HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 2 August 1979

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Administration of Acts Act Amendment,

Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings).

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments of the Public Service of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1980.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES 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: SUCCESSION DUTIES

A petition signed by 43 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoyed at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships was presented by Mr. Harrison.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PAROLE SYSTEM

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: During the past two or three months there has been considerable public discussion on the operation of the parole system in South Australia. This has been the result of two particular incidents, about which there has been a considerable amount of comment, much of it very ill-informed. However, as I appreciate that the public has a right to be concerned about the circumstances in which persons who have been convicted of serious crimes are freed from imprisonment, I instigated an urgent investigation into all grants of parole since the Parole Board was set up in 1970. This has involved a detailed examination of records relating to about 1 038 offenders and has engaged the attention of the Research Officer of the Correctional Services Department and two temporary assistants for more than one month. As a result, I am now able to put before the House a statistical summary of the operations of the board which I think will be of considerable value to all members and to those members of the public who are interested in a reasoned and reasonable assessment of the parole system. I point out that discussions I have had with the Chairman of the Parole Board have always assured me that the board believes that its decisions were almost always justified by the resultant behaviour of parolees.

Although there is little statistical evidence to back this claim, the Parole Board would, of course, in dealing with revocation of parole orders, have known of the cases in which parolees had subsequently offended and would have been able to form an impression of its success rate. However, I considered it essential that hard statistical information should be available both to guide the Parole Board and to inform me and the public as to the result of its operations. In recent discussions with the Chairman of the board, I suggested that it might be valuable if the board were to devote some time to considering the results of the statistical inquiry that was being carried out. This the Chairman, Her Honour Justice Mitchell, readily agreed to do and, in fact, this meeting was held this morning as soon as possible after the information was available. I am sure that the board will appreciate the additional information so provided and will welcome the continuing provision of such statistics. For the benefit of the House, I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table showing the results of all releases on parole during the years 1970 to 1978.

Leave granted.

PAROLE RELEASES, 1970-1978

Year	Original Offence—Violent Crime							Original Offence—Non-Violent Crime							Grand Total
	Parole Revoked, by reason				Successfully Completed	Still Current	Total	Parole Revoked, by reason				Successfully Completed	Still Current	Total	
	Violent Offence	Non-Violent Offence	Breach Conditions	Total Revoked				Violent Offence	Non-Violent Offence	Breach Conditions	Total Revoked				
1970	1	—	—	1	16	1	18	—	1	—	1	28	—	29	47
1971	1	3	4	8	26	—	34	—	9	5	14	62	—	76	110
1972	—	9	4	13	22	1	36	—	6	5	11	62	—	73	109
1973	1	1	2	4	15	—	19	1	8	10	19	73	—	92	111
1974	3	3	—	6	24	5	35	1	10	3	14	43	—	57	92
1975	3	4	7	14	32	5	51	2	11	6	19	69	—	88	139
1976	2	1	4	7	32	8	47	1	9	7	17	75	2	94	141
1977	—	7	3	10	21	13	44	—	7	7	14	75	14	103	147
1978	—	1	1	2	11	34	47	—	7	4	11	37	47	95	142
1970-78	11[x]	29	25	65	199	67	331	5[y]	68	47	120	524	63	707	1 038
Per cent of Sub-Group	3·32	8·76	7·56	19·64	60·12	20·24	100	0·70	9·62	6·65	16·97	74·12	8·91	100	
Per cent of Total	1·06	2·79	2·41	6·26	19·17	6·46	31·89	0·48	6·55	4·53	11·56	50·48	6·07	68·11	100

x Represents 4·17 per cent of 264 cases already completed or revoked

y Represents 0·78 per cent of 644 cases already completed or revoked

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Members will have an opportunity to study this material and to discuss it at length when new legislation is introduced later this session covering the area of correctional services and, of course, they may raise the matter in the normal course of Parliamentary business before that time. Perhaps it would be useful for the public if I summarised the statistical information. The parolees were divided into two groups according to whether their original offence constituted a violent or non-violent crime on the basis of the categories of the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The categories that were included in violent crime were: homicides, including murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, driving occasioning death, and conspiracy to murder; assaults, including major assaults, minor assaults, rape and attempts, other heterosexual offences, homosexual offences, others including kidnap, abortion, and threats of violence; robbery and extortion, including robbery with assault, and extortion.

In all, there were some 1 038 orders made, 331 relating to violent offenders and 707 to non-violent offenders. This excludes some other offences; for example, people who were put on parole, waiting for deportation, others who were sent interstate, and some others. There were 1 038 orders made, which resulted in people having parole revoked, or the successful completion of parole, or continuing parole. The outcome of the parole was examined to see whether the parole had been revoked and, if so, whether that was because of a violent offence (as previously defined), a non-violent offence, or a breach of conditions.

The number of cases in which the parole was successfully completed was established and, of course, there are some orders still current. Of the 331 offenders whose original offence had been a violent crime, over the nine-year period only 11 had had their parole revoked by reason of a further violent offence, and of the 707 parolees who had committed non-violent crimes, only 5 had subsequently committed violent offences. These figures represent 4·17 per cent and 0·78 per cent of the orders already completed or revoked in each category.

It is particularly pleasing to note that of those paroled in 1977 and 1978, totalling 91 violent offenders and 198 non-violent offenders, not one up to the end of June 1979 had had his parole revoked by reason of a subsequent violent offence. However, the statistics show that there has been a high and consistent rate of success since the inception of the system.

I believe that the figures indicate that the Parole Board has acted most responsibly and, indeed, most successfully, given the difficult nature of its task. I point out also that, given the difficulties of re-establishment in society faced by people who have been in prison, particularly in the conditions of the last three of four years with steadily increasing unemployment, the relatively low rate of re-offending in non-violent as well as violent offences is a great tribute both to the care of the Parole Board in making its orders and to the supervision exercised by officers of the Probation and Parole Branch.

I believe that the operation of this system has not only made a valuable contribution to the rehabilitation and re-assimilation of prisoners but has also saved the State an enormous amount of money, bearing in mind that it costs about $10 a week to supervise a parolee and over $220 a week to keep a person in prison. This saving of over $10 000 a year for each offender would, of course, not be justified if it was at the expense of putting the public to unacceptable risk. This can only be evaluated when a comparison can be made between the rates of re-offending of parolees and those who were released without parole. This is a bigger study which is currently under way.

Much has been made of the fact that the average caseload per parole officer in June 1978 was 59·9, above the level of 45 recommended by the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia in its first report, with a consequent risk of inadequate supervision of parolees. I point out that the figures for 1975, 1976 and 1977 ending on 30 June in each case were 85, 50 and 49·1 respectively, and that for what was believed to be temporary causes the downwards trend was unfortunately reversed in 1978. I have been informed that in the last year to 30 June 1979, despite the Government's policy of non-growth in the Public Service, the figure has fallen to 55, which incidentally is the figure suggested as appropriate by the United Nations. I have had inquiries made to ascertain the position in other States. These indicate the following caseloads: the Northern Territory, which has just commenced operations, 35; Tasmania, 55; New South Wales, 55·5; Queensland, 78; and Western Australia, 90. No comparable figures are available for Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory where this function is handled by a generalist social welfare service, in which probation and parole form only part of the social worker's caseload. The figures indicate that South Australia is doing at least as well in this regard as any other State and much better than those governed by Liberal and National Country Parties.

That does not mean that the position is completely satisfactory. Both average caseloads and those of some individual probation officers are too high, but it is ridiculous to infer that the system is breaking down because of inadequate staff. I must stress that every effort is being made to improve still further the operation of the parole system. The board, as I have said, is re-examining its operations in the light of the statistics. Improved accommodation is being made available to the board and appropriate administrative arrangements made to improve the facilities available to it and its Secretary. Continuing research will be carried out along the lines of that already referred to and 6 additional officers will be appointed to the staff of the Probation and Parole Branch this year, despite the manpower freeze. All of these steps will, I am sure, justify the continued faith of the Government and the public in the parole system and the effectiveness of the board and the Probation and Parole Branch.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO PROSTITUTION

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended until 30 August 1979.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I report that the honourable Deputy Premier is absent and that the honourable Premier will take any questions that would have been directed to that Minister.

POPULATION GROWTH

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say what are the reasons for the consistent fall in South Australia's population growth rate during the past five years compared to the rest of Australia, and how the

Government proposes to reverse this trend, in view of its demonstrated failure to attract industrial, commercial and mineral development? Examination of population statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics reveals that the annual population growth rate in South Australia has fallen from 2·15 per cent in December 1974 to 0·55 per cent in December 1978. This is the lowest rate of all the States, and the lowest recorded growth rate in the State's history. Further, in 1978, South Australia was the only State in which permanent departures exceeded permanent arrivals; that is, South Australia was the only State with a net migration loss.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I don't think that's true.

Mr. TONKIN: It is absolutely true, and I invite the Premier to look at the statistics if he has not done so already. In addition, the latest population projections released by the bureau in May show that South Australia's future growth rate will remain lower than the national average in the years ahead, and that a net migration loss will continue. Taken in conjunction with the figures for committed industrial and mineral development in Australia, showing South Australia's share at only 2 per cent of the total investment of $12·4 billion, these population figures provide alarming evidence of the failure of the South Australian Government to meet the needs of the State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether the Leader is suggesting that the Government is responsible for the state of the population in this State, because, if people had followed my example, we would have many more people here than we have at present.

Mr. Tonkin: It's no joking matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I accept that. I suppose the Leader has played his part, too, and I do not reflect on him. Obviously, he has had the advantage of studying statistics on this matter. I have not had that opportunity, but I shall be pleased to look at them, because the Leader knows what can be done with figures. The projections made about five years ago have been found not to have occurred, and the projection into the future now is very much different. I should like to examine the facts and give the Leader a report, because the matter warrants consideration and study. As I have said, I make perfectly clear that the fact that population is dropping is not because of any lack of effort by the Government.

HOUSING FUNDS

Mr. CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Planning say what effects South Australia will suffer as a result of this year's further savage cutback in Commonwealth housing funds to the States? I am aware that total Commonwealth housing allocations to the States have been set at $260 000 000 this financial year, a reduction of $70 000 000 on the allocation last financial year. I am also aware that this is the second consecutive year that a cut of this magnitude has been made in funds allocated under the Housing Assistance Act. Hardly a day goes by without families coming to my district office seeking assistance to find housing. I am sure they will be anxious to hear the answer the Minister can provide on the effects of this latest cut.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Regrettably, in answering the first question put to me by the member for Norwood, I cannot give a definite statement regarding the amount of money South Australia will receive. The position is as outlined in his explanation. This is the second year of very savage cuts in the provision of Commonwealth funds for welfare housing in the States.

An honourable member: How much was it this year?

The Hon. R. G PAYNE: This year, the cut Australia-wide was $70 000 000, following the effort of the previous year at the same level— a further cut of $70 000 000. The honourable member mentioned that the overall figure for this year is $260 000 000. Two or three weeks ago, a meeting was held in Canberra, attended by all State Housing Ministers and the Commonwealth Minister, and at that meeting Mr. Groom invited State Ministers to put forward their views on how the sum of $260 000 000 should be apportioned between the States. He did not invite the Ministers who were present to tell him what they thought about the $70 000 000 cut with which they were faced, but I am glad to report that the Ministers did not wait for an invitation, but told him exactly how all the States, involving Governments of both political persuasions, felt about the Commonwealth action at a time when the need for funds for welfare housing has never been greater and is increasing rapidly.

More than 50 per cent of the applicants for Housing Trust rental accommodation in South Australia cannot afford to pay what would be the economic return rent which should apply to the class of accommodation they are seeking. When members think about the implications of that situation in relation to a State housing programme and a State Budget, they will realise how severe are these cuts and how they are impinging on the activities of the State.

I do not suggest that the magnitude of the cuts is being felt only in South Australia. Ministers from all States made clear that this was a major attack, and that the supply of housing on a welfare basis was being made almost impossible, bearing in mind the other cuts the Commonwealth was applying to State Budgets generally.

I am not able to indicate accurately to the honourable member the amount that South Australia might receive, but I can give the likely order of the sum if the generally agreed apportionment arrangements discussed at the meeting were to apply. Mr. Groom did not give an assurance to any of the Ministers present about which of the discussed arrangements for apportionment he would apply, but he did say that he would take into account all the views put forward at the meeting.

Based on past divisions of money between the States for the provision of housing, it is likely that South Australia would receive $37 300 000, $11 000 000 less than we received last year. That is the scaling that would apply in South Australia, and it was of that order in the previous year (about $10 000 000). How the Commonwealth Government expects any State to be able to absorb, in a two-year period, a cut of more than $20 000 000 in housing funds, yet still provide on the same basis and at the same rate for housing for the needy, is beyond me.

The State Government is aware of this deficiency on the part of the Commonwealth, and every effort within the Government's resources will be made to ensure that as many houses as possible are constructed or obtained for the many people who are now entering the needy classes in greater numbers, mainly as a result of the policies of this same Commonwealth Government, which will not recognise what it is doing to people by maintaining and continuing a high level of unemployment.

I suggest that the record of the South Australian Housing Trust and the South Australian Government in this matter will bear examination. Figures I have showing completion rates for the past two years indicate that, despite the sorts of cut that we have been receiving from the Commonwealth in this area, we have managed to maintain a reasonable level of construction. In 1977-78, one of the years I have referred to with respect to cuts in funds, 2 195 homes were completed; in 1978-79, the year

just ended, 1 928 houses were constructed, despite the savage cuts that we have been suffering.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What does the Minister of Labour and Industry mean when he says that it is necessary for "an orientation towards upgrading and maintaining Government facilities in the Public Buildings Department" and "it is believed the corporate role of the department should be under consistent and continuing review"? Those are the words the Minister used in explaining the formation of an internal committee to inquire into the workings of the Public Buildings Department. It is not clear from the Minister's statement whether he intends to scale down the operations of the department, which has been bitterly criticised by private builders and their professional organisations for some time. These people are also highly critical of the action the Minister is taking by setting up this committee and thus delaying the making of decisions to assist the private sector, which is in desperate straits at present. They see this as a delaying tactic, as the committee will not report for a year, and the establishment of innumerable Government committees of inquiry in the past has just been window dressing, to delay decision making until the heat goes off. Many others in the industry have said that they believe that the Minister intends to destroy the private building and construction industry, as is shown by his determination to press on with amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act that will have disastrous effects on the industry.

An honourable member: He's commenting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am explaining what these people are saying. These are not my comments; they are comments of people in the industry. So that the Minister will not forget the question (as one Minister did yesterday)—

The SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the question being asked at the moment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am asking the Minister to explain those words, which to me were gibberish.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It amazes me that the honourable member, who professes to have been a school teacher, cannot understand a press statement. The second point I want to make, and I think it is just as valid as the first, is that it is peculiar that nobody from the building construction industry has bothered to ring me this morning. With all these concerned people that the honourable member talks about, surely there would be one phone call to my office criticising the action I have taken! There has not been one complaint, and I doubt very much whether there have been any to the Deputy Leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: By the smile on the Deputy Leader's face, I think I have struck oil. I do not think that there is one complaint.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I cannot help laughing when I look at you.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I know—because you have been caught out. The Deputy Leader stuck his head into something last week which convinced not only me but also the public of South Australia that he knew absolutely nothing about public works.

His was a totally ignorant statement. I refuted it the next day, and the honourable member has not bothered to come back. He has been caught out twice in two weeks; he leaves himself wide open. The review I have been asked to explain is to assess the present situation in the public works area, where it has been and where it is going. There has not been an assessment for a long time of the quality or otherwise of work done in this area, and I have decided that needs to be done.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Yesterday, an Opposition member spoke about Ministers answering questions. This is another occasion when interjections are delaying a Minister in answering a question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If I was not taking action to establish functions in the public works area I would be criticised for not taking such action. The Opposition has been demanding inquiries into all sorts of things, as was obvious from what the honourable member said last week. He has been caught, because the Government is in front again, having decided to have this internal review. It is not altogether an internal review, although it is being conducted within the department, because an outside consultant will also advise in this area.

A similar review held into the functioning of the Engineering and Water Supply Department has resulted in new targets and new destinies being set. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is now running as well as any other organisation in Australia. This is good grounds for holding a similar inquiry into the Public Buildings Department. That is what we are going to do. We have just got another job from the Deputy Leader because he has put his feet through the partition. I am making no criticism of the present situation in the Public Buildings Department. The Government is about to investigate that area to see that it is made as efficient as possible.

TRAFFIC LAWS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Australian Transport Advisory Council has considered recommending each State to introduce legislation to provide for uniform traffic laws in all States? If such consideration has been given to the matter, what progress towards this objective has been made? *The Australian* yesterday contained an article, headed " 'Road laws a shambles': Police Federation urges uniformity", which states:

> The Police Federation of Australia called yesterday for uniform traffic laws and road signs in Australia . . . The President of the Federal Police Association said Australia's present road laws were an absolute shambles and a disgrace. He said it was necessary to establish a national authority to set the rules so that some uniformity could be obtained.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I could not quarrel with the comments made because I am one of those who have advocated strongly the necessity for uniform traffic laws throughout Australia because of the movement now of people quite easily from State to State. Unfortunately, my view is not shared by my Ministerial colleagues in other States. Time and time again we have had ATAC discussions about this question. Lip service is always paid to the notion that there should be uniformity, but there are plenty of cases where we have agreed to do a specific thing uniformly and some Ministers have gone back to their own States and done exactly the opposite. I do not think there will be an answer until we can get Ministers who are prepared to accept the need for uniformity.

Two classic examples come to mind immediately. Some years ago we considered the variation in the States in the requirements in relation to stop signs, a highly dangerous situation. In some States one was required, as in South

Australia, to stop and give way to all traffic in all directions, while in some other States, particularly Western Australia, there was a "stop and give way" situation at stop signs. It was decided that uniformity was absolutely essential and that officers should examine the situation and report back to a further meeting on the most desirable interpretation to apply. Within six weeks of that meeting, two States attempted to move unilaterally to do their own thing. Fortunately, the other States were able to stop them, but harsh words were needed.

Another classic example is that every State was unanimous in agreeing, when the change to the metric system was made, that there would be a 110 kilometre maximum speed enforceable, not the *prima facie* provision, throughout Australia. Today, I think two States, South Australia and one other, have stuck by that. Therefore, motorists really do not know where they are. I agree with the sentiments that have been expressed, but unfortunately I do not have a remedy to suggest to overcome the ills.

POLICE MOBILITY

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Chief Secretary say whether it is a fact that police mobility has been considerably reduced by the setting of shift distance limits, distances that vary for different police activities? What are the limitations and what effect are they having on the efficiency of the Police Force and, consequently, on general police morale? Are the cuts consistent with the recent announcement that additional funds were being made available for a necessary police presence?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am not aware of the cuts to which the honourable member has referred; the matter has not been referred to me. I will obtain a report to see whether there is any truth in the allegations that have been made. As far as I am aware, there has been no reduction in the mobility of the Police Force, something the Government is at pains to maintain.

WATER TREATMENT

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Planning report on the stage reached on the Anstey Hill water treatment plant project and supply any other relevant information?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: By a strange quirk of chance, I happen to have the up-to-date information with me, and I am delighted to be able to supply it to the honourable member and members opposite. I have been advised that work is proceeding on schedule at the Anstey Hill water filtration plant and that it will be ready for commissioning by the end of this year. I think I informed the honourable member previously that that was the probable target date.

Construction work on buildings and structures is virtually completed. The work still to be done involves mainly installation of mechanical equipment and electrical installations. The testing of equipment and pipework is already under way and full-scale testing of the plant is expected to start in October this year, following completion of the main control panel. The plant will supply filtered water to about 50 000 homes in the north-eastern suburbs, including all or part of Highbury, Windsor Gardens, Gepps Cross, Para Hills and Tea Tree Gully, and in the foothills suburbs from Athelstone to Burnside.

The foothills suburbs were to have been supplied originally from the proposed Kangaroo Creek plant, but, following modifications to the distribution system, they will now be served from Anstey Hill. All members will be pleased to know that not only will these areas get filtered water earlier than originally scheduled, under the Kangaroo Creek proposal, but it has been possible to drop that plant proposal as a whole from the programme with consequent savings of $12 000 000.

SOUTH-EAST COAL

Mr. RODDA: In the absence of the Deputy Premier, is the Premier in a position to give the House a report on the alleged coal find in the South-East and what progress has resulted from this discovery? I seek leave to explain the question. It has been known for a very long time, as the Premier will know, that there have been reported deposits. Some of the deposits are quite good in the areas where drilling is being done. I speak of the Comaum-Joanna-Lochaber area. The local opinion is that the show is very good and the radio is somewhat enthusiastic about these things. A projected big power station is to be constructed at Port Augusta and, if this find is as good as will be hoped, is the Government considering constructing that power station in the South-East on this new coal deposit?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I share the hopes of the honourable member and his constituents in this regard. The discovery of coal near Lucindale is about 50 metres down, with a 7-metre seam. A preliminary judgment is that the quality of the coal is possibly slightly better than that at Leigh Creek, so it certainly would be usable for the production of power.

We are not at the stage where we can estimate the extent of the find, so no thought has been given yet to how it would be exploited—in other words, whether it would be exploited on site by building the power station there to utilise it or whether it would pay to transport it. That question has not yet arisen. I am not certain about the rate of exploration that is going on. I will check that for the honourable member and get what details I can to add to what I have already told him, and give him a report as soon as possible.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Education tell the House what effect the recently announced Federal cut-back to kindergarten funding will have on the State Government's policy of pre-school education for all four-year-olds? The electorate that I represent has seven kindergartens and a large proportion of young families with pre-school children. Therefore these cut-backs, if they affect that programme the State Government has initiated, will cause some degree of distress.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member will be aware, a considerable campaign has been launched recently by people in pre-schools under the arresting slogan—if I can read the backs of motor cars correctly—"Does Canberra Care for Kids?" I guess that is a reasonable question. I am not aware of any recent announcement from Canberra as to the contents of the Department of Social Security budget.

Mr. Mathwin: We are talking about—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think the honourable member will find out just how pertinent that particular slogan may be. Let us look at the respective merits of what has been argued. I think that is important. I am not aware that there has been any final decision from Canberra as to the contents of the budget of the Department of Social

Security for this current financial year. What people are reacting to are the now perceived realities as a result of the budget for the last financial year. Honourable members, having had to give assent to the State Budget, will know that it was a standstill Budget which in most cases did very little more than given indexation to the various Government departments. Now that the actual expenditure figures are known, I believe that the Education Department finished up having about 7·9 per cent more funds available in the last financial year than it had the year before.

The same thing was largely true of the Childhood Services Council, but that component of its budget that came from State sources was increased by 45 per cent, in a stand-still budget. That 45 per cent did no more than make up for what had been cut back by the Commonwealth.

Mrs. Adamson: What about the general revenue grants?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed, what about them?

Mrs. Adamson: They were increased.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If the member would hark back to a question asked of the former Premier—

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

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

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am speaking to the honourable member, and he continues to interject.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The member for Eyre really wants double taxation. He approves of the legislation introduced a year or so ago by the present Liberal Government, and he wonders why the States are not prepared to take up the so-called opportunities inherent in that legislation. That is the sort of thing that the Federal Treasurer is saying. He is writing to people around the country who rightly are expressing concern to the Commonwealth, and the only advice he can give is, "Let the States take up their option that is inherent in the legislation that my Government has introduced." They want double income taxation.

Let me return to the matter of the general revenue position of the States. Some time ago the former Premier was asked a question in this House, and the figures that were released, which had regard to general revenue, Loan, and specific purpose grants, made quite clear that all those moneys coming to the States from the Commonwealth had dropped well below wage inflation. I can give the honourable member a reference to the page in *Hansard* if she wants it. To return to the question—

Mr. Klunder: Has she had a good lunch?

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The States provided 45 per cent more money to the Childhood Services Council in the last financial year than was provided in the previous financial year. All that that did was make up for the cutback from Canberra. The source of the problem is that there was a time when the Commonwealth automatically paid 75 per cent of the salary of every person working in the pre-school field and, when it proposed, in its new federalism fervour, to change that policy to simply provide a block grant for the States, there were those of us who feared what the outcome would be. Of course, what was feared has come about. The block grant for a couple of years was not escalated to be in line with indexation, and in the past couple of years has actually dropped back.

If, in the coming financial year, a similar thing happens, we will be in an extremely difficult position. How can the States (South Australia is not alone in this matter) continue to increase their subventions to this area by that amount each year, not to provide expansion but merely to maintain the position at its present capacity? The situation is extremely difficult. The people going around with a sticker on their car are acting on the best financial advice available to them. There is no denying the extent of the cut-backs by the Commonwealth in this area. They have gone on long enough, and it is time that Canberra faced up to its responsibility and indicated that it did care for kids.

WATER INSTALLATIONS

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Planning say whether the Government will reconsider its policy of not allowing water supply installations to be made by other than the Engineering and Water Supply Department? During the past week I have been made aware of several instances throughout South Australia where water supply extensions by the department have been costed at 200 per cent and 300 per cent in excess of the cost that would have applied had the work been undertaken by tender contract or, in some instances, by local government. The Government has a monopoly on this work and it is forcing local government and developers (and, in turn, the public) to pay far in excess of what is reasonable for this essential service.

In many instances, it is considered little short of scandalous. I ask the Government to put it to the test by offering the work for tender. The Engineering and Water Supply Department, with its facilities and its expertise, should be well placed to win its share of work and at the same time provide this essential service at a reasonable cost to the public.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I suspect that this question was triggered off by a meeting I attended last week at Paringa, when I was in the Riverland trying to make myself more knowledgeable about water matters, irrigation, and so on, in the area. The honourable member was present at that meeting, and the matter was raised of a development proposal which the Paringa council might like to pursue if a suitable water supply could be provided for that section of the land which it proposes to develop.

Mr. Arnold: There are others.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not suggest that there are not others in that situation, but I probably would be close to the mark in suggesting that the matter may have been triggered off in that way, because figures were bandied about during the discussion in the council chambers with the representatives from the council. I think, from memory, that the Engineering and Water Supply Department figure for the provision of a fully standard water supply to the number of blocks mentioned, taken for that section only (that is, the local reticulation and the local main), was of the order of $22 000. It came down to a matter of 600 metres of main of a certain size, and the argument put forward by the council was that it had been able to get a quote of about $6 000. So far, Sir, I am receiving nods of approval from the honourable member for being able to remember the exact figures.

Mr. Arnold: The first figure was $26 000.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The figure of $26 000 illustrates why the honourable member cannot ask for a change in policy on the basis of one, two, three, or even four specific instances, and not expect the matter to be put into the proper context.

This case was being supported by the honourable member on behalf of the local council. I do not quarrel with him on that point, because it is his area and he is entitled to assist and to make representations on their part. The water supply presently available in the existing township of Paringa is such that supplying these additional blocks would involve a complete revamp of the present

supply. I am not getting any horizontal nods, Sir, so I must still be on the right track. The situation in which the Engineering and Water Supply Department often finds itself is that it provides a water supply on an uneconomic return basis in many proposals. The honourable member is one of those who is supposed to be representative of the alternative Government in this State. They are constantly exhorting the Government to cut down and save money, to do this and do that, yet at the same time he is advocating action in matters which would involve the Government in the connection of additional water supply schemes, requiring the provision of Loan moneys, with resultant interest charges, and so on. One needs to look not just at the specific problem but also at the total area before questioning the policy. I will examine the questions the honourable member has raised.

HEARING DAMAGE

Mr. KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Health indicate whether any research is being done or is contemplated into the damage to hearing that might result from the ever-increasing levels of sound to which the young especially are being subjected in various places of entertainment? Over the past 20 years, roughly paralleling the developments in amplification technology, there has been a fashionable swing towards louder and louder music in places of entertainment. The obvious advice for people who do not like it is to stay away from those places, but the young often do not mind discomfort for the sake of fashion, and I, for one, would like an assurance that those high levels of sound amplitude are, in fact, only discomfort and not possible causes of permanent damage.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not know whether I can give the assurances that the honourable member seeks. Indeed, on looking into this matter some time ago, I was surprised to find that, at least to the knowledge of officers of the Health Commission, no detailed investigation or research is being undertaken in Australia into this matter.

Mr. Dean Brown: There are some figures from New South Wales.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the honourable member would wait for a moment, I will explain. Probably, the reason why no current research is going on is that it is already fairly well established that loud noise does contribute to a lowering of the efficiency of the human hearing system. My colleague points out that the correct terminology is that it causes "a lowering of the efficiency of the auditory response in human beings". I am told that, in the occupational health area in the work place, there are regulations which limit the maximum level of noise to 85 decibels, because the research that has occurred in the past has indicated that this is the maximum level to which humans should be exposed over a long period. Because, in the work place, a person is, by contract, required to be present, no doubt the law has sought to amend those contracts to ensure that in their work persons are not effected in this way.

As the honourable member who sought this information has pointed out, a person decides of his or her own volition whether to attend a discotheque, and, therefore, this Government (and Governments elsewhere) to date has not felt that it is appropriate that it should regulate noise levels at places of entertainment. Apart from the general noise regulations, which are related to inconvenience to neighbours and the like, there are no noise level requirements outside the occupational area. In the light of that there is nothing to stop an individual from harming himself quite seriously by attending private parties and other activities where loud music is played. I imagine that most honourable members have had the experience (happily or otherwise) of attending parties on private premises where young people are present and loud music is played.

Mr. Nankivell: They are all tone deaf.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That may well be. That, certainly, is a view to which I would not subscribe. I think that the only course I would advocate the Government taking in this matter is that of attempting to increase the health risk warnings in this area. I will certainly undertake that I will investigate that matter. It may be that we will require or request dance halls, discotheques and the like to give clear notice to people that their hearing may be impaired as a result of attendance at such places. I think it is also important that we should attempt to provide information to people generally about the potential danger that can be done to their hearing by their being exposed to loud music. I will certainly consider this matter and ascertain what steps the Government might take to educate the public about this matter.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Planning say what stage has been reached in preparation of the intended development control legislation foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech? Has a decision yet been reached by Cabinet on this legislation? Will the Minister say when legislation will be introduced into the House, and will he provide details of the programme of consultation that has taken place, or is still taking place, between the Government and parties interested or involved in the proposed legislation?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Preparation is under way. Cabinet has not yet made a decision, because the legislation has not yet been before Cabinet.

Mr. Wotton: What stage has been reached?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think probably the best description would be a draft, (draft) stage. There is an embodiment paper which sets out principles and an outline of the legislation.

In answer to the third question about when the legislation will be introduced, I would suggest that that will be after Cabinet has approved final draft instructions and also the form of the legislation. What was the fourth question?

Mr. Wotton: Will you provide details of the consultations? You can put that in writing if you like.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: At this stage there has been a good deal of contact consultation on a non-formal basis. My information is that local government bodies have been involved to a fair degree by the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs having discussions with officers of local government. I think one or two seminars have been held on the general topic of planning legislation as distinct from this specific proposal. Some papers, which I think the department prefers to call "position papers", have been circulated.

Mr. Wotton: Have they been circulated officially?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I was trying to indicate that it is being done on a non-formal basis. I think most people would agree that the planning legislation we have now whatever its defects or shortcomings, has been in operation for a long time, and this has allowed for a degree of acceptance to occur. As the responsible Minister, I am most anxious not to produce legislation which ostensibly is an improvement on the old legislation but which subsequently turns out to be a matter of jumping from the frying pan into the fire.

I welcome the type of thing to which the honourable member refers, that is, consultation and input. It is my intention to continue the type of consultation we have had up to now and also to put it on a more formal basis when we have at least a reasonable draft arrangement upon which people can be expected to comment.

NEAPTR

Mr. WILSON: Can the Premier say what plans the Government has to borrow overseas to finance the north-east railway system, when it is intended to arrange the loan, and how much will be borrowed? It is my understanding that after the last Loan Council meeting it was announced that the States would probably have permission to borrow overseas for energy conservation projects. It was announced in the press a few weeks ago that in fact the Government was going to borrow overseas $110 000 000 for the purposes of financing the north-east railway.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I never did.

Mr. WILSON: I did not say that you announced it; it was announced in the press. Last week the Minister of Transport—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is that one of your announcements again?

Mr. WILSON: No, it was not one of my announcements. Perhaps I could just ask the Premier the question and not the Minister of Transport. I do that because I want an answer. The Minister of Transport announced last week or the week before that the Government might be looking to borrow overseas the $28 000 000 extra required for tunnelling under King William Street. The Opposition would like to know which is the true story.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The statement made by the Minister was the true statement. When the various States suffered the savage 13.4 per cent cut in capital work, because of the debate that followed and the anxiety expressed by the various Premiers as to what this would mean in real terms in relation to their capital works programme in each State, towards the end of the conference the Prime Minister indicated that he would be prepared to deal sympathetically with proposals put forward by the States which would be of a nature that would allow the States to borrow overseas for particular projects, such as the relocation of Leigh Creek and the development of the northern power station that will go hand in hand with that project, and projects of that nature. It was pointed out that any scheme of an energy conservation type could attract sympathetic consideration, and it was the electrification aspect of the north-eastern transport scheme that the Government would propose to put forward to the Commonwealth to see whether or not it would be sympathetic in allowing the State to borrow overseas for that aspect of it.

At this stage no preparation has been made. No doubt costing will have to take place, and that aspect will have to be isolated and costed and a proposal be drawn up to place before the Commonwealth. It is my view that we can put before it a compelling case, and I feel confident that the Commonwealth will approve the borrowing overseas by the State for that aspect of the scheme.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Premier outline to the House the Government's attitude to small businesses, specifically in those areas where the Government is in direct competition with small business?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I would like the honourable member to be more specific about where the Government is in competition with small businesses. It is certainly not the intention, nor is it the role, of this Government to take over the role of small businesses in our community.

Mrs. Adamson: Hardware, nurseries, retail sales.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reason for the development of the nurseries in the first place was to encourage people to use native trees, shrubs and plants, and that was not being done, as I understand it, in the commercial area. That started with the Athelstone wildflower garden, and it has developed from there. I see that as perfectly fair and reasonable competition. There is plenty of scope for people in that area.

The Government strongly supports small businesses in this State. The incentives we have for them are well known to the honourable member (or they should be), and I do not intend to outline them to this House. The honourable member mentioned hardware, but I am at a loss to know where we are in competition with small businesses in that area.

Mrs. Adamson: Zed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That was an arrangement mainly for the Woods and Forests Department to obtain an outlet for its own products, because, as the honourable member would be well aware, there has been difficulty in that area. Sometimes, because of the attitude of merchants to our product, we are forced into it.

The Government does not intend to get into competition with small businesses. Indeed, I have said that we recognise the importance of small businesses, particularly small industries, in this State. I have pointed out that those industries which employ up to 20 people are the largest employers of labour in South Australia and they are developing faster than any other section of industry in this State. I want to make perfectly clear that the Government is sympathetic to small businesses. It will give them every encouragement it can, and it will not capriciously go into competition against them, but it will do so if there is some reason.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Transport say what is the present policy for the allocation of road grants to rural councils, and whether the Government intends to alter this policy? If it does, what changes are being contemplated?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The policy that the Government follows regarding road grants to local government is the same now as it was last year, the year before and the year before that. There is an increase in the total allocation that has been made to local government, but always the Highways Department engineers assess the requests of the various councils and allocate the money to individual councils on what the departmental engineers consider to be justifiable need. In other words, the money is allocated on a needs basis. Inevitably, what has happened, as happened this year, is that some councils received more money last year and some received less. Nothing has been heard from councils that received more, but we have heard plenty from councils that received less—that is human nature. The total amount that has been provided is the same percentage as the total sum indexed from Canberra.

Mr. Russack: Are any alterations contemplated in policy?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I imagine that the policy has

worked fairly well, especially for those councils that receive a little more, and I do not think that the councils want to change anything.

STATE BANK MORTGAGES

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether the extra interest paid on the mortgages through the State Bank from Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money is paid straight back into a housing fund or is the interest paid into general revenue? I understand that, since the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement has been made, persons who have contracts have been asked to pay an extra percentage per year until the interest rate reaches 1 per cent below the long-term bond rate that prevails at any particular time, that figure being the maximum to be paid. This has amounted to quite a considerable sum, which is paid back to the States. A request on the matter was made by the Commonwealth, and the State Government agreed. Is the money involved used for housing or paid into general revenue of the State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain information about exactly what happens to this money, and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier say what is the estimated overall cost of the Royal Commission into the Floodlighting of Football Park? A conservative estimate of cost to bodies other than the Government is $130 000. In the early stages of the Commission, the cost to the Government was reported to be more than $100 000. Bearing in mind that the decision to allow floodlighting was made by the Government before a Royal Commission was convened, and the Royal Commission ruled in favour of the original lighting proposals of the South Australian National Football League, I consider that the public is entitled to know the cost.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask the Minister of Transport to obtain the information because he had the carriage in this matter. I think he will appreciate that the cost is not known to the Government as yet. The honourable member knows the reason for the Royal Commission; the Government had no other way in which to conduct the sort of inquiry that was necessary to solve the problem with proper protection for the witnesses and for the arbitrator.

Mr. Millhouse: That's open to some doubt.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member can say it is open to some doubt but the advice I had, which came from a more reliable source than the member for Mitcham,—

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —was that there could not be adequate protection for witnesses or for the arbitrator himself if an inquiry had proceeded on any other basis. The honourable member knows that, but he would still want to make a noise about it.

Mr. Millhouse: It was an extensive waste of money.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Mitcham could not tell this House, or anyone else, what other method could have been used to resolve the problem. He knows that, and I challenge him to tell us of another method. He knows that the Government was reluctant and did not want to have a Royal Commission to solve the problem, but there was no other course open.

Mr. Millhouse: That's rubbish.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Of course it is not rubbish, and the honourable member knows it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will cease interjecting. If he continues in this vein, he will be warned.

Mr. Millhouse: Mr. Speaker, he is being very provocative.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain information about the cost. Perhaps the Royal Commission cost almost as much as the police inquiry into allegations made by the member for Hanson some time ago.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of the general revenue a further sum of $270 000 000 for the Public Service for the financial year ending 30 June 1980. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides $270 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill which, together with the detailed Estimates of Expenditure for 1979-80, I expect to present to the House later this session. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for $220 000 000 and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The amount was the same as that provided in the first Supply Bill in 1978. The Bill now before the House is for $270 000 000 (the same amount as the second Supply Bill in 1978), which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until debate on the Appropriation Bill is complete and assent received. The Bill provides the same kind of authority as has been granted in the Supply Acts in previous years.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR FUEL RATIONING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 July. Page 227.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Liberal Party supports the Bill, although it is not entirely satisfied with it; it is certainly supported so that amendments can be made. The Bill deals with the possibility of a petrol shortage within the State. It is worth while looking at the two possible reasons why such a shortage may occur: first, there is the new world energy crisis, with supply problems from countries in the Middle East, and especially OPEC countries.

In the last two months, the world has suddenly woken up to how short oil supplies are and what the world will face if those supplies do not come through at least at the rate we have had in the past. Countries are suddenly

starting to realise there may not be the fuel oil available to produce petrol so that motorists can use private cars in the way they have done in the past.

I have found rather devastating effects in South Australia. A company telephoned me recently and pointed out that its crude oil supplies had been cut by 50 per cent. Being a country-based industry, it was faced with an almost impossible task of trying to produce heating on a substantial basis from some other source of energy. Virtually every other source of energy it looked at was quite impracticable in terms of cost. It was not in a position to use natural gas. So, one can realise the devastating effects that could occur to our society in the case of shortage. I think anyone would agree that in such a case the Government must take control of the situation. If it does not, we will have the chaos that is currently being experienced in certain States of the United States of America.

It is interesting to look at the other reason for petrol shortage, which is the likely effects of an industrial dispute, particularly at the oil refineries. The Minister in his second reading speech refers to five such cases where there has already been an industrial dispute which has led to a shortage of refined petrol in South Australia. So, the Bill is designed to cope with those two possibilities—the shortage of world crude oil and the unofficial shortage brought about by industrial disputation.

Several countries around the world have already faced the possibility of rationing petrol. Even industrialised nations like New Zealand have adopted a practice whereby motorists can use their motor vehicle for only six of the seven days a week. President Carter has recently attempted to introduce petrol rationing legislation, quite unsuccessfully. I understand that Congress knocked the measure back.

Here in Australia the Federal Government has adopted a policy of attempting to reduce crude oil consumption by 10 per cent over the next 12 months. If that is its target, I think this State should look at what role it plays in trying to assist that. I certainly support the policy of the present Prime Minister in encouraging the use of l.p.g. in motor vehicles, especially in the metropolitan area. Of course, that needs a change in attitude by companies, especially vehicle manufacturers, so that they can readily use l.p.g. without having to spend about $700 to have special equipment fitted to the motor vehicle.

I think a Bill like this measure also raises the possibility of what dispute-solving procedure should be adopted in the case of an industrial dispute in an essential service. So far, there is no laid down procedure to solve the dispute once it occurs in an essential service. An example has occurred recently with the Torrens Island power station, where a group of labourers lost their cool and, despite the fact that they did not actually work in the production of power, they went down and picketed the Torrens Island power station, thereby threatening the supply of power to the entire Adelaide metropolitan area. The cost of that ran into millions, even though it was only a spontaneous type of dispute.

I believe that that type of disruption should force this Parliament to introduce legislation to establish a compulsory dispute-solving procedure for essential services. I am referring specifically to the power industry, petrol refining industry and the transport industry, and other essential services that the entire community depends upon. Any such compulsory dispute-solving procedure should include compulsory conciliation, compulsory arbitration, a cooling-off period, and a compulsory vote (or a mandatory vote), with employees using a secret ballot before they are able to strike within that industry.

I believe such a procedure would give some protection to the community before an essential service is cut off, and certainly it would give the Minister of Labour and Industry some warning that such a dispute was brewing. On several occasions when the Opposition has attacked the Government as to why it has not taken action on disputes, the Minister's sole defence has been that he did not realise that the dispute was brewing, as no-one had in fact informed him until the strike had already occurred.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to what I see as one major area of shortage of petrol within our community, that is, industrial disputes. As the Minister pointed out in his second reading speech, a shortage occurred in 1972, 1973, 1974, 1976 and 1977 due to industrial disputes. I make a comparison between the operation of this Bill and the previous Bill debated in this House on 15 February 1978. The House no doubt recalls that on that occasion the Liberal Party supported the Bill to the second reading stage but then attempted to make several amendments. We objected to that Bill because of the way in which the Government was seeking powers to ration fuel.

First, it gave the Government the power to take complete control of all supplies in any vessel of 44 gallons or greater. In that case it referred to litres, but it was equivalent to 44 gallons. So the farmer who had a 44-gallon drum of fuel out in the paddock could suddenly be forced to stop using that fuel and to come to Adelaide and seek a permit (no doubt in a long queue at the State Administration Building) before being allowed to use that fuel for farm purposes.

The approach this time by the Government has been quite different. On this occasion the Government, instead of attempting to take control of all petrol supplies, is attempting to control the sale of petrol, so it is placing restrictions requiring a permit before a person can sell or buy petrol from a retailer, and retailers will be required to carry details and have permission before they are allowed to sell petrol during a rationing period. Certainly as an Opposition we would support that change of procedure adopted here. Secondly, we support the change in the powers given to police to question people.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you looked at the clause?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, I have looked at the clause in the previous Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't have looked at it too closely.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member will have a chance to speak to the Bill, and we will look forward to his speech. One would hope that he is not so impetuous as to try to interject in the Chamber at present. The previous Bill gave the power to the police to stop a person, to ask that person from where he had come, where he was going, and the purpose of the visit. I am pleased to say that that power is not included in this Bill.

The third objection we had to the previous Bill was that it failed to give the power to the Government to tackle what could be seen as the cause of the petrol shortage, and that was the industrial dispute. So we attempted to amend that previous Bill in exactly the same way as the Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Neville Wran) drafted his emergency legislation. I would like to read to the House the provision introduced by the New South Wales Premier. Section 32 (1) *(b)* (ii) and (iii) provides:

> (ii) to direct a person who extracts, provides, transports or distributes the proclaimed form of energy to extract it for or provide, transport or distribute it to a person specified in the regulation;
>
> (iii) to specify the terms and conditions on which the

> proclaimed form of energy shall be extracted, provided, transported or distributed;

The Bill does not give the Government that type of power. It does give a power to direct any corporate body, and I believe that it is an uneven approach by the Government to say that it has complete control over a corporate body, with a fine of $10 000 if that body fails to obey that direction, yet no power is given to the Government to direct an employee who may be causing the shortage. I hope we will put balance into the Bill to allow for a direction to both a corporate body and an employee. In other words, the Government should be able to direct any person who is stopping the supply of fuel.

One major objection that I have to the Bill is the lack of an appeal provision. It gives power to the Minister to grant a licence. However, although the rationing period can be for only a maximum of 30 days, during that period a person could be put out of business if the Minister's decision was somewhat unfair, unjust, and perhaps discriminatory against one company compared to another in the same line of business. There should be some form of appeal against the Minister's decision. I think he will agree that, if thousands of people in South Australia are asking for permits and he has to consider them quickly and in a rushed way, as he will have to do under such emergency legislation, he will make mistakes. I am not saying the mistakes will be deliberate: they may be unintentional, but there should be provision for a person to seek justice.

I believe that there should be provision for an appeal against the decision of the Minister not to issue a permit, or on the ground that the quota given under the permit is unreasonably low. I concede that such an appeal should not go through the full procedure of court, because that could take more than 30 days and the period of rationing would be over. I envisage that the appeal would be to a judge of the Local Court, in Chambers, in the most informal manner possible, and to take place as quickly as possible.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you think it is quicker if it is in Chambers?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought he might answer—

The SPEAKER: It is not Question Time.

Mr. Millhouse: He doesn't know the answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will have an opportunity to speak in this debate. I have spoken to him once previously today.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The main point we are debating here is whether such a power should be given to a Government, and, in general, I do not believe that such power should be given. In an emergency, Parliament should be called together to grant such extreme powers. I think the Minister will agree that the powers given in the Bill are not the kind that we, in a democratic society, like to hand out readily. I think a case can be established that the possibility of an energy shortage is real, as is the possibility of industrial action affecting supplies of fuel. Perhaps a shortage would occur in a time when it would be extremely inconvenient to call Parliament together, such as in some period over Christmas, and the power should be on the Statute Book for the Government to take immediate action.

I repeat that the power applies for only 30 days. It cannot be extended beyond that or reintroduced until a further period of 30 days expires, so I believe that it is reasonable and proper for such a power to be put on the Statute Book. However, I think we need to be careful about how we can operate that. Certainly, I would be opposed to the period being extended beyond 30 days without Parliament being called together. The Liberal Party intends to support this Bill at the second reading stage, because we see it as essential legislation. However, we hope that the Minister will be reasonable enough to put some balance in it and allow some right of appeal so that justice can be done to all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I agree with the member for Davenport that this is a Bill that ought to be supported in principle, and I certainly do support it. A few years ago a similar Bill regarding motor fuel would have been unthinkable in this State, but now we are waking up to the realities of life, that from time to time there is a shortage and that the frequency of shortages will increase as time goes by, until, I believe, eventually the supply of these fuels will dry up altogether.

We must be prepared for that in the long term. In the short term, there is nothing else we can do but give the Government power to ration. Recent experience shows that that often comes on us quite suddenly, and it is wise for the Government to have powers to ration fuels. I have a few points to make about the Bill, but, first, I should like to say that I particularly appreciate the powers that the Minister is taking in clause 9. Clause 9 (1) provides:

> Where, in the opinion of the Minister, it is in the public interest to do so, he may, during a rationing period, give directions to any body corporate carrying on a business involving the supply of motor fuel in relation to the supply of rationed motor fuel.

Although there is the qualification about being only during the rationing period, that provision comes fairly close to my intention, in a notice of motion that I gave yesterday, to give the Minister power to make sure that, when there is not sufficient supply at any level of the system for all retailers to get their supplies, he can make sure that what is available is distributed equitably.

That comes again to the problem that we have had in the past few weeks with Southern Cross Petroleum. I understand that people from that company approached members of the Labor Party and the Liberal Party without success. Then they approached me, because the matter was getting urgent. I was able to launch some publicity for them and put them in touch with my Federal colleague Senator Chipp, who took up the matter at Federal level. We did what we could and I accept that the Government here, although I was disappointed that it did not get anywhere, genuinely tried to help. I looked at the legislation in force in this State and, although the Southern Cross people considered that there might be a chance in one of our Acts (I forget which one)—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Consumer protection legislation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it was. We have something to do with licensing petrol supplies, have we not? Anyway, I looked at an Act which they suggested might help, but it did not do so. I was satisfied at the time that there was no legislation that could force Golden Fleece or Esso to be equitable in supplying retailers.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you agree that the State Government could have the constitutional power to introduce it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid the member for Davenport has not been following my argument. That is irrelevant to the point that I am making, which is that there is not power now. I realise that there is another side to the matter and, after the publicity for Southern Cross, several Golden Fleece dealers telephoned me and said, "Good heavens, go easy: we are in trouble, too. We cannot get our supplies from Golden Fleece."

I know that there was trouble all around for Golden

Fleece. I have no doubt, if Southern Cross had to prefer one section (either the independents or Southern Cross), which they would prefer, and Southern Cross would go to the wall. I hope that that will not happen. In the past few days, I have received a reasonably optimistic letter from Mr. Tonkin dated 27 July, which states:

> Locally our position has not changed a lot. We have scaled down our operations considerably and now that the price has gone up we are finding that the bulk fuel agents are tending to defy their oil companies and supply us petrol in bits and pieces under the lap. It is very expensive fuel but we are keeping alive and retaining most of our personnel as we endeavour to buy time.
>
> The Shell oil company, after stating in writing that they could not tender due to shortage of supply have signed up for twelve months our largest volume shareholder. He is the only one to break the ranks but Shell's performance on that one was incredible. I believe that the Golden Fleece representative asked [someone in a country town] if they would consider becoming a Fleece site.

At the time of writing the letter, he had not heard of the result of the Deputy Premier's visit to Melbourne last Wednesday week, and he was hoping to hear. It was a very difficult situation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Hasn't he been told now by the Deputy Premier?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The letter was dated 27 July, and he may well have been told by now. I think Hugh Hudson mentioned it in the House the other day, and I am not implying any criticism in that regard. Except by publicity, and therefore the pressure of public opinion, there was no other way in which we could help Southern Cross Petroleum. That way, difficult though it was, does seem to have been of some help to them, and I hope they can keep going.

It seems to me that, under this Bill, the Minister will, at least during a rationing period, have time to direct an equitable distribution at the wholesale level of the fuel that is available. One last point I would make—it is nothing new, it has been made before—is that there is a very great suspicion that the shortage which has so bugged Southern Cross was an artificial one, and not a real one. They are convinced of that. Whether or not that is so, I do not know, but the Bill leaves it up to the Minister. It is his opinion and, however it is created, if there is a shortage he can do something about it. A few years ago, such a Bill would have been unthinkable, but today it is a reality and we have to accept it.

Clause 10 is a pretty strong clause. I am not critical of it, but it gives the Minister power to get information about supplies at any time, not only during a rationing period. Obviously, if he sees or believes that a period of shortage is coming, before it comes he should know what supplies there are, but it is a power that could be abused. I am not suggesting that he would abuse it, but it is a wide power.

I do not like clause 11. The member for Davenport apparently thinks it is all right, but I do not like cutting out every avenue of approach to the courts, and that is what clause 11 does. It states:

> No action to restrain or compel the Minister, or a delegate of the Minister, to take or refrain from taking any action in pursuance of this Act shall be entertained by any court.

That is a Draconian provision, and I think at the moment that it is unnecessary. The marginal note describes it as "Actions for injunctions and mandamus against Minister"; they are out. The member for Davenport is quite wrong (and I do not blame him, because he does not have the knowledge, and there is no-one in his Party to give it to him) in saying that any proceedings which could be taken if that clause is not passed might last more than 30 days. He should be told—and I am telling him—that it is possible, in extreme emergencies, for a judge to make an order even over the telephone, without it being in writing. There is no reason why a matter such as this, if it is important and urgent, cannot be dealt with in a matter of hours. Because people are members of the Supreme Court Bench, they are not absolutely inaccessible; quite the reverse. I do not believe that that clause is warranted, and I should like to see it cut out of the Bill. It is very severe, Draconian, and I think at present unnecessary.

The other clause which the member for Davenport apparently thinks is all right is clause 13. I acknowledge that the police must have power, but it seems to me that the way the clause is drawn makes it very difficult. If a motorist is blithely driving along the street, how is he to know, if he is signalled by a police officer, that the police officer is exercising power under this provision? The power to stop a vehicle under clause 13 (1) *(a)* is only for the purposes of this legislation. How on earth does a police officer who is flagging down a person communicate to the driver sufficiently to let him know that he is acting pursuant to clause 13 (1) *(a)* of this Bill?

If a person ignores the flagging down of a police officer—and so far as I know there is no automatic obligation on any person to stop just because a police officer tells him to, although almost everyone does because he thinks he has got to, but he has not—if he does not stop, I would not have thought, unless the officer has been able to communicate that he is being stopped for the purposes of this legislation, that he is committing any offence. It is, perhaps, a mechanical thing. I do not think I am seeing a difficulty where there is none. I believe there is a difficulty here and it is because, included in the drafting, are the words "for the purpose of putting questions to the driver of a motor vehicle under paragraph *(b)* of this subsection". If that were not included, I do not think there would be any problem, but then it would give power to stop for any purpose. It is a difficulty. It may have been considered, and perhaps there was no other way around it, but it bears a little thought because, in its present form, it is unsatisfactory.

I do not believe that offences which carry terms of imprisonment—I see 12 months here, and there may be more severe terms—and a fine of $10 000 should be dealt with by a magistrate, and that is the effect of providing for proceedings for offences to be disposed of summarily. I believe that, when we get to big money like that (and $10 000, the maximum fine, is still a lot of money), although a magistrate now can give up to two years imprisonment, with a $10 000 fine, a person is entitled, if he wishes, to be tried by a jury. We have made it much easier to have trial by jury in this State. We have District Criminal Courts. When you are going to mulct a person of that amount of money, it is only fair that he should be tried by a group of his peers, another group of citizens, if he wishes.

I do not like clause 15, but no-one else seems to worry too much about it in either House. Those are the comments that I think should be made on improvements to strengthen the Bill in one case and to reduce its powers in another. They are my suggestions, but by and large I support the Bill, as I think it is absolutely necessary. It has been necessary to have these powers in the past, and we have not had them. It will be increasingly necessary in future.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the second reading. We all appreciate that, over recent years, we have come dangerously close to a very serious situation in our fuel supplies in this State. Our past experience has been

that industrial disputes have brought us close to embarrassment, but we also have facing us the possibility of unavailability of supplies, and we should have on our Statute Book measures enabling the Government to take the necessary action at comparatively short notice. Perhaps we could argue about whether this measure should be on the Statute Book, because the Government can recall Parliament in case of an emergency, but, if we are to be honest and practical, this situation could arise, and it is only reasonable that the measure should be there so that the Government can act, hopefully in the best interests of the citizens.

My greatest concern about this matter (and I moved a notice of motion on the subject) is that the needs of primary industry and the fishing industry are considered should any rationing period be implemented. For instance, should a rationing period commence on 15 November, it could well be that little of our total grain harvest could be taken off.

The SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member is more or less speaking to his amendment to the Bill at the moment.

Mr. BLACKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your guidance. People in my district are concerned about what will happen to them if there is rationing; no doubt, constituents of most members want their member to look after their interests. Clause 5 provides:

(3) A rationing period shall expire—

(a) upon the revocation of the proclamation under which it commenced;

Can the Government say that there will be, for instance, a rationing period of two months and state that on the proclamation?

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

Mr. BLACKER: I accept the Minister's advice that it will be a 30-day maximum. Paragraph *(b)* provides for 30 days, but I wondered whether the two paragraphs of the subclause were connected.

Another matter, which was raised by the member for Mitcham, relates to summary offences. I do not have any legal training, but I am concerned that, under clause 14, a person is guilty until proved innocent. In other words, he is obliged to prove that the complaint lodged against him is not true. I think that that is a dangerous provision. In today's society every person is entitled to be thought innocent until proven guilty.

The question of the proceedings being disposed of summarily has been raised. I agree with the statement already made that, if penalties or fines in excess of $10 000 and imprisonment for six months are provided, surely these people are entitled to take their case before the court. I will support the second reading because I think that the Government has the right to step in at short notice should a shortage of fuel become imminent through industrial action or a lack of supply. I understand that during a recent dispute the State Transport Authority was reduced to one day's fuel supply. That being the case, there is obviously a need for Government action. I think that this Bill will serve the Government's purposes in this matter. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): Members will be given an opportunity to deal with most of the matters they have raised by amendment in the Committee stage. The member for Mitcham, while giving the Bill general approval, made some criticism, which may or may not have some justification (being a lawyer he may be right and I may be wrong about a couple of things). Nevertheless, he has not bothered to put on file amendments to the Bill.

I want to assure the House, and the public of South Australia, that everything was done by this Government that could be done to assist Southern Cross Petroleum, using the present legislation at the Government's disposal. The law was examined by lawyers and advice was given that the Government had no enforcement power, so it had to involve itself in voluntary negotiations with the oil companies, particularly with BP, and so forth. That was done at length on four different occasions. I interviewed Mr. Tonkin, the company President, and other officers of Southern Cross on several occasions. What the Government was able to do was done under the present law. I, like the honourable member, want to see this company survive.

Mr. Millhouse: It's just a pity that Peter Duncan had given such wide open assurances a couple of years ago that it thought it could rely on.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I cannot be held responsible for what somebody else said, or did not say. I am not sure that the assurances given by the Hon. Peter Duncan were as emphatic as it is said they were.

Mr. Millhouse: I've seen a transcript of them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have seen a transcript, too. That company was given all the protection it could be given in present circumstances. I want to see it survive. I was somewhat responsible, in the initiating stages, for suggesting it do as it did, and it was a very successful venture during the period while there was no crisis about supply. I was pleased to see how Southern Cross was going, and I am disappointed that the international crisis has brought about a slowing down. If the position does not stabilise at a future stage, some of these places may have to close down. I sincerely hope that that is not the case. I understand from the Deputy Premier that the management in Melbourne was able to guarantee at least 40 per cent of the supply for August. It may be that that can be improved as time goes on; I sincerely hope so.

The three members who spoke supported the Bill in principle except for three amendments, which we will talk about later. I want to say something about the member for Davenport, who really used this forum to talk on the industrial level; he talked more about the industrial connotations of this Bill than he did about the necessity for rationing. He also said that in my second reading explanation I gave five instances in which industrial stoppages caused shortages. Nothing in my second reading explanation relates to industrial stoppages. I merely pointed out that on five separate occasions there were petrol shortages in this State; I made no reference to why those shortages existed.

Mr. Dean Brown: You agree that—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: They were not all caused by industrial disputations, because I recall that in one instance at least the cause was a fire. I do not recall all of the instances; certainly some of them were caused by industrial trouble at that plant. It would not matter what sort of legislation we had dealing with confrontations; it just will not work. The member for Davenport ought to have learned that by now, after his four or five years going around telling people how to fix up industrial disputes. He does not know how to fix them. It would be a nice state of affairs if he was running the State in this particular area! The important thing about this Bill is that it gives power to the Government to ration and control petrol supplies in times of shortage.

Mr. Dean Brown: You disagree—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! This is the third time that the honourable member for Davenport has been

called to order. I hope that he will take notice of the Chair.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I heard him in silence today. I did not interject once and I would have hoped that he would extend the same courtesy to me. The member for Mitcham did not mention the industrial problems. I think he understands the industrial scene better than does the member for Davenport. The member for Mitcham made some criticism, but he did not get into the area on which the member for Davenport built his platform for this debate. The member for Davenport wanted to say again something about the nasty unionists, controlling them, confrontation, and so on. That was the basis of the speech; it was not about the necessity to ration petrol. I will not have any part of that. I have had no part of that in the past when attempts have been made in this place and in the other place to allow the Government to control every person working within industry.

The member for Davenport said something about its not being proper in a democracy to do something or other. I could not think of anything more undemocratic than giving any Government the right to issue orders and instructions to every person working in an industry. That is what the member for Davenport is asking this Government to do. There is no possibility of that happening, and the honourable member knows that it will not happen.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Permits."

Mr. BLACKER: I move:

Page 3, after line 42 insert subclause as follows:

(10) In determining to whom permits should be granted under this section, the Minister shall have due regard to the needs of primary industry in the light of seasonal conditions as they exist from time to time.

The use of motor fuel in the country is very much a seasonal requirement. In many cases a farmer with an auto-header with a petrol-driven machine would find that 85 per cent or 90 per cent of his farm fuel consumption for a year would be during a one-month period. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that the Government shall have due regard and recognise the needs of the industry in that particular time. Should a rationing period commence on 15 November there would be considerable difficulties within the total grain industry, and a similar situation applies to other primary industries. For example, from 1 March the prawn-fishing industry could be seriously affected if this were to be the case. It is well known in country areas that the fastest selling commodity is the overhead fuel tank. Every farm engineer is rapidly building these tanks. I was at a small engineering shop the other day that had seven such tanks at various stages of construction. To alleviate the fear in primary industry, this amendment needs to be written into the legislation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have to oppose the amendment, although there is a good reason for it. I do not want to place primary industry in any worse position than is any other industry in this State, but at the same time I do not want to place it in any better position than is any other industry in the State. I would have to take into consideration, at the time, what was happening. I give the guarantee that I will give every consideration to the protection of the people in the country, and I think any Minister would take that stand. That must be judged at a certain stage; it cannot be done by inserting of a provision like this.

In my view this provision could not be written in without also accommodating other industries of a vital nature. We could finish up with a clause covering all sorts of vital industries in the State, and we would have no power then to ration because we would have to consider all those areas for which the legislation provided. Even then we might not be able to fulfil our obligations. I think the position should be left for it to be considered on the merits of what is occurring at the time, with the earnest consideration of the Government being given to the farming communities in a crisis or in other circumstances.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed that the Minister will not support this amendment, which I support. With deference to the member for Flinders, I say that it is not much more than a cosmetic amendment because it does not say that the Minister must do anything; it merely puts an obligation on him to have due regard to the needs of primary industry in the light of seasonal conditions.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I said I'd do that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister is prepared to do that, why is he not prepared to have it written into the legislation?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Where would it stop?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It stops where the amendment stops. It is only telling him that he has to look at the matter; it does not put any obligation on him. I have no difficulty at all in supporting my friend from Flinders on that. I would have had some difficulty if he had said that absolute supply priority had to be given, which was in his notice of motion yesterday, which I seconded, because I think that is going too far.

This is really only a guide, to make sure that the Minister's attention is directed to the matter without putting any obligation on the Minister at all. As for his fear that it might go further, it is up to him whether it goes further or not, as he has the numbers in this place. I do not see how it can go any further than that. It is really only a gesture and, because it is a gesture to a section of the community which is very important and which, I think, as a member for Flinders says, feels itself threatened in the present situation, I think it is amply justified.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will accept it in the light of what has been said by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. BLACKER: I thank the Minister for his consideration because people in primary industry felt that, unless they could get some assurance from the Minister, they would not be guaranteed supplies to take off a harvest after all the trouble of planting.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the Minister, after consideration, has accepted this reasonable amendment. I think he would be aware, as other members have pointed out, that there is concern, and people will now be greatly relieved. There might not be the necessity now for them to store large quantities of fuel, for which most people do not have a need. I think the Minister would be aware that, particularly in the more marginal parts of the State, some of which are in my electorate, there is a limited period in which to plant crops. If crops are not in the ground, there can be problems. If there is a shortage of fuel, a terrible predicament could result for people in South Australia.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 passed.

New clause 8a—"Application for review of administrative decisions in relation to permits."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

Page 4, after clause 8 insert new clause as follows:

8a. (1) Where the Minister decides—

(a) to refuse to grant, or to cancel a permit; or

(b) to grant a permit subject to conditions, any person aggrieved by that decision may apply to a judge for a review of that decision.

(2) An application under this section shall be made by instrument in writing addressed to the judge setting out the

grounds on which the applicant objects to the decision of the Minister.

(3) An application under this section may be heard and determined in chambers and without formality.

(4) Where the judge is satisfied that a decision of the Minister should be varied or reversed he may direct the Minister to vary or reverse his decision accordingly.

(5) A direction shall not be given under subsection (4) of this section unless the Minister has been allowed a reasonable opportunity to be heard upon the application.

(6) The Minister shall observe any direction of the judge under subsection (4) of this section.

(7) Where an application has been made to a judge under this section no further application shall be made to the same or any other judge in respect of the same matter.

(8) The decision of a judge upon an application under this section shall be final and without appeal.

(9) In this section—"judge" means a judge of a local court.

The effect of this amendment is to insert a new clause to allow for an appeal against the decision of the Minister. As I pointed out in the second reading debate, the Bill as it is drafted gives complete and absolute power to the Minister in deciding who should obtain a permit, and also in relation to the petrol sales allowed to the permit holder. That power is extensive, and I point out the haste with which the Minister would be making many decisions. I believe there is almost bound to be an injustice done because people have changing circumstances in which they may have applied for a permit, been rejected, and believe that the Minister does not understand or appreciate the circumstances confronting them. There is a need for the right to appeal against the decision of the Minister.

Obviously, any appeal will have to be fairly hasty; there is no point in having extended periods because the entire rationing period is only 30 days. I propose that the appeal should be heard by a judge of the Local Court, in Chambers. I point out that the amendment as drafted would not allow a further appeal on the decision of the judge of the Local Court, so the decision would be final. I hope the Minister, in his wisdom, will accept the amendment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In any circumstances other than an emergency, I would accept the proposition, but this is a Motor Fuel Rationing Bill, which will be introduced only in times of emergency and crisis. How is it possible for anyone in those circumstances to depend on an appeal? A state of crisis will exist. During the last crisis situation, hundreds of permits were issued daily. I am not saying that mistakes will not be made, but I am saying that there will be no time in a crisis period even to consider appeals because a date of hearing cannot be set, or the evidence considered in such a short time.

How long will it take? The last crisis did not last longer than six or seven days. I am not saying there would not be mistakes made; they certainly would not be deliberate. The proposition is not practical in regard to this sort of Bill, which will be used only at times of emergency and crisis. In any other circumstances, I would not object to an appeal provision because it would be proper. However, an appeal provision is not practical in these circumstances.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I agree with the Minister in this matter. Normally, I am the last one to say that there should not be an appeal, but he has pointed to the circumstances. The crux is, to me, that a Local Court judge will be asked to make a decision on an administrative matter, not on a matter of law at all. With due deference to Their Honours, they are really in no better position than anyone else to make that kind of quick decision.

As the Minister says, this Bill will only apply in an emergency. I do not think it will necessarily take time for an appeal, because that could be done quickly, but why is a judge to be given power to overrule a Minister on a purely administrative matter when that judge, in the nature of the circumstances, is highly unlikely to be in any better position than the Minister or one of his senior officials to make a decision? That is the problem.

I used the word "Draconian" earlier. This legislation will be used, at least in the foreseeable future (and it may get worse later when it might have to be changed), when sudden crises blow up and something has to be done quickly. In all the circumstances I suggest it would be far better for the member for Davenport not to worry about this amendment but to support me in knocking out clause 11 which, to me, is the ultimate safety valve and the one we should retain, rather than putting in what I think is an inappropriate form of appeal.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am amazed that the member for Mitcham purports to be a democrat and yet he is prepared to give to the Minister an absolute power, a power that I think anyone with any sense would agree could cause absolutely devastating economic consequences to a person if he could not get fuel for the purposes of business, big or small. I am astounded that someone who purports so often to represent the interests of the individual, the small business man, is prepared to oppose an amendment that provides an appeal against the Minister's decision.

The Minister's statement upheld the point I was making that permits will be issued in haste and that mistakes will be made. The Minister has blithely sat back, as he so often does, and said, "To hell with the consequences: people will have to put up with this and suffer", not for six days but up to 30 days, because the Bill gives power to the Minister to ration fuel for 30 days. I am not surprised by the Minister's reaction to this amendment but I am surprised by the member for Mitcham, because I thought at least he had some principles when it came to the rights of the individual. Unfortunately, the member for Mitcham does not on all occasions uphold such rights. Perhaps it is a charade that he occasionally carries on for political purposes.

I certainly support this amendment. I believe it is essential, if we are to have a rationing period such as is provided for in the Bill. I do not believe that in a modern democracy any Minister should have such overwhelming powers with absolutely no rights whatsoever for the individual. Too often complete and absolute power is given to Governments to do whatever they like, and to hell with the individual. I can think of numerous examples where Governments, by bureaucratic decision, have destroyed or devastated the lives of the individual. The Labor Party, unfortunately, does not give too much credence to the individual. It believes that the State (or what it interprets as the State), is almighty and that the Government has complete and absolute control—to hell with the individual. I certainly do not accept that standard.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not intend to prolong this debate any further because I believed what I said was the proper argument and that was supported by the member for Mitcham in these circumstances. However, the member for Davenport has alleged that the Labor Party is not concerned about individuals. The record book stands in our favour in that area, and that is why we get the majority of votes—people do recognise that we look after them.

I have just had this matter checked while the debate has been going on. For the information of the honourable member, the only two pieces of similar legislation I could check in that short time, in Western Australia and New

South Wales (one being Liberal and one Labor), do not have a provision of the type the honourable member wants to put in this legislation.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crafter, Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Gunn and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Hudson and Olson.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 9—"Directions in relation to the supply of national motor fuel."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

Page 5, lines 4 to 6—Leave out "any body corporate carrying on a business involving the supply of motor fuel in relation to the supply of rationed motor fuel" and insert "any person in relation to the manufacture or supply of motor fuel".

The reason for moving this amendment is that the Minister has absolute power to direct a corporate body to carry out his instructions to supply motor fuel. Although he has that absolute power for a corporate body, he has not taken that same power in relation to directing employees or individuals. I see that there needs to be an even-handed approach in this matter. I have pointed out the power written into the New South Wales Act by a Labor Premier. I stress to the Minister that I am simply advocating here the adoption of similar power already adopted in New South Wales by a Labor Premier. Only a few moments ago, the Minister thought it important enough to point out that he apparently held the New South Wales Act in high regard because he said there were no appeal provisions in the New South Wales Act. If the Minister holds the New South Wales Act in high regard, I hope he will accept this amendment.

A vast majority of the recent short supplies of petrol have been caused by industrial disputes, and I would bet London to a brick on that the next shortage of petrol that will require a rationing period will again be caused by an industrial dispute. The Minister can say that I am abusing the unions. I am not doing that; I am simply being a realist. The odds are that the next shortage of petrol will be caused by an industrial dispute, that shortage being severe enough to cause rationing of petrol. If that is the case, the Minister needs the power to cope with the situation. There is no point in just adopting the power to direct a corporate body.

He knows only too well that he can say to a corporate body, "You shall distribute the fuel." He also knows the corporate body is protected if there happens to be a strike on and it cannot achieve that. Therefore, he is adopting the power in which he is prepared to instruct employers but not apply exactly the same standard to the employees. I cannot see how he can claim to be a fair Minister of industrial relations if he is prepared to take under his wing absolute powers in directing employers but not the same absolute powers in directing employees. It is again a classic case of the Minister very carefully protecting his industrial base, the trade union movement.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The difference between the honourable member and me is that I only want to control the product. I do not want to control the union resources within the industry that makes that product. They are two different areas. The product is what this legislation is all about. We are seeking control of the product, not of the end resources in that area.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why are you prepared to direct a corporate body?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Because if I cannot control the petrol or the product, there can be no rationing. Surely, even the member for Davenport can see that argument. Surely there must be a control of the product within the industry.

That is where the different beliefs come in. I do not think it makes any difference whether you put it in the legislation or not: it cannot be exercised.

Mr. Chapman: Rubbish!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Fraser isn't doing very well in exercising his powers. It is time the Liberals woke up to how to control industrial disputes. It is not by confrontation.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why do you think Neville Wran put it in his measure?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not hold up Neville Wran's Bill as the ideal Bill: I held it up in only one regard—the control —which I checked. In the last amendment that we dealt with, the honourable member tried to restrict my power by placing it in the hands of a judge. Now he is trying to give me the widest powers possible. He is not leaving it where the petrol emanates, but is taking it right down to a worker in a service station. Has any Government the right to have that sort of control? Is that what democracy is about?

The Opposition talked about overwhelming powers when we were dealing with the previous amendment, and now it is trying to give me more power. Are we being consistent, or are we merely moving amendments that we think are politically popular? I have incited the Leader to come in. That is good, because the more they talk about control the better I like it. If that is the philosophy of the Liberal Party, it will never win Government in this State. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. TONKIN: It gives me pleasure to support the amendment. It is unusual to find the Minister speaking so quietly on this subject, but he is not speaking rationally. He is working on the assumption that trade union officials are above the law that applies to everyone else. That is the basis of his objection to the amendment. It seems rational that, if corporate bodies can be directed and controlled by the Minister in times of crisis, members of the work force and trade union officials should be subject to the same power of direction. To say that the position is separate and divorced is ridiculous, as the Minister knows.

This matter was debated some time ago on similar legislation, and the Minister adopted the same attitude. He was willing to fine the corporate bodies—the employers—if they did not comply with his direction, but he was not prepared to direct those producing and distributing the commodity. Although circumstances have changed because the likelihood of a crisis causing a fuel shortage is much greater now, the likelihood of a shortage caused by industrial action is as high as it used to be. The Minister now upholds the ridiculous situation that the shortage of fuel is likely to be due to an industrial action, and he is denying himself the power to direct the people who cause the dispute and, therefore, the shortage, to supply essential areas.

The Minister is not being honest and the truth of the matter is that this legislation has been considered by his masters on South Terrace. He knows that it is the policy of his Party to exempt trade union officials at common law and he is not prepared to do what is best for the State in an

emergency. He is not prepared to direct every section of the community associated with fuel. His action does not make sense; it is inconsistent, and it is hypocritical. Perhaps, as the Minister says, it does not matter whether the provision is in or not, but Mr. Wran has put it in, and he has done much more. He is the sort of Labor Premier who is giving some hope of sense coming into industrial affairs, and I wish that we had a Minister and a Premier of his calibre here. Then we would be getting further.

We have a Minister, a Premier and a Cabinet totally bound by Trades Hall. That is the cause of this legislation. If, as the Minister says, it does not matter whether the provision is in, let us be fair, even-handed and just and let us put this provision in so that the Minister's power of direction applies to everyone in the industry. If he does not agree to that, he is not fair dinkum.

Mr. CHAPMAN: If the Minister accepts the argument put forward by the Opposition, it will place him in a position where he may have to confront his trade union representatives, and he is running away from that element. He is not prepared to place himself or his Government in a situation where they may have to confront the trade union movement.

It makes the Minister's remarks this afternoon, when he was agreeing to the amendment moved by the member for Flinders, rather hollow. He agreed to an amendment requiring him to have regard to the needs of primary industry, in the light of seasonal conditions that may exist. He can agree to that type of amendment. It does not matter which industry or group is involved: the Minister can agree and accept amendments of that type. However, the amendments are worthless unless he controls the distribution of fuel, and he does not have that control by simply having control over the authorities owning or operating the premises.

Unless he has control and is given the authority to have control in the legislative sense over those employed on industrial sites, those employees, through their trade union movement, will continue to dictate the degree of supply. The Minister knows that, we know that on this side, and I suggest the public know it, but the Minister denies taking on board the responsibility he should in this instance by giving that extra power to the Government, because he knows that, given the power, the Government will be challenged to use it, and it is not going to do so.

Mr. TONKIN: I think it worth putting on record what the Minister said by way of interjection just after I sat down. He said, "Of course, I have made up my mind. What do you think we bring legislation in here for—not for you to chop it around, or cut it up", or words to that effect. I should like to get that on record, because it demonstrates the Minister's attitude, not only to this legislation, but to many of the Bills introduced, and it is pretty symptomatic of the very sick condition of this Government. Parliament has become an unnecessary impediment to the Government's megalomanic way, and I hope the people of South Australia remember, in future, what has been said. It reminds me of another interjection across the Chamber some years ago when someone said, in response to a question from this side about our rights, "You're the Opposition. You haven't got any rights."

Mr. Dean Brown: From a person who is now a Minister.

Mr. TONKIN: Certainly, from a person who is now a Minister. I very much regret that level of attitude now adopted by Governments to the Parliamentary institution, and the Minister is not helping his case much by carrying on in the ridiculous fashion in which he is now carrying on.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McRae): Many members of the Committee are not helping the Committee by continually interjecting and ignoring the authority of the Chair and undermining it totally by talking directly to each other. I am trying to run this Committee in a fair manner. I will not continue to tolerate what has gone on in the last 10 minutes. It does not reflect much credit on any of the members here.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crafter, Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Gunn and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Hudson and Olson.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Davenport has further amendments on file.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The other amendments were consequential amendments.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Action for injunctions and mandamus against Minister."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose this clause. The effect of it is to take away what is, I think, the ultimate safeguard for any person, and that is to apply by way of prerogative writ to a judge of the Supreme Court for either, as set down here in the marginal note, an injunction or mandamus: an injunction to stop the Minister from doing something or mandamus to oblige him to do something.

We had a little dust-up some time ago about the amendment which the member for Davenport wanted to put in. I thought that was inappropriate, but I do not believe that a Minister should be put, as this clause puts him, above the law (that is what it means: it puts him absolutely above the law), because the ultimate safeguard of the citizen is to be able to go to a Supreme Court judge for an order either of mandamus or injunction.

Let me assure the Minister that such an order is not granted lightly. It might be done quickly, but the Minister would be given, within a matter of hours, an opportunity to put his side of the story and to have the order either discharged or confirmed. I do not believe that we are likely to face such a crisis in the near future as to take away what is the ultimate safeguard of the individual, and that is the right, in a real emergency, to apply for an order of this kind.

I assure the Minister that it is far less likely that such an order would be given to any person than that an appeal would be allowed, as was provided in the amendment that was lost some time ago. This would only be given in the most extreme circumstances. It would be given after the exercise of as much judicial discretion as could be exercised within a limited time. The Supreme Court judges are not fools, they are not people who can be pushed into things, and they will have due regard to both sides of the question. However, it is the ultimate and, if we cut out that ultimate by leaving the clause in, then literally the Minister is, for the purposes of this Bill, above the law. I do not believe we have reached that stage yet, and I hope we never do.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As our previous right of appeal was knocked out, I will support the member for Mitcham on this clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crafter, Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hudson and Olson. Noes —Messrs. Chapman and Goldsworthy.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): I wish to raise two matters if I have time. The first matter concerns the airport at West Beach. As honourable members may recall, last year two motions were before the House dealing with this matter. One motion was moved by the member for Hanson which sought to prohibit Adelaide Airport from ever becoming an international airport. The honourable member did not seek to put that motion to a vote or have it debated, because he did not have the support of his Party.

Mr. Becker: That's not true; I did not have time. Say that outside and see how you get on.

Mr. GROOM: I have no doubt about the honourable member's genuineness when it comes to the airport at West Beach. However, the problem for people who live in that area is that the honourable member does not have the support of his Party in relation to this matter. He was not prepared to put his motion to a vote last year, because he knew that most of his Party members would not support a prohibition on Adelaide Airport from ever becoming an international airport. It is well known that the Federal Government has a preference for Adelaide Airport becoming an international airport. This is probably despite the recent joint Government report that was released in Adelaide. Although that report has now been released for several months, the Federal Government has not sought to implement those recommendations regarding the acquisition of land in the Two Wells-Virginia area for the establishment of a permanent international airport. In the *Australian* earlier this month, under the heading "Airport curfews to be relaxed for jets", an article stated:

> Night curfews on aircraft at Sydney, Brisbane and Adelaide Airports have been relaxed by the Transport Department.

The article went on to say that big jet aircraft would be permitted to operate during the curfew hours.

Mr. Becker: No!

Mr. GROOM: The honourable member was very silent when these matters appeared in the press. This article appeared in the *Australian* earlier this month, when the Transport Department advised reporters—

Mr. Tonkin: What date was the issue?

Mr. GROOM: I do not have the exact date, but it was in July. I can obtain the exact date for the honourable member. The report was quite clear that the Federal Government wanted to permit more jet aircraft to operate during curfew hours at Adelaide Airport.

Mr. Tonkin: That's not true.

Mr. GROOM: This will please the Leader. A *News* report of 18 July (if the honourable member wants specific dates), under the heading "Jet curfew regulations ease", states:

> The Federal Government will allow more jet aircraft to use Adelaide Airport during the daily 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew. A spokesman for the Transport Minister, Mr. Nixon, said today it was certain an increasing number of planes would be permitted to land and take off during the curfew.

The member for Hanson knows what that would do to people in our districts. That is the attitude of the Federal Government. I did not hear the member for Hanson on radio or television, or see in the press where he raised this matter. He knew full well the repercussions of letting jet aircraft operate during the curfew.

Mr. Tonkin: Did it state "jet aircraft"?

Mr. GROOM: My word it did! I will give the Leader the newspaper report relating to it.

Mr. Becker: What kind of jet aircraft?

Mr. GROOM: The honourable member will have a chance to speak about this during a future debate. Members will recall that last year I moved a motion which, despite attempts by the member for Hanson to amend it, was passed in this House. It set out the Government's policy on the airport quite clearly and said that the curfew hours would not be relaxed and that the Government would not permit any extensions of Adelaide Airport beyond the existing boundaries.

In the *News* of 19 July, the Minister of Transport in this State, the member for Ascot Park, was quick off the mark in saying that the State Government would ban these extra late jets. It was obvious, from the State Government's quick efforts in this matter and the clear statements made by the Minister of Transport in South Australia, that we rejected a Federal Government move to allow more jets to use the airport during the 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew. The Federal Government, however, has been following a persistent policy of permitting jet aircraft to operate during curfew hours.

Last October, I wrote to the Federal Minister for Transport, pointing out to him the number of complaints that I had received and asking the circumstances in which jet aircraft were permitted to operate during the curfew hours at Adelaide Airport. He advised me in a letter dated 7 November 1978 that, during the first nine months of that year, 16 jet aircraft had operated during the curfew hours at Adelaide Airport, four for reasons of operational safety and 14 with approval, two of which were low-noise aircraft. He went on to give some further examples of other breaches of the curfew hours that had taken place.

I do not think I need to remind the member for Hanson, but I may need to remind other members opposite, that it is well known that the member for Fisher supports the West Beach airport becoming an international airport, and there are others opposite who do so. That is the precise reason why the member for Hanson was not prepared to put his motion to a vote. He knows his Party is divided on this matter and that he has only the support of one or two colleagues. He also has the problem of the Federal Government to deal with. It is only as a result of action by the Minister of Transport, myself and other members of my Party who have districts near the airport that we have been able to put a stop to jet aircraft operating during the curfew.

The other matter that I want to raise is the way in which the member for Hanson carries on about land tax. He has been doing this for a number of years. He carries on with the same swansong, but never once has he said at a public

meeting, never once has he explained, how he will replace the $17 000 000-odd paid in land tax.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

Mr. GROOM: I know that this is a sore point with members opposite, who keep carrying on about this matter. Most people pay a relatively small amount of land tax in South Australia, but members should consider the rip-offs that are taking place at Federal level. Consider the extra $1 billion that Mr. Fraser is ripping off the Australian motorist by switching to world parity oil prices. How can saving $20, $30 or $40 each year per person on land tax really assist people. The whole system of taxation in this country has to be looked at. It is time that the member for Hanson stopped misleading people at public meetings and got up and said "Let's examine the whole taxation basis".

Mr. Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson has been interjecting consistently. He must cease interjecting.

Mr. GROOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sixty per cent of all income tax raised in this country is paid by wage-earners; 20 per cent is paid by small business people; and 20 per cent is paid by public companies. This means that 80 per cent of income tax revenue raised comes from wage-earners and small business people. It is because public companies do not pay a proper proportion of their share of tax that these two groups are being squeezed. There is no talk by the Liberals of a resource tax on the windfall profits the oil companies are making.

The member for Hanson does not explain that at these public meetings, nor does he tell those present that his Government, at Federal level, is ripping the people off to the tune of $1 billion extra tax for the 1978-79 financial year; instead, he carries on about some Proposition 13 in California, which has not been a success, as the honourable member well knows. He might care to read *Westside* this week, in which it is clearly pointed out that the so-called tax revolt in California has not been a success. What has happened is that the poorer members—

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I will read to the House an extract from a letter from a worker on the Constitutional Museum site, immediately west of this building. The writer was not the timekeeper at the site. I point that out, because some of the information refers to the time sheets, and one might get a false impression. The letter states:

> I am a workman on the Constitutional Museum site, next to Parliament House. I am writing this letter on behalf of at least three-quarters of the men on the job to make a complaint about a few of the men and management of the Public Buildings Department. The majority of the men are now just sick and tired of this site and the way it is run. We have tried to make this job run smoothly, but when you have casual labourers and a couple of P.B.D. labourers stirring up trouble it is very hard to get anything done. For example:
>
> (1) The shop steward labourer comes in to work late and walks off the job any time he likes and gets paid for a full day's work. Management does not do a thing about it.
>
> (2) The shop steward labourer picks his own jobs and does what he likes by telling foreman; again nothing is done about it by management.
>
> (3) The shop steward labourer told (as in ordering) the timekeeper to get out of the office while he made a phone call. Once again management did nothing about it.
>
> (4) The casuals, when they say they will work Saturday, either have the Friday or Monday off and get paid for it, and once again management has done nothing.
>
> (5) Last Saturday the casual labourers took off the outriggers of a mobile scaffold so that neither the carpenters nor painters could use it to work on for this week.
>
> (6) Last week the shop steward and the P.B.D. labourer came back from lunch 1½ hours late, very drunk and were endangering the other workmen's lives while working up on the roof in that condition. Normally that is instant dismissal, but once again management turned a blind eye.
>
> Today a P.B.D. boss came to the job and blasted the timekeeper to be quiet or he will be transferred, but he was just doing his job by docking the time they had off but the foreman changes the time sheets after the men have already signed it which is illegal and means that these lazy casuals are getting paid for time they have off.
>
> We have tried to get something done about all of this through unions and the top bosses of the Public Buildings Department but they all just turn a blind eye. So I am writing to you now because you run the Government so you should be able to get something done about this problem very quickly.

The letter was originally written "To whom it may concern". The letter came to me and I have since spoken to the person who was the author. He seemed to be quite genuine and sincere in making these remarks, and he pointed out that they were the views, as he expressed in the letter, of the majority of workers on the site. He said that the reason he had written the letter was that he and other workers wanted better supervision and improved productivity on the site.

Mr. Whitten: Did he sign the letter?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: He initialled the letter but, after I had spoken to him, I was convinced that he was the original author of the letter, and I had a lengthy discussion with him. The pertinent point is that the Minister of Labour and Industry has a responsibility to investigate the matters and to take action to deal with them as soon as possible. Although disciplinary action may be needed regarding some people, the important issue is to ensure that better management and acceptable standards of efficiency in the Public Buildings Department are achieved. I asked a question earlier this week about the cost of the Constitutional Museum. The Premier, I think, replied to my question, and indicated that the costs of the renovations of the building and the equipment inside the building now totalled $3 300 000. I have checked in *Hansard* and I find that the original cost of this building as given in this House by the then Premier on 1 August 1978 was $2 300 000. In a period of 12 months, the cost of the building has escalated from $2 000 000 to $3 000 000, an escalation of 65 per cent in one year.

It would appear that the waste and mismanagement about which one hears so often in the health area, through the Public Accounts Committee report, also exists in other Government departments. This waste of public funds is allowed to occur because in this case the Public Buildings Department had no competitive tendering from the private sector. I raise this point now because it has been a contentious issue for the past week or so. The Liberal Party's policy released last week by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition provides that all Government work of a significant nature will go to private tender. I believe that that is essential to ensure cost efficiency and proper management within Government departments.

I publicly released details two weeks ago, concerning a situation in which the State Transport Authority did not trust the work of another Government department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which was doing structural steel work for some bus depots. There was so little trust that the S.T.A. approached an engineer in a

private company and asked for a tender for the structural steel work. The private company was paid for supplying that tender because the Government did not intend to give the work to the private contractor—the Government only wanted (and made this quite clear) some sort of guarantee to ensure that the E. & W.S. Department was not cheating the S.T.A. That shows the amount of trust regarding tendering between Government departments—absolutely none. I have heard that the same practice now applies between the South Australian Land Commission and the E. & W.S. Department. Perhaps the E. & W.S. Department has a reputation for putting up high prices to other Government departments for contract work, and perhaps other Government departments are becoming wary.

I am also concerned in this case that trade union officials are exempted from any disciplinary action from higher management in the Public Buildings Department. I wonder whether this is common practice under this administration, throughout other Government departmens and through the rest of the Public Buildings Department. I think the case before us is incredible.

It needs full investigation by the Minister and a report to Parliament as soon as possible. Serious allegations have been made in this letter. I have checked them out to the best of my ability; I have discussed them with the workmen concerned; I have had lengthy discussions with him and have cross-examined him on various points raised in the letter. I believe that he has done it sincerely.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Apparently, attempts were made to get action through the Public Buildings Department previously. He claimed that attempts were made to get action but so far no satisfaction has been received, and now the last resort has been undertaken, of coming to a member of the Opposition and asking him to air it in this Parliament, which is what I have done.

The important point is that once again the mismanagement and waste in certain Government departments is highlighted. The Government should no longer tolerate such mismanagement; that is why I have raised this matter. I challenge the Minister in his present investigation of the department to ensure that such examples are eradicated in the future and, that if such reports are made to higher management, they are immediately acted upon.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has recently made some silly statements, although that is something that we have come to expect from him. As well as making silly statements when he has been trying so desperately hard to justify the Opposition's stand on uranium mining, the honourable member has made some extremely dangerous statements, designed deliberately to confuse and mislead the South Australian community and, as the Opposition spokesman on uranium, he has hung the Opposition's case on uranium on the views of one man: Peter Blackmann, who wrote *The Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear.*

On his own admission, the Deputy Leader is a scientific man, but it seems that the honourable member has been such a long time away from his chosen profession that he needs to go back and do some rethinking on this subject. I refer to what the Deputy Leader has said about uranium mining. First, he dismissed the Harrisburg incident as nothing, claiming that it was a triumph for engineering, merely because no-one was killed. He also dismissed the anti-nuclear body as a group with no scientific training. However, his most hypocritical argument concerned the moral argument. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition claimed that he would be prepared to argue at the moral level at any time but that we had a moral obligation to supply customer countries. He said that the human race would kill itself one way or another. What an attitude from a so-called scientific member of our community, from a man who aspires to be the Deputy Premier of South Australia.

Some members and the public are fully aware of the danger of the nuclear industry, and I intend to refer extensively to the second edition of a list of nuclear accidents in the nuclear industry published in a report by Latrobe University. The Deputy Leader pleaded with Government members to read *The Hazards of Not Going Nuclear,* but I suggest that Opposition members digest a copy of this report, which lists 129 incidents. Obviously, I will not be able to refer to all of them; I will just deal with the more prominent cases. Members of the Opposition should read the report and not just base their opinions on the view of one man.

The report lists accidents in the nuclear industry that have occurred since the late 1950's until September 1978. I will not include accidents involving the military, although they are even more frightening, because the military is supposed to be able to handle nuclear devices. Certainly, those cases are extremely frightening. I intend to refer to cases involving commercial nuclear reactors. The report states:

> The following is a list of some of the numerous leaks, accidents and near accidents in nuclear reactors and waste dumps throughout the world. We are told that the probability of a serious accident in a nuclear reactor is about the same as that of two fully loaded Jumbo jets colliding (as happened in the Canary Islands in 1977).

The first incident was in Windscale, England, as follows:

> Eleven tons of uranium ablaze released a cloud of radio isotopes from the melted fuel. Milk from an area of more than 500 square kilometres (some two million litres) was poured into the rivers and the sea, unsafe for human consumption. How much radioactivity descended on Westmoreland and Cumberland? Locals say there is a high incidence of cancer deaths in the area, but the Government saw fit to do no medical or statistical checks. Both Windscale reactors have since been "decommissioned". The radioactive cloud reached up to Denmark. In London, 500 kilometres from Windscale, the radioactivity reached 20 times the normal level.

The report then refers to another incident in 1958 in the Ural Mountains, U.S.S.R., as follows:

> An explosion occurred in a radioactive waste stockpile. Hundreds of square miles were left barren and unusable for decades and maybe for centuries. Hundreds of people died, thousands were injured and surrounding inhabitants were evacuated.

Another incident was on 3 January 1961, at Idaho Falls, U.S.A., as follows:

> Three men were killed instantly in an explosion, the cause of which is still unknown today. The bodies of the men were so severely irradiated that their exposed hands and heads had to be severed and buried in a dump for nuclear waste. It took years to disassemble the wrecked plant and its burial ground will have to be guarded for years to come.

The report also states:

> Mrs. Mary H. Weik, secretary of the American committee on radiological dangers, compiled a list from the official statistics of mortalities in the U.S.A. for 1962 (published 1964). She established a disquietening correlation between living in the area of a nuclear installation and the increase, sometimes quite large, in deaths by various causes:

		Percentage
Leukaemia	Garfield, Montana	600
	Scaix, North Dakota	290
	Mohave, Arizona	270
Miscarriages ...	Morten, North Dakota	215
	Garfield, Montana	230
	Sherman, Oregan	162
	Massac, Illinois	240
Malformed	Sherman, Oregon	310
babies	Carroll, Missouri	273
	Massac, Illinois	240

(The percentage shows the increase as compared to the national average)

The member for Hanson can yawn, but if we mine uranium in South Australia perhaps he would like to have a 370 per cent increase in malformed babies here. Obviously, he treats the whole thing as a sham. The next incident reported was on 5 October 1966 at Lagoona Beach, Michigan, U.S.A., as follows:

> Partial meltdown. The reactor was successfully shut down. It took 1½ years to work out the cause of the accident. Several pieces of sheet metal had broken off the bottom of the reactor vessel and were swept up in the coolant flow, blocking it. The reactor had been operating at 15 per cent of full power and was afterwards decommissioned. Four million people lived within a mile of the site. It is not widely known that the authorities considered evacuating Detroit over this incident.

Yet another incident occurred on 11 May 1969 at Rocky Flats, Colorado, U.S.A., as follows:

> Plutonium spontaneously ignited in a container of nearly 600 tons of combustible material; the fire burned 2 000 kilograms of plutonium (a microgram of which can be toxic), giving off plutonium oxide, and caused a further $45 000 000 damage. Soil samples taken from around the plant were contaminated with plutonium. (Private investigation by Dr. Edward Martell was necessary because the Atomic Energy Commission, which owned the plant, and Dow Chemicals, which operated it under contract, refused to do sampling in the area).

The report continues with another incident on 3 April 1970 in Pennsylvania, U.S.A., as follows:

> Strontium 90 in the soil at the edge of the site of the Shippingport nuclear reactor (claimed to be the safest in the U.S.) reaches a level 100 times greater than the national average. The radioactivity in the milk is four times greater.

Another incident occurred on 5 June 1970 in Dresden, Illinois, U.S.A., as follows:

> A spurious signal starts off an incredible series of mistakes by both technicians and equipment; for 2 hours the reactor was out of control; pressure built up inside it until it released radioactive iodine 131 to 100 times the safe limit to the dry well.

The report refers to an accident that occurred at Indian Point, America, in 1972, as follows:

> Pressures in the primary cooling circuit increase by 30 per cent. The water released subsequently killed 150 000 fish in the Hudson River. Studies in the United States have shown that there is a slight increase in radiation levels in rabbits and fish around all sites in the United States.

It also refers to an accident that occurred in France in 1972, as follows:

> In the reactor there were two gates through which radioactive wastes and normal wastes would pass. One would go into a special container, the other went straight in to the drains. After the emptying of more than 10 cubic metres of radioactive liquids, the special container was still empty. The reason was that the gate leading to it was still closed, while the other one, the one leading to the normal drain system, was open.

The report then refers to an accident in New Jersey, America, as follows:

> Edward Cleason, a New Jersey truck dock worker, accidentally spilled plutonium on himself while handling a leaking box of liquid waste in 1963. Four years later his hand, then his arm and shoulder, were amputated because of a rare form of cancer, from which he died in 1973, aged 39. The company responsible refused to pay his compensation before he died.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 7 August at 2 p.m.