

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 August 1980

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

LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS SUBSIDY 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: MAIN NORTH ROAD

A petition signed by 74 concerned parents and residents of Mount Bryan and surrounds praying that the House urge the Government to straighten Main North Road at the southern-most tip of the township, which will alleviate the present safety hazard for schoolchildren, was presented by Mr. Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: STURT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

A petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal which would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location was presented by Mr. Hemmings.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 1, 2, 8, 25, 40, 59, 64 to 66, 68, 69, 99, 159, 161, 175, 178, 179, 188 to 190, 196 to 198, 202, 204, 210, 212, 213, 230, 238, 239, 260, 262, and 263.

MR. J. R. SWINCER

In reply to Mr. **MILLHOUSE** (5 August).

The **Hon. W. A. RODDA**: Mr. J. R. Swincer's special permit to trawl for prawns was revoked as a result of his actions at Kingscote, Kangaroo Island, on 19 February 1980. Mr. Swincer pleaded guilty in Kingscote court to a charge of damaging a Department of Fisheries "Shark Cat" boat. Mr. Swincer was seen by two witnesses interfering with the stern of the boat, and subsequent inspection showed that a split pin had been removed from a motor, and the lock-nut retaining the propeller was not tightened.

Tampering with a propeller of the boat which operates in unpredictable and reef-infested waters could have endangered the lives of departmental officers on board. Because of the potentially serious nature of his actions, Mr. Swincer was advised that revocation of his special permit was being considered. He was given the

opportunity to attend a hearing and explain any matter which he wished to be taken into account. This hearing took place on 21 July 1980. Mr. Swincer's explanation was not satisfactory, and his special permit was revoked accordingly.

The Director of Fisheries independently considered Mr. Swincer's actions at Kangaroo Island and, after due consideration, decided not to renew Mr. Swincer's class A fishing licence for a period of six months. A review of the Director's decision by a competent person appointed under the Fisheries Act may be obtained should he request it. There is ample evidence of the dangers and discomforts of the jobs of Department of Fisheries field officers without their being subjected to irresponsible actions which could further endanger their lives; consequently, the revocation of Mr. Swincer's special permit is considered justified.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (The Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1978—Regulations—Construction Safety—Cranes.

- ii. Construction, Logging and Rural Safety—Penalties.

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Companies Act, 1962-1980—Regulations—Companies Auditors Board—Fees.

By the Chief Secretary (The Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—Amendments to General Laws.

- i. Independent Order of Rechabites, Albert District No. 83.

- ii. South Australian United Ancient Order of Druids Friendly Society.

- iii. The Independent Order of Odd Fellows.

By the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1974—Regulations—Cream Prices.

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Corporation of Tea Tree Gully—By-law No. 5—Proceedings of Council.

By the Minister of Planning (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Planning and Development Act, 1966-1980—Regulations—Metropolitan Development Plan—Corporation of Campbelltown Planning Regulations—Zoning.

By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Bus and Tramways Act, 1935-1978—By-laws—Fares.
- ii. Railways Act, 1936-1979—Regulations—Fares.

By the Minister of Lands (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980—Section 189—Closer Settlement Lands—Statement, 1979-80.

QUESTION TIME

S.G.I.C.

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say what is the nature of the review being conducted into the State Government Insurance Commission, who will conduct the review, and whether the commission itself was aware of this review before the announcement of it in Parliament last Wednesday? Last Wednesday, in reply to my question about delay in the Government's giving approval to an investment account life policy proposal by the S.G.I.C., the Premier said the whole future operation of the commission was being taken into account as part of what he said was "a total review of the operation of the no-fault accident insurance scheme and the compulsory third party scheme". This was the first public revelation about a review of any part of the S.G.I.C. Two days later, in the *News*, the Premier enlarged slightly on his statement in Parliament, in a manner that the *News* described as the possibility that the role of the commission might be dramatically altered in the near future. The Premier was quoted there as saying that a review of the commission's role was to follow an inquiry into the no-fault third party scheme; in other words, an inquiry first, then a review.

The House might recall that I raised the matter last November, that is, about the fate of the investment account life policy desired by the commission. I was then told by the Premier that the commission Chairman had been ill, that that was why the Government had not been able to come to a decision, and that to suggest the Government was "dragging its feet" was ridiculous. Therefore, the announcement in the House last Wednesday and the press announcement on Friday of what appears to be an internal review, with no public participation, has come as somewhat of a shock to the many clients of the S.G.I.C.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would be very distressed indeed if I thought that what the Leader has said in his last comment is accurate. I am certain that the many clients of the S.G.I.C. would be very much heartened to think that the Government was taking a continuing interest in its doings. I am not certain what the Leader is getting at in his question. Certainly, there was an announcement in this House—and it was not really an announcement, but purely and simply a statement of fact—that there is currently a considerable study being done on the implementation of the no-fault insurance scheme. As the Leader will know, the Liberal Party has had a policy to establish such a scheme since before the last election but one. That study is now being carried out by, among other people, officers of the Minister of Transport, a representative from S.G.I.C., and a number of other people who are able to contribute towards the preparation of a no-fault insurance scheme. That has been going on for some time, as indeed have a number of other studies in relation to other policies that the Liberal Party had before attaining Government. There is nothing out of the ordinary about it and I am not quite sure what the Leader's question is directed to uncovering; there is nothing to uncover. An announcement will be made as to the Government's decision on the no-fault insurance policy when it has been decided, and when it has been considered by Cabinet.

The Leader also said that the Government will review S.G.I.C.'s operations. Yes, indeed, until we determine what parts S.G.I.C. is to take in the operation of the no-fault insurance scheme, we are not in a position to do anything to examine the future operations of S.G.I.C. I want to make quite clear that policy holders (and I hope

that the Leader's concern was centred in that area) have nothing to worry about, because their insurance will be quite secure. We are simply looking to find the best form of no-fault insurance scheme and the best way of administering such a scheme. When we have made that decision, we will make whatever changes may be necessary to the running of S.G.I.C. to allow for its involvement, or otherwise, in various aspects of the no-fault insurance scheme.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Dr. BILLARD: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy seen a statement at the weekend by the Leader of the Opposition about the Redcliff petro-chemical project, and will he say whether the statement was accurate? In that statement, the Leader of the Opposition stated that his Party supported the Redcliff project but implied that the present Government was only interested in development at any cost and was not showing sufficient concern for environmental factors.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I did see the statement by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that the Leader made this statement at Port Augusta. The statement, as reported, said that the Opposition remained convinced that Redcliff should proceed and from time to time the Opposition would like to still stay in the act in regard to Redcliff, and it announced the fact that Redcliff was to proceed from time to time. The Leader also stated:

We will not, however, adopt the open slather approach of the Liberals, who have shown that they are prepared to cut corners and if necessary risk safety and the environment in a frenzied attempt to chalk up development agreements.

The plain fact is that that is not true. Either the Leader of the Opposition—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. It appears to me that the question directed to the Deputy Premier asks him to comment on a statement outside this House; it appeared in the press. Is that in order?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The question was framed, quite obviously, to ask the Deputy Premier whether he had seen a statement and asked him to make comment upon it. If the honourable member who asked the question had indicated that the statement had been made in a newspaper, I would have had to call the question inadmissible; however, the statement very clearly made by the honourable member in asking the question was that it was a statement made over the weekend without his identifying where the statement was made. If the question had indicated that the statement was from a newspaper, I would have ruled the question out of order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I heard the statement over the air, and I believe that it was also reported widely on the news. The Leader of the Opposition would not deny that he made that statement. The honourable member asked me whether the statement was accurate; the fact is that it is plainly not true. Either the Opposition Leader was so junior in the former Cabinet, or else he was not told that the procedures being followed by this Government in relation to the environmental strictures and so on are those laid down by the former Government, namely, the environmental effects statement, which has just been published and left for public comment. That comment has now concluded. The Dow company is assessing that, and the company's response will be known publicly within a few days, I believe. I expect to take to Cabinet, probably early next month, the final e.e.s. The Government will consider it, the Federal Government will consider it, and a decision will be made in relation to the project.

The procedure just mentioned is precisely the procedure that the Labor Government, had it continued in office, would have followed. I should have thought the Leader would know that. I am accused, from time to time, by the Opposition of taking it to task rather vigorously in this place for misrepresenting the Government's position. We have another example of that misrepresentation on this occasion. If the Leader expects me to pat him on the head and say, "Good boy, well done" (or, if he has a biblical twist, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"), he does not know what it is all about. Whilst Opposition members continue to misrepresent the Government, the Government will continue to ram the facts down their throats.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Hooray!

The SPEAKER: Order! I make one further statement in relation to the point of order taken. Erskine May, between pages 325 and 329, when referring to this matter, makes clear that questions are inadmissible when asking whether statements in the press, of private individuals, or of unofficial bodies, are accurate. I do not accept that the honourable Leader is an unofficial body. Also, there was no identification of the source of the statement.

BITUMEN PLANT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Highways Department sold its bitumen-making plant at Northfield to Pioneer Concrete for only \$100 000, and, if it did, why? I have been reliably informed that the Highways Department's main bitumen-making plant has been sold at a price far below market value. I was also told that the Highways Department, by using that Northfield facility, was able to charge \$26 a tonne for hotmix. I am told that the Highways Department has now had to buy hotmix at \$34 a tonne because it no longer has that facility to produce bitumen. I have been further informed that the Highways Department recently signed a contract for 75 000 tonnes of hotmix from Bitumax, a move that I am further informed will cost the taxpayer an extra \$600 000 because of the difference in price per tonne. Will the Minister explain the reasoning behind this move?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department previously owned two bitumen-making plants, one at Northfield and one at Marino. Soon after I became Minister, the Commissioner of Highways informed me that the Northfield plant needed replacing. A decision was taken by me in conjunction with the Commissioner that the Northfield plant should be sold. I cannot remember the exact sale price, but I understand that tenders were called for that sale and that the price tendered was acceptable to the Highways Department. I will investigate the figures mentioned by the Deputy Leader. It is true that a contract was let for the purchase of, I think, 60 000 tonnes (not 75 000 tonnes), of hotmix from Bitumax. I understand that the price was extremely competitive with the price for which the Highways Department would have been able to produce that product at its own depot.

STEELWORKS ACCIDENT

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs give the House any details of investigations into the explosion on Saturday last at the Whyalla steelworks?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, I can. I will relate to the House the contents of a statement I have issued today relating to the accident at the B.H.P. steelmaking plant.

On Saturday afternoon a violent thermal reaction occurred in a basic oxygen steelmaking furnace at the B.H.P. Steelworks, Whyalla. This caused molten cast iron to erupt from the furnace, igniting combustible gases and fine dust in the immediate vicinity of the furnace. The initial ignition then appeared to start a progressive burning in the form of a fire ball which travelled the length of the building in which the steelmaking furnaces are situated. In the basic oxygen steelmaking process, scrap material from various sources, such as off-cuts from billets, industrial scrap steel and iron from slag heaps, is fed into the furnace, which is tilted to one side to receive it.

After the scrap has been loaded, molten iron from the blast furnace is then poured in on top and the furnace is then returned to its normally upright position. At this point, oxygen is injected into the mixture and accelerates the melting process. When the melting is finished, the furnace is tilted to the other side and the molten mass is poured into a ladle and the furnace is then ready to begin a new cycle. Normal operation produces about 10 cycles per shift. The violent reaction occurred when the molten iron was poured on to the scrap material.

Eleven workers were burned and one has since died from his injuries. The people injured were engaged on work not directly concerned with steelmaking. They were B.H.P. employees and employees of contractors who were working on modifications to an adjacent furnace which had been out of service for some time. B.H.P. employees working on normal steelmaking furnace operations were not among the injured, as they work from enclosed safety areas.

It is impossible at this stage to be certain of the cause of the blow-out of the molten metal from the furnace. However, one theory is that the scrap material may have included too high a proportion of very small iron particles, known as fines, and when they were exposed to the intense heat of the molten iron they exploded with great violence.

Inspectors of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment began investigating the accident soon after it occurred. Three of them were at the works all day Sunday. These inspectors have now directed that additional safety procedures be adopted to prevent a recurrence. First, they have directed that scrap material shall not include fines. Secondly, while the furnace is being charged, all persons other than those who operate from protected areas and are directly employed on the furnace operations shall leave the site. B.H.P. management has agreed to these conditions. On behalf of the Government, I extend condolences and sympathy to the relatives of the people involved in the accident.

EDUCATION FINANCE

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Is the Minister of Education aware (despite his previous assurances) that the Premier has prepared Budget plans that will cut back expenditure on education by more than 3 per cent in real terms and, if he is, would he make strong and urgent representations to the Premier to restore education funds? On 27 February of this year the Minister of Education told this House:

There is certainly (and I repeat "certainly") no reason why the South Australian Institute of Teachers should assume that a 3 per cent cut is definitely on, particularly in view of the fact that I issued a press release some five to 10 days ago stating precisely that.

The Minister went on to say that the 3 per cent cut was definitely not a *fait accompli*. Is the Minister so sure today?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I can assure members of the House that there will be no Budget leak at this stage, but I can tell the honourable member that his source of information is not nearly as reliable as he might assume, and that there will not be a 3 per cent cut in real terms in education, as he alleges.

WAYVILLE SHOWGROUNDS

Mr. RANDALL: Can the Premier say what principles the Government will follow in making any decision on the possible future alternative uses of the Wayville Showgrounds? There has been much speculation during recent weeks over the possible relocation of the showgrounds. This speculation culminated here last week when the Leader of the Opposition quoted a series of press reports, and asked whether the Government had given an undertaking to a commercial group that would lead it to expect Government support for a housing development on the showgrounds land.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat what I said last week in answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question that there have been no negotiations with the Government concerning housing development at the Wayville Showgrounds. Since the Leader asked his question, I have checked with the company involved and I have ascertained from that company that the housing idea that the Leader mentioned is no more than a long-range concept of the development group, and that the primary interest of the development group is in a major new entertainment complex somewhere in Adelaide.

The entertainment complex proposal has been discussed with the Government, and the company is examining possible sites. No decisions have been made, and they are unlikely to be made for many months.

The land at Islington, to which the Leader referred in his question in relation to the complex, is that part of Regency Park that has been set aside for the new railways freight centre, as part of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standard gauge line. That freight centre is considered to be an absolutely vital part of our transport links, certainly part of the enormous advantage we can offer intending investors and industrialists in South Australia, and obviously that freight complex will go ahead. So, that land is not available.

The principles that would be applied in any suggestion to relocate the showgrounds can be summed up easily. The Government has made clear on all occasions (and I repeat here today) that any decision as to the possible relocation of the showgrounds will be entirely subject to the wishes of the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society. In other words, we always have believed (and always will believe) that the first consideration of the Government must be the society's view on the matter.

I have always been (and have often said so publicly) of the opinion that premature announcements by the Government about major projects can be counter-productive and, in some cases, they can adversely affect open communication between the Government and would-be developers seeking advice. Today's confirmation in this answer regarding Community Development Proprietary Limited's proposal for an entertainment complex in Adelaide is certainly premature. The company agrees, however, that, because of the speculation which has been raised, it is necessary to put its proposals into perspective, and that I have done.

In my view, a great deal of the loss of spirit in this State over the past nine or 10 years has come about because of

premature announcements of projects by the previous Government, projects which, having been lauded to the skies and highly publicised, did not come to pass. I believe that the policy which this Government has adopted of keeping a low key and of not making an announcement until at least heads of agreement have been signed, and there is some way clear ahead, is a wise and prudent one.

WATER CHARGES

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: How can the Minister of Water Resources justify the decision made by the Government, no doubt based on a recommendation made by him to the Government, to increase the cost of water this financial year by 12½ per cent, in the light of the vehement and prolonged criticism that used to emanate from the Government members, when in Opposition, to any increases made by former Governments? Many members will recall the opposition to which I have referred, in particular, the opposition by the Minister of Industrial Affairs who, at one stage, said that he would not pay the increase in rates but who found out later that he had to back off, because I believe that he discovered that his seat could be declared vacant if he did not pay.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment in that way. He has sought leave to explain his question, but he has been going beyond what that leave allows.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I sought leave on the basis of the opposition put forward by members of Government when in Opposition and was explaining that opposition. It is a wellknown fact that the Minister sneaked through the back door and paid. As the previous Government had a firm policy in relation to any increase in water rates for any financial year, I should be interested to know whether that policy has been varied in any way by the Government in arriving at its decision.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The information and the documents available to me and the department shows that there is a clear direction from the previous Government that it was its intention to increase the charges for water steadily in irrigation areas until such time as the cost of supplying that water was virtually made by the irrigators receiving that water.

The increase of 12½ per cent has been made in an attempt to maintain the present situation. The present Government does not intend to increase water rates to the extent intended by the previous Government, an extent that would return to the department the full cost of supplying that water. The rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas that is proceeding at present is costing many millions of dollars, and it is quite unrealistic for that cost to be applied to the growers themselves. On a recent overseas—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In my question I was not referring to irrigated areas. I was referring to the metropolitan and country water supplies for domestic use.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. I make the point to all honourable members that the way in which a Minister answers a question is his own decision.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will just complete what I intended saying in relation to Government irrigation water rates because it is part and parcel of the whole scene, since the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Ministry of Water Resources are responsible for the total water supplies in South Australia. I will continue by saying that the

Government does not intend to impose the capital costs of the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas on to the grower ratepayers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The supply of water to the metropolitan area and other parts of South Australia is part of the total scene. Members of the previous Government will be well aware that it has been a long-standing approach of Governments that the water rate in South Australia for domestic water supplies will be established on the basis of a break-even point in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. The current water rate has been struck precisely on that basis. That policy has applied for many years; it has not been altered. The approach has been to apply right across the board in South Australia the water rate which is struck for the metropolitan area of Adelaide. This means that in some instances in relation to remote areas of South Australia there is a considerable subsidy through the taxpayers of South Australia to maintain that situation. I believe that that position is justifiable, and this Government will continue with that policy. That is the policy, and the increase has taken place to ensure that that break-even point or slightly better than the break-even point is achieved, so that a loss does not occur. The Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: —is well aware that that has been the situation for a long time, and the Government does not intend to alter it at this stage.

The water rating situation in South Australia must be considered as a whole, and that is why I commenced the reply by referring to the Government irrigation areas, because that is part and parcel of it. Moreover, there is a domestic supply component in the irrigation area, and the member for Hartley failed to recognise that during his comments when asking his question. It is a pertinent part of the total water supply scheme for domestic water throughout South Australia, whether the honourable member likes it or not.

NGARKAT NATIONAL PARK

Mr. LEWIS: Will the Minister of Environment indicate whether the Government is willing and able to do anything to alleviate the increasing livestock losses being suffered by stockowners who have flocks grazing adjacent to Ngarkat National Park, in which the dingoes responsible for the maulings are living? Members would know that Ngarkat is a huge national park in the middle of my electorate in the South-East, in what was called tiger country. It is an area approaching ten times that of the greater metropolitan area, from Noarlunga to Gawler and from the coast to the hills, covering more than 250 000 hectares. The dingoes living there are real. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Government and the Minister previously, during the Budget debate last October, and again the week before last. Stock losses are escalating now that the pups, I am told, have come to maturity and are spreading themselves more evenly through the land they wish to occupy, under social pressure from their peers. Unless something can be done about the matter, I fear for the sanctity of the park, since I would expect "hot pursuit" to be the course followed by landholders when they determine in their own way to eliminate the pest that presently removes their livelihood.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The honourable member has brought this matter to my attention privately, expressing his concern, and he brought it to the attention

of the House, as he said, in debate last year and again last week. It is a very real problem, which I certainly recognise. The honourable member has asked what we are doing about it, particularly in regard to Ngarkat conservation park. It is a policy of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to maintain a level of dog control equal to that which existed prior to the area's being made a reserve under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. To this end, the National Parks and Wildlife Service has worked closely in conjunction with the Box Flat Dingo Control Committee. At the request of the committee, only recently the Regional Superintendent of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in the area has become a member of that committee.

Also recently, the dingo control committee sought an increase in the department's contribution to enable the committee to provide a much improved service in the area. I am pleased to say that I have recently agreed to this request, and have informed the secretary accordingly. Previously, we have paid \$3 500 annually, and I have increased that contribution to \$4 800 for this year to try to help solve the problem.

I have been handed a note from the Minister of Agriculture, who points out that liaison has commenced between the South Australian Government and the Victorian Vermin and Noxious Weeds Destruction Board in order to co-ordinate the dingo control work on both sides of the Victorian and South Australian border. This policy has been developed and put into practice during the past 12 months.

I believe that the increased co-ordination and co-operation between the two States will help greatly to alleviate this problem. I appreciate the honourable member's concern. I know that he is acting on behalf of constituents in his district, and I want him to know that we recognise the problem and that we are doing something about it.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct to the Minister of Mines and Energy a question which is not at all an antagonistic question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Government propose that, when a pipeline is constructed to connect the Mereenie-Palm Valley gas system to the Moomba complex to bring gas from Mereenie and Palm Valley, the pipeline be constructed, owned and controlled by the South Australian Government? Over the past few weeks, I have had correspondence with the Minister about the bringing of gas south from Mereenie and Palm Valley, and after a couple of letters the Minister stated:

When the exploration programme has been completed, further consideration can be given to the proposal to connect the Mereenie-Palm Valley gas system into the Moomba complex.

It is because of that statement that I ask my question. As a rule, I prefer private enterprise to Government enterprise, but we can see the screaming mess that South Australia is now in because of the pipeline to Sydney.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was just referring to the fact that one of the previous Premiers allowed the gas pipeline to Sydney to be privately constructed and controlled, and we are now in a mess because of that decision. We do not want again to make the same mistake, whether it is private enterprise or Government enterprise. Personally, I favour

the pipeline's being Government owned and controlled and, therefore, I have asked the Minister the question.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As the honourable member points out, there has been some correspondence from me to him in relation to the possibility of a supply of gas from Mereenie to link up with the South Australian pipeline at Moomba. One could not put it any stronger than a possibility at present. The Government is pursuing several options with a view to coming to grips with the very serious problem with which we are faced.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is not one of those premature announcements that the Premier referred to, is it?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No. There has been no collusion between the member for Mitcham and me in regard to this question; it cannot be classed as a Dorothy Dixier by any stretch of the imagination. The honourable member is genuinely seeking information. In relation to ownership of the pipeline—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will exercise extreme self-control and desist from answering in the obvious way, but they really ask for it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Talk to your friends.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitcham is not trying to misrepresent me, as the Opposition is continually doing; if he asks a civil question, he will get a civil reply. It is premature to make predictions about the ownership of a pipeline in the Northern Territory, and the Northern Territory's view in relation to ownership of pipelines in that State would be particularly influential. The honourable member alluded to the Sydney pipeline; the problem as I perceive it is not really about the ownership of the pipeline but that there was no saving clause in the contract to protect the State's rights. However, we will not open up that topic, because it would be a sore point, and we are being very kindly in this answer.

LEARN-TO-SWIM CAMPAIGN

Mr. OSWALD: To enable parents and students to plan for the end of school holidays this year, will the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to continue the successful learn-to-swim campaign conducted by the Education Department and the Recreation and Sport Division?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The learn-to-swim campaign has been very successful. Funds will be made available in the forthcoming Budget so that the scheme can be continued during the present financial year.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: My question is a civil one, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say why he refused to attend a meeting which was organised by the Conservation Council of South Australia and which was held last night to discuss the environmental, social and economic implications of the Redcliff project? Also, why did the Minister not allow Public Service officers to attend that meeting as his representatives?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In reply to an earlier question today I alluded partly to the answer to this question when I pointed out that the response of the Dow Chemical Company to the environmental effects statement and public input were not yet known. In fact, the e.e.s. outlines the environmental effects and then, as a

result of input from various sources such as the Government and the Department for the Environment, one seeks to identify the problem areas and to come up with the appropriate solutions to those problems. That process is not yet completed. As I pointed out earlier, it seems to me a bit premature to talk about environmental constraints that will be put on the company before the process whereby the result of the e.e.s. is considered. I made it perfectly clear that the Government intends to refrain from comment until the results of that survey and assessment are known. The Government will then discharge its responsibility to the Public, and particularly to the people of Port Augusta who are likely to be affected. The Government will be convening a public meeting at Port Augusta, where the facts will be put to the public and any queries answered.

DR. RATHJEN

Mr. OLSEN: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government has agreed to provide funds to the Adelaide University to secure the continued appointment of Dr. Rathjen to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute? If so, has the Minister informed the University Council of the Government's decision? If it has not done so, when will it do so?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Honourable members may be aware that a few months ago we were acquainted with the fact that the State might lose the services of Dr. Rathjen, a gentleman who has been involved in cereal research at the Waite Institute on projects of inestimable value to the State. As a result of discussions between the university, the Waite Institute, the Premier's Department and me, the State Government decided that it would make funds available for Dr. Rathjen's project specifically in order that his services might be retained. I believe that, so far, the only commitment has been a verbal one, but written confirmation will be sent to relevant persons in the near future.

QUEEN VICTORIA HOSPITAL

Mr. HEMMINGS: Has the Minister of Health an opinion that she can share with this House about the suggestion that Adelaide's Queen Victoria Hospital be closed? Various groups in the community have taken a stand against any suggestion that the Queen Victoria Hospital be closed following the recommendation of a Health Commission task force that its facilities be relocated at other major Adelaide hospitals. Among these groups is an *ad hoc* committee known as "Friends of the Queen Victoria", which is backed by many prominent Adelaide citizens. The Australian Labor Party is also opposed to any interference with the Queen Victoria Hospital. The latest newsletter of the National Council of Women of South Australia takes a strong stand in support of the hospital, and challenges the Australian Labor Party to complain loudly in Parliament about the proposed closure of the hospital. Will the Minister set at rest the fears of these people and declare on behalf of the Government that that proposal is just not on?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Until I have any recommendations before me in respect of the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital I am not prepared to make any comment and, indeed, it would be wrong of me to do so. The member for Napier may be aware that investigations into the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital were instigated as a result of that hospital's request for quite large amounts of capital expenditure.

Mr. Hemmings: They can pay for it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: If the member for Napier will wait he will hear the reply. The Queen Victoria Hospital sought additional funds and permission to use additional funds. The honourable member may not be aware that the provision of obstetric and gynaecological services throughout the whole of this State has never been addressed effectively, although there have been previous committees looking at this matter, in the light of projected needs. The reason for the Health Commission's study was based on the projected needs for the provision of obstetric and gynaecological services. A task force made a recommendation to the Health Commission; that recommendation was received by the commission, and the task force report was made available for public comment.

I would be interested to know whether the honourable member, who says he is opposed to the closure of this, that and the other thing, has actually read the report of the task force. If he had done so he would realise that the provision of these services is an extremely complex matter which requires very careful planning. The fact that such careful planning has not been undertaken in the past is all the more reason why it should be undertaken now. The new Health Commission, and the new Chairman, felt that it would be wrong for them to be bound by a decision of the previous commission. Therefore, they proposed to examine any report that comes to them as a result of public comment and, following that examination, to make recommendations to me.

Until I receive such recommendations, I have no intention of commenting on the future of the Queen Victoria Hospital, other than to say that those who have established themselves in order to create what might be described as a fighting fund to "save the hospital" (and I use those words in inverted commas) may find that they are, in a campaign which is not necessary, using money which could well have been put towards the benefit of health services. I should also add that, if ever a women's hospital had a friend in terms of recognition of the special needs of women for obstetric and gynaecological services, the Queen Victoria Hospital has a friend in me.

PRISON COSTS

Mr. MATHWIN: In view of the high costs which must be met by the Government to keep offenders in prison, can the Chief Secretary say what progress has been made, if any, to achieve economies and in the working towards self sufficiency within the prison system? Can the Chief Secretary also say whether such activities pose any security risk? The Chief Secretary is well aware of the high cost of housing and detention of prisoners, which gets more and more costly as time goes on. Also, the immense cost of building these institutions and prisons is certainly the concern of this Government.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member is quite right: it is a costly business detaining people who offend against society in prisons, but unfortunately we must have these institutions. The department is taking considerable steps towards obtaining self sufficiency within the prison system. It is expensive to keep these people fed and looked after in the proper manner as should be accorded to people whom we hold in custody. In the majority of institutions, rural programmes operate, and the output from these programmes is used to maintain the bill of fare in all of the institutions spread throughout the State. The rural programmes produce most of the fruit and vegetables, canned products and foodstuffs used by inmates.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Where's the canned products factory?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: They provide all the foodstuffs, with the exception of potatoes, used by the inmates. For the honourable member's benefit, I point out that the canned products factory is at Cadell and, although it is small, it is a most effective canning plant. The programme of rationalisation being put into effect will see the closing down of some of the inefficient programmes and the stepping up of more profitable ones. The production of new lines of foodstuffs has also been started on the advice of the Government agronomist and horticultural adviser employed in the department. Only people of minimum security risk are employed on these rural projects, and they are supervised by industrial and correctional officers. People assessed as maximum security risks are confined behind security walls.

REMAND CENTRE

Mr. ABBOTT: Does the Government intend to proceed with the construction of the new remand centre, at Regency Park, which was approved by the former Government and, if it does, when will construction commence? If it does not intend to do so, why not?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The matter raised by the honourable member is under review by the Government. I can assure him that the Government is looking at a suitable site, which might perhaps be a little more suitable than the one about which he has spoken.

PINBALL MACHINES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport confer with and ascertain from the Minister of Community Welfare what effects pinball machines have on the youth in our community? I refer to reports in the *Advertiser* of 13 August 1980 headed "Pinball machines 'ruined my son'" and the *News* of Monday 18 August headed "Move to repel space invaders". The *Advertiser* reports that a 15-year old boy was sentenced to nine months in a training centre after admitting 36 counts of burglary and theft. He had attended school only five days of the year, and spent the rest of his time playing pinball machines and snooker, his father said. His father is reported as saying, "He wanted to be an airline pilot, but that's finished now. I reckon he'll be lucky getting a job emptying the garbage." The boy was given a weekly allowance of about \$10, but needed a lot more to keep playing the machines.

The report in the *News* refers to the Metropolitan Council of the Municipal Associations of Victoria, whose concern was expressed because a few school children had been playing these machines before and after school and during school hours. The *News* report states:

It is considered that the indiscriminate installation of these machines in milk bars and shopping centres is most undesirable. There is concern that one coin-operated amusement machine in a building is one too many—particularly having regard to the addictable attraction of such machines to the young.

I have been informed by delicatessen operators in the metropolitan area that they are being encouraged to install these machines. They must receive about \$50 income for each machine before making a profit. Such people, and those who operate shops such as fish and chip shops, are concerned at the large number of young people who congregate around these pinball machines.

I believe that this is having an effect. This type of addiction is similar to that caused by poker machines, to which my Government and the previous Government are opposed. I ask the question of the Minister and his colleague because I am concerned about what will be the future for these young people if they become addicted to these machines.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Regarding the similarity of some pinball machines to poker machines, I think the honourable member was referring directly to the in-line bingo machines, which I have already announced this Government will prohibit in South Australia. The in-line bingo machines are able to take more than one coin at a time; in fact, they can take as many coins as a person likes to put into them. They have been compared to poker machines in the effect they have on those who play them.

However, the honourable member referred to the wider problem of the use of pinball machines generally and to fun parlours and the whole question of amusement centres. My officers are at the moment in touch with officers of the Department of Community Welfare and the Department of Consumer Affairs (because it has to do with that department also) on the whole question of these machines. I could not imagine that the Government would want to ban pinball machines as such.

Mr. Millhouse: You cannot possibly do that.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, that is what I just said. I can see significant problems in that, but nevertheless we are concerned about it. I undertake to the member for Hanson that I will consult my colleague in another place on the whole question of pinball machines.

WOMEN'S ADVISERS

Mr. CRAFTER: Does the Premier intend to change the functions of the Women's Adviser to the Premier to that of Adviser on Equal Opportunities, in line with initiatives taken in other areas of Government, and as a consequence to change the functions of the Premier's Women's Advisory Unit?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Some proposals have been put forward by the present Women's Adviser in the Premier's Department regarding her role and matching it in with the role of Commissioner of Equal Opportunity. For instance, the suggestion has been made that the Women's Adviser in the Premier's Department could be retitled, and that perhaps it could be a full-time Public Service position rather than a contract appointment, as it is at present. Those matters are all receiving attention, and a decision will be made at the proper time.

I remind the honourable member that the Sex Discrimination Act is administered by a Commissioner of Equal Opportunity, and I can simply reassure him, if he needs reassurance, that, regardless of any change in name which might occur from Women's Adviser to Equal Opportunities Officer, the interests of women, the particular problems that they have in relation to discrimination, and all other aspects, will be firmly kept in the forefront of the minds of all those people working in the area. I personally do not think that it matters particularly much what these people are called; they may be called Women's Advisers or they may be called Advisers on Equal Opportunity. What does matter is that they stand ready to assist in all instances where there is any form of discrimination on whatever subject.

As I think the honourable member will know, I have a particular interest in this matter, because I introduced the first sex discrimination legislation into this Parliament.

Whatever happens, the problems that women have in the work force and elsewhere will be foremost in the minds of these people.

REDCLIFF

Mr. BLACKER: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware of a statement made by Professor H. S. Green, of the Department of Mathematical Physics at Adelaide University, in his response to the environmental effects statement by Dow Chemical Company when he said:

A spill of 10 m³ of E.D.C. would therefore result in the evaporation of about 100 kg per day within the Port Augusta area and almost certainly require the evacuation of the town.

If the Minister is aware of the statement, does the Government question that comment and, if so, what action has the Government taken to check its validity?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am aware of Professor Green's statements. In fact, it has been my habit over the months to invite people who have had concern in relation to the Redcliff scheme to meet me in my office or at Parliament House with officers of the Government so that they could put their point of view. We have certainly not tried to dodge any of these issues.

I am well aware of Professor Green's submission, because he handed it to me, I think, before he handed it to Dow. Professor Green came along on that occasion with other people from Adelaide University; I think Dr. Hails was one, and I forget the names of the other gentlemen. We were certainly at pains to hear what they had to say. I have not studied the document in detail, but I remember the conversation quite clearly. Professor Green's thesis was predicated on a spill in the first instance of a fair bit more E.D.C. than that, I think, but it may have been that quantity. He was suggesting that the movement of water in that part of the Gulf was such that the E.D.C. would sink to the bottom and be carried towards Port Augusta, eventually coming to the surface and evaporating, which could lead to the probable evacuation of the town. This is worked out on the basis of a mathematical model of the way in which E.D.C. will behave. There is some scientific argument as to the correctness of this theory and calculations. I have not yet been presented with a final assessment of Professor Green's thesis but I, as Minister, and the Government will certainly require to know the answers to what Professor Green has put to us and be satisfied that what he is postulating will not occur in that way before we are satisfied.

Mr. Keneally: What if he is correct?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is not much evidence anywhere else in the world that he would be correct. Let us face it: Professor Green put it up as a scientific submission and it will require a scientific answer. If there was any real possibility of the people of Port Augusta being poisoned by E.D.C. or having to be evacuated, we will have to reassess the matter.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal

the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research Act, 1974-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the repeal of the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research Act, 1974-1975. The South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research ceased to function last year when the previous Government withheld funds for the preceding financial year. This Government is also of the view that the council is no longer required and should be disbanded and, accordingly, this Bill provides for the repeal of the Act establishing the body.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research Act, 1974-1975.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 14 August. Page 401.)

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): When I sought leave last Thursday to continue my remarks, I had been talking about Mr. Fraser and what he had done to mar sport in Australia and all over the world. I was pleased the other day to read some comments of Mr. Ellicott, a Federal Minister, who spoke of the setting up of colleges where people can learn sport and where their skills can be developed to a high level, both in the sports and academic spheres. The public life of a sportsman is short if his prowess is not up to world standard, and I hope the ideas expressed by Mr. Ellicott will be brought to fruition. Such a project has been talked about for years, but perhaps now something will happen.

The finances of our State do not permit us to do as we would like, even though the various Governments help as much as possible. Sometimes, if the people concerned contribute half the necessary funds and the Government puts in the other half, good results can be achieved in the provision of facilities. Many people who wish to play sport cannot do so, because of financial reasons. The young unemployed find it almost impossible because of the price of equipment, much of which is tax taken by the Government.

I hope soon to see the centenary test. I do not know whether Mr. Fraser will stop me from doing so, because I once spoke to some Russian cricketers, but perhaps he has not heard about it. Like the Olympic Games, the centenary test will be watched by millions of people. Such sporting events cement friendships and are watched with considerable interest.

In my letter box recently, I found a pamphlet from the Liberal Party. We often hear untrue rumours about people, and I do not suppose any person in the political sphere in this State has ever had so many untrue statements made about him as has Don Dunstan. I do not know where these rumours start. In the case of this pamphlet, I have something positive about members opposite. The tactics they used against the former Premier will not work with me.

The pamphlet comes from Robert Nicholls, who is to be the Liberal Party candidate for Unley at the next State election. At the most recent election, the Liberals said that he would be the next member for Unley. Although the election result for me was not my best, I retained the seat. The Liberals will not win Unley at the next election; the

A.L.P. will win, and by a greater margin. Robert Nicholls has been given a plum job for the boys, something this Government always complains about when the position is reversed. He is a nice person, and I have nothing personally against him. We worked amicably together during the recent election campaign, and he came to the declaration of the poll, which is more than I can say for many members opposite when one of their members has been defeated. The pamphlet is authorised by D. Willett, of 67 Greenhill Road, Wayville. Everyone knows that I have to retire before the next election; it is common knowledge in my district. Recently, a Liberal sub-branch opened in North Unley, so that when the next election comes around the Liberals hope they will have enough influence in the area to win the seat. Mr. Nicholls has now moved into the district. Either Mr. Nicholls or Mr. Willett has made a statement in the pamphlet that is quite wrong. It states:

Mr. Gil Langley, the present member for Unley, may retire soon. When he does, please support Robert Nicholls for Unley.

That is on the blue card, too, and I do not want my name on that. It is scurrilous; it is not the truth. They must be wanting to give me the kiss of death. I will be past 65 when the next election takes place, and I think it is a good idea to retire. We have seen members on the Liberal side sitting on and on. I have never mentioned the name of Mr. Nicholls in my pamphlets, but since this card has been distributed I have had many telephone calls asking whether I am retiring. It is quite wrong for the Liberals to carry on like this.

Mr. Randall: He's going to take over from you.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Henley Beach has one thing in his favour: he will not be here after the next election. I will be retiring gracefully, and he will retire defeated. It is wrong for the Liberal Party to say that I may retire soon. My secretary and I have been answering telephone calls about my possible retirement.

Unemployment is a serious problem, and many people in my district are worried about the present situation in relation to cleaners and cleaning contracts. Cleaning is a job many women can do, and several lose their jobs each time a change is made. Cleaning is being done by contractors, and the people who are losing their jobs are not given an opportunity to work for the contractors, who put on people from outside. This makes no difference, in my opinion, to the unemployment situation, but it is about time the Government thought of these people and of its promise that it would not retrench anyone. Opportunities are being given for people to go to Port Lincoln, Whyalla, or anywhere else where there is a vacancy, but it is about time the Government showed some consideration for the people I have mentioned. In many cases, they have their own homes and cannot afford to leave the district, and some are at an age where they cannot get another job. They have worked for the Government for years, and have done an excellent job. I deplore the actions of the Government in this matter. I have read correspondence from the A.G.W.A., from which it appears that disruptions and strikes are being caused.

If the people concerned had sat down around the table to negotiate, they would have ascertained that people in different walks of life have a life to live and should have the opportunity to continue in their jobs. However, if people do the wrong thing, that is another matter. I support the motion.

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I am pleased to take part in this debate and to endorse the sentiments so ably put by my colleagues who moved and seconded the

motion. I was heartened to hear in the Governor's Speech that tourism is now acknowledged by this Government as being one of the fastest growing industries in the world. Of course, honourable members would know of my great interest in this subject and that I based my maiden speech last year on this topic. The Government acknowledges the important benefit of tourism to the State and realises that this State should take advantage of present trends.

Part of the acknowledgement has led the Minister of Tourism to initiate a review of the Department of Tourism and, in so doing, she has instructed the committee of review to consider ways and means by which the effectiveness of the department will promote and enhance tourism, how that can be done, and how the great potential of this State as a centre of tourist activity can be realised. I hope that the review will show that, in this State, we have as much to offer the tourist as has any other State and that, with a co-ordinated plan of attack, we can gain ground and recover the initiative in marketing that we have lost over the past few years.

However, one area of marketing which is often forgotten but which is so fundamental affects all South Australians. If you were to ask a restaurateur about the best way to market food, he would undoubtedly say that this depends on service, quality and presentation of the food. This creates a reputation which, by word of mouth, will spread throughout the community and advertise the effectiveness of the product. If you were to ask any major marketing expert about this, he would say that word of mouth advertising is the fillip of any campaign, because, if the product is good and if you can produce happy and contented customers and consumers, you cannot go far wrong.

Last year, it was estimated that about 45 000 South Australians travelled overseas and about 100 000 to 200 000 South Australians travelled interstate. I will lay London to a brick that, at some stage of those trips interstate and overseas, during a conversation somewhere, someone would have asked, "What is South Australia like; what do you have; what is it like to live there?" After all, some facets of South Australia are envied by travellers from other parts of Australia and overseas.

We were informed recently by the Director of the Constitutional Museum that South Australia was steeped in history. For instance, Adelaide had the first municipal Government established outside the United Kingdom. The Director also informed us that at least 30 000 years had passed since Aboriginal people first colonised this region. He told us that our Government had met in regular sessions for 123 years, a record of continuity matched by only four nations in the world. The Director also mentioned that Adelaide rose 144 years ago when San Francisco and Los Angeles were little mission towns and before there was a Vancouver, a Dallas or a Hong Kong.

He further told us that our university is older than 36 of the 45 universities in Britain, older than the Universities of Stanford and Chicago, and older than 15 of the 36 colleges of the University of Oxford. The Director also told us that the building that houses the Constitutional Museum was completed 10 years before Britain's present Houses of Parliament were completed. Therefore, we can justly and rightly claim that South Australia is a State of history and that we are proud to be South Australians because of that sense of history.

However, sometimes being proud is not enough, because, unless we can relate what we are proud of, we do ourselves and our State an injustice. Perhaps we need to encourage every South Australian and every person in South Australia to visit our many points of interest to see for themselves some of the unique attractions that we have

and to absorb some of our history. I refer, for instance, to one of our newest attractions that is drawn from one of the oldest buildings—namely, the Constitutional Museum. Not only can we see a visual historic record of the past but also we tend to lean towards reliving that history. When one thinks of the sum expended on the Constitutional Museum, one may tend to be cynical about the cost.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GLAZBROOK: One may tend to be cynical and condemn the sum expended on the Constitutional Museum. However, if one tours the complex, after the 100-minute session one cannot help feel a little taller because we have in Adelaide such an institution, which I believe to be equal to any institution I have seen in the world. Our Festival of Arts, first started in 1960, and the traditional John Martin's Christmas pageant, which started in 1933, are established events and certainly lend colour and culture to our calendar of tourist offerings. Even Johnny's itself is an institution, having been established in this State in 1866.

Adelaide has many buildings of architectural merit, one being Edmund Wright House, which was designed by E. W. Wright and built in 1876 to 1878. Another famous building, which is located on North Terrace, was started from a small cottage in 1855; in 1859 it was enlarged by the addition of a ballroom, and in 1874 a dining room was added. That building is known today as Ayers House, and it contains the headquarters of the National Trust and a restaurant complex. St. Francis Xavier's Cathedral in Wakefield Street, the southern section of which was begun in 1856 and completed in 1858, was described in the *Mercury and Sporting Chronicle* of April 1857 as "a noble edifice". St. Peter's Cathedral was under construction a few years later, in 1869.

Other buildings such as the Lutheran Church in Flinders Street, built in 1872, occupied rather less prominent sites, but builders and architects responsible for these buildings, such as Henry Stuckey, who designed St. Peter's College at Hackney, which was described as one of the finest Gothic buildings in Australia, were fortunate to have most of the materials available locally. We also have our own Festival Theatre, which is an architectural attraction.

Mr. Slater: What about the Adelaide railway station? You missed that.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: That is not bad either. The Murray River, sometimes referred to as Australia's Mississippi, abounds in history along its banks and still supports a growing tourist trade.

Our metropolitan beaches can be described as some of the best family swimming beaches in Australia. Certainly, we should be able to cling to the fact that they are just that. Many people are apt to take the negative approach and say, "Why should we worry about tourism; what have we got to offer?" As I mentioned earlier, the best selling tool we have for this State is ourselves, and the information we spread by word of mouth. I believe that if we look carefully at what we have we will realise that we have much to offer. Perhaps the reason for the existence of the knockers who mention the things we do not have, the people who love to say, "What have we got to offer?" is that they do not want to realise just what we do have.

I believe that a great number of people in South Australia are uninformed, or ill-informed. I believe that they are not conscious of what we have to offer tourists from interstate and overseas, and also to offer South Australians. When talking to a group of young people the other day I posed the question: if a stranger was to visit our State and ask questions about the State, or ask

directions as to where he would find, say, the telecommunications museum, just how many could answer? I also asked them how many could answer correctly if asked where the museum of economic botany is, and what is there, or where the Edmund Wright building is situated. How many people know where the Constitutional Museum is and what is to be seen there? How many people, if asked by someone to direct them to the museum, or what specialist collections are in that museum, could answer those questions? How many people could answer simple questions such as where is the statue of Queen Victoria or where is Colonel Light's statue? Some of the answers I received to those questions would astound you.

Incidentally, the telecommunications museum was written up in the *Advertiser* of 16 March 1978 by Mr. Ray Polkinghorne, as follows:

The telecommunications museum display at Electra House, King William Street, is a reminder that South Australia has had its moments of historical glory.

Honourable members may not know it, but we have resounding firsts in Australian telecommunications, such as, in January 1878, the first Australian use of telephone over a long distance wire; in September 1897 the first public demonstration of wireless telegraphy; in July 1898, at Henley Beach, the first wireless telegraphy link was established; in 1921 the fixing of the South Australian-Western Australian border by wireless signals which circled the earth.

The museum of economic botany, of course, is located at the Botanic Gardens, which was established itself in 1855 when George Francis became the first superintendent. The garden fulfilled many important functions for the colony in those days. Economic crops such as strains of wheat, oats, fruits, vines, flax, etc., were tried and, if considered suitable, distributed to the public for further assessment.

Mr. SLATER: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Two of the early directors in the area of economic botany were avid botanists. Plant collectors were encouraged to send native material to Dr. Schomburgk, who exchanged both seed and herbarium specimens of the States flora with overseas scientists. Exotic ornamental plants were introduced to soften the colours and textures of this harsh new environment. The public flocked to enjoy the lush paradise established at the Botanic Gardens which revived memories of their homeland. Today, the displays in the Botanic Gardens continue for the use and information of the public.

When we add to our list of attractions in the State the Birdwood Museum, the galleries and restaurants of Hahndorf and the wine producing centres in the Southern Vales area, and when we consider our sailing, water skiing and swimming areas, we must realise that Adelaide is an important tourist destination in this State.

Adelaide also serves as the base for tours to surrounding areas, for, whilst the Barossa Valley brings many visitors from interstate and intrastate, it also serves as a secondary attraction to many more visitors who come here for other reasons. The Southern Vales area and the scenic area of the Hills are, to many people, still little known or sought. The main attraction, we are led to believe, is the Barossa Valley. Historically, the wineries with their offer of free wine for tasting purposes, of purchasing wine at cellar door prices and of learning more about the wine industry, have been great attractions. Little is known, however, of the private museum and collection at Chateau Yaldara, with its priceless treasures.

The five-day biennial Barossa Festival is another major attraction. Such festivals as Melodies Nacht and the brass band concerts add to the flavour that is the Barossa Valley, as do the German food, the festivals and even the language. Angaston's blacksmith's shop, the museums at Nuriootpa, Tanunda and Lyndoch, the old winery, Lyndoch's old telegraph office and the whispering wall are all part of the history that is the Barossa Valley.

I recently had the opportunity to visit parts of Eyre Peninsula with the member for Eyre. It was patently obvious to me that the main attraction of the area is the coastline with its inlets, safe sheltered bays, surfing beaches, rugged coastline and spectacular cliffs. They are probably equal to some of the best scenery I have seen in the world. Of course, one of the most wellknown events in that area is the Port Lincoln Tunarama Festival. However, the national conservation parks with their natural flora and fauna from the edge of Port Lincoln to Lock, Kimba and Ceduna are attractions well worth seeing.

The Far North is known for its diversity of landscape, with its natural features of the mountains, deserts, salt lakes and, probably, its emptiness. The Coongie Lakes with their vast birdlife population are a definite attraction. The outback safaris that take in Coober Pedy, the Birdsville track, Andamooka, Innamincka, and Cooper Creek are highlights which are certainly lending themselves to the feeling of that area's being the last frontier.

Probably one of the most visited areas in South Australia is the Fleurieu Peninsula, probably because of its short distance from Adelaide. The area is renowned for its variety of natural and man-made features which create ideal holiday zones. It has a variety of scenic attractions, including the dairy country, natural bushland and the magnificent coastal scenery from the abrupt and sheer cliffs, to the stretches of good sandy beaches, all lending themselves to the availability of scenic drives, bush walking, fishing, surfing, boating, swimming, and so on.

Most South Australians have been to Victor Harbor and Goolwa, and they know the latter town as the main departure point for paddle steamer cruises on the lower part of the Murray River. People also know about the prime recreational areas which abound.

In the North of the State we have the Flinders Ranges from Wilmington to Lake Blanche, and the attractions of the natural features of the mountains, the outback, and the picturesque rugged beauty of the area. During the spring, wildflowers bloom, and the mass of colour probably creates a uniqueness compared to any other part of Australia. I believe the area has a somewhat unique national significance.

We must not forget the Pichi Richi railway service, the ruins of Kanyaka homestead or the Aboriginal rock carvings at the Yarrumboola caves, which are unique. Also in this area is the Arkaroola development, which is one of those establishments we have in Australia worthy of praise.

Kangaroo Island, the second largest island off Australia, has mainly natural environmental attractions. The man-made facets are limited to museums and to some small historical areas at Kingscote and Penneshaw. Probably the most popular aspects of Kangaroo Island are the fishing, which includes big game fishing, the beautiful beaches, rugged coastline and scenery, Flinders wildlife reserve and Seal Bay.

My comments about the rest of the State and about what we have to offer apply particularly to people who love to knock South Australia and say that we have nothing. For instance the Murray Mallee tourist region begins approximately 50 kilometres east of Adelaide and

stretches to the Victorian border. The major attractions in this area are the River Murray itself, Lakes Albert and Alexandrina, and the Coorong, which are choice natural resources. Bearing in mind the size of the river and its navigability, one cannot but refer to it as the Mississippi of Australia. As such, it is very attractive and is very much sought after for use for many water sports, such as pleasure boating, water skiing, fishing and swimming. In the large areas of surrounding bushland and lagoons, wildlife is in abundance. Although it is difficult to gain access to Lakes Albert and Alexandrina because of the mud flats, it is possible to get water access at Milang and Meningie. Parts of the Coorong, of course, are a national park and are protected. However, I believe the area is unique and could offer a great deal to the tourist and in relation to the exploration tours which people tend to look for. The more known and attractive parts of the area cover the river trade, especially that of the *Murray River Queen*, the *Coonawarra* and the *Avoca* paddle steamers. The early pioneer museum at Murray Bridge and the paddle wheeler museum at Mannum are areas well worth seeing. The Weerama Festival held in Murray Bridge each January attracts many hundreds of people.

The Mid North region has much to offer, because from Gawler to south of Port Augusta some of the most fertile pastoral and agricultural areas of the State abound, and the area offers a vast range of scenery, historic sites, mining areas and wine-growing areas. I believe that all of these places have great potential and do attract tourists. There are such towns as Burra and Clare, which remain unknown even to many South Australians. Throughout the region there are about 12 museums, the most popular of which is located at Port Pirie. Burra has enormous potential with its copper mines, miners' cottages, old hotels and buildings, attractive river areas, miners' dug-outs and the historical gaol.

I noticed with interest yesterday that the Minister of Tourism, in combination with the Minister of Environment, released a statement on the heritage town schemes, and said:

Visits to historic towns, precincts, monuments and museums are now a significant characteristic of Australian tourism, and there is every indication that this trend will continue.

Another point is raised in this same release, as follows:

Overnight visits, just by South Australians, to heritage towns would create significant tourist expenditure, and the Department of Tourism estimates that if the number of these overnight interstate tours increased by 5 per cent an additional income of about \$8 000 000 a year would be generated.

So, we cannot afford to forget some old towns such as Burra. With regard to the Riverland tourist region, which centres around the upper South Australian section of the River Murray extending from Big Bend at Swan Reach to the New South Wales and Victorian border, its attractions of history and recreation are two main contenders for the tourist. Both the river and Lake Bonney feature highly, and the well-organised cruise holidays on paddle steamers or the leisurely houseboats, which are for hire for private cruising, are available at Berri, Loxton, Renmark and Waikerie. With the solitude and peace of the river, and its natural attractions, it makes a very popular type of holiday. From floating restaurants to cruises and barbecues, it has it all. There are also very many reminders of our past along the upper reaches of the Murray River.

Many of the old wharves that line the river are still in existence, and probably those at Morgan are the best. While there are a few paddle wheelers still operating up and down the river, one can see many derelict vessels

along the banks. With the natural river environment linked to its interesting history and its links to primary industry, historical attractions and so forth, I suppose it could be said that the Riverland is a definite tourist area.

In the South-East we have Mount Gambier as the major tourist location. Because it is equidistant from Melbourne and Adelaide, it stands to gain a great deal from the influx of interstate tourism. Mount Gambier has its famed Blue Lake, and the allied lakes of the region, the limestone caves, the forests, a rugged and beautiful coastline, and the historic old seaports of the region, which add to its major attractions. The Tantanoora and Naracoorte caves are some of the best tourist drawcards. While over 60-odd caves have been discovered to date, four of the Naracoorte caves are open to the public, and apart from being of great scientific value the caves contain the most important deposits of marsupial remains in the world.

The coastal areas are regarded by some as the best in the State and offer a vast range of activities. The old seaports such as Robe show us, through the architecture, the early links with our history. Many of Robe's buildings reflect this link to its former position as being a very important port.

Each year a Bavarian festival is held at Mount Gambier with a theme of dancing and feasting. Because of the natural environment the national parks and wildlife reserves, and the preservation of flora and fauna, the attraction to tourists with the scenic drives, the lakes, the wineries, and the lesser-known museums, make it an area for prime development.

Last, but not least, I refer to the area of Yorke Peninsula, which spans from Port Broughton and Port Wakefield to the tip of the peninsula at Cape Spencer. To many people the region's main tourist claims are its coastline and sheltered waters, its fishing, swimming, surfing and boating facilities. Because of its relaxed atmosphere and close proximity to Adelaide, it is well patronised by South Australians. A popular area in this part of the State is Innes National Park, on the south-western tip. The area incorporates some spectacular rugged coastline, as well as delightful sheltered beaches. There are many references to many wrecks of ships lost off this rugged area in our early history.

On the northern end of the peninsula are Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta, which were worked as copper mines and on which, in typical fashion, the Cornish miners have left an indelible print with their miners' cottages and their little Cornwall. Looking at the history, one thinks of the Kernewek Lowender Festival, with its dances, fairs and concerts celebrating the memories of its Cornish ancestry dating back to 1861. There are a number of museums, the most famous being the "Weal Munta" Historical Museum. Having said all this, I suppose some members might wonder why I should be using a travelogue as my Address in Reply speech.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GLAZBROOK: The reason is straight forward and simple. I say to those knockers of tourism and to those who say that this State has nothing to offer tourists, that what we, as South Australians, should be acknowledging is that we have much to offer tourists of this State and to tourists from other States and overseas. Unless we, as South Australians, acknowledge this point and spread the message by word of mouth (more important still, from the experience we gain from seeing our State), no matter what money the Government and private industry spend, it will all come to little. We would be doing only part of the job if we did not concentrate on this combination of

salesmanship.

Some opponents will probably raise the furphy of the cost of petrol as a deterrent to the tourist boom. Regarding discussions with the member for Gilles (and I am sorry that he is not present in the Chamber to consider the argument I would put to him), if one looks at comparisons with, say, 1960, when the average wage was about \$43.36, and the cost of fuel was 3s. 5d. standard a gallon and 3s. 8d. super a gallon, or the equivalent of 7.56c standard and 8.29c super a litre, it will be seen that today, with the average wage at \$230 and with the purchase price at the pumps in the metropolitan area of a litre of petrol being about 28c standard and about 30c a litre super, wages have risen about 530.44 per cent, whereas petrol has risen only 370 per cent standard and about 361.88 per cent super.

Thus, if petrol prices had risen in line with wages, today we would be paying 40.10c standard and 43.9c a litre super, so it could be claimed that the argument to which I have referred is fallacious and that petrol today is cheaper a litre than it was in 1960 by about 10c a litre in relation to today's values. In 1960, most families owned only one car, whereas today most families have two cars and, if the wage-earner is providing for two cars, together with the associated costs, in these cases he is paying more. It is only dearer by our own making.

The point of my address is aimed also at the multiplying factor for job creation. The Department of Industry and Commerce, in Canberra, recently released figures showing that, for every \$1 invested in tourism, one could expect a \$3 return. Other statistics show that, for every three tourists gained, one job is created. On this analysis, if we wished to employ, say, 25 000 additional people in the State, from tourism we must generate at least 75 000 more visitors to our State. Earlier, I stated that about 45 000 South Australians had travelled overseas in the past 12 months and that between 100 000 and 200 000 South Australians had visited other States. Hypothetically, if each of these South Australians had talked to interested people and had sold the State when overseas or in other States to just one other person, and had invited and brought one person back to the State, we might have gained about 145 000 tourists. Realistically, let us say that, even if we managed to bring back 60 000 or 80 000 people, we could start to look at providing many new jobs.

What I am trying to say is that each and every one of us in South Australia holds the key to solving or helping to solve some of our own unemployment problems. As I have said, for every three people invited to South Australia from other States or overseas, we have a possibility of creating one additional job. I therefore throw out the challenge to all South Australians who will be travelling or who have relatives or friends in other States or overseas to be part of the job-creator force by inviting someone to South Australia. First, I believe that we need to learn far more about our own State, and how to market it, and how to invite those we meet in other States and overseas to visit South Australia and see it for themselves. We need to explore every possible suggestion to create the work needed to absorb the unemployed.

We have all seen the television advertisements stating that "It's our State, mate", and we have probably seen the advertisements on the backs of buses at the moment. The first line of a current advertisement on channel 7 says, "See our State". I believe that we all know that South Australia is a great place in which to live, and we all know that we need to work towards solving some of its problems. We all agree that we have to build up South Australia, that we need to provide jobs, and that it is a difficult task. We all have ideas, and I believe we all hold a

key. We should all take the responsibility, because it is within everyone's power to play an active and positive role in doing something to make the State great. We can do this and show that we are proud that it is our State, simply by inviting people here to see it and to contribute to the work force. By inviting people here to have a holiday, we will create greater demands in our shops and in our restaurants and in every facet of our living.

I suppose people will cast it aside and say that it is a ridiculous idea because it sounds too silly to work, and they will not do anything about it because of apathy and because they do not really care about solving some of the problems. We will continue to complain and to groan, and I guess the Opposition will still attack the Government for not doing anything, and other people in the community will attack each other for not doing anything, because we do not want to make suggestions one to another to solve the problems; we expect the other person to solve them for us.

I throw out to the Opposition the challenge that I throw out to all South Australians, to present and to support some ideas to create employment, particularly in the area of tourism. I believe we should take it up conjointly, Governments and private citizens alike. I do not for a moment suggest that the State Government should abdicate its responsibility or even want to take a lesser role; nor should any of the tourist bodies. If we combined we could become a mighty marketing force in Australia, worthy of consideration in the stakes of vying for the tourists in Australia and throughout the world.

I also throw out the challenge to the media to take it up and to urge public participation, for the people of the press have enormous influence on the people of a country and of a State. The media can certainly urge South Australians to invite other people from interstate and overseas to pay us a visit and to play a part in actively doing this to create more and more jobs. Perhaps we need to encourage industry and commerce in this State to take an active role interstate in inviting people here. Perhaps we will need to look at education to ensure that our young people appreciate more about the State's history and what we have to offer, for in the long run it is these young people of today who will become our marketing force of tomorrow.

To realise the great potential of the tourist dollar, we must demonstrate a determined effort to grapple with the problems of marketing and market strategy. However, we must acknowledge the great limitations of the economic restraints that we have in our budgetary controls; it cannot be left to the Government on its own or to the industry on its own; it is a total joint venture. I anticipate that the review now being conducted by the Minister of Tourism will provide the springboard into the 1980's for tourism. I hope the challenge to all South Australians to play their part in bringing a visitor to this State will prove to everyone the inherent benefit to us all that tourism can provide, particularly the employment component of increased tourism.

As I have said in this House previously, tourism is a people-to-people industry; it is a labour intensive industry that holds to the fact that computers cannot look after people. In Queensland, I believe that 29 000 are employed in the tourist and allied industries, and in Tasmania it is estimated that nearly 9 000 to 10 000 people out of a population of 456 000 are employed in the tourist industry. In Tasmania, tourism provides jobs for 5 per cent of the work force. Over the past few years in South Australia, with the decline in tourism, we now have only about 9 000 people employed in the tourist and allied industries. With less than half our population, Tasmania employs many more people than we do in tourism. In the United

Kingdom last year, 1 500 000 people were employed in tourist and allied industries, and \$8 billion was pumped into that economy from tourism.

Tourism has always been a Cinderella industry, and the tourist (the Prince Charming) is looking for the place where the glass slipper will fit. The tourist is the provider of income and jobs. We could have both. It is like the mineral wealth of the State—we can have it if we want it, if it can be developed. I look forward to the development of tourism in this State, and I await with much interest the Minister's report.

I now turn to another area of interest to us all, unemployment. During a discussion the other day with a group of year 12 students, I was heartened to hear of a unanimous feeling within the group that they as individuals would rather work for the equivalent of the unemployment benefit than receive a hand-out. We discussed this issue at length and the reasons for their statements. All said that they did not want to be seen or spoken of as "dole bludgers", or anything similar. Having heard this, I started to think that, if the equivalent of the unemployment benefit was paid to an employer and the employer or State added a sum to this to create an over-award incentive, perhaps we could find some employment opportunities in a range of places and spheres that are at present unavailable.

In further consideration of this thought, I introduced into my argument an idea that, if school leavers were given an opportunity of taking up such tasks as maintenance of school grounds, or even acting as trainers or assistant coaches for after-school training sessions, we could see that these young people, with such an incentive, could really take an active interest in working for the community. I guess that any parent who has had to front up at the school oval once or twice a week to help train the children will know what demands and sacrifices are necessary to undertake these tasks. For such work, I suggest that the young people should receive a payment over the amount currently received from unemployment benefits. This might be further developed with local government, with councils taking the role of employers. This would perhaps be similar to the old RED or SURS schemes, but it would be over a much longer and more definite period and perhaps for lesser determined hours.

This scheme would not preclude those who wished to do so from finding better or higher paid employment, but it would stop the rot of the loss of that sense of purpose in young adults. These poor young people, some of whom have lost their incentive, could find that, by some over-award payment, their incentive would be uplifted by the thought that they could work and earn a little extra. The scheme could well be expanded to community areas, such as litter patrols or park attendants. It could be extended to help youth clubs, kindergartens, elderly citizens' homes, and so on. There are so many other areas that could be looked at.

In harsh terms, it might be referred to as a civilian type of volunteer national service, and it could include areas of people being retained for further vocational guidance training. I am sure that those in contact with other employment areas, and with more expertise in this area than I have, could offer further ideas on extensions to these thoughts. Perhaps, to build up an interest in community work, we might need to act as a catalyst, and pay those presently unemployed to do the work so that later, in life, when they have found full-time employment, the interest in community work and the realisation of the need for it to be done will be known to them.

Whilst my argument is based on the need to reinstil a sense of being, and a sense of being wanted, and to

recreate the feeling that there is a purpose in life, I also believe it will do the community a favour in educating our future community to see that they in turn, when better times have been reached, can take their part in helping those less fortunate. There are also, amongst the unemployed, those who could teach under the adult literacy programmes. There may be unemployed surveyors or architects who could help associations or organisations with projects of a community nature, each receiving that incentive payment—the motivator.

What of the cost to the nation or to the State? As I have said, the major component could take as its base fund the present unemployment rate. Thus, it could be argued that it would cost no more federally than it is already costing. So, the additional incentive must come from the employer or from the State, but, in these harsh, hard, economic times, we have to proceed through the argument and look to see where perhaps we could gain the extra money to provide the incentive. Let us suggest that the incentive we are going to offer is worth \$30 a week, and that we want to offer this to 20 000 unemployed people. This would mean that \$600 000 a week, or \$31 200 000 a year, would have to be found. However, we all know that, in a State such as ours, with very limited income potential at present, and with a Budget already stretched to the limit, perhaps of necessity we must find an alternative method of funding.

Another method which certainly would not be popular amongst some people would be to reduce the current amount of the unemployment cheque by \$15, and perhaps at the same time increase unemployment benefits by \$15 for those who want to work and do some community work for the additional amount, to create an incentive, so that they would then be seen to be, and would feel that they were, working for that incentive. By this method, the cost to the State would be nothing, but it would give the honest, persevering unemployed person a sense of satisfaction at having earned the incentive, not just being given a handout. At the same time, those who could not give a damn and could not care less, those who perhaps are the real dole bludgers, could have their lives in this way made a little tougher, to the end of realising that they cannot expect to continue to get something for nothing.

I do not put this forward as an ideal solution; I merely suggest it as something that may be worth exploring to overcome the arguments on unemployment and dole bludging. I believe that this method could be used quite successfully, and that the hours to be worked for this amount, this incentive, could be based perhaps on the average wage over a 40-hour week. If the total amount paid could be earned in 20 hours, that would be the time worked for that incentive, whatever the ratio was. It could be scheduled in such a way as to permit individuals to apply for work in the normal fashion, and to have the time off to do so. It could be seen as an adjunct to the home handyman scheme which is going on at the moment. It could look at specified work for the elderly, the disadvantaged and the sick.

Federal Parliament would, I believe, be no worse off than it is at present. As the work situation becomes more progressive, fewer unemployed would need the scheme. I have floated the idea, and it is only an idea, to see what people think. I believe that the idea is to permit those who want to work to exercise the right to work and to employment. I have come across people doing community work who are unemployed and who rightly deserve that incentive because of the work they are doing for the community on a voluntary basis. I believe that they are entitled to the reward of getting something a little better than those who do not care about anyone or anything.

Let us be honest with ourselves. Very few people want

to work for nothing, but thousands of people want to work. In any sales situation, the proverbial carrot is the all-important incentive. To re-establish a lost number of our unemployed in our work force, we may need to offer that proverbial incentive. I have empathy with those who are unemployed and who are struggling, and I feel for those who are pushed into the corner of desperation and despair, who look for the alternative way out through drugs, prostitution, crime, and, regrettably, even through death. I suggest to the House that, before the suggestion is thrown out by either side or by anyone, it should be looked at, rather than just being cast aside as useless. I challenge the House and the people to look for an alternative themselves, to put forward suggestions, to stop knocking and complaining that the State is not doing something, and to come up with suggestions about how they in turn would solve the problem of unemployment.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I indicate that, as is somewhat customary in this type of speech, I will refer to contributions made by earlier speakers. In fact, I have prepared some notes for that purpose. However, before I concentrate on my prepared efforts, I will make some remarks about the pathetic performance of the Minister of Water Resources who, earlier this afternoon, was asked a very simple question by the member for Hartley. The honourable member asked the Minister, "You have recently put up water charges by 12½ per cent. This is a policy decision that you, as a responsible Minister, together with Cabinet, have taken. When the previous Government put up water charges in a similar way, you, in Opposition, were bitterly critical of such a step. Therefore, what is your viewpoint about this matter now?"

The question was quite simple and straightforward; it was certainly to the point, because it floored the Minister, who rambled on about irrigation charges while he fought desperately for time to extricate himself from the position in which he found himself. A little honesty would not have gone astray. Members on both sides have been in Opposition and in Government. I believe that the Minister lost some of the respect of other members because of the way in which he handled the matter.

If the Minister had been open and had said that there is a necessity for the Government to balance its books and that commodities such as water cannot be supplied as a charge on the State without an attempt being made to recoup the cost, his remarks would have been accepted; however, the Minister chose to run and hid behind a plethora of comments about irrigation and water charges and about making the metropolitan water bill accounts balance. As I have stated, I believe that the Minister lost some respect, and I hope that he notes my remarks.

The earlier speakers whom I have heard in this debate (unfortunately, I have not heard all speakers, because I was sick two days last week, but I read in *Hansard* some of the speeches) have made interesting and varied contributions. Some contributions, to say the least, were somewhat hard to follow. The member for Henley Beach was at some pains to attack the A.T.E.A. for having the temerity to elect its Secretary to the State Executive of the A.I.P. After an interjection to the effect that that body was affiliated, he said that he would tell us how that took place. He said that he was a member of the A.T.E.A. when the affiliation debate took place and that he was glad that the honourable member (Mr. Slater) had raised the issue by the interjection. He explained to the House that all members of the A.T.E.A. in the State who could attend were called to the Dom Polski centre to vote on

whether they believed that a wage offer was satisfactory. The honourable member stated:

Pieces of paper were given to us, as is normally the case at such meetings, as we entered the hall, indicating what was on the agenda, together with the union recommendation.

He went on to say:

Everyone was pleased to support those motions.

He was referring to the wage component. He further stated:

... they also supported the third motion for affiliation, not realising what they had done.

What sort of comment is that from a member in regard to other members of the union, who had every right to be there, who had a written agenda before them, and who could obviously read, because they debated over a long period the matter of technical officer status, which was a long-running battle with the Commonwealth Government. However, when it came to the point of whether they should vote on affiliation, the honourable member asked the House to believe that they became a bunch of dunderheads. Nothing more nonsensical could be put forward.

The honourable member went on to say, as he stated he had said on an earlier occasion, that he was proud to stand as the member for Henley Beach and say that he had come from a trade union background. He said that he had his trade union membership card to verify that fact. In other words, he was saying he was proud to be a member of an organisation that he said contained a body of delegates who were a bunch of nongs who could not read and who voted on a particular resolution without giving any thought to the matter. Not content with that, he went on to say that he was unhappy to say that he was no longer a member of that union. The honourable member outlined activities which he believed were incorrect and which he criticised. He further stated:

However, after listening to the member for Florey the other day, I felt at home again, back in the days of union meetings, because the same thing happened then. If they disagreed with you and wanted to put you down they used innuendo or made a personal attack on you.

The honourable member's left hand does not know what his right hand is doing. This is demonstrated by the fact that he said he was sorry not to be a member of a body that allowed occurrences that ought not be allowed in any organised body—if it happened, and I am sure that it did not. I believe I have illustrated the shallowness of those remarks, which were an attempt to build up a smoke screen, behind which the honourable member could get stuck into the union, the very union of which he said he was proud to be a member and of which he was sorry no longer to be a member. "Interesting" would be the most charitable word I could use in interpreting those remarks.

Another contribution came from you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in your capacity as the member for Eyre. I noted that you gave a good deal of study to the very vexed question of nuclear energy and that, on an overseas visit, you went to a great deal of trouble to acquaint yourself with power generators and other installations concerned with the nuclear fuel cycle. You referred to visits to establishments in France and in other places. I was impressed by your contribution, since I believed that it was very thoughtful and certainly indicated a great deal of application in an obviously tight schedule. A great deal of your time was given to the study of the topic.

Just as I was feeling good about the contribution generally, I was let down, because reference was made to a certain publication called, I think, *The Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear*. This book came to your attention and was purchased in a Covent Garden bookshop in London.

With all due respect, this book was put forward as a snippet of information for the benefit of other honourable members who had not been fortunate enough to go to London and obtain a copy. For your information, Sir, I point out that that book has been in the Parliamentary Library for quite some time. I borrowed the book so long ago that I have had two reminder notices to return it. I found the book extremely interesting but very biased.

The writer, Petr Beckman, set out to put forward a case making use of statistics which are readily available from all sorts of authorities on this subject. Mr. Beckman is described in the back of the book as having been born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and having obtained a Ph.D. and D.Sc. degrees, so is certainly well qualified academically. He worked for the research institute of the Czechoslovakia Academy of Sciences until 1963, when he was invited to the University of Colorado. I ask honourable members to note the charming nature of those words, "... when he was invited to the University of Colorado and did not return behind the Iron Curtain." One often sees that act being described as someone having defected to the East or West, wherever they go. In this case, the gentleman was invited to the University of Colorado and did not return to Czechoslovakia. The book states that he is the author of eight books and more than 60 scientific papers.

Originally he worked in electro magnetics and probability theory, and he became strongly interested in questions of energy, and now publishes the monthly newsletter *Access to Energy* in his spare time. The book goes on to list other qualifications. It states (I believe this is of some interest, and in fairness I wish it to be recorded) that he has no personal stake in nuclear power, owns no stocks of any corporation, nuclear or otherwise, and is not involved in any research projects funded by any corporation or the federal government. If I were uncharitable, I would suspect that that is why he wrote the book (because he is not in receipt of any other emoluments, so he was forced to pick up a few dollars). I am not going to be so uncharitable, because there is a good deal in the book that is worth reading. Whether one accepts the information in the book is up to individual interpretation.

The member for Newland was at some pains in his Address in Reply speech (and I propose to deal with his contribution later in my remarks) to point out what a healthy occupation involvement in nuclear power generation is. Of course, he was using statistics which are available and which can be presented in various ways. In your speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking as the member for Eyre, you were at some pains to read quotations from this book. I have some quotations from the very same book, which is quite clearly devoted to indicating what a healthy occupation nuclear power generation is. I thought that I would also introduce into the record a few quotations from that book. At page 143, for example, the following is stated:

There was indeed undue laxness in the security of some of the phases of the nuclear fuel cycle when the book was published—

Beckman was there referring to the book *Nuclear Theft, Risks and Safeguards*, 1974, written by Theodore Taylor, a nuclear physicist, and Mason Willridge, a Professor of Law—

and it doubtlessly played no small part in bringing about the remarkable tightening of security at nuclear facilities that has taken place in the last two years.

That book was written in 1976. Let us look at that statement a little more closely. What is being said by a person who is a proponent of nuclear power generation is

that everything in the nuclear garden was not as lovely as outwardly indicated at that time. The whole point of my introducing that quotation was to show that that is the problem with this whole area. There is so much money at stake, and so many reputations involved, that at times the public does not have Buckley's chance of finding out the truth. This is, I believe, an indication by a proponent of nuclear power generation that, certainly up until 1976, anyway, things were not going as well as they ought to have been, nor as well as was being publicly indicated with relation to the possible (and I use that word carefully) hazards associated with nuclear power generation. Beckman goes on to point out the series of engineering safety systems to control any malfunctions that may occur, as though engineers are gods and their work is never wrong. Yet, on 22 March 1975 (well documented in this book), at Browns Ferry, in Alabama, a nuclear power plant had a fire. I was not aware of this fact before, so I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for reminding me to look at the book.

This fire, which occurred after Mr. Beckman had pointed out how many redundant safeguards are built in in nuclear power generation plants, was caused, in his own words, as follows:

Yes, there was a fire at Browns Ferry plant in Alabama in March 1975. Yes, it was started by a candle which an inept electrician used to check whether some cables went airtight through the wall. (Since then, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requires all electrical cables to have fireproof insulation.)

That is the important point. We learn another little fact that few of us realised before. Obviously, a fire is a hazard in a nuclear power plant, yet up until that time the Nuclear Regulatory Commission of the United States had not thought to specify fireproof insulation for the very wiring that may carry the power that controls the fission or provide emergency measures built to provide various safeguards. A simple precaution such as fireproof insulation was not used. It is something that is commonly done in the Navies of the world where the need has been long recognised, yet it was not thought of by the same god-like engineers who can construct giant plants where nothing will go wrong, and where, if something goes wrong, they have it covered.

The Browns Ferry fire involved a number of other errors. First, an electrician who could not find his torch took out a candle, lit it, held it up to look at something and ignited the insulation on a bunch of cables he was checking. Further errors listed by Mr. Beckman included the fact that firefighters and security people were not called in until the guard sounded the alarm 10 minutes later, after calling the wrong number first. Apparently, there had been a change in the number for the security man to call, it had not been put up on the wall, he did not know about it, and he called the old number. Eventually he discovered his mistake. These are those redundant, built-in, guaranteed sure-fire safety precautions that will make sure that nothing will ever go wrong. The matter does not end there. Only after seven hours did the plant superintendent allow water to be used on the fire. The plant superintendent, probably quite rightly, was worried initially about where water which might have been contaminated might go. He, therefore, insisted on the firemen using chemical means to put out the fire. The fire got bigger, so he had to agree to water being used after seven hours. Then, of course, the fire was put out. The thing I want to stress is that Beckman then made a rather charming assertion when he said that, because nothing disastrous happened, the foregoing comedy of errors showed how much human error a nuclear power plant can

take. I do not know whether the ordinary population is happy about that sort of comment.

If we look at page 73 of his book we find some rather curious wording. It sets out a report of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission which came out considerably later, of course, after a thorough investigation had been carried out, stating the bare facts as I have already given, that on 22 March 1975 a fire was experienced, and so on. Paragraph 1.3, which is photocopied into the book, states:

The review group has studied the considerable evidence now available on the Browns Ferry fire and has considered the possibility that the consequences of the event could have been more severe even though in fact they were rather easily forestalled.

"Seven hours later," I would add to that. Even so, we can accept that the Regulatory Commission published those words. It continues:

It is certainly true that, in principle, degraded conditions that did not occur could have occurred.

There is an admission that something worse could have happened, but fortunately did not happen. It continues:

Some core cooling systems were, or became unavailable to cool the core.

This is a reference to a possible melt down, which I think most members would understand. It continues:

Much attention was drawn to the unavailability of emergency core cooling systems.

I mentioned that I thought that some of the wording is curious and I draw members' attention to this:

While it is certainly true that the availability of these systems would have been comforting—

they are the ones that turned out to be not working—they were not required during the Browns Ferry fire. In the absence of a loss of coolant accident, systems other than those designated as emergency core cooling systems are capable of maintaining an adequate supply of water to the core.

We are left to work out what that is. Presumably that means one could call out the local fire brigade—it is not clear to me; certainly, I believe those words are rather strange, to say the least.

I shall try to summarise into three or four sentences the argument that Beckman continually advances: (1) nuclear power generation is a piece of cake; (2) just in case something does go wrong, we have a great deal of redundant fail-safe arrangements built into the system; (3) most of the things we guard against cannot or will not happen anyway. The gentleman is an electrical engineer, as far as I know, and I find that rather curious logic. I shall leave it to members to make their own judgment on that matter. I point out that probably one of the most recent examples that we have had of a super-doooper piece of equipment, in the United States or anywhere else, is the United States defence early warning missile set-up. I imagine, having been in electronics myself before coming into this House, that there is any number of built-in fail-safe, duplicate, plug-in and what have you arrangements to try to make sure not only that it is going but also that it is going in a dinkum fashion and not giving one an erroneous indication. Yet we have been treated recently to quite a lot of information as to the performance of that equipment. Of course, much of the safeguard equipment associated with nuclear power generation is electronic in nature, and one can only assume that it has no better reliability than has been publicly aired in relation to what one would hope is the finest piece of equipment in the world, bearing in mind the possible consequences of a wrong indication and of someone pushing the wrong button.

I repeat that, despite my criticisms, there is information of interest and value in the book; I do not wish to dismiss the book out of hand completely. What I am suggesting to members who read the book and the contributions made in the debate so far is that they put their own interpretations on it and try to weigh and assess its real value. One of the worries that very many ordinary people in the world have in relation to nuclear power generation is, in simple terms, that the more uranium that is required and in circulation the more the possibility of an increase in nuclear weapons as a corollary. On page 136 of the book Mr. Beckman, who likes nuclear power generation, referring to the fact that Brazil may get an enrichment plant, states that the Brazilian Foreign Minister said:

We would never dream of making a nuclear bomb—which I believe many people would have found reassuring—

unless Argentina made one first.

It is that kind of worry that most people have about nuclear generation.

To give us a clue as to the character, background and thinking processes of Mr. Beckman, I draw members' attention to the following quotation from chapter 9, headed "Why?", and with the subheading "Look deeper". Beckman is talking about the motivation of people who oppose nuclear generation. In this paragraph he states:

Who is it that has so far most effectively opposed the anti-nuclear hysteria?

He goes on:

Let me say that I have, in general, little love for contemporary trade unionism—

which is rather strange to find in a book of this nature, I guess, but this might indicate the character of Mr. Beckman—

and I have a positive aversion against the American Federation of Teachers.

He goes on to say that those very people he dislikes he does like because they are the ones who speak up decisively in defence of nuclear power. I think that is an interesting commentary on the character of the gentleman concerned. He has little love of contemporary trade unionism, but when unions have the same view as he has he is pleased with them, and congratulates them in the book. I think members would be well advised to look at the whole of the book and its statements.

I now want to assist the House and public of South Australia by dispelling and disposing of two myths put around by the Minister of Mines and Energy and other Government Ministers. The myths they are circulating are that it is the Liberal Government which has been responsible for a great upsurge in mining activity, and that it is the Liberal Government which is taking steps to improve South Australia's energy position. Those are the myths; what are the facts? The facts are that before the last election the then Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson, in a press release dated before the present Government came into office, said:

A \$10 000 000 a year gas and oil exploration programme will be conducted by South Australian Oil and Gas in the Cooper Basin over the next three years. This is an increase of \$15 000 000 over those years on the programme previously planned.

We know that since that time the present Government is trying to claim the credit for that. Mr. Hudson also stated:

The Government would continue to promote electric vehicle development and continue to support development of the Flinders electric vehicle.

In this area of development, the present Government has dumped support to quite a degree, and I believe the Government is wrong in doing that. It ought to have

another look at this matter and provide further support. Mr. Hudson also said:

Plans for the delivery of l.p.g. from the Cooper Basin and its distribution in South Australia as well as plans to encourage appropriate conversion facilities for cars and encouragement for cars to be designed especially for liquid petroleum gas . . .

The present Government has made similar announcements, so there is no change whatsoever there; the Government is continuing to perpetrate the myths I have mentioned. Mr. Hudson also said:

There is continuing priority in bringing the Redcliff project to reality.

What is the state of play now? It is exactly the same. It is largely dependent on Dow, and whether that company can make it viable economically, etc. That is the present position with this Government, which has made announcements, despite what was said in the House today, about Redcliff.

Mr. Hudson went on to say that provision would be made for a pipeline to bring the liquids down from the gasfield, and so on; that announcement has been made. Mr. Hudson further announced that the northern power station planning was well in hand, and the project was under way, yet we were treated last year or early this year to an announcement from the present Minister of Mines and Energy, who drummed up a little publicity in respect of the very same project.

I have said that there were two myths, and that one of them was that the present Government is claiming that it is responsible for a great upsurge in mining activity. What are the true facts? Never mind the myth.

Perhaps one measure of mining activity could be argued to be the number of exploration licences extant at a given time in a Government's period of office. So, I refer to the Department of Mines and Energy list, South Australia, current as at 1 July 1980, headed "Exploration licences—Mining Act, 1971-1978". We find that the numbering begins at 412 and ends at 534, and the date is a rather pointed one as far as I am concerned, namely, 17 September 1979; it is a one-year licence, meaning that it was issued on that most unfortunate date last year.

Mr. Blacker: Election day.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is right. Deducting 412 from 534, we find that 122 exploration licences were extant at that time last year. Let us look at the record now. We find (and this sheet is valid on 1 July 1980; the figures refer only up to the end of June) that from 535 to 654 was the then current number on 30 June. Licence No. 654 was issued to the Dampier Mining Company Limited for one year ending on 29 June 1981. So, only 120 licences were extant on the date many months after the new Government came to power. I am not saying that that is the be-all and end-all of mining activity, but the official list of exploration licences currently available for use is certainly an official indication of the state of activity.

Having simply dispelled those two ridiculous myths perpetrated by the Government, I turn now to the contribution to the Address in Reply debate made by the member for Newland. In his early remarks, he said:-

I want to take a brief look at the relative economics and at some of the environmental consequences of each of those options.

He was referring to various methods of providing electricity by generation. He continued:

I cite as an example the car sticker which says, "Solar employs, nuclear destroys". The premise on which that car sticker is based is that solar energy and nuclear energy are alternatives.

Would you note the following words, Mr. Acting Speaker:

They are not.

The honourable member, who I understand is a data analysis scientist, is so knowledgeable in this vastly complex area on which the entire world is engaged and trying to sort out at the moment, namely, the provision of enough energy to keep our economies and lifestyles viable, says, "They are not". My response to that kind of remark is that as a scientist he ought to be more cautious in being so devastating from a base which can at least be questioned. I add my little postscript to his remarks and say, "Perhaps not yet". I believe that that would be a much fairer statement of the position.

Mr. Ashenden: And not this century, either.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member who is interjecting should stick to putting cars together or whatever he used to do for Chrysler (or Mitsubishi, as it will be in a few days), and he will probably be on safe ground. The point I am trying to make to him is that he should talk about what he knows. Where there is room for doubt and consideration, he should at least do the House the courtesy of so indicating. "They are not" is a nice bald statement.

Mr. Ashenden: He's quite right.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: He is not, but he may not be quite wrong, either. I am not saying that he is wrong. If the honourable member, whose chief achievement in the House has been to try to dob in a member who had an unfortunate accident with the mechanism that we leave this building with, continues in that vein, I can think of other ripostes he may not enjoy so well. This matter requires our earnest and sensible consideration; it does not require misguided loyalty to a mate. The member for Newland could probably handle himself in this matter, and he will certainly do better than accept assistance from his colleague who is trying to help him, because he does not know what he is talking about. The honourable member should think over my remarks, and I will try to proceed with my contribution to the debate.

Dr. Billard: Your comments haven't negated what I said.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I did not say that I was right or wrong, but the honourable member made that three-word declarative decision on a matter which is engaging half the world's energy scientists day and night right now. I said that a true scientist is usually humble when in the company of his superiors and would at least have the grace to say that this matter is still under consideration by the best brains in the world. He might even realise that his brain is not in that category. It may be, but it has not yet been demonstrated to us. He continued:

There are many factors operating which are pushing us in this direction. First, there is the crisis in natural liquid transportation fuels, such as oil and gas.

Fancy a member who put that in as supporting his speech on energy espousing the cause of O'Bahn. Here is a member pointing to the oil shortage facing the whole world yet, in another arena and on another plane, he is happy to espouse a different cause. I look forward to his improving his attitude on public transport.

Dr. Billard: Why didn't you read it all?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will. If the honourable member stops interjecting, I will give him further advice and discussion on the contribution he made. He continued (and this is a beauty):

Thirdly, there is a trend within the technology of power generation which favours larger centralised power installations. For example, nuclear power stations must normally be at least of a size of 500 megawatts . . .

That is not true, as one will see if one has recourse to the

third report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee; it is an excellent report, well worth reading. The committee comprised all kinds of eminent members, some of whom are quoted regularly by the Government. The report contains a list in relation to the total nuclear power generation in the world.

There are 201 plants listed as operating, and this is defined as being in commercial operation. The summary contains only plants which are over 30 megawatts. The countries with nuclear-powered generators smaller than 500 megawatts that are contained in the South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee report (which uses figures from the Australian Atomic Energy Commission as at 1 September 1978) are as follows: Argentina, India, Italy, Bulgaria, Netherlands, Pakistan, Switzerland, and the German Democratic Republic. I am trying to be fair in this matter, so I will quote other countries that are listed as having nuclear generators, the capacity of which is shown as a lump total. I suggest that it is at least reasonable to suppose that some of the generators will be of less than 500 megawatt capacity. These countries are Spain, France (12 nuclear generators with a total capacity of 4 703 megawatts, which would suggest that some are smaller than 500 megawatts), United Kingdom (33 nuclear generators with a total output of 8 094 megawatts), and the Soviet Union (21 nuclear generators with an output of 7 743 megawatts). The honourable member said that nuclear power stations must normally be of at least a size of 500 megawatts. I would suggest that that indicates that there are many abnormal nuclear power generators in the world, because there are many in that list of 201 generators with a capacity of less than 500 megawatts. The honourable member said:

Nevertheless, any discussion of power sources must be within the context that . . .

The honourable member had already committed an error earlier in his speech which he then compounded. He went on:

. . . we recognise that there will be a large and increasing need for large scale electric power generation.

The Uranium Enrichment Committee Report of October 1979 estimates that there will be a 5 per cent increase in electric generation demand up to 1985 and from 1985 onwards there will be a 3½ per cent increase in demand. They are not my figures, but figures which are provided by far more eminent authorities than I and which are available in the library for any member to read. I suggest that a 5 per cent increase is not a large increase. I do not believe that the use of the words "large and increasing need for large scale electric power generation" can be justified.

We were then treated by the honourable member to a treatise on all the ills of possible hydro-electric power. He said that dams all over the world keep breaking and flooding and killing people. He referred to incidents as far back as 1928 and as recent as 1972 in which a great many people were killed. I venture to say that all those dams were engineered and designed by the same Godlike engineers who keep telling us that there is nothing wrong with nuclear power generation. Since they can apparently make errors when designing dams for hydro-electric power, why is it that they cannot make errors and false assumptions when they are building nuclear power generators?

I am not saying that they do make errors, but I am saying that there is such a possibility. That is the sort of thing that worries many people in the world and that is why the nuclear industry is where it is now. That is part of the reason for the Labor Party's policy on this whole matter in South Australia. We are not saying, "It is

hopeless," "We must not," and "Never," we are saying "Unless and until." I think that is a fair way of putting it. The honourable member said:

Coal, in the U.S.A., for these studies was quoted at \$25 a tonne, whereas coal in Europe, on the other hand, costs about \$55 a tonne.

The honourable member then said:

The U.S.A. studies found that nuclear energy was more economic at those coal prices.

What is the basis of the nuclear power generating cost, because authorities can be found in the library that argue about the amount of money that has been a direct subsidy to the nuclear power industry in America, but the smallest amount I could find was \$25 000 000 000 by way of subsidy to the nuclear power industry since it began in the 1950's. When that cost is transferred to the cost of nuclear power generation we find it is not as cheap as we are being asked to believe.

Having got to a point in his speech where he was saying how lovely, how delightful and how healthy nuclear power generation is, the member for Newland got right down to the end of the springboard. All of a sudden he realised that, if what he was advocating and the "facts" that were being put forward by him were sound, then why was he not advocating loudly anywhere he can that we should be using nuclear power in South Australia? We all know why the honourable member is not advocating that. First, it is not as simple as a clear-cut difference in cost and health hazards as he was trying to put forward. It is far more complex than that.

Secondly, the honourable member is a political animal, just like the rest of us, when it comes to having to go against his Party, as might be required, or even to put the future of his Party in jeopardy. In relation to the argument about uranium and nuclear power generation in Australia, a heck of a lot of people are prepared to make money out of this development as long as it is done somewhere else. Anything associated with having it actually in our State or in our country brings a vastly different reaction from them, and that is the dilemma in which the honourable member found himself. He was doing so well in accordance with the series of statements and facts that he had to recoil and resile from his position, so he posed the following question and made the following comment:

Should, indeed, we abandon all coal-fired power? No, I do not believe that that is the case, but it does mean that we should proceed with caution.

I call the honourable member's attention to a publication which he might find interesting (I am sure he will take the trouble to look at it): the *World Coal Study*, which has been available since May this year. That study states that the study team comprised 38 persons holding key positions in Governments and private and public organisations in 16 countries. Many of those countries also have nuclear power, an interesting fact, considering that this study was into the use of coal. They were eminent, qualified people who got together to study the use of coal.

Australian members of the World Coal Study team included three participants and two associates, and the study went on for 18 months. Secondment from Government departments was provided for, and so on. There is one interesting statement, and the honourable member could have recourse to this book, as could other honourable members if they wished to pursue the matter further. Point 4 in WOCOL's summary relates to a press statement embargoed to 13 May of this year and states:

Coal can be mined, moved, and used in most areas in ways that conform to high standards of health, safety, and environmental protection by the application of available technology and without unacceptable increases in cost.

That is important, because in the past far too often cost has been a factor which decided the level of safety in an industry, whether coal or otherwise. That is a clear statement: "Without unacceptable increases in cost". The quotation continues:

The present knowledge—
and this will interest the honourable member, who made a point on this—

of possible carbon dioxide effect on climate does not justify delaying the expansion of coal use.

I refer to only a few extracts from the book. There are comments in relation to emissions, speaking of the sorts of thing the honourable member quite rightly pointed to in his speech. On page 145 of the book, we see outlined the steps being taken to provide for necessary improvements in the area of emissions. Undoubtedly, a copy of this book will be in the Library. It points out that one of the simplest methods is that which requires by legislation the use of low sulphur coal, and this can often be done. There are countries which have very low sulphur coal, sulphur being one of the nasty ingredients after combustion that we do not want around the place. Steps can be taken, both legislatively and technologically, to improve the scene with respect to emissions.

In relation to CO₂ problems, the amplification from the summary in the book makes the following statement, among others:

There is a disagreement amongst scientists about the magnitude and the urgency of the problem and the detailed interactions involved.

However, the problem is recognised, and one simple method available that comes to mind is reforestation. There is an interesting one that I had not heard of, and that relates to the solubility of carbon dioxide in the ocean. Apparently, scientific work has been done which shows that this is not harmful to the ocean because of a further chemical process which takes place. Work is being done on this. It is mostly theoretical, with some practical experiments at this stage. It is important to note that there is disagreement in the world among scientists on this matter.

I have read many arguments, both for and against, and most of us have heard them: what will happen if the sea level rises by 6 metres, and the temperature goes up, and so on? There are people who say that it cannot happen and people who say that it can. The problem is unresolved, but it is important that it is recognised that we should be looking at it. The honourable member did not deny that much more coal will be needed for the necessary energy supply for the world to go on as it is, or whatever course of action we have in mind. Something must be done about it.

The book to which I have referred lists the countries involved, and the list includes all the countries one would expect to find. Interesting tables show the likely splitting up of future power generation in all the major countries of the world, and they show that the whole area of nuclear power generation is one of ifs, buts, maybe's, and estimates, and nothing more than that. I suspect that most pressure in the energy world comes where the most dough is. There is a great deal of money to be made out of uranium and the rest of the nuclear fuel cycle. No-one denies that. I suppose that, as is often given in this type of book, with low and high estimates, probably what will happen in relation to the percentage of nuclear power in the total power generation field will be in the middle of the low and high estimates.

If I had had another three hours, I had proposed to talk about Urenco-Centec. A recent report introduced into this House purported to point out some further progress in the deliberations of the Uranium Enrichment Committee.

One paragraph in that publication I thought was the most important paragraph in the whole thing, because it set out that the viability and feasibility of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia is wholly dependent upon Urenco-Centec's ability to market the product, and there is an absolutely damning statement on that matter, which I have here and which I will save for another occasion, from a Mr. Kehoe, Urenco-Centec's Marketing Manager. It is a transcript of an address he gave in London in November 1977, in which he painted the most dismal picture of all time for the future of enrichment. Suffice it to say that Villani, a well-known authority on uranium enrichment, said—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Are you an expert?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Villani is certainly an expert. He said, in a table in that publication, in chapter 1:

The annual separation work—

which is a unit applied to what goes on in an enrichment plant—

for the Western World, including Western Europe, United States of America, Japan and the rest of the Western World . . . the requirement for enrichment in 1985 is 38 000 tonnes, and by 1990 it will be 58 000 to 82 000 tonnes.

That is the best estimate. The capacity for enrichment of the countries I have listed is, by 1985, 40 700 tonnes, so apparently there is already an over-supply of enrichment before we kick off Urenco-Centec's proposal in the north. In 1990, there is the first ray of sunshine, if there could be such a statement about the nuclear fuel cycle: 53 900 to 78 700 tonnes.

Dr. Billard: It takes eight years to build.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On the contrary, it does not take eight years. Urenco-Centec proudly announced in the publication I obtained from the Library, that it takes four years and, because of the modular construction, it may be as short as three years, and one adds modules and up goes the output. The near horizon is not as rosy as some people would have us believe in relation to enrichment, but the later horizon may be somewhat improved.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I support the motion. I wish to refer to social welfare issues. It is a tragedy that growing numbers of people in our community find themselves without means of adequate livelihood. The social services system, which is operated by the Commonwealth, is providing less and less relief in many such cases. The Federal Government paid \$73 000 000 less for unemployment benefits and \$60 000 000 less for pensions than it had budgeted for in the 1979-80 Budget.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Are you going on the Laurie Oakes budget?

Mr. ABBOTT: For the benefit of the Minister, I will refer to the Laurie Oakes budget later. It would appear that the present campaign by the Department of Social Security to counsel and refuse as many invalid pensions as possible is yet another attempt by the Government to reduce costs and to force more and more of these unfortunate people on to and below the poverty line.

However, before dealing further with this matter, I refer to two State initiatives that I regard as cause for concern. The first of these relates to the State Government's decision to withdraw from 1 July the Commonwealth-State agreement on sole supporting parents' benefits. Previously, the State Government paid half of the bill for benefits paid to sole supporting parents for the first six months. According to the Laurie Oakes budget, the six-monthly waiting period for supporting parents' benefits will be removed. However, we cannot be too sure about that, because we do not know whether that leak is accurate; we will know that later this evening. I hope that

it is accurate, but we need not be fooled by what that leak (or the Federal Government) promises, because the Federal Government has a history of breaking promises.

Not only will the State Government save millions of dollars by withdrawing from the scheme, but the Federal Government will also save because all new applicants must apply to the Department of Social Security for a special benefit, which is paid a fortnight in arrears. It will be interesting to see the outcome of the Federal Budget tonight and to see whether the Government intends to include this particular payment as from day one, instead of, as previously, its being paid a fortnight in arrears.

It is accepted that income security is clearly and properly the responsibility of the Commonwealth, but the decision of the South Australian Government to withdraw from the agreement was made without any proper contingency plan and, as a consequence, the sole parents will suffer. The State Government seems bent on giving these parents and their children, who are among the most vulnerable people in our society, a very hard time in order to save millions of dollars. The many families who depend solely on this form of assistance as their only means of support have been left in a state of fear and doubt in regard to their future survival.

The first six-month payment to a lone parent previously on State benefit under the States Grants (Deserted Wives) Act is no longer a system; in fact, it is a mess. Until the end of last year, the Commonwealth and the State paid about half each of the \$60 000 000 involved. Victoria was the first State to break the ranks; it announced that it would no longer pay single parents with dependent children because it considered that such payments were a Commonwealth responsibility. Single parents in Victoria and South Australia are now paid by the Commonwealth at special benefit rates, and the States top up the sum to supporting parent benefit level. The topping up involves a certain sum for those over 18 years and another sum for those under 18 years.

I understand that other States have not yet decided what to do in regard to this matter and, when last heard of, the issue had been placed on the agenda of the Premiers' Conference. Some States consider that they are committed to paying State grants plus other welfare services; but Victoria and South Australia are keen to save the money. The only sensible course is either for the Commonwealth to take over all payments from day one of the application or to completely reimburse the States at supporting parent benefit level for the first two months and then take over full responsibility. Until such a lead is given, a great deal of anxiety will be felt by single parents and by organisations that care for their welfare.

Staff employed by the Department of Social Security have told me that this decision has also placed an added burden on them and that additional staff should be employed. Staff shortages in the department are causing problems in many States, and this has resulted in poor service to claimants, particularly in regard to benefits and allowances. The delays in processing applications and changes of address cause people to telephone to ask why their payment is late. The need to deal with phone calls means that less time can be spent on processing claims. Staff are suffering from low job satisfaction because they know that they are not coping adequately with the work since they are overworked from working at night and on Saturdays and they are concerned about the welfare of people whose cheques are held up.

It is under conditions of staff strain and delayed payments that desperate claimants could become aggressive and violent. The Department of Social Security has an allocation of \$2 700 000 for overtime, \$400 000 more than

originally budgeted for. Of this sum, \$2 100 000 is spent in the benefits processing area. It appears that staff levels are being held down to levels that jeopardise the health and welfare of staff and the rights of clients. The only solution to this problem is the allocation of more staff to these heavily pressured areas. Again, it seems that this State Government and the Federal Government are not interested in helping the unemployed or in creating additional jobs. There is to be no alteration, I understand, in the Budget tonight to increase the staff levels of the Public Service.

The second matter about which I am concerned relates to the recent State Government undertaking with respect to family policy, and the introduction of a system of family impact statements. As far as we know, this means that all major State Government proposals that are likely to affect families will be subject to assessment for their potential impact on families; proposals prepared for Cabinet or Ministerial consideration (and I emphasise the word "or") must now be accompanied by a family impact statement.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Don't you think that that's a good idea?

Mr. ABBOTT: It is a good idea if the statements are made public; otherwise it is no good at all.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Before it is considered by Cabinet?

Mr. ABBOTT: From the statement, it seems that the Minister can make decisions about these statements. Therefore, a matter need not go to Cabinet; a Minister can make a decision on his own account.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Do you have a copy of the minute?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, and I have read it several times. It is a pity that the Minister has not read it. It is claimed that, in this way, information about family issues will be considered alongside economic, technical, environmental and other relevant issues in reaching decisions, and the Government will receive the necessary advice to ensure that its decisions do not have an adverse effect or consequence on the family. The protection and strengthening of family life is a matter about which we can all agree, but is the Government serious about this policy, which is claimed to be a world beater? I think not. To a recent Question on Notice about whether the Government intends to make those impact statements public, I received the following answer:

Family impact statements will be completed by the department or authority concerned. They will be included with Cabinet papers and will form part of Cabinet submissions. Cabinet papers are confidential.

What is the purpose there? What is the good of family impact statements if they are to remain confidential? The Government boasts that its policy is one of open government by making information available to the people. Government decisions are and can be detrimental to families, especially low income earners who cannot afford the increases that have been announced by this Government. What are the family impact statements on the recently increased transport charges; on water and sewerage rate increases; on electricity charges; on sole supporting parents I have just referred to; and on increased rents and proposed education cuts? Nobody will know, because these statements are being kept confidential. What impact will Budget cuts on hospitals have on families, with the possible loss of hundreds of jobs and the downgrading of patient care?

When the Government stopped patients in public hospitals and institutions from having biscuits with their morning and afternoon tea so as to save a few cents, that had a big impact on patients, especially people like the

pensioner to whom my colleague the member for Unley referred, who is an inmate of the Hillcrest Hospital and whose pension cheque is taken for his keep. That has had a substantial effect on that person, who I might mention is over 70 years of age.

The Minister has denied in this Chamber that that decision taken by the hospitals and various institutions was her decision, but I believe that, indirectly, it was a Government decision. The Government has apparently instructed the hospitals to cut costs, and hospital boards have taken the decision to cut out biscuits. I regard that as penny pinching. The bureaucrats will not care two hoots about the effects that their decision will have on the family, because many departments have a vested interest in their programmes and undertakings. Family impact statements and assessments are prepared only on major Government decisions. They do not apply to private enterprise, the closing down of factories, business operations, new housing developments, and so on. It seems that it is just an idea that was plucked out of the air and given much window dressing by the Government.

To show how insincere this Government is about this matter, I will refer to a report prepared by an officer of the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs and titled, "Bowden and Brompton, Plan for Action", which is based on the second report of the Hindmarsh Steering Committee. Among other things, it makes recommendations regarding land surplus to transport requirements in those suburbs. The report has already been discussed with the Hindmarsh council, even though it has no Government sanction at this stage. No information will be made public until the report has been adopted by both the Government and the Hindmarsh council, and until consultation has been carried out with property owners and other agencies.

There are 20 recommendations in the Bowden and Brompton Plan for Action Report, and I will now quote five of them. Recommendation (7) states:

That the Highways Department, council and Gerard Industries Pty. Ltd. conclude an agreement on the general arrangement of the company's future development with regard to local improvements by council, the disposal of land surplus to transport requirements, and with the objectives and relevant recommendations of this report, prior to the transfer of Government land to the company.

Recommendation (8) states:

That land surplus to transport requirements as delineated in table 1, item 1, 2, map 3, circle 1, 2, be reserved for Gerard Industries Pty. Ltd. until an appropriate agreement is reached on the general arrangement of the company's future development according to recommendation (7) above.

Recommendation (9) states:

That the South Australian Housing Trust be requested to assemble land between Second and Fifth Streets, Bowden, subject to the requirements of Gerard Industries Pty. Ltd. for employee car parking, and of council for road widening, using land surplus to the South Australian Gas Company and to transport requirements as a basis of acquiring a suitable land stock for industrial and commercial development, either on its own account or for resale in suitable parcels to private industry.

Recommendation (14) states:

That the Highways Department review its land holdings within the block bounded by Hawker, Drayton, Third and East Streets in conjunction with Hindmarsh Council, Detmold's and other owners, with the view to providing for the sale of surplus land in a manner which promotes satisfactory development. Where warranted to permit the achievement of the objectives of this report, land should be compulsorily acquired with the co-operation of Hindmarsh council, if necessary using its powers under section 382D of

the Local Government Act, and aggregated with surplus Government land to facilitate orderly development.

Recommendation (15) states:

That land surplus to transport requirements, which is recommended for disposal on the open market, be retained pending the identification of any needs which may arise from the displacement of firms following the adoption of a preferred alignment for Hindmarsh Boulevard.

There are many other startling recommendations in that report. There is no intention of consulting the residents. Indeed, in a letter to the Hindmarsh council the Government's officer stressed the need for strict confidentiality until negotiations for private sale of surplus land had been completed and agreement reached between Cabinet and council.

When I asked the Minister of Planning whether he had received Bowden and Brompton Plan for Action Report he replied "No". I asked whether the report would be made public and whether the Government would conduct family impact statements on all recommendations contained in that report. The Minister replied that Cabinet had not yet considered the matter but that a nominated officer would be responsible for carrying out a family impact statement in relation to the recommendations. It seems to me that that decision is to be taken after the ball is over. What a sham!

The Hindmarsh council adopted the report in principle in May, when it was still confidential. Part of the report recommends that land between Park Terrace, South Road, Port railway line, Second Street, Brompton, and Sixth Street, Bowden, be redeveloped for industrial use. To achieve that, a large amount of Highways land in that area will have to be sold to industry or redeveloped by the South Australian Housing Trust into industrial allotments. Residents living in the area will have to move, according to the Hindmarsh council. However, significant residential enclaves exist in the area concerned, and a lot of thought must be had for those residents and families who remain in those areas, as there will be a very real impact upon them. How can people have any confidence in these confidential family impact statements? Residents of Bowden and Brompton are entitled to be extremely critical of the Government and of the manner in which it has handled this issue. They have a right to know what the Government is about.

The present campaign by the Department of Social Security to counsel and refuse as many invalid pensions as possible is vicious and arbitrary. It is vicious because the department knows that a person certified as 85 per cent incapacitated for work three, five or 10 years ago who still suffers from the same impairment has probably less capacity now because any skill he or she had will have been diminished during that time.

Mr. KENEALLY: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The SPEAKER: I would ask that any member who is drawing the attention of the Chair to any matter before the House do so with due decorum, without a paper in front of him.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. ABBOTT: A severe alcoholic, mentally retarded person or a person in an iron lung may not, on the basis of one examination by a reviewing doctor, appear to have the required 85 per cent incapacity, yet they will not be employed because of their medical and employment records. It is arbitrary because the department keeps no records of invalid pensions granted in medical classifications, and no record of how many invalid pensioners are counselled for medical reasons, as against other reasons.

In crack-downs against the unemployed, it has been the

same story. The department has moved in with a bludgeon and kept no records of the cost effectiveness or operation effectiveness, that is, how many were later restored to the benefit. If invalid pensioners appeal against the decision to strip them of the pension, they are reviewed by a different Commonwealth medical officer, but one who is also handicapped by the Health Department in conjunction with the Department of Social Security. Because no outsider can see or judge the medical review or other relevant information on file, the whole review procedure is run as an unchallengeable private bureaucratic operation. As always it is the poorest, the weakest and the most vulnerable being attacked by the Department of Social Security, a department which is established to protect those people. Justice to the incapacitated comes a very bad last under the Fraser Government.

I refer to a social security bulletin issued by Senator Don Grimes, the shadow Minister for Social Security. In this bulletin the Senator issues a statement on the direct attack being made on these invalid pensions. The Senator states:

The present crackdown on invalid pensions originated in the need for the Department of Social Security to justify the suspension of invalid pensions of Greek-Australian pensioners here and overseas. The Director-General, Mr. Lanigan, sought legal opinions on the definition of "85 per cent incapacity" from outside the Government and apparently accepted the most restrictive, that from tax avoidance lawyer, Mr. S. E. K. Hulme, and Mr. Gavan Griffith.

The Lanigan departmental minute "Control of Invalid Pensions" (23 May 1979) claimed a 9.4 per cent increase in invalid pensions for the year, higher than "normal growth". First, the number of invalid pensioners for the year ending June 1979 was 7.7 per cent above the previous year, not 9.4 per cent. Secondly, Mr. Lanigan did not explain how he worked out "normal growth".

Senator Grimes goes on to say:

I asked Senator Guilfoyle for the explanation in March this year, but she ignored the question. Unless one believes it has been correlated with road and industrial accident figures, mental breakdown and other health and personal tragedies—and I do not—it seems Mr. Lanigan is pulling out an imaginary "normal growth" figure to prop up a weak case for cutting back "increased growth".

The alleged Social Security conspiracy: The Lanigan minute, circulated to his department with the legal opinion, was based on argument that, as the Commonwealth doctors who examined the overseas Greek pensioners whose pensions were cancelled in April 1978 confirmed 75 per cent of the cancellations, the system of granting invalid pensions must be at fault. He stated: "... a minority of the (invalid pension) claimants were getting benefits to which they were not lawfully entitled".

Since some of those same pensioners have returned to Australia and had their invalid pensions restored, both the figure and the examination methods seem open to doubt. As there has been no truly independent medical assessment of the overseas Greek pensioners, no judgment can be made about their "lawful" entitlement.

On the question of unprovable ailments, the Senator says:

The Lanigan minute said that the above experience "has highlighted the fact that Commonwealth medical officers are not always able to tell, from the kind of consulting room examination they are able to provide, whether or not a person who claims such unprovable ailments as bad backs or neurotic problems is really ill enough to be granted a pension". It follows that if a doctor cannot "prove" a person suffering from an ailment should be given a pension, neither can he "prove" that person should be refused one.

Should a Commonwealth Medical Officer give a patient the benefit of the doubt, something contrary to the spirit of

the Lanigan minute, a senior Health Department official or Mr. Lanigan himself will be able to veto it, without ever having to conduct a medical examination or see the patient. Mr. Lanigan worries that "... there is a great deal more than can be done than we are doing at present to ensure that false claims will not be inadvertently allowed". It does not worry the head of our major welfare department that his "revised procedures" mean that genuine claims will in future be "inadvertently" disallowed.

The Senator then goes on to talk about a number of social security instructions, which are headed "Invalid Pensions—Revised Procedures." He states:

The effects of the new procedures have been catastrophic. Dozens of patients with severe asthma, epilepsy, mental retardation, schizophrenia and other disabling illnesses have lost their pensions, to the concern of social security staff. Many cases have been documented in the media. A doctor who appeared on *Nationwide* estimated that the majority of the 400 pensioners he had recommended for invalid pensions in the past wouldn't now qualify if subject to reassessment. He said: "... a lot of Commonwealth Medical Officers I am sure—will feel it necessary to follow such forceful instructions. It is going to cause extreme hardship to a lot of people and it is going to push people back on to having unemployment benefits or sickness benefits".

Invalid pensioners going to sickness or unemployment benefits lose \$9.60 a week in pension. They lose the rent assistance of \$5 a week, which 101 000 now get. They lose health cards and fringe benefits worth \$15 a week, at present received by 199 300 (91 per cent) of invalid pensioners. If they have additional income from, say, bank interest, they lose \$1 for every \$1 over \$6 a week, instead of \$1 for every \$2 over \$20 a week. They will also have to take out costly health insurance from their reduced payments unless they find doctors who will classify them as "disadvantaged".

I believe that these comments show quite clearly the treatment being dished out to the nation's 229 000 invalid pensioners. It is a pity that the organisation which gave an award to the Prime Minister as a great humanitarian did not first do its Australian homework.

Tell the unemployed that Malcolm Fraser is a great humanitarian. Unemployment has risen by huge proportions because of his Government's economic policies. The Prime Minister has turned the unemployed into third-class citizens by freezing unemployment benefits below the poverty line. The unemployed are subject to raids, harassment and severe financial penalties.

Tell the invalid pensioners that Malcolm Fraser is a great humanitarian. The Government directive that pensioners should have medical reviews under harsh new rules means that they are losing \$10 a week, together with their medical and transport concessions.

Tell the aged that Malcolm Fraser is a great humanitarian. He cut out twice-yearly indexation of pensions in his first Budget after the 1977 election, but public opinion forced him to restore it. He cut money on housing for the aged and on senior citizens centres. Rent assistance to poor pensioners has not been increased.

Tell the Greek pensioners who were raided two years ago that Malcolm Fraser is a great humanitarian. Hundreds of pensioner families not accused of anything had their pensions cancelled without explanation, thus causing anxiety in the whole Greek-Australian community.

Tell families with dependent children that Malcolm Fraser is a great humanitarian. There has been no rise in family allowances for four years, and none at all for pensioners' children. All single parents depending solely on their pensions are below the poverty line.

Tell the Aboriginal people that Malcolm Fraser is a

great humanitarian. He has cut money on work projects, their housing and their health. The living conditions and health of our Aboriginal people are a national disgrace.

Tell Australian workers that Malcolm Fraser is a great humanitarian. The Prime Minister has redistributed tax benefits to the top 10 per cent of the population (his kind of people) while the rest of the country pays. Malcolm Fraser is no humanitarian.

I was pleased to read in His Excellency's Speech the following:

Major public consultations have been held by the Department of Community Welfare in relation to the nature of community welfare services that should be provided by the department, and the manner in which they should be made available to the community. These consultations have been followed by an inquiry and report by an advisory committee chaired by Professor Mann, of Flinders University.

My Government believes that valuable contributions have been made in relation to the formulation of new provisions relating to community welfare and accordingly a Bill will be introduced in Parliament to give effect to the new proposals.

One disturbing feature existing in our community which every South Australian should take to heart is the serious matter of homeless youth. As this critical problem of youth homelessness requires urgent attention, I hope that the Government will make provisions available to provide proper and adequate shelter for these young people.

According to the Minister of Transport, when acting in the absence of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a Government working party report on youth housing was expected to be completed by 30 June. He said that the State Government placed a high priority on assistance to young homeless and was investigating the best methods of dealing with the problem. Two months have passed since those comments were made and, as far as I am aware, no report has yet been released. So much for the high priority and assistance the Government is giving this urgent measure.

I believe that the Government could learn much from the efforts of the Woodville Youth Accommodation Committee. During March, the committee issued a discussion paper for the purpose of stimulating thought and awareness of the problem of homeless youth in the western region of Adelaide. It was hoped that, by meaningful consideration of the problem, an agreement might be reached to obtain a property to establish a youth accommodation centre at Woodville. The Woodville committee was successful, and plans for the accommodation centre are progressing well, I understand. However, finances are urgently required for the project, and I urge and call upon all members of Parliament to support this important project and appeal. This project is a fine example of what can be done, but it will accommodate only a handful of young people and an adult family. Many more similar centres are needed.

Over the past 12 months, workers in the field of social welfare have become increasingly aware of the problem of youth homelessness. The problem has reached crisis proportions in Sydney and Melbourne, and Perth was reported as facing difficulties. In Adelaide, the problem is continuing to grow. It is not surprising that people from the middle class, with secure family backgrounds, find it difficult to understand why there should be a problem with young homeless persons.

Social workers come in contact with many young people who, for one reason or another, are put out of their home or find it intolerable to live at home. It is sad to say, but nevertheless a fact, that the family ideal based on love, compassion, genuine caring and respect just does not exist

for some young people. For a society to expect that ideal to be upheld in face of facts to the contrary is in itself selfish and lacking in compassion. The major social problems of today are causes of homelessness amongst the young. The problems of unemployment, family breakdown, divorce, education, poverty, the so-called generation gap, and general communication breakdown all play a part in this problem.

I have in my possession a copy of the Survey Report and Conference Proceedings on Youth Housing published by the South Australian Council of Social Services Incorporated. In brief, the report is the result of a survey into the housing needs of youth over a two-week period last March. The survey suggests that there may be up to 9 000 young people in need of some sort of accommodation in Adelaide on an annual basis. The report is also based on a conference held on 2 April to consider various recommendations concerning the problem. The introduction to this report is worth reading to the House. Written by Melinda Branson, Executive Officer, South Australian Council of Social Services, it states:

The housing needs of young people are perhaps one of the least understood and poorly researched social issues in the community today. It is a complex and often emotive issue that, if not kept in perspective easily, leads to blaming young people and/or their parents for what is essentially a societal problem.

The majority of young people make the transition from the family home to independent living with relative ease. They are usually supported by their parents who have endeavoured to ensure that they are adequately prepared for their new lifestyle. This report, however, focuses on what appears to be an increasing number of young people who experience some degree of trauma or crisis in this transition to independent living.

Young people who are intellectually or physically disabled, single and pregnant, offenders or ex-offenders have perhaps always experienced difficulty in making the transition to independent living, and their often previously neglected housing needs, as this report indicates, requires further attention.

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

Mr. ABBOTT: The report continues:

The report, however, also focuses on what appears to be an increasing number of young people who are seeking alternative accommodation because they are finding their family relationships unsatisfactory. It would appear, therefore, that any examination of youth housing issues needs to occur within a greater social context, taking into account those factors and pressures in society which have an increasing role in affecting the nature of relationships within the family, factors and pressures which the family has less and less control over.

The South Australian Council of Social Service, the Council to Homeless Persons, and the Youth Workers Network have in this document, and in the conference and survey which led to it, attempted to come to grips with some aspects of this potentially divisive issue.

It is our hope that the survey and conference results detailed between these covers will serve to help stimulate a better understanding of young people's housing needs and more creative approaches to assisting young people to obtain suitable accommodation.

The information compiled here will also form a major contribution by the three organisations involved to the State Government Working Party on Youth Homelessness—in itself a positive indication of Government concern about this potentially critical issue.

The three recommendations from the surveys and the seminar are as follows:

1. That State and Federal Governments take immediate steps to implement a national programme to fund local youth housing assistance schemes developed to meet local needs. We also recommend that such funding be on a three-year basis, subject to appropriate evaluation in the third year of the programme, and be the joint responsibility of State and Federal Governments. We call on the South Australian Government to negotiate for the implementation of such a programme as a matter of urgency.
2. That the Federal Government lift the level of the single persons unemployment benefit to the poverty line.
3. That the State Government provide adequate resources for monitoring the youth housing situation and to facilitate the establishment of a wide range of local initiatives in youth housing assistance.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. ABBOTT: I will also quote several extracts from the opening address given at the seminar by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The Minister stated:

The Government places a high priority in dealing with the pressing problem of youth homelessness. It is our intention to encourage and enhance the goodwill and co-operation that already exists between the voluntary sector, as only a concerted effort will ensure success.

A major factor contributing to youth homelessness is the present high unemployment among our young people. If there were more jobs, the problem would be greatly reduced. Shortly, I will outline measures the Government has taken to solve this fundamental problem by increasing employment. But, first, let us look at the extent of the problem. The Council to Homeless Persons recently completed a survey which suggested that as many as 6 000 young people in South Australia have no homes. Although the Emergency Housing Office has no responsibility in the area of youth accommodation, in the nine months to February it had received requests from some 450 households for assistance. The help was sought by groups or individuals whose ages ranged from 14 to 24 . . .

It is universally recognised that adequate shelter is a basic human need . . .

Security of shelter may well enhance the possibility of finding solutions to many of the problems facing our young people. This is why the Government puts a high priority on the matter of youth housing . . .

I would repeat that the State Government places a high priority on the issue of youth homelessness. It has an important role to play in solving this and other problems experienced by our young people, but to ensure success all sectors of the community must co-operate.

The Minister stated no less than three times what a high priority the Government places on the problem of youth homelessness, and I feel certain that the whole community will be interested to see whether this is an expression of genuine concern or whether it is an exercise in speaking with a forked tongue.

The Government has stated on a number of occasions that it places a high priority on the accommodation needs of young people, but so far, apart from setting up the Working Party on Youth Homelessness, its actions have tended to be contradictory. The off-loading of Government hostel facilities for non-residential purposes is but one example. On 27 June, I wrote to the Minister of Community Welfare in relation to a number of inquiries that I received concerning the department's closure of the Kumanka Youth Hostel, at Childers Street, North Adelaide. As yet, I have received no acknowledgement or

reply—seven weeks ago and not even an acknowledgement.

Rumours have it that the department has decided to move the Central Admissions Unit from Somerton Park to the Kumanka Hostel. Whilst this, if it is true, is a better usage of the facility than is office space, it does seem a bit absurd that the unit is shifting from an existing establishment to Kumanka when there is an obvious need for general youth hostel accommodation in the central metropolitan area. It is my belief that the Government must pay more attention to these serious and critical issues in regard to youth homelessness.

Earlier in my address, I referred to the history of promises broken by the Fraser Government. The member for Albert Park referred to some of those broken promises, but unfortunately he was unable to cite them all, because it was impossible to do so in one hour. It would be impossible for me, in the time I have left, to list the multiplicity of these promises broken by the Fraser Government.

I referred earlier to the fact that the Federal Government had saved \$73 000 000 less in unemployment benefits than it had budgeted for in 1979-80. The Treasurer's claim that the saving of that money was because of reduced unemployment is sheer nonsense. Unemployment is as bad as it has been at any time over the past two years. The major reason is that, having tried for three years to deceive people into believing that unemployment was dropping by fixing the estimates for unemployment benefits at an absurdly low level, it made a policy switch and last year it lifted the estimate by \$200 000 000.

In three years before July 1979, the Federal Government had understated the pay-out by about \$160 000 000 a year. In 1979-80 it over-stated the estimate so that it would not again be caught. Other reasons are new legislation to restrict the payment of unemployment benefits, and harsher procedures, which include the following:

Refusing unemployment benefits to a union member not on strike but laid off because another part of his union is in an industrial dispute.

Making a six to 12-weeks suspension of unemployment benefit mandatory for an infringement of the work test, saving the department \$300 to \$600 each time.

Requiring applicants to look for work independently, in some cases demanding proof of looking for seven jobs each week.

Introducing a new unemployment form of great complexity which has the effect of daunting applicants.

Freezing the unemployment benefit of three-quarters of the beneficiaries at a rate \$10 a week below the pension. These petty measures have all saved the Government money. They have done nothing for the unemployment figures, which are 50 per cent higher now than when the Fraser Government first took office. They have certainly done nothing for the unemployed. The alleged saving of the \$73 000 000 on the unemployed merely proves how ruthless the Government is in accomplishing the dubious goal of slashing welfare.

I think that the Premier of South Australia, who in the past has promised to create so many thousands of jobs, is falling for the trap for which the Fraser Government has fallen. We need to wait only a few months longer and we will see what happens in the motor industry. I have heard from very good sources that General Motors-Holden's has about 300 workers more than its present-day requirements, and several hundred at the Elizabeth plant. Whether G.M.H. is waiting for the Federal election to take place I am not sure, but time will tell whether it will

retrench those workers in the motor industry before or after the Federal election.

The Woodville plant is over-staffed. I am also advised that the company at the present moment is sending hundreds of its work force to English courses during the day because there is no production for them to perform at the plant. Rather than retrench them at this stage, the firm is putting them on buses and sending them to schools for English lessons. It is only a matter of time before the bombshell is dropped in the motor industry in South Australia, and the unemployment figures, already a record for any State in the Commonwealth, will be worse than they have ever been.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): In supporting the motion, I pray that all the promises made in the Speech will come to fruition, for the welfare of the people of the State. I would like to cover a couple of areas specifically affecting the Semaphore district. One of the important things for the electorate generally is the performance of the Coast Protection Board. To give an analysis, I would like to go back over the reasons for the formation of the board and some of its achievements in some areas and, conversely, its lack of achievement in others.

In February 1953, a number of metropolitan seaside councils met and formed a group called the Seaside Councils' Committee to discuss common problems associated with the coast of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Mathwin: I was on that committee.

Mr. PETERSON: Good. I have now found someone I can blame. In 1960, after a period of extensive storm damage the State Government and the Seaside Councils' Committee sponsored an engineering study of the metropolitan coastline. The study, when published in December 1970, stressed the need for protective and restorative works. It also recommended a programme of continuous research and the establishment of the necessary administrative and financial machinery to do this work.

A committee known as the Foreshore and Beaches Committee was then set up, and was operated on an advisory basis until the passing of the Coast Protection Act, which came into operation on 3 July 1972. The Coast Protection Board held its first meeting in August of that year. It is interesting to read the annual report of the board for the year ended 30 June 1973, to discover how it viewed its function, and I quote from that report, as follows:

In recognising that the 4 000 kilometres of coast of South Australia is an asset of the State, the Government decided that the cost involved in maintaining this asset should be shared by the community. Accordingly, the Coast Protection Act was created to conserve, protect and develop the beaches and coast of this State. The "coast", as defined by the Act, includes the land between high and low water mark, plus land 100 metres inland from high water mark and within three nautical miles seaward of low water mark. In addition, the Act provides for the declaration, by regulation, of any other area which could be deemed to be part of the coast. Provision therefore exists for the protection of areas of special aesthetic or ecological value extending further inland than the statutory minimum of 100 metres.

That is how it saw its role in 1973. Also in the initial annual report was an item headed, "Functions of the Coast Protection Board", and I quote it, because it is interesting to note how the board saw its role. The report states:

The board, which is responsible to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, is charged with the following responsibilities:

- (1) To protect the coast from erosion, damage, deterioration, pollution and misuse.
- (2) To restore any part of the coast that has been subjected to erosion, damage, deterioration, pollution or misuse.
- (3) To develop any part of the coast for the purpose of aesthetic improvement, or for the purpose of rendering that part of the coast more appropriate for the use or enjoyment of those who may resort thereto.
- (4) To report to the Minister upon any matters that the Minister may refer to the board for advice.
- (5) To carry out research, to cause research to be carried out, or to contribute towards research into matters relating to the protection, restoration or development of the coast.
- (6) To carry out such other duties as are imposed upon the board by or under this Act and to prepare printed matter for the information of the public.

To assist in its management, the coast was divided into districts; the metropolitan district, the major district, extending from the southern boundary of the council of Willunga to the northern boundary of the council of Munno Para, was declared in June 1973. The district incorporates the councils of Willunga, Noarlunga and Munno Para, the cities of Brighton, Glenelg, Henley and Grange, Marion, Port Adelaide, Salisbury, West Torrens, and Woodville, and the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust.

Under section 15(1) of the Act a consultative committee for each coast protection district shall be appointed, and the inaugural meeting of the Metropolitan Consultative Committee was held on 14 August 1973. Was the honourable member for Glenelg on that?

Mr. Mathwin: No. I missed that, but it was my advice they sought.

Mr. PETERSON: It was reported in the Coast Protection Magazine *Coastline*, edition No. 2 of December 1973, that this committee, together with those for other coast protection districts, would perform a vital role in ensuring that management plans have real local significance and meaning. To many councils on the metropolitan coastline, it has.

To assist the board and the consultative committee, provision was made in the Act for advisory committees. Clause 18(1) states that the board may appoint such advisory committees as it considers necessary for the purpose of providing the board with expert advice on matters pertinent to the protection, restoration and development of the coast. To further assist the board, a study report for the metropolitan coast protection district was formulated with the assistance of P.G. Pak-Poy and Associates. That document was tabled in March 1974.

Mr. Mathwin: It came out strongly against the erection of groynes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will get the call in due course.

Mr. PETERSON: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. In that report it was suggested that areas within the metropolitan area should be classified into specific defined areas to make it easier to apply the provisions of the Act and various regulations, and the report suggested actions in a wide range of undertakings. Once again, it is interesting to refer to the Coast Protection Board's own publication *Coastline*, edition No. 3, to see how it viewed this study report. It states:

With the completion of the study report an important step has been taken in the process of developing a plan for the better management of the metropolitan coast. This edition of *Coastline* briefly explains the purpose of the study report, the

reasons why it was undertaken and its effects upon the population and, more importantly, the individual. Under a further heading, "A Need for Coastal Management", it states:

Problems have been complicated by the multiple controls over land with various State and local government organisations having a voice in the way their particular pieces of coast were to be managed. With the passing of the Coast Protection Act in April 1972, the way was cleared for a more responsible approach to the use of the coast. The Act not only provided legislative power to do this; it also contained special financial provisions to assist with development where this was approved.

The study report includes suggestions about where development and redevelopment might occur and gives guidelines as to the form that that development might take at certain places. It also gives priorities and attempts to rationalise the expenditure necessary to provide more attractive areas of coastal recreation for metropolitan residents and tourists. In summary, edition 3 of *Coastline* states:

The Coast Protection Act means that there will be a better coastal environment in the future. The Act gives the power to achieve this not only by the making of regulations, but also by the funds that the board can grant to local government authorities. This study has endeavoured to obtain all relevant information pertaining to the use of the coast from which the management plan will later be made.

The management plan was subsequently prepared and a draft was presented in May 1978. I believe that it was never ratified, so the only official documents we have on coast protection relating to the board's view of its performance and where it should go are the Pak-Poy Report, *Coastline*, and the board's annual report.

From these sources of information I have taken most of the comments I wish to make and some of the criticisms, and I will work from there. The whole concept of the Coast Protection Act and the formation of a board to control the development and use of consultative and advisory committees is a sound one. There is no doubt that the areas that have received assistance from this organisation have benefited, as have the people of those areas as well as the people of the State. The real difficulty, it seems, is getting some assistance from the Coast Protection Board, most importantly, in my case, for the electorate of Semaphore. One of the conclusions of the study report investigation (and this was in 1973) was as follows:

Average peak beach usage levels along the metropolitan coast between North Haven and Seacliff can be expected to increase by the order of 25 per cent between 1975 and 1990. Within this area there will be variations of increased demand about this mean according to the facilities provided and the attractiveness of each area.

From that conclusion it is clear that the board, and the people who compiled that document, believed that the condition of the respective areas along the metropolitan coast would dictate whether or not people would use those areas. If that is the conclusion of the document published by the Coast Protection Board and in its name why will it not assist one metropolitan electorate that has not received anything? It is not as though assistance has not been requested, or that money has not been spent on similar projects on other metropolitan electorates.

Over the years since the board's inception, and up until 1976 (which is as far as I can find composite information), the figures I have been able to compile from the board's annual report or from *Coastline* for the year 1972-73 show the following facts: Brighton received \$187 130; Glenelg, \$127 453; Henley and Grange, \$90 586; Marion \$9 066;

and Woodville, \$15 000 in assistance. The first year, 1972-73, was apparently a ripper of a year. The 1972-73 annual report states:

Section 33 (1) of the Act provides that the board may recover from councils part of the cost of works carried out by the board in council areas.

However, in 1972-73, with the exception of a 20 per cent contribution by the Glenelg council towards a removal of some 12 000 cubic metres of sand from the Glenelg breakwater, all costs were met by the board. The district of the member for Glenelg did not do badly that year.

In 1974-75, expenditure appears to have been combined, but under the Act the subsidies are received anyway. The figures for 1973-74 were as follows: Brighton, \$57 841; Glenelg, \$187 898; Henley and Grange, \$28 379; Noarlunga, \$85 478; West Beach Trust, \$89 164. In 1974-75 the amounts were as follows: Brighton, \$52 230; Glenelg, \$101 673; Henley and Grange, \$12 985; Noarlunga, \$15 150; and Salisbury, \$4 500. The figures for 1975-76 were as follows: Brighton, \$50 058; Glenelg, \$232 220; Henley and Grange, \$24 712; and Woodville, \$1 500 (which was more than we got); Noarlunga, \$3 905; West Beach Trust, \$9 086; Salisbury, \$25 517; and Noarlunga, \$20 718.

During the period 1972-76, right up until today, only three grants have been made to the Port Adelaide corporation for work done in the Semaphore area. Those grants total \$21 105; nobody could say we have been spoiled!

Mr. Randall interjecting:

Mr. PETERSON: That was not a grant to the council. That was done in its own right. It bought it. Turning to the projects that have been under way in the Semaphore area, in the year 1974-75 the projects cost \$49 000, yet the district received only \$21 000. In 1975-76 the projects in the Semaphore area cost \$87 000; in 1976-77, \$98 000; and in 1977-78, \$56 000. It seems that at about that time the council gave up in desperation.

Despite a real need for help in my electorate, despite the board's failure to live up to its stated ideal of developing any part of the coast for the purpose of rendering the coast more appropriate for the use or enjoyment of those who seek to use it, and despite a study report prepared in 1974 to draw attention to the problems, to recommend solutions, and to predict what the requirements of the coast were likely to be during the next 15 years, six years of that period has passed without anything being done on our beaches, purely because of the lack of assistance from the Coast Protection Board. It must be our turn shortly; there must be a bit left over.

Mr. Evans: You'll have no beach left.

Mr. PETERSON: It is all going down to Brighton, Grange and Henley. Part V of the Coast Protection Act is headed "Control of Development", and section 26 (1) provides:

No works of a prescribed nature shall be carried out in a coast protection district without the approval in writing of the board.

"Works of a prescribed nature" are defined as "building, construction, mining or excavation of a kind or extent declared by regulation". I assume that the North Haven harbour development comes under that definition and was approved by the board. The establishment of the harbour breakwater brought significant change to the pattern of sand and seaweed drift. These movements have been well known, and indeed the Pak-Poy Report states:

The Outer Harbor and adjacent beach areas are the deposition areas for the net northerly littoral sand drift and seaweed.

Further, the report states;

Particular attention must be given to any build-up of sand which could occur adjacent to the southern arm of the haven following its construction. It is suggested that the board identify this area as one sand supply source for replenishing the metropolitan beaches.

The fact that the nature of the beach would be significantly altered by the construction of the breakwater was clearly outlined in an article on "Beach groynes for sand maintenance", in *Coastline* No. 4 (February 1975), as follows:

The use of groynes to improve a particular length of beach has long been practised overseas. The engineering principles behind this method are by projecting the groyne into the sea. Littoral sand movement is interrupted and an accumulation of sand by the groyne results in a build-up of the beach immediately on the downward side of the groyne, so that one section of beach is improved while another section deteriorates.

Mr. Becker: Just keep sending your sand to us. We don't mind.

Mr. PETERSON: All we are doing is recycling your sand. Are there three in that group: Larry, Shep and Mo? The article continues:

Whilst this is not always the case, for there are places where groynes can be successfully employed, it is a proven fact that the use of groynes on Adelaide's beaches would, on the whole, be disastrous.

I emphasise those points because both the developers of that harbor and the board were well aware of the effects of interrupting the littoral drift. The major problem for the people of the area is the accumulation of seaweed on the beaches to the south of this development.

Mr. Mathwin: Groynes are no good at all. I don't support them at all. They ruin the beach.

Mr. PETERSON: Has the honourable member finished? This pollution has occurred in an area that was noted in the Pak-Poy Report as an area for development. The report states:

The coast between the carpark just north of Fort Largs Police Academy and the Outer Harbor, the wide strip of foreshore land should be used to advantage to cope with the increasing population nearby.

That statement was made in 1974, but since then there has not been one iota of effort in that area, except to take sand away. There has been no effective action by the board in this area, despite the comments made in its 1975-76 annual report, as follows:

Another matter of concern is the accumulation of seaweed on Adelaide's northern beaches.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. PETERSON: The report further states:

Large quantities of seaweed were deposited on South Australian beaches, most notably at Taperoo in the metropolitan area.

It goes on:

Whilst the seaweed remains. It is important that the foreshore reserve areas be attractively grassed and landscaped for public use.

This was the board's statement four or five years ago on what should be done in that area. All Parties have been aware of the problem for many years, yet there was the recent futile attempt by bulldozers to stock pile the seaweed in the area. I think I know what that was all about, because the Minister stated:

The main purpose of the present experiment at Taperoo is to provide information on the quantity of weed accumulating.

The seaweed has accumulated for six years. One has only

to look at it to see how it has been accumulating. That exercise was only a waste of money. It was an exercise to see whether one could get more sand for southern beaches.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PETERSON: We do not mind it going: just do a bit for us in return. It is realised by most people that seaweed is a problem there. It is a fact that nature deposits it there; it has been happening for hundreds of years. The problem is to get something done to make the area more attractive and to reduce the problems caused by the seaweed. The experiment undertaken by the Minister recently had little to do with the seaweed itself. The report also states:

The wide expanses of the foreshore south of North Haven development is, and will continue to be, a natural area for sand accretion. Surplus sand south of the southern boundary of North Haven should be reserved for possible use for beach replenishment.

That was the whole point of the exercise—to see how much sand was available. Again, one does not need to use a bulldozer there to determine how much sand is on the beach. The build-up of seaweed over the years has created a wall on the beach itself. Behind that wall of seaweed is a stinking swamp of rotting seaweed. The swamp prevents access to the beach and causes acute discomfort to peninsula residents with the smells and, in the summer, the fresh water providing a breeding ground for mosquitoes. Again, this is not new—it was foreshadowed in the report in 1974, and the possibility of this situation was covered in the section relating to the area of Taperoo. The report states:

Because of the continuing accumulation of sand and seaweed in the area, regrading of the foreshore is occasionally necessary to prevent ponding around storm-water drainage outlets.

This, too, has not been done. In referring back to the board's reports, it is interesting to see that the area that is now practically an inaccessible bog was referred to in the 1970 report of the Coast Protection Board, under the heading "Programme of works", as follows:

Approximately 20 000 cubic metres of sand were moved from Taperoo to Adelaide's southern beaches in July 1973 and a further 45 000 cubic metres are being held in reserve at Taperoo for further replenishment of depleted beaches at the appropriate time.

That is information about an area where not many years ago thousands of people could be found on a nice summer's day. Cars were on the beaches and thousands of people were enjoying themselves, yet now one cannot even walk to the beach. We are carrying the can for everyone. Adjacent to this now unusable section of coast is a large car park, built some years ago by the Port Adelaide corporation to cater for the large crowds to which I have just referred. That car park is not now used at all, except overnight by some. There is just no access to the beach. The car park is in serviceable order and, with the current cost of providing such facilities, it is extremely surprising that the board does not try to encourage the use of the established facility, especially as in *Coastline* No. 5 (April 1975), under the heading "Beach Relaxation With or Without the Motor Car", an article states:

The beach, always a place of recreation, will continue to fulfil this role, particularly as increases in leisure time have resulted from a shorter working week. The Coast Protection

Board intends to assist in the provision of off-beach parking. Many of the problems in this particular area could be solved by the very simple expedient of taking excess sand from other beaches in the electorate and filling in the low-lying swampy section, which is within the Coast Protection Board's defined area of responsibility (that is, 100 metres

from the high-water mark). This could be supplemented by dredging the sand that is already building up on the North Haven breakwater and which will have to be moved shortly to prevent blocking the channel. If the channel is blocked, that will be the end of the boat haven. Sand accumulations all along the beaches of the Semaphore electorate are creating problems: the sand is overflowing fences and other barriers, making it impossible in places to maintain lawns, despite the fact that, since 1976, 55 000 cubic metres of sand has been taken from the beaches at Semaphore.

This matter was also covered in the study report, and an item headed "Control of Wind Blown Sand" states:

Deflation from beaches and sand dunes is a serious problem, not only because of the loss of sand, but also because of the cost imposed on local councils for its removal from inland areas by accumulation. The control of wind-blown sand is rarely 100 per cent effective. Along the whole of the foreshore there are certain quantities of sand blowing inland collecting against fences and other obstacles. The collection and return of this sand is a constant job for councils.

It is a constant job; we must pay to remove sand from other beaches. If the surplus sand piling up on our beaches was removed the basic problem would disappear, but it appears as though there is a policy not to have sand removed. In the *Coastline* No. 2 (December 1973) it was stated:

The very existence of a sandy beach depends upon the care of the dunes that form a most vital part of this system, for it is the dune that must act as the sand reservoir to feed the beach when it is being lowered under storm attack. The dune must also play a further role as the physical barrier protecting land and property behind the beach from flooding by the sea.

Mr. Randall: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETERSON: You need it; we don't. This policy is apparently adhered to, despite the following comment made on page 74 of the Pak-Poy Study Report:

... the Outer Harbor area and adjacent beach areas for the net northerly littoral sand drift and seaweed and as such are not noticeably vulnerable to storm attack.

The beaches are too long and flat, and they do not have problems. I believe there are plans under way now to remove another substantial amount from the Semaphore beach area. When the last batch was taken earlier this year a section of the sand build-up along the seawall was also taken. It is to be hoped that this will become the practice on all occasions and that the replenishment of one beach can be to the benefit of another with the removal of the surplus.

If the maps used in the study report are accurate, and it must be assumed that they were considered to be by the board, because the report came out in its name, some two-thirds of the beach and foreshore areas between the Lady Gowrie Drive, the Esplanade and the high-water mark in the electorate of Semaphore are eligible for assistance under the definition of the Act, that is, areas within 100 metres of the high-water mark. The other third of the foreshore has been ignored by the board, despite its ability to assist in upgrading the area and the fact that the pollution and drastic degradation of that area is a result of coastal works that it condoned.

Even in the area of basic requirements, such as change-rooms and toilets, despite again the fact that its own study report in 1974 suggested upgrading four of these facilities in the electorate, a grant for only one block has been grudgingly given, while tens of thousands of dollars has been spent by it on like facilities in other areas. This definitely does not show an interest in catering for the needs of the people who wish to use the beaches in the

Semaphore area. In the board's *Coastline* No. 4 (February 1974) mention is made of the coastal area containing "some of the State's prime real estate" and, therefore, an investigation that had been undertaken "was most detailed so that a thorough understanding of the coastal processes might be achieved".

To assess what might be classed as "prime real estate", I referred to the district council zone chart in the study report, which shows that in classification R1 Port Adelaide has 4 670 metres of foreshore length, second only to Noarlunga with 4 810 metres. So much for prime real estate being a consideration in anything that happens.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. PETERSON: Or is it that it is considered that the people who have bought seafront houses in the electorate of Semaphore are not entitled to the same as are those in a similar position in another metropolitan coast area? Only the board can explain that. It is of interest to note the declared attitude of the board towards urban renewal. In its No. 8 edition of *Coastline* (June 1977) it was stated in relation to the Main Street Square, Henley:

... being well located with direct access to the city and an area that, historically, has always been popular with the Adelaide public, but over the years the area has deteriorated to the unfortunate condition of being potentially a slum with vacant shops, and others in a poor state of repair and pockets of sub-standard housing.

The present position is that what redevelopment does occur is slow and often of a sort that does not produce lasting benefits to the area. In an effort to improve present conditions and encourage a better form of urban renewal, the board, in conjunction with the Henley and Grange council, has commenced a major scheme aimed at rejuvenating the whole area, together with the provision of increased open space. The report also stated that the cost of the scheme is \$650 000. It states further:

The Coast Protection Board sees it as essential that work of this nature be undertaken so that a better coastal environment is created in the older parts of the metropolitan area.

In view of the attention given to the Main Street Square development it will be interesting to see whether the board will apply that philosophy to the area defined under regulation No. 117 of 1979 of the Act which defines the area at the western end of Semaphore Road as part of the coast for the purposes of the Act. This area contains the Customs House, which was purchased and renovated in 1977 at a cost of \$103 000 and which stands empty to this day. The Minister of Environment last October in this House, referring to the electorate of Semaphore, said:

There are problems at these beaches, and I am sure that the board will do its best to help solve these and to continue to assist the council to improve this foreshore for public enjoyment.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What if it doesn't?

Mr. PETERSON: I will come to that. The Minister was quoted in the *News*, in an article headed "Northern beaches may get State Aid", as follows:

State Government aid may be provided to improve beach facilities in the Semaphore, Outer Harbor area. The Environment Minister, Mr. Wotton, said today that if the need arose the Government would consider helping the Port Adelaide council and the North Haven Trust to carry out improvements.

The Minister is not here, but I inform him that the need has arisen. We need help; where is the aid? I said previously that I believe the concept of the Coast Protection Board is sound and worth while. I also said that

the beneficial effect that it has had on the preservation and development of many metropolitan beaches and adjacent areas was undeniable and that it is obvious to any user of those beaches or visitors to the districts that have been favoured by the board's consideration. I accept in part the Minister of Environment's statement last October when in reference to my comments he said:

The member for Semaphore has stated that other metropolitan councils have received more financial assistance from the Coast Protection Board than has been provided for the Semaphore area. This is to be expected, because some other council coastlines are eroding whereas Semaphore is not. Money has needed to be spent on rock protection and sand replenishment for these coastlines.

I accept that statement; it makes sense. I accept that money had to be spent and will continue to be needed to be spent on such protection and replenishment.

However, surely, when one looks back over the expenditure in the years from 1972 to 1976 (for instance, for Brighton about \$350 000; for Glenelg about \$650 000; for Henley and Grange about \$160 000; for Noarlunga about \$104 000; and for the West Beach Trust \$100 000) something must have been done with that money. Something must have been provided in the form of permanent protection or are those areas going to continue to attract so much funding that there will be nothing left for the electorate of Semaphore? It is fairly obvious when one looks at those areas that all of the money did not go into the provision of coast protection equipment. A lot of that money went into providing facilities such as change-rooms, showers and toilets, which are so badly needed in my electorate.

After years of other seaside councils being assisted in this manner, I believe that most of them now appear to be fairly well catered for, except Semaphore. In a reply to a question I asked relating to the Coast Protection Board policy, the Minister said:

I am inclined to suggest that too much emphasis is being placed on looking after jetties and building toilets rather than carrying out the research that is necessary in relation to coast protection.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who said that?

Mr. PETERSON: The Minister said that in this House. In a letter dated 19 November 1979 in relation to funds available to the board, the Minister stated:

The funds in total consist of an amount allowed by the Government in relation to approved borrowings by the Loan Council; so far in 1978-79 this is \$1 000 000 plus an allocation from revenue in 1978-79 of \$1 000 000.

Therefore, \$2 000 000 is available to the board. Surely, it is pure logic to suggest that there should have been a little bit left over for Semaphore in that money. In closing my comments on the Coast Protection Board's performance, I refer to section 36 (1) of the Act, which provides:

The Minister may require the board to make such inquiries pertinent to the administration of this Act as he considers necessary or expedient.

I request that pursuant to that section the Minister require the board to justify its almost total disregard for the problems of the coast of the electorate of Semaphore. Further, pursuant to section 14 (1) (d) I request that the Minister refer those problems to the board for advice on remedial action to be taken. Pursuant to section 21 (2), which authorises the board to execute any works that are necessary or expedient, I request that such works be undertaken for the intent of the Act to protect, restore and develop the coast for the purpose of aesthetic improvement or to render the coast more appropriate for the use or enjoyment of those persons who use the beaches in the electorate of Semaphore. There is one glimmer of hope in

this matter. In the last few days I received a letter from the Minister hinting that we may receive some assistance; I pray to God that we do.

The next topic to which I wish to refer is tourism. The member for Brighton also spoke on this topic, but I wish to speak about the potential for tourism in the Port Adelaide area. The present Government has stated that it acknowledges that tourism is one of the fastest growing industries in the world and that it is important that this State should take advantage of present trends. It also seems that the Liberal Party's tourism policy supports the concept of providing the people of this State and visitors from interstate and overseas with the possibility of seeing all that is possible. In part, that policy states:

Our goals are to make the most of existing opportunities and, where desirable, create new opportunities for the people of South Australia to know and enjoy all that our State has to offer. . . (and to) . . . encourage an awareness amongst people in other States of the attractions of South Australia.

The key words in that statement are "to make the most of existing opportunities". To do that, as a State, we must recognise, catalogue and ensure that those opportunities are available and well presented to the public. I believe that, despite the predictions of a massive growth in international tourism, we in South Australia will in fact benefit much more by intrastate and interstate tourism than by overseas visitors. The current trend is for the majority of Australian tourists to go overseas for their holidays. That fact is borne out in an item in the *News* of 28 July under the headline "Gloomy outlook for tourist trade" which stated:

The tourist outlook for Australia—and South Australia—is more gloomy than boomy, according to the latest figures available from the Statistics Bureau.

More of the Australian tourist dollars are heading for exotic spots while the rise in the number of international tourists coming here has been only marginal. In South Australia, hotel occupancy rates have stagnated or dropped slightly.

Cheaper international air fares and the introduction of discount internal fares have done little to attract more tourist dollars into the nation's or South Australia's wallet.

In fact, they seem to be working the other way. In November 1979, the number of incoming overseas tourists was 3 400 more than in November the previous year, but the number of outgoing Australian tourists was 7 000 higher.

And domestic airline figures suggest more South Australians are going to sample Queensland's beaches than there are Queenslanders or New South Welshmen wanting to come south.

South Australian Tourism Department research manager, Mr. Kent Rossiter, says the State has made neither gains nor losses in its share of the international market and seems to be holding its own with domestic travellers.

He said: "Over the past few years South Australia's growth in total tourist activity hasn't been all that bright in comparison with some of the other States."

The bed occupancy rates listed by the Statistics Bureau indicate it has been decidedly dull.

Only 61.5 per cent of rooms in the major hotels and motels were booked daily during the March quarter this year—nearly two per cent down on the March quarter last year and four per cent down on the 1978 quarter. The number of rooms available increased only marginally. Mr. Rossiter believes the problem of winning more domestic tourist dollars rests partly with the massive promotion campaigns launched by other States.

Therefore, it appears that we as a State are about to pursue vigorously what the Tourist Bureau says we have

missed out on and are not likely to get. A light on the horizon may be indicated by an article in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 16 August under the heading "Overseas air fares up again", as follows:

International air fares will rise on 1 September—the sixth increase this year. Increases announced yesterday mean the cost of international tickets will have jumped almost 30 per cent this year.

It seems to me that, as it gets more expensive to travel overseas, we can expect more to holiday in Australia. Let us hope that we can get our share of that but, for us to get those tourists, two provisos apply. First, we must provide facilities for travel and accommodation at reasonable cost, and, secondly, we must be able to provide something for them to see and enjoy while they are here.

The review of the tourist department's role (I understand that one is under way) may help define where we are headed in this matter. Whatever occurs, we in Port Adelaide believe that we have something to offer or have the potential to develop attractions for the tourists, and we are within easy travelling distance of the city. Ports and seafront areas generally have an attraction for people, and for many the sight of a ship is still an unusual occurrence with the many types of ships now in use and unique features such as the container terminal and the roll-on-roll-off berths. For many people, that would be something different. There is also the new harbor development at North Haven and the jetties with their history.

I think that, if we have anything special to offer visitors, it is in the area of State history and in particular maritime history. There exists within Port Adelaide and its environs an opportunity to preserve an important section of the State's heritage, to develop a valuable tourist and educational facility, and to encourage commercial and community development.

With the current Port Adelaide Redevelopment Project well under way, it is hoped that the older features will be a complementary part of that scheme. Many buildings in the area are well over 100 years old. Some of them are run down but many are still in fine serviceable condition and are still, in many cases, used for their original purpose.

Examples are the Port Adelaide Police Station, built in 1860, which still serves that purpose. Most of the hotels in the Port were built from 1840 on. The Bank of Adelaide building in Lipson Street is one of the finest old buildings in the "high Victorian" style of the 1880's, while others of varying styles that served as office buildings, warehouses and bond stores continue to fulfil their original function.

The Customs House, as anyone who knows Port Adelaide would have seen, which was completed in 1879, typifies the utilitarian nature of buildings of those early days. There is political history in Port Adelaide, too. Glanville Hall, the home of Captain John Hart, who was three times Premier of South Australia, is another building of interest. The Largs Pier Hotel is another fine example of construction. It was built by the Largs Bay Land and Investment Company, along with a railway and a 2 100-foot long jetty, and was opened on 23 December 1882.

There is in Port Adelaide a significant amount of historical marine and nautical items in various collections. A study commissioned by the National Trust in 1976 stated in summary:

The study concludes that historical gaps, not represented by buildings and artefacts in the Port, are few. The display of the very good collections of artefacts, and the condition of the surviving vessels, leaves much to be desired. Current museums are small, isolated, scattered and suffer from lack of finance and, hence, professional organisation. This is seen to be the most serious deficiency in the preservation of Port Adelaide's heritage.

Adelaide has been tied to the sea since the earliest days of settlement, and we should not as a State forget those ties but do all we can to present the artefacts from our past in a professional manner and ensure their preservation.

Certainly the oldest collection currently on display in Port Adelaide is in the Port Adelaide Library. It is the oldest nautical museum in Australia, having been started by the Port Adelaide Institute in 1859. It has Australia's largest collection of ships' figureheads, many fine engravings, photographs, models, and ships' wheels, all relating to the era of sail and worthy of much better presentation than at present. A later collection was assembled by Mr. Keith LeLeu. Since about 1960 he has been building up a display of wheel houses, steam winches, and steam reciprocating engines. In 1965, Mr. LeLeu established his own museum and to add to the display he acquired the steam tug *Fearless*. In 1973, the whole collection was donated to the National Trust.

Another steam tug, the *Yelta*, which was the last tug of her type to operate in the Port, was bought by the National Trust in 1977. Both of these tugs lie alongside the wharf at the Port. The Maritime Committee of the National Trust, which has brought together a significant collection of artefacts and vessels, has obtained a site adjacent to the river to create a maritime park.

A display as envisaged by the committee, with one tug afloat and one dry berthed, and an exhibition of artefacts in a building constructed from the materials used in 1882 for the passenger terminal on the Largs jetty, would, I am sure, have wide appeal. There is need to provide additional facilities. The National Trust collection contains many artefacts that would not be suitable for the Maritime Park. The Port Adelaide Historical Society has a collection of non-maritime but Port-oriented items, and there are also a number of private collections.

A museum of this type could portray the working of the harbor and the major associated trades, and it would reflect the development of the State. Such a museum could be the focus of the development of historical tourism in the district. It would complement the Maritime Park and the Port centre redevelopment. Buildings with their own historical significance are available for conversion into a museum, and the opportunity should be taken to preserve and display our historic mementoes.

Recent announcements by the Ministers of Environment and Tourism may give us some hope of presenting our Port Adelaide history. A report in the *Advertiser* of 18 August 1980 states:

\$8 000 000 profit envisaged in "Heritage towns plan". A working party, to be convened by the Department of Tourism, will develop a plan progressively to implement the concept up to 1986, South Australia's 150th birthday.

Port Adelaide was proclaimed a corporate town from 27 December 1855 and has contributed at every stage of the development of the State's growth, and we are quite prepared to contribute now. When thinking of items of interest to the tourist, we have a structure of unique military interest which has the potential to develop into a major tourist attraction in its own right. I speak of Fort Glanville, which was built in 1878 and which has an A class National Trust classification. Despite this classification, which is defined as "Buildings having great historical significance or high architectural quality, the preservation of which is regarded as essential to their heritage," very little has been done over the years to use the fort in a constructive way with an eye to tourism or for the enjoyment of the people of this State. I have been informed that work is to be undertaken to restore the fort as near as practicable to its original state, but that should be only the starting point, especially as we move towards

our 150th year celebrations and perhaps the working party could concentrate some effort on this sole remaining military monument of the State.

Mr. Glazbrook: What about the barbed wire?

Mr. PETERSON: That is to keep people out. People are not even allowed in there now. You cannot go in there—not a bad set-up!

There are plans to hold a celebration in October this year for the centenary of the fort. It is hoped that after that celebration the potential for development is not ignored and that a lasting sensible programme for Fort Glanville as a feature should be continued with. The history of the fort is linked with the history of South Australia's own military forces and, as such, is unique.

The original plan was for a row of three forts, one at Largs, one at Glanville and one at Glenelg to be linked by Military Road, which still exists. Fort Glenelg was never built and Fort Largs has been altered and is now the Police Academy. The forts were recommended by colonial, naval and military committees as the best means of protecting the port of Adelaide.

The main armament for Fort Glanville was provided by two 10 inch muzzle loaders, weighing 20 tons each, and they could fire a 400 lb. shell. These guns were shipped on the S.S. *Aberyswith Castle* and arrived at Semaphore in September 1879. The flank guns of 1872 manufacture arrived on the S.S. *Garrone* in October 1878. The barrels of those guns are still there but unfortunately the carriages were cut up for scrap during the Second World War. The fort was built by John Robb, a contractor from Victoria, in 1878, and the guns were first fired at 3.30 on the afternoon of Saturday 2 October 1880.

Manning the fort were South Australian volunteer artillery men under Royal Artillery instructors. A significant result of the manning by volunteers was that they were re-organised into volunteer military forces and the South Australian permanent artillery. They were our first indigenous regular soldiers. They belonged to South Australia and were South Australians.

As the structure did play a major role in developing the State's awareness and development of a positive military attitude and because it is still basically a very sound structure, it lends itself to historical re-enactment and this is the area where something totally different could be provided in this State.

The original manning of the fort is known from records kept, and the relevant gun drill procedures are available in their original pocket manual form. Military re-enactment groups are active in this State, and I am sure we could get something arranged with those groups. This approach of making live displays is now used widely in tourist promotion, and a display such as this is living history and well worth serious consideration by the Tourist Bureau.

The other factor about Fort Glanville that is of interest is the fact that it is a fort. Little children love it and, once they get in there, you cannot get them out. I believe that the fort has the potential to be a tourist feature if planned and managed correctly. I hope the current restoration programme is but the first step in providing a unique attraction for South Australia. There are forts overseas that have been developed in this way, and they provide revenue in their own right. One that comes to mind is Old Fort Henry, in Canada. Some 200 000 people a year go through those forts.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I approved of the contract for that to proceed today.

Mr. PETERSON: What is going to happen?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The contract is for suitable renovation work there.

Mr. PETERSON: Port Adelaide has the ability to

display many facets of our history. The collection of artefacts is important and deserves much more recognition than it has received. If we do not look after this collection, present it correctly, and look after our own history, no-one else will do it for us, and we will miss out on the tourist dollar.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The work will be finished in time for the centenary, too.

Mr. PETERSON: Can I fire the gun?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You will have to debate that with the Minister of Environment.

Mr. PETERSON: We must protect these items of history. We have them at Port Adelaide. Unfortunately, the Minister of Tourism is not here now, but a full investigation of the area should be made with a view to using what is there.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I begin my illuminating remarks in this debate by dealing with a particular subject—

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Minister of Industrial Affairs wants to have a dizzy spell at this stage, but we will fix him up soon. I want to deal first with a subject that previous speakers in this debate have dealt with at great length. I believe that it is an important issue. The member for Brighton is in the Chamber, and he took exception when I raised the matter last week in a grievance debate. I want to deal with the question of nuclear energy.

Mr. McRae: Did he take exception?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. I was most intrigued, particularly at the speech by the member for Newland when he moved this motion. I suggest to that member—

Mr. McRAE: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MAX BROWN: I believe that the speech by the member for Newland could be described as a desperate endeavour by him to justify to this House the use of nuclear energy, in some magical way, implying, without proof, that the use of uranium as a world energy source was somehow safe. I want to refer only to one particular paragraph of the speech by the member for Newland, because I think that that paragraph sums up apparently how he feels about this question. I quote from his speech, at page 61 of *Hansard*, as follows:

This, then, is the situation we face in South Australia, where there is a clear difference between what is offered to the people by the Government compared to what is offered by the Opposition. The Government offers to the people of South Australia a future in which mining projects will be pursued with vigour, subject to rigid environmental standards.

I stress "subject to rigid environmental standards". I suggest to the member for Newland that the present Government has spent time, energy and money in pursuing the mining of uranium, particularly without any attention being paid to rigid environmental standards. The Government, when in Opposition, like it is doing now, overdid its obvious ego to assist multi-national interests to mine uranium, with no regard for the interests of the people who would be required to work in that industry. One afternoon last week, we heard the Deputy Premier, in reply (and I may say it was a detailed reply)—

Mr. McRAE: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MAX BROWN: As I was saying, one afternoon last

week the Deputy Premier, in reply to an obvious Dorothy Dix question from a colleague, implied that uranium mining would go on, and that it would obviously go on with no regard for the health of the people who worked in this industry. Obviously, the Deputy Premier has not worked in heavy industry and has not come into contact to any great degree with the results of accidents and bad health conditions within industry.

I can recall, many years ago, the great hardship—physical, mental and financial—experienced by workers in heavy industry, despite proper safety requirements. Tragic accidents have occurred, bringing great emotional and financial hardship to good and sincere citizens of this country. A number of years ago in my district an electrical welder-operator, who worked for a subcontractor to the big Australian company, the B.H.P., was sent into an enclosed cylindrical drum to electric weld a seam or butt. Unknown to the worker in question, a highly flammable and dangerous gas was present in the drum.

The company was aware of the presence of this gas but had not seen fit to place a safety tag on the outside of the drum. Consequently, when the worker entered the drum and struck an electric arc, the drum with the worker inside blew up. The results of the accident were unreal and most inhuman. The worker lived, but his life, because of that accident, was a mere existence. That worker was a very capable tradesman, a husband and a family man, and a man dedicated to his job; however, through no fault of his own, working in an industry that applied meaningful safeguards, he was subjected overnight, as it were, to a life of inhuman existence. I might add that, apart from his normal work, the person in question was a most capable pianist and played in bands which, prior to the accident, provided an additional income for the family. However, because of a human error, all that disappeared, even though he was working in an industry that normally practised proper safeguards. Perhaps I should now refer to the more recent accident involving B.H.P.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MAX BROWN: Despite all the things I have said about B.H.P., I have never said that it was not mindful of safety issues. In fact, I would go on record, as I have done in the past, and say that B.H.P. would be the most safety-minded employer in Australia, and I say that quite seriously.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Why don't you bring some of your colleagues in to listen to you?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am glad the Premier is here. Obviously, he does not know anything about this issue, so I will enlighten him. There is one disadvantage in regard to the B.H.P.'s safety guidelines, and that is that the company also requires production. Sometimes, I question whether the trade union movement safety policy is not the best. The trade union movement believes in safety first, production second. It was the E.T.U. in this instance that first placed a ban on labour working in close proximity to the steel pour; it was not B.H.P., the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, or the Minister of Industrial Affairs, but a union. It is rather ironic, to say the least, that it was left to a union to suggest the proper and safe method that should have been used in the event of an accident. In regard to this latest episode, it was reported to me that B.H.P. was back in production within two hours of the accident. Despite the fact that B.H.P.'s safety record is without question, I believe that the company should pay more attention to safety than merely to production.

Coming back now to the remarks made by the member

for Newland, I emphasise his words "subject to rigid environmental standards". The Minister of Mines and Energy has not once advanced in-depth guidelines for rigid environmental standards, and I suggest that he never will. He is obsessed with the possibilities of huge mining royalties lining the Treasury coffers of the State and with the mining companies lining their own pockets. He has no regard for the health and safety of the people who will work in those mines.

Mr. Hemmings: He doesn't understand.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is correct. I wonder what would have been the position in America if time had been taken by American Governments over the years to provide "rigid environmental standards" (to use the member for Newland's words) in regard to that country's use of nuclear energy. I recall the catastrophe that occurred last year at the Three Mile Island nuclear energy plant. I do not know whether honourable members have seen what I consider to be a very good film called *The China Syndrome*, but I saw it and was most impressed. I was interested in an editorial that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 7 April 1979. The editorial stated, in part:

The impact that the Harrisburg accident is having on the United States—and in due course may have on Australia—has been increased by the fact that it coincides with the release of Jane Fonda's new film *The China Syndrome*, which is based on much the same sort of crisis that threatened Harrisburg, except that it is, of course, fictional.

It seems strange that it should be fictional, because it was dangerously close to the Harrisburg accident, I assure the House. The editorial continued:

It was attacked in America as an attempt to "manipulate anti-nuclear hysteria". A *Newsweek* critic says that "it uses fact, where convenient, for believability and implies, falsely, that the fiction is light coating on a heavy core of fact". Jane Fonda herself says the film is aimed not so much at nuclear energy as at human greed—"about placing the public interest in the hands of business people whose primary interest is maximising their profits".

I suggest Jane Fonda's statement could easily be directed to the Deputy Premier. It has been interesting to note what people in prominent positions within communities similar to Harrisburg think concerning what our future holds as regards nuclear energy. I refer to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 7 April 1979, in which comments were made by a leading identity at Harrisburg, as follows:

And in Harrisburg, the State capital, 40 kilometres from Three Mile Island, recently elected Governor Ray Thornburgh went on television this week to declare that his own once-easy optimism about the future of nuclear power had been shaken, perhaps shattered.

"Not all the safety assurances in the world, true as they are, will erase the crisis of confidence," he said. "Not all the celebrities in the world can erase the awareness of these good people that something out there is powerful and strange and not entirely under control."

I could not agree more with that statement. As I said earlier, no matter how safe one might be in an ordinary industry, there is always something that by chance has been left unguarded or not done, and a major accident occurs. I wonder whether, if the present Government carries on its hell-bent ego to plunge into the uranium and nuclear era, as did those of similar political views in America some years ago (and they now have some reservations about it), some people will not live to regret that ego. The results of accidents in the nuclear industry cannot be undone; they cannot be rectified.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the accidents in the coal industry?

Mr. MAX BROWN: They cannot be compensated for and the people involved cannot lead the proper and decent life to which every human being is entitled. Here again, people such as the member for Glenelg want to make a farcical situation out of a serious position in the industry. It is all very well for the member for Glenelg to talk about red flags in front of trains. If he were to become involved, as I have been involved over many years, with real calamities within our industrial world, where life has been taken, simply through stupidity and greed in many cases, perhaps he might have a different outlook on the real human problems within our industries.

I conclude this subject by saying that in this matter I will not accept the airy-fairy suggestions made almost daily by the Deputy Premier. I say sincerely, as I have said before, that I would not support the mining of uranium, the involvement in a uranium enrichment plant, the selling of uranium, or nuclear power stations until I am satisfied in my mind that the operations can go on safely. That has not been proved up until now.

Mr. Randall interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: I have some reasonable doubts whether it ever will be proved, despite all the so-called stupid interjections by the member for Henley Beach. If he wants a uranium enrichment plant built, I suggest it should be at Henley Beach. He can then see what his people say about that.

I am glad that the Minister of Industrial Affairs is in the House, because I want to deal with the gigantic Bill brought in by the Minister at the beginning of this year. I refer, of course, to the Shop Trading Hours Bill. As we recall, the Minister brought a Bill into the House at the beginning of the year under which it was proposed to extend retail trading hours from 5½ days and one night to include Saturday afternoons to 6 p.m. The introduction of this Bill was an exercise in what I could only describe as private enterprise in all its glory. It was ironical to see where the opposition to this private enterprise project came from; to name just a few, it came from the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce, Eudunda Farmers, and most of the small business fraternity within the retail industry. Those groups opposed the presentation of the Bill because they could see what the people in the Labor movement have seen for some time—that the exercise is one of the big monopolies squeezing the little people out and in turn lining not only their own pockets but also dictating the price structure and availability of every-day commodities.

Mr. Becker: Your Government was going to extend trading hours.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am quite sure that the Government back-benchers are indulging in wishful thinking. There is no foundation for that. For the member's own benefit, I refer to an article on this issue that appeared in Whyalla's local paper in June 1977. It was given to the local paper, not by the trade union movement, by me or by any opposers or known opposers to the retail industry but rather by representatives of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce. Dated 29 June 1977, three years ago, it is headed, "Fears of unrestricted trading hours are fully justified"; the report states:

Victorian State Chamber of Commerce President, Mr. J. Harrow, has provided proof that Whyalla's fears of unrestricted trading are fully justified, and that problems foreseen by the Whyalla chamber are a reality in Victoria. President of the Whyalla chamber, Mr. Peter Lord—who unfortunately is deceased—

said this after he and Mr. R. Bray attended the 20th annual

conference in Clare of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce. Basically, Whyalla fears that unrestricted trading would adversely affect country areas, prices, and job opportunities.

That is what the trade union movement and the A.L.P. have been saying for some time. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has a little grin, but we will come to him in a moment.

Mr. Hemmings: He backed down.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, he did. The report continues:

Mr. Lord said Mr. Harrow was clearly and strongly against unrestricted trading hours. Friday night trading alone in Victoria added 10 per cent to costs of goods to the consumer, said Mr. Lord. The South Australian federation felt costs could increase by as much as 25 per cent if unrestricted trading came about. This would necessitate some \$16 000 000-worth of additional sales in the retail industry to offset increased costs on overheads.

That is a classic example of private enterprise. The report further states:

Each sales person, it was estimated, would have to sell an additional \$100 worth of goods a day. It was felt that the consumer would not spend that much more, but possibly, and naturally, would take advantage of extended trading mainly just to spend what they are spending at present. In fact, people would be paying a lot more for goods they would normally buy during existing hours. It was obvious the increased costs in extending hours would have to be passed on to the consumer.

That is not what I said, what the trade union movement said, or what any member of the Labor Party is saying. It was the Victorian Chamber of Commerce and the South Australian representatives of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce who said that. They saw the position.

Mr. Becker: Anything about service stations? Your lot were looking at service stations in those days.

Mr. Mathwin: No, it was building them.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is not my interpretation. The honourable member is trying to put words into my mouth. That has never been my interpretation at any stage. The report continues:

Mr. Lord said that in Victoria it was shown large supermarkets expanded their range to include 20 per cent more of general goods generally sold by smaller shops.

That is rather interesting. The report further states:

Small businesses which could not afford to extend hours were forced to open because of such actions, just to try to compete to exist. Many could not keep viable. In Victoria, small business has not benefited from unrestricted trading, as currently proposed in South Australia and instigated in Victoria by a national supermarket chain whose policies were dictated by overseas interests.

Mr. Lord said that though Victoria still had late night trading, the Victorian Chamber of Commerce was still fighting to resist moves to have weekend trading. So far, it was winning the battle, but late night trading was still a costly problem.

Those were interesting words, to say the least. I come now to a saga I have been involved in with the Minister of Industrial Affairs relating to a matter in Whyalla. I turn, first, to a letter I wrote to the Minister of Industrial Affairs; at the time, he was overseas but it was answered by one of his colleagues.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I did not write a report like yours on my trip.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, you did. The Minister is jumping the gun. In fact, he is trying to confuse the issue. My letter stated:

I wish to voice my concern at this particular time that it has

been strongly rumoured in Whyalla that supermarkets, currently owned by Coles and Woolworths in particular, are threatening to open, and in fact I understand are putting into operation, this opening on Saturday afternoons and possibly all day Sundays.

It is obvious to the writer that if this policy is pursued small traders and middle sized traders in the restaurant, grocery and vegetable business will be severely affected.

I understand that the Late Shopping Act as such does not have any effect with respect to the City of Whyalla—and this is the important issue—

and I believe that some proper assessment of the problems which will eventuate, if the large supermarkets do in fact carry out the proposal outlined above, should as a matter of extreme urgency be carried out now and every consideration should be given to the possibilities of amending the current Act, so that Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading be outlawed.

Mr. Becker: But your Party brought this legislation in.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The honourable member is still not with it. Bear with me, and we will get to that in a moment. My letter continued:

I would appreciate very much if this approach to you at this time is treated as a matter of urgency. I understand verbally that the Whyalla Chamber of Commerce does not support the Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading for supermarkets and I also believe that some small businesses in Whyalla are already feeling some effects from this proposal.

I turn now to the Acting Minister's reply.

Mr. Hemmings: Who was the Acting Minister?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Minister of Transport. His answer opens up all the matters fired at me by Government members. It was a rather interesting reply, to say the least. His letter states:

In the Minister's absence overseas, I have obtained a report on the matter from the Chief Investigation Officer of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. He has confirmed that, as Whyalla is not a proclaimed country shopping district, shops may open there at any time.

I emphasise "at any time". Here is what we must do to solve the problem. The Minister's letter continues:

For a country district to be proclaimed, an application must be made by the local council to the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Sufficient evidence would need to be given that the people of the district wish such a proclamation to be made. I suggest that if the council wishes to pursue this avenue, that they contact the Chief Investigation Officer directly for advice.

As you will be aware, the general question of amending the law relating to shop trading hours will be reviewed by Parliament later this year, in the light of the many representations which the Government has received.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Do you realise this is the Bill that you voted for? You voted for the very measure you are now criticising.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: Oh no, I did not. It is interesting that the Minister, by way of his rather stupid interjection, has shown that he does not know that country shopping zoning is far different under the law from the existing metropolitan position. To alter the existing country law, the local council has to be practically unanimous in its support of any such proposal, and the shopkeepers have to be unanimous in their support of it. Also, we may have to have a local poll.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla has the floor.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Perhaps I should refer honourable members opposite to a detailed advertisement issued by

the Premier. Honourable members opposite obviously are not aware of this advertisement or do not want to be aware of it. The advertisement states:

Let's cut the red tape out of running a business in South Australia.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: Honourable members opposite must be aware of it. The advertisement continues:

Over half the State's work force—

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MAX BROWN: The advertisement continues:

Over half the State's work force is employed by small business. In many cases these firms have to comply with regulations that are designed for large organisations.

I pause there, because that is the point I am trying to get home to members opposite, but they are not listening. The advertisement continues:

The Government recognises that unnecessary controls can stand in the way of job creation, investment and business expansion. Sensible controls are always needed, but the Government has promised—

I stress "promised"—

to get rid of the restrictive and unnecessary red tape which is petty, time wasting and adds to business costs. The Government is planning a programme to rationalise existing legislation and reduce unnecessary controls.

That is what I am talking about at present.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Mallee says, "Hear, hear"; so do I. I raised this issue with the Premier, asking him to cut the red tape and to do something about the situation. It seems rather ironic to me that, to my knowledge, neither the Whyalla Chamber of Commerce, the small business people who have petitioned him, nor I have received any response from the Premier. I can only suggest to the laughing members opposite that they are about as sincere on this issue as are dingoes.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the comment made by the member for Whyalla, which I believe is unparliamentary. He referred to members on this side as "dingoes".

Mr. Hemmings: I thought that was complimentary.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Whyalla referred to members of the House as dingoes, I would ask him to withdraw unconditionally.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I did not refer to members opposite as dingoes at all but, if the member for Eyre wants to take it that way, fair enough.

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the honourable member use that term? If he did, in what context was it?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I said that, if they were not prepared to look at this matter and be sincere, they could be described only as being as sincere as a dingo. I was not calling them dingoes.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a very convoluted way of approaching the subject, and one that is not acceptable to the Chair. I ask the honourable member to withdraw unconditionally.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I withdraw unconditionally, but I—

The SPEAKER: Order! "Unconditionally" does not require explanation.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The point is taken, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw. I turn now to a matter that I consider most important in my own electorate and in country electorates throughout the State. I refer to legal aid services. Probably members opposite do not know much about legal aid, but from my experience as a member it has become an important issue.

Some years ago I became involved substantially in what could be described as worrying, minor, but nevertheless really complex problems, which constituents of mine found themselves combating.

The facts of the matter are that for many years, particularly in country areas, decent, honest citizens, facing everyday problems, either were unable or could not afford to obtain advice to overcome properly those everyday problems. This situation became so prevalent that to be honest my office and, I myself, on many occasions, became a form of legal adviser.

Mr. Mathwin: Heaven help them!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The honourable member can say that. I am sincere about this; I do not know whether other members have had this sort of experience, but I do not wish it on anyone. I point out for the benefit of the member for Glenelg that there were dangers in the development of that situation because, first, neither my office staff nor I was trained in legalities and, secondly, it opened up the real possibility of giving wrong advice and being answerable to legal procedures and to questions by legal practitioners. I say that sincerely.

Slowly but surely I became closely allied to the Legal Services Commission. Because of my involvement particularly with underprivileged people, many cases of humane proportions were referred to the Legal Services Commission for advice. This involvement was often somewhat trying because of isolation and the cost of having to deal, from a country electorate, with an organisation based in the city.

At this time I became more and more involved in what was obviously a real need for an office of the Legal Services Commission to be established in Whyalla or a near country area. It was not long before I found out some interesting facts about the establishment of a Legal Services Commission office. First, the setting up of a country office of the Legal Services Commission had to be funded 65 per cent by the Federal Government and 35 per cent by the State Government. Secondly, I found out that, whilst the then State Labor Government was prepared to find the 35 per cent of its commitment, the Fraser Government did not intend to meet its part of the bargain.

Because of these two factors, the necessary provision of a legal aid service in the country (and, particularly from my viewpoint, in Whyalla) seemed doomed, and I point out that South Australia was, and I believe still is, the worst-off State in Australia as far as this service is concerned. If members opposite were to look in depth at the question of legal aid services throughout Australia they would find that statement to be correct.

It was with some delight that I received advice in about October 1979 that the Legal Services Commission had, despite an un-cooperative Government, agreed to the establishment, at least on a temporary basis, of a country Legal Services Commission office in Whyalla. In November, I received correspondence from the Legal Services Commission. In part, the letter that I received from the Director states:

The Legal Services Commission is expanding its services in four areas of South Australia by commencing weekly legal services at Whyalla, Port Augusta, Noarlunga, and Port Adelaide. These services will commence in the second week of December, and will operate one day each week between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. It is hoped that in the course of 1980 it will be possible to upgrade these services into full branch offices of the commission. However, in the meantime commission staff will be able to provide through these weekly arrangements all the services now available from the commission's city and Elizabeth Offices.

Legal advice will be available free to any person attending

the service office on the appropriate day, and legal service going beyond legal advice can be provided to any person who satisfies the commission's flexible means and needs test. These services may be provided either through commission staff or through local private practitioners acting on assignment from the commission. Unfortunately, it is not possible to give legal advice over the telephone through the weekly service.

The letter went on to say that pamphlets and the like were enclosed. That was an important step forward, especially regarding the underprivileged people living in my electorate. This service began, as promised, on a one-day basis as from 5 December, and I was assured early in 1980 that the numbers of people seeking that service in Whyalla one day a week had grown very quickly, and in fact to increasing proportions. So, it was with very much regret that I received correspondence from the Legal Services Commission in February of problems with the service, and I received that letter on 27 February 1980. It states:

You may recall that in November, 1979 I wrote to you advising that the commission was establishing a weekly legal advisory service in your area and hoped to upgrade this into a full legal aid office in the course of 1980. Since that time, the commission has operated a service at Whyalla every Wednesday, and Port Augusta every Thursday. Our figures show that this service has assisted many local residents with legal problems, and I hope that it has been of help to you in your work. However, I am now obliged to inform you that it appears that our efforts to obtain funds to establish a full legal aid office in your area have been unsuccessful, and that indeed the commission may be obliged to discontinue the present limited service.

The current position is that this commission takes the view that there is a need for a full legal aid office in Whyalla, with at least a regular service to Port Augusta, and has sought funds from both State and Federal Governments to establish one. The proposed office would be similar to that now operated by the commission in the Elizabeth area. It would employ two lawyers, one trained interviewing officer, and one secretary/receptionist and would provide the full range of Commission services—i.e. free legal advice, legal aid to eligible clients on any legal problem, a duty lawyer service in the local court, Do-Your-Own Divorce classes for local residents, and all other advisory and educational functions. The commission based its view that such an office was needed on extensive investigations into the legal needs of different areas in South Australia and the resources available to meet those needs.

The letter continues in a very important vein, as far as I am concerned, and as far as my constituents are concerned. It states:

As a result of these inquiries, the commission requested funds to establish eight regional offices in South Australia, but it has made it clear that the two areas which it regards as having highest priority are Christies Beach and Whyalla. Our first such request was unsuccessful, as the Commonwealth, in making initial funds available for the current financial year, refused to approve the establishment of any regional offices. You may not be aware that the commission is jointly funded 65 per cent by the Commonwealth and 35 per cent by the State, and thus the agreement of both Governments is necessary for the commission to undertake any new projects.

However, the commission continued to press its needs for regional offices, and sought additional funds to enable the establishment of offices at Christies Beach and Whyalla in the current financial year, pointing out that funding for legal aid in South Australia is, per capita, the lowest of any State or Territory in Australia, and that we have fewer legal aid offices than any other State. As a result, the commission was advised in November 1979 that the Commonwealth would

assist if possible, and it was suggested that our chances of obtaining Commonwealth funds would be strengthened if a regular service was established in these areas before 14 December, the closing date for Commonwealth estimates. Despite the very severe strains which this imposed upon staff, the commission accommodated this request and established weekly advisory services at Christies Beach as well as at Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Adelaide.

Unfortunately, our efforts have been unsuccessful in that, although the Commonwealth have now indicated that they would be willing to fund offices at Christies Beach and Whyalla, the State is not willing or able to provide its 35 per cent of the cost and therefore the service cannot proceed. The cost of establishing an office of the type outlined above is approximately \$15 000 and the cost of running such an office for a year is approximately \$100 000.

The letter continues:

I regret that this means that we are unable for the present to proceed with plans to establish an office in your area. I will not read any more of that correspondence, but I point out that it was certainly brought home to me that here was a most desirable and important facility for my electorate, and that, although I had then broken through the Fraser Government, I crashed because the Labor Government had lost office in this State and we had a Liberal Government.

Following the receipt of this correspondence, I believed that I should raise the matter with the Attorney-General. I endeavoured to make an honest and sincere submission to the Attorney-General to review the position. My letter stated in part:

Over a period of several years, I have been involved in an endeavour to obtain a resident office in Whyalla of the Legal Services Commission. It was with some pleasure that, in November of last year, I was advised that the commission intended to open such an office in Whyalla on a one day per week basis, so as to establish two things:

1. Whether there was a need for such a service, and
2. to substantiate a submission to the Federal Government for adequate funding to establish ultimately a full-time country office of the commission.

Since the inception of the weekly service to Whyalla, it has been more than substantiated as far as need is concerned. I have been advised at this time that up to some 30 cases have been endeavoured to be processed in the one day—

that could only be described as an enormous amount of legal work in one day by any office, whether private or of a legal commission—

thus considerably proving the very great need for such a service. You may be aware, but if not I point out that the State of South Australia, in relation to other States, is the worst off by far in respect to legal aid and I find personally, because of the unique situation which has developed at Whyalla, this fact to be an appalling one.

I have been advised currently by the Legal Services Commission that the one day per week advisory service has assisted many local residents, both at Whyalla and Port Augusta, but, unfortunately, the test case so instigated is doomed to failure.

The current position is that the commission believes that there is a real need in this area for a full legal aid office manned by two lawyers, one trained interviewing officer and one secretary/receptionist, providing to the general public free legal advice, legal aid to eligible clients on any legal problem.

The letter continued:

On this basis, I advise you that the commission requested funds to establish eight regional offices in South Australia, but in that request it has been made quite clear the two areas of most need and concern are Christies Beach and Whyalla.

In that letter I then point out the required funding by the Federal Government and the State Government.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MAX BROWN: I pointed out to the Attorney-General that, although the major hurdle had been overcome, namely, that the Federal Government had come to the party, the State Government advised that apparently it was unwilling or unable to provide its 35 per cent of the funding. My letter continued:

Because of your Government's decision at this time it is impossible to proceed with a requirement not only substantiated in need but, by its absence, depriving underprivileged people of a service so urgently and desperately required in their every-day struggle for survival. It is currently considered that the temporary one day per week service to Whyalla and Port Augusta will be discontinued as from the end of March, thus delaying, in fact, possibly ending, any real progress in the desperate need for this service to country areas.

I concluded my letter by asking the Attorney-General to give serious and proper consideration to my submission.

Ultimately I received a reply to that correspondence from the Attorney-General. I would suggest to the House that, in his reply, the Attorney-General has adopted purely a procedure for protecting private legal practitioners, a callous attitude in relation to the underprivileged and ordinary citizens in real need of legal assistance. By his and his Government's action, he has deprived this State of a much needed facility that is provided much more widely in every other State of this country. Lastly, he has created enough red tape to see that the Legal Services Commission cannot function or fulfil its real role to ordinary people in our society. In part, the Attorney-General's reply stated:

The Government's policy with respect to the provision of legal aid is that, whilst the Legal Services Commission has the principal responsibility for co-ordinating the delivery of legal aid, it does not have the principal responsibility for providing that aid. The Government recognises that in the provision of legal aid the private legal profession should play the principal role. However, it is recognised that there is a place for salaried legal officers within the Legal Services Commission in providing part of the necessary legal aid services.

I shall not refer to the Attorney-General's reply further. In regard to that paragraph, I find it most annoying and inhuman to put the responsibility of providing free legal advice for these people on private practitioners. I just cannot understand the attitude of the Attorney-General, and I find it very difficult to align my thoughts with the way in which the Government is proceeding in this matter.

As I understand it, up until now the one-day legal aid office of the Legal Aid Commission is still in existence in Whyalla, and I sincerely hope that it will continue. In conclusion, I wish to refer to a subject that is very near to us all; that is, the forthcoming Federal election.

Mr. Lewis: Come off it!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Mallee is either having a dizzy spell or it is not near to him. I was very interested to read the reported pledge made by the Labor Party's Federal Leader which appeared in the *Adelaide News* on 13 August 1980. The article, headed "Hayden promises cut in petrol", in part states:

A Federal Labor Government would offer cheaper health insurance, petrol, and lower sales tax, the Opposition Leader says. Labor also would consider lowering income tax. The pledges involve a wages pact with unions, and a "virtual end" to annual Federal Budgets.

If items such as health insurance, fuel, lower sales taxes

and lower income taxes could be achieved, a Labor Government could convince the unions not to aggravate wage increases, Mr. Hayden said in Tasmania as he launched the A.L.P.'s Federal election campaign.

The article continues:

We have a special relationship with the trade union movement, and I am confident we can do it.

I point out that only a Federal Labor Government could possibly come to an agreement with the trade union movement on a wages pact. Obviously, if inflation is to be grappled with in any degree of positiveness, someone somewhere must provide a real lead: who better to do that than a Labor Federal Government? I believe it is true to say that over the past 12 months much of the increase in our inflation rate has been caused by the taxing methods of the current Federal Government. Every time there is an increase in indirect taxation, so our inflationary rate is increased.

I have said before, and I say again, that prices, not wages create inflation. I now wish to deal with one commodity which over the past few months has become very dear to me; that is, the price of beer. The price of beer has risen no less than three times in no more than the last four months.

Mr. Slater: It has gone up five times since November.

Mr. MAX BROWN: My colleague has stated that the price of beer has risen five times since November, and it has risen three times this year. I point out that the first price increase in beer occurred when the brewery put up the price of a keg by 50c for no reason at all. That increase resulted in a 1c increase in the price of a butcher, schooner and pint. The second price rise occurred when wages rose by about \$4 or \$5 per week, but that did not justify a 1c increase in the price of beer. To my knowledge, the last time the price of beer rose it was simply because this Government allowed it to rise. At one time there were three different prices for beer in the city of Whyalla.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion. I, too, wish to express my condolences to Mr. Parrish's family at their sad loss. Mr. Parrish was a former member for the seat of Murray. I am sure that all members would know that at the time when Mr. Parrish was a sitting member (1915-18), we were at war, and even though he served only three years it was a time when not only this country but the whole world was in a crisis situation. I also congratulate the mover, the member for Newland, and the seconder, the member for Mawson, for their contributions to the debate.

The Address in Reply debate is a debate in reply to the Governor's Opening Speech to the two Houses of Parliament expressing the Government's policies and its intentions in relation to legislation for the coming session. There is no doubt that if members, regardless of political attitudes, were asked to express an opinion privately, most would agree that the Government's record since last September has been a great credit to it. The record of those members who have taken on Ministerial responsibilities has been excellent. I believe it is fair to say that most people in the community, in particular those close to the political scene, have been amazed at the capacity that was immediately shown by Ministers of the Crown when

the Liberal Party took office after nearly a decade on the Opposition benches.

I believe that the political commentators and writers would also agree that the Australian Labor Party, now back on the Opposition benches for the first time for nearly a decade, has found it difficult to operate in Opposition. While in Government, Labor Party members learned to be arrogant and to believe that, because they had a silver-tongued orator leading them, the community at large would continue to follow them regardless of whether they had a silver-tongued orator or not. It is no good any person arguing that the Hon. Don Dunstan as Premier was not a capable orator and as a person was able to lead not only his own group, which is a mixed bag, but also the community. In saying that, I do not intend to cast any reflection on the member who lost the election on 15 September, because it is not easy for any man who has a different and more forthright approach and who is perhaps not so silver-tongued but who in the main said what he believed and had an aggressive approach to get the message over, so he paid the penalty of calling an early election.

We now have a Government that is setting out to put this State back on the road to prosperity. No-one would argue that that is going to be an easy task. All members would be aware that within the last decade, not only within this State but within the Commonwealth, overall we have spent more than we have collected. If one belongs to a club, which is all that Australia is, and one spends more than the people pay in subscriptions (taking subscriptions as taxes), the end result is that one becomes insolvent. A country is in the position to borrow and pay interest rates that prevail internationally or internally with the funds they borrow, and in the short term that sort of policy will work. However, in the end result our children and their children must foot the bill. Sections of our community consistently lobby for more money to be spent in whatever field they may be interested in. I offer the following challenge to those lobby groups to say: we know that the country we have belonged to for the last decade on average has spent more than it has collected and, therefore, for that reason we are advocating that you the Governments of this country—State, Federal or local, if it be district council—should apply higher charges, whether it be taxes or charges for services given so that you have the money to spend on those things for which you are asking.

If a society will not say that, that society is being dishonest. It is saying that it believes that a country can go on borrowing and spending on a deficit Budget without ever facing up to judgment day in the financial sector. That cannot happen. I say strongly to those groups that lobby for more, "If you lobby for more, tell us whence it will come?" Some will say that perhaps we can tax the multi-nationals or the rich, or that we should not have discontinued succession duties but, if there is one thing we have learned in Australia in the past decade, it is that, if you destroy incentive, you destroy the whole country's economy. That is exactly what we did.

People who had the capacity through their own energy and ability to use their brain or body to earn more refused to do it. Throughout the history of mankind, whether we go back to the tribal state or whatever period in the history of the human race, we find that, unless those who had the extra talents were given the opportunity and encouraged to use their extra talents, those without the talent ended up by suffering more than they do under the system by which you try to distribute wealth by taking it away from those who have the ability to accumulate or earn it. There is a difference between being able to accumulate it and

wasting it. If ever there has been an argument in Australia that people should start spending money by investing it in their own industries, it is right now.

When the United States of America first began, a lobby in that country said, "Don't let the multi-nationals come in from the United Kingdom, Germany, or France, because they are taking the wealth out of America." That is where the money first came from to develop the United States of America: from Europe, in the main. The people of that era, 150 years or so ago, said, "Stop these European companies coming here and taking our wealth. They'll break us. They're bleeding us." What happened was that, eventually, they produced enough wealth and confidence in their own country. Now we are saying that U.S.A. companies, German companies to a lesser extent, and the United Kingdom and the Japanese companies to a larger extent should be stopped from coming here and investing. I predict that our young people of the future will see the benefit of investing money in our own developmental projects within Australia. We should ask among ourselves how many of us are prepared to say that we will go without the second motor car and the luxury items, and invest money in our own country. How many of us do that?

Mr. Keneally: Have you a second motor car?

Mr. EVANS: The largest percentage of families within the State have a second motor car, and the member for Stuart, who interjected whilst out of his seat, knows that. Once people begin to realise that one way of Australians owning Australian developmental companies or any company is by Australians saving money and investing, thus we will take control of our own resources. It is no use saying, "We don't want someone else to develop," if we are not prepared to put our own money towards the projects. That is what has been happening. The member for Gilles will agree that what has happened in Australia in the main is that we have become the working agents of money-lenders and the slaves of interest rates. Instead of setting out ourselves to save and invest and make our money work for us, in the main we have all gone into the hire-purchase field (and I exclude from that the buying of a home, because that is important) and have ended up becoming no more than working agents for finance companies and slaves of interest rates. They know that, and we, as a country, know that.

What we really need is an attitude of Australians investing in Australia. I repeat that, when the U.S.A. first began in developmental fields, it was mainly European money that was used. Now we complain about the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, Germany or whatever country it may be, beginning to take an interest in Australia. I am convinced that this Government is on the right path in encouraging development in the mining fields and industry to come here, and offering incentives wherever possible. Views have been expressed recently by the Premiers that the one tax which is a bad tax in this country is pay-roll tax. We should all support that view, whether we belong to a socialist philosophy or to a private enterprise philosophy.

Mr. SLATER: Mr. Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. EVANS: I thank you for that, Mr. Acting Speaker. Also, I thank the socialist part of the Australian Labor Party for the two supporters it has in the House out of a total of 20, which shows their real interest in what happens in the House and in what the contribution may be. That has been typical of what has been happening all day. I know that they are proud of it, but I know that their supporters would be ashamed of them. Pay-roll tax is a tax on people who employ other people. In a country where we have a high unemployment factor, as does most of the

Western world, a tax on employing people is a bad tax. The Premiers, with Commonwealth Government support, will, I hope, find a way of eliminating that tax because, if ever we need a time of encouragement for employers to employ people, it is right now. We need to consider that sincerely, and I hope that the A.L.P. will support any move made to abolish that tax.

My colleague the member for Brighton spoke for some time earlier today on tourism and the potential for tourism within the State, and I will contribute briefly to his point of view. Undoubtedly, if this State were promoted, and if our attractions were promoted, we would gain a substantial number of tourists from within Australia, if not from outside. We have many areas of historic interest and many areas of natural beauty and interest that would attract people if they were told of them. However, unfortunately, we have a system where the cost of travel within Australia is very expensive, whereas travel to some of our near neighbours in Asia is close and cheap. In travel time, it is as easy to go to some of the Asian countries from Sydney or from the East Coast as it is to go to Perth. The East Coast of Australia contains 11 500 000 of the 14 000 000 people within Australia, and there is a big incentive for those people not to go to South Australia, Western Australia or even to the Northern Territory. So, we need to consider that matter.

A point of view that I have expressed more recently is that I believe that every person should be entitled to claim from his taxation a substantial amount as a direct tax deduction if he spends his holidays within Australia. I believe that that would encourage people to stay within Australia. The greatest benefit in people seeing the rest of Australia before seeing the world is that they would come back and tell their friends about the beauty they saw, the attractive areas, and the historic sights. If that occurred, we would find that substantially more jobs would be created within Australia.

The member for Brighton made the point that has been proven world wide. That is that, wherever you have three tourists, you create one more job, so if we want to start to create employment opportunities the tourist field is one of the greatest. I read recently that the number of people leaving the United Kingdom was about 5 000 000 a year and the number going into that country was 4 500 000 a year, so even the United Kingdom has a greater number leaving than going in.

However, they have \$2 000 000 000 being spent by the people going in, compared to \$1 500 000 000 by the people going out. We in Australia have more people leaving Australia, except that it is not exactly similar in this particular case. Our people leaving Australia spend far more than do the tourists coming in, so we have an imbalance, because our people wanting to go and see the wonders of the world, new cultures, and new and different lifestyles take out money that they have earned in this country.

Many of those people, when they leave Australia, leave behind a son or daughter who is unemployed. When the people come back from an expensive trip overseas, they say "What are you going to do about unemployment?" Those people have been to Hong Kong or Singapore and have bought cheap clothing and goods to bring back, yet when they come back they complain because their family is out of work.

I say to people like that that they are hypocrites. They know what they are doing. They know that they are taking money out of this country and denying people in this country the opportunity to have jobs. That will continue while we have the high travel component and no possibility of tax deductions. If we look at how business

men and professional people have the opportunity to claim for travel and accommodation, often under the subterfuge that they are doing genuine business when they are not—

Mr. Keneally: Like Fraser and Peacock.

Mr. EVANS: It may be that the member for Stuart is one of the biggest offenders in that field: I do not know. He seems to suggest that he may be. However, we should be concerned about this matter. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHANGE OF NAME) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 20 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 August 1980

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MILTABURRA SCHOOL

1. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: To what stage has planning progressed for the new Miltaburra school?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A project team has been formed, sketch plans are being prepared, and the Public Buildings Department has been requested to investigate the water supply to the site.

FIFE PACKAGE

2. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has the Premier communicated to the Prime Minister the resolution passed by the House of Assembly on 12 June concerning the "Fife package" of legislation, and, if so, when?

2. What reply, if any, has been received, when was it received does it indicate that the Federal Government intends to accede, and what action does the Premier propose as a result?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. On 20 June 1980.

2. See Ministerial statement in *Hansard* for the House of Assembly on Thursday 31 July 1980.

RESERVOIR RESERVES

8. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What use, if any, may members of the public make of reservoir reserves?

2. What consideration, if any, has been given by the Government to allowing the public greater use of such reserves?

3. Have any reports been made either to this or to the previous Government (and which) on this matter in the last five years and, if so, when, by whom, and to what effects?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Members of the public are admitted to reservoir reserves between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4.30 p.m. for passive recreation such as sightseeing. Certain reservoir reserves have additional recreation facilities in the form of picnic grounds and barbecues.

2. The Government is considering the possibility of introducing a range of recreational activities to certain reservoir reserves that meet water quality protection criteria. An inter-departmental committee is expected to report to the Government on this matter by the end of September 1980.

3. A committee of enquiry chaired by Dr. J. Melville was established by the former Government in 1977. The Melville committee submitted Part I of its report to the former Government in September 1978. This report dealt with policy, needs, demands and current practices for reservoir reserves and made 31 recommendations with respect to recreational use of reservoirs and reservoir reserves. The committee of enquiry foreshadowed a further report on controls, manpower resources, facilities, costs and legislative and other requirements for managing possible recreational activities within reservoir reserves.

Comments on Part I of the report of the committee of enquiry were received from the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport and the Department for the Environment. These comments, together with Part I of the report of the committee of enquiry, were referred to Cabinet for consideration on 12 December 1978. On 18 December 1978, Cabinet accepted the recommendations as a basis for further detailed evaluation. It is this evaluation which is being undertaken by the inter-departmental committee referred to in 2.

WOODVILLE SPECIAL SCHOOL

25. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is it the Government's intention to build a new special school to replace the Woodville Special School at present situated at Torrens Road, Woodville, and, if so, when will it be built?

2. Has a specific site been purchased or set aside for the new school and, if so, what is the location?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Subject to funds being available a replacement Woodville Special School will be built in 1984.

2. The replacement school will be built on land adjacent to the Challa Gardens Primary School. This land is at present held by the Department of Further Education.

CORPORATION RELOCATION

40. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Government propose any legislative changes similar to those put forward in some American states to require adequate advanced public notice to be given by corporations intending to relocate so that the social and economic impact on the community which the corporation leaves can be minimised?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No.

DENTAL DEPARTMENTS

59. **Mr. LANGLEY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the Government opened the dental department at Gilles Plains?

2. Does the Government intend to place further dental departments in other districts for pensioners?

3. What is the present waiting time for pensioners eligible for treatment?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, on 14 April 1980.

2. In addition to the clinic at Gilles Plains, the Government has established dental clinics for the treatment of pensioners at Flinders Medical Centre and at The Parks Community Health Centre.

3. With the existing resources available, the present waiting time for pensioners eligible for treatment is:

	Dentures	Other
Gilles Plains	12 months	2 months
F.M.C.	2 years	1 month
The Parks	12 months	3-4 weeks

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

64. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Did the Premier write to the Road Traffic Board in February or March of this year concerning the traffic management plan installed in the Rose Park/Toorak Gardens Ward of the Corporation of the City of Burnside and, if so, did this letter request any specific action by the board, what was the course of action, and what reason did the Premier give for requesting it?

2. Has the Premier's letter been responsible for causing the board to approve, as an alternative to the then existing plan, a scheme previously rejected by that board in March 1978?

3. Does the Premier approve of the introduction of the new scheme, previously expected to increase accidents, and does this reflect the policy of the Government on traffic control in local government areas?

4. Will the Premier table his letter?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No. The honourable member may be referring to a letter from the Mayor of Burnside on this matter which I forwarded to the Minister of Transport in December 1979 requesting that council's wishes in this matter be considered.

2. Not applicable.

3. It is not appropriate to give a personal opinion on such matters.

4. Not applicable.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

65. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What change of manpower is expected in the Department of Fisheries by 30 June 1981, and how many of these changes will be Public Service positions and how many will be weekly paid?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Some change in manpower is expected during the period 1 July 1980 and 30 June 1981. It is not possible to quantify these changes at the present time.

PORT DOCK

66. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Have there been any negotiations or discussions involving the Police Department or the S.T.A. in respect of purchasing or leasing the Port Adelaide dock freight offices as the new headquarters for the Police Department in that area and, if so, when will this occur?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: A proposal to change the site of the new police divisional headquarters, patrol base and the courts complex has been initiated by the Project Manager of the Port Adelaide Centre through the Minister of Planning. The proposal does involve the transfer of land from the State Transport Authority and the purchase or transfer of land from the Australian National Railways. Both parcels of land form part of the Port Adelaide Dock railway complex.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES EMPLOYEES

68. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What number of people are expected to be employed in the Department of Fisheries under the Public Service Act as at 30 June 1981?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Eighty persons is the staff ceiling.

BICYCLES

69. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government intend to make any concessions that would encourage the greater use of bicycles, mopeds and small motor cycles?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Government encourages the greater use of bicycles, mopeds and small motor cycles. For example, mopeds and small motor cycles weighing less than 50 kg and pedal assisted are exempt from registration fees. In addition, funds are provided to assist in development of bicycle tracks, and additional accommodation is being provided for bicycles on trains. Encouragement by further incentives is being kept under review.

HOUSING TRUST PREMISES

99. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Does the South Australian Housing Trust own the premises at 86 Main Street, Beverley, and, if so, when was it purchased and who were the previous owners?

2. Are the premises currently occupied by trust tenants, and, if so, who are they and is the trust aware that the tenants own other premises?

3. Is it the policy of the trust to rent premises to tenants who own other premises?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. It was purchased in March 1980 from a private person.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) The names of all trust tenants are confidential. However, the Minister of Housing will provide this information to the honourable member on a confidential basis if the honourable member further requests it.

(c) Yes.

3. No, but the trust will consider exceptions under certain special circumstances. In the subject instance, negotiations were in hand to dispose of the other premises.

HOME FOR INCURABLES

159. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is an inquiry being made into the Home for Incurables and, if so—

(a) is it being made by the Health Commission or, if not, by whom;

(b) what are its terms of reference;

(c) from whom are submissions being accepted;

(d) when is it expected to report; and

(e) will the report be made public and, if not, why not?

2. How much money has been given in each of the last five financial years (including this financial year) by the Government to the Home for Incurables, for what purposes has this money been given and how has it been spent?

3. What obligation, if any, has the Home for Incurables to account to the Government for such money and has any such obligation been carried out and, if so, how?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. An inquiry has been held.

- (a) No. By the Minister of Health through a Committee. The Chairman was Sir Charles Bright and the members were Sir Dennis Patterson, Sir James Irwin, Professor Dennis Smith, and Dr. C. B. Sangster.
 - (b) "To inquire into the criteria for admission to the Home for Incurables, and other related matters".
 - (c) The committee engaged a consultant specialist geriatrician and sought information from relevant bodies.
 - (d) By 30 June 1980.
 - (e) The report was released publicly in early July 1980.
2. The following funds have been provided in each of the last five financial years:
- | | |
|---------|-------------------------|
| 1975-76 | \$2 226 000 |
| 1976-77 | \$2 640 000 |
| 1977-78 | \$3 971 000 |
| 1978-79 | \$4 990 000 |
| 1979-80 | \$5 397 000 (estimate). |

These funds have been provided to support the operation of the home in accordance with its constitution and objectives.

3. The home is requested to submit detailed estimates on an annual basis to obtain the necessary funding and to provide audited accounts and reports on its administration of such funds.

DISABLED PERSONS

161. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. When will access to Parliament House be provided for disabled persons, and why has it not been provided before now?

2. Has the feasibility study undertaken by the Public Buildings Department on this matter, as mentioned in the Minister's letter to the member for Mitcham of 21 May, yet been completed and, if not, why not, and, if so, how much is it expected to cost to provide such access, and where will such access be?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Public Buildings Department has now completed an investigation into the provision of access to Parliament House for disabled persons and the following modifications to entrances, the Strangers' Galleries and toilet facilities are recommended:

1. It is proposed to modify Western entrance No. 1 adjacent to the Constitutional Museum at lower ground floor level, and the entrance from the Festival Centre Car Park to basement level, at an estimated cost of \$2 000.

2. Access will be provided to the Strangers' Galleries of both Chambers from where Parliamentary proceedings can be observed. Access will be limited to two persons in wheelchairs for each Chamber at first floor level. It is not considered feasible to provide unlimited access throughout the Chambers. The estimated cost of modifications to the first floor level of the Strangers' Galleries of \$9 000.

3. The provision of toilets suitable for use by handicapped persons will be made at the lower ground floor level. The estimated cost of this work is \$8 000.

The total estimated cost of the work is in the order of \$19 000.

SPENCER GULF POLLUTION COMMITTEE

175. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Why has the Spencer Gulf Pollution Committee never made a formal report?

2. Is it still in existence?

3. How many times has it met, and when did it last meet?

4. What are its terms of reference?

5. Will the Minister now ask it for a formal report and, if not, why not?

6. Will the Minister make public any such report he receives and, if not, why not?

7. Has the committee ever reported to anyone on any matters and, if so, to whom, and will the Minister now make such report public and, if not, why not?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. The Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Co-ordinating Committee was established in August 1973 and disbanded as such in November 1976. At that time the South Australian Marine Environment Advisory Committee was created.

The Spencer Gulf committee produced internal reports during its three year existence but not a public report. The committee played an important role in co-ordinating major investigations within the Spencer Gulf as recommended by the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Studies—Reconnaissance Survey. It acted as a forum in which represented Government departments and universities could report upon and discuss their respective research programmes.

The committee thus fulfilled a relatively passive, yet essential, function in Spencer Gulf studies, and study reports were prepared by the departments directly concerned rather than by the committee.

2. See 1. above.

3. On 15 occasions, the last meeting being on 1 November 1976.

4. The terms of reference of the Spencer Gulf committee were as follows:

"To examine the report Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Studies—Reconnaissance Survey and to make recommendations regarding the priorities, programmes, machinery and resources for implementation and co-ordination of—

1. The specific studies recommended by the Reconnaissance Survey;

2. Such other studies as the committee may consider necessary for the short and long term protection of the Spencer Gulf.

Any investigation of any type involving the waters of Spencer Gulf should be authorised and co-ordinated by the Committee."

5. and 6. In view of 1., 2. and 3. above, these questions are regarded as inappropriate.

7. The Spencer Gulf committee submitted reports of some importance to:

a. The Minister of Works on 19 October 1973 outlining research priorities in Spencer Gulf and making specific recommendations for the administrative organisation of the committee; and

b. The Minister of Environment on 30 September 1976 summarising the achievements of the Spencer Gulf committee and recommending the formation of the South Australian Marine Environment Advisory Committee as a successor body.

The recommendations of both reports were accepted by Cabinet.

Numerous other items of correspondence were also prepared by the committee as part of its day to day

operations. However, their release to the public is deemed inappropriate because of their routine and specific nature.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

178. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Did an A.B.C. TV crew visit Netley and Pennington in mid-July to report on allegations that Government policy had resulted in P.B.D. employees having to sit around idle and, if so, was the TV crew turned away?

2. Were any such employees left idle at that time at either site and if so, was any action taken to try to conceal this fact by dispersing the employees to other sites even though work might not readily be available there either?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN : The replies are as follows:

1. An A.B.C. TV crew visited the Pennington Depot on 9 July 1980. They arrived at the depot at approximately 3.30 p.m. and left shortly after having been advised by the workshop superintendent that Ministerial authority is required for the issue of press statements.

2. On the afternoon of 9 July 1980 certain tradespersons were temporarily awaiting allocation to projects. The following day they were utilised on new assignments.

DEMAC BUILDINGS

179. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Has the Engineering and Water Supply Department sought about 15 Demac buildings from the Public Buildings Department and, if so, was the order rejected?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In November 1979 the Engineering and Water Supply Department requested the Public Buildings Department to prepare design sketches and provide budget estimates for the provision of 7 Demac modules at Thebarton. However, the Engineering and Water Supply Department later advised that work be discontinued as the project could not be finalised and funds made available before the closure of Demac operations on 30 June 1980.

SEXIST ADVERTISING

188. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Did the Minister write a letter of complaint to Gordon Distributors on sexist advertising using Ministerial letterhead in a Ministerial envelope and signed as Minister of Health and Tourism and if so, was the letter written in her capacity as a Minister and did it reflect Government policy on such advertising or Government policy on the sanctions to be applied to firms using such advertising?

2. By what means did the Minister propose to use influence to encourage a boycott of the firm and what success has she had?

3. How did the promotional pamphlet for the 3M Model 307 photocopier come into the possession of the Minister?

4. Did the Minister state in one interview that the pamphlet had been delivered to her electorate premises and did she state in another interview that it had been brought to her by a constituent?

5. When the Minister stated the material had been delivered to her electorate premises, did this mean it came directly to her electorate office through the post or by some similar means?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. No.
2. By discussion with interested persons.
3. By direct mail.
4. Yes. No.
5. Yes.

PATHOLOGY SERVICES ENQUIRY

189. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is the Blight/Gray submission said on page 3 of Appendix A of the Report by the Committee of Inquiry "Pathology Services in South Australia" to be "attached to this report" available and if so, from whom and if not, why not and why does it not appear in published copies of the report?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The Blight/Gray submission is classified by the authors as "confidential" and not for public release as it contains information provided to the authors under privilege. However, the submission was available to the Minister of Health and attached to an Interim Report when presented on 20 December 1979.

MALLEE ELECTORATE OFFICE

190. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Has a formal request yet been received from the member for Mallee to establish an electorate office within the electorate of Mallee?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No such request has been received.

KANGAROO ISLAND ROADS

196. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What kilometreage of the roads on Kangaroo Island is—

- (a) sealed; and
- (b) unsealed?

2. On what basis were funds which were provided for road maintenance and upgrading allocated within Kangaroo Island?

3. Does the Government propose to upgrade the roads leading to some of the significant tourist attractions on the Island?

4. What prior warning, at the time of booking holidays through the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau or before leaving the mainland, is given to visitors to Kangaroo Island concerning the nature of the roads they will encounter or the hazards involved in driving at night as a result of kangaroos on the roads?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 103 km; (b) 1 000 km (approximately).

2. Funds are provided for road maintenance and upgrading on a State-wide basis to maintain a satisfactory level of service and to provide for upgrading in order of priority. The roads on Kangaroo Island are considered within this context.

3. It is proposed to reconstruct and seal the unsealed section of the Kingscote-Peneshaw Road during the 1980-81 financial year.

4. Both the Kangaroo Island map and the Sightseeing Guide to Kangaroo Island are distributed to visitors making their arrangements through the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau. Both of these items of

literature give clear indications of the different road surfaces on the Island and additionally there is a paragraph in the Sightseeing Guide indicating the necessity for caution when driving on loose surface roads.

SUNDAY TRADING

197. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Premier recently received any further approaches from the Australian Hotels Association on the issue of Sunday trading?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

PHOTOCOPIERS

198. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Has the Minister reviewed his decision of 18 January regarding the provision of photocopiers to electorate offices?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: A further review regarding the provision of photocopiers to electorate offices was recently made. In view of the high cost involved in supplying a suitable machine to all electorate offices, it has been decided that photocopiers cannot be provided in the foreseeable future.

COMPUTING CENTRE

202. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What are the Government's intentions concerning the implementation of the previous Government's plans for a Computing Centre in Wakefield Street on the site of the old Menz Biscuit Co. building?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The design of the proposed building is being reassessed to take advantage of improved management approaches and the benefits of recent rapid developments in computer software and hardware.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FILMS

204. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What progress has been achieved with relation to the need for specialised films that can be made using Education Department or Department of Further Education resources, conflicting with the South Australian Film Corporation's control over the production and copyright of such material?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Such films are produced under conditions agreed between the Education Department, the Department of Further Education and the South Australian Film Corporation with account taken of the Corporation's obligation to ensure that film production is undertaken by the local film industry wherever appropriate, rather than by a Government funded teaching institution. This has the dual effect of controlling production and copyright of such material.

GLENELG TRAMLINE

210. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What action will be taken with weeds and undergrowth along the Glenelg tramline before the commencement of the period of the year when the impact on hay-fever sufferers is likely to be at a peak?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority has a regular maintenance programme for the Glenelg tramway which includes the mowing of weeds and undergrowth. Activities in this regard are increased during the latter part of the winter and early spring.

245T

212. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the health of spray operators using 245T checked regularly and, if so, what are the checks used to assess the health of such workers?

2. Does the Health Commission keep a register of spray operators using 245T?

3. Is there an annual assessment of illnesses caused by 245T and other herbicides and insecticides made by the Commission and, if not, why not and, if so, will the Minister make this report public?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no mandatory health checks for spray operators in South Australia, but some employers have arranged for their spray operators to have annual general medical examinations.

2. No.

3. The S.A. Health Commission maintains general surveillance of morbidity and mortality in the State. There is no special surveillance of illnesses attributable to pesticides as distinct from other potentially hazardous substances, because it is impractical to accurately identify and record the use and health effects of substances which are so widely used. Where cases of pesticide poisoning are identified, they are investigated and reports are provided to those concerned.

213. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Is the level of 245T in the Adelaide water supply measured and checked periodically and, if so, by whom and how often and, if not, why not?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: A monitoring programme for pesticides, including 245T is carried out by the State Water Laboratories. The programme includes regular sampling of major water supply reservoirs on a six-monthly basis and at four locations on the Murray River on a monthly basis. The samples from the Murray River are taken at lock 9, Morgan, Mannum and Murray Bridge.

KANGAROO ISLAND WATER

230. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Does the Government intend to provide additional standpipes on Kangaroo Island to assist stockowners during times of drought?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Standpipes are operated by local councils and, if it is felt that further standpipes are necessary, applications should be addressed to the local council. Applications supported by council are given full consideration by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. There are currently six standpipes strategically located on Kangaroo Island which provide relief in times of drought.

Dr. D. R. TURNER

238. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Minister seen the letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser* on 5 August 1980 and, if so, how does the Minister justify her criticism of Dr. D. R. Turner?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes. The Board of Flinders Medical Centre (where Dr. Turner is employed) has specifically prohibited use by staff of the Centre's stationery and stenographic services for personal reasons.

CAR POOLING

239. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Minister considered the concept of promoting car pooling in a bid to reduce road traffic and conserve fuel?

2. Does the Minister agree with this concept and is the Government considering introducing such a scheme into South Australia and, if so, when?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The concept of car-pooling and ride-sharing has obvious benefits and the Government would expect to realise these benefits in appropriate circumstances.

YOUTH ACCOMMODATION

260. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the present need for general youth accommodation facilities in the Adelaide Metropolitan District?

2. Is it a fact that the Central Admissions Unit is to be moved to the Kumanka Hostel in Childers Street, North Adelaide and, if so, what are the views of the local residents regarding this matter and have their views been taken into consideration and, if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is anticipated that the working party established by the Minister of Industrial Affairs to consider this question will give an up to date assessment of youth accommodation needs when it submits its report.

2. The exact use of Kumanka Hostel has not been resolved. The alternatives of an admission unit for

children and several other different uses are still being considered. Views of local residents have not been sought. Continued use of Kumanka for children would not change its previous purpose.

NORTH ADELAIDE

262. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is it the intention of the Adelaide City Council to deinstitutionalise North Adelaide and make it purely residential?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No. Planning matters in the City of Adelaide are controlled by the City of Adelaide Development Control Act of 1976. This Act contains provision for the continuance of existing uses in the A.C.C. area at the time the Act came into force. Therefore, those institutions in North Adelaide, which were in existence in 1976, will be able to continue operations.

It is, of course, an implicit assumption of the plan for the North Adelaide precincts that further "institutional" expansion will be restricted. The general principles of the plan produce guidelines to protect residential district from further encroachment by incompatible activities. However, it is noted that some flexibility is exercised by making allowance for activities which serve the needs of the city's residents.

DIFFERENTIAL RATING

263. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the Government intend to remove the power of local government to set differential rating?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government has not considered the removal of differential rating powers for local government. The Local Government Act is presently under total review by a special committee consisting of officers of the Department of Local Government, Law Department and the Parliamentary Counsel. The general and differential rating provisions will be examined during the course of that review.