, the Chairman did commend the member for Hanson and me, and said there would be a further study, adding that in no circumstances would the Committee be bulldozed or bullied. I agree that it would be wrong if the committee was in any way bulldozed or coerced into coming out with a report before it had completed its inquiries. To prove that the member for Hanson and I were prepared to sit on the committee and were in no way wanting to delay the committee's work, on 9 February 1978 we wrote the following letter to the Chairman:

> Dear Mr. Wells, We wish to advise that we are concerned that this morning's Public Accounts Committee meeting was cancelled and that we were not advised until we arrived at the meeting at 10 a.m. Because of our very busy schedules over the next few weeks, could you please inform us of when you anticipate holding the next meeting and what the programme will be for the next few weeks.
>
> We believe that a meeting should be held Tuesday morning next commencing at 11.30 a.m. to take the place of this morning's meeting. We further consider that we should discuss the interstate visit. Also as a matter of extreme importance, the draft report on the Hospitals Department should be considered and completed by the committee within the next month.

I have read that to demonstrate that we have not deliberately delayed the report. Another problem the committee has had is that some Government departments, particularly the Hospitals Department, have been very slow in providing information to it; in fact, one witness from that department declined to give certain information because the Corbett Committee was taking evidence.

I have made this statement—and I informed the committee that I intended to make it—because I believe it is essential that the public should be fully aware of the involvement of the member for Hanson and me. I have enjoyed my time on the committee, and I look forward to continuing my role as a member of that committee. The only thing that perturbs me is that we, as members, do not have enough time to carry out this activity, and I believe that Parliament would be better served if we had more such committees. It is a role members should be involved in, and probably we could do more good for our constituents if we spent more time on such committees and a little less time going around our districts. Most of us feel obliged to spend as much time as possible in our districts.

I have received a letter from the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association, dated 14 March 1978, as follows:

> Enclosed are a number of letters relating to the proposed development of a tourist complex in the Coober Pedy area, and the new mining regulations.
>
> Our main objection is the excising of land from our precious stones field, and the Minister seems to have chosen to ignore this as the basic issue. The C.P.P.M.A. has still not been notified of the position or area of land concerned. We would also be interested to know what terms of reference the "detailed governmental investigation" was carried out under. We consider that, if any land is going to be excised, it should be made public; as far as we know this is not the case. The mining subcommittee would have been more sympathetic if the town's boundaries had been extended and the area made available to all interested persons. We would feel more secure if the power of the Minister was curtailed so that it is not he alone who can determine or change the field's boundaries.
>
> The mining subcommittee is rather confused as to the jurisdiction of the Lands and the Mines Departments over the precious stones field. Could you clarify this for us? You will note that the Minister states that the proposal (tourist complex) is being considered by the Department of Lands.

A person who was President of the A.L.P. at Coober Pedy (I do not know whether he is still in that office) wrote a letter at the recent campaign recommending that people should vote for the A.L.P., and being critical of me. He and another person were given an opportunity to obtain this land. The general public was not invited, by advertisement or any other method, to avail itself of the area. Some time ago, the Government enacted legislation prescribing a precious stones prospecting area. The land in question was situated outside the town boundaries.

I believe that many people at Coober Pedy would have liked the opportunity to make application or to tender for this land. It is quite wrong that two people could be given land when the feelings of the local residents, especially the miners, were well known to the Minister and the department. The President of the A.L.P. in that town not only received a benefit in that area, but a few weeks later, I understand, the A.L.P. sub-branch at Coober Pedy was given the licence to be the can collection depot in the town.

Those two interesting exercises took place at the one time. I intend to follow up both matters. I do not want to engage in mud raking, but I believe that the people in the area, as well as the progress association, should have been given an opportunity to tender for that land.

I hope that any tourist ventures in the area are successful. The district attracts thousands of tourists a year, and I want to see it developed further, to the benefit of South Australia. The local people have done an excellent job in providing facilities that have attracted people from all over the world. It is an important section of industry in South Australia.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 August at 2 p.m.