HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 December 1981

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Forestry Act Amendment,

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2),

Statute Revision (Fruit Pests).

PETITION: VICTOR HARBOR TO YANKALILLA ROAD

A petition signed by 237 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport to realign the Victor Harbor to Yankalilla main road approximately eight kilometres from Victor Harbor was presented by the Hon. W. E. Chapman.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING

A petition signed by 5 165 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide through the Housing Trust 300 houses over a three-year period for long-term accommodation for young people; establish an independent central agency for youth housing; provide significant increased funding to the housing sector; request the Federal Government to increase the youth unemployment benefit to the adult rate and increase the unemployment rate generally to at least the poverty line was presented by Mr Hemmings.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* Nos. 206, 225, 229, 230, 235, 236, 237, 240, 245, 260, 264, 265, 266, 268, 270, 271, 275, 277, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 305, 306, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321 and 327.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

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

Yatala Labour Prison (Toilet and T.V. Facilities, A and B Divisions).

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975-1976—Actuarial—Investigation of Fund, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison):

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Justices Act, 1921-1980—Variation of Rules—Form of Complaints and Informations.

II. Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—'Supreme Court Rules, 1981'—Applications for Appeals.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton):

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981—

I. South-East Planning Area Development Plan—Corporation of Mount Gamber—Zoning.

II. Outer Metropolitan Planning Area Development Plan—District Council of Yankalilla.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J. L. Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Health Act, 1935-1980—Regulations—Inspection Fees.

II. Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913-1972—Regulations—Revocations.

III. Residential Tenancies Act, 1978-1981—Regulations—Various Amendments.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I advise that any questions normally asked of the Premier will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

ROXBY DOWNS INDENTURE

Mr BANNON: I ask the Deputy Premier whether the differences between the Government and the Roxby Downs partners over the royalty formula and provision of electricity and water were resolved by the crisis talks held last weekend. If so, can the Deputy Premier now say whether the indenture Bill will be introduced before the House rises and, if not, when, and what areas of dispute remain? Last Thursday the Deputy Premier admitted that senior officers of the Treasury Department, as well as his own advisers, would be negotiating last weekend with representatives of the Roxby Downs partners in an attempt to resolve a number of disputes that have cast doubts over the future of the indenture Bill.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader of the Opposition persists in his misrepresentation of the continuing talks relating to the Roxby Downs indenture as crisis talks. I thought I had laid that to rest in the House on Thursday last when the Leader asked a similar question and when I said, 'There are no crisis talks.' The talks are continuing. The fact that officers saw fit, of their own volition and by arrangement with some company representatives in town, to meet at the weekend did not in any way invest these talks with the title 'crisis talks'. Discussion out of normal office hours has been the norm, rather than the exception. As members who have had anything to do with government administration know, it is very difficult to get a group of senior public servants together for continuous protracted discussions during normal business hours. As I outlined, the Stony Point discussions continued all one night.

I repeat, for the Leader's benefit, as he appears not to have absorbed the point, although it has been oft repeated, that the weekend discussions were not crisis discussions but were part of continuing negotiations in relation to the indenture. I find it strange that on the one hand the Leader suggests that we do not need the indenture and do not want it, yet on the other hand he is eager to get it into the House. Those two statements are strangely at variance with each other. The fact that the Leader does not know where

to jump and is only left with recourse to falsification of the situation regarding the indenture is regrettable. It is not proper to discuss the details of that indenture publicly while they are being discussed with the companies. As I mentioned in the House last week, there is a range of matters on which the Government negotiators and I need to be satisfied that the draft properly reflects what has been agreed over a period of months. That is a fairly laborious task. For the Leader to suggest that I should be perfectly specific and say that on such and such a date the indenture Bill will be introduced is quite unrealistic. The indenture Bill will be introduced at the first opportunity after it has been finalised.

ANCILLARY STAFFING

Mr ASHENDEN: Did the Minister of Education see the full-page advertisement in yesterday's *Advertiser* which was placed by the Institute of Teachers and the Public Service Association and which concerned alleged cut-backs in ancillary staffing and education funding? Can the Minister inform the House of the current position? I have been approached by a number of parents and teachers concerning these allegations and they would appreciate being advised of the correct situation in relation to the allegations that have been made.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I certainly saw the advertisement that has been mentioned. It is quite dishonest of the Public Service Association and the Institute of Teachers to talk of cuts in education.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Want to say that outside?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No Government has spent more on education than has this Government.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Not outside?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The plain truth of the matter is that no Government has spent more money on education than has the present Government in South Australia, which commitments to education one-third of its total State allocation. The previous Government, in its last two years of office, 1977-1978 and 1978-1979, was not even meeting inflation increases with its budgetary commitments to education. Inflation was running at around 10 per cent or 11 per cent, yet the previous Government was increasing the Education budget by around 4 per cent to 6 per cent. That is the comparison between the performances of the present Government and the previous Government.

I point out to the House that, in fact, the size of the Education Department's budget is quite irrelevant. What really is relevant in this matter is the fact not only that that student numbers are declining in South Australia (indeed, in the Western world), but also that within South Australia there is a quite considerable movement. About one-third of our youngsters (along with their parents, of course) are moving from one part of the State to another.

An honourable member: Looking for work.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Whether they are looking for work is not relevant. The point is that from the Education Department's point of view these children are moving from one area to another. In fact, from 1980—

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Rationalisation is surely the commonsense utilisation of resources. The honourable member for Salisbury must surely realise that, if some schools are considerably increasing in numbers and others are decreasing, it would be most unwise to maintain not only ancillary staff but also the professional staff where numbers are declining. Glengowrie High School, which had 500 students in 1970, had increased its numbers by 1975 to 1 500. However, by 1980 the school had returned to its original figure of about 500 students. Does the honourable member suggest that we should have left the staffing, both professional and ancillary staff, at the 1975 level? Of course not.

I suggest that the House is being confronted by the Public Service Association, the Institute of Teachers, and the Opposition with a degree of emotionalism and politicking. I suggest politicking because a suggestion has been made in that press advertisement that the Government had sprung this matter on the unions involved. That is grossly untrue, because not only has this Government been negotiating for two years on this issue and been deferring implementing clause 13 (3), but the previous Government in 1977 told the two unions involved, the P.S.A. and the Institute of Teachers, that it had no intention of deferring using clause 13 (3). A letter of 24 June 1977 stated:

> As you are aware, this matter was argued before the Industrial Commission prior to the handing down of the current award. The rationalisation programme being undertaken by the Education Department is in accordance with that award, and is necessary for the efficient utilisation of ancillary staff resources. I am unable, therefore, to agree to defer the current rationalisation programme. Yours sincerely, D. J. Hopgood.

That was not the end of the matter. Another letter, in answer to the Institute of Teachers and in regard to four different conditions that were sought by the institute, stated:

> The motion suggesting total rejection of a reduction in hours, opposition to relocation unless a person accepts it, and that no school should lose time, ignores the fact that, in terms of the award, the employer has the right to reduce hours where a school's entitlement drops in terms of the approved formula. The department is not obliged to carry out relocation which is seen as a humane alternative to reduction or redundancy. The last part of the motion which suggests that no school should lose time is completely unacceptable in principle.

In that letter of 27 July 1979, I suggest, the Minister gave the same discretionary powers as this Government has repeated to its officers in regard to cases of hardship to ancillary staff. We have extended that to cases of hardship to individual schools. We will listen to cases on a merit basis. If the present issue is not emotionalism and politicking, I ask the people of South Australia and the House in particular, what happened when those decisions were handed down in 1977. There was a quiet acceptance of the need for the Government of the day to rationalise. When things are not the same, they are different.

As for committing more money, let me also remind the House that this Government expended some $400 000 additional to Budget on ancillary staffing alone, and this year we will over-expend to accommodate those requests on the grounds of hardship. The formula for 1982 will remain the same as the formula for 1981.

Mr Lynn Arnold: What about the 1979 formula?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The formula will remain the same as for 1981.

Mr Lynn Arnold: What about the 1979 formula?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury is not listed on the Speaker's call list.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Another irony of this situation is that, while there has been a furore about the transfer of ancillary staff and the request that ancillary staff move from where employment is declining to where employment is increasing, which has been encouraged by the Public Service Association and the Institute of Teachers, what has happened at professional level? The Government has the right to move staff to areas of need.

Mr Keneally: It could move Ministers, too.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The House does not do that: I suggest that that decision is made elsewhere. No-one would be more aware of the ability of the public to shift Ministers than members opposite, who felt the ire of the public at

the last election. I can see how sensitive members opposite are on that issue.

The point I am making is simply that the Institute of Teachers has been quietly and responsibly negotiating with the Education Department for equitable country service and for the acceptance of the transfer principle within professional staff. What could be more ridiculous than that we should be able to transfer one section of the teaching community and that there should be a minor furore over the Government's request to move people in another sector of the Education Department? Obviously, the issues are one and the same.

As I said at the beginning of my answer, the real issue is declining student numbers, the movement of students from one part of the State to another, and the request that ancillary staff co-operate with the Government in checking to see where positions are vacant and then voluntarily moving from areas of decline to areas where work is occurring. Given that high degree of co-operation that we have already experienced, we would anticipate that the hours of relatively few people would need to be compulsorily reduced or that few people would need to be transferred at the beginning of next year, but that remains to be be seen. If the Institute of Teachers incites people not to co-operate, obviously the number of people who will be compulsorily reduced at the beginning of next year will be far greater.

VISITING TRADESMEN SCHEME

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs explain to the House the scheme apparently called the visiting tradesmen scheme which, according to a statement issued by his office this morning, has been in operation for about 18 months and is a scheme that utilises the energies of surplus P.B.D. workers on community work for selected councils and other organisations and yet a scheme that, as far as we can discover, was never officially announced except perhaps to a few carefully selected parties? This morning I issued a press statement about what appeared to be a scheme being operated quietly by the Government somewhat along the lines of SURS, although the Government had publicly found SURS unacceptable. The news media put my statement to the Minister for comment, and the reply came back that I was referring to what was the visiting tradesmen scheme, which had been in operation for some 18 months. I must say that I have never heard of this scheme, and I have been unable to find anyone else who has.

It is news to the Local Government Association and to the Mayor of West Torrens (the Mayor of a council I represent), and it is also news to the Clerk of the Thebarton council (a council which I also represent), so I am not in isolation. It seems that it was not news to those few councils and organisations who have benefited from labour provided at no cost from the surplus work force of the Public Buildings Department, numbering 150 or so. What is needed is a statement about the guidelines of this scheme, which I do not oppose, so that all may share in it, and also needed is information on who has taken advantage of it so far. A search of press statements issued by the Minister does not reveal any announcement at any stage that such a scheme was being brought in or was already operating, except perhaps for an oblique reference on 5 May 1980 that the Government had used P.B.D. employees to assist outside bodies in construction work. That reference could hardly be said to be an announcement of a scheme that would be—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: —available to local government and other organisations generally.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I find it incredible that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition can say that he is ignorant of such a scheme when in fact it has been widely known throughout the community—

Mr Millhouse: I've never heard of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Just because the member for Mitcham is never here, and just because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not know about it, does not show that the scheme has not been talked about openly and publicly. I think that if the honourable member would—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If the honourable member would look at the Budget papers, I think he would see a special allocation of $300 000 for it in last year's Budget. It suggests that members opposite do not bother to read their Budget papers. Then they have the hide, having failed to do that, to stand up in this House and accuse the Government of trying to hide something. I point out to the Deputy Leader what the visiting tradesmen scheme is all about. Seeing he is ignorant—

Mr Randall: It's a good scheme, too.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is a very good scheme.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Every member of the House wants to hear the reply being given by the honourable Minister to the question posed to him.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I find it incredible that all the little scouting bodies and girl guide associations and other charitable bodies around the State know about the scheme, but that the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in their ignorance, do not. The scheme arose because there was a known surplus of tradesmen in the P.B.D. That occurred because the previous Government, from 1975 to 1979, did absolutely nothing to curtail the increase in employment of weekly-paid people in that department, even though the Loan funds were starting to decline.

We found the incredible position when we came to Government that there had been a decline of something like 45 per cent in real terms in Loan funds to be expended through the Public Buildings Department, yet we found that there had been no significant reduction in weekly-paid employees in that department at all. In fact, after 1975 the number of employees in that department actually escalated, even though the Loan funds being granted to that department in real terms were declining. I think the official figure was 42 per cent, and the decline in employment during that time was 1 per cent in the weekly-paid work force; that is, from 1975 to early 1980.

Therefore, the Government set about using those surplus employees in a useful way. The first thing we did was look at those areas of the Government where a Government financial grant was given to outside organisations, and then we asked those organisations whether we could actually do work for them in lieu of, or in addition to, the grant actually given. Each Minister was approached and asked to highlight areas of outside charitable bodies where such work might be given.

Mr Hamilton: Was that circularised to your back-benchers?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, it was circularised to the Ministers.

Mr Hamilton: What about the back-benchers?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It was circulated to the Minister because the Ministers make money available to charities or outside bodies.

Mr Hamilton: Did you circulate it to your back-benchers?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, I did not. I circulated the request to Ministers and the Ministers started to come in with specific requests to the Public Buildings Department. This was known by the Trades and Labor Council. In fact, I find it interesting that apparently communications between the Opposition and the Trades and Labor Council are breaking down.

Mr Hamilton: You never consult with them.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I would suggest that there is probably closer consultation between the Government and the Trades and Labor Council than there is between the Opposition and the Trades and Labor Council, even though we know that the Opposition always likes to react if there are instructions coming from the Trades and Labor Council, and the Opposition certainly does react, as we saw in the House last week.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Leader, in his pompous little way, says that. There is no secret scheme whatsoever.

Mr Hamilton: Like the home mortgages.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I find it incredible that I stood there and opened the Burnside council chambers, which was one of the bodies at which restoration work was done—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I did so in front of the television cameras and talked about the scheme, yet the Opposition is accusing us of keeping the matter confidential.

Mr Bannon: What district is Burnside in?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is in my own district, as the Leader knows.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What about the football oval—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We had nothing to hide at all. If members opposite are opposed to the scheme, I ask them to ask Bedford Industries what it thinks of the scheme and of the work done.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We are not opposing the scheme: we are opposing—

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Oh, yes, you are.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We are opposing the secrecy of it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: There is no secrecy whatsoever, as the Deputy Leader knows. I will show the members some of the letters that have been written by the scouting bodies, the Girl Guides Association, and anyone else wanting to know whether they could participate under the scheme. I want to highlight to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in his ignorance, exactly how the scheme operates. I just hope that the Deputy Leader will listen in his ignorance so that he is no longer ignorant. Under the scheme the appropriate body writes to me, as Minister of Public Works, making a request that certain work be done. It is a requirement under the scheme that, first, it is to be work that would not otherwise be done if no Government assistance was given. Secondly, under the scheme, it must be a community-type project, and the body concerned needs to indicate its willingness to pay for the trade contracts and the materials going into that project. The Government actually pays by paying its own employees for the cost of the labour.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is SURS.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will please resume his seat. The Chair currently has listed 16 questions, eight from each side of the House, which members want to ask during the period of Question Time. If the degree of backchat that is taking place at present continues (and it will not so far as the Chair is concerned), very few members will get their question asked and I ask members to constrain themselves.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. It is nothing like a SURS. In fact, it is a scheme to ensure that the surplus weekly-paid employees within the Public Buildings Department are usefully occupied and the situation has arisen only because of the negligence of the previous Government. If that Government had been a strong manager of the public sector and if it had been disciplined rather than trying to stop the ever-increasing number of unemployed people in this State by taking them on in government, we would not have been faced with literally hundreds of surplus workers in the Public Buildings Department.

I think it is a credit, frankly, to this Government that it has used those surplus workers out on community-type projects for the benefit of the community. I will indicate to the member the favourable response that has been received from those outside community bodies that have received assistance. As I have said, I have received letters from the Girl Guides and Boy Scouts Associations stating that they appreciated the $500 or $1 000 worth of work that has been done on toilets here or there and on other projects around the community. Bedford Industries has also expressed appreciation for the work that has been done. I think it is to the credit of this Government that it thought of such a scheme and implemented it so quickly.

ANCILLARY STAFF

Mr RANDALL: My question is to the Minister of Education and could be seen as being supplementary to the question directed to him by the member for Todd. Will the Minister advise the House what his intentions are in regard to the implementation of clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award? Teachers and parents associated with a high school in my district are extremely concerned at the loss of 20 ancillary staff hours a week because of the inability to effect the rationalisation of ancillary staff. This has now totalled up to about 800 hours of lost entitlement to that school this year. A letter addressed to a local newspaper in April, headed 'Needs of students have been sacrificed', reads as follows:

> The Staff Association of Kidman Park High School wishes to provide information on the implications of the Government's action regarding reduction and redistribution of school assistant services.
>
> First because of the resignation of the groundsman, the school is without the services of such a person for an indeterminant length of time.
>
> Until the school assistants' crisis is resolved the school council has been forced to organise voluntary help to provide this service. This is not a just solution to the problem. The situation at Kidman Park High School regarding groundstaff is reflected in other schools.

The letter goes on to explain a second issue and, because it is not relevant to this issue, I do not intend to read it. The letter is signed by S. Kerr, Secretary, Kidman Park High School Staff Association. Parents and staff are fed up. They want the issue resolved now, so that the 1982 school year can commence hassle free.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is pleasing to hear from the member for Henley Beach the other side of the story. I think everyone in the House would have to acknowledge that, for each school that is carrying ancillary staff membership over entitlement, there would have to be schools that are waiting for their allocation of staff, and this would have been the case for the past 12 months to two years had it not been for the fact that the Government carried a substantial number of staff in those schools that were waiting.

However, in case there is any doubt in members' minds, this matter has not been sprung on the Public Service

Association and the Institute of Teachers. We have been in close contact for the past two years, particularly over the past seven or eight months. Surely, the term of our current agreement that we would not invoke the use of clause 13 (3) until 31 December 1981 carries an open implication that clause 13 (3) might then be invoked in 1982.

Of course, the Public Service Association wrote to me on 30 November 1981 asking what was the Government's intention. We responded in a letter dated 2 December, which was hand delivered to the institute and to the Public Service Association, and in which we stated that we would use clause 13 (3) as a last resort in order to bring schools to the required levels of entitlement. That relates to the schools in the electorate of the member for Henley Beach, where they are waiting for their correct staff entitlement. The letter stated that meanwhile we would, through attrition and co-operation, attempt to move students from one school to another by voluntary or other means before the end of December.

The institute and the Public Service Association have co-operated, to some extent, during the past year. They claim a high degree of success. However, I suggest that the success rate that the Government and the schools that were waiting were really seeking was a much higher rate of success than that which we achieved. As a last resort we will implement clause 13 (3), which is the clause within the industrial award that gives the Government the right to reduce ancillary staff hours, should the need arise. Incidentally, that clause was confirmed by the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission in mid 1981. At the same time, the commission confirmed interpretations of that award by the present Government and the past Government.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT

Mr HEMMINGS: Will the Deputy Premier tell the House why the Government has refused to call on the Federal Government to raise the unemployment benefit and to make available to young unemployed people of 16 and 17 years of age the single adult rate of unemployment benefit if they have been living independently for a suitable qualifying period? In its submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare inquiry into homeless youth, presently meeting in this House, the Tonkin Government rejected the recommendation of the report of the working party on youth housing regarding levels of unemployment benefits. In its submission, the Government stated:

> The State Government will not call on the Commonwealth to raise the level of unemployment benefits, nor will it approach the Commonwealth with respect to providing unemployed 16 and 17 year olds with the single adult rate of unemployment benefit (this was only to apply if the person had been living independently for a suitable qualifying period). These recommendations were rejected.

Every conference that has been held in Australia in recent years on youth housing has stated that one of the major factors on youth homelessness is the entirely inadequate level of unemployment benefits being paid to young people.

Mr Jeff Kennett, the Victorian Liberal Housing Minister, has repeatedly called on the Federal Government to increase unemployment benefits to young people. Today I presented a petition signed by 5 165 people on youth homelessness, which amongst other things said:

> The State Government put pressure on the Federal Government to increase youth unemployment benefits to the adult rate and that the unemployment benefit be raised at least to the poverty line.

Finally, a report by the youth shelter network, being submitted at present to the Senate Standing Committee, states that there are 9 000 homeless youth today in Adelaide. One of its prime recommendations to this Senate Standing Committee is that there should be an immediate increase in unemployment benefits for people under 18 years of age to bring them to the single adult rate.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If we acceded to every request made by the Opposition to contact the Federal Government in relation to something that displeases it, we would do nothing else but have a continuing dialogue with that Government. We hear Labor spokesmen frequently complaining about the tax level. In fact, they complain at Federal level, as they do here, that the taxation system is too severe. Yet, without even drawing breath, they make demands on the Federal Government, and, indeed, on the State Government, to increase social benefits without limit. The two just do not stick together.

Mr Hemmings: You're out of step with the Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that, if this matter is exercising the honourable member's mind, he take the earliest opportunity of contacting the Federal Government himself.

Mr Hemming: That is a cynical answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

BUSINESS FUTURE

Mr GUNN: Does the Minister of Industrial Affairs find the gloom and doom spread by the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition reflected by South Australian companies when compared to their counterparts interstate? I await with interest the Minister's answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is contemplating whether the question is pertinent to the affairs of the House. Would the honourable member please repeat the question?

Mr GUNN: Does the Minister of Industrial Affairs find the gloom and doom spread by the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition reflected by South Australian companies when compared to their counterparts interstate?

The SPEAKER: I rule the question to be inadmissible. The question is not a matter of the affairs of the State in the manner in which it has been posed.

TOURISM

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Tourism say whether any attention has been drawn to the promotion which is currently on show in the Rundle Mall and which is called 'Barossa in the Mall'? I understand that the Barossa Valley Tourist Association has undertaken a five-day promotion to bring awareness to South Australians of the forthcoming functions and attractions in the valley in an attempt to encourage all South Australians to revisit the area.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The 'Barossa in the Mall' promotion, which started yesterday and which will last throughout the week, has been arranged officially to launch the 1982 tourist season in the Barossa Valley. It is interesting to me to note that when Barossa Valley representatives took the promotion to Sydney last month they managed very effectively to crack the New South Wales media, which I think South Australians would agree is not an easy thing to do. However, the South Australian media seems to be less responsive to what I regard as an extremely imaginative promotion that is being conducted on our own doorstep. The promotion has been organised by the Barossa Valley Tourist Association, and the winemakers and traders of the Barossa Valley.

Each day there will be a series of events in the Mall designed to draw the attention of residents of the metropolitan area to the attractions of the Barossa Valley. Those attractions include not only the wines but also the restaurants, cultural attractions, heritage attractions and a whole wealth of facilities that provide an extremely worthwhile day trip, a short holiday, or even a visit for a meal.

I think that the tourist association is to be warmly commended for its initiative. It has shown the kind of get up and go of which South Australians should see more. It certainly demonstrates, I think very effectively, the truth of the maxim that tourism is 10 per cent business and 90 per cent show business. Anyone who has seen the happenings at 'Barossa in the Mall' today, watching certain celebrities dining in the fine style as guests of a series of well-known Barossa restaurants, would agree that the Barossa Valley people certainly know plenty about show business. I can only commend the promotion to South Australians generally and to the media in particular, because we look very much to it to get across the messages that are important to the whole of the State. I hope that the efforts of the Barossa Valley Tourist Association, the winemakers and traders will be met with great success in the form of a superb tourist season in 1982.

WINDANA NURSING HOME

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Health provide some sort of clarification as to what really is the current attitude of Magill Home residents and residents of the local community to the proposed move of patients from Magill Home to Windana Nursing Home, Glandore? In response to a question on 18 November in this House, the Premier implied that Magill residents were more or less delighted with the proposed move. For example, he stated:

> Notes that I received demonstrate a very, very disturbing manipulation by the trade union members involved at the home . . .

He went on to say:

> The President of the Residents Club, Mr Barney, has in fact been to see the Acting Director of Community and Planning Services to discuss a number of issues concerning him about the entire handling of the matter by the unions. I understand that the Residents Club has severed its connection with the unions because it believes that it is being manipulated for the union's own purposes.

He went on to say that it was Mr Barney's view that there was no concern for the welfare of residents who would be living at Windana as expressed by members of the union. Yet the *Advertiser*, 10 days later on 28 November, quoted Mr Barney somewhat differently. The article stated:

> The chairman of the home's residents' club, Mr Harry Barney, 66, has visited Windana and found it wanting in comparison with Magill.

He admitted that Windana is a modern building, but he stated:

> It hasn't the happy, homely and integrated atmosphere of Magill—and never could . . . At this stage Magill should be preserved and developed, not split apart.

A staff member was quoted in the same article as being opposed to the move, and another resident was quoted as follows:

> Sitting in her wheel-chair, sunlight filtering through the leaves of a spreading apricot tree, Mrs V. J. White, 79, summed up the situation succinctly: 'You cannot transplant an old tree; old trees die as we will die if we are moved from the home we all love.'

Judging from the media, it would appear that there is support in the community, because the Payneham and St Peters *News Review* of about 25 November carried a letter to the Editor, which would appear to be indicative of the local feeling and which related to a visit by the Minister, as follows:

> After reading the article in your paper concerning Magill aged residents, I was absolutely appalled at Coles M.P. Mrs Adamson's attitude to these old people.
>
> How cruel and insensitive can anyone be to move these dear old people from a place they call their home?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to finish this explanation without using the comments of other people to—

Mr Millhouse: Bolster his own.

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the honourable member finished his explanation?

Mr TRAINER: Yes.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The remarks made by the Premier in response to a question on 8 November were accurate in so far as they represented the views of the residents that had been expressed to staff of the Department for Community Welfare. They are certainly in accordance with reports that I have received. As I understand, they were made prior to the visit by the President of the Residents Association to Windana. I believe that Mr Barney's comments that Windana did not present such a homely, integrated atmosphere must be seen in the context of the fact that there are no patients or staff, other than the day care staff, at Windana. Of course, it is the presence of people that makes a home homely. Mr Barney's comments should be seen in that context.

I am advised by officers of the Health Commission that the residents who visited Windana recognised that the standard of facilities was far in excess of what they could expect to find at Magill Home. That is not in dispute. Regarding the comments made by the woman who was quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying that one cannot transplant an old tree because it will die, I point out that it is worth noting that, when regulations providing for the conduct of nursing homes in the United States were changed to ensure upgrading, as I recall, no fewer than 36 nursing homes had to be closed and the residents had to be moved to homes that met the new specifications. A very careful evaluation was conducted of the health and mental attitudes of those elderly people following the transfer. In almost every case, it was demonstrated that the elderly patients benefited from the change: they had been stimulated by the change and they had flourished in their new surroundings.

I think that that experience should be borne in mind and that it should also be borne in mind that the Government is proposing the transfer (and we do not yet know whether it will take place, because it depends entirely on Commonwealth Government approval for the payment of benefits) in order to provide facilities of a high standard for care of the aged in excellent nursing home accommodation. I should say that the politicking that has gone on by the A.L.P. and the unions over this issue in a deliberate effort to arouse high levels of anxiety amongst the people in Magill Home does them no credit whatsoever, and I think that it is really beneath contempt.

Mr Trainer: Who else will defend the elderly against the Minister?

The SPEAKER: Order!

ENERGY RESEARCH

Mr LEWIS: What information can the Minister of Mines and Energy give the House about the Government's assistance to energy research programmes this financial year? Who and what will benefit, and how?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: More than $300 000 is provided in the Budget for grants to energy research to be allocated through the State Energy Research Advisory

Committee. This will bring the total allocation in the Government's financial assistance in this area since September 1979 (when that happy event occurred and this Government was elected) to almost $900 000. Solar energy research and development projects have received particular support from SENRAC. Specific categories of solar energy research supported include direct solar energy for heat generation, solar air-conditioning, selective surfaces for solar absorbers, measurement of solar radiation and testing of solar equipment.

As recently as last week I announced the latest grants to be awarded by SENRAC. They will assist seven projects and total more than $132 000. Briefly, they involve comparison testing to improve tillage efficiency; installation of low energy systems in housing for the aged; biological production of hydrogen by photosynthetic bacteria; beneficiation of Wakefield coal with particular reference to the reduction of the sodium content; development of gas burners with controlled mixing; evaluation of a solar-heated open-air 50 metre swimming pool; and development of a slow combustion stove.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr MILLHOUSE: Will the Deputy Premier say what progress, if any, the Government considers was made at the so-called Constitutional Conference last Friday and Saturday week on the two problems for which it was supposedly held, that is, the possibility of extending the life of Parliament to four years and the means of ensuring that Parliament serves out a full term. With your permission—

Mr Lewis: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the honourable member for Mallee call 'Question!'?

Mr Lewis: Yes, Mr Speaker.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Good heavens—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will well know that that removes his opportunity to explain the question. In relation to the question in the first instance, the honourable member has on notice question No. 337, which asks what was the cost to the Government of the Constitutional Conference held, what result, if any, has come from the conference, and whether the Government proposes to have any more such conferences. The second part of the honourable member's question (No. 337) is quite clearly aimed at the same sort of information which he has at this point sought from the honourable Deputy Premier—

Mr MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I very carefully framed my question; as you can see, I have the Notice Paper open here, and what I asked on notice in the second part—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has the perfect right to continue with a point of order, but by the same token I indicate to him that the opportunity exists for a member whose question has been called into doubt by the Chair to approach the Chair to discuss the matter so that other questions may proceed. I will not deny the honourable member for Mitcham the opportunity to proceed with his point of order, but I do indicate quite clearly that there is another means of approaching the matter.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I take your hint, Mr Speaker. I hope I get a chance later on to ask a question. I will come up and have a word with you, because I am quite right about this. There is no doubt about that whatsoever.

CHELTENHAM RACECOURSE

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether he or any other member of the Government has had recent discussions with the South Australian Jockey Club in regard to the sale of the Cheltenham Racecourse?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have had discussions about the matter with some of my Cabinet colleagues. I have not had recent discussions with the South Australian Jockey Club on the matter, that I can recall. It depends on what the member means by 'recent'. I certainly had discussions with the S.A.J.C. at least 12 months ago about the sale of Cheltenham Racecourse. I have had no recent discussions on that matter, although I have discussed it with some of my colleagues.

BUSINESS FUTURE

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether South Australian companies with whom the Minister has had regular contact share the feelings of doom and gloom as spread by the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in respect of the State's business future?

Mr Bannon: A farcical question.

Mr Trainer: Here comes puff and stuff.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is always interesting to see the very volatile reaction from members opposite when one gets up to give the facts about what is really happening in South Australia and how our companies compare with those companies interstate. I was interested to note when looking at the *Advertiser* on Saturday morning that five of the 20 companies in Australia selected for Export Awards were from South Australia. That is 25 per cent on a per capita basis, if the Leader of the Opposition will be polite enough to listen.

Mr Bannon: I was busy congratulating the member on his question.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I realise that the Leader of the Opposition, as Mr Gloom would not like to hear the true facts. However, I bring to his attention the fact that five of the 20 companies that received export awards were South Australian companies. I compliment the companies concerned, namely, Anchor Foods Pty Ltd, John Shearer Ltd, Rover Scott Bonnar Ltd, Australian Bacon (as Dandy Meats), and Riv-Sam Pty Ltd of Berri. Further, for the Duke of Edinburgh design awards there were 11 finalists for the whole of Australia four of whom came from South Australia; so we are now up to the proportion of four out of 11. I again bring to the attention of the Deputy Leader the fact that those finalists were Sealy Bros, the Maco caravan jockey wheel, Sabco, with its water timer, and Beasley, the hot water people. It is interesting to note that it was a South Australian company that won the national Duke of Edinburgh design award. So, we see again that on a per capita basis South Australian companies are outperforming those of all other States of Australia. There is no other State in Australia that won five out of 20 of the export awards or four out of the 11 design awards.

To finally cap the whole lot off, just over a week ago a South Australian apprentice won the Australian Apprentice of the Year for the second year in a row, and it has been given for only two years. I compliment Grant Makowsky on winning that award. I think those matters highlight the fact that there is no need for gloom and doom as spread by the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and it shows that companies in South Australia are more than equal to those anywhere else in Australia. In fact, on a per capita basis the companies of this State will outperform them any day.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to restate his question as originally delivered.

Mr Millhouse: As what?

The SPEAKER: As originally delivered.

Mr Millhouse: Yes, thank you, Sir. I knew I was right.

Mr Slater: Have you ever been wrong?

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have been, but I am not this time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will come to the question.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir, and I hope we have better luck with the explanation. Will the Deputy Premier say what progress, if any, the Government considers was made at the so-called Constitutional Conference last Friday week and last Saturday week—

An honourable member: Watch him. He's on you.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Well, if he is on me, he will get short shrift himself from now on—on the two problems for which it was supposed to have been held, that is, the possibility of extending the life of Parliament to four years and the means of ensuring that Parliament serves out a full term?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will please resume his seat.

Mr Millhouse: Well—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Millhouse: I had not even asked for permission to give an expianation before he called it last time. Surely I can at least ask. He hopped in before I had finished the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows that the question was asked to be put in precisely the same form, for the obvious reason that already the opportunity for a member of the House to explain his question had been declined. On that basis, I intend now to call the Deputy Premier to answer the question.

Mr Millhouse: I had such a good explanation ready too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Millhouse: I didn't think he'd understand the explanation. He's not very good at these things.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that the member for Mitcham thinks that he is the nearest thing to the deity that will ever visit this House. Notwithstanding, that I will do my best to enlighten him. Everyone to whom I have spoken agrees that the Constitutional Conference, so-called, to use the 'member for Mitcham's' phrase, was an excellent one, except the odd man out, the nearest thing to the deity we are likely to have visit us, as I said earlier. It is a great pity that the agreement, of everyone except the member for Mitcham and his small band, about the success and the worthiness of the Constitutional Conference was not conveyed, in my view anyway, substantially to the public, although the goings on of the member for Mitcham certainly were. I understand that he left in a fit of pique because his will had not prevailed over that of the conference. In answer to the question, I think I can simply say 'excellent'.

MANGALO WATER SUPPLY

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Water Resources obtain a report on whether the Government has any plans to provide a reticulated water supply to the Mangalo area, and, should it be the case that it has, can he indicate the likely construction programme for such a scheme? The Minister would be aware that Mangalo is one of the few remaining developed areas of Eyre Peninsula that does not have a reticulated water supply scheme. Whilst Mangalo is a highly productive area in terms of cereal crops, its potential in terms of stock carrying capacity is largely untapped and a reticulated water supply would enable full development of the area to take place.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I am aware of the area to which the member has referred. I will bring down a report on the latest situation regarding the area in relation to the total works programme.

MARRYATVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Education say when I can expect a reply to my written representations to him regarding a most unsatisfactory staffing situation at Marryatville Primary School and, particularly, give an unequivocal assurance that the recent transfer of special classes from that school to nearby schools is not a first step towards closing down the school as part of the Minister's rationalisation of the schools programme?

On 4 November I wrote to the Minister seeking information about why a teacher was transferred from the school without due notice, that teacher not having been replaced. Parents and other teachers have improvised to maintain the teaching programme, as the teacher was transferred in mid-third term, which is a crucial period in the school year. The school has now been notified that a further staff member will be transferred in 1982 and not replaced. The staff-student ratios at the school for levels three and four are 75 per cent and 50 per cent above the respective staff-student ratios recommended by S.A.I.T. and the Education Department. I have been advised that this situation is resulting in adverse effects on some children's learning and behaviour.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as I possibly can.

MOTOR VEHICLE TARIFFS

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs state the best policy to ensure that South Australia has a viable and efficient motor vehicle industry? With your leave, and that of the House, I seek leave to briefly explain my question.

Mr Millhouse: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I appreciate the member's asking this question, and I appreciate the embarrassment of the member for Mitcham, because his Australian Democrats have sold South Australia down the drain. No wonder he is embarrassed to allow an explanation of the question!

Mr Schmidt: He is selling the people of my district down the drain.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Exactly. The member for Mawson represents an area from which the employees of Mitsubishi largely come. Only on Sunday the Australian Democrats said that they wanted to close down one of the two motor vehicle manufacturers in South Australia. The choice is not very great; it is either Mitsubishi, with a loss of 5 000 jobs directly and thousands of others with component manufacturers, or it is General Motors-Holden's, with a loss of about 8 000 jobs and a loss of many thousands of jobs with component manufacturers.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: He would close down G.M.H., according to his logic.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: He said G.M.H., did he?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Well, he would have to, wouldn't he?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I do not think the member for Mitcham has too much logic or knowledge of this matter. Let us not get carried away with only the Australian Democrats, because the Federal spokesman for the Australian Labor Party (Mr Chris Hurford) made a similar statement about selling this State and certain manufacturers in South Australia down the drain.

Mr Hamilton: That's not so.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The member says that that is not so. I refer him to an article in the *Age* of 29 September 1981, which has the headline 'A.L.P. wants fewer car makers'. The article stated:

> A Federal Labor Government would support a reduction of the five big car manufacturers in Australia to as few as two, the Opposition spokesman on industry and commerce, Mr Hurford, said yesterday.

The article continues:

> Mr Hurford and the Opposition spokesman on industrial relations (Mr Hawke) combined for their first appearance before senior officials of the 'Big Five' manufacturers (G.M.H., Ford, Mitsubishi, Nissan and Toyota) at a luncheon in Camberwell to attack the I.A.C. recommendations for the local car industry . . . Mr Hurford said vital changes that the Labor Party saw included a need to reduce the five big manufacturers to only three or two. He suggested that this could be achieved by mergers.

We find the Australian Democrats and the A.L.P. both prepared to sell down the drain at least one manufacturer here in South Australia. This is not coming from backbenchers in their Parties: it is coming from their official spokesmen who enunciate the official policy of the two respective Parties. This State is largely dependent on the Australian automotive industry for the support and viability of its manufacturing industry. Some 20 000 jobs would be lost if protection for that industry were wiped out.

I am not ashamed of the fact that I am proud of the manufacturing industry that we have in this State or of the fact that we have two healthy viable car manufacturers here in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I say that despite the interjections across the House. We know the extent to which members opposite are prepared to sell certain manufacturers down the drain. They have an absolute hatred of all multi-national companies.

They cannot stand them, despite the fact that those companies make significant investment in this State and give jobs to thousands of people. For the Australian car industry to have a long-term viable future, it needs a policy that includes Australian content that the South Australian Government believes should be held at about the present level, and it also must be able to participate now in the world car concept, which highlights the fact that the industry needs to participate, therefore, in the export facilitation scheme. With export facilitation people will manufacture components here in Australia for world cars, both in Australia and overseas. For instance, that gives a chance to produce engine parts or components for engines in South Australia, such as those already being produced by R.O.H. or Castalloy, for export to all parts of the world for use in these specific cars.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In addition to that, if the honourable member would listen, we support the concept of export facilitation. I will come to the extent to which we support it shortly. The third part of our policy that we strongly support is that imports should be limited to about 20 per cent of the domestic market. I point out that certain free traders (and I admit that some back-bench members of the Liberal Party in Canberra support the free trade policy) fail to see that the rest of the industrial world, when we are calling for a breaking down of our trade barriers, is doing the opposite.

Recently, France imposed import restrictions of 3 per cent on Japanese vehicles. We are talking about increasing our 20 per cent, and France imposed a restriction of no more than 3 per cent imports. Britain has imposed restrictions of no more than 11 per cent. The United States of America has just imposed voluntary restrictions of no more than about 20 per cent. At the same time, people of this country want to very substantially abolish tariffs. We have countries with which we compete industrially, including the South-East Asian area, currently maintaining tariffs of at least 50 per cent on manufactured goods.

Take, for instance, electrical items. In South Australia they have a tariff protection of about 15 to 20 per cent, yet, that same industry in Taiwan, the Philippines, or Korea, would face tariff protection of at least 50 per cent. Also, some countries do not formally have tariff policy, but severely restrict imports by other mechanisms. Japan imposes its restrictions on imports by requiring the importer to lodge with the Central Bank of Japan the total value of those imports for the next 12 months, virtually interest free. That means that it is extremely expensive, if not almost impossible, for any importer to import large amounts of items in Japan. We believe that we need to stand, protect and ensure that there is continued support for the automotive industry of South Australia. Certainly, we will have no part of the statements by the Australian Labor Party or the Australian Democrats about reducing the number of manufacturers in South Australia from two to one or two to none.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I desire to make an explanation of my own position and, incidentally, that of a good number of members of my Party, on the question of the motor car industry. You will appreciate, Sir, that I sought leave to make this explanation following the attack just made on me and my Party by the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Every word of it they deserve.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Apparently the Minister of Agriculture agrees with it. I must say that I cannot understand why the Minister did not include Mr Chapman, the member for Kingston, in which area the Mitsubishi factory is located.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has sought leave to make a personal explanation. I have listened very carefully to what he has said thus far. Even though it is rather wide of what is normally a personal explanation in this House, because he has identified answers this afternoon relative to his position, I am prepared to accept it. I tell him that I am not going to listen to a discussion or a debate which takes into account the position of people other than himself, because he is the only person who can seek to make a personal explanation in this House.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I think that, having mentioned that name, I need do no more in any case. I should like to quote, because it represents my view of these matters, from the press release to which the Minister referred in his attack on me and which is dated 5 December. This is what we said, in part, and it represents my views:

> The major thrust of the Democrats' approach—

and this was not reported: whether it was known to the Minister or not I do not know—

to the motor vehicle industry is to strengthen the components industry first and reduce the number of vehicle manufacturers. The proportion of Australian made components should be increased and the design of these should be standardised wherever possible. This could again be done through taxation or depreciation measures.

I go on to say:

The Democrats believe the 85 per cent local content plan should be modified to exclude in-house costing of the vehicle manufacturers and assemblers. At present manufacturers can include a proportion of their profit, overheads, in-house expenditure, and so on, in the 85 per cent local content requirement. Only 25 to 30 per cent of the car's value is, in fact, left for Australian-made components. A problem with the existing system is that is does not encourage Australian components manufacturers to be efficient. It suits vehicle makers to charge high prices for Australian components, because this decreases the effective local content.

The last part I desire to quote is as follows:

If the Australian motor vehicle industry was properly planned, it could become much more efficient and more competitive and the cost to consumers of all vehicles would steadily decrease in real terms. It is vital Australia should maintain a viable and dynamic motor vehicle industry, since it is a major manufacturing industry and is essential for Australia's defence preparedness.

There is only one other point that I mention in explaining my position on this matter, in view of the attack made on me—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Have you tabled that document?

Mr MILLHOUSE: The Minister knows very well that I am not able to table a document: only a Minister can do that. The last point I make in my personal explanation is that it is true that in the press report of Senator Siddons' comments it was said that he had said that the number of vehilce manufacturers should be no more than two or three, and one of those should be in South Australia. After discussion with Senator Siddons, I believe that he now agrees he should have said, 'at least one of which should have been in South Australia, because my view is that South Australia should, of all the States, be the centre for motor vehicle manufacture in this country.'

At 3.20 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The 1978 Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement expired on 30 June 1981. There have been numerous discussions at Ministerial and officer level since December 1979 on the subject of a new five-year agreement. The agreement, as it has now been authorised by Federal Parliament in the Housing Assistance Act, 1981, is attached. Major changes from the 1978 agreement, which was a three-year agreement, are as follows.

First, the objectives have been enlarged to include attention being given to energy conservation policies, to the needs of handicapped people, and to encouragement of tenant participation. South Australia has supported this. Secondly, a base level of funds for the five years of the agreement is provided for; that is $200 000 000 a year. This is the first occasion on which the principle of the base level of funds has been agreed to by the Commonwealth Government. South Australia has welcomed the concept, although $200 000 000 is by no means high enough, and South Australia has asked and fought for a higher amount.

Thirdly, provision has been allowed for non-earmarked grant funds to be made available under the agreement. South Australia has welcomed the added flexibility that this will mean, but has pointed out that innovative schemes would be more feasible if some of these funds had been included in the guaranteed base funds. Fourthly, the purposes for which funds may be used have been widened to include provision of rental subsidies for private tenants. South Australia requested this. South Australia unsuccessfully asked that funds should be able to be used to pay for public housing rebates, to help private mortgagors in difficulties, and to rehabilitate privately-owned housing. Under the agreement, however, extra purposes can still be agreed to by the two Ministers.

Finally, there is to be progressive movement during the term of the agreement to full market rents. South Australia has argued against this and for the existing wording of 'market-related rents' to be retained. As well, under the new agreement a uniform rebate policy is to be developed and implemented. South Australia has argued that there is no virtue in uniformity for its own sake. In addition, provision is made, not in the agreement itself but in the Housing Assistance Act, 1981, for a new basis for distributing funds between States, which would reduce South Australia's share. In the early 1970s Loan Council used to agree on a total works and housing programme for each State. South Australia then tended to put relatively more of its funds into housing compared with other States, and less into works. When the Commonwealth decided to allocate housing funds separately, South Australia consequently received a large share of these funds. The Commonwealth has managed a limited redistribution over the past few years by providing grants earmarked for pensioners and Aboriginals and distributing them on the basis of the numbers of these people in each State. The intention now is to move, over 10 years, to a per capita distribution of all the rest of the funds.

South Australia has argued against any agreement and instead for housing funds to be absorbed back into Loan Council allocations as in the early 1970s. South Australia, of course, has also been opposing specific purpose agreements generally on the ground that they are wasteful in terms of administrative effort and tend to distort State priorities.

There has been considerable publicity of late concerning the fact that the Commonwealth has reduced financial assistance to the States for welfare housing significantly over the past few financial years. In 1977-78, $400 000 000 was provided, and this excluded the Northern Territory, which is now included. The 1981 agreement provides for supplementation of the base $200 000 000 from the Commonwealth Budget, and the Budget brought down by the Federal Treasurer in August provided $50 000 000 for this purpose. Aboriginal housing grants of $12 200 000 previously provided by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs have now been absorbed into the Housing Agreement. Thus, total funds provided by the Commonwealth under the agreement for 1981-82 will be $262 200 000. South Australia's share is $34 700 000; this compares with last year's figure of $37 300 000 or $39 700 000 if the Aboriginal housing funds previously provided separately are included.

Notwithstanding some unsatisfactory aspects of the agreement, South Australia seems to have little choice but to sign it. The agreement will have to be signed by 31 December 1981, or else the funds which South Australia has already been receiving since 1 July will have to be refunded, and further funding foregone. I am sure all members of the House will support this Bill. Some of the innovations in the provision of housing assistance that will be possible under the new agreement, such as providing subsidies to private tenants and help to private mortgagors in difficulties, are not activities for which State legislation specifically provides at present. Accordingly, the Bill also includes powers for those State instrumentalities which are allocated funds under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement to spend them in accordance with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 defines the agreement. Clause 3 authorises the execution of the agreement and requires the Treasurer to carry out its terms. It also authorises any necessary appropriation and ratifies acts that may have been done in anticipation of the agreement coming into force.

Clause 4 provides that loans or grants under the agreement are to be made by the Treasurer with the approval of the Minister. Subclause (2) provides that any body or authority to which a loan or grant is to be made under the agreement is authorised to accept the loan or grant and to apply the moneys lent or granted in accordance with the terms and conditions on which the loan or grant is made.

Mr HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 December. Page 2320.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition will support this Bill, which is brought into this place only as a result of a complete bungle made by the Government earlier this year in its haste to try to get rid of the current Governor, Sir Keith Seaman, before his appointment expired, and in its haste to appoint a new Governor before another election, after which a new Government might take office. The Government introduced two Bills into the House earlier this year but was not able, in those Bills, to achieve what it intended to achieve, namely, to ensure that the Governor retires six months before the expiration of his term and be paid in lieu of furlough at the expiration of that term, and so that the new Governor could be appointed and take office. I think that the situation that has arisen here is absolutely disgraceful. In June (six months ago), I alluded to these matters in an earlier debate in this place. The Opposition then drew attention to what the Government was attempting to do, but we got very little response at all at that time. In fact, there was some sort of cover-up, and, indeed, not much media attention to the matter, either. Since then, the Government has moved to appoint a new Governor, has announced his appointment and generated considerable publicity about the matter. I might add that there was absolutely no consultation, prior notification or indication of any sort by the Government and no courtesy paid to the Opposition in relation to that appointment. I think that that was disgraceful, too. It may well be, as in the earlier debate, that the Government will say that that has not happened in the past. It certainly happened in 1968 when the former Premier Steele Hall countermanded Sir Mark Oliphant's appointment as Governor and replaced him with his own appointee when he took office. Whether or not that has been the case in the past does not concern me at all: it ought to be the case now. It certainly ought to be the case after the 1975 debacle at the Federal level and after the constitutional consequences of that debacle which have been with us since that time.

In response to what has been said, it is totally inadequate, as it was back in June, for the Premier, or Deputy Premier, simply to say that that was not done. The fact is that I issued some sort of request to the Government in the course of that previous debate. I acknowledge the Government's right to make the appointment. It is a Government appointment, and the prerogative of the Government rests there. Any Government of which I have charge would demand the same prerogative, but, as a matter of ordinary courtesy in a period when the new Governor is to take office and serve out the bulk of his term after the next election, I should have thought that, even though the Opposition was not consulted, at least some kind of notification could have been given to it. However, there was none of that—none whatsoever!

I hasten to add, in case the Government (as no doubt it may wish to do), attempts to misrepresent what I am saying as some sort of criticism of the appointment of the new Governor, that that is a perfectly proper and very good appointment indeed. I am not objecting to Sir Donald Dunstan's appointment as Governor. At the time that the appointment was announced, I was interstate and heard nothing about it. A media member rang me and said, 'The new Governor has been announced. What is your comment?' I had to say that that was the first I had heard of it, that that was the first notification that we had been given. I said that it so happened that I had met Sir Donald Dunstan and recall him as a courteous and capable person. I said that he seemed to have good qualifications, but perhaps I would personally feel that the appointment of military Governors is not a tradition that should be continued; and that if the reporter wanted anything more far-reaching and more profound than that that I was afraid I could not give it, because the Government had gone ahead off its own bat.

In the light of the debate that we had had earlier this year, I thought that that was a gross discourtesy and a failure to realise the constitutional role played by the Opposition in this State. Let me reiterate that I make no criticism of the appointment and that I look forward to working with Sir Donald as Governor of this State in the future. However, I am making a criticism of the way that the appointment was made, and I am suggesting that the Government failed to take into account the sort of remarks and suggestions that were made in the earlier debate.

We now have another Bill before us, this time a Bill to amend the Constitution Act. Let me reiterate what the Premier said when introducing this Bill, as follows:

> As honourable members know, the present Governor proposes to retire on 29 March 1982—

I might add that the Government proposed that the Governor retire then, I imagine. However, that was covered in the earlier debate—

> Sir Keith will then have completed more than 4½ years of his five-year term and will not have taken the customary six months furlough. It is not intended that Sir Keith should suffer any financial detriment by reason of his early retirement.

Nor indeed should he, because Sir Keith has served this State very faithfully and well under some considerable difficulty at times, caused by at least one member of this place. The Minister's second reading explanation continued:

> The present Bill therefore makes it possible for a Governor who retires after completing nine-tenths or more of his term of office to receive salary on the basis that he has completed his term.

I was rather curious about that second reading explanation and that intention in the Bill, because I referred to the

earlier Bill which we had considered and which allowed the Governor to retire earlier. It meant, in the words of the second reading explanation, that the Governor could now take his six months leave before retiring without losing his pension entitlement. The Bill contained a new provision that would allow the Government to appoint a new Governor immediately the previous incumbent took his furlough. This effectively means that Sir Keith Seaman will leave his position in March next year.

We considered two Bills at that time to cover that point, and debated and passed them. So, what is this Bill? This Bill has been introduced because, in its haste to get this done and to announce a successor before there was any more public comment about the shameful way in which Sir Keith Seaman was being treated and in the Government's eagerness to appoint a successor before a new Government could have a hand in the matter, this Government put through two Bills that were defective. Those Bills did not achieve the purpose that the Government intended them to achieve. Now, in this last week of the session, in December (six months later) we are confronted with this legislation. That is just not good enough. It indicates the total cynicism with which the Government has handled this entire matter.

The facts are that Sir Keith Seaman was due to retire in September 1982. In the normal course of events, he would have served his term to its fruition. If, indeed, Sir Keith had not been able to take furlough at that time, he could have taken it and provision should have been made for him to take it at the end of that period. If, on the other hand, it was thought desirable that he took such leave from March, before his term expired, again the normal course of events would have been for a Lieutenant-Governor to be appointed. This Government wanted none of that. First, it wanted Sir Keith to go early, and, secondly, it wanted to appoint the new Governor. However, the Government knew that there could be some unfavourable public comment if that appointment was made in September, about the time that the Premier wants to go to the people.

Quite rightly, we would have said at that time, 'We object to the fact that the Government's ordinary three-year term is almost complete and it proposes to appoint a Governor for the next five years. What about or rights? What about consultation with the Opposition, which may well succeed the present Government?' The member for Newland chortles. Whether or not he believes that the Government will change (and he is whistling in the dark, as one would expect him to do) is this not the point that I am making? I hope that the honourable member listens to what I am saying. An appointment made at the end of a three-year term should have involved consultation. In 1977, within a few months of an election, the then current Government appointed Sir Keith following the enforced illness and retirement of Sir Douglas Nicholls. However, the election was early, and did not come.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: What did you mean by that?

Mr BANNON: I meant that he did not wish the illness on himself: it happened.

Mr Millhouse: Most people do not wish an illness on themselves.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I know very few who wish they were sick.

Mr BANNON: I will not quibble about that word: the Minister knows what I am talking about. The facts were that Sir Douglas was forced to retire because of his illness and a replacement had to be appointed. It is not good enough to say, in regard to that case, that the Opposition of the time was not consulted. I am saying that it should have been consulted, and it is a pity that the Opposition was not consulted. In this case, the reasons for consultation are very much more stronger than they were then, because the Government is coming towards the end of its three-year term.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Very much stronger.

Mr BANNON: I thank the schoolteacher for that.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That's all right, lawyer.

Mr BANNON: I thought that the Minister had a science degree, not an English degree.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Trainer: He was a dreadful teacher, too, they tell me.

Mr BANNON: That is fine. The facts remain that this Bill is being introduced as a result of a bungle. The agreement made with the Governor, which prompted him to retire earlier, was not kept and was not enforceable in the legal way in which it should have been enforceable. We went through this exercise twice in regard to two Acts about six months ago, and now we are confronted with this Bill. The whole thing has been a pretty shabby, hasty execution of one Governor in order to appoint a new Governor. I hope that the people of South Australia and politicians on all sides have learnt something from this experience. I will not forget it. I can give an assurance that, when I come to make a gubernatorial appointment, there will be consultation along the lines that I have suggested. I believe that the way in which this Government has acted on this occasion is despicable.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I agree with some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, but by no means do I agree with all of them. It seems that getting rid of the present man is causing as much difficulty as he has caused during his term of office.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: That is just one of the ironies of the situation. I will certainly not hold up the Bill. Anything to bring the term to an end will suit me.

Mr Bannon: You don't have to elaborate on that line. It doesn't do you any credit.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, indeed—no credit at all. I did not intend to elaborate. I was just making a point. The honourable member has put me off: I cannot remember what I was going to say next.

Mr Trainer: It was probably something pretty scurrilous.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, it was something important. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the Government must be pretty embarrassed, having bungled a matter that it believes to be quite sensitive. I feel embarrassed that I did not look more closely at the Bill. I was so glad that the Bill was introduced because I knew its object that I did not look at it. Perhaps the Labor Party did the same thing: it had enough legal talent in its ranks to pick up something like that if it wanted to. The Government must be embarrassed to have to introduce the Bill, but, if it helps to achieve the object that we all have in mind, that is all right by me.

I would like to put right one or two comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, and I am not sure that these things were not raised six months ago in the earlier debate. The Leader referred to 1968. In 1968, the outgoing Dunstan Government proposed to appoint Sir Mark Oliphant; there was no consultation whatsoever with the then Opposition. We were still in Opposition for six weeks after the election. There was no consultation whatsoever, and it was only because Sir Edric Bastyan (whose term was expiring and who had already been appointed Governor of Tasmania) suggested to the then Premier, Mr Dunstan, that, in all the circumstances it would be proper to raise the matter with Mr Steele Hall, who was the Leader of the Opposition, that the matter was raised at all. If Sir Edric Bastyan had not intervened before the recommendation went to Buckingham Palace, there would have been no consultation in 1968. I

know that that was the position, because I thought that I was in on it, and I regret the advice I gave on that occasion.

However, that is beside the point. That is what happened in 1968—there was no consultation at all. As the honourable member stated, there was no consultation in 1977 when, just at an election time, a new Governor was installed. The only point in favour of the argument, put by the Leader of the Opposition, for consultation is that, if there had been consultation in 1977, the whole unhappy four years since then might have been avoided. That is a very good reason for consultation, and I believe that there should be consultation in the future.

Let us not think that one Party or the other, either the Liberal Party or the Labor Party, is clean in this—they are not. There has never been consultation until now. If there is to be consultation in the future, it should be not only between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party but also between all the Parties that are represented in Parliament so that, if possible, we can come to a consensus. That will probably not be possible, but at least there can be an attempt. The Leader of the Opposition claimed that he was not told of the imminent announcement. Even Blind Freddy could have seen that an annoucement was coming.

Mr Bannon: Did you know who it was going to be?

Mr MILLHOUSE: We did not know who it would be, but it was plastered all over the papers that there would be someone. The Leader of the Opposition had no right to be told (and this is apart from the consultation factor), any more than he has the right to be told about any announcement that the Government makes or that I make. That is one of those things.

Mr Bannon: The Government does not have a Constitution.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: Bring him into line, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker!

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair needs no assistance from the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I was suggesting that you discipline your Leader. It is a good thing.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: I guess you would like to do it more often, but you do not get the opportunity except when you are in the Chair.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Mitcham continues in that vein, the Chair will deal with him.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I will not say any more about it. I believe I have said enough to make the point. Therefore, I cannot accept what the Leader has said when he bleated about his not being informed. I was not informed either, but I was able to make a comment pretty quickly. I have heard the story that the Hon. Mr Sumner, who was away at the time, received in some Sydney street the information that Don Dunstan had been appointed Governor of South Australia and had taken a knighthood. I cannot repeat what he said, but I have been told about his comments. The Hon. Mr Sumner was told that Don Dunstan had taken a knighthood to boot, and he said, 'The so and so.'

I believe that that is what happened to the Leader of the Opposition and that is why he is so cross. He was caught with his pants down, metaphorically speaking. Enough has been said about this subject. The sooner the Bill gets through and the man goes, the better.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): We have heard an interesting little contribution from both of the previous speakers.

Mr Millhouse: It was what is called a cameo.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was an interesting little debate—amusing, in fact, if one has an acute sense of humour. To put it plainly, the offering from the Leader was pathetic. He says there has been a complete bungle, and yet in the next breath he says that we have been planning it as part of a deliberate policy.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Now that the Leader has interjected, he has made it a bit clearer. The first point he made was that the Government in this exercise was bungling, and in the second breath he said that this was all part of a deliberate plan. I find that those two statements do not stick together terribly comfortably. There has been no bungling whatsoever. This Bill was introduced because it was felt that it would be fair to the Governor to see that he is paid for a period which normally would have been taken as furlough.

Mr Bannon: Why didn't you fix it up in June?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that it has been considered since June that if the Governor retired as planned the arrangements would be such that he would not have received furlough, and it was considered that it was fair that he did receive it. If that is construed as bungling, I think that the Opposition really does not have much to complain about. It was considered that it would not be fair to the Governor to expect him to retire not having had the benefit of furlough, and for that reason the Bill has seen the light of day.

The Leader of the Opposition talks about the shameful way in which he has been treated. This Bill itself indicates that the Government is trying to be entirely fair in its dealings with Mr Seaman in relation to the remunerations he should receive. If it were not for the fact that the Government is attempting to be scrupulously fair, the Bill would not have seen the light of day. Words such as 'despicable' are bandied about by the Leader. This Government has treated the Opposition in precisely the same way as his Party in Government treated us. If this Government's behaviour is despicable, so was that of previous Labor Government's because there was no consultation at all, to my knowledge, regarding the appointments of Governor.

The Leader suddenly wants a change of ground rules; he expects full consultation in relation to the replacement, and we know just how secure that would have been. One of the interesting exercises that the press indulges in is speculation about the Governor. If we consulted the Opposition, we know how secure that information would have been; it would not have lasted five minutes. We have behaved in precisely the same fashion as the Opposition behaved except in one single instance, namely, that, in keeping with the continuing Dunstan Administration philosophy, members opposite attempted in all they did to be pace-setters. Likewise, with the appointments of Governors, the Labor Administration wanted to give this new-look pace-setting image to the Governorship as much as to anything else. They sought, in a series of their appointments, to be what they saw as being pace-setters at the time. I remember at the time when Sir Douglas Nicholls was appointed that I was invited to comment on the appointment. The then Leader of the Opposition was away, and I was Acting Leader. I recall it perfectly well. We had not had any prior information about the appointment of the Governor before the announcement was made public by the then Premier. I remember my comment perfectly well, because it proved to be the case. My only comment was that we welcomed an appointment as Governor and I hoped that his health would be satisfactory, and in the fullness of time it proved that his health was not satisfactory.

Mr Keneally: What made you think his health might be bad?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He was of a reasonably advanced age; I had seen the man interviewed publicly once or twice, and my immediate impression was that Mr Nicholls was not particularly robust. The Labor Government, to put the kindest construction on it, sought to be pace-setting in relation to the appointment of its Governors. I am not intending to comment on the way they turned out, but when we were in Opposition we were not consulted. When the Leader uses words like 'despicable', he is talking about the way in which the Government of which he was a member behaved. If he describes this as despicable, so equally was the behaviour of the Labor Government when it appointed Governors. So, I reject the second point as being quite inconsequential. The member for Mitcham did not say much, except that he attempted to have another crack at the Governor, unsuccessfully. He attempted to have another crack at the present Governor and I have made a general comment on successive appointments by the Labor Party. Sir Mark Oliphant turned out to be rather better, I think, than the Labor Party thought he might be when it appointed him. He turned out to be an excellent Governor—

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McRae): Order! I trust that honourable members are aware of Standing Order 150, which requires certain standards of conduct when honourable members are dealing with Governors. A great deal of tolerance has been allowed, but I do not propose to allow this to go on much longer.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have said all I wish to say Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, because the speeches I am following are quite inconsequential. The member for Mitcham believes that the Government is embarrassed—he is wrong again. I make no apology for the fact that we believe we are being fair and even-handed in introducing this Bill in the House and in seeing that the present Governor suffers no financial detriment as a result of his not having taken furlough in the normal course of duties.

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

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 December. Page 2152.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition opposes this Bill, the intention of which is to abolish the South Australian Development Corporation. The S.A.D.C., as it is known, is the successor to the Industries Assistance Corporation, which was established in 1971 by the previous Government. As outlined in the second reading explanation and is well known in this community, its major role was the provision of loans to industry, the making of grants, the purchase of equity and also the provision of guarantees.

In recent years (again, as stated in the second reading explanation) the corporation was given a number of quite difficult and politically-sensitive financial assignments to handle. I do not think that we need to be ashamed or apologetic about that. The fact is that all over the world, Governments, particularly regional Governments such as the South Australian Government, in order to promote and stimulate industrial development, to provide assistance to small industries and for small businesses to establish, and generally to assist and bolster industrial development, have found it necessary to establish State corporations or some means by which the Governments could mobilise some of their capital resources in a joint venture, a partnership or purchase arrangement to let those things happen—a very important function indeed of any Government. It took far too long for this State to get around to it.

Much has been said about the industrial development that took place during the days of Premier Playford. Much of that development took place during a period of maximum growth of manufacturing in this country; they were good years for development and growth, and in the 1950s it was possible to run the Premier's Department, as Sir Thomas Playford did, with few advisers and little assistance. However, the business of government and, in fact, the business of business itself has become vastly more complicated over recent years, particularly in relation to financial arrangements. It became no longer possible to do things on that basis. In addition, the general slowing down of world economy, the reduction in the number of migrants coming to this country, and the bottoming out of the growth phase all made the task of stimulating and promoting industrial development in this State very much more difficult. It is a great pity that previous Governments, the Playford Government in particular, did not establish during those good years the sort of body that the S.A.D.C. was so that it was up and running at a time when it was needed.

However, the Dunstan Government acted very promptly in this matter and devised a formula which I think has been copied in some other parts of the world. It has certainly been recognised as very successful. This formula involved the Parliament itself, through the Industries Development Committee's looking at proposals and making recommendations—a Joint Party committee, one which has operated very effectively and in a confidential atmosphere, and on which the members are representing not so much a particular Party political decision but the interests of the State. Coupled with that was the capacity of the State, initially through the Industries Assistance Corporation and later through the South Australian Development Corporation, to provide capital, management expertise, and other support services for some of these ventures.

The thing about this Bill that concerns me most is that, first, it abolishes the corporation without providing any concrete alternative to replace it. Secondly, it abolishes the corporation on false premises, if you like, premises that suggest that the corporation has failed in its task. I know that in the second reading explanation tribute was paid to those people who worked very hard indeed on the South Australian Development Corporation, both private sector representatives and Government representatives. According to the words of the second reading explanation, the Government 'places on record its appreciation of the work done by members of the board of the corporation who have worked hard on many projects, some of which have been difficult and unrewarding'.

That is a very scant and I think fairly grudging recognition of some quite fine work that has been done by people involved with the S.A.D.C. Of course it has had some hard problems to deal with. Unfortunately, on a number of occasions, such as was the case of the Frozen Food Factory and in the case of the Riverland Fruit Products exercise, there was little area in which to turn in what was really a very necessary intervention by the Government, and the S.A.D.C. was able to provide that. It is very interesting to note that at the moment Riverland Fruit Products is operating only on the basis of the effectiveness of general food lines.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: How do you mean 'effectiveness of general food lines"?

Mr BANNON: Without that there would not be one person employed at that location at the moment; the whole operation would have completely gone down the drain, with appalling consequences to the Riverland.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The general food line is running at—

Mr BANNON: The general food line is the only part of the operation that is going at the moment. That is not to deny that there are not great problems up there. However, the S.A.D.C. was able to move in an attempt to do something about that. In the course of doing that, the S.A.D.C., for various ideological and other reasons, was attacked by the present Government in a pretty poor and appalling way. The Government, of course, has had an inquiry proceeding into the S.A.D.C.; it was one of the things that it promised at the last election. The Government was hoping to downgrade its function and dispense with it. In order to provide it with some sort of framework or ammunition to do so, in 1980 the Government announced the establishment of an investigation committee in order to get rid of it. That report has never been made public.

One would have thought that at the very least, in presenting this Bill to us, the Government could have produced the report and its findings to this Parliament. However, it has not done so. If one looks through the second reading explanation, one finds no real solid justification as to why the S.A.D.C. should be wound up or dispensed with. There are not many words surrounding the purpose of the S.A.D.C. and the possibility of its carrying out its operations in some other way. As I mentioned a moment ago, no alternative is proposed, and, as importantly, there is no solid argument or justification as to why the S.A.D.C. does not have a function.

In abolishing this I suggest that we are going against the trends of Governments everywhere else in the world, particularly regional or State Governments. Every one of the successful governments in the Western Provinces of Canada has a body equivalent to the S.A.D.C. thriving and active and with plenty of capital at its disposal, working very hard in harness with the private sector. One of the problems is that this Government gives no legitimate role whatsoever for the public sector in conjunction with the private sector. The Government sees it as anathema that the public sector should have any connection with private sector activities, so that any means of doing this, such as through the S.A.D.C., is to be decried.

As long ago November last year my colleague the member for Gilles put on notice a number of questions about the S.A.D.C. He asked about the committee of inquiry, who was on it, its terms of reference, and whether the report would be made public. The Premier replied then that the Government was to assess its efficiency, as to whether that was the best and most effective mechanism for achieving the Government's objectives of industry assistance. The Premier outlined names of those who were on it, set out its terms of reference, and said that he wanted to know whether it should have a role, given the existence of other specialist development financial institutions, such as the Commonwealth Development Bank, the A.I.D.C., the Primary Industries Bank, together with the existence of State-controlled financial institutions such as the State Bank.

The report, he said, was expected in mid-December (that is, December 1980, 12 months ago). He said that no decision had yet been made on publication. The report has never been published and here we come to this Bill, surely the occasion on which the Government reveals its findings, and again there is silence as to what that report said and what its findings were. I call on the Government to table that report as part of this debate. It has owed it to the House to tell us what those findings were and to give us details of them so that they can be analysed and discussed publicly.

I thought that that suggestion that the S.A.D.C. role should be looked at, given the existence of other institutions, was a very significant insight into this Government's thinking about State development and State organisations, because it referred to a number of other specialist bodies that we were meant to believe in some way duplicated or could stand in place of the S.A.D.C., and they are the Commonwealth Development Bank (not owned, controlled or operated by this State but a national body), the Australian Industries Development Corporation (another Federal creation, with no special responsibilities or rights in this State), the Primary Industries Bank of Australia (the same argument applies to it) and then the State Bank. The State Bank is already overstrained in attempting to meet the particular obligations that it has.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Rubbish!

Mr BANNON: The Minister says 'Rubbish'. In other words, he is saying that the State Bank can carry out its functions to the full. I suggest that he look at the annual report of the State Bank and look at the amount of capital it can generate and see whether that is a realistic assessment. The facts are that it is not. That approach, that suggestion, that someone else can do it, somewhere else, typifies this whole Government's attitude to the business in this State, and it is little wonder that someone with the eminence of Sir Norman Young has to talk about someone writing the saga of Adelaide's abandoned boardrooms, because the attitude that has brought about this Bill and the abolition of the S.A.D.C. is the same attitude as the one that lost us the Bank of Adelaide and as the one that has seen numerous take-overs and numerous attempts to gain control of key South Australian industries and enterprises while the Government has not lifted a finger.

Indeed, on one occasion when it did with S.G.I.C. try to save John Martins, action was called off and the company was told to sell out. Then we had the terrible sight of that major institution being taken out of the hands of the State, and we were assured it was not going to some other competing body or some large corporation. No, a splendid Melbourne retailer, Mr Solomon Lew, who had decided he would devote himself and his business future to South Australia, was going to take it over. Mr Lew was highly praised in the House when we asked questions about the matter. He sat in the gallery of this place and was pointed out by the Premier, and the plaudits of this man who had come to look after that South Australian enterprise sounded very hollow indeed about four months later when what we prophesied came to pass and Ezywalkin Ltd, based in Melbourne, took over the whole show.

That has happened with so many enterprises that Sir Norman Young is able to talk about Adelaide's abandoned boardrooms. He referred to the serious extent to which control over and ownership of a relatively large number of South Australian major business undertakings have fallen into the hands of overseas and interstate interests during the past few years. Elder Smith comes into this category, following recent moves which see Carlton United, together with Henry Jones who have merged, having taken it over. Sir Norman has put his finger on an important point. These consequences, he says, must inevitably take the form of an eventual decline in the health, vigor and size of the State's industrial and commercial base. He said:

> I shall not further labour the point except to add that in my opinion the directors acted in the best interests of shareholders and employees and the State by inviting the Government to intervene to the limited extent that was proposed.

Unfortunately, those calls fell on deaf ears and they have fallen on deaf ears so often over the past two years. Some-

thing tragic has happened to business in this State and what it is is the devolution, the withdrawal of South Australian control, and its removal to other States. How are we going to attract investment, and how we are going to attract national attention are becoming crucial problems in South Australia, because we have lost those institutions on which we relied in the past to do so, and the Government has sat by and done nothing. More than that: it is now going to abolish the very instrument of Government that could have done something about it.

The S.A.D.C. does not just stop at the level of larger business problems and particular employment problems. In some way I think an argument could be made out—some of those problems were a bit too hard to hand to the S.A.D.C. and it may have been better if we could have formed some other institution or found some other ways of looking after them and attempting to do something about them. Unfortunately, the S.A.D.C. is far too well known for the major problem areas that it attempted to do something about in the interests of communities. Let the Minister say that we should have let the Riverland community go to the wall, be finished, because that would have been the alternative to lack of Government intervention.

Let him say that any of these activities by the S.A.D.C. were not done in the interests of employment and preserving some sort of employment base in key areas in our community, but perhaps some other instrument may have been devised for that. This Government has certainly not done so. It has done nothing productive. Since the Premier received his report supposedly in mid-December last year, we have seen no alternative and have heard nothing about what can be done. Let the Government not criticise the S.A.D.C. on those grounds.

The S.A.D.C., in respect of small business, could well have had a role. I thought there was a particularly brief and possibly unfortunate reference to it in the recent report, discussion paper, entitled 'A strategy for the future'. On page 32 of that report it was pointed out that the criterion adopted by banks in rationing funds which are available to small business has been to give its preference to customers with real property security or established trade record. The report states:

> Credit-worthy young businesses requiring finance for working capital or for starting up new innovative ventures have been disadvantaged by these arrangements. While responsibility for monetary policy rests with the Federal Government, State Governments do have some financial scope to assist small business development and in the past the S.A.D.C. has been the States' primary mechanism for financial aid to small business.
>
> Assistance has taken the form of loans, loan guarantees, and on occasions purchases of shares in enterprises. The activities of the S.A.D.C., however, have become increasingly preoccupied with the problems of big businesses and stagnant businesses in trouble at the expense of assistance to small innovative business. Orientation towards larger and stable businesses has been the principal cause of a high default rate of loans guaranteed by the S.A.D.C. There is obviously a need for reorientation towards the original goal of serving the needs of small businesses, including the provision of loan guarantees. Consideration also needs to be given to a special financial institution which could make funds available for small and medium-sized firms embarking on new ventures.

If that is right (and I think there is some strength in what is being said in that passage), surely the response is not to abolish the corporation, to do away with it and leave a vacuum, but to direct the S.A.D.C. along those lines, to give it capital and the criteria to operate in those areas. The report itself makes very clear, in that passage on page 33, that there is a need for such institutions, that there is a need for such loans to be made.

What is the Government offering on this occasion? Absolutely nothing. The suggestion is that there may be some sort of committee that the banks may operate. The banks have always been there. They have always been able to operate in those areas. No doubt, we will get reference to all those Commonwealth institutions again, which like the boardrooms in Adelaide, are based in Canberra, Sydney or Melbourne, and we will go there cap in hand and plead the case for South Australia.

Why is this Government not standing up for South Australia and recognising that a healthy private sector is dependent on an active public sector and that the Government has a great capacity to stimulate and provide assistance to all sorts of entrepreneurial and innovative ventures in this State, if it has the right sort of Government corporation to do so? Instead of abolishing it, let us strengthen it and turn the S.A.D.C. into an even better, stronger and bigger institution to work in partnership with the private sector.

However, my remarks in this respect are falling on deaf ears. They are bound to do so while the present Government stays in office. We have no real hope of us doing anything to reverse this trend, the exit and flight of business from South Australia. There is no opportunity. There will be no way in which we can ensure that the State, on behalf of the community, plays its part in stimulating and working with the private sector in South Australia's economic development. The Government should read its own discussion paper and try to develop some proposals there, instead of spending its time trying to say it has already done it, and that there is nothing new in this report. It should take a few of the better parts of the report to heart. If it did, it certainly would not abolish this body.

As I have pointed out earlier, if one looks at any major regional economy, one will find such a corporation. Recently, I had the advantage of looking at a number of parts of the world. I have already mentioned the western Provinces of Canada. British Columbia, for instance, had such an active corporation, which the conservative Government abolished upon taking office in 1976 and sold its shares to the public of British Columbia.

When I was there, there was considerable public disquiet about what had happened, because it was found that, in order to chase the investment dollar, what is known as the 'brick' in British Columbia, the State Investment Corporation, which had been sold to the public of British Columbia and which was no longer run by the Government, was in fact investing substantial sums of its money in projects outside the Province. So, there was no direct advantage to all those people who felt they had a stake in their own Province. The value of their shares was not great in any case, and the whole reason for that corporation's operation had been completely overthrown. It was interesting, too, that, despite the establishment of that British Columbia Investment Corporation, there was still a Government corporation doing work similar to that done by the S.A.D.C. It was discovered in British Columbia that it could not be given away entirely, because there was too much at stake.

We move to the Province of Alberta and find a similar situation, an active industry development corporation. It is a centrepiece of their work, together with the private sector. It is well respected for its management. Its capital is usefully employed and it is ensuring that Alberta keeps a share of developments occurring there. It provides funds in areas that directly help those people in their Province. For instance, one of its projects was the commissioning of the purchase and construction of railway waggons to transport wheat produced in the Province because Canadian rail was not providing sufficient waggons. This State corporation intervened, using its investment funds to buy them, and they are being used for the Province's benefit. That is the sort of thing that can be done. It is a conservative Government with an overwhelming majority. It is very gung ho about resource development and it is extremely conserva-

tive, politically, yet it sees the need for this sort of corporation. Put in those terms, this Government is so far out of touch with what modern regional government does that it is not a joke.

Mr Evans: Are they mining uranium?

Mr BANNON: No, not in Alberta. They are mining it in Saskatchewan, where there is also an Economic Development Corporation. We are not talking about resource development here, I remind the member for Fisher. We are looking at strengthening our manufacturing and industrial base. That Economic Development Corporation works very actively in all sectors of the economy in the industrial manufacturing area. It provides capital, joint ventures, loans and guarantees, which are eagerly accepted by the private sector. In this case, it is a Social Democratic Government that sees the value and absolute necessity for this sort of institution. Three Provinces, with three difference shades of political opinion and three different economies in which to operate, have a feature in common with ours, namely, that they are regional economies that all recognise the need for this sort of institution.

One could go to Britain and find the same thing happening in some regions. For instance, in the Cumbrae region, in the north of Scotland, around Aberdeen and those towns, there is again an active provincial regional development corporation playing a very important role in ensuring that what happens so far as resource development and so on is concerned, the manufacturing back-up to it, occurs in that region and provides employment there. If we talked to them and asked them if it was a good idea to do away with the S.A.D.C., they would say, 'You are mad. We have only just discovered this concept. You have had it 10 years. If only we had had it 10 years ago we would be better off than we are today. It is absolutely vital if a regional economy is to prosper.'

Obviously, at this stage of the session, in these proceedings we will not have much impact on the Government, but I warn the Government that, if there is going to be any hope of leaving anything in this State, any power of decision making, there needs to be a development corporation in State Government hands. The private sector will demand it, the public sector needs it, and the economy will require it. Unless it exists, the State's capacity to influence any kind of industrial economic development here is virtually nil. Heaven knows, it is hard enough already, in the face of national and international trends, to have a direct impact. Why does the Government not read its own report and note what it says? Why not look overseas to examples of all prosperous regional economies? Why not look at the vulnerability of our economy, read the words of Sir Norman Young, and take stock of what is happening?

Let us forget about all the propaganda about frozen food factories and so on. The record of the S.A.D.C. is not too bad there, either. That factory would not have been sold to the private sector or it would not have been profitable enough to do so if the S.A.D.C. had not done a very effective job indeed there. Let us not concentrate on only those things, but let us look at the basic function of the S.A.D.C. and the very high amount of good it has done over its 10 years of operation. We oppose this Bill knowing that, even if our Opposition is carried and the S.A.D.C. remains in operation, it will continue to be treated with contempt by this Government, but at least we will have something when we come to Government to build on and on which to work with the private sector. We will not let this exodus of decision making and abandoned boardrooms continue. We will recognise the proper role the public sector must play in it, and we will have a corporation to do so.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I support the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition about this very important Bill. No doubt it will be pushed through the House in the last week of this session. The Deputy Leader and Leader of the House is doing the very thing that he often complained about when in Opposition, namely, the introduction of important legislation, as this Bill is, and the Government's desire to push it through the House in the next two or three days.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You have had a week.

Mr SLATER: The Bill may have been introduced a week last Thursday, but it is now being debated in the final three days of the session. No doubt the Government wants this legislation through during those three days.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Can't you read a page in a week?

Mr SLATER: I can read a page in probably the same time as the Minister can, but the complaint I am making is the same as the complaint that the Minister of Industrial Affairs and, in particular, the Deputy Leader and Leader of the House used to make when in Opposition. This is an important Bill, because it intends to do away with the South Australian Development Corporation, a corporation that has, over the past 10 years, made a significant contribution to the industrial development of this State. As the Leader said, in its second reading explanation the Government gave no valid reason and no justification for why the South Australian Development Corporation's activities need to be terminated.

It seems to me that the only reasons why the South Australian Development Corporation's activities are going to be terminated are purely political and philosophical. Let us look at some of the comments made when the Industries Assistance Corporation was set up in 1971. That was later to become, by amendment, the South Australian Development Corporation. On 6 April 1971, during the second reading debate, the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Steele Hall, supported the establishment of the Industries Assistance Corporation, as follows:

> No doubt, as further power is required to strengthen the measure, or perhaps as controls are required to safeguard the public purse, these amendments will be made. However, the success of the measure will depend largely on its administration by the Minister and on the efforts of the five members appointed to the board. I support the second reading, reserving the right to ask questions in Committee.

The spokesman on industrial affairs at that time was the member for Torrens, Mr Coumbe, who said:

> I support the principle of this Bill. For many years, as a backbencher, I supported the principle of giving greater incentives to secondary industries in South Australia . . .

Another speaker was Mr Millhouse, who was still a member of the Liberal Party and who said:

> I, too, support the Bill, but I point out that this is what is now as I understand it, conventional Labor doctrine. Having failed to achieve any significant measure of nationalisation by legislative means, the Labor Party in the U.K. (and I presume in Australia as well) now has the doctrine of trying to get hold of what are euphamistically called the commanding heights of the economy by buying into various concerns . . .

The other speaker was the then member for Murray (Mr Wardle), who said:

> This Bill could have a tremendous effect on and benefit for my district. The District of Murray comprises three large towns which have a large labour force, are favourably sited in relation to road and rail transport . . . The Bill could readily give an advantage to the small manufacturer who is experimenting in a small way with a product and who now finds it difficult to get sufficient capital to launch out into the mass production.

The legislation, when first introduced into this Parliament in 1971, was supported by the then Opposition, the Party now in government. I believe that the Government has given no valid reason and no justification for the life of the South Australian Development Corporation being terminated. As the Leader has pointed out, I asked a question

of the Premier some 18 months ago in this place seeking information about a report, what it would contain and what was the future of the South Australian Development Corporation. I received a fairly non-commital answer. We find now that this legislation is being brought before the Parliament without any opportunity for public comment. We are asked to consider it without knowing what was contained in that report. Comment is made in the second reading explanation that the committee comprised officers of the Department of Trade and Industry and the Premier's Department and that they examined the type of assistance possible for the development of industry with a view to determining the most effective way of providing finance. We are not privileged to know exactly what that report contained.

Perhaps the Minister of Industrial Affairs, when he replies to this debate, will give further information regarding that report. I think that we ought at least know exactly what that report contains. If the Government considers that the South Australian Development Corporation has not played a significant part in industry and development in South Australia in the past 10 years, I think that the Minister of Industrial Affairs ought to say so.

There is comment in the second reading explanation relating to the fact that the previous South Australian Government, through the South Australian Development Corporation, had involved itself in what is described in the second reading explanation as an unhappy episode with the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd. However, no comment whatever is made in that explanation about the number of matters that the South Australian Development Corporation has handled on behalf of the Government in an effective and efficient way. I know, as a member of the Industries Development Committee, the significant part that the corporation has played regarding industrial development in South Australia. It is true that it has had to handle some difficult matters. I wonder whether those matters would have been handled in the same way if corporation had not been available during that time. What would have happened (as the Leader has asked), regarding the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd?

Mr Evans: It probably would have been handled better.

Mr SLATER: We cannot determine that. However, it was in the public interest at that time that the corporation took up matters and the problem that existed for the Riverland Co-operative. I point out to the House, and to the Minister in particular, that the South Australian Development Corporation (and I know this because of my involvement with the Industries Development Committee) has played a significant part regarding many other industrial development matters in this State in the past 10 years. As the Leader has indicated, the Opposition opposes this Bill, which I think was introduced for purely political and philosophical reasons. I do not think that the Minister has given any valid reason why the South Australian Development Corporation should not continue, for the benefit of South Australians.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): On behalf of the Premier, for whom I am handling this Bill, I thank members for their contributions, although small, to this debate. I think it appropriate that I touch on a number of points raised. I go right to the heart of the point raised by the Leader. I think one would have anticipated the sort of response that came this afternoon from the Leader, because on the day the Bill was introduced, the Leader went with the Chairman of the South Australian Development Corporation to the Festival Theatre to have a cup of coffee.

One could assume that on that occasion he would have been primed to defend the role of the South Australian Development Corporation. It was not without some surprise, and it was certainly not unexpected, that the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon defended the role of the corporation. Let us look at the exact position. The main accusation made by the Leader of the Opposition was that there will be nothing to take the place of the corporation. If one looks at the Auditor-General's Report, which was recently brought down, in regard to the accounts of the corporation, one sees that the total outstanding loans as at 30 June this year amounted to $1 951 000.

I hope that the Leader is listening to what I am saying, because it is the real crux of what he stated. It appears that the Leader is deliberately not listening and that he does not want to, because he may be embarrassed by the facts. When one considers the figure for total loans in terms of loans to small business, one can see that it is an absolute drop in the bucket. If the loan to one small business was $100 000—

Mr Bannon: I agree, and it is your fault.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That sort of figure for outstanding loans has applied since the corporation was originally set up by the Dunstan Government 10 years ago. That figure means that about 20 companies have been assisted, if one divides the sum on the basis of $100 000 for each company. Of course, guarantees were given over and above that figure. If one looks at the reports of the corporation, one can see that it was through Government guarantees that the greatest assistance was given.

Mr Slater interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am delighted to hear the honourable member opposite shake his head in agreement.

Mr Slater: I am trying to be fair, and I am asking you to be the same.

Mr Keneally: I am delighted to hear the Minister say that he was delighted to hear the honourable member shake his head in agreement!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I was delighted to see the honourable member nod his head in agreement. There are a number of ways in which a government can assist industry, and I would like to cite them. The first is by way of loans. We find that the total outstanding loans for the corporation amount to less than $2 000 000. Yet this Government, in the past few weeks, has arranged for up to $5 000 000 initially to be made available in additional finance through the Savings Bank and the State Bank. In other words, 2½ times the amount allocated by the previous Government in the general area of small business loans is to be provided. Yet the Leader of the Opposition has stated that the Government is taking away something from small business in this State. I assure the House that the Government is substantially adding to the availability of finance through loans for small business by going through the banking procedure and by making available initially up to $5 000 000. I say 'initially', because that $5 000 000 will be further expanded.

Another means by which assistance has been given to business in this State is through guarantees. By supporting this Bill, we are in no way diminishing the Government's ability to provide guarantees. Guarantees are currently approved by the Industries Development Committee and vetted by the Department of Trade and Industry.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is interesting to hear that honourable members opposite are trying to create as much noise as possible, knowing full well that they are embarrassed by the facts. I know from the smile on your face, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, that you agree with me in that conclusion.

Mr Keneally: He is impartial.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Of course, the Acting Deputy Speaker is impartial. That is why he is smiling: he is impartial. I point out that the mechanism for guarantees still exists. We have simplified that mechanism. Previously, a company that required a Government guarantee approached the S.A.D.C. For a large guarantee, it approached the I.D.C., which conducted an investigation using the officers of the Department of Trade and Industry and, if it agreed, it made a recommendation to Treasury. Under the proposed alteration, the procedure will be simplified. It will be a one-stop shop. Companies will approach the Department of Trade and Industry, the department will take the matter to the I.D.C., if necessary, and the I.D.C. will make a recommendation direct to the Treasurer. I stress that in no way are we diminishing the ability for companies to obtain guarantees through the Government.

Another method of assistance is Government grants. The grants made available to industry by this Government have been substantially increased, compared to the grants made by previous Governments. I will refer shortly to the financial assistance that is available to companies in that way. The other area about which this Government is concerned and which certainly needs more attention is that of seedbed industries and venture capital. I have already indicated that the Government is currently considering that area.

I would like to highlight the great amount of assistance that the Leader of the Opposition fears will be taken away. The Leader stated that the S.A.D.C., as a means of providing loans to business in this State, is a crucial body. In the past 12 months, only two loans have been provided through the corporation at a total of $290 000. What a pittance! That figure reflects the level of loan capital available through the corporation not only for the past 12 months but also for the past 10 years. The Leader was very vocal in trying to highlight the number of companies that are apparently deserting this State. In fact, we find that the opposite is occurring. For the first time, there is a significant inflow of development capital for the manufacturing sector in this State. I would like to highlight—

Mr Bannon: Like the size of Elders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been most tolerant of interjections, but honourable members must allow the Minister to proceed with his speech.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I found it amusing that the greatest success story in Australia today in regard to take-overs was not mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, although a South Australian company was involved. Adelaide Steamship has successfully raided company after company in the Eastern States. It has been praised throughout the nation, and yet it gets no mention whatsoever from the Leader. He could not care a damn about successes; he only wants to talk about the other side of the balance sheet and try to convey a very biased picture in doing so. He could have talked about the companies that were taken over by Adelaide Steamship, such as Tooths, Penfolds, Nylex, David Jones, David Jones Properties, Buckleys, and Georges. The list goes on and on. Let us match them up company by company. Is John Martins as big as David Jones? I fear not. Are the other companies that were mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition as big as the companies that were taken over by Adelaide Steamship? I fear not. Therefore, if one is to get down to the issue of where the power is flowing, it is fair to say that Adelaide Steamship has brought its fair share of companies into this State and under the control of the boardroom in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the Government is taking away an important service to industry in this State and that there is nothing with which to replace it. He said that no other alternative was being put forward. I would like to highlight the expanded role of the Department of Trade and Industry. That department now administers a number of new schemes. I recall that, in 1978, under the then Dunstan Government, I complained that the total financial assistance given to industry in this State was less than $2 000 000, whereas the assistance given to the arts was about $11 000 000 or $12 000 000.

Under this Liberal Government, that amount has been lifted substantially this year to the order of where it is now, I think between $7 000 000 and $10 000 000; in fact, it is $10 000 000 in total assistance given to industry just through the Department of Trade and Industry. I highlight some of the schemes, for instance, the establishment payments scheme, whereby this year a grant of about $3 400 000 is being made available to industry in this State. I compare that $3 400 000 (which is by way of grants, or a 99-year interest-free loans) with the two loans granted under the South Australian Development Corporation of $290 000 in the year: in other words, more than 10 times the amount that has been given this year by loans through the S.A.D.C. The total outstanding loans accumulated to this point of time through the S.A.D.C. over the last 10 years is still less than $2 000 000, yet in the one financial year this Government under the one scheme—the establishment payments scheme—is giving more than $3 000 000 direct to industry.

We have also introduced the export bridging finance scheme. We are strengthening the guarantee system to industry, whereby industry receives a Government guarantee and then goes out and obtains a loan. We are streamlining that through the department so that there is not the long delay that occurred previously in seeking approvals for that scheme. We have the motor vehicle assistance scheme whereby financial assistance is made available to companies in the motor vehicle area to restructure to take account of the world car concept and to improve exports. Then, of course, we have strengthened and upgraded the small business advisory unit into a small business advisory bureau. One can see that the Government has thought carefully through the various roles played by the various bodies available in this State in order to assist industry.

The next area is the Industries Development Committee, which I believe under its present chairmanship is a superb tribute to this State and the assistance we give through Government to industry. I have heard a great deal of praise from individual companies that have appeared before that committee seeking assistance. We have strengthened the role of the State Bank and the Savings Bank. Only last week this Parliament passed a Bill amending the Savings Bank Act to allow that bank to sell commercial bills so it could raise additional finance. We have broadened the scope by which it can lend finance to individuals and especially to small businesses. Also, we have made available to those two banks an additional $5 000 000 initially, so that they can go out and make additional loans or allow additional overdrafts to small businesses. The facts stand there. The Government has considerably strengthened the financial assistance available to business and commerce in this State. If it is put down on a dollar-for-dollar basis it would be more than a tenfold increase on what was given by the Dunstan Government in its last year of operation.

I also draw to the attention of the House certain points raised by the Leader of the Opposition, particularly involving the Riverland cannery. He shows his ignorance when he claims that it was the general products line which has kept the cannery going; in fact, it is the general products line which has landed the cannery in the financial crisis it now faces, whereby it has been placed in receivership. It would appear to me that the Leader of the Opposition is a

master of making a bland statement which has absolutely no truth behind it whatsoever. For the honourable member who claims to be the Leader of the Labor Party in this State, it is incredible that he has not even bothered to look at the background of the cannery to realise that it was a Labor Government that plunged the cannery into a general products line, without doing adequate research, and also plunged it into an agreement that automatically meant that the cannery made a substantial loss. I highlight the fact that the general products line has never made a profit. It has been the general products line which has run consistently in a very—

Mr Bannon: You'd let them all go to the wall and lose thousands of dollars.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: What is the point in getting the cannery into an area of canning which involves a loss of between $200 000 and $300 000 a month and then claiming that you have a success? That is incredible. I believe it has been clearly justified that this Bill as it currently stands is warranted. The Government, by this measure, is streamlining its entire assistance to industry in this State. It is through the assistance given by this Government that we have been able to achieve substantial success in new investment and new employment in the manufacturing industry in South Australia. I ask all members of the House to support the Bill through the second and third readings.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown (teller), Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Rodda and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs Corcoran and McRae.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Power of Treasurer to grant direct assistance to industry.'

Mr BANNON: What machinery will the Treasurer have to process the recommendations of the committee in the absence of the S.A.D.C.? What administrative arrangements for machinery is being set up to analyse applications that are to be made?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The mechanism is that a person who wishes to seek a Government guarantee or a loan would come to the Department of Trade and Industry, the matter would be examined by officers of the department, and those officers would then make recommendations to the Industries Development Committee, and, if that committee approved, the machinery mechanism would be put into effect by the Treasurer. If it is a very substantial guarantee, it could well be taken to Cabinet, as Ministerial authority could be exceeded. That situation applied to the previous Government as it does to this Government. Normally that situation would apply for any Government guarantee of more than $300 000, that figure being the magical mark at which something is referred from the Minister to Cabinet for its approval.

Mr BANNON: What role will the Minister, as Minister of Trade and Industry, have in this process, and what involvement in the matter does the State Development Office have?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: My role would be the normal role that any Minister would have in administering a department. I point out that I do the referring when a matter needs to be referred to the I.D.C., and I have the Treasurer's authority to do that referring. Therefore, the matter comes through the Minister and he simply acts as the Minister referring the matter, on behalf of the Treasurer, to the I.D.C. It has nothing to do with the State Development Office. The responsibility for this and the administration of this area comes under the Department of Trade and Industry.

Mr SLATER: A significant proportion of the guarantees that have been given in the past (in some cases, anyway) have not been available through normal banking and commercial channels. A person or a company looking for the provision of a loan has not always been able to obtain that loan through the normal banking arrangements. Of course, in those circumstances the South Australian Development Corporation has undertaken to make some arrangements for that guarantee. I ask the Minister what is likely to be the position in future of companies that are not able to meet the requirements relating to this? What will happen to their applications in the future?

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the member for Stuart has been given a great deal of latitude this afternoon, yet he continues to interject virtually full-time. I suggest that, if the honourable member wants to make a contribution, he receive the call of the Chair.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I highlight that the area referred to by the member for Gilles is the very sort of area where I believe Governments should not be lending. A normal commercial operation, even though it has a Government guarantee, still cannot go out and borrow money from the bank. It must be an enormous risk, if no bank is willing to lend it money, despite the fact that it has a Government guarantee!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If guarantees on that basis were given by the previous Government, and bodies could not get bank loans, despite a Government guarantee, that sadly reflects on the type of corporations to which the previous Government lent money. I point out to the honourable member that if there is an exceptional case a body could still come to the State Bank. I highlight to the honourable member that, although the Riverland cannery is in receivership at present, certain guarantees have been given through the State Bank which normally would not have given on a commercial basis. However they were given because of an Act passed through this Parliament in relation to that cannery, and because of a guarantee given by the Government to pay those loans.

Mr SLATER: I have listened to the Minister's reply. However, I point out that for various reasons there have been a number of companies which have been referred through the Industries Development Committee for consideration and which, for a variety of reasons, have been unable to obtain a loan through normal banking and commercial operations. But, because the Government has guaranteed the loan, the opportunity for those commercial and banking operations to be undertaken has been provided. That has been the basis of the exercise in the past, and I point out that many of those companies that have come to the Industries Development Committee under those conditions in the past have turned out to be commercially viable, their development has been in the public interest, and they have created employment in this State.

One cannot always take a case at face value, but one thing follows the other. Where a loan is not able to be undertaken through a commercial or banking institution,

sometimes with a Government guarantee a bank will then provide the finance.

The Minister has made great play of the $1 900 000 that is outstanding in regard to loans by the S.A.D.C. I ask the Minister whether he has any information about the total amount of loans that have been made in the corporation's operations over the past 10 years? I think the significant thing is not the amount of loans that are outstanding now but the total amount of loans that have been made by the corporation, either as the Industries Assistance Corporation or as the South Australian Development Corporation over the past 10 years.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In getting to his feet a second time, the honourable member has put a quite different case from that which he put the first time. The first case related to what would happen if the Government gave a guarantee and that company then could not go out and borrow the money. The second time he said that the company could not borrow the money initially but, once the Government gave a guarantee, they could borrow the money. There is no problem there, and that is what we expect to occur here. The Government will give a guarantee and the firm concerned will have no difficulty in going out and borrowing the money from a commercial bank. If it cannot borrow it from one of the private banks, it can go to the State Bank or to the Savings Bank, which is now eligible. I cannot give the honourable member the exact figure of the total loan funds given by the corporation. I will see whether I can get some figures and make them available to the honourable member. If I can get some figures, I will certainly do so.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 and title passed.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I take this opportunity to thank the members of the South Australian Development Corporation board for the role that they have played over the years. I pay a tribute to the fact that they have worked hard for the Government over a 10-year period. I believe that one of the significant reasons for a number of problems with the South Australian Development Corporation is that it was subject to Ministerial direction. In fact, it got plenty of that political direction from the previous Government. There are a number of classic examples of where the previous Government, by way of Ministerial instructions, told the corporation that it shall get involved in a particular application or it shall do certain things.

Mr KENEALLY: On a point of order, the Minister must speak to the Bill as it comes out of Committee. I put to you that the points that he is now making are much more relative to a second reading speech than they are to a third reading speech, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: I must point out to the Minister that he is straying fairly wide in his comments, and I therefore uphold the point of order. I ask the Minister to relate his comments to the Bill as it came from Committee.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Certainly, Sir. I am paying a tribute to the board and thanking its members for what they have done. I am pointing out that some of the problems that have arisen have not been problems—

Mr KENEALLY: On a further point of order, Mr Chairman, that is exactly the point that I brought to your attention in my original point of order, which you upheld. I point out that the Minister is now repeating the points to which I objected in my point of order, and that is in defiance of the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister was referring to the board. The Chair intends to allow the Minister to refer to the contribution that the board has made. However, when the honourable member raised a point of order previously, the Minister was going considerably further than just referring to the board. I therefore ask the Minister to relate his comments strictly to the Bill as it arrived from Committee.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Sir. I again highlight the fact that the board has had a difficult task over the past 10 years. It has worked hard, and I pay a tribute to the board members for what they have done. I was highlighting that some of the difficulties have arisen because of the political nature of the directions given to it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is straying a considerable distance from the Bill, and I point out to him that as this is the third reading debate I must remind the Minister that the Chair cannot continually remind him of the manner in which he should speak.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Sir. I also take this opportunity to highlight to industry in this State that the Bill as it has come out of Committee in no way weakens the assistance that the Government can give to industry in this State. If anything, it will streamline it, and will hasten applications considerably.

This Government has made a commitment to give financial support, and to guarantee loans, grants and other forms of assistance to industrial development in this State and the Bill, as it comes out of Committee, enables that to occur. We look forward to continuing healthy growth of our private sector in South Australia.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I believe that the Bill as it comes out of Committee will have exactly the opposite effect to what the Minister has just described. As some sort of afterthought he began by thanking the board, and, as my colleague pointed out, at this stage of the debate that was quite out of order. The Bill itself, as it came out of Committee, provides no machinery whatsoever to do the things that the Minister suggests it is going to do.

In Committee the Minister was questioned about procedures, and I do not believe he gave a satisfactory answer. I rather suspect that he is not fully familiar with the procedures that are available, anyway. I cannot blame him for that in part, because the Premier's administration has created total confusion in this area. Prior to this Bill's coming into operation there was a clearly defined corporation that businessmen could approach. Now, as the Bill comes out of Committee, we have a situation where no alternative machinery whatsoever is being provided for, and under the Premier's administration there is the State Development Office, there is a Minister—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, as I understand it, the ruling given just a few moments ago explicitly expressed the view that the third reading debate must restrict itself in its ambit to the Bill as it comes out of Committee and that it has nothing to do with the way in which the Premier administered things before or will administer them in the future. I ask you to rule on the remarks being made by the Leader.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): I ask the Leader to contain his remarks to the Bill as it came out of Committee.

Mr BANNON: I will certainly direct my remarks to the Bill as it came out of the Committee. The Bill, for the information of the member for Mallee, is an amendment to the Industries Development Act, and clause 5 thereof talks about the power of the Treasurer to grant direct assistance to industry. In that context the administrative arrangements of the Treasurer in providing that assistance are totally relevant. They are the whole basis of this Bill, and I am sorry that the Minister has missed that point. It certainly casts some doubt on the way in which his vote will be

exercised if he has missed that point. This Bill provides no machinery at all to enable the Premier to direct such assistance to industry and, as such, it is totally deficient, and that is why we are opposing the Bill. The Minister's confusion is understandable, just as it is shared in industry. Do they go to the State Development Office? Do they approach the Minister of State Development or the Treasurer? Do they go to the Department of Trade and Industry? Do they talk to the Minister of Trade and Industry? What does one do, as far as this Government is concerned, to get assistance? It can have all the schemes in the world, but those schemes have no direction and no focus. I think that many events that have occurred today show that out very starkly. This Bill effectively does away with one of the key economic instruments that the Government has to assist the economic development of this State.

At this stage, there have been two years of absolute rundown, and mass exodus of businesses. The Adelaide Steamship Company example is just one against the trend, and we pay credit to it. Thank goodness at least one South Australian company can take that action, but businesses and their control are leaving this State. This Bill provides no machinery whatsoever, any focus in the Government to do anything about it. It is totally irresponsible, in the light of our current economic situation, to do away with this important instrument of Government activity. I undertake that, whether in this precise form or not, a future Labor Government will certainly do something, in partnership and co-operation with the private sector in this area.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown (teller), Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Gunn and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs Corcoran and McRae.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

MOTOR FUEL DISTRIBUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2277.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill, which was described by the Minister in his second reading explanation as being brief. Although it is short, it is very important. The number of litres is now recognised in the Act. As there is not any power in the board to allow tanks above the size of 1 800 litres and as those tanks are not made any more, there needs to be legislation and, rather than make any provision so far as allowing the board to receive and deal with applications is concerned, which would simply create more work for a board that is active and has sufficient to do, the simple and cleanest way to deal with the matter is to amend the Act in such a way that it will in future allow industrial pumps to be extended from 1 800 litres to 2 001 litres.

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

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2280.)

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): The Opposition will not be opposing this measure, but that should not suggest that we will be embracing with any enthusiasm the alienation of further Crown land. Not only will we not be embracing it with enthusiasm; it is a principle to which we are opposed. Any action that the Opposition takes on this measure today should not be interpreted by anyone as indicating that we will adopt the same attitude towards any attempt to alienate Crown land in the Marginal Lands Act or the Pastoral Act if such unfortunate legislation ever comes before this House.

There are, as the second reading explanation points out, two main aspects to this Bill. I must pay a tribute to the Minister or his departmental officers for the construction of the second reading explanation. It is, I believe, a good one and explains clearly what this Bill intends to do. For that I am particularly grateful, and I imagine that anyone who wishes to read *Hansard*, or any member in either House who wishes to contribute to the debate on this Bill, will find the second reading explanation a significant help. That is not always the case, unfortunately, in this Parliament, as I said previously. One particular Government is no more at fault than another in this matter. There has been a reluctance by Governments to state clearly in second reading explanations just what a Bill sets out to do.

One of the reasons why we are prepared to go along with the Government, or to at least not oppose this measure in this particular case, is that we realise that in irrigation areas in South Australia there is very little, if any, land that is not under development. The concern we have about the alienation of Crown lands is not so significant in this case. Therefore, we do not oppose this Bill. I understand that there are considerable administrative problems and costs in the present system and that, if all the perpetual leases are converted to freehold or fee simple leases, there will be a reduction in administrative costs. This is not, philosophically at least, the reason why the Government has introduced this measure. The Government has set out quite clearly in the second reading explanation that it is a policy that it would like to see carried through to all other land tenure in South Australia.

Mr Gunn: Hear, hear!

Mr Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr KENEALLY: The member for Eyre says 'Hear, hear'. That is where the honourable member for Eyre and the honourable member for Mallee and members on this side of the House come into conflict. I do not believe that the future of South Australia is necessarily advanced, if advanced at all, by the alienation of Crown land, the alienation of land that the people of this State own. The land is not an asset that will continue to grow or amass. It will reduce marginally, of course, as a result of erosion, which is a fine point, indeed. However, the Opposition has some fundamental problems with the further alienation of these Crown lands.

Mr Gunn: You're not game to oppose this one because you don't want to upset the people in the Riverland. That is what it is.

Mr KENEALLY: Despite what the member for Eyre has said, I have pointed out the difference between the conversion of perpetual title to freehold title in areas where no further development will take place as against the conversion of perpetual lease to freehold in the wider and larger areas of the State.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That is a bit subtle for the member.

Mr KENEALLY: Yes, that is a bit subtle for the member for Eyre, as my colleague points out.

Mr Gunn: I think that both the members know nothing about agriculture.

Mr KENEALLY: The continued interjections from the member for Eyre are rather astounding. We are not discussing matters agriculture here, in that sense. We are discussing the conversion of leasehold land to freehold land. There is, of course, the relationship of this land with irrigation and to that extent the honourable gentleman may just be right. However, in the wider context, what he is trying to put to the House during this second reading debate has no relevance whatsoever.

There is one aspect of this matter about which I ask the Minister to comment briefly. In so asking, I point out that in no way am I reflecting upon him as an irrigator. However, there is no doubt that people within the irrigation areas of South Australia who wish to be able to convert their holdings to freehold see that there is some benefit in it for them. As the Minister is an irrigator, I think he should tell the House what his personal position is. It may well be that the Minister has freehold land now: I have no idea. I merely suggest, with absolutely no reflection on or criticism of the Minister, that it may be a good idea if he makes this point clear.

The Opposition is pleased, having read this Bill, that when leasehold land is, as it inevitably will be, converted to freehold land, the freehold titles will be subject to the Irrigation Act as the current lesehold tenures are. Our irrigation areas will continue to be developed in the interests of the State. I am also pleased that, should any leaseholder wish to convert land to freehold, it will be under the conditions applied by the Minister. There are, within this Bill, stringent provisions that the Minister can use to ensure that any such conversion will be in the interests of the State. I am also pleased that, when a conversion takes place and a freehold owner is able to dispose of sections within irrigation areas, the Planning and Development Act will apply and that, at least, the Minister will ensure that none of these sections can be disposed of unless it fronts both a drainage and a water supply.

A concern expressed to me was that some irrigators might wish, immediately they have freehold control of their land, to dispose of the uneconomic sections of that land and hold on to the more economic sections. The fear here was that that landholder could then dispose of sections that are not serviced by water supply and drainage and that the new owner would then be wanting to impose upon the Government to have those facilities provided. All of these concerns that I expressed have been referred to in the second reading explanation. As I have said earlier, the second reading explanation is explicit. I have no intention of repeating it.

The only question I have is whether the Minister may feel that it is not an imposition on him to declare his interest in this respect. He might have intended to do so in any case. If he had not, I invite him to take such action. The Opposition will not oppose the Bill. We are not enthusiastic about it, but we see that, within irrigation areas, this measure could have some benefit for current leaseholders. We would violently oppose any suggestion that our support or lack of opposition here could be taken as an indication that we will support the wider aspects of the Bills to which the Government referred. The Opposition will consider the merits of those Bills if they reach this House, and only then.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Irrigation): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I take this opportunity to respond to the member for Stuart, because I did not do so at the conclusion of the second reading stage. The member raised one or two points in relation to this Bill. I must say that, before every election, this Government and the Liberal Party have clearly spelt out their philosophy in regard to freeholding of land. I believe that that philosophy was clearly accepted by the people of South Australia at the 1979 State election and that we have a mandate to take this action. There is considerable and very widespread interest throughout South Australia in regard to freeholding of land. Numerous people in the community have a strong desire to own the land that they occupy.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister please relate his comments to the Bill as it comes to the third reading stage.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Yes, Mr Speaker. This Bill deals very much with the freeholding aspects of irrigation and perpetual leases; it is before the House to meet the desire of the people who hold irrigation perpetual leases and who wish to convert their irrigation perpetual lease to a freehold title, in the same way as provisions apply under the Crown Lands Act. However, the Crown Lands Act has always contained a provision for freeholding, whereas the Irrigation Act did not contain that provision.

I can see absolutely no administrative problems, because freeholding in irrigation areas has always occurred on the basis of freehold titles to the land involved in irrigation. The Renmark Irrigation Trust is a very old and established irrigation development in South Australia.

Mr Keneally: I suggested that the administrative problems would be less under freehold conditions.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: That is correct. In the not too distant future, significant amendments will be introduced to the Crown Lands Act. This action was commenced during the term of the previous Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I appreciate that the honourable Minister is providing information for the honourable member for Stuart, but I again point out that the Minister may only speak to the Bill and its clauses as it came from the Committee stage.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: As I have said, unfortunately I missed the opportunity at the completion of the second reading stage to respond to the member opposite. I intended to speak then: I certainly did not intend to pass over the matter. However, the matter proceeded a little too quickly for me. As the Bill comes from the Committee stage, it provides for control by the Minister of water and drainage connections. That is quite vital in the administration of the irrigation areas. It would be disastrous if sections of the land that are rated could be sold off without an irrigation water connection or a drainage outlet.

While certain areas within the Government irrigation areas are not served by drainage outlets, certainly all of the rated properties must have a water connection. Consequently, without that water connection, and if a subdivision occurred, the section without the connection would be virtually worthless. I cannot imagine that anyone would want to make such a move, because there would virtually be no buyer for that section. In many respects, the Bill is self protecting.

The member also asked whether I have any freehold property. No, I do not have any freehold property: I have three irrigation perpetual leases in the Government irrigation areas. With the passing of this Bill, I will be able, if I desire, to freehold any of those three properties. The option is provided. There is no request to or compulsion on any person to freehold his land, but this action can be

taken, in line with the undertaking that the Government gave prior to the 1979 State election.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DISCHARGED SOLDIERS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2280.)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): As the Minister states in the second reading explanation, this Bill is consequential on the measure we have just passed. The Opposition supports the Bill, and I place on record the fact that I agree entirely with what my colleague said in relation to alienation of Crown lands generally.

There are situations such as that with which we are confronted, where such action can be justified; however, for the most part, that action cannot be justified, and as long as we are in Opposition it will be our object to ensure that every move by this Government to in any way alienate Crown land is subject to the closest possible Parliamentary and public scrutiny. We have already co-operated with the Government in the speedy passage of the substantive measure before us. This Bill is consequential on that measure, and I will not delay the House further in regard to this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Repeal of section 25.'

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In the second reading explanation of the Bill, in relation to clause 5, the Minister said:

> Clause 5 repeals the section that requires a lessee to obtain the consent of the Minister before transferring, subletting or mortgaging his lease.

I assume that this is one of the administrative arrangements to which my colleague referred when talking about the previous measure; it is one of those administrative arrangements that can be eliminated by the measure that went through involving the Irrigation Act. What is, in fact, the administrative arrangement that we are eliminating? Is there an office in the Riverland to which application is made? Do all these applications have to come before the Minister for his signature, or is it arranged at a departmental level?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Under the Crown Lands Act or the Irrigation Act, it is necessary for all applications for the transfer of land to receive the consent of the Minister of Lands. He has to give consent to mortgage, and he has to give consent to transfer. The amendment eliminates that in the same manner as will be the case in further legislation to be introduced at another time in relation to the Crown Lands Act, whereby land will be able to be dealt with in the same manner as regards freehold title without consent. It is one of those provisions that have been in the Act since it was created. I can never recall a time when any Minister has ever declined to give his consent to mortgage; or, in fact, unless a subdivision is involved which would upset the balance of the land, I can never recall an occasion when a direct transfer has been declined. So, in actual fact, it is an administrative matter that enables the lessee to deal in that land as though it was freehold land.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2336.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I sought leave to continue my remarks on the last occasion when this matter was before the House. In the course of those remarks I had spoken about the Government's need to raise taxes despite its election propaganda to the effect that it would not be doing so. I would just like to turn, as I was doing towards the end of my previous remarks, to the impact of this measure. A headline in today's *News* suggests that, as a result of the wage settlement, the price of bottled beer could jump by 5c a bottle. I do not know whether the calculation made there includes the impact of this particular tax. As I was saying at the time we adjourned, this is effectively a 12½ per cent increase, and it has been estimated that it will raise the price of beer by about 2c a schooner. That can be extrapolated into various other areas of price increases. No doubt it is intended to generate quite a bit of revenue.

I think it is somewhat ironic that the Government chooses to raise revenue in this way on this occasion; after all, it spoke out very strongly indeed against the Federal Government's impost, in particular, about the rumours that surfaced, as they normally do around Budget time, that an excise on wine was to be imposed. Yet that was not imposed, as it turns out, and the Federal Government was duly congratulated for its prudence. Some weeks ago we find the State Budget being introduced which by taxing this liquor turnover does, in fact, apply some sort of tax to wine itself.

Another matter raised fairly strongly by my colleague in another place relates to the fact that fees for next year will be based on the turnover for the financial year ended 30 June 1981. It is, in this respect, a retrospective tax. In the light of the very savage increase of 12½ per cent that I have spoken of, it could be suggested that some sort of recognition could be applied to that and that the financial year should be broken up or some adjustment made which would ensure that its full impact did not apply retrospectively to the extent that it would otherwise.

As it is a revenue measure, I do not believe that we are in a position to oppose the Bill. It is part of the Government's Budget. It would have been much more proper to introduce it in this place rather than another place, but with those complaints about it, echoing the remarks made by my colleague in another place, I indicate our dissatisfaction with the way in which this measure will have an impact on that important industry in South Australia at a time of real economic hardship.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I certainly do not support the Bill. Its main purpose is to increase licence fees from 8 per cent to 9 per cent on licensed premises, on the gross turnover. It also seeks to make amendments to increase fees associated with section 66 of the principal Act, which involves reception houses, also with section 67 in relation to club permits. It is certainly a revenue measure arising out of the Budget, and of course the cost will be borne by the consumer. There is no doubt that these increases in licensing fees will have a very substantial effect on the overall price of liquor to the consumer. It has been suggested to me by people in the liquor industry that the increase in prices made by this measure could be in the vicinity of 10 per cent. This afternoon we have seen in the press where already there will be an increase in the price of liquor (quite a substantial trade increase), but I do not think that that will be quite as significant. I believe that the reason for the increase announced today is justified because of the

increase in costs and prices, of course, arising from the decision of the court to increase wages for people working in the industry.

The increase in regard to licensing fees about which we are now speaking will have a greater substantial effect on the industry in general. It will create a further problem for the hotel and hospitality industry at the most inappropriate time. The industry is already reeling from the effects of legislation introduced into and passed in this House only a few months ago, namely, that relating to random breath tests. There will be considerable consumer resistance to the industry for some time in regard to the purchase of liquor by consumers because of the increase in prices. Of course, the hospitality industry is very important and is a vital part of our tourist trade. Tourism is regarded as a very important part of our State economy, and, of course, the Government claims to support tourism, which will be affected by this legislation. We find already that hotels, motels and restaurants are having difficulty maintaining business. I refer to a recent press article on this subject. Headed 'Our nightlife takes tumble', it states, in part:

The man most responsible, Transport Minister Michael Wilson, says he is very heartened by an apparent improvement in the road toll. But, cautiously, he does not attribute it entirely to random bag blowing.

Some consequences, though, are directly attributed to it. The State's hospitality industry—its pubs, clubs and restaurants—has taken a battering.

Mr Bill Sparr, President of the South Australian Association of Restaurateurs, said today a survey of members had found that business was generally down by between 20 and 30 per cent. As a consequence, some licensed restaurants had began trimming staff.

There was some sign of recovery as the peak Christmas season approached. But Mr Sparr said bookings to date around the industry indicated that the lost ground would not be recovered entirely.

I claim that the increases in licensing fees, which will have an overall effect on the industry, will further create difficulties for the hospitality industry, the hotels, motels and restaurants in this State.

We were told in the second reading explanation that there will be a rebate on low-alcohol refreshments, beer and other products. I believe that that is only a ruse to cover the real reason for the legislation, namely, revenue for the Government. The major impact of the Bill has been glossed over in the Minister's second reading explanation. I point out also that, despite promises made by the Premier in respect of taxation, this is simply another taxation measure. I also mention in passing that already there have been increases in 72 State charges since the beginning of the year and, as far as I am concerned, this is another.

The Minister of Tourism, who is in charge of the Bill in this House, should take careful note of the effect that this legislation will have on the hospitality industry. I note with interest the Minister's reply to a question last week from the member for Elizabeth regarding a matter pertaining to the consumption of alcohol. I refer to a comment made by the Minister in reply to the member for Elizabeth, as follows:

Fortunately, in respect of this particular issue, all members of the Liberal Party are as one in wanting to see a completely responsible attitude towards alcohol that permeates the community at all levels and is reflected in our laws, not only in practice but also in law.

I take it that certainly the Liberal Party does speak as one on these increases in licensing fees, which, of course, will increase quite substantially the price of liquor to consumers. I point out that there have been a number of increases in the price of liquor since the Government came to office in 1979. There is an increasing consumer resistance to these liquor increases, and the industry is most upset with the intent of the legislation. This is best expressed in an article in the *Hotel Gazette of South Australia*, the official publication of the Australian Hotels Association. The editorial of the magazine's October 1981 issue states:

The hotel industry in South Australia is concerned, and disappointed that the State Government has decided to echo Victoria in amending the liquor licence fee structure. And the industry is not alone in its feelings towards the measures announced in the South Australian Budget.

Restaurants and all others who contribute to State coffers through licensing fees are just as 'put out'. The amendments—which will require alterations to the Licensing Act—will boost Government revenue significantly when they operate from next April. In other words, the changes are further examples of the liquor industry being penalised by Governments—Federal and State—because it seems an easy target.

Briefly, the general licence fee payable is lifted 1 per cent to 9 per cent, while the fee on low alcohol beverages is reduced to 2 per cent. And the fee on spirits is now calculated not only at 9 per cent but on the added factor of sales tax. The 1 per cent increase will lift annual revenue by 12½ per cent and, together with the new 'measuring stick' for spirits, will bring in about an additional $2 000 000.

The new scale for low-alcohol beverages—it is yet to be defined what these are—is to be commended. The Australian Hotels Association (South Australian branch) fully supports any sensible move associated with drinking and driving. But it is yet to be seen how the public will react to the lower retail prices—

of course, this refers to low-alcohol beer—

which may be in the vicinity of 2c a butcher of beer, 3c a schooner, 4c a pint, and 5c a 750 ml bottle. And the Government has not apparently made any allowances for the inconveniences and extra costs hotelkeepers will face in providng the public with all the choices, particularly with draught beers.

The article concludes as follows:

Hotels are not a never-ending pit of revenue. Nor should the numerous services they provide be taken for granted. Fair is fair!

That indicates the feelings of the hotel industry in relation to these new licence fees. As I say, there will be an increasing community resistance to these price increases, and the hotel industry will be affected quite considerably. Of course, this will play a very significant part in the hospitality industry and the tourist industry in South Australia. I also noted with interest a letter to the editor published in the press recently signed by persons involved in the hotel industry, A. J. and L. E. Saturno, the proprietors of the Norwood and Victoria Hotels, which stated:

A proposed amendment to the Licensing Act will effectively increase licence fees retrospectively—

that is an important point—

to 1 July 1980, by 12.5 per cent for purchases of non sales-taxable goods and as much as 32 per cent for purchases of sales-taxable goods.

Licence holders, however, have not had an opportunity from 1 July 1980 to incorporate these substantial increases into their price structures.

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

Mr SLATER: Before the dinner adjournment, I was referring to a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* from the proprietors of the Norwood and Victoria Hotels, A. J. and L. E. Saturno, in which they strongly condemned the Government in regard to its proposal to increase the licensing fees. The letter states:

This action by the Government leaves us with complete uncertainty as to the future and the provision we should make in our trading for what, in all fairness, should be a fixed operating cost, namely, the licence fee payable on our purchases.

For a regime that has promised, as an electoral platform and throughout its term of office, to protect and encourage the State's business and commercial interests, the fact that these increases are to have a retrospective effect for a period of approximately 18 months is, in our view, treacherous to the liquor retail industry and leaves suspicion as to the Government's real motivation.

On top of the introduction of random breath testing, this action is a severe blow to a struggling and highly competitive industry already being forced to reduce employment.

Why not apply the increases only on purchases from 1 January 1982, thereby affording liquor retailers with an opportunity to make provision for additional payments of which they then would have had adequate and fair warning?

That letter indicates the feeling of some people involved in the liquor industry in respect of these particular fees. But, as I have already said, in relation to an editorial in the *A.H.A. Gazette,* the feeling is general throughout the hospitality industry.

In addition to the proposals to increase licence fees for hotels (this will also have an effect, of course, on clubs), there is also a proposal to amend section 66 of the Licensing Act, which deals with reception houses and places that have a permit in regard to the consumption and dispensing of liquor, which provide that service for various functions including weddings, engagements, and so on. Of course, the customer will then be asked to pay the additional licence fee that has been requested by the Government.

In addition, it is proposed to amend section 67 of the principal Act by striking out from subsection (l) the passage '$5 and not more than $100' and substituting the passage '$10 and not more than $300', which, in effect, means that for a section 67 permit, the increase will be, in one case, 100 per cent, from $5 to $10 as the minimum, and from $100 to $300 as a maximum. I believe that the Minister in another place, in his presentation of this matter to the Upper House, said that this was to cover inflation. I am not prepared to accept that the increase is in respect of inflation only. There is no doubt to me that it is a revenue-raising matter; it is a significant increase, which will also affect clubs very significantly.

I believe that those members of clubs, like those patrons who patronise the hotels, will be asked to pay a substantial increase in the price of liquor. Clubs play a very important part in the social life of the community. As I say, the proposed increases will be passed on to club members. There is a substantial number of clubs in South Australia. In this respect, I refer to the *South Australian Year Book* of 1981, which gives figures for liquor licences and permits in South Australia. Of course, these are only to 30 June 1980, and are the latest figures that I could obtain. I note that there are 604 licensed publicans; 73 limited licences; 193 storekeepers licences, which cover wholesale and retail outlets and distillers; 109 vigneron licences; 260 club licences; and 295 restaurant licences. It will be interesting to see how those numbers are affected as time goes on, when the effect of this increase is felt throughout the community.

I point out that of the permit clubs (those working under a section 67 permit) there were 798 with permits current at 30 June 1980. So, those 798 permit clubs, instead of paying the $100 as at present, will be required to pay $300 for the privilege or purpose of a licence, and those costs will be passed on to club members.

The smali section 67 permit clubs are usually formed by people with a common interest who combine to support that interest. They elect a committee to run the club on their behalf. The club is usually funded by subscriptions of members who, in addition, provide finance by the sale of liquor and food on the premises. These clubs, whether they be fully licensed or work under a section 67 permit, play an increasingly important part in the social life of our community.

The Government is placing a very severe burden on these clubs. They are usually run by hard-working, dedicated and, in many cases, voluntary committee members, who give both their time and effort on behalf of their club to pursue their common interest. I believe that their interests are being prejudiced by the increases in these licensing fees. Clubs were made aware that they would be affected when they received their financial statements at the end of the appropriate time, or at the end of the financial year.

The Liberal Government is slugging these clubs and their members, by these extortionate licence fees, for Government fund-raising purposes to cover its own economic inadequacies. It is interesting to note the comments made back in 1974 by the then Opposition members, who are now in Government, when the previous Government increased licence fees from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. There has not been an increase since 1974. How critical they were of the increase in licence fees at that time. Let me quote some of the comments which were made and which I believe are very significant. The first speaker was the member for Kavell, Mr Goldsworthy, now the Deputy Premier, who was critical of the Bill. Then, the next speaker was the Leader of the Opposition, Dr Eastick, who said, 'This Bill deserves to be opposed; it was only a revenue-raising measure,' and so on. However, I thought the most appropriate remark then came from the member for Hanson, who said:

> I, too, oppose the Bill. Any Government that turns around and claims it has a mandate from the worker and then levies the worker, as this Government has done, deserves the strongest condemnation.

He went on to say that it also changes the licences for storekeepers, brewers Australian ale licences, and so on. There was then an interjection by Dr Tonkin, who said, 'It's a real slug.' Mr Becker continued:

> It is. It is the greatest imposition that could be made upon the workers. Most people in the community enjoy the opportunity to partake of alcoholic beverage, whether beer or various types of wine. The hotel industry has served this State well; it has provided amenities and facilities for those people wishing to use its premises, such as licensed and permit clubs.

I am wondering whether the member for Hanson remembers making those remarks and whether on this occasion he will make some contribution to this Bill, which is exactly along the lines of the Bill introduced in 1974 by the previous Government in regard to an increase in licence fees. I wonder whether he will be prepared to make the comment that he made on that occasion, that it is a slug on the worker, or whether he has actually changed his mind since then. There were other speakers at the time, including Mr McAnaney, the then member for Heysen.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Did he mention the railways?

Mr SLATER: I think so, although it probably was not in order. There were a number of interjections, and at one stage the Speaker called 'Order!' and asked the member for Heysen to link his remarks to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: History repeats itself, and the honourable member should now do the same.

Mr SLATER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will return to the licensing fees and the amendment to the Licensing Act now before us. However, a number of speakers spoke very stongly against the increase in licensing fees at that time. I believe that the increase now proposed is very disadvantageous to the hospitality industry. I have already made the point that it is a most inappropriate time. There has been quite a considerable effect, quite a considerable amount of consumer resistance in the hotel and club industry, and I was advised by a person involved in one particular club that its business is down something like 30 per cent in the last few months.

This may not be general but there has been a significant decrease in trade at clubs and hotels, which are very important, as they create employment. I remind the Minister of Tourism that we in the Labor Party, too, have a responsible attitude to the consumption of alcohol. We believe that the working person and people on fixed incomes should have the opportunity to have the convivial glass and to do so without being imposed upon.

Mr Peterson: Taxed to death.

Mr SLATER: Taxed to death, I am reminded by the member for Semaphore. I know people on fixed incomes, elderly gentlemen who are pensioners and who do like to have the convivial glass, and if there is a further considerable increase in the price of beer and the price of liquor

generally those persons will be denied that opportunity. We on this side of the House have a responsible attitude to the consumption of alcohol, and we believe that the proposed increase exemplifies the Government's attitude—that the working person, the pensioner and people on fixed incomes will be priced out of the market.

As a consequence, the hotel, club and restaurant industry will be significantly affected and the employment of full-time and part-time employees in the hospitality industry will be placed at risk. Jobs will be lost. Yet the Minister claims the Liberal Party has a responsible attitude to alcohol. The measure, as I said in the first instance, is only a Government revenue raiser. Those who will pay are those people I referred to who do like to imbibe in the convivial glass, whether it be in a licensed or permit club, a hotel, restaurant or any other facility in the hospitality industry. They certainly will be seriously affected by this legislation.

I concur in the remarks that the member for Hanson made in 1974, that it is a slug on the worker. That is what the member for Hanson said when the then Government increased licence fees. I agreed with him on that occasion and I trust that he now agrees with me, that it is a tax on the ordinary person who likes to imbibe in liquor, whether it be at a particular club or in a hotel. The Opposition realises that this is a revenue-raising matter and that we are obliged to give the Bill our tentative support, but in principle we oppose it. I believe that the reduction in the fee for low-alcohol beverages is only a ruse or a trick so as to make the legislation a little more palatable to the community in general.

I understand that the revenue raised will be something like $2 000 000 per year, and that is a significant sum to be raised from the people in this State who indulge in the drinking of alcohol. We give the Bill our support, because it is a revenue-raising matter, but we are opposed to the principle on which the Bill has been introduced.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. The first point I want to make is that we all know why the licensing fee is worked out as it is; at least, I hope we do. It is calculated on the previous year's sales, and any licensee can make a calculation during the year of how much his fee is likely to be. The reason it is calculated on the previous year's figures relates to the Federal Constitution. Those who were here would remember that when we discussed the charges on those who sold tobacco we had to use the same process then, because otherwise it comes to be considered an excise. If you make a charge at the time of sale and fix your licence for the current year, you can encounter the difficulty of a challenge being made against it.

I remember sitting through a conference of both Houses on the tobacco measure, and I believe that it was the present Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I who came up with the suggestion that the same practice as that involving a hotel licence should be used. It is not a retrospective tax in that sense. The Leader of the Opposition knows that his allegation is not correct, and he knows why the present method is used. The other thing that amazes me is that the Leader of the Opposition said that a 1 per cent increase in the case of beer containing a normal amount of alcohol would result in a 2 cents increase in the cost of a schooner of beer, yet the member for Gilles read out the A.H.A.'s figures and said that a 7 per cent less tax on low-alcohol beer would result only in a 3 cents less charge for a schooner of beer. There is something wrong with those figures. I cannot see how 1 per cent extra makes it 2 cents a glass dearer, and yet 7 per cent less makes only a 3 per cent less charge for a schooner of beer. Somebody is wrong, either the A.H.A. or the Leader of the Opposition, and I am not sure which one it is.

The hotel, restaurant and club industry is not necessarily based totally on tourism, although it is to a large degree, and it is not true to say that tourism hangs its hat on alcohol, although it is part of the scene. Clubs, hotels and restaurants have had a tougher fight in selling alcohol, not just because of increased charges and random breath tests but also as a result of people's attitudes in the community. More families are now saying to friends, 'We'll have a barbecue at home', and so people meet in their homes, because the cost of dining out, largely because of the wages factor, whether it be for alcohol, soft drinks or food, is becoming prohibitive.

There is no doubt that an extra cost for alcohol could affect some people's attitudes to having one less schooner or butcher of beer. Under the Government's proposal, if people go on to low-alcohol drinks they can drink substantially more for the same amount. They have the opportunity to drink more and still not be as adversely affected as they would be by drinking beverages with a higher alcoholic content. Therefore, people have a choice. The Government is giving people an opportunity to move to a lower-alcohol beverage so that they do not risk their health and the life of someone else, for instance, when they are driving a motor car. That is not a bad idea, and I congratulate the Government for making that move.

It is true that the club industry has had a reduction in sales and that there is tougher competition, and there is no doubt that, because of the many more licences issued to clubs, the hotels have felt the pinch, and restaurants to a lesser degree. In many cases, hotels and clubs have redirected their attention not to selling more alcohol but to putting on other types of functions. Clubs, in particular, have taken on another role. I am President of two licensed clubs, both of which are reasonably large. We went through some tough times in recent days, but we have learnt that by redirection and better management it is possible to become more viable and to get people interested in other activities while still being able to make a profit. That is what a club is all about. It is not just a place where everybody goes and drinks alcohol. If that is what a club is developed for, I believe it is failing in its community responsibility.

I believe that, in the past, we may have directed too much of our activity in that area. If by Government legislation we can redirect that activity, make it more a community function and make clubs places where all sections of the community over the age of 18 can go and enjoy themselves, I think that we are moving in the right direction. I support the Bill. The member for Gilles referred to something said by the member for Hanson in 1974, but I never heard the member for Gilles or any of his colleagues complain that a 33⅓ per cent increase in tax was a slug, or refer to a 12½ per cent increase in this case for beer with a normal alcohol content, while in other areas there is a massive reduction.

If one averaged it out and people turned to drinking low-alcohol beer, there would be an overall reduction but not one member of the Labor Party, to my knowledge, ever said that the 33⅓ per cent increase, from 6 per cent to 8 per cent in 1974, was a slug on the worker. I never heard members opposite, with a handkerchief in hand and wiping tears from their eyes, mention the worker or the pensioner. Now, the member for Gilles is laughing, because he knows that when things are not the same they are different. We heard that said many times by someone who has now left the Parliamentary scene. I ask members of the Labor Party not to be hypocritical and to accept that a 12½ per cent tax increase after seven years is a reasonable increase and nowhere equal to the inflationary trend, and also to remember that it relates only to beer with a normal alcohol

content. In the other area, there has been a massive reduction from 8 per cent to 2 per cent.

Yet there has not been one word of credit for the Government's trying to redirect people's attitude to drinking a lower alcohol beverage so that they can drink for longer and still drive safely. To my knowledge, every member of the Labor Party supported random breath tests, because they said that a problem was involved and that we should attack that problem. If we are going to be genuine and honest about this matter, we should say that we do not like increasing the cost of goods but that the cost of running Government, and also the cost of running the Licensing Court, is more expensive, and that, as the inflationary trend since 1974 has been much more than 12½ per cent, this is a reasonable and modest increase for beer with the highest alcohol content.

Mr Slater: Go and tell the members of your club that.

Mr EVANS: I know that there will be complaints from people in clubs. If you raise the price of membership they complain. The membership fees of the clubs to which I belong have risen by more than 12½ per cent in the past seven years, because we had to manage the clubs, and we have had to tell members that that was the case. After two or three weeks they have admitted that they understand and that we are correct and recognise that, if you are to supply a service, you must make the charge. The same applies in this case. I think that this is a very moderate increase. I think that if the honourable member checks back he will find that there was an increase of 6 per cent in 1969 and that it was five years before his Party increased that by 33⅓ per cent. This Government is seeking a 12½ per cent increase after 7½ years, and as it applies to only part of the beverage area it is only a small percentage increase. I support the Bill.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I must mention the effect that this Bill will undoubtedly have on the cost of beer to consumers in this State. Beer is one item that has increased in price quite rapidly during the term of office of this Government.

Mr Slater: Five increases in 12 months.

Mr CRAFTER: As my colleague says, five increases in 12 months. There was an increase of 5 cents on a bottle of beer today, and we can anticipate another increase, as a result of this legislation, of 2 cents on a schooner glass of beer. It will be interesting to see whether or not the Prices Commissioner, when he investigates the proposed increase in the price of beer as a result of this legislation, sees this increase as justified. He found on an earlier occasion this year that it was not justified and reduced the price of beer.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Don't you give the Government credit for that?

Mr CRAFTER: The Minister may be interested to know that I asked the Premier on that occasion who would benefit financially from that decision of the Prices Commissioner. I asked whether it would be the consumers who overpaid for the beer during that period of over-charging, or whether it would be the manufacturers of that beer, the brewery. The Premier chose to ignore that question and to say that it was not a matter of Government responsibility at all. The Premier was quite erroneous in his answer because, of course, it is a Government responsibility. That is obviously why the Prices Commissioner has been vested with those powers. That money was money ripped off consumers as a result of official error and miscalculation by the various parties. It shows the ineffectiveness of that form of price control in our prices administration in this State. That was money that was paid, I suggest, in error by those consumers and money which should have been returned to them.

In fact, if we had the right to bring a class action, that would be a classic example where consumers would have had the ability to recover the money that they had paid in error for their beer. That money went towards the profits of the brewery, and the Government, through the Premier, stated that it was not its concern. That is one of the reasons why the consumers should have a right of class action or some other remedy in our courts. I do not for one minute believe that every consumer individually should be paid back those few cents, but that money should be passed on in the community interest for some purpose that would benefit that section of the community. In my question to the Premier I suggested that the thousands of dollars overpaid by consumers could be diverted to the activities of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board in this State. I look forward with interest to the adjudication of the Prices Commissioner when this matter comes before him.

I am very pleased to see that the Government has reduced the impost on the sale of low-alcohol beer. I referred to this matter in this House in the Budget debates about 18 months ago. At that time, the Victorian Government had brought down legislation similar to this Bill, and it is a shame that the Government has taken so long to decide that this measure is in the community interest. I suggest that the great majority of beer drinkers in this State drink in a responsible manner and do not over-consume. They are people who enjoy a glass of beer with their friends in a hotel, and the consumption of that beer is a minor aspect in their socialising with friends and relaxing after a day's work.

That activity has been part of our way of life since the very foundations of this State. It was one of the traditions that came with the early settlers in this State. When the Government introduces heavy imposts in that area of social life, concern is felt particularly by those members who represent the Australian Labor Party in this House, because many of our supporters are manual workers who have only this opportunity to relax and to socialise with their friends. This tax comes down unfairly on that section of the community.

Mr Becker: Many of our supporters are beer drinkers, too, you know.

Mr CRAFTER: Many of them have a greater ability to meet those imposts than do people on very minimum wages. I am most concerned about the deterioration of the State's licensing laws, and I am disappointed that this piece of taxation legislation (and that is substantially what it is, because in overall terms it will increase the taxing ability of this State) has overlooked some of the basic problems in respect of licensed premises in our community today. Since the 1966 Royal Commission, there has been a great change in trading patterns. Indeed, I suggest that the ability of some premises to cut-price liquor has brought about drastic changes in the delivery of this fundamental service.

At one stage I believe that we had an orderly distribution of licensed outlets from which a full range of services was provided. Not only did people have the ability to buy liquor over the bar or at the bottle department but also hotels provided dining-room and accommodation facilities, and many hotels also provided cabaret facilities and areas where families could socialise. Now we find that many of those services have deteriorated and new aspects of the provision of liquor have arisen. I have referred on numerous occasions in this House to the fact that this has resulted in conflicts in the community.

I refer in particular to the matters raised in a Government report that was brought down almost 12 months ago dealing with noise related to places of public entertainment, licensed and otherwise. This Bill could have provided an opportunity to redress some of the very real problems outlined clearly

in the report which must be solved urgently. The Government has once again overlooked the need for such legislation, or perhaps it has chosen not to address itself to this area.

Flagrant breaches of the Licensing Act are currently occurring. I refer, for instance, to the provision of alcohol with a *bona fide* meal. Consumers can now obtain alcohol outside the traditional trading hours, particularly in the early hours of Saturday and Sunday and through most of the day on Sunday. That is quite a common practice in this State. I suggest that the licensing laws are no longer effective in this regard and should be amended rapidly, otherwise the whole licensing system will fall. The Government has not seen this as an important aspect. I can only hope that a Bill will soon be introduced on this matter. The Bill before us is basically a taxation measure.

The member for Gilles referred to a letter to the editor about the Norwood Hotel, which is in my district. The proprietor of that hotel has raised a valid point with respect to the nature of the increase of 1 per cent in the licence fee. The Government must consider this matter. While it has been explained that this Bill is not a pure form of retrospectivity, I believe that it is retrospective legislation, and it will cause problems for the licensee in allowing in his budget for the payment of his licence fee. On the other hand, the reduction of the fee for the sale of low-alcohol beer will not follow that same path but will take effect in regard to some licences from 1 January 1982 and in regard to other licences from the point of renewal of the licence. So for a reduction in the sum owed to the State for some licences, that will apply some time in the future, and for an additional amount that has to be paid to the State, it will apply from a time in the past. That is a valid criticism, and it must be attended to in future amendments.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I listened with some interest to the comments made by the member for Fisher, who gave an explanation of the tobacco licensing system, which was quite elucidating, as were his mathematics on the price of a glass of beer. He explained how to run a club and tried to tell us that the Government has set itself up as the guardian of all who have a glass of ale in this State. That is very commendable if it is true. I suppose that the extra funds that are raised will go into a lucky dip for anyone who is caught over-imbibing, but I doubt whether that will happen. The honourable member also referred to the increase in tax in 1974 from 6 per cent to 8 per cent, and he stated that no voice was raised against that action. That may be true, but 1974 is a long time ago, and I do not see the relevance of comments made then to what applies today.

Previous speakers have referred to the effect that the increases in the price of liquor will have on different aspects of our community. There are real fears in the hospitality industry that have been explained by previous speakers. It is reported that trading is down some 20 to 30 per cent in some areas. Even tonight in the *News* a report states that beer prices are to jump by 5 cents a bottle. We cannot blame the Government for that, but it does increase the cost of having a drink. Why are the licencing fees being raised now? Is it to save lives? Let us read the statement made by the Minister of Transport on 19 November in the explanation of the Bill. He said:

> The Government is concerned with the carnage occurring on our roads and it is clear that alcohol is a contributing factor. However, the problem of alcohol abuse is much wider and includes health and social problems such as alcoholism, alcoholic illnesses such as brain damage and cirrhosis, drink-driving, family disruption, marital breakdowns and ultimately the costs of health and social problems to the community.

That is true. Alcohol does cause these problems. I do not think that the people who will be affected by these problems will stop because of the cost of a few extra cents, but the people who may be at a disadvantage from this tax, as has been mentioned, are other people on limited and set incomes. If it is to save lives, surely we have put a lot of effort into that aspect of legislation already in this Parliament. We are about to reduce the cost of L.A. Beer, which I think is a magnificent step. I did speak on that some time ago in this Parliament. I think it is a sensible and a logical step. I do not disagree with that at all.

Mr Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr PETERSON: Sorry to wake you up. We are about to deal with that legislation, and it does make sense. I do not dispute that. We have had random breath tests operating now for some months. There are varying opinions on whether they will be effective and whether they should have been introduced. I think the random breath testing legislation, for a short time, will be a very effective and good piece of legislation.

Noses will be put out of joint by it, but I believe it will save lives for a short period, and I support that. The effect of the legislation on the random breath testing has been referred to earlier tonight, and it has had effects. People are now considering how much they have had to drink. They are pacing themselves as to what they see as their capabilities and they are very apprehensive about driving under the influence of liquor. That is the good point about the tests.

However, I do not believe that that is really the point of the legislation before us. To me, it is a blatant tax upon the drinkers of this State. There is a limit to how much we can stop a person drinking by legislation such as random breath tests or other limits of that type, but to try to tax people out of drinking beer is ludicrous.

Mr Millhouse: Why?

Mr PETERSON: Because it does not work.

Mr Millhouse: Of course it will work if you put it up high enough.

Mr PETERSON: When has it done that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: Experience throughout the world has shown that even prohibition does not stop people from drinking.

Mr Millhouse: That's quite a different thing.

Mr PETERSON: I do not see how it is a different thing; if you put the price up, someone is going to make it. People can buy home brew kits and make it, which is much cheaper than buying it over the bar. I believe the sales of home brew kits have risen dramatically over the past few years. Obviously, to that extent it has an effect. Who says one does not get drunk on home brew? Who says it does not have an effect? I would think that some of the home brew I have had a sip of would have been at least as strong as you could buy over a bar at a hotel.

I do not think that has the effect of preventing people from drinking to excess. I do not know whether the home brew drinker is the man that we are really talking about regarding the problems referred to concerning alcoholic illnesses. I suppose some of those drink to excess, too, but that is not really the point. I do not believe we can tax people out of this. That does not work. Some of my constituents who enjoy a glass of beer have spoken to me about the increase in the cost of beer. I will quote them. They say this tax will be a mongrel of a tax.

Mr Millhouse: A what?

Mr PETERSON: A mongrel of a tax. That is their terminology.

Mr Millhouse: What do you mean by that?

Mr PETERSON: That is their terminology. I suppose mongrel means a lot of things in different places. When we refer to dogs, it means a cross breed of dog. When we refer to the law, we mean that it is not very tasteful at all.

The SPEAKER: I would be interested to know what clause the honourable member is referring to.

Mr PETERSON: I am sorry. I am just quoting what a constituent of mine said concerning the increase.

Mr Millhouse: He's a vet, you know; he may not like you saying things like that.

Mr PETERSON: I apologise if I have offended.

The SPEAKER: Now back to the Bill.

Mr PETERSON: Certainly, Sir. This sort of tax, as it has been referred to earlier, is one concerning people who are on fixed or limited incomes. It taxes the battler. I suppose a lot of people in this place have never had a bead of work sweat or of perspiration on them.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Thank you very much.

Mr PETERSON: I said I supposed they would not appreciate the true joy of a glass of beer.

Mr Lewis: Is all this supposition?

Mr PETERSON: No. I have had a bead or two there. This Bill penalises the pensioner on a fixed income. Many pensioners enjoy a glass of beer. They are human beings, even though sometimes they get lost in the rush now. We hear bottled beer will be going up 5 cents and it seems that there will be more with this tax. The hospitality industry and the employment in that industry are going to be affected, because as sales go down there will be fewer jobs.

Mr Slater: That's right. It will be $1 a schooner in a casino.

Mr PETERSON: If we ever get a casino, we may have to pay $1 a glass. This is a sly tax, when one thinks about it. It is a sly way of taxing for more money, a few extra dollars, from the people of this State who enjoy a glass of beer. I understand it is a money Bill and part of the Budget and it is accepted that we do not vote against it. One does not like it, but one does not vote against it.

I would like to quote what the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, said in 1979 regarding taxes. I do think this is a tax rather than anything else, as I have said. The Premier said:

> I am totally opposed to higher taxes and I am sure you are, too. The Liberal Party would not impose double taxation. We have no plans for a new State tax. More tax will not make this State great again. It will destroy it. A Liberal Government will cut State taxation and we can afford to do it. Our tax cuts have been carefully costed.

Obviously, this was not costed, because about $2 000 000 extra that will be raised was missed out in the calculation of that tax. I understand that we do not vote against a Budget or money Bills like this.

Mr Millhouse: If you want to vote against it, vote against it.

Mr PETERSON: Well, I oppose it. I think it is a terrible piece of legislation.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I only want to speak for a short time on this Bill. I can only remember too well the policy speech of the Premier concerning taxes during the course of his term of Government, which I must say will not be very long. Now things have come home to roost. When other members have spoken on a similar Bill in this House have all said the same thing. They did not want to do anything about it. They have all twisted around the opposite way now.

I know people who run a Government have to make money and, as the Premier said, times have definitely changed, as times in any other field have changed. However, five increases in the price of beer within two years is something that the Labor Government did not impose. Also, application had to be made to the Prices Commissioner to be able to increase the price. Times have definitely changed and the worker is being hit all the time. In the case of beer, as other members have mentioned, there is a time when there is an end to something and somebody has to go without. After work these days, people will find that, with the breathalyser, the risk of driving under the influence has played its part. Under this system, people must lose jobs. Anyone who speaks to those operating hotels or cabarets or places like that concerning the increases in prices finds that those places are falling away and many places are putting off staff. I know of one hotel that has lost twenty 18-gallon kegs a week. That is in a working area.

Mr Lewis: Where is that?

Mr LANGLEY: The Tonsley Park Hotel; members can check on it if they want to, but that is exactly what has happened. Twenty eighteens is a lot and someone must pay the penalty. This legislation will not help in any way at all. I thought that the Government of the day was keen to help these people. The liquor trade may be really big business, but little hotels are small businesses and they are the ones I thought the Government would try to keep going, but the small hotels are moving away.

I think there are three types of drinker. I do not know what category I would put myself in, but I usually go to hotels and have a drink and I have noticed the falling away in the number of drinkers at hotels. Hotels just cannot afford that. I refer to people who, after a hard day's work, go to a hotel. I am not saying that the Minister does not have a hard day's work, as she mentioned tonight.

Mr Millhouse: She goes home and has a few grogs?

Mr LANGLEY: Yes. There is another type, namely, the worker who goes along and has a social drink with his friends after work, but I notice that that used to be every night and has now dropped to about three nights a week. Then there is the type of person who has an expense account, and these people are a little different to other people, in that they can write the amount off. I am talking not about the Minister in this case but about business men.

Mr Millhouse: The sort that go to the Cremorne?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not know whether they do, but they buy their beer and different things and entertain people, and it costs them almost nothing.

Mr Millhouse: Or the Waverley?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not know. I do not know where the member for Mitcham goes; probably to the Torrens Arms, only a stone's throw away.

Mr Millhouse: That is the closest one.

Mr LANGLEY: I have not seen him there but I will check in his district. Last, but not least, I refer to the general movement of people towards making their own brews. I must admit that some of it is good and some not so good. I am not an expert. I have a drink at a hotel, but when one has a friendly drink with someone one takes what is offered and then gives an opinion, but I am not a connoisseur. Over many years, people have moved into the home brew area, some of which has been very good.

I refer also to what is called super and standard; super is the real stuff and standard is low alcohol, the same as one gets from a petrol station. I must admit that the introduction of low-alcohol beer has been very helpful and from what I have read today it appears that it is to go down in price, I think by about 7 cents a bottle; in any case, there must be a difference in how the breweries make it, because I do not think the breweries would give that much away. As members probably know, the beer at Football Park and the Adelaide Oval is low-alcohol beer. This was brought about by the Minister saying that it was to be cheaper, but we have been waiting a long time for that. I

hope that draught beer also will be cheaper. Low-alcohol beer is the same price at the Adelaide Oval and is probably the same price at other places, owing to the fact that such places have extra charges through licensing fees and employment of casual labour and things like that. Generally, these costs are higher, not cheaper.

I have considered each side of the argument. The provisions will not help people on fixed incomes, and it is about time that the Government made decisions on the right angle. Whether it involves an increase of 12 per cent, 6 per cent or 4 per cent, whatever the percentage, the fact is that it is just not going over, and it is about time the Government considered what was said in its policy speech, namely, 'No increase in taxes', said the Premier, and he also stated 'Taxes are not part of our policy'. Can Government members now hold up their heads on the score of what the Minister said? This tax is hitting not people with money, but those on fixed incomes.

As the member for Norwood has said, I hope that the matter can go before the Prices Commissioner, and that more consideration can be given to the matter. There is no fairer way. When one wanted to obtain an increase, one had to go to the Prices Commissioner, which I think helps people, especially those in the trade, to know that the Prices Commissioner is the man who says 'Yes', but when the Government does it, it is a totally different matter.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Tourism): This has been an interesting debate, mainly in respect of the fact that the Opposition appears to have missed the principal point and purpose of this Bill, namely, that it is very much a preventive health measure. It seems to me that the member for Fisher and the member for Semaphore were the only members who recognised that and gave the Government credit for it. I should lay to rest an allegation that was made by several Opposition speakers. That is the allegation that this Bill is a money Bill. It is not a money Bill. The definition of money Bills is contained in section 60 of the Constitution Act. It is to be strictly construed and does not apply to this Bill. If the Opposition is opposing this Bill, but not voting against it because it claims that it is a money Bill, then it is failing to vote against it on false pretences, because it is not a money Bill.

Mr Slater: It is a Budget measure; it is in the Budget.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is not a Budget measure. It is not a money Bill. Not even technically is it a money Bill. It does not accord with the definition of a money Bill as outlined in section 60 of the Constitution Act. The other principal theme of Opposition speakers was that it was a taxation Bill. The motives of the Government in introducing this Bill were identical to those of the Victorian Government when it introduced similar legislation, and those motives are clearly outlined in the second reading explanation.

I refer honourable members to the fact that the Government is concerned about the carnage on the road. It is clear that alcohol is a contributing factor to it, and the Government recognises that, if we can encourage people to drink alcohol with a lower alcoholic content, we are likely to perform a very great service in the form of a preventative health measure.

The report of the Select Committee recommended that this measure be taken, yet I think only one speaker on the Opposition benches (certainly the member for Fisher did) acknowledged that fact, and also acknowledged the fact that the Government was accepting the advice of the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee, which, I think all honourable members would agree, is not a committee that is in any way concerned with revenue; it is concerned with public health. It was the advice of that committee that changes should be made to allow the sale of wine with less than the then required 8 per cent by volume of alcohol. That is the principal purpose of this Bill and that is what it achieves.

Several comments and allegations that have been made cannot be substantiated. Much was made of the effect of Government actions upon the hotel trade. I think that no Government has done more for the hospitality industry through its initiatives in tourism than this Government has done, and I believe that the hotel trade recognises those initiatives and appreciates them. The member for Gilles dealt at some length with the effect of the legislation on licensed clubs and he claimed that the licence fees had been increased in a way that was not justified. I point out to the member for Gilles that in an amendment to the Licensing Act last year, Bill No. 78 of 1980, the base of licensing was changed. That came into operation in December 1980 and that change meant that the annual total sales allowed for these clubs was increased from $25 000 to $50 000.

Mr Slater: So what?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That means that the club can sell a considerably greater amount of liquor before it is subject to those licences. The clubs have doubled their turnover and that has to be seen in the context of a licence fee which by no means is a heavy increase. The member for Gilles described the lowering of the fees for low-alcohol wine as a ruse and a trick. That simply is without foundation. There is nothing he can say that can in any way demonstrate that that is the case. If the honourable member reads the Minister's second reading explanation, he will see that the Government's purpose in introducing this legislation is clearly outlined. The market for low-alcohol beer may indeed be a small proportion of the market at the moment.

The whole purpose of this legislation is to increase the proportion of low-alcohol beer as a percentage of the market and, in doing so, to decrease the likelihood of carnage on the roads, of anti-social behaviour in clubs and licensed premises, and of the health-related effects of alcohol. We are all very well aware of the adverse effects that an excessive intake of alcohol can have.

There was also an allegation that there is a retrospective component in this Bill. The House should be clearly aware that fees are paid in equal quarterly payments in April, July, October and January. Last year they were receiving 3½ months notice of this proposed increase. Certainly, the quarterly fees are calculated on purchases for the year ending the preceding 30 June, but this is not retrospectivity. It is merely a method of calculation that has been adopted by all States since 1963. Therefore, I think it is hypocritical of the Opposition on the one hand to say that it does not support the Bill, and on the other hand to say that it does not oppose it because it is a money Bill. I recommend to the Leader that he study section 60 of the Constitution Act, and I recommend to all members on the Opposition side that they take heed of the legislative and administrative acts which any responsible Government must undertake if it is to reduce total consumption of alcohol and encourage responsible use of alcohol.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Constitution of Licensing Court.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10—Leave out this clause.

Mr BANNON: I thank the Minister for her explanation of the reason why she moves to leave out the clause. I hope she says a little more than that she moves it, because this matter was canvassed in another place. Frankly, I am amazed at the pettiness of the Government in insisting on

moving this amendment in this place. It is really a petty act, because there is no great issue of principle involved in this. It is an extremely practical and reasonable matter. It was raised in another place and it was carried after debate in another place.

I would have thought that that was an end to the matter, but the Government wants to try to get its pound of flesh in this and it is moving it without explanation. If no-one on this side was prepared to comment, the Minister would have just let it go through, knocked the thing out, and that was an end to it. We are owed much more than that and I imagine the Minister is going to say something soon, but really it is quite petty.

What is involved in this? We have a Licensing Court judge who must retire at age 65. The provision has been in the Act since 1967. It was inserted in the Act at a time when general retiring ages were being introduced, but there were no retiring ages for Local and District Court judges or Supreme Court judges.

Mr Millhouse: Yes, there were.

Mr BANNON: In 1967? The member may know differently, but my information is that there were no retiring ages for the Local and District Criminal Court judges. In any case, the member for Mitcham thinks there were for Supreme Court judges at that time. Since then, retiring ages have been introduced for Supreme Court judges, and they certainly apply for District and Criminal Court judges. That retiring age is 70 years. The issue here, as was well pointed out by my colleague in another place when this matter was debated, is not whether the retiring age should be 65 or 70, or whether a person is capable at either of those ages.

The Minister in another place, I thought, quite extraordinarily, kept trying to remind my friend of Labor Party principle on this matter. He really thought it important that his interpretation of it be written into the Bill. That is not the issue. The issue is, I believe, a much clearer and simpler one than that. If we are going to be talking about the retiring age for all judges, let us talk about that. Let us discuss whether it be 70 years or 65 years, but the facts are that, with the exception of the industrial Commissioners, which came in an Act in 1966 in any case and has traditionally been look at separately, and this Licensing Court position, there is a 70 years retiring age. It also happens that the incumbent of the Licensing Court judgeship also carries a commission in the District Court. In other words, the incumbent is entitled to go to the age of 70 as a judge, come what may. That is the situation as we see it.

It makes a lot of sense for that judge to have a commission in the District Court, because there may well be occasions on which an extra judge is needed in that jurisdiction, his Licensing Court work has been disposed of, and he can help out in that jurisdiction. Again, that is quite a proper and rational way to organise, but it so happens that we have a specialist of long standing, Judge Grubb, in this particular position at the moment. What the Government proposes to do with this judge (but we suggest it goes beyond that, which is why an amendment to the Act is justified) is to relieve him of his duties in the Licensing Court, by insisting on this amendment, and transfer him across full time to the District Court for the remaining five years.

That means that the knowledge and expertise which this individual has, that his experience in the jurisdiction, that the indeed high regard in which he is held by all the parties in a fairly complicated jurisdiction, all of those values and qualities will be lost. Why? Why does the Government wish to do it? It seems to me that the only reason why it wants to do it is that it was moved by the Opposition in another place. It did not think of it in the context of this Bill, but the Act was open and perhaps representations have been made to the Government; I do not know. If they had been, obviously the Government did not respond to what was a fairly simple and practical suggestion.

So, the Opposition took it up at the behest of a number of people in the industry, from all sides of the industry. We looked at it and we realised that, indeed, there was an anomaly here. In this case, that anomaly could easily be corrected. If at some time in the future the retiring age for judges is lowered to 65 years, 60 years, whatever, so be it. It is not the age on which we are concentrating in general terms: it is the sheer practicality and the consistency of the Licencing Court judge. What could the Minister in another place think of to answer that? The member for Fisher is briefing the Minister at the moment, so obviously we will get some sort of reply.

However, I will be surprised if the member for Fisher is going to indulge in the pettiness that has produced this amendment in this place. I should have thought that he knew a little more about the jurisdiction than that. I would excuse the Minister, because it is not her field, but surely the member for Fisher, who has had some experience in the hospitality industry and who is interested in the matters affecting it, would know that what I am saying is correct. This very simple amendment will satisfy everyone in the industry. It does not create an anomaly or a special precedent, but simply recognises a fact of life, namely, that the services of a specialist judge will be lost to the specialisation for the final five years of his career, whether it be Judge Grubb or anyone else, unless the ages are brought into line. As I say, the Minister in another place, battling hard to think up reasons why he should oppose it, said, 'Well, I have it, here is one. It is a very strenuous jurisdiction. You have to fly around in airplanes—

Mr Millhouse: You can't inspect the loos.

Mr BANNON: One must inspect public unrinals, and the shock of a 67-year-old man confronted with a public urinal might be too much to bear. The argument was so ridiculous as not to be really worth canvassing. We felt the matter having been thrashed out in another place and carried (admittedly against the opposition of the Government) that it could reflect on it and say, 'Let it pass'. But in no way did that happen. With its petty, mean-minded, irrelevant approach, the Government is going to waste the time of all of us in trying to reinsert the existing age limit back into the Bill. It makes no sense in principle or in practicality. Really, I think it would be better if the Minister said, 'Look, let us not proceed with it.'

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! By way of clarification, a proposed amendment has been distributed, but the honourable Minister is not moving an amendment.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister is just opposing the clause. I raise this for clarification. I ask any member who wishes to speak to the clause to do so before the question, namely, 'that the clause stand as printed' is put.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise to speak in support of this clause. The Leader of the Opposition has described as petty the action that the Government is about to take in handling this matter. I think that that is entirely correct, but it goes much further than that. I think that it is a particular shabby act that this Government is about to attempt to perpetrate. The fact of the matter, as has been pointed out, is that His Honour Judge Grubb is held in the highest esteem by all persons who have appeared before him. He is held in the highest esteem by members of the Australian Hotels Association, by restaurateurs in South Australia, by the legal profession, and by the community at large.

Mr Bannon: And by the Liquor Trades Union, too.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Indeed, he is held in high esteem by the Liquor Trades Union, also. There is not one branch of this particularly complex and difficult industry that does not hold this judge in the highest regard. I say that from my experience as Attorney-General, as a member of the legal profession and as someone who has had wide contact with these people over a number of years. There would not be one person who would deny that fact. Why, then, is this Government going to these lengths, these extraordinary measures, to endeavour to have him retired, not from the bench at large, not from his judicial duties generally, but specifically out of the licensing area? That is a strange situation indeed. There is a reason and I will come to it in a moment.

Judge Grubb has had very wide experience in the Licensing Court. No other person in South Australia knows more about the licensing area than His Honour: there is no person who knows more about it. Not only does Judge Grubb know a lot about it but also his experience has enabled him to bring a degree almost of respectability to an area which previously (and this is no reflection on his predecessors, I might say) was an area in which there were often difficulties.

Mr Millhouse: There was nothing wrong with Laurie Johnston.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, I am not reflecting on him in the least. However, I think that His Honour Judge Grubb has handled this difficult area in an excellent fashion—recognised by all as such. I know that he is not anxious at this stage in his career to retire from this jurisdiction. If he has the opportunity I am quite confident that Judge Grubb will seek to go on for another five years. Why, then, is this Government so anxious to ensure that Judge Grubb retires? Others in the House or in the Parliament may know the reasons. So far, no-one has had what I consider to be the guts to say so. The fact of the matter is that the Government is not so anxious to get rid of Judge Grubb as it is to put another in his place. That is the reason. It is particularly unfortuntate that the Government has chosen to do that. I believe that it is the Government's intention to appoint as the judge in the Licencing Court the current head of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, Mr Noblett. I may be proved entirely incorrect in that, but that is certainly the talk of the department at present.

Mr Slater: I think you might have struck the jackpot.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not know whether or not that is correct. All I am saying is that that is definitely the talk of the department, and I believe that there is some truth in that. It may be that I am entirely incorrect. My friend Mr Noblett is sitting in the gallery—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! No reference is to be made to the gallery.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am not permitted to refer to the gallery. However, I believe there is some truth in that statement. It is unfortunate that it seems that one particularly excellent judge seems to be being pushed sideways, as it were, in the circumstances. The Licensing Court is an area that requires a particularly delicate approach, and Judge Grubb, throughout his career in that jurisdiction, has shown that he is able to bring that delicacy to the work. He has been able to mould all the competing interests into a reasonably harmonious group. One does not find in South Australia widespread complaints from one area of the industry against other areas. One does not find the retail liquor outlets complaining about the hotels. One does not find restaurants complaining about the hotels, or the hotels complaining too much in general terms against the other sections of the industry.

That is in marked contrast to the situation that exists in some other States of Australia where various sectors of the liquor industry fight tooth and nail with each other for licences and for the business. His Honour, in my view, has been an important factor in bringing the various sectors of the industry together and in creating a degree of harmony, which, as I have said, does not exist elsewhere. It would be a tragedy for South Australia if he was retired prematurely. As I have said, it will be a premature retirement because, of course, Judge Grubb can go on in the Local and District Criminal Court jurisdication until he is 70 years of age.

I might say, on the point of which particular jurisdictions are more or less arduous, that as a Local and District Criminal Court Judge he would be in the situation of having to preside over jury trials. From my observations of work on the bench, that task is a good deal more difficult in terms of the physical labour, stress and tension involved, than possibly the work in the Licensing Court. I think that all sectors of the licensing industry would be very anxious to see Judge Grubb able to continue for, I understand, a little over five years. I hope that the Government will not be so silly and so petty as to proceed on its current course, and that it sees the wisdom of what the Opposition is putting to the Parliament tonight.

I believe that if the Government does continue on its current course it will lose quite a degree of credibility in the community and particularly with those people who are part of the liquor industry. For those reasons, I hope that the Minister will take advice from the Minister of Consumer Affairs' officers, or others, and will change this course, on which I realise she has set out under instructions. I hardly imagine that she realised, when she set out on this course, the implications of it. I certainly hope that the Minister will take steps to reverse the course that has been set upon.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I was hoping that the Minister would rise and give some explanation, but apparently she has none.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Russack): Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: The member for Elizabeth quite bowled me over with the suggestion that Mr Michael Noblett is to be the new Licensing Court Judge. I must say that that had not occurred to me, nor have I heard it around the traps. It may or may not be so. However, may I say that, whether that appointment would be good or not, and whether it is likely or unlikely, I support this clause. I agree by and large, with the reasons give by the Leader. Let me just tell him that the retiring ages for Supreme Court judges came in, I think, in the 1940s and it was at that time that they were given superannuation. There was, in 1965 or 1966 when the Licensing Act was overhauled, one Local Court judge (who was really a glorified magistrate), who retired at 65 years of age. I think that it was probably because he was the only comparable figure that 65 years was made the age for the Licensing Court judge to retire in those days. However, that is history now.

When I introduced amendments to the Local Courts Act and when we set up the intermediate jurisdiction of the Local and District Criminal Court we fixed the age of 70 years for retirement for those judges, as for Supreme Court judges. There was one other comparable figure, that applying to the President of the Industrial Court. I can remember speaking to the then President of the Industrial Court and asking whether he would like his age of retirement raised to 70 years. He said that he did not want that to happen, so we did not touch that retiring age. So, I think the retiring age remains at age 65 years for the President of the Industrial Court. The generally accepted age now for retirement of judges is 70 years; there is no doubt about that.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That was as a result of the referendum.

Mr MILLHOUSE: That is the age now, as the member for Elizabeth implied by interjection, of retirement for High Court judges; that was fixed after a referendum. It is to me patently absurd that the Licensing Court judge should retire from that position at 65 years of age and then, for the last five years of his career (if he has been appointed as a Local Court Judge, as is the custom), that he should do (with very great respect to the Licensing Court work) more important and onorous work in Local Court and the District Criminal Court. It is an absurd thing to do.

When the idea of this amendment was put to me informally by my colleague in another place, I thought that it was a damn good idea and suggested that he should support it. He did that, and that is why it got through. I am certainly very much of the same mind. It is an anomally for the Licensing Court judge to retire five years earlier than other judges, and that anomaly is compounded in this case if the idea is that His Honour Judge Grubb should retire from that position and go on as a Local Court judge. That is unthinkable, and I, too, am surprised. I do not rub this in as much as did the Leader, but I am surprised at the Government persisting in trying to take this amendment out of the Bill.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government opposes this clause, and I am happy to explain to the House the reasons why. It seems that we are at least all agreed on one thing, namely, that Judge Grubb is held in universal esteem. He is regarded by the legal profession, the liquor industry, the Government and the Opposition, and even by the Australian Democrats it seems, as being pre-eminent in his field. I want to make quite clear to the Committee that nothing in the Government's attitude to this clause should be taken in any way whatsoever as reflecting on the capacity of Judge Grubb. As I have said, the Government holds him in the highest esteem. We are opposing this clause because it involves an alteration to the terms and conditions of appointment of Licensing Court judges on an *ad hoc* basis.

The Leader said that it was a petty act to oppose this. It is interesting that the Leader says that he has been approached by members of the industry, because I am advised by the Minister that he has not had one approach by any one who wishes the retiring age of judges in the Licensing Court to be increased to 70 years. Let us recognise that the Act as it stands, and as it stood for a long time during the term of the previous Government, provides for a retirement age of 65 years. An amendment has been agreed to in the Upper House to increase that retiring age to 70 years. I think that it is unwise to alter terms and conditions of retirement of judges or, indeed, of any other appointee on an *ad hoc* basis in respect of a certain individual, notwithstanding the outstanding qualities of that individual.

The Leader virtually recognised that when he said that the Industrial Commission, where the retiring age is 65 years, traditionally had been looked at separately. I refer the Leader to the debates in 1969, when the retirement age for judges in the Local and District Criminal Court was fixed at 70 years to bring it into line with the retiring age of Supreme Court judges. The debate then indicated that the provision for retiring age for Industrial Court and Licensing Court judges was to be kept separate because of the specialised nature of those courts.

It has already been stated that the two-tier retirement age for the Supreme Court and the Local and District Criminal Court judges as distinct from the Licensing Court and the Industrial Court judges is based on the special nature and duties of judges in these courts. The arduous physical work, including the travel, attached to the Licensing Court is reflected in the age of 65 years.

Mr Millhouse: District Criminal Courts judges go on circuit.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: We have stated that the work of the judges of the various courts is distinctly difficult. It was recognised as such when the ages were set for the respective courts, and none of those distinctive differences has altered since that time. It is interesting to note the different attitudes of the Australian Democrats and the Australian Labor Party: their attitudes have apparently altered, notwithstanding that the situation has not altered. The Labor Party when in Government made no move to amend the age for the Licensing Court judges, although it had ample time to do so.

Mr Bannon: The matter never arose.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Leader says that the matter never arose. The fact is that there was ample time in which to alter that Act, but the Labor Party when in Government chose not to do so.

Mr Bannon: We were not confronted with the question. You have been.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: One is always confronted with a matter of principle. As the Leader has said, the matter rests on principle. The Opposition has simply not addressed the fact that it is not proper nor appropriate to make *ad hoc* changes to the retiring age of judges on the basis that a Bill happens to come before Parliament at a time when a judge who is pre-eminent in his field is almost due for retirement. The Government opposes the clause. Any allegation by the member for Elizabeth that the Government is anxious to get rid of Judge Grubb is entirely refuted and absolutely without foundation.

Mr Slater: He didn't say that.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I believe that a reference to *Hansard* will indicate that the member for Elizabeth alleged that the Government is anxious to get rid of Judge Grubb. That is most certainly not the case. I reject entirely that quite unnwarranted slur on the Government's attitude in respect of this clause. We oppose it for the very good reason that judges in different courts perform specialised duties, and those duties are reflected in the different retiring ages. We believe that it is inappropriate to alter that retiring age on an *ad hoc* basis, and we do not propose to accept the advice of the Opposition that the clause should be supported. We oppose the clause.

Mr BANNON: I do not want unduly to prolong the debate. Obviously, the Minister is not prepared to listen to any reason in this matter. Her comments were fairly pathetic and irrelevant, because she did not address herself to the question. She talked about an *ad hoc* decision. This is not *ad hoc*: it changes the situation and corrects an anomaly. We made clear that that anomaly exists. No case has been made for the so-called strenuous nature or difference of duties. The fact that action was not taken by a previous Government is not relevant: I do not think that this matter was ever directly addressed by Government or Opposition amendment. If it had been, we would have directed our attention to it.

All the points that were made by the Minister fall against the fact that this House is now considering an amendment that has been made after due discussion and debate in another place. The arguments for this action are good, both in relation to Judge Grubb and in terms of his particular skills. That is a kind of bonus, if you like. Equally important (more important, I would argue) is the fact that we are correcting an anomaly. We are recognising that a judge who has been acting in a specialist jurisdiction should be able to finish his career in that specialist jurisdiction, unless he is transferred or chooses to transfer, to the retiring age of 70 years for which that judge holds a commission. It is

a simple matter, and involves the correction of an anomly that has been brought before the House for the first time on this occasion, as far as I am aware. Why cannot the Government bend a little?

Mr CRAFTER: I was quite surprised to hear the Minister say that the appropriate Minister in another place had indicated that he had received no representation from the industry on this matter, and therefore he refused to accede to the requests of the Opposition Parties. I would have thought that fundamental to this important matter, as the Minister told us in the earlier debate on this Bill, there would have been some consultation with the industry. Will the Minister say what consultation took place with the industry before this important decision was made?

South Australia is a small State. We have one judge only to practise in this complicated jurisdiction, and it is very important that the hisory of the development of licensing laws in this State is fully grasped so that the law can be applied as well as possible. To say that this is an *ad hoc* decision is completely false, because it is an approach towards uniformity of the retirement age for judges. That has been evidenced by the Federal referendum, which was carried by a vast majority of people, to bring about a similar retiring age for judges of the High Court. To say that the duties vested in the Licensing Court judge are onerous is ludicrous in the extreme. Who would have told Sir Mellis Napier that at 65 years of age he was getting too old to be the Chief Justice of this State?

Mr Millhouse: It was hard enough to tell him that when he was 84 years old.

Mr CRAFTER: Exactly, and then he wanted to carry on as the Lieutenant-Governor. Who would have told Sir Garfield Barwick that at 65 years of age he could not continue on in the High Court? Many advocates of the role that those two gentlemen played in the life of the Judiciary of this country would say that their better years came after the age of 65. Other people such as I would probably disagree with that. Nevertheless, the history of the Judiciary throughout the common law world has been one of great wisdom and dedication to duty, and great public service by men who were very advanced in years. I see no merit in the argument that has been advanced by the Minister tonight.

One can only conclude, as the member for Elizabeth has concluded, that there is some sinister motive in the Government's approach to this matter. I would be very pleased if the Minister would deny the suggestion made by the member for Elizabeth that there is some sinister motive in this matter, because if this Bill is carried into law and if the services of the current judge in this jurisdiction are disposed of, I assure the Minister and the Committee that the Opposition will vet very carefully the next appointment that is made in this jurisdiction and every decision that is made by that judicial officer, as well as the representations that are made by the Government in that jurisdiction that will affect the licensing laws of this State.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I do not know whether the member for Norwood was in the Chamber earlier, but I certainly rejected totally any suggestion by the member for Elizabeth that there is any malice aforethought whatsoever in this matter. In addition, it should be made clear that, in terms of consultation with the industry, the Government did not contemplate any change whatsoever to the Act as it stands in respect of the retiring age of judges, nor did it receive any representations from anyone, I am advised, to alter that retiring age for the Licensing Court judge which stands at 65 years.

I am also advised that no representation has been received since an amendment was moved in the other place. I repeat that the Government's attitude is quite consistent in recognising the separate and specialised nature of both the Industrial Commission and the Licensing Court. It would be interesting to know whether in the Industrial Commission the Opposition is going to propose any alteration to the age.

Mr Bannon: It's not relevant.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Leader of the Opposition says that it is not relevant. It is interesting that he says that the age is not relevant concerning one court compared with another, but it may well be that the position regarding the Industrial Commission will come before the Parliament at some time, and I will be very interested to hear what the Opposition's attitude to that may be. Recognition has already been given by the Parliament in respect of both these jurisdictions that 65 is the appropriate age for retirement. The Government does not propose to in any way alter that, and therefore we oppose the clause as it stands.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs L. M. F. Arnold, Corcoran, Hamilton, and McRae. Noes—Messrs Allison, Billard, Evans, and Tonkin.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 4—'Licence fees.'

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber. It would greatly assist if members would refrain from talking. I understand the honourable member for Semaphore wishes to address himself to clause 4.

Mr PETERSON: The Minister said there was a recommendation that the tax on the normal-alcohol-level beer should be increased, and I wish to clarify that point. I understand that the Select Committee on Random Breath Testing stated that a lower level of State taxes should apply to low-alcohol beverages to encourage their consumption. As I read this clause now, we have lowered it and we have also increased the tax level on full-strength beer. That is an extension to the recommendation of the Select Committee. How does the Minister justify this?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am not entirely sure that I heard everything that the honourable member said, but he is correct in saying that the report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the assessment of random breath testing recommended that the licences for low-alcohol liquor be reduced. It was stated on page 20 of the report by the committee that a lower level of State taxes should apply for low-alcohol beverages to encourage lower blood alcohol levels for the same amount of liquor consumed. I gather that the burden of the honourable member's question was whether the committee also said that a higher level should apply for normal alcohol beverages, and the answer is 'No', it did not, but needless to say, in implementing the recommendation of the Select Committee, the Government recognised that it was necessary to cover a short-fall in revenue from the newly reduced low-alcohol fees and in doing so to bring South Australian fees into line with those of other States. That is what this clause does.

Mr PETERSON: As I understand it, this will result in an increase in taxation to the State of some $2 000 000.

There is a reduced tax payable for low-alcohol beer; is there any estimate on what the difference would be between the estimated $2 000 000 increase and what is actually lost because of the lower taxation on l.a. beer?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The increased revenue will be in the order of $750 000. Does that answer the honourable member's question?

Mr PETERSON: What I am getting at is what will be the actual revenue from the increased tax, as against the loss in revenue from the reduced tax?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: If the percentage licence fee for normal alcohol liquor is increased by 1 per cent, that is from 8 per cent to 9 per cent, the extra revenue, based on 1981 figures, would be $1 720 000. This amount would be reduced by $120 000 due to the rebate on low-alcohol liquor. Therefore, the net increase in revenue to the State would be approximately $1 600 000 for a full year. However, allowing for a proposed change to the definition of gross amount paid or payable, it can be expected that the additional revenue for a full year will be $2 000 000. This represents an additional $750 000 revenue during the financial year 1981-1982, that is, three-eighths of $2 000 000.

Mr SLATER: What method will be adopted to ensure that low-alcohol liquor is actually dispensed? There is a fairly distinct difference now between the two types of beer; 9 per cent is payable on full-strength liquor, and 2 per cent is payable on low-alcohol liquor. What method will be adopted to ensure that the proprietor of premises, a club, hotel or whatever it might be is actually dispensing low-alcohol or high-alcohol beer, particularly when it comes to the dispensing of draught beer?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The situation will be monitored by the department and will be controlled, of course, by the penalties that are provided under sections 33 and 197 of the Act. Anyone who sells liquor that is not in accordance with the Act and the licence will be liable for a first offence penalty of not less than $50 and not more than $200, and for a subsequent offence, a penalty of not less than $100 and not more than $400. The department will monitor the situation, I presume, by the inspection of hotels.

Mr SLATER: I still think that it will cause some administrative difficulties for the licensing branch. In a question asked by a member here last week it was alleged that the practice is happening now, and it is likely to happen even more because of the large price differential between the two types of beer. I believe that even though penalties are included in the Act they may not be a sufficient deterrent to some unscrupulous proprietors wanting to take advantage of the large differential that will exist after this legislation comes into effect.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am advised that the kegs are distinguishable by a different marking, and I imagine that the customers will become aware of not only the different marking but also the different taste; not having tasted either variety, I am not in a position to identify how distinctive the difference is. The Government recognises that this type of differentiation creates an opportunity that could be exploited by unscrupulous publicans. It is certainly the responsibility of the department, by careful monitoring and inspection to ensure that that does not occur. That monitoring will be rigorously pursued, and anyone who attempts to sell low-alcohol beer and charge the price for high-alcohol beer will be prosecuted under the Act and will receive penalties accordingly.

Mr PETERSON: First, I want to explain to the Minister that kegs are not now seen in hotels; I have been into a hotel recently and the kegs are not in the bar any more but are down in the cellar. To clarify the Minister's previous answer, will she agree that the real effect of this legislation will be that drinkers in this State will pay $2 000 000 additional taxes?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: At no stage has the Government attempted to deny that revenue will be increased as a result of this measure: at the same time, I have made quite clear that the purpose of introducing the measure was, if you like, as a preventive health measure. We believe that it will achieve that purpose, and the revenue that results from that is incidental to the principal purpose.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Permit for supply of liquor at club.'

Mr SLATER: I refer to a comment that the Minister made in her reply to the second reading debate in regard to the increase in the amount that permit clubs can now take in turnover, from $25 000 to $50 000, before they have to obtain a full licence. Does the Minister believe that the gross turnover of a club bears a relationship to the fee for a club permit? I suggest to the Minister that a small club might turn over for a 12-month period only $9 000 or $10 000, whereas another club could turn over $48 000 or $49 000, just under the maximum allowed. However, I believe that such clubs would still pay the same fee, namely, $300, to obtain a similar permit. I ask the Minister whether a club's turnover bears any relationship to the actual fee that is charged by the Licensing Court in respect of its annual permit.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am advised that the court has discretion in this matter. It can take account of a number of factors, none of which is specified but any of which could be taken into account in assessing the licence fee. In other words, if there was a small club that had a very small turnover, that would be taken into account by the court when assessing the fee.

Mr SLATER: The maximum fee in the past has been $100, and I know plenty of small clubs that have paid the maximum fee. I take it that the maximum fee will now be $300. It would appear to me that the majority of or nearly all those 738 clubs of which I made a point in the second reading and which have a club permit will pay the $300.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I cannot presume to comment on what the court might, in its discretion, determine for any of those clubs. I can only repeat that the court can exercise discretion and take into account a whole lot of unspecified factors. I feel sure that the clubs are aware of this and can make representations accordingly.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

The SPEAKER: Order! As there is only one vote on the side of the Noes, the motion therefore passes in the affirmative.

Third reading thus carried.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That the Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move forthwith to rescind an order of the House made this day.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That the order of the House on the question that the debate on the second reading of the Housing Agreement Bill be adjourned until tomorrow be rescinded.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That the adjourned debate on the question 'that the Housing Agreement Bill be now read a second time' be now resumed.

Motion carried.

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): I think it is important to say at the outset on this debate that today we had presented in this House a revised second reading explanation. Too often, by the time a Bill introduced by the Hon. Mr Hill in another place gets down here, we have a revised second reading explanation. Today is no different. I have no doubt whatsoever that that was prompted by the Hon. Mr Sumner's very accurate description of the Minister's being a meek mouse when dealing with the Federal Government regarding the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

When one compares the second reading speech delivered today in this House with what was presented in the Legislative Council, it is fairly obvious that the speech writers are trying to convey the impression that the meek mouse has roared like a lion. However, we are not fooled, and nor would the people of South Australia be fooled. This Government has copped the reduction in Federal-State funding without as much as a whimper.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Oh, come on!

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister says, 'Oh, come on!' Let us have a look at the second reading explanation that was presented in the Legislative Council on 17 November. In effect, it said nothing. All it said in substance was, 'Notwithstanding some unsatisfactory aspects of the agreement, South Australia seems to have little choice but to sign it.' That is all it said. Then look at the amended second reading explanation as delivered by the Minister of Environment and Planning this afternoon. Scattered in that second reading explanation are references to the Minister having fought for South Australia, having argued for South Australia, and having tried to do this for South Australia, all without success. When we look at the record, which I will go into in more detail later on, we see that they prove that this Minister of Housing did little or nothing. He just went to the Commonwealth and State Housing Ministers' conference and accepted what Mr McVeigh had to offer. The Minister cannot deny—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Yes, I will.

Mr HEMMINGS: Perhaps the Minister, when he replies to my contribution, can explain why we have this revised second reading explanation that tries to make out that the Minister is a champion of the rights of the people of this State. Disregarding those sections in the revised second reading explanation that I have said try to make the Hon. Murray Hill the champion of the State, one to fight for the State's right, what has the Minister said he will do in March 1982, when the Commonwealth and State Housing Ministers meet to decide the terms of agreement in relation to full market rents and uniform rebate policy? I would like to quote from the second reading explanation regarding that matter. It says:

Finally, there is to be a progressive movement during the term of the agreement to full market rents. South Australia has argued against this and for the existing wording of market-related rents to be retained. As well, under the new agreement a uniform rebate policy is to be developed and implemented. South Australia has argued that there is no virtue in uniformity for its own sake.

They are glib words, but I expect the Minister in charge of the Bill in this House to say exactly what this Government's policy is going to be in regard to full market rents and the uniform rebate policy, because we only have until March 1982 for this Government to come up with some firm policy as to exactly what it is going to say to Mr McVeigh. I suspect that this Government has no policy at all in relation to that particular matter. As a result of the high interest rates and the fact that very few people are now able to afford to purchase accommodation in the private sector, private market rents have run wild. If Mr McVeigh can win the day (and I am sure the Hon. Murray Hill will be no match for him) the situation will be completely chaotic. I would like to refer the House to the particular clauses dealing with those aspects of full market rents and rental rebates. They are clauses 33 and 34 of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Clause 33 states:

The State will, in respect of the rent for its rental dwellings, apply a policy directed to the progressive movement during the term of this agreement of the rent for each dwelling to charge market rent and review rents at least annually.

Clause 34 states:

(1) Rental rebates are to be granted to tenants who are not able to afford to pay the rent determined in accordance with clause 33.

(2) A uniform rental rebate policy shall be developed by the Commonwealth and the States and shall be applied by each State for the calculation of rental rebates.

If the Federal Government forces those particular clauses to be adhered to, it will cause chaos within the South Australian Housing Trust. The trust's present rental rebate policy will be in ruins. Already, despite the fact that 50.4 per cent of South Australian Housing Trust tenants are on a rental rebate scale, the recent rent increases are creating real hardship. When one looks at the State housing authorities in the Eastern States compared to this State, one sees that, as under previous Governments, we have embarked upon not only welfare housing but also private sector housing or public sector purchase housing, and this is going to cause more problems in this State than anywhere else.

I do not have the exact figures but in New South Wales and Victoria something like between 80 and 90 per cent of housing authority tenants are on a rental rebate. That is going to cause very little hardship in those particular States but more so in this State, because since this Liberal Government took office it has already embarked upon a policy of achieving market-related rents in relation to the South Australian Housing Trust. If clauses 33 and 34 of the housing agreement are adhered to, as I have said, that will cause real problems. In what I must insist upon calling the revised second reading explanation, the Minister said, on page 2:

There has been considerable publicity of late concerning the fact the Commonwealth has reduced financial assistance to the States for welfare housing significantly over the past few financial years. In 1977-78, $400 000 000 was provided and this included the Northern Territory, which is now included. The 1981 agreement provides for supplementation of the base $200 000 000 from the Commonwealth Budget and the Budget brought down by the Federal Treasurer in August provided $50 000 000 for this purpose. Aboriginal housing grants of $12 200 000 previously provided by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs have now been absorbed into the housing agreement. Thus, total funds provided by the Commonwealth under the agreement for 1981-82 will be $262 200 000. South Australia's share is $34 700 000. This compares with last year's figure of $37 300 000, or $39 700 000 if the Aboriginal housing funds previously provided separately are included.

The Minister made the point that there has been considerable publicity over the fact that the Commonwealth has reduced financial assistance to the States for welfare housing. What has been the Hon. Murray Hill's contribution? It was rather enlightening. When this Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council, I asked the Parliamentary Library to extract statements made by the Minister and those made by Mr Geoff Kennett, the Victorian Liberal Minister of Housing, about the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. There have been just two miserable statements made by the Hon. Mr Hill.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr HEMMINGS: As I was saying, there have been just two miserable statements made by the Hon. Mr Hill concerning the question of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. When we compare that to the fact that the Liberal Minister of Housing in Victoria, a man who would possibly be in tune with our own Housing Minister, and with the Fraser Government's doctrine of using funds which were previously used for welfare public housing and which it has now diverted to so-called resource development, Mr Jeff Kennett made in excess of 50 statements criticising Mr McVeigh and the Fraser Government. There were 50 statements as opposed to the miserable two statements made by the Hon. Murray Hill, the man who, in his second reading explanation, tried to project himself as a champion of the State and a fighter for people who are so dependent on welfare public housing.

It is not often that I congratulate Liberals in this country, but on this occasion Mr Kennett deserves praise from this side of the House, because he has gone out to do battle for those people dependent on public housing in Victoria, which is a sight more than our housing Minister has done. All he has done is plead for more time to pay. The Minister almost reminded one of a person who is up for a hire purchase payment, cannot meet his debt, and goes to the local court, where he says to the magistrate, 'Please, Sir, give me more time to pay. I may be able to balance my books if you do that.' This is what Mr Hill said on 4 September this year, as reported in the *Advertiser* under the pathetic heading, 'South Australia to plead for time on house loans':

South Australia will ask the Commonwealth today to defer some Housing Trust loan repayments because of the 'crisis situation' in financial arrangements between the two governments.

The Minister of Housing, Mr Hill, said yesterday South Australia was now repaying the Commonwealth about $32 000 000 a year in interest and principal on advances made over many years for welfare housing.

However, with a $4 700 000 drop in housing funds from Canberra this financial year, the trust could not maintain its welfare housing programme at present levels unless the shortfall was made up in some way.

(South Australia received $39 500 000 in Commonwealth housing assistance last financial year and $34 800 000 this year).

The request will be put by Mr Hill to the Federal Minister for Housing and Construction, Mr McVeigh, at a meeting of Federal and State Housing Ministers in Sydney this morning.

Mr Hill said he would use the occasion to express South Australia's 'extreme disappointment' at the cut in housing funds in last month's Federal Budget.

That is the kind of wishy-washy statement made by the Hon. Mr Hill. He would plead with the Federal Government to defer payment. He was extremely disappointed with the cut in Federal funding to this State. However, he would not dare criticise Mr McVeigh. As the Hon. Mr Sumner said in another place, he continued to play his role as the meek mouse. I will not take the time of the House to read all of the 50 statements made by Mr Kennett.

Mr Mathwin: I should hope not.

Mr HEMMINGS: If the member for Glenelg wishes me to do that. I can quite easily ask my colleagues to bring in all those statements that Mr Kennett made criticising Mr McVeigh and the Fraser Government and read them.

Mr Mathwin: I said, 'I should hope not.'

Mr HEMMINGS: If the member for Glenelg carries on like that, I may read them. I think it is worthwhile to read what Mr Kennett said in an open letter to Malcolm Fraser as reported in the *Age* of 7 November. Mr Kennett, despite opposition within the Victorian Government and from Victorian Federal members of Parliament and Senators, took the opportunity to place advertisements in the *Age* writing to the Prime Minister and pointing out the folly of Budget cuts so far as public sector housing is concerned. I would love to stand in this House and congratulate our own Minister for doing such a thing, but he just says he is extremely disappointed. I read that letter, which is addressed to the Prime Minister as follows:

My dear Prime Minister,

I congratulate you and your Government on your preparedness to reconsider the priority the Federal Government attaches to the provision and availability of housing throughout Australia; importantly, the role Governments must play in promoting the Australian dream of home ownership.

According to media reports, your Government is currently considering a method whereby young people can be assisted into home ownership. Such a proposal, in its broadest form, is welcomed and I encourage an early decision. However, this represents only one aspect of the current housing problem. There are two others that cannot be ignored.

Firstly, there are the hundreds of Victorian families who are walking away from, or selling their homes, often at a loss, as a result of the effect which the rapid escalation of interest rates is having on their monthly repayments. The social and human cost of this undesirable trend, which is destroying families and their aspirations, must be halted. Invariably, these families become clients of the Government for accommodation, but we cannot assist them because of the current funding shortfall. When we can assist, it is at a huge financial cost to the community.

Secondly, your Government must reponsibly and urgently address itself to those in need of Government housing assistance. The low income families, one parent families, our senior citizens, and our homeless youth. In all these groups there are people who have already had their individual opportunities reduced.

At present in Victoria, we have approximately 30 000 applications from families and individuals genuinely requesting Government assistance to provide a reasonable standard of accommodation.

Importantly, on current trends, this figure will grow if decisive action is not taken quickly through a special housing grant to the States.

This area of assistance should be the Federal Government's first priority. And surely the only reason why Government should be involved in the field of housing is to assist those people who can't look after themselves in the private sector. Not to assist this area would be failing to address the problem of housing fairly and evenly.

Prime Minister, people are Australia's greatest asset. Australia's future strength will ultimately depend on the maintenance of our freedoms and democracies. That democracy will be dependent upon the existence of strong family units, and the opportunities and choices available to all individuals.

Housing is a major ingredient in developing family security and, in short, determining Australia's future. We eagerly await your decision as the problem is urgent and, in many cases, desperate.

Yours in anticipation,
J. G. Kennett
Minister of Housing
On behalf of the Victorian community.

The facts that were outlined in that open letter to the Prime Minister could be said to apply quite easily to this State. South Australia has not yet reached the situation where 30 000 people are awaiting rental accommodation, but we are very close to that. In excess of 23 000 people are awaiting accommodation in this State. As was outlined in the *Advertiser* today, there are 9 000 homlesss youth in this city. The Housing Trust has admitted that at least 30 per cent of the people on the age pensioner accommodation list die before they can be housed.

The situation in Victoria can be brought fairly and squarely to bear on this State. What did our Minister do? Nothing! In fact, last week in the other place the Minister stated that it is not his style to make waves: he prefers to argue around the conference table. What has the Minister achieved around the conference table? Next to nothing! He said in the other place that Mr Kennett has achieved nothing that will make the Fraser Government budge. At least Mr Kennett is keeping himself in tune with the needs of the Victorian community.

Mr Millhouse: They've got an election pretty soon, haven't they?

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Mitcham has made the cynical comment that there is soon to be an election in Victoria. Mr Kennett was making statements on this subject as early as May this year. I reject the comment that Mr Kennett did that only because an election is due in Victoria.

Mr Millhouse: I didn't say that. I said—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier has the floor.

Mr Millhouse: He has misrepresented me.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier has the floor. The Chair will not tolerate further interjections.

Mr HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I have outlined before in this House (and I do not know how many times I will have to say this before it sinks in to members opposite and to the Fraser Government) the problem that is facing the Government in regard to public housing. After unemployment, housing is the most serious social problem in this country. Over the past six years, we have seen the Fraser Government withdraw from its Federal responsibilities of providing housing security for the Australian people. We have seen an increasing neglect of immediate hardships experienced by people and an emerging social need for housing throughout the community.

Officially, there are no facts and figures as to how many people are homeless, because the Fraser Government will not carry out detailed inquiries to obtain that information. The Housing Industry Association estimates (and this is just an estimation) that about 280 000 people in Australia are homeless, a further 250 000 people at least are living in makeshift or mobile homes, and over 80 000 families are on the waiting lists of housing authorities. These people are being ignored and their needs and rights are being rejected by the Fraser Government.

While these neglected problems are increasing, the Fraser Government is reducing the funds for public housing. If the neglect continues, it may be almost impossible for a humane Government (and only a Labor Government would be a humane Government) in the future to cope properly with public housing needs. It would take a number of years to face and overcome this social problem.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: It will be a number of years before we see a Labor Government.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HEMMINGS: The Federal Government is prepared to sacrifice the housing industry quite deliberately. At this point, I will answer the Minister's interjection. Obviously, the Minister is not really worried about the housing problems that face the people in this State and in Australia generally. The Minister tries to make the glib remark that it will be a long time before we see a Federal Labor Government. The facts prove that only a Federal Labor Government acted in a humane way in providing funds for public sector housing. The Fraser Government, with the concurrence of this State Liberal Government (which urged everyone to vote for Mr Fraser for the sake of South Australia), has quite callously wiped out millions of dollars in its last Budget that should have been earmarked for public welfare housing and give that money to so-called resource development. The Federal Government has completely abdicated from the public sector housing market.

In line with that, the Federal Government has increased the crisis by allowing Mr Howard, with his stupid monetary policies, to raise the domestic interest rate. That is why I say that a future Federal Labor Government will be the only Government to face the problem fairly and squarely and at least provide some assistance to the States.

Mr Mathwin: What about the cost of loans in other countries?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier has the floor.

Mr HEMMINGS: Let us consider what the last Federal Labor Administration gave to public sector housing and what the Fraser Government is providing this financial year. In 1974-75, the last year of a Federal Labor Government, $392 000 0000 was made available for public housing: this year, only $255 000 000 was made available. In today's money terms, the 1974-75 allocation would represent $789 000 000. The 1981-82 Federal Budget shows an even greater dramatic decline in payment to the States for housing when one takes into account inflation and the repayment of capital advances. These figures are nothing more than a scandal, and the actions of the Federal Government and its appeasers in this State are also scandalous.

As I said earlier, they copped it all without a murmur. When one looks at the real net payments, comparing 1974-75 with 1981-82, one sees exactly how little this State is getting from the Federal Government. In 1974-75, the Federal Government's payment to this State was $115 600 000. The State repayment advance was $4 800 000 and the State repayment of interest was $26 900 000, which made a total State repayment of $31 800 000. That represented a net Federal payment of $83 800 000.

In 1981-82, we received $37 500 000. The State repayment advance was $5 100 000—very little different from 1974-75, when the State repayment of interest was $25 900 000. In fact, that was a drop of what we paid back in 1974-75. The total State repayment was $31 000 000—$800 000 less than we paid back in 1974-75. The net Federal payment to this State was $4 700 000. That is all that we received after the repayment of advances and the repayment of interest. We will receive only $4 700 000 from this Federal Government. That is shocking. I do not take anything away from the fact that progressive State Governments, including this Government, have increased money to the South Australian Housing Trust through different means. However, that is not the answer, because it is no use going to the S.G.I.C. or the Superannuation Fund and getting $5 000 000 here and $5 000 000 there. That will in no way halt the number of applications that the South Australian Housing Trust is processing. The answer lies in making the Federal Government responsible for its share of public sector housing, and that is exactly what this Government has not done. All we received is $4 700 000; in fact, that is less than 40 per cent of what the Housing Trust needs to carry out its programme. I seek leave to have all the State figures incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

REAL NET PAYMENTS TO THE STATES FOR HOUSING

	$m 1981-82 prices				
	Federal Government payments	State repayment of advances	State repayment of interest	Total State repayments	Net Federal payments
			New South Wales		
1974-75	252.9	13.6	62.1	75.7	177.2
1981-82	84.4	13.1	57.9	70.9	13.5
			Victoria		
1974-75	200.9	11.8	48.9	60.8	140.1
1981-82	59.8	11.0	45.6	56.5	3.3
			Queensland		
1974-75	201.2	3.4	14.8	18.2	183.0
1981-82	33.5	3.5	15.5	19.0	14.5

Real Net Payments to the States for Housing—*continued*

	$m 1981-82 prices				
	Federal Government payments	State repayment of advances	State repayment of interest	Total State repayments	Net Federal payments
			South Australia		
1974-75	115.6	4.8	26.9	31.8	83.8
1981-82	35.7	5.1	25.9	31.0	4.7
			Western Australia		
1974-75	76.9	3.4	14.8	18.2	58.7
1981-82	27.9	3.4	15.1	18.4	9.5
			Tasmania		
1974-75	53.5	1.6	9.8	11.3	42.2
1981-82	13.9	1.9	10.2	12.0	1.9
			Six States		
1974-75	789.5	38.6	177.4	215.9	573.6
1981-82	255.2	37.8	170.1	208.0	47.2

Mr HEMMINGS: Although this Bill does not relate to the homeless youth, I think it is important that we place on record this Government's callous attitude thereto. Only today I asked the Deputy Premier a question regarding a submission before the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare and Youth Housing. That was in regard to unemployment benefits and lifting up to the adult single rate the rate for 16 and 17-year-olds. *Hansard* will show tomorrow the contempt that the Deputy Premier showed for the homeless youth in this State today.

Despite a recommendation from the Government's own working party, despite recommendations from every conference that has been held in this country on youth housing and homelessness and despite repeated statements from the Victorian Minister of Housing, what was the Deputy Premier's answer to me today? He said that this Government could not care less about pushing a proposal to increase the rate of unemployment benefits for those young people who are being forced to seek accommodation. In fact, the Deputy Premier said 'It is nothing to do with me. You are the shadow Minister for Housing; you write to the Federal Government.' That attitude by the Deputy Premier today characterises this Government's attitude to welfare housing. It is not prepared to stand up and be counted as far as the Fraser Government is concerned. They want merely to have it easy. The Government is not prepared to go to Canberra and fight for this State. It is not prepared to make any effort to try to get a better deal for South Australia.

I predict that the Minister will come back in March 1982 when clauses 33 and 34 of the Housing Agreement have been discussed in Canberra, and say, 'There was nothing that I could do. I put up a good case, but there was nothing that I could do'. The end result will be complete chaos. In fact, more and more people will go on the rental rebate system in this State, which will cause an even greater burden and hardship on the remaining people who are paying full market rents.

I hope that the Minister in his reply will be able to explain what is meant by market-related rents and full market rents. What is the Government's policy in relation to that clause? What is the Government's attitude to rental rebates? That is very important. I hope that we do not get a situation like we usually do when discussing anything that is the responsibility of the Hon. Murray Hill, where the Minister of Environment and Planning says, 'I really have not got that information, but I will try to get it for you'. They are two very important parts of the Housing Agreement.

The Housing Trust is worried about this, and I think that the Minister should be aware of the trust's concern about those two vital clauses. We need to know, when discussing this Bill, exactly what the Government's attitude will be. We will not have Mr Hill putting out a press release saying that he is deeply disappointed about the way we were treated and that he will bat for South Australia, like Mr Kennett is going out to bat for Victoria. They are the kind of things that we need to know in the Minister's reply.

The ratification by this Government of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement (that is the purpose of this Bill) will merely serve to fuel the crisis in the public housing sector. It will create a situation where the present 22 000 applicants for rental accommodation will have little or no show of getting anything for five to six years. The aged and homeless youth will suffer. It is rather pertinent that I repeat what I said earlier. In the first second reading explanation, the Minister said that South Australia seems to have little choice but to sign it. I can only say to that that the Government's lack of guts at this stage will only serve to cause its downfall at the next election.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I rise simply to support the remarks made by my colleague the member for Napier. I think he has very eloquently and precisely expressed the total dissatisfaction that this State should have to the housing agreement that we are being forced to ratify. If that sort of eloquence and those things had been said at the national level more forcibly by the South Australian Minister of Housing there may have been some chance of our getting a better deal. Certainly, the Minister's colleague in Victoria, as the member for Napier pointed out, has not been backward. He has spoken out very strongly and consistently over a period of time. It may be, as the member for Mitcham implied, that this is due to some perceived electoral advantage that he might gain from it, but I think that the matter goes beyond that. I would hope that the attitude of the Victorian Minister for Housing, the New South Wales Minister for Housing, and others who have lent their voices so vigorously at the national level is related to the great problem of today, namely, housing in our community. I refer to the problems that have been experienced in the public housing sector, and in relation to welfare housing, youth accommodation, elderly pensioners' homes, the private rental sector, and among home buyers.

Housing is one of the great issues and problems of today. It is one in which there is an enormous feeling in the community of frustration and impotence. All sorts of attempts are being made to raise petitions, to organise protest marches, and to fly to Canberra to make representations, but really they have not got very far at all. However, they are the surface of an iceberg which represents the vast mass of people in this country who are suffering from substandard housing or who are incapable of attaining that thing which we are told is the Australian dream, that is, the purchase of one's own home.

The effects of that on the economy have been catastrophic, and in what State more than this? That is the mos extraordinary thing. As my colleague pointed out, it is evident from the figures and the statistics that this State has the most depressed housing and construction industry in Australia. That has been consistently so for months, and its depression in many cases is the key, the reason why this State's economic performance in a number of other areas is so comparatively poor. It is the reason why people are leaving this State.

If one talks to any of the building employers or any of the building trades unions, one finds that many of the skilled tradesmen who worked in this State and whose reputations were Australia-wide are leaving to pick up jobs interstate. They are going not because they want to or because they do not really enjoy the lifestyle here in South

Australia but because it is the only way in which they can get work. That is the depressing spectacle that confronts us at the moment. That is the parlous state of the housing and construction industry, yet we must cop this agreement and the Minister's acquiescence in it, and his disappointment, quietly expressed, to what is an absolute national scandal, which is hitting this State more than any other.

If the Minister had half the nouse of my colleague and half the velocity with the assessments that he has made in putting his arguments forward, we might well have achieved some sort of change at the Federal level. Regrettably, the Minister wants to play it low key. He is quietly disappointed and thinks that we ought to get a better deal, but he will not say it too loudly, in case he is heard or in case his Canberra masters embarrass him. That is not good enough for a State Minister of Housing in a State with the most depressed housing and construction industry in the country. It is scandalous!

I refer to the figures on homeless youth that have been brought out today as a result of the Senate inquiry and to the contemptuous way in which the whole question was dealt with by the Deputy Premier in the House. This indicates the problems that we have with this Government, which pays lip service to the problem. When the tent city for homeless youth was established a palliative was given—the offer of a few houses to look after them. That is fine, but that should have been the start of a major and massive programme. What have we heard since then? We have heard very little at all. There have been suggestions by the Minister that the Emergency Housing Unit was contacted by these people.

I have had these people in my electorate office and so have many other members. We have said to these young people 'There is a place for you to go.' They go there, but are told that they really just cannot be looked after in the short term. That is the sort of problem with which housing confronts us. It is one of the great issues of today on which there should be a national plan, and, in the absence of that, a State plan to do something about it. The Opposition will have a lot more to say on this issue as we approach the State election.

This Housing Agreement Bill gives us the opportunity, as my colleague has done, to put before the House the stark facts and figures about the Commonwealth squeeze, and about the situation of Housing Trust emergency housing, public housing and the various other forms of accommodation that at the moment are under such stress. Politicians of any colour will ignore that at their peril, and politicians in Government who do not come up with some sound, concrete plans to deal with it deserve to be out of office. Those Government members who are in charge of this area who are passively acquiescing in what is happening at the National level ought to be sacked or replaced immediately.

We need a Housing Minister, and indeed a Government, that will stand up to Canberra, that will say a lot more, and a lot more loudly. The Government is compromised (we know that). The Government's great support of the Fraser Government before the last Federal election has severely compromised us, however, I do not think it is too late for the Government to turn around and to begin saying some things on behalf of South Australians concerning housing conditions and the housing industry in an attempt to get something done about it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): Tonight we have heard from the member for Napier yet another personal attack on my colleague, the Minister of Housing in another place. We are becoming quite accustomed to this type of debate in this House relating to this type of legislation.

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Let not the member for Napier get too excited. Let me simply answer some of the points that he has raised. First, South Australia has fought long and hard through its Minister, the Hon. Murray Hill, for modifications to the Commonwealth proposals, and the honourable member opposite, the Leader and the Party to which he belongs should know it.

Mr Bannon: I wish we had heard about it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will tell the Leader. He should not get excited. I will tell you what we have done.

Mr Bannon: What?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Olsen): Order!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I make the point that the Minister of Housing has fought particularly for a better deal for South Australia. The Minister has argued strenuously against reductions in housing funds.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Minister has not engaged in front-page politics, as perhaps members opposite would prefer him to do. It has already been explained that perhaps the Minister does not agree with doing it in that way. This is a Bill to authorise an agreement. I make the point that the record of the Housing Ministers' conference demonstrates how extensive the Minister's active role has been in regard to this matter. It does not matter what one reads on the front page of the papers or anywhere else. I suggest that, if the honourable member opposite who has had so much to say about the lack of activity on the part of the Minister responsible for this portfolio were to seek out the record of the Housing Ministers' conference, he would find just how active the Minister of Housing in this State has been.

Mr Hemmings: Why did we have a revised second reading speech, then?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier was heard in relative silence; I would ask him to accord the same courtesy to the Minister.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The people of South Australia recognise the very high priority that the Government has put on housing.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Ha!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: We can have those ridiculous cackles from members opposite. It is nothing new for them to carry on like that. Reports released recently through the media indicate how high the priority is for housing on the part of the Minister.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: So the Victorian Minister was wrong. Is that what you're saying?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will deal with the Victorian Minister in a little while. I want to talk about market rents.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You have not got any notes; how would you deal with it?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I want to speak about market rents, because the member for Napier has asked about the Government's approach to this matter.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government's approach has consistently been for 80 per cent of market rents. This means that tenants who are better off are encouraged into private rental or home ownership. I do not think anyone could argue about that.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: If the honourable member had been listening, he would have heard. I suggest that those who need public housing are granted rebates based on income, and I should point out that the percentage that

are getting rebates is increasing. I imagine that the honourable member should know that. That means that trust houses are going to those who need them. Again, I do not believe that anyone can argue against that. Surely this is, after all, the purpose of welfare housing.

The member for Napier referred to clause 33. I should have thought he would recognise that clauses 33 and 34 must be read together. I do not intend saying any more about that. The South Australian Government has put a record amount into housing. We have heard from the member for Napier and the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, we have heard a lot said tonight. A suggestion was made that when the Tonkin Government came into office everything in housing ceased. I suggest that the member for Napier and the Leader of the Opposition should go back a little over their own record in government to see how pathetic it was, and if they are prepared to stand up and criticise—

Mr Hemmings: You weren't listening to what I said.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier is out of order.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: If members opposite are prepared to stand up and criticise the involvement of the present Government in housing, they want their heads read, or else they want to be in a position to look back over their own record. Let us talk about Mr Kennett, who has surfaced on a number of occasions in this evening's debate.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Tell us about Mr Kennett.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I know Mr Kennett, although I do not know him personally.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You know him, but you do not know him?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I have not met him. I said that I do not know him personally.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You said, 'I know Mr Kennett, although I do not know him personally.' That is what you said. Figure that out.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I know that it is getting past the honourable member's bedtime, and I sympathise with the fact that he is going to stay here for a little bit longer.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I will be here a lot longer than you, and I've been here longer than you, anyway.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I suggest that the member opposite, who insists on having so much to say, should be quiet and listen for a while, in case he might happen to learn something. Mr Kennett has spoken loudly through the media. I do not think anyone would deny that. The member for Napier has made particular reference to that, but let me say that no State, especially Victoria, even approaches this State's effort in regard to housing. Let the member for Napier indicate—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Your'e criticising Mr Kennett. Is that right?

Mr Hemmings: I said I agreed.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Mr Kennett has said a lot, but he has also antagonised a lot of people. That has meant very little in relation to results and what he has had to say. I understand that the open letter to which the member for Napier referred tonight and read to this House was put out without the consent of his Cabinet or his Premier. I can imagine what would happen if a member of the Opposition tried to do that in Government. If the member for Napier had not been quite so clever, too, he would have realised that the $32 000 000 to which he was referring in relation to repayments deferred in one year only would build nearly 1 000 houses in one year.

I do not know whether the honourable member is able to work that out. Also, the member for Napier referred to the Federal Government's contribution over a period and made all sorts of accusations about the Liberal Government and suggested that the Labor Government was the only Federal Government that had ever done anything constructive as far as housing is concerned. Of course, he has conveniently forgotten the fact that the Fraser Government gave $400 000 000 in 1977-78, which in fact was a record, but we did not hear about that. That is in the second reading explanation but the Opposition did not bother to tell us about that.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Because they didn't—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell is out of order. The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: As well, the present scheme, of course, includes straight grant money which is more value than loans. I would have thought, again, that the honourable member would recognise that. As I said earlier, the Leader of the Opposition has had a great deal to say about what the Opposition would do in Government as far as housing is concerned. I would only suggest that people can remember very clearly the involvement of the previous Labor Government in this field. They can and do appreciate how poorly that particular portfolio was handled under the previous Labor Government, and for members opposite to now suggest that our Government is failing in its responsibility suggests again that they should look very clearly at the involvement of their own Government in the housing portfolio.

I believe that our record speaks for itself as far as what we are doing in South Australia. I believe that the record of the Minister of Housing stands high in regard to his activity and his attempt to modify the Commonwealth proposals that we are looking at at present. Time will tell in regard to that matter, but I would again suggest that the Opposition's personal attack on the Minister of Housing is completely unfounded.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses and 1 and 2 passed.

New clause 3—'Authority to execute agreement.'

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 1, after line 7—Insert new clause 3 as follows:

3. (1) The execution of the agreements on behalf of this State is authorised.

(2) The Treasurer is, upon execution of the agreement, authorised and required to carry out the terms of the agreement on behalf of this State.

(3) The moneys required by the Treasurer for the purpose of exercising his powers or carrying out his obligations under subsection (2) are, to the necessary extent, appropriated.

(4) Any act done by the Treasurer in anticipation of the agreement coming into force is ratified.

The reason for moving this amendment is that it is a money clause, and it is not possible to move the clause in another place.

Amendment carried.

Clause 4—'Loans made under the agreement.'

Mr HEMMINGS: Can the Minister say what type of loan or grant, in pursuance of the agreement, may be made by the Treasurer upon terms and conditions determined by him and approved by the Minister?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It simply controls the flow to the State Bank and the Housing Trust.

Mr KENEALLY: My concern has been in trying to follow this debate when I do not have a copy of the Bill on file.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: We have all got problems.

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister's problems are problems that I would not like to relate to the Chamber, and I am sure he would not like me to do so. I am prepared to take the time of the House, if it wishes, to mention some of the problems the Minister has.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You're not trying to fill in time, are you?

Mr KENEALLY: That is an outrageous suggestion. I expect that you, Mr Acting Chairman, would rule on that. The Minister is suggesting that I am wasting the time of the House.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member for Stuart to relate his remarks to clause 4 of the Bill currently before the Chair.

Mr KENEALLY: I would be delighted to do so if I had the clause 4 before me and if I had any idea what clause 4 was. The Bill is now here, and clause 4 refers to loans made under the Agreement. It seems to be a reasonable provision and, as I cannot see any fault with it, I am prepared to support it.

Mr HEMMINGS: I seek your guidance, Mr Acting Chairman. After clause 4 has been passed, there is no way that we can question the Minister on the Housing Agreement. Perhaps if we stay on clause 4, I could ask questions of the Minister in regard to financial assistance, State matching funds, and financial assistance arrangements, etc. As this is a short Bill containing only four clauses, there is no way that the Opposition can question the Minister on the agreement, which is basically what we are ratifying tonight. I ask for your ruling on that.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The matter which the honourable member raises relating to the agreement is covered under clause 2 of the Bill which the Committee has already considered. It is the Chair's intention to put the schedule, and there will be an opportunity to put questions at that stage.

Mr KENEALLY: I refer to subclause (1). If the Opposition had access to information which could clearly show what the terms and conditions determined by the Treasurer and approved by the Minister might be, it would make our consideration of the clause much easier. Can the Minister give the Committee any guidance on the terms and conditions which may be determined by the Treasurer and whether they will be approved by the Minister?

As the Minister will realise, unless that information is available to us the Committee stage can be a farce. Quite often we have clauses of this nature which are written in legalistic terminology and which can mean almost anything that lawyers or Governments wish them to mean. Unless the Opposition is in possession of information which clearly states the intent of the verbiage, we are at a disadvantage. I am sure that the Minister would not wish that to be so. In fact, it would be a contempt of Parliament for any Government to try to rush matters of this nature through the House. As the second reading explanation would indicate, this is an important issue and one of fundamental importance to South Australians, particularly to those who are struggling to find suitable housing.

There are many of these people in my electorate. I represent an electorate, comprising Port Augusta and Port Pirie, which is predominantly made up of Housing Trust tenants, and there are many thousands of trust houses in my district. If it was not for the Housing Trust development, cities in the Iron Triangle, for instance, would not be able to go ahead. There is no way that we can expect the private sector to step into the breach and provide even basic housing, let alone welfare housing. I hope that a reply by the Minister will produce the information that the Committee is entitled to have.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Treasurer passes the Loan funds to both the Housing Trust and the State Bank for housing and housing loans. He also arranges for the Housing Trust and the State Bank to be able to repay interest and principal as they fall due.

Clause passed.

Schedule.

Mr HEMMINGS: Are you going to deal with the schedule in parts or as a whole, Mr Acting Chairman?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: As a whole.

Mr HEMMINGS: In the Minister's reply to my question about the Government's attitude to clauses 33 and 34 of the schedule, the Minister said vaguely that clause 34 was tied in with clause 33. I found that rather surprising. For the rest of the time, the Minister lectured members on this side about their lack of knowledge and understanding of what he had achieved at the conference table with Mr McVeigh and Mr Fraser. He also told us about this State Government's fine record in relation to rental welfare housing.

I take this opportunity to again ask the Minister what will be his attitude in relation to clauses 33 and 34 of the schedule when the agreement is discussed in March 1982 with the Federal Minister for Housing? At present we are working on market-related rents, and many people in the public housing sector would argue quite forcibly with the Minister that even 80 per cent of market-related rents is too high. Will the Minister tell the Committee a little more clearly what the Government's policy will be when these important clauses are discussed in March and what the Government's attitude will be to setting Housing Trust rents and rental rebates if Mr McVeigh bulldozes these clauses through at the conference?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The State will continue, as I said earlier (and I cannot make it any plainer) to argue for market-related rents. At present we are trying for 80 per cent, and we are attempting to make tenants who can afford to go out into private housing do so, thus making more housing available for those who really need welfare housing. We will continue to argue for market-related rents. To me that seems quite logical.

Mr HEMMINGS: As a result of the Federal Government's policy on housing interest rates the private rental market has got out of control. Already, because of this Government's policy of working towards 80 per cent of the private rental market, we are getting to the stage where Housing Trust rents are being increased twice yearly. Even though 50.4 per cent of Housing Trust tenants are on rental rebates, these increases are causing real concern and hardship to those remaining 49.6 per cent of tenants, and even those on rental rebates. That situation will continue.

The Minister can say that clauses 33 and 34 of the schedule will ensure that those people in need of welfare housing will have their demands met and that that will encourage those people who can afford it to go out into the private rental market. However, already there is evidence that a house that was being rented out in mid-1980 for $40 a week is now fetching between $60 and $70 a week, so within one year private rents have increased by almost 100 per cent, and no-one can dispute that fact. If the Minister read the article in the *Advertiser* this morning dealing with youth housing, he would realise that his comments on encouraging people to go out into the private rental market, those people who can afford it, are ludicrous, because the private rental market in South Australia is at its lowest level ever; it has been estimated that there is only 1.1 per cent of homes or flats available at present. If in March the Hon. Murray Hill comes back from Canberra with his tail between his legs and says, 'I tried hard but I have to accept the fact that we are on a uniform, full market rent', then we are just going to create a chaotic situation.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I do not know what I can say in reply to all of that, other than to make a couple of points.

Mr Hemmings: Write me a letter.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No, I will not write a letter. The member for Napier referred to the vacancy rate. I point out that the vacancy rate has reduced to 1.1 per cent. Therefore, it is obvious that rents are floating upwards. However, trust rents are increasing in relatively small steps.

Mr Hemmings: You're joking!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: They are. The member for Napier referred to the fact that rents were increasing twice a year, but they are increasing in small steps. No-one can argue with that. The majority of rents are still well below the market. No-one can argue with that. The rebate scheme ensures that anyone who is in hardship is cared for. The rebates are associated with income levels, not rental levels. I hope that the member appreciates that the vacancy rate has reduced to 1.1 per cent, and I also hope he realises the reason.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STONY POINT (LIQUIDS PROJECT) RATIFICATION BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That the report be noted.

I shall contain my remarks until I wind up this debate. In moving this motion, I would like to pay a tribute to the work of the members of the Select Committee. The committee worked hard and harmoniously so that the views of those people who appeared before us were given due consideration. The report of the committee is the result of fairly intensive activity and sittings since the committee was set up by the House of Assembly.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): It is not my desire to overly delay the House in this matter. I want to direct my remarks to several specific matters, and if members peruse the transcript carefully, they will note that these matters were raised fairly frequently by the witnesses who came before the committee. I accept what the Minister said: there was a desire on the part of all members of the committee to work together to ensure that proper consideration was given to the evidence that was placed before us. The committee members worked together relatively harmoniously.

The most frequent complaint that came from witnesses concerned the alleged haste with which this Bill was being processed through Parliament, of which the Select Committee exercise was a part. I draw attention to the detail with which committee members had to grapple and, therefore, by implication, with which members of the public who wished to come before the committee to give sensible evidence also had to grapple. First, there was the Bill. Bills are usually not easy for the layman to read. From time to time, as the Minister would concede, members of Parliament have to go to other people to obtain an explanation about the effect of certain clauses of Bills. That is one reason why the Parliamentary Counsel is always available; from time to time members of Parliament must have recourse to his advice.

A large number of documents were prepared in relation to this matter. Most of them were excellent documents in that they were very comprehensive and fairly easy to read, but there were a lot of them. Some of the documents to which I had to have recourse were as follows: the draft Environmental Impact Statement for Port and Terminal Facilities at Stony Point, South Australia, which was produced for Santos and released in July this year; the supplement to that draft e.i.s., again produced for Santos and released in October this year; the Assessment of the Environmental Impact, the Port and Terminal Facilities at Stony Point, proposed by Santos Limited and produced by the assessments branch of the South Australian Department of Environment and Planning in November this year and in relation to the site of the terminal facilities; the draft e.i.s. prepared by Bechtell Kinhill in July 1979 in relation to the pipeline route; the final e.i.s. prepared by the same people for the Pipelines Authority of South Australia in September this year; and the Assessment of the Environmental Impact of the Moomba to Stony Point Pipeline Facility, which was produced by the assessments branch of the South Australian Department of Environment and Planning in November this year.

In, I think, the supplement to the draft e.i.s. on the site there was a reference to the Cooper Basin Liquids Project Oil Spill Trajectory Study, final report. I was interested in this matter and through the Minister of Environment and Planning I was able to get a copy of that report. That was produced in September of this year. They are some of the documents with which the well-informed witness should have grappled. For the most part, they were prepared well in advance of the presentation of the indenture in the Bill to this Parliament, but I have no doubt that people would have wanted to go back to those documents in preparing the detail of the submissions that they placed before us.

In fact, for the most part, the witnesses found that that task was beyond them. We found that we were in the situation where they were asking us for advice; and what we were getting was not so much a submission as a series of questions, such as, 'Mr Chairman, does clause 17 mean that . . .?' and the Chairman, who is also the Minister, had quite properly to explain to these witnesses that it was not the function of the committee to provide information to witnesses; it was their job to go away and get that information and then come back. I ask what chance a person at Whyalla has of being able to get hold of the Bill, read it, understand it, take on board this mass of other material, get proper advice from somewhere or other, and then present evidence that will take account of some of the specialised and technical data which is already available. Obviously, it is a waste of time for a person to bring up a matter which has already been properly disposed of in one of these documents, yet that happened from time to time, as I will proceed to demonstrate.

The effect of this was that I believed that our report should contain some reference to the haste with which we had been asked to process this matter. Therefore, in the committee I moved the following motions as what in effect would have been an addendum to Finding No. 4 of the Select Committee. The majority on that Select Committee did not see it my way, perhaps predictably, and so what I am about to read out does not form a part of the report before the House. I think it is important, though, that the House should hear what it says. It is as follows:

A common feature of the evidence was the complaint that witnesses had had too little time in which to study the Bill and prepare material for presentation. The committee draws the House's attention to the first schedule of the Bill and clause 7 of the indenture. The first schedule indicates that the document was signed on 26 November. Clause 7 states:

7. If the Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Bill, 1981, does not come into operation as an Act on or before 31 December 1981, or such later date as the parties to this indenture may agree in writing, in the same terms as those now contained in the Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Bill, 1981, or in such other

terms as the parties hereto otherwise may agree in writing, this indenture shall lapse on and with effect from that date . . .

At the time of signing of the indenture it was common knowledge that the Parliament was to sit until 10 December, that is, clause 7 was agreed to in the knowledge that Parliament had six sitting days in which to process the legislation. The life of a Select Committee should ideally be determined by the quantity of evidence placed before it and the complexity of the matters addressed. In this instance we found a good deal of public interest and concern. The committee is not unsympathetic to the company's desire for early Parliamentary approval, particularly in order that financial arrangements be completed but on balance it accepts the argument that more time should have been made available for Parliamentary consideration.

In their wisdom, the majority of the members on the committee rejected my contention that that should form part of our report. This matter has been raised in debate in the second reading stage and the Minister instanced the case of the Cooper Basin indenture. In relation to that, I want to say that, if there was any undue haste in that matter, that is no justification for committing the same sin twice. The question I particularly put to the Minister is this: where were the people, as permanent residents of Moomba and Gidgealpa, who were objecting to the passage of that indenture? Were there, indeed, any objectors to the passage of that indenture, be they residents of Moomba, Gidgealpa, Innamincka, or, for that matter, Mount Gambier, who came before that committee? Is it not true that for the most part that was an arrangement between the producers and the Government that had general approval and was non-controversial? It may well be that there is generally overwhelming support within the South Australian community for this proposal. At Whyalla there is a substantial minority of people who hold very strong opinions on this matter.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In favour.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I said a minority. I do not believe the Minister believes there is a minority in favour. I believe there should have been more time made available to hear such witnesses who wanted to give evidence, and give them enough time to be able to develop their arguments. I also point out that, through no fault of the staff of this place or *Hansard,* we have only just had delivered to us the minutes of yesterday's meeting in Whyalla. There has been no time for any members of the committee to sit down with those minutes and consider at leisure the evidence that was placed before it. We have only had the advantage (or disadvantage) of the imperfect human memory as to what was said on that occasion that we can take up and use either in our report or in any remarks we make to this House. I record my great concern at the speed with which we have had to consider this matter.

I turn now to another matter altogether. The committee will be interested in reading Finding No. 3 of the Select Committee. I will not take up the time of the House to read it out. I point out that, if we refer to the supplement to the draft environmental impact statement, I believe that I can say that Santos and the producers generally are very much in favour of the viewpoint which we expressed. Referring here to the ongoing capacity to the people of Whyalla to be able to use the beaches at Weeroona Bay and Point Lowly as a continuing recreation background to the city, page 38 of that document states, in part:

In the opinion of Santos, its consultants have provided no evidence to suggest that the risks from its operations to public safety justify the closure of adjacent beaches or denial of public access to the area outside the development site.

Moreover, Santos is of the opinion that matters relating to plant safety do not justify the denial of access or the closure of the beaches.

Nevertheless, Santos will require the removal of shacks built on the 28 sites that lie within the proposed development site itself.

It is also problematical as to whether any security risks to the plant will arise from having an uncontrolled area next to the plant fence. However, Santos is of the opinion that a controlled area around the site would be prudent.

Santos recognises, however, that continued use of beaches and surrounding area is ultimately dependent on South Australian Government decisions, based in part on the information provided in this supplement.

Santos will comply with any Government decisions and co-operate with State and local authorities in devising and implementing such controls as may be felt necessary.

In evidence it was provided to us that there was conflicting advice to the Government and the producers as to what was an appropriate hazard zone and that more information would be available when the committee to which the Select Committee refers its Finding No. 3 reports at the beginning of March next year. Our finding here is quite clear, that, within the parameters dictated by the necessity to keep the health and safety of the public predominant, as much of the coastline as possible should remain open. There is no beach immediately in front of the development site, so that is not really a problem. The problem is in relation to the beaches at Point Lowly and at Weroona Bay.

I do not want to detain the Committee any longer than I absolutely have to. The House will find in our Finding No. 10 a reference to the construction phase of the project that is attracting a considerable workforce. The fact is that these people will probably be housed somewhere near the site (the Cultana industrial estate, which was one suggestion made to us) and also that there will be some planning of facilities required in relation to this, and also that the City of Whyalla may require assistance probably through joint committees with the Department of Environment and Planning, or something along those lines.

The reason why I was keen to see this happen was that there was some comment at Whyalla as to local government rates. The evidence we received was that the City of Whyalla asked only for what eventually came in the indenture; that, in fact, the facility will be rated on unimproved land values. It seemed to me that that was something that they had to have out with their own ratepayers but that was the submission that came from the City of Whyalla, and it was not for the Select Committee to report more than that.

I believe that there will be planning problems associated with the necessity to provide these facilities. If Whyalla is happy with the rate revenue it is going to obtain, I think that they may need some additional expertise which would be available from Government sources.

During the second reading debate I made reference to the route of the pipeline. Within the time constraints that were on us, I endeavoured to carry this question a bit further. We were able to get some useful information in relation to pipeline routes. It is now clear that effectively the decision was taken not on the advice of Santos or the Pipelines Authority, but rather on that of the Department of Environment and Planning. It is not altogether clear to me whether the original advice was in relation to the two western routes before the so-called Strzelecki option, which was the one that I canvassed in this House, came up, but certainly the Department of Environment and Planning believed that the regeneration of flora was the important consideration, and that in the higher rainfall areas of the Flinders Ranges this was more likely to happen than in the more arid areas.

I invite honourable members to read the evidence given to us by Mrs Iris Iwanicki, the Secretary of the Conservation Council. Mrs Iwanicki, in the course of her remarks, echoed what many others had said, namely, that the council was not able to put forward the standard of evidence that it would like to have put forward, because of the haste with which the matter was moving. Also, the council's Director was out of the State at that particular time.

May I say that the evidence that did come forward from Mrs Iwanicki was found by the committee to be compelling

and we were very impressed by her as a witness. However, if in fact, one reads the transcript one must say that Mrs Iwanicki remains unconvinced by the opinion of the Department of Environment and Planning and so do I. As a member of that committee, I think I would have to return an open finding in relation to the pipeline route, and that is about as far as one can take it, given the evidence, or the paucity of the evidence.

The only other matter that I want to refer to concerns oil spills and the containment and the mopping up of those oil spills. I direct members' attention to pages 76 to 82 of the minutes of evidence that were taken last Friday, and in particular to the evidence taken from Mr Kinnane and from Captain Carr of the Department of Marine and Harbors. I do not know that I can precis this as quickly as I would like to, but Captain Carr made the points that as yet there has been no contingency plan prepared. In itself that is unremarkable: no-one has ever suggested that in fact it had been prepared. Captain Carr went on to say that at this stage there have been no discussions with Santos in relation to the matter.

I think the following is an important statement that must be made. Halfway down page 76 of the evidence, Captain Carr had the following to say in response to a question I raised pointing out that the Department of Environment and Planning in its evidence had been fairly optimistic as to the capacity to be able to contain oil spills:

> I am not aware of any boom which can solely contain oil in a flow velocity the excess of one and a half knots. That would be a problem at Stony Point where the flow velocity in some circumstances is in excess of one and a half knots.

Further in the evidence the Chairman said:

> We have not heard mention before of the 1½ knots. I take it there will be fairly strict parameters in relation to whether a ship can berth and whether hydro-carbons can be loaded. A ship could not be just brought in and berthed under all conditions?

Captain Carr replied:

> We anticipate that, because of the necessity to site the berth in a general east-west alignment, there will be delays to the berthing of vessels due to the strong wind conditions that prevail in that part of the gulf at certain times of the year. Once alongside, I anticipate that larger vessels will be able to continue to operate in quite strong winds. I do not believe that winds of less than 40 knots would cause any problem, but winds in excess of 40 knots could cause some difficulty. It may be necessary to remove vessels from the berth.

Then I asked this question:

> How does that relate to the question of oil getting under the boom? We were told yesterday that the boom mechanism would satisfactorily contain any oil spill, which could be deflected off shore as you have indicated, or it could be contained and skimmed. You mentioned that if the current was moving at more than 1½ knots, the oil would get under the boom. I take it that you are saying that the boom would be ineffective. Presumably, the contingency plan would cover all contingencies, including an oil spill where the sea was running at more than 1½ knots. What are the chances of some problems occurring because the sea is running at more than 1½ knots, which occurs on occasions in that area? The committee would like to be reassured that an oil spill can be effectively contained. Your comments raise a lingering doubt as to what would happen if there is an oil spill and if the sea is running at more than 1½ knots. Would you comment further in that regard, because this is the first time on which a question has been raised in my mind in this direction?

Captain Carr replied:

> There are two aspects to be considered: first, the velocity of the flow; and secondly, the height of the sea. Boom manufacturers do claim that their booms are effective in flow velocities in excess of 1½ knots, but those people who have experience with the use of booms in tidal flows refute this quite firmly. I prefer to accept the advice of people who have had the experience of working in strong tideways with booms rather than to accept the advice of the manufacturers. I have a report which deals with this fairly extensively and there are a number of experiments which were carried out by the Warren Springs laboratory in Britain. Without exception, all of their findings emphasise that a boom can work, but not fully efficiently, in tidal flows in excess of 1½ knots.

So the matter goes on. Further questions were asked by my colleagues on the committee and by members of the Government on the committee and by the Chairman who I think was perhaps as concerned about the matter of oil spills as about any other matter that came before us. I have taken more time than I intended to take. No doubt other members of the committee will take up more of these points. I am satisfied that the committee is doing the right thing in recommending that the House proceed with the Bill. I am also satisfied that we have highlighted certain problems which will still have to be addressed. It is important that the Government and future Governments address the problem fully to reassure the people of South Australia.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I rise to support the findings of the Select Committee and the Bill before the House. I refer specifically to one or two areas that were highlighted as a result of the evidence taken by this Select Committee, one of which was referred to by the member for Baudin. I refer to the rating policy of the Whyalla council. In evidence the Whyalla Action Group indicated its criticism of council policy in relation to the rate revenue to be derived from the project for the City of Whyalla. It is interesting to note, and I think I ought to place it on record, the fact that the Whyalla city council has not given special rate dispensation to Santos.

Basic rating requirements of the council, as indeed with all other local government areas dictate that, until such time as a value is placed on the land (the best way for a valuation to be placed on the land in question is for a sale price to be established and placed on the record in relation to it), the value cannot be clearly established.

Council has to date agreed in principle to the project and has given approval for the Mayor and Clerk to negotiate with Santos in relation to the project and its rating policies. As the council has enunciated that Santos will be rated on the same basis as will all other ratepayers within the jurisdiction of the City of Whyalla, in accordance with the zoning of the area, Santos will not be given special dispensation. In fact, the Whyalla Action Group had before the committee a representative who gave evidence suggesting that they ought to be rated. I think the figure, from memory, was $7 500 000—a totally unrealistic suggestion to put forward.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That was the land value.

Mr OLSEN: That is so, but it was to establish the value of the land at $7 500 000 and to rate it as such. To that extent the action committee's claim is unjustifiable, particularly in relation to criticism that it levelled at the council.

The other aspects that were highlighted to me through evidence given to the committee is concern not so much for this industry but for the possible development of a petro-chemical industry on the site and the need for protection of the industries in the gulf, particularly the fishing industry, and for compensation against spills. As a result of suggestions by AFIC and consideration by the committee, it has been suggested that a monitoring system be maintained at the site with regular checks to protect the fishing industry in that area and right through Spencer Gulf.

Indeed, there was general agreement by the specific groups that gave evidence to the committee for the project to go ahead. Indeed, the fishermen (representatives of AFIC) today said that they did not oppose the project. Although they would have preferred it to be in open seaboard, they acknowledged that the project has significant benefits for the State and that it ought to proceed. I will refer to some of those benefits in a moment.

Other technical queries that were raised by the committee, and I believe were satisfactorily answered by Santos, related to why the wharf facilities were not at Black Point

rather than at Stony Point. A number of groups which came before the committee indicated that Santos had been a very responsible party in the negotiations and discussions in establishing the indenture and agreement which is before the House and which was subject to the Select Committee's considerations. Indeed, the Department of the Environment and Planning commended Santos on the e.i.s. that it had prepared in relation to the site and the significant amount of work that it had done on environmental and social matters relating to the development. To that extent, I commend Santos for its involvement.

Many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee yesterday suggested that the reference to the development at Stony Point was a misnomer and that it ought to be referred to as Lowly Peninsula. I think the inference was purposely made to suggest that there was not significant criticism because of the lack of understanding of the exact site about which we were talking. Indeed, on checking maps, I find that the site has been accurately named as Stony Point. It seems that local names for the area have misled, in particular, some members of the Whyalla Action Committee.

I mentioned that the measure had general agreement by the various groups that came before the committee, quite obviously because of the significant benefits that will derive to the State as a result of this indenture Bill. To that extent, I believe that the Minister and his officers deserve some mention and commendation for what I believe is a significant document with significant advantages for the State. I refer to such factors as wharf charges, which are expected to yield a surplus over operating costs of $500 000 per annum. That figure is indexed so that in real terms that value or income to the State will be maintained.

For example, the pipeline licence fee is also $500 000 and is indexed. One can refer also to royalties where some degree of protection for the State has been written in for the period about which we are speaking, namely, through to 1987 and 1992. In addition to those significant benefits to the State, virtually all infrastructure will be provided by the producers at their cost and owned by the State. Despite that, the producers have also accepted commitments regarding State preference, further processing, and environmental protection to name but a few.

As I have said, the project is very significant for the development of the State and requires a significant expenditure of $750 000 000. The majority of witnesses supported the project. They raised questions in relation to protection of specific environmental matters. I believe that the committee has obtained assurances that specific matters will be given consideration by Santos. I am further pleased that on its record to date Santos has performed responsibly in relation to the whole matter of discussion and preparation of this indenture Bill. I have no reason to believe that it should not continue to act responsibily and in the interests of the people of Whyalla, in the protection of the environment, and in providing social amenities for the people who will be forming part of that project.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am afraid that I cannot pussyfoot about this in the way that other members have already done. When I spoke in the second reading debate, I used the word 'farce' in regard to the Select Committee, and what has happened in the past week has absolutely justified what I said. This has been an absolute and complete farce. It is actions like this that bring Parliament into ridicule and contempt by the community.

I am not really surprised that the Labor Party is simply going along with the Government on this. We have heard one of the tamest speeches ever from the member for Baudin, who was a member of the Select Committee, excusing and apologising for all that has happened. We have been hanging around in this House for three hours tonight waiting for this debate to begin. We have been filling in time on licensing Bills home ownership legislation, and whatever else. Labor Party members have been co-operating with the Government by making long-winded speeches to take up time. It was not until 11.5 p.m. we got any of the papers connected with this indenture Bill. Indeed, it was the first item of business on the Notice Paper for today, and members were entitled to expect that this report would have been tabled at 3.15 p.m. Yet, it was 11.5 p.m. before we got it.

There is absolutely no time whatever for any of us, even if we wanted to, to try to digest what this is all about. We have a two-and-a-bit page report which is said to have an appendix to it setting out the witnesses. However, there is no appendix to the report that I have got. I have got, only by courtesy of the Secretary of the Select Committee, what I am told is the official copy of the evidence, 257 pages of it, and we are supposed to debate the thing now in the middle of the night! It is an absolute farce! It has been perfectly obvious from the beginning that the Minister regarded the committee as a tedious, boring necessity that he had to go through, and that he treated that with contempt. He was not even going to take it to Whyalla until people told him that he had to go to Whyalla at least for the sake of what it was going to look like; otherwise there would not have been even a visit to Whyalla yesterday.

I do not think anyone is against the project as a project. I have not come across anyone who seriously objects to the project. However, there are a lot of people who object to the Stony Point site for the terminus, and those are people at Whyalla, particularly, and fishermen as well, who are afraid that the gulf will be polluted and that the opportunities for fishing will go down because fish will be killed, and so on. We were told by the Minister when he introduced the Bill that this was the largest resource development in the State's history, yet it is being pushed through the House within a week. This is a farce, and I protest about it. If I could do anything about it, I would. However, because of the way in which the Labor Party is going along with the Government, I cannot do anything effective. Of course, we know why the Labor Party is going along with the Government: it is because it is so afraid of being labelled as anti-development that it thinks it has to agree to this project for the sake of it. Yet, Whyalla is one of the Labor Party's strongest seats, and the people who are most offended are their own political supporters in that area.

I do not know how many members know it (certainly it has not been mentioned yet), but last night the Whyalla City Council carried without dissent a motion of dissent or protest about all this. I checked it tonight. I spoke to the councillor who introduced it. The council was most concerned about the haste with which everything had gone forward, and it protested that it had not been notified about it. Council members did not even know until Friday night that the committee was going to Whyalla. That did not surprise me, because the committee did not decide to go there until about Thursday. That is the sort of thing that has gone on. I have had protests today from people who had appointments to give evidence at Whyalla and the Whyalla Action Group is one of those. Its members were given an hour to speak, and at the end of that hour it was chop, chop. That was the end of it, and they were told to return at 5 o'clock, when they got another half an hour. They still had not given all the evidence that they wished to give. A man called John Scott was given half an hour at 2.30 p.m. He go on at 10 to 3 I am told, protested about having only half an hour, but was chopped off at the end of half an hour and told to come back later. He went back

and got another half an hour, wanted more time, but was told, 'Too bad, we're catching a plane,' and the committee left.

If one looks (and I am the only one who can look, because I have the only copy of the minutes), one sees that there were 30 or 40 witnesses. How could the committee possibly give any proper consideration to the evidence, to the points put, or to anything else? We might just as well not have had a Select Committee as to have gone through this exercise, and goodness knows what it cost to take everyone up there and have the meeting on Friday and a meeting this morning (which I see was had). It was pure formality meant to appease people, but it has not appeased people; it has meant nothing. I understand that we have Select Committees so that matters can be considered, people can give their views, the committee can then make a recommendation to Parliament through the appropriate House, and the matter can be debated. None of those things can possibly happen in this case. All we have is, 'Yes, it is a good idea. We will let it go forward.' This is not what Parliament is about and, if it meant coming back next week, we could have come back then.

An honourable member: You wouldn't have been here.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Of course I would have been here. I am here now. I am always here if it is necessary. What if I were not here? That has nothing to do with the point at all. The point is that it is not important what I think about the matter: it is what other people think about it, what the community at large thinks about it, and what is the job of Parliament. The job of Parliament is to scrutinise this Bill. What do we find when we look at the Bill? It is 60 pages long. I would be very surprised if most of the members of the Select Committee have even read the Bill or can understand the indenture. It is quite a technical document and runs to 112 clauses and a number of schedules. I will bet that not one member has read all this or can understand it; nor can I blame them, because they have not had a chance to do so.

We did not see the Bill until 1 December, nearly nine days ago now, as it is getting on towards midnight. I make as strong a protest about this matter as I can, as other people have made a protest about it. If I had any way of doing it, I would hold up the Bill. Of course, it will go through because the Labor Party is co-operating with the Government. That is the position. The pertinent question is why the Bill was not brought in earlier. Why was not time given to this Bill? If the Government could get itself organised, this sort of thing would not have happened. Of course, we found tonight how disorganised it is. Here we were, hanging about waiting for the typing to be completed because there was no proper assessment of the time that would be taken.

Let us have a look at the report now (for what it is worth) and see what it says. I have already mentioned the question of witnesses set out in appendix A when there is no appendix A. However, I can see from the minutes that there were 30 or 40 witnesses. The committee accepts the justification put forward in relation to the selection of the Stony Point site. It states what a pity it is that the local people are going to lose some of this resource. Of course, we know that when the matter is finished the local people will lose the lot; there is no doubt about that whatever. There will not be any Stony Point, Weroona Bay or Point Lowly left at all. It will all be included in the project and members of the Select Committee know that perfectly well. I do not know why they did not say that. That is the only possible recreation area at all near Whyalla.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have you been there?

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, of course I have been there.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How often, and when?

Mr MILLHOUSE: Often. I have camped there with the Army over the past three years or so. I do not believe that it has changed much in that time, has it?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Yes, it has, as a matter of fact.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I cannot believe that any changes would affect what I saw and know of the area. The fact is that this will all be lost to the people of the area. Then the question of oil spills is cursorily dealt with. Then there is a bit of regret about the shacks going. Then there is the question of pollution potential, the fishing industry, and marine ecology, and that is the end of it. There is not one positive suggestion there at all.

I could go on and on over this, but there is no point. The Liberal Party and Labor Party will get this through. I suppose that this Bill will go through the Parliament this week now, because the Parties are co-operating on the matter. It does not matter what the results will be. Parliament is completely abdicating its responsibility, and every member of the Select Committee is abdicating his responsibility. I am surprised that the member for Whyalla, whose district is particularly affected, is apparently going along with this, as, indeed, is the member for Flinders.

At least a few weeks ago he had some reservations. In a letter of 1 October that he wrote to Mr Adams (who gave evidence and who spoke to me about this matter), the member for Flinders stated that he had spoken briefly with Santos officials. He further stated:

> From their point of view, Stony Point has the attraction of deep water in reasonable proximity of the shore. While Stony Point is Santos's first choice, it is by no means a foregone conclusion that that will be the case.

Well, it is. That is all we are getting: Stony Point. There is no suggestion of any alternative in the Select Committee's report or that the members of the Select Committee even considered that. The honourable member suggested that, if Mr Adams had not already done so, he should write to the Minister to add weight to the growing pressure for the retention of the beach at Stony Point. There will be no retention of the beach at Stony Point—the whole lot is going. It may be a small price to pay, but it should not be done with ignorance and contempt with which this matter is being treated, first by the Government and the Minister and now by the Select Committee and the Parliament.

I will not be part of all that, and that is why I have made this protest. I know that my protest is in vain and that honourable members do not like to hear what I have to say and would rather I did not say it, because they know that what I am saying is true. This matter is going through so fast that it is a complete farce. People at Whyalla had only two copies of the Bill on Friday and could obtain no more copies to study it, let alone prepare a submission. They had no time to prepare and present submissions, and they were chopped off when they tried to do so. This is just not good enough.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Being a member of the Select Committee, I feel that I must make a few comments, particularly in relation to some of the comments made by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. I take some exception to the point of view that the member for Mitcham expressed when he suggested that the members of the committee did not know what was in the Bill or, for that matter, what was in the indenture. It is fair to say that many of the witnesses went through the indenture clause by clause, and I noted that alongside each clause as they went through the indenture the initials of the people who made comments appeared. Almost invariably, the same clauses were referred to, particularly by two people and sometimes by a third or fourth person. Obviously, people had sat down together. I had no objection to their discussing

the whole thing. Time and time again the same clauses were brought before the committee for consideration.

I take strong exception to the implication that committee members did not know what was in the Bill or the indenture. I thank the House for giving me the opportunity to be on the committee. During the nine years in which I have been in the House, I have expressed great concern about the pollution of the gulf. In fact, I believe that the very first question that I asked in Parliament in 1973 was about the then proposed Redcliff petro-chemical project. Members will have been aware of my concern throughout that time for the marine ecology of the gulf, particulary as it relates to Port Lincoln.

Witnesses appeared before the committee from just about every interest in relation to the project, and in all 46 people gave evidence. I am sorry that the member for Mitcham did not receive a copy of the appendix listing those people. I have a copy, and I believe that the appendix is being further circulated. There are 39 prawn fishermen who operate from that area; they are basically Port Lincoln fishermen, and their commodity is processed through Port Lincoln. The Western Waters Prawn Boat Owners Association, in giving evidence to the committee, stated:

The above associations in this brief submission acknowledge that the Stony Point development will be of benefit to the State of South Australia. However, the Government must also give careful and responsible consideration to the fisheries of Spencer Gulf, the western king prawn fishery, being a valuable one to the State, particularly to the economy of Port Lincoln.

Spencer Gulf catch value in export, form and local market value is $20 000 000. There are 39 boats supporting 156 families.

Mr Keneally: Do you mean that 39 boats provide $20 000 000? The figures change to suit the arguments.

Mr BLACKER: If the member for Stuart had listened, he would have heard me say that the Spencer Gulf catch value in export form and local market value was $20 000 000. That refers to turnover, not only to wharf value. It is the value as it goes through the works. The submission further stated:

Factory Work Force—		
Australian Bight Fishermen Pty Ltd	100	predominately female casual workers
Safcol	60	
Port Lincoln tuna processors	75	
Others	150	
Total	385	

That figure of 385 relates to persons directly employed in the factory work force. The submission then referred to the ancillary work and workers, namely, the engineers, electronics, fishing gear and packaging.

It was estimated that there are 600 employees in Port Lincoln, 400 of whom are directly employed in the processing of prawns and the other 200 of whom are in ancillary industries, their livelihood being dependent on this industry. These people probably face the greatest risk in regard to any future development of the industry, yet they are prepared to accept the proposition, provided that the necessary scrutiny is maintained and that the industry in that area is monitored. The Australian Fishing Industry Council in its submission stated:

The Spencer Gulf is one of the most important areas in South Australia for the production of many very valuable species of fish. It is the Upper Spencer Gulf area that contains many of the vital nursery areas and spawning grounds for these fish, and as such is economically important to recreational and commercial sectors of the South Australian fishing industry.

It was further stated:

In 1977-78 the Spencer Gulf fishery provided a livelihood for 727 professional fishermen and employees, operating out of Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Whyalla, and Port Augusta, and represents an investment in the order of $30 000 000, with an annual turnover of approximately $12 000 000.

I believe that that answers the question raised by the member for Stuart: the turnover of the fishery is about $12 000 000 ex wharf.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: It is 727 fishermen.

Mr Keneally: You said that the total value of the fishery in the Spencer Gulf, including all types of fish, is $12 000 000.

Mr BLACKER: That is what I said. The submission further stated:

The Spencer Gulf is the breeding ground for the 1837 tonnes of prawns caught in the Gulf in 1978-79 and is the basis of an Australian and overseas market with an estimated annual value of $20 000 00.

Once again, we come back to that figure of $20 000 000. It is not necessary for me to reiterate the importance of the gulf to the fishing industry, and likewise the importance of the fishing industry to my district. However, I acknowledge, and I believe that the industry acknowledges, that it will not be so stubborn as to prevent industry developing within the State.

I believe that the industry was very responsible in the presentation of its evidence. It stuck up for what it believed should be done—a monitoring programme—but at the same time was prepared to accept that there are other people in the State. Comments have been made about the alleged haste of the Select Committee, and I must share that concern. I would have much preferred a longer period for public evidence and I suppose that all other members would have preferred that, so that this criticism could be avoided. I do not doubt for a moment that the Minister would have liked to have extra time to avoid that sort of criticism.

My earlier comments on the fishing industry get back to a suggestion that a petro-chemical plant could be established. I have stated on many occasions that I am firmly opposed to a petro-chemical plant, and so is the fishing industry. I believe that if a petro-chemical plant is mooted for that area it will have the strong opposition of the fishing industry. The reason behind that is that fishermen accept that a petroleum industry there is all right from the point of view that, if there was a spill, there is a reasonable opportunity to clean up that spill without causing any extensive long-term damage. The involvement of petro-chemicals, however, is a little different, because e.d.c. (that is the main commodity) is heavier than water and sinks. So immediately a spill occurs the problem is not one of skimming it off the surface of the water but getting it off the sea bed. Needless to say, that is virtually an impossibility.

In general, most of the witnesses appearing before the committee were knowledgeable in their specific spheres. They were very responsible in the way in which they presented their evidence, and I believe that the committee members all learnt a lot from their evidence. I do not think there would be one committee member who would disagree with that comment. Nobody was able to go into that Select Committee with preconceived ideas and not learn anything, and I am sure that they all learnt something.

Mr Keneally: Even the Minister?

Mr BLACKER: I think the Minister learnt one or two things, too. I appreciate the way in which the committee operated; I believe that it operated in a non-partisan way, and to that end I think that that is shown in the final outcome of the committee's deliberations. The real concern of the prawn-fishing industry was: where do we go from here? To that end it was requested that a monitoring programme be set up and, more importantly, an immediate assessment be made of the present position so that can then form the data base from which any further assessment can be made.

The only research work that has been done particularly in the prawn industry is in the vicinity of Chinaman's Creek (in the Redcliff area), and no work has been done in the area adjacent to Point Lowly or Stony Point, the area we are now considering. I think that that is a great pity, because the proposed site of the jetty at Stony Point actually protrudes into the prawn-trawling areas that are now operated, and any impact that it could have will immediately affect those prawn-trawling grounds. The fishermen may want an immediate data base set up now so that any monitoring can be gauged from that. I was pleased that the committee saw fit to recommend as follows:

The committee recommends that the Department of Fisheries in conjunction with the producers and the Australian Fisheries Industry Council undertake an immediate detailed assessment of the marine ecology in order to provide a data base from which further monitoring will be based.

I believe that that is a direct result of the evidence given by the Prawn Fishermen's Association and AFIC. Concern was expressed about the weather conditions prevailing at the site of the jetty. Many witnesses gave the committee to understand that there are many periods, particularly during the summer, when prevailing winds could make it quite hazardous for the berthing of vessels, and it was suggested that this would have to be very carefully controlled and perhaps guidelines set down as to when boats could or could not berth. The fishing industry stated that it would not like the area closed off for long periods when vessels were berthing at or leaving the jetty because as it is adjacent to their prawn-trawling grounds they would not like the fishery to be inconvenienced to that extent.

However, the industry was quite prepared to accept that any increase would be relatively minor. It is likely that a vessel would be in there only two or three times during the actual prawn trawling period (the open period). All the prawn trawling is carried out at night, and the majority of berthing would be done in daylight hours, because it would require tugs to berth effectively.

The point about the containment of an oil spill raises some queries. The guidelines for the loading of ships should be set down so that loading should not occur in winds above a given strength (it was suggested 21 knots) or when the tidal pattern was strong, for if that were the case, even if a boom were placed right around the vessel when loading, if the tidal movement was more than 1.5 knots an oil spill would not be contained within that boom.

Some potential problems could occur, but I do not think that any witness had not considered these problems or was not willing to accommodate contingency plans to ensure that a spill was highly unlikely. Every endeavour has been made to ensure that such a calamity does not occur.

My only other comment relates to the letter that the member for Mitcham read out. I do stand by the comments in that letter. I was waiting rather apprehensively to see what I wrote on that occasion, as one sometimes does. I received two or three letters in response to use of the beaches at Point Lowly. I regret (as does every other member) that these beaches may be lost, but it has been stated quite clearly by the committee and by witnesses that if possible those beaches will remain open. We must have that proviso, because a safety element is involved and in no way could the general public be allowed on to the beaches if there were any potential for an envelope of gas to drift over the beaches and an ignition to occur. The mind boggles as to what might happen. Where public safety is involved, it is obviously necessary that people be kept out of that area if it is in their own best interests.

Many witnesses said that an irresponsible attitude could be adopted by the producers. Whilst those comments were made in fairly general and bland terms, there was no evidence at all to suggest that any one of the companies involved had on other occasions demonstrated irresponsibility in their endeavours to work with the environment. My only personal experience in this matter is that some months ago I went to Moomba, and I can only say that I was very favourably impressed with the way workers at Moomba respected the environment and did everything they could to protect it in whatever way possible. I can only commend them and say that if they continue with that same attitude towards the environment they will be acting in a very responsible way. I support the motion.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): First, I refer to the blast of hot air to which we were subjected by the member for Mitcham. He made some extraordinary statements, and I gained the distinct impression that he was suggesting that in some way the majority of people in Whyalla did not support the project. Let me say that people in Whyalla, maybe a majority of people, have concern about certain areas of the project. I think that that fact was borne out quite clearly in the evidence provided to the committee, but to suggest that the majority of people did not support the project is quite misleading.

It is not the first time that the member for Mitcham has grabbed an issue in this House and tried to make it a huffing and puffing exercise. I suspect that he does this simply because he knows that there is no likelihood of his ever having to accept any responsibility whatsoever in these areas. There is no foreseeable way in the future that he could be a responsible member of a Government and have to face up to such a problem as the one we are considering. The member for Mitcham suggested that fishermen were opposed to this project. The evidence put forward by fishermen indicated that they were concerned about certain areas of concern, but they were not totally opposed to it. I understand that the member for Mitcham was suggesting that the Labor Party supporters in Whyalla were also opposing the development, when in fact the point came out clearly in evidence, for example, that the trade union movement was not objecting to the development but, again, it had areas of concern.

As a member in the House particularly involved with this indenture, I point out that the time element has made it fairly difficult for me to explore all the matters concerning my electorate that I feel ought to have been explored in depth, particularly the areas of concern to people whom I represent in this House, although those people may represent a minority compared to the total number of my electorate.

The committee received a great deal of evidence from interested and concerned parties at very short notice. These people gave their evidence because they were desirous of having their voices heard on the matter. I stress that all members should take the time to read at least some of the evidence, particularly that given by the general public, in order to make themselves aware of the concerns to which I refer. There are many areas that I could discuss, but I intend to address myself to those areas that I believe are of top priority as far as the City of Whyalla is concerned, and top priority as far as the project is concerned. Some people may argue that my priorities are not correct, but nevertheless I intend to deal with the indenture as I see those priorities.

I have given considerable thought to this project ever since it looked like becoming a reality. Some of the opposition to the project has come from the fact that upon completion the project will not be labour intensive. I agree with that contention but I point out that in an environment of high unemployment (Whyalla, on a ratio basis, having the highest proportion of unemployment per capita in the

State) the project warrants support, if for no other reason than that involving unemployment. I have accepted the project, but in so doing I indicate to the Government that I will have dialogue with Santos. I have made it abundantly clear to the public of Whyalla and to the Government that I am particularly concerned with the real need to examine, improve and develop safeguards in respect of the environment. I am satisfied that a great deal of adequate safeguards have been provided and are being examined by Santos and the Department for the Environment, but a close watch must be maintained as the project develops.

The second reason why I have accepted the go-ahead for the fractionisation plant is that I believe that the development in the foreseeable future could involve a petro-chemical works. Unlike the member for Flinders, I believe that the possibilities of the establishment of a petro-chemical works distinctly point to a labour-intensive industry, and it is for that reason also that I support the project.

Mr Lewis: We are getting somewhere.

Mr MAX BROWN: I point out to the honourable member, who seems to be inclined to have a dizzy spell every now and again, that it is a fact (and I am sure the Minister knows it) that when the Dow Chemical Company was examining the Redcliff project it was expected that there would be some 4 000 workers on site during the construction period and, I believe, about 700 people employed in the actual industry upon completion of construction. I say that that is being a reasonably labour-intensive quota.

The committee heard a great deal of concern expressed about the time being very restricted for witnesses to make submissions and do their homework. I agree that the time element was short. In the negotiations with Santos, surely it would have been apparent to the Government that the financial concerns expressed by Santos within the indenture would have to be considered when the indenture was considered by Parliament. I suggest to the Minister that that matter should have been considered long before the time table for the commencement of the project was apparently decided.

If the requirements had been reasonably considered by the Government and Santos, maybe the committee would have received more precise environmental evidence and could have provided reasonable answers to that evidence. I fully understand the witnesses' concern in this area, and certainly I am not unsympathetic to the point raised. I should remind both the Government and Santos that there is a real need for Santos to have urgent discussions with the trade union movement concerning an industrial agreement for the area. It was pointed out in evidence by the trade union movement in Whyalla that reasonable approaches were made to Santos as early as the beginning of this year.

To date, however, there has been no response by Santos. The rush to get the Bill through the House at this time will all be in vain if there is no industrial agreement, and the project will not proceed on time. I am giving some friendly advice to Santos that it ought to proceed immediately with negotiations with the trade union movement. In respect of the evidence by witnesses that Weeroona Bay beach would be lost to the community of Whyalla (and the member for Mitcham somehow got on to this topic, too), I can only say that on several occasions Santos has been questioned about its intention in that area. At all times Santos has reiterated that there is every likeihood that that beach will be retained and, further, that it will be accessible to the general public of Whyalla. Indeed, this matter will be a continuing area of negotiation as far as I am concerned, because it is important that this beach be a public facility. I go further and say that the Whyalla city council should consider negotiations with Santos, particularly on social requirements of the City of Whyalla in that area. A working party is yet to report on this question, but I believe that the area is open to negotiation.

The shacks question is yet to be resolved, but I believe that, in any deliberations it may enter into in respect of resiting, the False Bay area should not be considered. With a much improved situation in regard to Stony Point, the False Bay area will become publicly accessible and should remain an area for future consideration in regard to relocating shacks in the area if public access becomes questionable. The ratable provisions in the indenture demands some comment. The indenture provides for a local government rate that will not place Santos at a disadvantage to other industries in Whyalla, and that has been spelt out quite clearly in the indenture. I could be wrong, but I suspect that the Govenrment has done a deal with Santos. It may be that the Whyalla city council is involved in some way, the deal being that a demand for a yearly local government rate similar to that payable by the Port Stanvac company to the Port Noarlunga council (some $250 000 a year) would not occur. I further suspect that the Government has not properly negotiated with Santos a rate to the City of Whyalla comparable to the social responsibilities that Santos by right should accept.

It was submitted to the committee this morning that some legality exists as to whether Santos is not required to pay any rate at all because of the existence of the B.H.P. Steel Indenture Act. That Act legally exempts the B.H.P. steelworks and its subsidiaries completely from the legal requirement to pay rates to a council. For as many years as the B.H.P. Steel Indenture Act has been in existence, the B.H.P. Company has made what it and the Whyalla council consider to be an *ex gratia* payment. There is no legality or obligation on the B.H.P. to make that payment. I remember very vividly the establishment by the Playford Government of the firm of C. A. Parsons in this area which in turn was governed by the B.H.P. Steel Indenture Act and was not legally obliged to pay any rate to the Whyalla City Commission (as it was then called). On one occasion I recall being on the Whyalla City Commission and C. A. Parsons supporting correspondence to that body suggesting that, in lieu of a rate, it would be prepared to purchase a town clock. The clock was purchased, and to my knowledge it never worked. That is what the B.H.P. Steel Indenture Act is all about.

According to the witness this morning, Santos could legally argue with the Whyalla city council that, if B.H.P. was not obliged to pay rates, why should it be legally obliged to do so. Maybe Santos would advance such argument, but nevertheless this matter does concern me, and no clear protection in that area, to my knowledge, has been afforded to the Whyalla city council by the Government. Even if the *ex gratia* payments to the Whyalla city council by the B.H.P. involve something like $60 000 a year. When we compare that with the Port Stanvac project paying $250 000 a year, we have an area of concern.

I support the indenture, but I give warning to the Government and to Santos that it is my every intention to keep the matter under close examination and my door open to negotiation with Santos in respect of those areas that I believe need further consideration. I support the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I welcome the opportunity to comment on the findings of the Select Committee. For the benefit of the member for Mitcham, as one who supports the Select Committee process, I believe that the setting up of and the work done by the Select Committee on this occasion not only was worthwhile but also gave members of the public the opportunity to come forward and state their views in a clear and precise manner. It was clearly indicated to the

members of the committee that there are some well considered concerns about this proposal, and it gave us the opportunity to properly consider those matters. I believe that resolution of certain problems will result.

It was unfortunate that the member for Mitcham, in his usual fashion, set out to denigrate all concerned. If he was so concerned about not knowing what was in the measure he, like any other member of the community, had the opportunity to sit in on the Select Committee and listen to its deliberations. As the member in whose district this plant will be established, I wish to make one or two comments.

First, I believe that this particular project will have long-term benefits for the people of this State. It would have been irresponsible if the Government and the Parliament refused to consider this matter and delayed it, which could have resulted in the project not going ahead. We have been crying out for large industrial development in this State and this, I hope, is the first of many projects that will be affected by this Government in the relatively near future.

A great deal of concern was expressed by people in Whyalla at the loss of a recreation area, and I sincerely hope that areas will be found to take the place of the areas from which the public will be excluded. I sincerely hope that everything possible will be done to minimise the area closed off to the public. I believe from what we were told by the company that it will do everything in its power to put that into effect. Obviously, it would be quite irresponsible if the public were let into any area where there was any danger whatsoever.

The next matter is that of the shack owners who are going to vacate their sites in the relatively near future. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Lands will take action in the next few weeks to find suitable alternative sites so that these people can be permanently sited again. My next comment is that some people who came before the committee were, in my view, looking for a fight with the committee. They held strong views in relation to this matter. I believe that if we had given them three weeks they still would not have been satisfied, so I do not think that some of the claims that people were not given enough time to consider the matter were really justified, because those people spent a considerable amount of time arguing about the lack of time they had to present themselves before the committee.

It was short notice, I agree, but I think, as has been explained, that it was essential to the viability of the project that the Parliament proceed with the measure as quickly as possible. The other matter of concern, which has been mentioned by the member for Flinders, is the effect that this project could have on the fishing industry. As someone who has been involved with the fishing industry for a long time, I would certainly not want to see any course of action taken that would jeopardise that particular industry. I certainly hope that the suggestions made are put into effect. In particular, I hope that the Department of Fisheries and the industry can get together and monitor the situation to make sure that our valuable prawn grounds are in no way affected.

I believe that this project will allow the people of South Australia to gain considerable benefits from the resources that we have in the northern parts of South Australia. I believe that the people of this State are fortunate that a company such as Santos has been able to organise a project of this nature. That company was established in South Australia and has considerable South Australian involvement in it. This is the sort of project that has brought great benefit to Queensland and Western Australia. The royalties alone will allow the Government to involve itself in areas that are crying out for Government assistance. I sincerely hope that this project is just the beginning of a large development in that area.

Great concern was expressed in relation to the possibility of a petro-chemical plant being established on the site. I would not want to see a petro-chemical plant established on the site unless we had a full-scale inquiry into its effect on the gulf and the surrounding environment. I believe that before a project of that nature could take place we would have to repeat the whole process we have just gone through and, hopefully, would have more time to consider the matter.

I understand the need for haste on this occasion, but I am pleased that the Government has been able to negotiate this measure. I hope that the problems highlighted, particularly at Whyalla, in relation to the loss of a recreation area, can be overcome quickly and that the road that is going to be constructed will be open to the public as often as possible so that the facilities that are going to be provided, such as electricity and water, will be available to adjoining shack owners left in the area. Like the member for Whyalla, who has been involved in this matter, I support the proposition and look forward to the project being brought on stream.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the Bill. In so doing I would like to briefly occupy the time of the House in respect of what was said by the member for Mitcham, who was not a member of the Select Committee. That may not have been his fault, but he was not informed enough to make the statements he made, among which were the following. He said that this was not an occasion on which he was going to pussyfoot around on this matter and went on to say that actions like this cannot fail but to bring Parliament into disrepute. He then packed his bag and went home. I am not quite sure whether that was what he was referring to or whether he was referring to some other matter, but he did not stay to enlighten us any further.

During his remarks the honourable member tried to convince the House that the committee was in some way remiss in its duties because of a certain happening he alleged occurred on the night of Monday last during a meeting of the Whyalla council. I think that there is some point in reminding the House, from the evidence available now, and which committee members certainly heard the opinion of the Whyalla council in respect of the proposition before the House. On our arrival in Whyalla on Monday the first witness to appear before the Select Committee was Aileen Christina Ekblom, 25 Herbert Street, Whyalla, who happens to be the Mayor. When she was called to be examined, the Chairman pointed out the form that hearings take and that anyone who appears as a witness, either by invitation or by request, can put to the committee any information that they think is relevant, or that witnesses may choose another form. I am paraphrasing this to save the time of the House. The Chairman went on to say the following:

> In your case we would be interested in knowing how the city council views the development, whether you are supportive of it, or any other information you have that you think is of value to them.

The response to that question from Mrs Ekblom was as follows:

> Council has debated it. It left it until rather late to debate it so that it could get the feeling of the people. It has been passed as a policy of council, that it will support it. It thinks that the development will be good for the area and that it is far enough away from the city not to provide very many pollution hazards, or anything like that. I think there is a fair amount of pleasure in the fact that we are getting a diversification of industry here.

She went on to speak of a small minority of people who have another view, and so on. If the council wishes to change its opinion within 24 hours, can the committee be

held responsible for that? The opinion which the committee had before it clearly indicated that the council was supportive of the project, that it had debated the matter, it felt that it was welcome in the area, that it had considered the location of the project, and so on. I cannot understand why the council has changed its view. I do not know that it has for sure. We have only the word of the member for Mitcham that that has occurred. If it has, the Minister may have to take that into account, but I do not believe that at this stage it is the Parliament's problem.

The committee cannot occupy itself permanently within locations where projects are proposed. Has the member for Mitcham proposed that the committee take a daily sample of the opinion of people in the area and that the council hold meetings seven days a week and take an average of the opinions? That is absurd. The committee took all reasonable steps to ascertain the position and the feeling of the council. I have outlined the council's opinion and feeling. There can be no doubt that the committee discharged its duty in that area.

The member for Eyre, in speaking to this matter, made what I considered to be some less than judicious remarks. You are now occupying the Chair, Sir, so I might have to pussyfoot around, as the member for Mitcham suggested, because you are now in a somewhat different position from the position in which you spoke as the member for Eyre. The remarks made by you, Sir, in your other capacity were that some witnesses who came before the committee were, as I took it in note form, looking for a fight with the committee. I did not perceive the attitude of any of the witnesses who came before the committee to be of that nature. I did not perceive that any people who appeared before the committee (and there were 45 all told, either singly or in groups) held the attitude that might be described as looking for a fight.

I perceived people who were nervous, agitated and upset at appearing before such an august body, as they saw the Select Committee of the House. I observed people who were humble in their opinion of themselves and indicated that attitude to the committee. In all cases, they had no need to feel humble, because I believe it would be fair to say that I perceived a great concern among witnesses, whether from the Public Service, the so-defined producers, or people who reside in the Whyalla area, a genuine concern that this project should eventuate in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

I cannot recall that anyone was totally opposed to the project, either in Adelaide or Whyalla. I can recall people who were opposed to aspects of the Bill, and one person suggested that the project might be located in the metropolitan area, associated with the existing refinery at Stanvac. I do not recall any person who said that the project as such should not eventuate. That is really what the committee was called upon to consider.

In that respect, it may be of interest to remind members that, if one peruses the Standing Orders of this Chamber, one will see that they do not provide that a Select Committee of the House of Assembly will do this, that, or anything specific. The Standing Orders contain guidelines and rules as to how a committee will report and how it will comport and conduct itself, but no rules are laid down to say what the committee will actually do while it is constituted as a committee. There may be recourse to the various guide books that are available as to the precedents that exist elsewhere, both overseas and in Australia, but nothing is laid down.

I wish to explore briefly that aspect. I believe that the Select Committee conducted itself very well, from and including the Chairman. The Chairman, who was the Minister, held the view that there was an urgency about the matter and he would brook no opposition to the fact that there was a need to progress this matter. This point of view was recognised by members of the Party of which I am a member. We did not like it, but we understood the position in which the Minister found himself in relation to the project.

Since we had already indicated, on a date much earlier this year, that we supported the proposal in principle to set up a project that would bring to fruition the utilisation of the liquids in the Cooper Basin, it would have been not only churlish but also insensible of members on this side to adopt any view other than the view we adopted, which was a view of total co-operation with the Minister and the time requirements that were inherent from the time the measure was introduced in the House.

That clearly shows that there is a need to finalise this matter in time for a 31 December deadline to be met by the people who will put their money where their mouth is, namely, the producers. The producers are called upon in this indenture to do many things. Certainly, the State, through the Government, is also called upon to provide certain support to the venture in various ways, but it is the producers who are called upon to marshal the finances that are necessary to organise their business acumen and the necessary arrangement of contracts and so on so that the construction phase can proceed to provide for the utilisation of the liquids in the Cooper Basin.

Of course, inherent in and allied to that prospect is the fact that there is the need for the producers to meet obligations to which they are already contractually obliged in relation to the supply of gas for South Australia and New South Wales through various intermediaries. The necessity for the producers to continue to supply gas at a rate specified in those contracts is such that they are required to utilise gas from wet holes (in simple terms) or wet wells and in so doing there is the possibility of wastage of a vital energy resource which would not be financially useful to the producers and would not be useful in relation to the shortage of energy on today's world scene.

When we were faced with this need to be speedy and to work hard on the Select Committee, we did not take the view that the member for Mitcham has put forward. It would have been easy for members to say, 'Hell, this is hard yacka. Why can't we not have five or six weeks?' I am speaking only for members on my side: I observed similar behaviour from member opposite, but I do not know what was in their minds. We said that it was a tough job but that there was a genuine need for speed, and we decided that, if every effort was needed, we would give it. We did not do that for the Government: let us be clear about that. That is not our function. As members of the Opposition, we did it for the people of South Australia, and I believe that that is a requirement of the Opposition under the Westminster system.

We gave the same effort as we put forward in Government, as we have done in the past, and we will do shortly in the future when we take over what is rightfully our area, situated from me at the moment only a few metres on the other side of this Chamber. In any event, at the present time we are placed here by the people of the State, and as we have done in the past, we will continue to act responsibly in the matter. I think that disposes of all the nonsense we heard from the member for Mitcham in this matter. We had a job to do and we set about doing it. It was hard and it was difficult.

I did not find it easy to absorb all the information contained in the Bill and the indenture and I suspect that the producer representatives that we encountered on the committee were somewhat surprised at the reasonable grasp we were able to exhibit in our questioning and in the

behaviour generally of this Select Committee. I think that is all I can say. We did a good job for the people of this State. We asked many questions. We probed in all sorts of directions and probably 80 per cent of the time those questions were justified in the directions we pursued. In the other 20 per cent, we may have wandered off at tangents, but I do not believe that was the order of the day. For most of the time we sought information assiduously. I will go on record as saying that wherever that was available, I believe we were given it.

In evidence of that, it can be seen clearly from the remarks of my colleague earlier, the member for Baudin, who pointed out that we received some fairly critical information from Captain Carr, from the Department of Marine and Harbors, who pointed out, I believe very frankly and honestly, something that I had suspected from a long-forgotten naval background. That was the information published about the most amazing mechanical marvels of booms, namely, that if one surrounds a ship with them, we can spill all the oil we like and it will contain it. I had some doubts about those sorts of prophesy that one sees from time to time in literature.

Captain Carr demolished that in about three sentences when he said that he did not believe the evidence he had been able to obtain showed that in tidal speeds in excess of 1.5 knots, the boom was yet to be made that could be put around a ship and that it would put everyone at rest whenever the possibility of a spill was in the offing in relation to oil. It is not the function of a Select Committee of this House to say, 'All right, this project will not go ahead because a certain responsible witness came before us and said there was a problem.' He did not say it could not be surmounted.

What he did was his proper duty in pointing out to the Select Committee, when asked, that there was a problem. He also indicated that there were ways to handle that problem that were not the ways other witnesses had said was the correct path. It is the committee's job to assess that sort of information, in my opinion. I am taking that view because, as I have pointed out, there is nothing in the handbooks or whatever that says what our actual job is. I believe we were on the right track when we took the view that there needed to be a very careful assessment of spillage risk. There needs to be a proper plan prepared. The producers cannot get out of a major obligation in this matter. It is their responsibility to front up and provide the funds, equipment, and technology needed to cater for such a mishap and to make sure that it stays at that level and does not become a disaster, a catastrophe.

I believe, regarding the promises and statements of intention that have been given by the producers and where applicable, by the relevant Government departments, that the people who gave them are genuine persons and that the intent they expressed to us will be met in the promise by delivery of performance. That is the acid test. I made a note earlier, and I hope it does not sound too cynical. The member for Rocky River said that Santos has been a very responsible party when appearing before the Select Committee. I do not quarrel with that. I simply point out that it is very easy to be responsible when making promises. You check the degree of responsibility in relation to the delivery and that is when you issue the marks: pass, fail, or hopeless.

I am prepared to say to this House that I believe that Santos will get over the pass mark with a bit in hand. I believe it would be fair of me to point out, Sir, that I think that, whilst you are in an acting capacity, as an interested party in this matter within whose district the project is located, it might have been somewhat more judicious if another person were occupying the Chair. I take it no further than that because I feel only slightly constrained.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that Standing Orders are fairly clear that in the absence of the Speaker, it is the obligation of the Deputy Speaker to take the Chair.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I draw your attention to a Standing Order in relation to Select Committees that states that any person who has an interest in the matter might also divorce himself from any responsibility in that matter. I do not wish to make an issue of it, but I assure you that that Standing Order is there. I took the trouble to look it up before I got to my feet, which is a bit sneaky, I admit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member continue with his remarks.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Certainly. I think I am raising a principle in this case, which is no reflection on the Chair or the person occupying it. I think it was a slightly injudicious occupancy of the Chair, and I would be very happy if it could be taken under notice by whoever should take these things under notice for the future. I hope I have not been derogatory in any way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that it is the view of the Chair at this stage that the remarks are somewhat uncalled for, but I will allow the honourable member to proceed.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can only reiterate, Sir, that there is no intention on my part to reflect. I think that in matters involving the commitment of $850 000 000 for a project, involving the State in an amount of that magnitude, that there should not be in any way the possibility of a comment from a person in any direction. If you were not in the Chair, I would not have been able to make those remarks. That perhaps may indicate to you the line of thought I was following. I stress that, there is nothing personal in those remarks, nor am I suggesting that in any way whatsoever there has been anything other than a slight feeling of constraint that I have.

I feel that I could, with justification, have spoken for about 3½ hours on this matter, but I have only seven minutes left. I have no desire to do that. What I have done is try to show the House that the Select Committee on this matter worked very hard. We believe the project to be in the interests of the State. As a member of this House I am not over-excited about the royalty arrangement that has been negotiated, and I made my position quite clear in the Select Committee. As a matter of fact, I toyed with the idea of opening my remarks by saying that any member of a Select Committee could stand in this House and say that he had sung his song and run his race, and what else had he to say? That is all I have to say. All the action is in the Select Committee. We come back into the House endorsing the report which has been pre-agreed to anyway after a great deal of discussion and consensus. That is the way it usually goes; we only lost one vote on our side in the Select Committee. That is probably better than par for the course.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I agree, we had only one, so we had a 100 per cent loss ratio. I am not so keen on that now. However, I did not intend to introduce a note of levity, because this is a serious matter. It is important to the State's future and concerns the more sensible use of some of the State's energy resources. I do not think that there is any quarrel on either side of the House regarding the project itself and the aims of it. Concerns were expressed, particularly in relation to the area where the project is to be located. However, everyone in Whyalla had the opportunity to put forward a veiwpoint, although they were constrained by time and by notification.

In that respect I think it was very germane to the project to note that one man, a Mr Blight, who came representing the Shackowners Association was, at the time that the advertisement was published in Whyalla, at one of the shacks. I point out that the *Advertiser* is not delivered there in the same way as it is delivered to Clovelly Park, or wherever. So, it was by chance that Mr Blight heard that he could appear before the committee if he came to town on that day, which he did. He was able to put forward his viewpoint. The committee gave a fair hearing to every person who turned up, apart from one or two minor *contretemps*. I do not think that anyone could honestly say that he was not given a fair go. To those who ran out of time, and to whom the member for Mitcham referred (saying that in some ways they were constrained) and for whom more time was needed, I believe a further reasonable allocation of time was given.

I trust that the difficulties and problems that will arise following the authorisation of this indenture (and they will, as no-one that I know of writes perfect legislation; nor does anyone make perfect agreements) will be met in a spirit of co-operation by the Government and by the proponents, described as the producers, in such a way that the interests of the State that we have all set out to assist will continue to be facilitated. I wholeheartedly support this project.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I want to make three brief points. I was concerned when the member for Mitcham suggested that proper access had not been given by the Select Committee to interested parties.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I was concerned to hear what he had to say. Also, I was interested to hear what the people on the committee had to say. However, from what I have heard, it seems that most people had reasonable access. The member for Whyalla said that time was short, and it seems that overall the matter may have been a little hasty. However, that is over, and we have received the report.

My second point relates to clause 5 of the Select Committee's report dealing with oil spills. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind, nor probably in that of anyone who has had anything to do with shipping, that there will be oil spills connected with a terminal such as this. One has merely to look at Port Stanvac where at times an oil spill is almost a daily occurrence. Every oil terminal has oil spills. Reports from all over the world clearly indicate the limitations of oil spill control mechanisms. I was interested to hear the member for Mitchell support that point. I also heard the comments that were made by Captain Carr and Mr Kinnane from the Department of Marine and Harbors, two gentlemen for whom I have the greatest respect and who are learned and experienced men. I think that the point made regarding the oil spill mechanisms is a valid one, which should be pursued to the utmost to ensure that there is adequate protection.

I refer to clause 6, which concerns recreational facilities. Having been to Whyalla many years ago, I have an idea of the set-up of the area in question. Recently I received a deputation of people from Whyalla who were deeply concerned about the loss of recreational facilities to the City of Whyalla by the construction of this plant. I am vaguely aware of the area, and it concerned me that these people would have these facilities taken from them. I was also interested to hear tonight the members who represent the areas in the vicinity of the development say that they would do their utmost to ensure that the recreational facilities would be kept in the very best manner for the people of Whyalla.

Generally, I support the project. Stony Point will be great for the State. I am pleased that the Select Committee could work together, which again shows the strength of Select Committees. As I said earlier, I am concerned that perhaps enough time was not given to the matter, but it was successful, and I support the acceptance of the Select Committee's report.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWOTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I do not intend to speak for very long because I think that most of what needs to be said has been said by other speakers. I reiterate my appreciation of the efforts put in by members of the Select Committee. Every member of the committee approached his task with a degree of diligence; no-one sought to skimp the task in hand, and all members of the committee made a significant contribution.

I want to deal very briefly with the remarks made by the member for Mitcham, because I utterly reject his suggestions. He described the proceedings of the Select Committee as a farce. If the honourable member takes the time to read the evidence, he will see that what I am saying is perfectly true, that is, that the committee did indeed approach its task seriously and perform that task admirably. The honourable member suggested that we did not intend to go to Whyalla. The fact is that I discussed with the member for Whyalla very early in the life of the Select Committee the possibility of going to Whyalla. We decided that either we would go to Whyalla or we would pick up the fares for people to come from Whyalla to Adelaide if that was to their liking.

Mr Max Brown interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is so. At the first meeting of the Select Committee, this matter was discussed and the committee in its wisdom decided that we should go to Whyalla. So, for the member to suggest that the member for Whyalla was neglecting his duty or that the committee went there only as an afterthought is quite absurd, and I utterly reject that suggestion.

The fact is that I knew that the member for Mitcham was only kidding and grandstanding when he suggested that he would be prepared to come back here for a third week in December. He really gave the game away when he suggested that we were making a farce or a sham of the deliberations of the Parliament, and that he would come back for a third week in December, when it was the member for Mitcham who got up and so loudly protested that we were sitting for two weeks in December, and that that was a farce. That was when the member for Mitcham really gave the game away. If anyone treats this House with contempt, it is the member for Mitcham. He is so interested in this Bill that he has now gone home to bed, I understand. One of our members was returning from a night function and he passed the member for Mitcham heading home.

Mr Whitten: Was he on a bike?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I believe that he was in a Mini Moke. The honourable member has left the place and I believe that he is now well asleep. So, if anyone treats this place with contempt it is the member for Mitcham. I do not know of anyone who from time to time is more universally held in contempt by the rest of the members in this House who do approach their duties with a degree of seriousness that is sadly lacking in the member for Mitcham. He says that the Bill is 63 pages long and that he has not had time to read it. However, he has had it for a week. If the honourable member was not so busy in his extra-curricula activities, the member, as a lawyer, would have had plenty of time to come to terms with that Bill. The honourable member has had the Bill for eight days, so I reject completely his claim that he has not had time to study the Bill; he has had ample time.

Witnesses who appeared before the committee with far less legal training than the honourable member or no legal

training have come to grips very well with the Bill. For the member to suggest that the Government is treating Parliament with contempt because he has not had time to read the Bill shows that he is too busy with his extra-curricula activities to pay proper attention to what should be his first priority. It is interesting that the honourable member is on record as saying that he would have held up the Bill had his will prevailed. I guess Santos and other representatives who read *Hansard* will be interested in that comment. The member is not interested in developing the resources of the State as expeditiously as can be done. He would be quite happy to see the project stalled and, in fact, the project would be in jeopardy if we did not agree to proceed. He would be quite happy with that.

The member suggested that we were disorganised tonight because the Bill was not called on until 11 o'clock. The committee was perfectly well organised, as it concluded its deliberations today. The honourable member is really insulting the *Hansard* staff who have been working overtime to prepare the transcript. It took longer than anticipated. I do not suggest for one moment that *Hansard* has been slothful in its work. The honourable member is really insulting the *Hansard* staff if he is suggesting that anyone is disorganised. We were waiting for the transcript to be properly prepared. To suggest that there is something wrong with that displays an ignorance of Standing Orders. If the evidence had not been available, the member would complain that he had no evidence to read.

Standing Orders dictate that evidence shall be presented to Parliament and that no-one shall be privy to that evidence other than the Select Committee before that time. So, that argument was completely nonsensical. I know how much time the member for Mitcham would have spent on wading through the hundreds of pages of evidence when he could not get through 63 pages of the Bill in over a week. That was a complete farce. The member for Mitcham attacked the member for Whyalla. If anyone approached the Select Committee and the affairs of their constituents responsibly, it was the member for Whyalla. That has been his prime concern throughout the whole of the hearings. So, I throw that back in the teeth of the member for Mitcham.

There have been repeated suggestions in relation to timing. I repeat that there would have been universal condemnation of the Government if, when this indenture was first brought into the House, we had scheduled a third sitting week for December. We cannot pre-empt the sittings of the Upper House and that could perhaps be forced upon us. However, I do not see the necessity for it. The Bill has been available for perusal for over a week. This matter is so important that the Government would be quite happy for that to happen. I repeat that if we scheduled a third sitting week in December to give extra time for witnesses and Parliament to consider the Bill we would have been roundly criticised. We were certainly roundly criticised by the member for Mitcham for cutting into the time that he might have at Maslins Beach or somewhere else in December.

Mr Bannon: How pathetic!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: What is?

Mr Bannon: The criticism of the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Was the honourable member with him?

Mr Bannon: No, I'm saying that I don't agree with his criticisms.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: They were pathetic. I thought for a moment that the Leader was criticising me. No-one fulminated more loudly than the member for Mitcham about the second sitting week in December, let alone the third week that he is now advocating. I will not waste the time of the House going on with what the member for Mitcham had to say. However, I refute his suggestion that the committee did not give the witnesses a fair go. The member for Mitchell mentioned that in his remarks a moment ago. I believe that the committee went out of its way to accommodate the people of Whyalla yesterday. It heard every witness who indicated that he wanted to appear, and we gave the opportunity to some of coming back later in the day to complete their evidence. Anyone who suggests that witnesses were not given a fair go in my view is not making a fair judgment of the proceedings. Again, I commend the report of the Select Committee to the House. In essence, the committee is suggesting that the Bill should proceed with two minor amendments, which will be moved in due course.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Modification of State law in order to give effect to the Indenture, etc.'

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I feel somewhat discomfited rising to speak on this clause. On further study I cannot equate the purpose of the recommended amendment. One cannot be any more honest than that. At this stage I cannot see the sense of it. I do not believe the House should do something which it does not understand even though we believe we understood it at the time of the Select Committee. Clause 5 (2) *(k)* provides that the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act shall not apply. Does the Minister have an explanation?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I hope that it is better than the one which the Minister gave this morning and which did not convince us for more than 24 hours. The proposition contained in the amendment is a great thing to do if it is sensible. We are doing it because we may be modifying various laws of the State in the indenture. We are taking it out and bringing special attention to that fact. I have great difficulty in working out why we would want to modify section 34 (1) *(a)*, which states:

> A person shall not use, operate or be in charge of, as the case may be, any of the following apparatus:
> *(a)* any internal combustion engine;

I do not see why we should do that. I thought I saw it earlier, but now I do not.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

> Page 3, line 26—After *(k)* insert 'section 34 (1) *(a)* of'.

I understand that the normal practice in a process industry of this type (this understanding is generally accepted) is that people who drive compressors in the field, for instance, or operate a gas turbine style of engine, are not required to have an engine driver's certificate, which I think is required to operate an internal combustion engine. By deleting section 31a, we are opening the way to what is now known as normal practice in this industry.

In this industry trained operators, who have an operator's certificate other than an engine driver's certificate, are permitted to, and currently do work on this sort of machinery in this industry. By inserting that it will read:

> Section 31a of the Pressure Vessels Act shall not apply in relation to activities that the producers contemplate in the indenture.

I understand that that means that people will not be required to have this engine driver's certificate to work this sort of equipment. That is generally accepted in the industry. If the amendment does not mean that, it is deficient in its effect. However, that is what I understand the amendment does.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I appreciate the Minister's explanation. Section 34 of the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act states in part:

unless he holds certificates of competency to use, operate or be in charge of . . .

We appear to be on the right track. I am happy to leave it at that, if the Minister will make sure about it in another place.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As explained to me, that is the intent of the amendment. If it does not do that, we will see that it is rectified in another place, if that is required.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Application of this Act to land subject to the Real Property Act.'

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

(ii) Page 4, after line 2—Insert new clause as follows:

8. (1) The Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group established pursuant to clause 81 of the indenture shall, not later than a date stipulated by the Minister of Environment and Planning, in each year present to that Minister a report on the work of the consultative group during the previous financial year.

(2) The Minister of Environment and Planning shall, as soon as practicable after his receipt of a report presented to him under subsection (1), cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

This amendment is moved as a result of a number of sbmissions put to the committee as people believed that this was an important part of the indenture. They believed that it should be public knowledge so that environmental groups and others could be reassured in relation to the effective working of this group. The committee concurred with that view.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I support this amendment. It is certainly being included in the Bill, although it has a direct relationship with clause 81 of the indenture. You, Sir, as a participant on the Select Committee, would understand how it came about. I should like to place on record my appreciation that the Minister saw that, although the provision as it was in the indenture in clause 81, set up a group, it really did not provide for anyone to know what he was doing, which is what it comes down to. If there is a requirement to make a report and for it to be tabled, that will, I think, serve the interests of the public generally in making know whether there are problems in an environmental area in relation to this project. People will then know about it and also know about the steps that are being taken to correct any problem that may have occurred.

Mr BLACKER: I support the amendment. I think that the original clause 81 of the indenture was a little broad and that, although basically the intent of all members could have been covered in broad terms, it was not sufficiently specific. The amendment strengthens it and gives it more teeth, so that there is a responsibility on the Stony Point environmental consultative group to report at least annually to the Minister and, subsequently, to Parliament so that a continuing assessment of the overall activities of that group can be made.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 1.29 to 1.40 a.m.]

PLANNING BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In 1911 the Corporation of the Town of Glenelg (as it then was) closed a public road which lay to the west of the seawall which was then situated on the western boundaries of Colley and Wigley Reserves. The northern section of the closed road extended from the Patawalonga River to the northern boundary of the then Adelaide Road (Anzac Highway) and the southern section extended from the southern boundary of Adelaide Road to a point to the west of the council's chambers and offices on the northern boundary of Jetty Road.

Part of the Glenelg Sailing Club's building and some harbour installations are erected on the northern section of the closed road. An amusement park and the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club's building occupy the southern section of the closed road. The amusement park buildings and structures include:

1. A substantial brick building housing a 'dodgem' car circuit and pin-ball machines which stands partly on the closed road and partly on Colley Reserve. This building was constructed and is occupied by the proprietor of these amusement enterprises pursuant to a lease from the corporation.
2. The Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club's building, including public conveniences, which is held on lease from the corporation and was constructed with the assistance of loan funds from the council.
3. A substantial building erected by the corporation and occupied under permit by proprietors of various amusements.
4. Other structures used for the purposes of amusements, such as a miniature golf course, ferris wheels, trampolines and a merry-go-round.

Under the Metropolitan Development Plan City of Glenelg Planning Regulations—Zoning, both sections of the closed road are within the 'District Commercial (Patawalonga) Zone', which is stated in the regulations to be intended primarily to accommodate an amusement park, fun fair and harbour installations.

MacMahon Constructions Pty Ltd is proposing an extensive redevelopment of portion of the 'closed road' extending from a point to the west of the Glenelg Town Hall and extending to the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club building. The proposed structure is to be covered with cladding in the form of an artificial 'mountain', including water slides terminating in a plunge pool. The facilities proposed, either to be housed within the 'mountain' or in the open air in the proposed lease area, include:

(1) An 80-year-old merry-go-round to be renovated for the purpose.
(2) A snack-bar and take-away food restaurant.
(3) A 'sky-cycle' ride.
(4) 'Bumper boats' in a lake.
(5) Two 18-hole miniature golf courses.
(6) Change rooms for users of the water slides and beach.

The company wishes to complete the redevelopment in time for the next summer season. MacMahon Constructions' solicitor searched the Certificate of Title to the 'closed road' (Certificate of Title Register Book Volume 912 Folio 32) and through a caveat entered upon the title discovered a declaration of trust, made by the council on 10 September 1912. The declaration of trust was in the same terms as a trust set forth in the road-closing order made on 6 October 1911, under which the road was closed. In addition to closing the road, the order vested the lands comprising the closed road in the council, and purported to declare a trust in respect of the land under which it was to be used for the recreation and amusement of the inhabitants of the Corporation of the Town of Glenelg. The trust provided that the corporation should not erect or cause or permit to be erected any building erection or structure on the land, except for temporary buildings or structures for the periods (totalling 23 days in each year) over the Christmas-New Year and Easter periods, and one other holiday weekend.

There is a difference of legal opinion as to the validity of this trust. On one view it is a valid charitable trust. However, some are inclined to doubt whether the council ever had power to bind itself by such a trust and any such deficiency of power would of course be fatal to the validity of the trust. The Government has taken the view that it should intervene to put the matter beyond doubt. Hence the present Bill provides for the discharge of the trust and the validation of transactions that might be impugned because of its past existence. Any decision as to the use of the land, or the construction of buildings, is a matter for the local council. Because the company will require a reasonable long lease, it is desirable that the operation of section 44 of the Planning and Development Act, which would require the approval of the Director, be excluded. Of course, all other relevant provisions of that Act and the Local Government Act will apply.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enacts new section 886ba of the principal Act. Subsection (2) provides for the extinguishment of the trusts and the discharge of the caveat relating to them. Subsection (3) provides for consequential alterations to the Register Book. Subsection (4) validates past transactions that might have been affected by the trusts. Subsection (5) provides that the council is to continue to maintain the area in question as a public park and provides for the erection of facilities or amenities for refreshment, recreation or amusement either by the council itself or by lessees or licensees of the council. Subsection (6) excludes the operation of section 44 of the Planning and Development Act.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.43 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 December at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 December 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICES

206. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Premier aware that the Federal Government is considering restricting the operations of the various State Government Insurance Offices in the general insurance industry, and, if so—

(a) what discussions have taken place with the Federal Government and when; and

(b) does the Government agree with the Federal Government's intentions and, if so, why?

2. Is it also a fact that the Federal Government is to discuss with the general insurance industry whether it wishes to see restrictions placed on the operations of State Governments in selling workers compensation and compulsory third party insurance premiums?

3. What alterations to the Third Party Insurance Premiums Committee are proposed by the Government?

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

1. No—the Federal Government has not indicated it is considering restricting the operations of S.G.I.C.

(a) None.

(b) Not applicable.

2. No.

3. The Government has not considered any alterations to the Third Party Insurance Premiums Committee.

DIESOLINE TAX

225. **Mr LANGLEY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How much is collected in State taxes on diesoline?

2. How much of this is given to the Highways Department to be spent on road construction and maintenance?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies as follows:

1. The average amount collected monthly for diesoline since the inception of the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act, 1979, is $308 736.36.

2. All amounts (less administration expenses) collected under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act, 1979, are paid into the Highways Fund.

PRIVATE RAILWAY SERVICES

229. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it intended that private railway operations should be extended in South Australia and, if so, why?

2. What discussions have been held or agreements reached with A.N.R. regarding sale or lease of country lines and what railway lines are involved?

3. What private entrepreneurs have had discussions with the Government and what railway lines were involved?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. I am unaware of any private railway operators' proposals to extend their operations.

2. The Chairman of Australian National Railways Commission is unaware of any negotiations with private railway operators.

3. Refer to 1.

WATER PRESSURE

230. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Why was the water pressure reduced in the vicinity of Regency Road, Happy Valley, two to three weeks ago?

2. Is the reduction to be permanent?

3. Was adequate notice given of this reduction to local householders?

4. Is the Minister aware that, with the reduced pressure, underground sprinkler systems installed at considerable cost no longer work?

5. What remedial action is the Minister prepared to take?

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

1. Water pressure was reduced as the result of a programmed re-zoning of the Happy Valley/Reynella area. When this area was first developed, it was supplied with water from a higher zone as this was the only way of bringing water into the area. With the development that has occurred, the distribution system has expanded so that it is now possible to supply the area at its correct zone level. In fact, this reduction in pressure was a practical necessity as in certain sections of the area, pressures were excessive and have been the subject of complaints.

2. Yes.

3. As residents still receive a supply which is above the Engineering and Water Supply Department's minimum standard, no advance notice was considered to be necessary.

4. Provided internal piping is in good working condition, underground sprinkler systems should operate satisfactorily.

5. Not applicable.

TOURIST ROADS

235. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What is the programme for building and upgrading tourist roads this financial year and what is the estimated cost of each project?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The programme for building and upgrading tourist roads under the Tourist Board Grant Scheme for the 1981-82 financial year totals $50 000 and comprises the following works:

1. District Council of Lincoln, continuing upgrading of 6 kms of the Tulka/Sleaford/Cape Wiles road. Estimated cost $20 000. Grant $10 000.

2. District Council of Robe, completion of Robe scenic drive. Estimated cost $10 000. Grant $5 000.

3. District Council of Murray Bridge, construction of an access road and lookout at Sunnyside Reserve. Estimated cost $27 000. Grant $13 500.

4. District Council of Victor Harbor, sealing of portion of the Waitpinga Beach access road. Estimated cost $135 000. Grant $21 500.

HONEYPOT ROAD

236. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister concerned at the condition of Honeypot Road, Hackham West?

2. How many complaints have been received in the Minister's office in the last 12 months about the condition of this road?

3. When is rectification work likely to begin and by whom will it be done?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is presumed that the honourable member is referring to an 0.8 km section of Honeypot Road running westerly from South Road, which has not been upgraded, unlike the remainder of the road. When inspected on 3 November 1981, this section of road was found to be sealed and considered to be in fair traffickable condition with no potholes.

2. Nil.

3. Honeypot Road, and hence improvements thereto, is the responsibility of the City of Noarlunga and the honourable member should approach council for the desired information.

KENIHANS ROAD ACCIDENTS

237. **Mr O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many accidents involving fatalities have occurred on Kenihans Road, Happy Valley, in the last 12 months?

2. Has the Minister received complaints about the poor condition of the western end of this road?

3. When is it intended that the interrupted reconstruction of Kenihans Road will be recommenced?

4. Who will be the constructing authority and how long will the job take?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Nil according to Highways Department records.

2. No.

3. Kenihans Road, and improvements thereto, is the responsibility of the District Council of Meadows and the honourable member should approach council for the desired information.

4. See 3.

GAOL INMATES

240. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many persons were in each gaol in South Australia as at 30 September 1981?

2. What is the average cost of keeping a prisoner in gaol for one year?

3. How many males and females, respectively, were in gaols in this State as at 30 September 1981?

4. How many male and female juveniles were in the respective correctional institutions as at 30 September 1981?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Institution

	Male	Female	Juv.	Total
Adelaide Gaol	216	—	—	216
Yatala Labour Prison	372	—	6	378
Women's Rehab. Centre	—	14	—	14
Cadell Training Centre	89	—	—	89
Port Augusta Gaol	55	3	—	58
Mount Gambier Gaol	12	—	—	12
Northfield Security Hospital	28	1	—	29
Port Lincoln Prison	25	—	—	25

2. As at 30 June 1981—$16 700.

3. See 1.

4. See 1.

HOLDING SCHOOL POLICY

245. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In relation to the 'holding school' policy, for what reason has the Government now moved away from supporting 'essential condition (4)' contained in the memorandum to the Director-General of Education (32/1/254) dated 25 September 1978, which stated:

> A commitment made in the cash flow of the Directorate of Educational Facilities major works programme for the permanent school to be completed in three to four years after the commencement of the holding school.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The cash flow alluded to in September 1978 was based on expected levels of funding. The position has changed because of present financial reality, not anticipated at that time, including a cut in real terms in Commonwealth Government allocations for capital works. It has therefore become necessary to review all projects intended to be included in the building programme, with priority going to those schools where facilities are most in need or where additional accommodation is essential.

HUMAN ACHIEVEMENT SKILLS

260. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the human achievement skills programme continue in 1982 and, if so, at what level of commitment and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The human achievement skills programme is a joint Department of Community Welfare/Education Department project in the central northern region. When the programme started it was agreed in principle that it should operate until March 1982. However, continuance beyond December 1981 is subject to a satisfactory review of the programme and the availability of funds. The review is currently underway.

STUDENT TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES

264. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the Minister expand the 'distance criterion' for students' travelling allowances to incorporate educational needs as well as social and emotional needs so that, among other things, students will not have excessive travel costs as a hurdle to educational opportunity at specialist schools and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No. Parents who wish to choose other secondary schools because of particular options which might be available, are expected to pay the transport costs involved as a result of the exercise of that choice.

FARM MACHINERY

265. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When does the Government intend to introduce amendments to the Highways Act regarding stock and farm machinery access across controlled roads?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department is presently looking at amendments to the Highways Act to provide some easing of the restriction regarding the movement of stock and machinery across controlled access roads. The amendment is not considered an urgent measure as all factors relating to the safety of the travelling public must also be considered and compensation is paid to the owners of properties adversely affected by a controlled access road.

TRUCK EXHAUSTS

266. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it a fact that the Government intends to permit the repositioning of exhausts on trucks used for general cartage and primary production and, if so, when?

2. What effect would this resiting have on noise levels emitted and what is the highest noise level permissible?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Road Traffic Act does not contain any specific requirements relating to the position of truck exhausts. There are no proposals to introduce any specific requirements relating to the position of truck exhausts at the present time.

2. The maximum allowable exhaust noise for a 'drive by' test is between 82db (A) and 89db (A), depending on vehicle and engine size. In a stationary test the limits are between 91db (A) and 95db (A).

LEVEL-CROSSING ACCIDENTS

268. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many level crossing accidents have occurred at Port Road, Woodville, in each year since 1976 and how many were between S.T.A. railcars and:

(a) motor vehicles;
(b) trucks or semi-trailers;
(c) cyclists; and
(d) pedestrians,

and how many occurred on the up and down Port Road intersections, respectively?

2. Does the S.T.A. intend to install boom gates at these level crossings, and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

3. What is the estimated cost of boom gates for these crossings?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON The replies are as follows:

1. 1976-77 nil; 1977-78 two; 1978-79 nil; 1979-80 two.
(a) Five. Three on up road and two on down road.
(b) Nil
(c) Nil
(d) Nil

2. No. The standard method of protection for level crossings throughout Australia is by provision of red flashing lights. In addition, the State Transport Authority provides a warning bell. Because some motorists cross level crossings after a train has passed but before the flashing lights have ceased to operate, it has been known to occur that on crossings with two or more tracks a second train has collided with a car which has moved off prematurely. As there is only a single line of rails at the Port Road crossing there is no requirement for installing automatic half-barriers. It is considered that adequate warning systems are provided at the crossing.

3. The estimated cost of providing automatic half-barriers at Port Road crossing, Woodville, would be $65 000.

TRAFFIC FLOW FIGURES

270. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What are the latest traffic flow figures available along Frederick Road in each direction during the following periods:

(a) 7 a.m.-8 a.m.;
(b) 8 a.m.-9 a.m.;
(c) 9 a.m.-10 a.m.;
(d) 10 a.m.-4.30 p.m.;
(e) 4.30 p.m.-5 p.m.;
(f) 5 p.m.-5.30 p.m.;
(g) 5.30 p.m.-6.30 p.m.?

2. What are the latest traffic flow figures available for those periods for the Trimmer Parade/Tapleys Hill Road intersections?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON The replies are as follows:

1. The Highways Department carried out a two-way traffic count along Frederick Road on 3 October 1979 at the undermentioned locations, with the details being as follows:

	North of Grange Rd	South of Trimmer Pde	North of Trimmer Pde
7.00 a.m.- 8.00 a.m. . .	754	643	663
8.00 a.m.- 9.00 a.m. . .	745	733	756
9.00 a.m.-10.00 a.m. . .	492	370	387
10.00 a.m.- 4.30 p.m. . .	3535	3152	3606
4.30 p.m.- 5.00 p.m. . .	421	415	473
5.00 p.m.- 5.30 p.m. . .	490	365	398
5.30 p.m.- 6.00 p.m.* .	317	299	333

* The Highways Department does not have available the hourly two-way traffic volume figures after 6.00 p.m. as such counts are conducted on an 11 hour basis, viz. 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.

2. The Highways Department carried out a two-way traffic count on 27 May 1981 at the Tapleys Hill Road/Trimmer Parade intersection with the details being as follows:

	Tapleys Hill Road (North Arm)	Tapleys Hill Road (South Arm)	Trimmer Parade (East Arm)	Trimmer Parade (West Arm)
7.00 a.m.-8.00 a.m. . . .	1469	1328	647	446
8.00 a.m.-9.00 a.m. . . .	1397	1256	771	602
9.00 a.m.-10.00 a.m. . .	1047	960	585	368
10.00 a.m.- 4.30 p.m. . .	8573	7888	4860	3313
4.30 p.m.-5.00 p.m. . . .	1237	1163	555	365
5.00 p.m.-5.30 p.m. . . .	919	877	531	369
5.30 p.m.-6.00 p.m.* . .	761	680	486	331

* The Highways Department does not have available the hourly two-way traffic volume figures after 6.00 p.m. as such counts are conducted on an 11 hour basis, viz. 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.

SEATON ACCIDENTS

271. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many motor vehicle accidents have occurred since 1975 at the intersection of Trimmer Parade and Frederick Road, Seaton, and what are the numbers of injuries and deaths as a result?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Highways Department records indicate that the following reported accidents occurred at this location during the years 1975-80 inclusive: number of reported accidents 72; persons injured 17; persons killed 0.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

275. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. How much money was generated for the Planning and Development Fund—

(a) from subdivisions under the Planning and Development Act; and
(b) from strata titles under the Real Property Act, in each of the years 1976-77 to 1980-81?

2. Was any other money paid in during this period and, if so, from what source?

3. What moneys were paid out of the fund in each of these years?

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

1.—	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
(a)	282 210	274 660	226 520	155 320	159 360
(b)	903 760	700 200	392 600	317 940	348 140

2. Yes.

	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
Semi Government loans	800 000	800 000	800 000	1 000 000	—
Treasury loan	—	—	—	28 000	—
Interest free, non-repayable assistance from S.A. Government	—	—	—	—	506 000
Contribution from Consolidated Revenue	303 796	12 362	100 000	100 000	100 000
Contributions from councils	28 000	—	—	—	—
Coast Protection Board grant	14 306	50 000	—	—	—
Treasury interest	137 977	86 620	51 551	61 476	95 200
Rent, royalties, etc.	83 345	80 143	88 889	89 542	86 905
Sale of land and improvements	17 944	27 700	7 500	190 500	268 218
Grants for special work project for Aboriginals	—	—	19 500	11 100	—
Regency Recreation Park reserve fees	—	37 809	53 028	28 793	—
State Unemployment Relief Scheme grant	—	31 891	3 369	—	—
Recoupment of funds held by Crown Law Department	—	527 029	420 000	—	—
Miscellaneous	—	3 304	2 483	5 712	12 052
3.	3 892 102	3 386 999	1 817 732	1 807 579	2 092 944

OCCASIONAL CARE

277. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. When is it expected a decision will be made on the occasional care policy proposal?

2. When that decision is made and, if it is approved, how long can the Salisbury North Neighbourhood House expect to wait before processing of their application is complete?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. As at 30 October 1981 the Ministers of Education, Health and Community Welfare had approved the occasional care policy.

2. Funding for submissions under the occasional care policy cannot be considered unless funds are available in the 1982-83 budget. At the time of the new budget, the submission from Salisbury North Neighbourhood House will be considered on merit and in relation to the priorities of other submissions before the Childhood Services Council.

WHITES ROAD ACCIDENTS

282. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What has been the incidence, cost of damage and extent of injury of reported accidents along that portion of Whites Road, Paralowie, where presently the dog-leg bend exists, over each of the past 10 years?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Highways Department records indicate that the following reported accidents occurred on this section of Whites Road in 1980: No. of reported accidents, 2; property damage, approx. $1 000; persons injured, 2; persons killed, 1.

The department has no record of any accidents being reported on this section of Whites Road during the years 1971-79 inclusive.

PARAFIELD TRADE FAIR

283. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: When is it proposed to hold the 1981 open day and trade fair at the Parafield Plant Introduction Centre and Poultry Research Station?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The 1981 Poultry Trade Fair, held at the Parafield Poultry Research Centre, was officially opened by the Minister of Agriculture on Wednesday 4 November 1981.

PARAFIELD GARDENS SITE 4

284. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Housing:

1. What is the present state of planning for the 'Site 4' commercial/retail/community complex in Parafield Gardens?

2. When is it now expected that each stage will be completed?

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

1. With informal discussions with Salisbury council officers in October it was understood that the council may reassess its district centres policies. The South Australian Housing Trust subsequently wrote to Salisbury council on 3 November expressing a willingness to participate in any formal reassessment affecting the Parafield Gardens Centre site. No response has as yet been received.

2. Until the future status of the site is determined it is not possible to give details on development stages.

SALISBURY NORTH-WEST RAIL SERVICE

285. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister give consideration to the provision of a suburban rail service to Salisbury North-West by either relocating Direk railway station or the construction of a new station and by the scheduling of railcars to that station at peak hours?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is not proposed to provide a suburban rail service to Salisbury North-West by either relocating Direk railway station or constructing a new one. The area is presently serviced by Bus Route 400-401 from Salisbury railway station.

DARTS ASSOCIATION

286. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. When did the Northern District Ladies Darts Association apply for assistance from the Department of Recreation and Sport and for what did they apply?

2. During the currency of that application or related applications what decisions or changes of decision have been made regarding the level of assistance to be granted?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. In May 1979, an application for financial assistance under the Capital Assistance Scheme was received to erect a licensed club facility for dart playing and community entertainment.

2. None.

ETHNOSCIENCE COURSE

305. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. It is proposed that the ethnoscience course at the Adelaide College of Arts and Education be no longer offered from 1983 and, if so, why?

2. In the event of the closure of that course, what alternative avenues of study are available to those students wishing to undertake studies in those areas presently covered by the ethnoscience course?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Ethnoscience is presently available at the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education as an option in teacher education courses. That arrangement will continue in 1982. All courses, including components of courses, presently offered in the colleges to be merged into the South Australian College of Advanced Education will be reviewed by the management of the new college when it comes into existence in 1982. It is not possible to prejudge the outcome of that review or any decisions based on it which may be made by the college council, which has not yet taken office.

KEEVES COMMITTEE

306. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When is it anticipated that the second report to the Keeves committee of inquiry will be released publicly?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The committee of inquiry into education plans to submit its second and final report to me by 31 December 1981. When I have had an opportunity to study the contents of the report I will be in a better position to comment on the matter of its public release.

SECURITY AGENTS

316. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: Is it a fact that the Government intends to use private security agents to man metropolitan law courts and, if so, why?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No.

TAXIS

317. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of the Government to amend legislation so as to provide for the use of smaller vehicles to complement the existing taxi fleet in South Australia and, if so, when and what restrictions will apply in relation to the number of persons carried in such vehicles and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No alteration to the regulations under the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act is required to enable smaller motor vehicles to be licensed as taxi-cabs. The discretion is vested in the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board. Vehicles of two litre engine capacity licensed to carry four adult passengers are already operational supplementing those vehicles licensed to carry five adult passengers. Two children under the age of 12 years may be carried in addition to the four or five adult passengers.

Any application from licence holders to utilise motor vehicles smaller in engine capacity and/or interior dimensions that would necessitate the carriage of less passengers would be closely considered by the board having regard to safety, economy and comfort.

TICKET-SELLING MACHINES

318. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it the intention of the S.T.A. to introduce automatic ticket-selling machines in metropolitan Adelaide at railway stations or various bus stops and, if so, at what locations and when is it anticipated that such machines will be introduced?

2. Are the increased penalties for evasion of ticket fares part of the Government strategy for the introduction of automatic ticket-selling machines?

3. What studies have been conducted, when and by whom, to determine the anticipated staffing reductions that may be achieved by introduction of the automatic ticket-selling machines in bus and tram, and rail services, respectively, over the next five years?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority has no immediate plans to introduce automatic ticket-selling machines in metropolitan Adelaide at railway stations or various bus stops. Authority officers are continually monitoring developments in automatic ticket-selling machines interstate and overseas.

2. The increased penalties for evasion of ticket fares are not a formal part of any strategy for the introduction of automatic ticket-selling machines.

3. No calculation of anticipated staffing reductions resulting from introduction of automatic ticket-selling machines has been made.

RAILCARS

319. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many S.T.A. railcars were in traffic with motors permanently isolated as at 16 November 1981 and what are the reasons for this practice?

2. How many S.T.A. railcars are awaiting repairs or maintenance due to lack of spare parts?

3. How many S.T.A. railcars are in service with two-way radios non-operational and when are these radio units to be repaired?

4. How many radio units are installed in the S.T.A. rail fleet and what is the annual maintenance cost of the radios?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON The replies are as follows:

1. Seven. This situation occurs occasionally due to unusual peaks in maintenance required on the railcars. The practice of running railcars on one motor is not unusual and enables consists to be run during peak periods without reducing their length or the level of service available to the public.

2. Nine. Six of these railcars are being used in service on a restricted basis.

3. On 24 November 1981 there were defective radios in two railcars. These were repaired on the same day.

4. 136. Fifty-three of the units have only recently been installed and an actual annual maintenance cost is not available. Based on experience with radios previously installed, the State Transport Authority estimates that the annual maintenance cost will be approximately $40 000.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

320. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many applications were received during 1980-81 and since 1 July for the installation of traffic lights and pedestrian crossings in the metropolitan and country areas, respectively, and how many have been rejected or deferred?

2. What amount of money would be required to meet all those requests?

3. What is the waiting period for these installations to take place in the metropolitan and country areas, respectively?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Highways Department records indicate the following:

(a) Period 1.7.80-30.6.81

Metropolitan area

	Traffic Signals	Pedestrian crossings (inc. school crossings)
Applications received	24	28
Found to be not justified	20	25
Country Area		
Applications received	3	2
Found to be not justified	3	2

(b) Period 1.7.81-23.11.81

Metropolitan area		
Applications received	5	14
Found to be not justified	3	9
Country Area		
Applications received	—	7
Found to be not justified	—	7

2. Had investigation revealed that provision of all the traffic signals/pedestrian crossings requested was necessary, the expenditure of some $2 300 000 would be involved. This is a rough estimate based on the average cost of these facilities.

3. The minimum waiting period would be approximately 12 months. There is no 'average' waiting period as traffic signals and pedestrian crossings are installed in order of priority, that is, the date they may be shown to be justified is not the major factor in determining when they are installed.

VIOLENT CRIMES

321. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What was the respective incidence of assault, robbery, rape, and other forms of violence against persons aged 60 years and over during the year 1980-81?

2. Have the figures increased over the previous year and, if so, by what percentage?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Statistics relating specifically to ages of victims of crime are not separately maintained by the Police Department.

2. See 1.

WATER MONITORING

327. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What restrictions apply to the use of 245T and 24D in water catchment areas in metropolitan Adelaide?

2. How often is monitoring carried out, on what basis and by which departments?

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

1. The use of 245T and 24D is not permitted in reservoir reserves close to the water's edge.

2. Monitoring of metropolitan Adelaide's water sources for pesticides is carried out by the State Water Laboratories of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, each water source being sampled every six months. 245T and 24D have not been detected.