

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 21, 1977

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

PETITIONS: CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 67 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce, without delay, stringent laws with appropriate penalties which would protect children from abuse by pornographers, and take action to prohibit the sale of all pornographic films, books and other material which includes children.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 87 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations was removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoyed at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a similar petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SCHOOL STAFFING

Mr. GROTH presented a petition signed by nine electors of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government not to reduce ancillary staff hours in individual schools, to appoint ancillary staff to schools with less than their full quota, and to implement the recommendations submitted by the South Australian Department for the national survey of educational needs.

Petition received.

PETITION: MAIN ROAD 323

Mr. BLACKER presented a petition signed by 1716 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to support the upgrading and sealing of Main Road No. 323 between White Flat and Koppio.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

HOUSING COSTS

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say how he justifies his recently expressed claim that building costs in South Australia are among the lowest in Australia, and will he, in the light of the evidence, now retract that claim? The most recently available figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics on average cost a square metre for house

building, on the basis of final contract prices for houses when complete, show that it costs \$209 a square metre to build in Adelaide, \$199 in Melbourne, \$189 in Perth, and \$184 in both Sydney and Brisbane. Examination of the prices quoted by a national builder reveals that the same builder erects an identical three-bedroom house in Adelaide for \$22 651 and in Sydney for \$18 200. Recent announcements by the Government apparently rely on information from the Commonwealth Savings Bank. A letter from the bank on this matter states:

We would like to emphasise that we did not undertake any detailed analysis of the components on which a contract price is calculated. Therefore the costs of building a house as quoted are based solely on the cost of the completed dwelling as agreed upon by the owner and the builder and do not allow for extras or other variations to the original contract figure.

Further, the Commonwealth Savings Bank figures are based on the average of a cross-section of housing only, not on the total number of houses built. The facts and figures I have quoted are from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Further, the figures quoted earlier are based on a comparison of identical houses built in Sydney and Adelaide. The public is entitled to the truth in this matter. The Premier has deliberately set out to mislead, and there is concern for young people who are encountering costs in Adelaide that are the highest for any mainland capital city. How can the Premier, his Minister, and his non-political propaganda front group now persist in these ridiculous and deliberately misleading statements?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is very fond of calling the kettle black while he is bubbling away himself. On this matter, the Leader has quoted figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics that take the total of house building but do not take account of the different forms or standards of houses built in various States, and the Leader well knows that.

Mr. Tonkin: It allows for—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has previously carefully quoted figures for low-standard Queensland weatherboard houses, compared to figures for full brick houses in Adelaide. That is the sort of twist in figures that he goes in for.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They are built by the same builder.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader says that he has figures from a national builder. I can only say that they are not agreed to by other builders and by architects, one of whom recently pointed out publicly what his experience as an architect here and in Sydney showed him. However, the Leader then says that there is **something wrong** with the figures from the Savings Bank that I quoted, and so he reads out something about the bank's analysis of the figures, but what did not come out of that was that there was anything wrong with the Savings Bank's final figures in contrasting the cost of houses on loans it made in the various States. Clearly, the Commonwealth Bank is the biggest lender. Its experience in lending for house-building, State by State, shows that, for comparable houses in South Australia, the cost is lower than in any other mainland capital city except Perth. Regarding Perth, the difference in comparable houses lies in the fact that Perth does not have similar soil conditions to those in Adelaide that require heavier foundations. Those are the facts and the Leader, in this matter, is doing what he is doing regularly about South Australia generally, namely, running down conditions in this State as hard as he can for political purposes. Nothing suits the Leader better than to get up and say, "Conditions in

South Australia are terrible. Woe it is for South Australians to live here, because South Australia is in a disgraceful situation." He knocks South Australia continually when, in fact, conditions in most areas of activity in this State are the best in Australia, and remain so.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fact that the Leader carries on in this way is getting over very well to the public. I am grateful to him for his effort this afternoon, and I hope he continues with it.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. KENEALLY: In view of the great public disquiet and the growing angry debate over the Federal Government's education funding guidelines and the disastrous Loan Council talks, can the Minister of Education tell the House what effect this cut-back in funds will have on education expenditure in this State? Since the guidelines were announced, they have been denounced by university Vice-Chancellors, administrators of colleges of advanced education, teachers and teacher organisations, spokespersons for parent groups and, indeed, by members of the Schools Commission itself, as well as in the strongest possible terms by our Minister of Education.

The major criticisms have been directed at the fact that the concept of the "rolling triennium" as of now is completely meaningless; that the independence of the Schools Commission has been destroyed; that there are two misleading statements in the guidelines dealing with the general financial assistance available to the States from the Commonwealth; that there is a disastrous lack of indexation of capital costs; that there is no indexation of non-wage/salary recurrent costs; and that there is only a belated and inadequate recognition of the technical and further education area as a recipient of substantial Commonwealth support. What effect will this recipe of Senator Carrick, which has been condemned by the education community in the most humiliating way, have on education in this State?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have had my officers working on this exercise for some time, because it is important for our own planning purposes and our own budgeting purposes that we have some idea of the final wash-up of the share as between the States. First, as the honourable member has said, the States were not treated particularly well at Loan Council. The amount they are able to borrow for their own capital expenditure has been increased by 5 per cent in money terms over the past financial year, and this will not keep pace with inflation. Assuming that it would have been reasonable for the States to expect to get at least sufficient expansion to be able to keep pace with inflation, we assume that we have lost \$1 400 000 out of that particular exercise, and that is all completely from the capital programme. Secondly, although the Commonwealth, through Senator Carrick's guidelines to the Schools Commission, has said there will be indexation of salary and wage costs, there is to be no indexation of capital costs: this, of course, is going back on an undertaking that was given.

The Opposition in the House of Representatives and the Senate, in Canberra, last year was taunted by Senator Carrick because it had predicted that there would be a cut-back in education funding but, indeed, there had been a 2 per cent real growth. The chickens are now coming home to roost, and there will be no indexation of capital

costs. Again, we predict that this will mean a loss to this State of about \$1 400 000 from its capital programme. That is \$2 800 000 in all lost to the school-building programme as a result of Commonwealth decisions (a) for there to be only a 5 per cent increase in money terms on Loan Council approvals; and (b) that there be no indexation of capital costs from the commission's moneys. Thirdly, the House will be aware that the Commonwealth Minister has instructed the commission that there will be some diversion of funds from the State to the non-State sector, and in this case it will be in the recurrent rather than the capital areas.

I do not want to comment for any great length of time on that matter. It is possible that the commission itself, if left to its own devices, might have made this sort of recommendation, but such a recommendation would have arisen out of a proper and thorough examination of the relative needs of schools in Government and non-government areas. That is the way we are used to Commonwealth funding operating in relation to finance for education, but this is a political decision. This is an outright direction to the commission about how it will find money for a particular programme and whence it will find this money. We calculate that that diversion of funds will cost this State about \$1 300 000. Overall, we are looking at about \$4 100 000 loss to the State's capital and recurrent programmes because of the Commonwealth decisions.

I remind members that in relation to the \$2 800 000 there is virtually no escape whatever for the States. It is simply not possible to go into open-market borrowing, as that avenue is closed by the nature of the Loan Council agreement. Of course, it would be possible to divert Budget funds to capital programmes, as has been done before, but that means that there must be some loss of our ability to carry out Budget recurrent programmes in the way that we like to do but, as I have indicated, a \$1 300 000 component in the \$4 100 000 is lost to the State's recurrent programme. Moreover, it would not be reasonable to expect that the State Government would boost significantly its contribution from its total Loan programme to school-building programmes at the expense of other areas. South Australia has significantly overmatched in Schools Commission terms its school-building programme in the past two years. I mean that we are unable to get capital money from the commission unless we spend to a certain level, and we have spent well beyond that level in recent years in our efforts to ensure that accommodation for students, teachers and, indeed, parents, in our schools is of a high standard. The State is already doing more than the commission expects of it in this area. There is no real salvation from that area.

Senator Carrick, I notice, has been approached by people and by the Australian Council of State School Organisations, and has sent them away empty-handed. I am distressed by this, and I believe all members should be distressed by this outcome. All members of the community, especially those who have the future of education at heart, should be distressed, particularly by the news item that appeared in yesterday's *Age*, under the heading "Liberal M.P. hits education spending", as follows:

A Liberal back-bencher yesterday accused the Federal Government of spending too much on education. Mr. Groom (Tasmania) said the Government's proposed allocation of \$1 740 000 000 to education in 1978 could not be justified. "Education is an area of incredible financial waste," Mr. Groom said. He said there might well be a correlation between increased Government spending and the lowering of standards of education.

This sort of tomfoolery should not be allowed to go on. People in the education community should be prepared to condemn that sort of public statement in the strongest possible terms as, indeed, do I.

The SPEAKER: Whilst I cannot control the length of time a Minister takes to reply to a question, I appeal to Ministers to perhaps consider making more Ministerial statements, and their replies to questions briefer.

HOUSING COSTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what action the Government intends to take to reduce high building costs in this State? It is a statistical fact that the cost a square metre paid for building in South Australia is the highest on the mainland. Maybe that price includes the cost of heavier foundations, an allowance for soil and what-have-you, as the Premier has indicated, but the statistical fact is that it costs more a square metre to build houses in South Australia than it costs in other mainland States. It is also a statistical fact that 10 years ago South Australia had the lowest cost a square metre, and we are still building in the metropolitan area. Costs incurred by builders in recent years have escalated markedly in this State. We can recall some of the Government's pace-setting legislation, which would have added to building costs in South Australia. In addition to the basic wage applying to building workers, the on-site loaded hourly wage rate includes allowances to cover annual leave, 17½ per cent annual leave loading, long service leave, workman's compensation and insurance payments, and public holiday, pay-roll tax and other allowances. During the past four years, the average on-site loaded wage for a building worker increased in 1973 by 21.3 per cent, in 1974 by 46.5 per cent, in 1975 by 18.2 per cent, and in 1976 by 16.6 per cent. What does the Government intend to do to reduce costs to restore South Australia to its traditional low-cost advantage which was of such importance in attracting industry and commerce to South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The cost of a completed house to the market in South Australia is still the lowest of all the mainland States.

Mr. Tonkin: That's absolute balderdash.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader did not listen to what I said.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said they were dearer because the foundations were heavier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I referred to the cost of a completed house to the market. I have already dealt with the question of building costs in this State, and I dispute the honourable member's explanation. I do not agree with his figures and, as I have already dealt with this aspect this afternoon, I do not intend to reiterate what I said.

Mr. Tonkin: Most people do believe them, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader had better look at his poll figures as to believability in South Australia, and have another think. The honourable member carefully overlooks the fact that this Government, bitterly criticised by the Opposition, proceeded to take action about a major component of housing costs in South Australia, the price of land. When one adds building costs and land costs together, whatever dispute may occur between the Opposition and myself concerning the actual

building cost, the result one inevitably gets is that the cost of a completed house to the market in South Australia is less than it is in any other mainland city.

Mr. Tonkin: The land costs in Sydney are rapidly reaching parity with Adelaide.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader says that land costs in Sydney are reaching parity with Adelaide. I tell you what I will do for the Leader, I will give him an extra trip to Sydney just to check that. I know what the land costs are in Sydney and they are at least three times the cost of a block of land marketed by the Land Commission in Adelaide, and the blocks are miles farther from the comparable G.P.O.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If they were the same distance from the G.P.O. they would be four times the cost.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right.

Mr. Tonkin: Not true; they're falling.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader tries to change the topic, of course, in saying that land prices are coming down in Sydney. The fact is that the completed cost to the market in South Australia, as a result of this Government's actions in controlling a major component of home building costs, is the lowest of any capital city, and remains that way. Members opposite bitterly attacked the relevant legislation when it came before this House, saying that it would create a black market, and that it would lead to greater speculation and the like. Even the speculators admit that all that criticism was nonsense. A constant surveillance of building costs is kept by the South Australian Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, who takes a close interest in any changes in the cost of materials. Further, the Government maintains a close watch on these matters to see whether there is any exploitation of the market. If the honourable member proposes some other measure in connection with further controls on building costs, I will be grateful if he will tell us what that is. I assume from what the honourable member has said that a Liberal Government in office would decrease wages and knock off workmen's compensation, long service leave for building workers, annual leave, and the 17½ per cent loading. If those are the things that the Liberal Party proposes, we will tell all the people engaged in the building industry that that is the Liberal Party's policy.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the attention of the Attorney-General ever been drawn to an advertisement that appears in the *Advertiser* usually once a week? If his attention has not been drawn to the advertisement, I now draw it to his attention. The advertisement states:

Receptionist Career. Step forward into a highly paid job. Three-week diploma course starts Monday. Inquire now. Receptionist Centre, 23 King William Street. 51 2699. Another advertisement of this type states:

Become a receptionist. Today's employment market requires a very high standard of skill. These can be obtained here at the Receptionist Centre in only 15 days. Complete training is given in switchboards—typing—office procedures—grooming and deportment.

All in 15 days! The advertisement continues:

Ask about our free employment assistance. Receptionist Centre, 23 King William Street. 51 2699.

Another advertisement of this type states:

Receptionist career. Step into a highly paid job. Three-week diploma course for school leavers and those wanting an exciting, worthwhile career. Receptionist Centre, 23 King William Street. 51 2699.

I had observed advertisements of this type for a long time, but I did not for a moment believe that anyone would be silly enough to expect to get a job in that way. However, one day into my office came a young lady who asked my secretary whether we had any jobs available. She told us that she had done this course, which cost her \$300. She was boarding with an old couple, but she could scarcely pay the board because her assets were so depleted. My secretary said, "I think you had better come in and talk it over." We found that she could barely type and she had very little knowledge of office procedure, but we got her a job—not as a receptionist, of course. This made me interested in the whole matter, and I have since found that two other people have similar stories to tell. So, I assume that many people must have fallen for the trap. Will the Attorney-General have this matter investigated and bring down a report?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member has left me somewhat mystified as to just what sort of a job he was able to get this young lady, but that is another matter. I have had these advertisements brought to my attention, particularly the statement, "Step into a highly paid job." In my view, that statement could tend possibly to mislead people into thinking that this centre was, in fact, an employment agency that had jobs available. Whilst I, as a lawyer, and other lawyers in the House, could well see that it does not specifically state that jobs will be available on the completion of the course, nevertheless an ordinary person in the community could well be misled into believing that this was an offer to supply jobs to people who complete the course. These problems have existed for several years to my knowledge, related especially to employment agencies when statements of this type are made, and people are misled into believing that, after paying out large sums, they will obtain a position. A couple of times this Government has been able to use the provisions of the Unfair Advertising Act, which covers goods and services of the nature offered by this firm in the advertisements, to prosecute people, and we have been successful in some instances in stopping this type of practice.

However, it is a matter of whether the court believes that the advertisements concerned are misleading to the extent that the person concerned would reasonably have accepted the suggestion made in the advertisement. Possibly this advertisement, for example, would not be sufficient to sustain a prosecution under that Act. I believe that the solution we may have to consider, as has been done in some Canadian provinces, is to introduce a type of registration system for employment agencies. In fact, the Minister of Labour and Industry examined this matter when he was overseas to ascertain whether this type of agency should not, in fact, be registered and whether such activities could come under the scrutiny of a registration board, in order to ensure that people were not misled by advertisements of this type and that, when offers of employment were made, such offers were genuine offers, with jobs being available for people who undertook the course, while also ensuring that the courses supplied provided a satisfactory standard of training. As the honourable member has said, in his opinion or that of his secretary the lady concerned who came into his office was barely able to type and had little or no knowledge of office procedure. That would indicate what sort of training some of these organisations provide. We will examine the matter of future registration, but in the meantime I will consider the matter and have an opinion drawn up whether in this case there has

been a breach of the Unfair Advertising Act. I fear that the advertisement probably has been worded carefully enough so that it does not breach that Act.

HOUSING COSTS

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier accept from the Liberal Party a free trip to Sydney in order to examine building costs and make relevant comparisons between Sydney and Adelaide? I am not prepared to accept an extra free trip from the Government, at the expense of taxpayers, but I am perfectly happy that we should pay the Premier's fare to Sydney so that he may investigate for himself the differences in building costs between the two cities. I am appalled that the Premier is so far out of touch—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Oh, Mr. Speaker!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: —with relative building costs—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: —between the two cities.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has been here long enough to know that, when I call "Order", he must cease speaking and must not continue to defy the Chair in this way. He of all honourable members in this House should set an example. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful for the Leader's generosity, but I can tell him that it is unnecessary. I have been to Sydney and investigated alternative building costs, and I have given the results of my investigations already this afternoon.

RECREATION PARK

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister for the Environment obtain for me a report on the stage reached in the project to transform a quarry site adjoining North-East and Perseverance Roads, Tea Tree Gully, into a sports and recreation park on land acquired by the State Planning Authority as part of the planned 345-hectare Anstey Hill regional park? I point out to the Minister that I sought from him a report on the last occasion on November 25 last year, to which he replied on December 9. I would now like an up-to-date report.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I think this matter probably falls within the province of the Minister for Planning, and I shall be pleased to get a report from him as quickly as possible.

STAMP DUTIES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say what action he will take to reduce the heavy burden of stamp duties on people acquiring houses in this State? South Australia's stamp duties are the highest in Australia. I accept that the Premier and his Government have recently announced a moratorium on duties in respect of new houses valued at up to \$50 000 for a period of six months. The stated motive was to help the building industry to sell some of the surplus houses on the market, and one accepts that it helped some people buy new houses from spec builders, but it did not help people buying second-hand houses in any way at all. There may have been another motive for the Government's doing it at this stage.

The comparative figures for a \$35 000 house are as follows: for South Australia, \$730; for Western Australia, \$500; for Queensland, \$600; for Tasmania, \$588; for New South Wales, \$502; and for Victoria, \$645. I take that as being for an average house with land included. From that point upwards, the South Australian duties increase further in front of other States (I do not wish to go through all the figures but the Premier will be aware of them) to the point where we start paying \$4 in the \$100 at one stage, at the highest range, and no other State reaches that point. We have the highest stamp duties in Australia. What will the Premier do to help those people buying houses in relation to this heavy burden imposed by the State Government as an indirect tax?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The basis upon which stamp duty has been set in South Australia was discussed at the time of the introduction of stamp duty charges in this House and in the context of the Budget. The State Government has made a whole series of significant tax remissions over the past 18 months, but we are at the stage, particularly given the reductions in finance available to this State from the Commonwealth Government (and they are severe reductions), where it is not possible for us at this stage of proceedings to make further concessions.

Mr. Tonkin: Are you saying that the reductions to other States are not just as severe?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the reductions to other States are severe; we are certainly getting it in the neck, as I have said before. All the States have protested about this. It takes a good man to get Mr. Bjelke-Petersen and me on the same side of an argument, but Mr. Fraser has done it. However, the fact is that given the tax base in South Australia the amount a head collected in South Australia in total taxation is lower than that in any other mainland State; and we are running the highest level of services of any State.

Mr. Dean Brown: That is not true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is true.

Mr. Dean Brown: We got our figures from the Library.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My figures were certified by the Under Treasurer of this State, who is one of the finest public servants that this country has.

Mr. Tonkin: Perhaps that's because they're earning less.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, if the honourable member likes to look at average earnings he will find that his statement there again is not correct.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member goes in for a great deal of fantasy around his own wishes as to bad conditions in South Australia in order to try to lend, in his own mind, some sort of authenticity to the nonsense that he talks about this State. Knock as he will, the fact remains that the tax collections per head in South Australia—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are you counting royalties?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course I am counting royalties.

Mr. Tonkin: Whose fault is that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the honourable member seems to assign to me some responsibility for the fact that we have not been able to discover bauxite

in South Australia, or the kinds of coal deposit found in Queensland, or as much iron ore as is found in Western Australia. The fact remains that mineral royalties are an essential element of the State taxation sphere, and in consequence—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member says that we cannot take into account, in looking at the money raised by the State (the money that is available for services), what is paid in royalties because some other States have got more in royalties than we have. The simple answer is that the only way in which one can contrast taxes between the States is to look to the revenue that is raised by the State from all sources available to it through State legislation.

Mr. Tonkin: Not per capita?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As soon as one looks at it per capita, South Australia has the lowest in Australia. In consequence, that means that in some areas of taxation we will be a bit higher than some other States and in some other areas we are lower.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Which ones?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In South Australia we do not choose to run poker machines. New South Wales, in consequence, gets much revenue in that area, which brings in a substantial amount of money. We are not going to have them in South Australia, which means, of course, that in some things we will probably have to charge a little bit more here in South Australia to be able to afford services comparable to those in New South Wales. As a result of this, South Australia's taxation, I believe, is a fair basis of taxation. It is as much taxation as is needed to discharge the present responsibilities of Government, despite all the nonsense talked from time to time by members opposite. They were looking at the monthly surpluses during the year as though they were final surpluses for the year and, although they were warned to the contrary, they went around saying this sort of thing, trying to mislead people into believing that we had a surplus at the end of April, according to them, of \$34 000 000. I pointed out that we could not run on monthly balances but we had to look at the final balance at the end of the year. We came out with a small deficit. We need the amount of taxation that we presently have in order to run the services of the State. If the honourable member proposes to reduce taxes, it means that we reduce the present services of the State. Honourable members had better get up and start saying what they have not been willing to do before, although they have been talking about cutting the public sector: they had better say where the cuts are going to happen and who else they will add to the unemployment market.

HALLETT COVE FUND

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister for the Environment tell me what has happened, or is likely to happen, to the funds that were raised by the Save the Hallett Cove Committee? Members will probably recall that, after the Government identified the site of scientific interest at Hallett Cove and purchased the area, an approach was made to the Federal Government regarding the purchase of a buffer zone. A number of interested people subscribed, and called on others to subscribe, to the Federal Government to encourage it to assist with the purchase of that buffer zone. At that time, we had in office a sympathetic Federal Labor Government, which

provided a subsidy to help the State Government purchase the buffer zone, with the result that money in the Save the Hallett Cove fund was probably not required to be used towards that purchase. Some of my constituents who have donated money to the fund have asked me to obtain this information from the Minister.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member about this matter, because I know what an active part he played in preserving Hallett Cove about three years ago. My department has been engaged in negotiations with the Federal Environment, Housing and Community Development Department on this matter. There is a long history relating to it. However, I will deal now with only the tail end of it, which refers to the matter raised by the honourable member. Mr. Uren, who was the Minister responsible for the matter at the time, invited a team from a Canberra college to report on environmental, conservation and social issues associated with the Hallett Cove site of scientific interest. This team was led by Dr. Peter Rudman, and the Rudman report, as it was subsequently known, made a number of recommendations. One of these is relevant to the matter raised by the honourable member. In all, \$1 103·62, I think it was, was raised by public subscription and sent to Canberra.

Mr. Millhouse: How much did you say?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The sum of \$1 103·62 was raised.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not much money to spend all this time on, is it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had almost finished. Indeed, had I not been interrupted by the member for Mitcham, I would have been finished by now.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, I'm sorry that I interrupted.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: So the honourable member should be. Anyhow, this money was sent to Canberra. The authorities have agreed, and so have we, that this money should be used to plant a grove of native shrubs and trees to screen the site of scientific interest, because it was stated in the Rudman report that such a screen would improve the visual appearance of the area. National Parks officers have been co-operating with Miss Maude McBriar of the university's Geology Department, which has, as the honourable member would realise, taken an active interest in the Hallett Cove site. It has been working out the best types of species to plant to achieve the desired end. The stock will come from the Woods and Forests Department's Monarto nursery, and it is hoped to engage the interest of the relevant conservation bodies in the planting and care of the plants, which will be put alongside a walking track, along which the member for Mitcham might like to walk to enable him to admire the site.

GOVERNOR

Mr. CHAPMAN: In view of the Premier's claims today regarding prompt action by his Government, will he tell the House when it is intended that South Australia's new Governor will be appointed? I wish to raise two points, the first of which is that the circumstances that require this appointment to be made are indeed regretted publicly. The other point is that in no circumstances

am I criticising the admirable job being done by Mr. Walter Crocker. I think it would be agreed that a considerable delay has occurred since the resignation of Sir Douglas Nicholls; in fact, his appointment terminated late in April, 1977. On June 21, apparently the Premier said that no announcement would be made at that time. Indeed since then I am not aware of any indication of when the important appointment will be made. It has been put to me that the delay in appointing the Governor in this instance is longer than can be recollected applying between any previous resignation or retirement and appointment. In view of this long delay, with no public indication, I ask the Premier to inform the House, if possible, of any information in this direction.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The appointment of the Governor, whoever he or she may be (and I am carefully urging members not to jump to any conclusions on that score), is necessarily a matter between the Executive Government and Her Majesty. It is not possible—

Mr. Chapman: That's what we're asking you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —for me to give any information on this topic until the requisite approval from the Palace is obtained.

Mr. Chapman: Have you made a recommendation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not proper for me to discuss that, either. When an announcement is to be made, of which Her Majesty has approved, I assure the honourable member that I will make it.

SUPPORTING FATHERS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare indicate what response there has been to the extension of State financial assistance to supporting fathers? Organisations representing supporting fathers have long campaigned for equal treatment to that received by women who, for various reasons, have the sole care and support of their children. The Government's decision to end this form of discrimination is welcome, but can the Minister indicate to what extent supporting fathers are taking advantage of the new benefit?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is early days to gauge how much demand will occur for the service and the assistance that will be provided by the Government to supporting fathers. However, I did anticipate that the honourable member and others might be interested in this matter, so on Monday last I had a check carried out to ascertain what had been the response so far, at least on a sampling basis. A check carried out of four major country Community Welfare Department offices and five of the larger and busier metropolitan offices showed that, in the case of country offices, seven applications were made and, in the case of metropolitan offices, 45 applications were made, making a total of 52 applications, of which 18 applicants are now receiving the benefit. Obviously a considerable interest is being shown in this assistance, since 18 people have qualified in the circumstances that I have outlined. I am sure that I do not need to remind members that, in some cases, the inquiry would not go to the stage where assistance will be accepted; however, it is important to remind the House that the Government has taken what I regard as an excellent step so that supporting fathers who have a need to be at home with their children who, of course, are already deprived because they have only one parent, can do so. In those situations, the fathers will now be able to elect and take the same option as has been available to mothers.

URANIUM

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier explain to Parliament why he, the Australian Labor Party, and the State Government have adopted a public policy of an indefinite moratorium on the mining and treatment of uranium, while confidentially and secretly the State Government is preparing economically to exploit uranium development if the Federal Government approves uranium mining and treatment? The A.L.P. conference in Perth adopted a policy resolution, seconded by the Premier of South Australia, for an indefinite moratorium on the mining and treatment of uranium. The Premier and his Government are at least morally bound by that policy. However, in secrecy the Government has adopted a definite policy of being prepared to exploit uranium mining and processing, if mining and export of uranium are allowed to proceed by the Federal Government. As evidence, I produce three specific examples which support this claim. First, at the latest meeting of State and Federal Mines Ministers, the South Australian Minister promoted a strong case in favour of the mining and enrichment of uranium. Naturally, I cannot disclose my reliable source of information, but I assure honourable members that it is an extremely reliable source. Secondly, specific areas are in the process of being registered for exploration, and these areas are known to involve uranium. Although registration is not issued for specific minerals, it is well known that exploration in certain areas is taking place for the specific purpose of finding uranium. I make the distinction: not copper and uranium but specifically uranium. Finally, the South Australian Government has not stopped work on feasibility studies and the other associated work for the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. All these examples display a breach of the policy of an indefinite moratorium. It appears the Premier is doing some crafty double footwork.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is his usual childish self on this matter. The South Australian Government has made its position perfectly clear on the subject of uranium. That is, that we do not believe that it is safe, in present circumstances, to provide uranium to a customer country, and until we are satisfied that it is safe there will be no mining and no treatment or enrichment of uranium in South Australia. That is the stand which we have taken and which, I may say, every member of this House voted for. That includes the honourable member, although there seems to be a bit of a back flip on it now, because I have noticed that this morning the Leader did not think we might have no choice on whether to mine uranium, that we should mine not only uranium but that, if we decided to do that, we should also process it, so as to maintain complete control over it. Therefore, he does not seem to be going along with what he voted for in this House. The Government publicly has made quite clear that, whilst we will not allow the mining, treatment, or enrichment of uranium in South Australia until we are satisfied with international techniques and safeguards in providing uranium to customer countries, at the same time we are keeping up with current technology.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In no circumstances will South Australia throw into the wastepaper basket reports on the various investigations into uranium that we have undertaken, nor are we going to say that we will not establish what uranium there is in South Australia, and that is all that is involved in exploration licences.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If adequate safeguards come forward at any time, they will be the first to criticise us if we do nothing about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that it will be some time off, and I have made that clear. At present, it is impossible to put a time limit on when international arrangements and international technologies will be developed, simply because there are none in sight at present. How can we possibly in these circumstances put on a time limit? We cannot. In the meantime, it would be utterly absurd for South Australia not to know what uranium there was within its boundaries. The honourable member has given up debating uranium and is now playing Fagin. I suggest that he comes back to earth and stops this insincere nonsense that is going on. The Government's position is clear, and I wish that the Opposition would make its position clear. If it believes, as apparently the Leader does, that we must go ahead now with supplying uranium to customer countries and with the enrichment of uranium in Australia, he had better get up and say why he is now contradicting the vote that he and every other member of his Party gave in this House.

CARE OF MENTALLY RETARDED

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, provide any information on the proposed establishment of "The Pines" complex for the totally dependent mentally retarded? Have the extensions to the Ru Rua Nursing Home at North Adelaide, to increase its capacity for residential care of mentally retarded people, been completed? If not, when can it be expected that they will be completed? Finally, have there been any admissions to Ru Rua this year? Constituents of mine who are concerned parents have been attempting to have their daughter, who has been assessed by the Intellectually Retarded Services, admitted to Ru Rua for some considerable time, but to date have been unable to establish any definite details relating to admissions, the proposed new buildings, or other expansion programmes.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I understand the honourable member's concern for his constituents and their natural worry over their daughter. However, the information he needs should be more properly supplied by my colleague in another place, and I will try to obtain it for him.

SCHOOL SECURITY

Mr. ALLISON: My question to the Minister of Education, concerning school security, is supplementary to the one I asked yesterday. Can the Minister say whether the security officers who have been appointed could investigate the possibility of installing additional lighting at schools? I am informed by police that night lighting is one of the cheapest and most efficient means of deterring vandals and that strong, safe, and strategically placed lights (especially in high-risk areas) may provide part of the answer.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Inasmuch as I briefly referred to this matter yesterday, it would be inconsistent of me to say anything other than "Yes".

JUDICIARY

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General say whether there is a shortage of judges in South Australia? I understand that Executive Council this morning considered the

temporary appointment of Iris Stevens to the Local and District Criminal Courts.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And a very good appointment.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: As an acting judge.

Mr. BECKER: Is there a shortage of judges in this State, and what action is the Government taking to attend to this matter?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: There is no shortage of judges, as such, in South Australia but, because of most regrettable and unfortunate circumstances, three of our judges in the past six months have suffered heart attacks. The appropriate thing for the Government to do in such circumstances is to provide extra judicial manpower so that the courts can carry on their business in the normal fashion, and that is what we have done in three instances; in the instance of Acting Judge Di Fazio, Acting Judge Stevens and Acting Judge Grubb, we have sought to appoint further judges to the Local and District Criminal Court to overcome the difficulties.

Mr. Millhouse: Who was the last one?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Acting Judge Grubb who, of course, is Judge Grubb of the Licensing Court. Further, because of long service leave being taken by some Supreme Court judges at present we did appoint Judge White of the Local and District Criminal Court as an acting justice of the Supreme Court. However, these moves are normal in the circumstances where sickness, illness and long service leave take their toll on the number of judges available. It is the regular practice for the Government to appoint acting judges, and we have done so where necessary. Regarding the overall strength of the judiciary in South Australia, to my knowledge there is no shortage of judges available to deal with cases coming before the courts.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 19. Page 36.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): At the outset I should like to express my regret and that of the Opposition that the Governor, Sir Douglas Nicholls, was forced to relinquish his office well before the allotted time. I join with other members who have expressed already their appreciation of the way he carried out his duties and their great regret that his illness forced him to leave his position. We wish both Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls a healthy and enjoyable retirement.

The South Australian Government is on the run and, if honourable members do not believe me, if they take another look at His Excellency's Speech they will see that is clear to all. The Government is in trouble over the key issues which face the community today. Dealing with the first issue, conscription into unions or, if we want to be honest about it, we can call it by its real name—compulsory unionism—where is the legislation promised in the previous Governor's Speech opening Parliament last session? I refer to the relevant part of that Speech (paragraph 6), which states:

A Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will be placed before you. It will give effect to the undertaking contained in the policy speech of my Government, before it was returned at the last election, that civil action for damages should not be taken in

industrial disputes, but that disputes of this nature should be resolved in the tribunals specifically provided for the purpose. The Bill will also propose the removal of the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission to provide in its awards for absolute preference to members of trade unions.

That form of language does not fool anyone. Absolute preference to trade unions means exactly compulsory unionism, and it means nothing else. Nothing is mentioned in His Excellency's Speech this time, and we certainly did not sight any legislation in the previous session of Parliament. The question that immediately comes forward is, "Why not?" Why has the Government backed off? Why has it not brought this legislation forward? Why is there no mention of it at this time? The reasons are obvious, perfectly obvious, even to people on the other side of this Chamber, even to the Deputy Premier. The Government is frightened of public debate on this issue. It knows very well that public opinion is almost totally opposed to the so-called "absolute preference to unionists" line adopted by this Government and implemented by stealth.

This policy is already being foisted on members of Government departments, members of Government instrumentalities, and people working for contractors with Government departments. This is particularly so in the field of housing. There was the disgraceful episode at Smithfield recently when subcontractors were forced to join a union or lose their employment. They were not employees, they were subcontractors and employers in their own right, yet they were forced to join a union. They would have been black-banned and lost their means of livelihood if they had not joined the union. How can anyone, in what we consider to be a free State—South Australia—for a moment countenance that sort of stand-over tactic. The Government is clearly using the Housing Trust as a vehicle to introduce compulsory unionism into the building industry, just as it is using the Electricity Trust and the Housing Trust to try to bring in its industrial democracy programme: by stealth—around the back door.

By doing so it is depriving people of their freedom of choice, a fundamental right. I find it repugnant that the Government has ordered the Housing Trust, an independent instrumentality, to require building contractors to employ only union labour. Where is the legislative backing for this? Where has been the debate in this House? Where has approval been obtained from the representatives of the people? It has not been obtained, and this action has been taken by the Government, I am quite certain in direct contradiction to the wishes of the majority of the people of South Australia. The Government should have introduced legislation into this House for debate. I ask why it has not been debated because it involves the fundamental freedoms of individuals. It contravenes specific sections of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organisation Convention, although the Government pays sanctimonious lip service to both of those.

Lip service is of no value whatever when the Government takes the action that it does. I believe that the Government is frightened to debate the issue in Parliament because it knows that, traditionally, Australians value their freedom and that it would certainly lose any public debate on the issue. The truth is that the Premier and his colleagues in the Government do not care if they trample on people's rights. The Government is showing its contempt for the Parliamentary system by continuing this abhorrent practice without any legislative backing. It is hoping now that it will not attract any notice. It hopes that by going about these things by stealth nobody in the community will realise what is happening. Some

hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker! All I know is, that while the Premier and his team of super salesmen run around the countryside telling everybody how well off we are in South Australia, how we have conditions which are the envy of every other State, the people's rights and the truth are being trampled underfoot by a Government frightened of public debate and a few union bully boys who want the Government to act for them to conscript members instead of getting out and attracting members in the traditional trade union way.

I have no quarrel with trade unions. I think that they have a very real part to play. It is when they are playing that part, and playing it best, that they can expect to attract membership. As we have seen in a case in relation to Leigh Creek recently, when we see compulsory unionism and compulsory membership we find that the union will not take action on behalf of its members, as it should. The union becomes lazy and does not have the best interests of the union members in mind. It takes unilateral action and goes its own way, usually in this kind of instance because it suits the particular union official to do so.

I will not have any part in any Government instruction to any Government instrumentality insisting on absolute preference to trade unionists. I say here and now that we will cancel all such instructions immediately we take office. The Government should come clean and clearly state its intentions. Is it going to introduce legislation, as it promised last year, on this matter and on the subject of exempting union officials from any common law action? Or, will it do nothing, hoping that the public will forget these fundamental aims before the next election? If necessary, the Opposition will introduce a measure opposing this practice in order that public debate may take place. I assure the Labor Party that in Government we will, if necessary, do just that in order that there will be no compulsion. The Government must stop being secretive about the issues. If, as a Government, it believes that it has public support let us debate the subject. I know what the answer will be.

This Government lacks the intestinal fortitude to face up to the issue. It is afraid for its skin, but the people of South Australia will have the opportunity to express their strong opposition to this and other measures at the ballot box at the next election. We can all remember the Kangaroo Island case. How could we forget it? The Government spent the taxpayers' money in meeting the costs incurred by a union official, now a member of another place, in a common law action brought against him.

I have already quoted the then Governor's Speech at the opening of the previous session outlining the Government's plans to protect union officials. The question that immediately comes to the mind of any member of the community is this: why should trade union officials be above the law? Why should they not be subject to the same conditions for behaviour that apply to the rest of the community? Why should trade union officials be legally enabled to trample on other people's rights, because that is basically what this legislation means? This is totally against the principles of justice and against the principles of the common law, a system that has served us well and has preserved our freedoms for the whole life of this country.

Again, what does this Government stand for? What does it intend for the people of this State? Does it intend that a new hierarchy of union officialdom will be set up? Apparently, we are about to adopt the so-called industrial

democracy scheme of Yugoslavia and, it appears, ultimately the form of socialist control of the community exercised in that country by the absolute power of trade union leaders over the total community as conscripted members of trade unions. That is the picture that is now opening up. Yugoslavia may have been adopted as the model for South Australia's future because it is a so-called benign communist State but I, for one, and I am sure I can speak for the great majority of South Australians, will have no part of this Government's plans for the destruction of our freedoms or for any form of totalitarianism.

Mr. Dean Brown: Yugoslavia wouldn't know what democracy is all about.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes. The freedom of the individual has been lost in that country for so long that Yugoslavia is not qualified to give us any advice that would enhance democracy here. For a start, we should not waste the taxpayers' money in sending people to Yugoslavia to study worker participation and to learn how to take over control of our society. West Germany does not seem to be popular any more with this Government as the model for industrial democracy and union affairs, and we seem to have moved across to the Yugoslav pattern. Why has the Government not brought forward this matter of common law suits against union officials again this session? It was not brought forward last session, either. The answer is clear. It knows that the community will not tolerate this legislation any more than it will tolerate compulsory union membership. The Government hopes that its intentions will be forgotten, and hopes to win the next election by conveniently sweeping these matters under the carpet and out of public view. In doing so it hopes it may stand more chance of winning. However, we can be absolutely sure that its intentions will not be forgotten and that its intentions will not be dropped.

The people of South Australia will face this very real challenge to their freedoms if the present Government is re-elected, and that is the plain truth. The community's strong opposition to any of these plans leading to total control can best be demonstrated at the ballot box, and I sincerely hope that the people of this State will be very conscious indeed of the issues by the time they come to cast their votes. The next issue is conspicuous by its absence, and I quote from the then Governor's Speech of July 23, 1974, as follows:

My Government, in co-operation with the Australian Government, is examining proposals for the development of a uranium enrichment plant in the Spencer Gulf area. Such a project is a furtherance of the declared policy of my Government that maximum use will be made of energy resources within its jurisdiction.

A further consideration of this pronouncement is more revealing, and a report in the *News* of May 13, 1974, stated:

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

In the *News* of September 27, 1974, a report stated:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today that he did not think the Federal Government's decision to establish a uranium smelting plant in the Northern Territory would rule out the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant being built in South Australia.

The following report appeared in the *Advertiser* of October 17, 1974:

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

The *News* of October 24, 1974, contained the following report:

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

A report in the *News* of November 4, 1974, stated:

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

A report in the *Advertiser* of November 5, 1974, stated:

Mr. Hopgood, Minister of Mines and Development, said, "Mr. Connor is awfully keen on letting us have Redcliff as well. He has made that pretty clear to most people I have talked to."

Mr. Vandeeper: Are we going to get anything at Redcliff, do you think?

Mr. TONKIN: I would like to see something at Redcliff, because we are desperately in need of something there. We need any form of industrial development in this State at present, and we would be lost without it. The most significant factor in this most extraordinary saga has tended to be overlooked, and that was when the Attorney-General forwarded a telegram, which he released to the press, congratulating the President of the Australian Railways Union on his refusal to provide transport for uranium oxide.

That was the first time we saw this dissention coming through in Cabinet ranks, and showing a contrary attitude to that being expressed by the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy, and the previous Minister at the time. Following the Australian Labor Party convention held recently in Perth, and in the middle of the present public discussion and controversy, we find that the Premier has the audacity to insist that there is no split or difference of opinion at all in the A.L.P. You could have fooled me! Bob Hawke certainly does not agree; Mr. Whitlam did not agree at the A.L.P. convention but he seems to have changed his mind a little since then. He has been forced to come out publicly with a line that he does not really support. If the Premier maintains that there is no split in the A.L.P., he has to be joking. There is not a person associated with the news media in Adelaide who is not aware that both the present and the previous Ministers have lost their control over the Premier in this matter and that it is now the Attorney-General who dominates him.

The Premier has been looking over his shoulder, because he knows he has to obey the left wing in this as in so many other things, or else!

Members interjecting:

Mr. TONKIN: Members of the left wing are probably the people who are laughing the loudest about it. Following the answer that the Premier gave to a question asked by my colleague the member for Davenport today, I am not so sure whether he knows where he stands any more, either. He has gone from being totally in favour of a uranium enrichment plant to not wanting any form of uranium mining, processing or anything else, and he made that clear in this House. I will return in a little while to the motion that the Premier is fond of quoting. Now today it seems that he is having two bob each way. I wonder whether the delegates to the A.L.P. convention knew that he intended to have two bob each way when he moved that motion at that convention banning uranium. They would be interested to know—and my information has been confirmed now by the Premier as correct—that

his department is going on with planning for the enrichment plant, for the exploration of uranium deposits, and obtaining details. I do not know where he stands on this issue. He had better say exactly where he stands, because he certainly did not explain it today, and I do not think members opposite know where they stand on this issue.

Mr. Keneally: You tell us where you stand.

Mr. TONKIN: I say that the Premier has completely about-faced since 1974 and has now turned half-way back again. I challenge both Ministers, the present and the former Minister of Mines and Energy, to speak up and let us hear from them in this debate and indicate what their real view is. Let us ask them whether they hold the same view as the Attorney-General and probably the Premier (I say "probably" advisedly) in relation to uranium mining.

Mr. Keneally: We had a debate and you supported the Government's view.

Mr. TONKIN: In spite of this, I maintain that they are totally confused. I do not think the Ministers would answer because, if they answered truthfully, they would risk being expelled from the Australian Labor Party because they would contradict the official view of the Labor Party, with which the Premier did not quite agree today. The Premier would not lend a hand to help them, either: he would not dare. The most extraordinary section of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech was paragraph 10, which states:

An important copper and uranium discovery by the Western Mining Corporation in an area 25 kilometres west of Andamooka and 80 kilometres north of Woomera has encouraged a resurgence of exploration activity in that region. However, much more work will be necessary to determine whether or not mining activity in this area would be an economic proposition.

Whom do they think they are kidding? They know, I know, many mining authorities know, and the Mines Department knows that the solution system of mining uranium would certainly be an economic proposition in that area and would be a valuable asset, particularly in the Roxby Downs area, if it is combined with copper mining. They must think we are stupid if they think we will swallow that story, and they must think that the whole population of South Australia is stupid if they think they can get away with that. Here we have the Premier spending some considerable time in Perth making sure that uranium cannot be mined and now going on to say, having two bob each way, that investigations are continuing. How on earth does the Government expect the Western Mining Company, or whoever else takes on the development of this mineral resource, to mine the copper without the uranium? In fact, the whole development of that project hinged on the passage of the strata mining legislation which came before this House in the previous session. Honourable members know that full well. It was designed entirely for that complex and to keep in mind, and rightly so, opal mining.

Perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is a little more practical and certainly has more common sense than the Premier, could explain how the decision of the A.L.P. convention in Perth has created the most extraordinary difficulties for any proposed development of this resource. All I can say is that the Premier is probably the greatest disaster ever produced if, by his actions in being one of the leading lights of the Perth convention, he has placed in jeopardy for all time (and he has virtually said that it is for all time) something that South Australia desperately needs. Although he said he supported a moratorium on uranium until he

could be satisfied that adequate safeguards existed, he made clear outside this House that he did not expect those safeguards would be found at any time in the future.

In reply to a question, he said, "Probably never", and then he went to Perth and got a moratorium on uranium passed by the A.L.P. convention in Perth. I presume he still means that the safeguards will not ever be found. I presume he holds to that opinion—or has he come half-way back and does he really expect that adequate safeguards will be found? Will he decide, once the Federal Government has completed its deliberations, that it will be safe and that we will go ahead with uranium processing? Is all this moratorium talk nothing but a great big sham? I believe that it is. It is a sham put forward for Party political advantage, and nothing more. The Premier has shown his hand this afternoon.

We desperately need mineral development. I spoke yesterday in this House about increased unemployment and about the nature of unemployment, the fact that it is now largely structural unemployment and that we are going to have to restructure and retrain and change our entire industrial base. Anyone who does not believe that has his head in the sand, because that is the position. One of the ways out of this difficulty is by developing our mineral resources. Of course, we have to know what those resources are. The humbug I was objecting to this afternoon was that the Premier was trying to say we did not know what they were. We do know what they are, and we know that there are significant deposits at Roxby Downs, that they could be exploited, and that that would go a long way towards helping our economic problems.

Let us look at the mining royalty figures the Premier has been throwing about this afternoon. The actual receipts in 1975-76 in New South Wales totalled \$31 000 000, in Victoria \$43 000 000, in Queensland \$38 000 000, and in Western Australia \$43 000 000. There is only one State lower than South Australia with \$2 000 000 and that is Tasmania at \$550 000, although Tasmania has other natural resources, such as hydro-electric power. The estimated receipts for 1976-77 in New South Wales totalled \$39 000 000, in Victoria \$45 000 000, in Queensland \$45 000 000, in Western Australia \$50 000 000, in Tasmania \$830 000, and the South Australian figure is still \$2 000 000.

I suppose we can, to some extent, borrow from what the Premier said this afternoon. He is not willing to make any effort to lower stamp duties or state taxation. Because we have so little income in royalties, it shows how badly we need the new mineral developments. I believe that the Premier is acting under instructions from the Attorney-General, who is, I think, probably sincere about wanting to ban the mining of uranium. However, the Premier is certainly not sincere. He is acting under instructions from the Attorney-General for political purposes, to save his own skin, and because he thinks he can get out from under when it suits him.

We should at least be investigating this major development in great detail pending a decision on uranium mining. When we in this House debated a motion on the subject that was carried in this House with an amendment moved by the Opposition regarding the development of solar energy, we agreed that uranium should not be mined or developed until we were satisfied that adequate safeguards existed. We debated that motion before the second Fox report was released and before much of the material that is now being considered by the Federal Government had been collated. If we cannot depend on the deliberations of the Fox report and the opinions of Mr. Justice Fox

on the international safeguards that are being set down, on what can we depend? What special resources has this State got to enable it to make any other decision unilaterally? Obviously, none! With the copper deposits at Roxby Downs, and with the appropriate safeguards for uranium and the rights of opal miners, Roxby Downs has been described as a potential Mount Isa development. In our present critical economic and structural unemployment situation, we cannot afford to allow such a potential development to fail simply by default.

I repeat what I said on the radio this morning: I am coming more and more to the view that, with the danger presented by fast breeder reactors and the plutonium that they produce, we may have a moral obligation to export uranium, or at least to export the energy derived therefrom. However, I am willing to wait until a decision has been made federally. I believe that, if we can, by exporting our uranium, insist on a ban on fast breeder reactors, we will be doing the world a service. Other factors are still to be considered, although there is no doubt in my mind that that one factor is a potent one indeed that must be considered carefully.

I turn now to other matters. Let us examine another proposal promised in 1973 in the Speech delivered at the opening of Parliament, as follows:

A Bill will be laid before you to establish a waste disposal authority.

I have not seen a waste disposal authority, and I do not think anyone else has, either. I am sure that the member for Henley Beach will recall, with some chagrin, the difficulties he experienced in getting this matter off the ground. I should like now to refer to various press statements the first of which, in the *Advertiser* of October 8, 1973, was as follows:

Mr. Hopgood said the Government intended introducing a Bill to constitute a metropolitan waste disposal authority to deal with the litter problem.

I refer also to a report in the *Advertiser* of May 22, 1974, as follows:

The State Government plans to set up a waste disposal authority in South Australia.

One notices that that was a considerable time later. The report continues:

The Acting Premier (Mr. Corcoran) said yesterday the Government intended to introduce a Bill in the next session of Parliament to establish the authority.

Did we see that Bill? No, we did not. However, that is not uncommon for this Government. A report in the *Advertiser* of July 12, 1974, was as follows:

"Legislation is being prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel to provide for a waste disposal authority in South Australia," the Minister of Environment and Conservation (Mr. Broomhill) said today.

That was the member for Henley Beach, and he probably remembers saying so in July, 1974. A report in the *News* of September 17, 1976, stated:

The State Government has set up a three-man committee to prepare a blueprint for waste disposal in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

That is all the activity we have had. This Government is characterised by long delays between the announcements of propositions and actual delivery of the goods. I am reminded very much of the salinity problem, with which I shall deal in a moment. We are now midway through 1977 and it seems that a waste disposal authority has a snowball's chance in hell of ever getting off the ground under this Administration.

Mr. Nankivell: The Government confuses people with its baffle-gab.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, and its promises, and it does not care whether or not it keeps them. I predict that the Government will pull its usual trick and re-announce the establishment of a waste disposal unit before the next election. See whether I am not right. This time, however, we will be ready and will expose the fraud for what it is. This Government can certainly not be accused on inconsistency, because it has been consistent in one area at least—it has consistently deceived the public.

After much research the Government's report on the salinity problem was released in, I think, 1970. The report contained a detailed analysis of the problem. Figures on salinity levels were included, and it was stated that the problem was being exacerbated by the activities of growers upstream over the border causing quantities of salt to flow downstream. The report was worthwhile, containing commendable solutions, but consideration of the report, known as the Gutteridge report, was deferred. We heard that the Government was examining the report, but apparently to implement its recommendations would have been too expensive. Did the Government then set to and make further inquiries based on the Gutteridge report's basic data? Did it set up another committee to consider the problem so that it could produce as soon as possible another solution to the salinity problem that we could afford? No, the Government did not! It took no action until a little earlier this year.

Unfortunately, the member for Chaffey was overseas when the Minister of Works made a public announcement that salt in the Murray River was at such a level that it was a danger to health and to plant growth. Surprise, surprise! It was something that no-one had realised before, or was it? What a sham! The whole principle behind this exercise was to create a problem so that it could be said that the problem was being solved and so that it looked as though the Government was doing something positive and active. The result is that 6½ years have passed without anyone doing anything further about the salinity problem. It is typical of this Government that it allows so much time to go by before it tries to put into effect what sometimes are worthwhile ideas, but the Government just cannot get off the ground.

Let us consider another announcement. Queensland has the Gold Coast, but this Government wanted to go one better and have a Copper Coast. If you do not believe me, Sir, just listen to this. The *Advertiser* of May 18, 1973, stated:

A \$3 000 000 tourist development is planned to promote the Wallaroo area of Yorke Peninsula as the "Copper Coast" of Australia. Although final details of the plan have yet to be worked out, the Premier described it last night as a "very significant development". A planned foreshore complex will also mean the improvement of the old copper-mining town and surrounding districts, and will make Wallaroo the tourist centre for Yorke Peninsula and surrounding areas. The development is planned to include: a hotel-motel complex, holiday shacks and homes, a golf course, and a boat haven.

It is an imaginative plan and would greatly benefit the area, but what has happened to the Copper Coast? If you think the Premier had his head in the clouds, listen to this:

A restaurant of world standard was planned in 1970 at Windy Point.

This was in a most interesting paper. *Tourist Development in South Australia*, given in 1970:

The restaurant at Windy Point should be able to provide the following facilities: a first-class restaurant of gourmet standard and a larger area which can be used for general catering purposes, cabarets, and the like. Within this there should be provision for a smorgasbord service at lunch

time. There could be a terrace for people to eat in the open air, having either got food from the smorgasbord or from a barbecue area on the terrace, and ideally there should also be a swimming pool and changing rooms.

In 1972, in the capital works programme, the Premier allocated \$40 000 to begin construction of a first-class 100-seat restaurant at Windy Point. A barbecue, snack bar and kiosk area would seat 200 in a completely enclosed area and 100 in a partly enclosed extension. A year later, on February 1, 1973, still as optimistic as ever, he announced the following:

Such Government-backed projects as the Adelaide Festival Hall, Edmund Wright House, Ayers House, and the Windy Point restaurant were nearing fruition.

What does that mean? Apparently, he meant that it was nearly built. However, I have not seen it and I have been to Windy Point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a few times, as no doubt you have been. It is a pleasant place from which to show visitors Adelaide. I have seen a hot-dog stand there on wheels, but I have not seen a restaurant of gourmet standard, a barbecue area, a smorgasbord area, a terrace, a swimming pool, or change rooms.

Mr. Whitten: Would you like to see that?

Mr. TONKIN: It does not really matter as long as this Government is in office, because it has not a hope in hell of providing it. If the Premier now believes that there is a restaurant at Windy Point (and I am referring to the one said to be nearing fruition in 1973), he must have an even more vivid imagination than I gave him credit for. It was always possible, but it still remains absolute nonsense and is yet another example of the Premier's failure to come to grips with reality.

The next pie in the sky project must surely be the international hotel in Victoria Square, which should in future be referred to as the Hans Christian Andersen Hotel, as it appears to be just another one the Premier's fairy tales. In 1970, the Premier first proposed an international hotel in Victoria Square. In July, 1971, he claimed to have Japanese companies interested in building the hotel. In January, 1972, he claimed that work could start on the project that year. In July, 1972, he claimed to have an international consortium preparing detailed sketches.

In September, 1972, the details and the cost were given by the Premier. It was to be 22 storeys high, to contain 420 bedrooms, and to cost an estimated \$12 000 000 to \$14 000 000. In October, 1973, he had two groups ready to build the hotel. One of these groups was claimed, to quote the Premier, to be "very firm". In August, 1974, the Premier felt sufficiently moved to make the following pronouncement:

The Government had not abandoned plans for a Victoria Square hotel.

However, four months later, quite understandably, the Premier stated that he was urgently requesting the final proposals for the hotel. In June the following year, the Japanese group, the international consortium, and others, seemed to have disappeared, and the Premier at this stage claimed that he was negotiating with some unnamed architect in another State over the development of an international hotel on the site. Two months later the Premier was confident enough to make the extraordinary announcement that there would be no penny-pinching over the international standard hotel proposed for Victoria Square.

By December, 1975, the project was looking a little jaded, to say the least. In fact, the outlook was so bad that Mr. Casey (it was left to honest Tom to tell us the truth) was prepared to inform us that people who had

looked at the site were not very enthusiastic about it. By April, 1976, the Premier had shifted back overseas looking for mythical backers for the project and claimed he was negotiating with an oversea development group. Five months later the oversea interests, who obviously came from Hong Kong, were clearly losing their enthusiasm. Various people have come to Adelaide since then, but have just gone away again.

However, the Premier claimed at this stage that other international and local developers were showing renewed interest in the proposal. In November, 1976, he claimed that the whole project looked promising, and a month later he repeated this claim. That is where the matter still stands. I wonder whether we will have an announcement of an international hotel of world standard to be built on the corner of Victoria Square and Grote Street just after the next election.

Mr. Jennings: Just before the next election.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, and I am grateful to the member for Ross Smith, because he also has a sense of the ridiculous, along with the Premier. The constant stream of words on this issue epitomises the style of this Government. It deserves nothing but contempt for the way that it has systematically misled the press and the public with a constant barrage of misleading statements. The time to make announcements is when there is some reality to the projects, when there is a reasonable chance they will proceed.

This is the style of government to which we have become accustomed. Everything must be seen through rose-coloured spectacles. It does not matter what your water rates or your land tax is, or whether you cannot get a job. It does not matter whether you have to pay more than people pay in any other State to put a car on the road. It does not matter whether building costs are higher here than in any other mainland State (and the Premier has not convinced me on that score this afternoon). The fact is that, to have an identical house from a builder building in Sydney and in Adelaide, one must pay considerably more in Adelaide, and that is the essence of it. Without doubt, if one goes to Sydney and compares the prices of those identical houses, one finds that they are thousands of dollars cheaper in Sydney. The Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics figures clearly relate to average costs paid, not to what might happen, not to a small selection of houses. Those figures, the highest of any mainland State, represent the average of what people are paying in South Australia. The Premier cannot talk his way out of that one, and neither can his front man, nor the committee for good government.

We must face facts. It is no good denying that things have gone wrong. In fact, I believe that this Government would get much more credit by facing facts, being honest and saying, "We are in difficulties in South Australia, not because of the Federal Government or someone else, but because the situation in South Australia is economically finely balanced and because our policies until now have done nothing but aggravate the situation." I believe that the Government, if it undertook to reverse some of these policies and was honest about it, would gain a great deal of support from South Australians but, as long as it persists in seeing everything through rose-coloured spectacles and denying that building costs, stamp duties, the cost of a car on the road, water charges, harbor charges, and State taxation are at high levels, it will not succeed.

The Government is trying desperately to maintain its public relations exercise to convince everyone in South Australia that everything is wonderful under a Labor

Government. God help us! Government information films (Government propaganda films, as I prefer to call them) were prepared at a considerable cost. Although I do not know what the total number is to date, I think there were about 15 or 16 of them at an average cost of about \$7 500 of taxpayers' funds.

No matter what those films show (and they always show the best possible picture), people in South Australia are starting to say, "Why does the Government have to show these? What is it trying to cover up?" In fact, that is exactly what the Government is doing—it is covering up. Apart from that, we now also have a front organisation—non-political! It stands as a committee for good government, but I have already made the point publicly that I believe it should be called a committee for better government, because that is what South Australia desperately needs. Whence did the funds come for that campaign? Could it have come from the Premier's \$100-a-plate dinner? That source had not previously occurred to me.

Finally, this Government (and unfortunately a Labor Government has been in office ever since I entered this Parliament) and its predecessors since 1970 have reacted to criticism, especially legitimate criticism of its activities, by trying to shift to someone else the blame put on it. Occasionally, it has transferred that blame to senior public servants, and a despicable act that is, too. On this occasion, because we are blaming the Government of this State for what it is doing to South Australia, anyone who dares to criticise the Government is accused of knocking South Australia. I want this to be clear: the more often the Government pushes this old hackneyed ploy, the clearer it will become to the population of South Australia. I want it to be clear that I am knocking the Dunstan Government.

I am a South Australian: I am proud to be a South Australian. I love this State and all that it can provide for me and my children, and I do not like what is happening to South Australia. I do not like the course that has been chartered for us by the Dunstan Government and, if it means that I have to get up and knock the Dunstan Government and run the risk of being called a knocker of South Australia, I will knock the Dunstan Government—and I will continue to do it, because there is no future for this State under a Dunstan Government.

Waste, broken promises, mismanagement, and neglect are all the key words describing what we see from the Government. I need not mention Monarto any more, because everyone knows about Monarto and what it has done to the inner urban area of Adelaide. It has seriously affected the living conditions of everyone in the metropolitan area. Let me continue to knock the Dunstan Government and return to the issues that I raised in the first part of this speech. Compulsory unionism, industrial democracy or union control, and exemption from responsibility for union officials and their actions add up to totalitarianism in South Australia.

Mr. Allison: They add up to union control, too.

Mr. TONKIN: True, total union control, the same thing. I, for one, will have no part of it, and I believe that the people of South Australia have a clear choice to make at the next State election. They have to choose between a socialist Government moving towards total trade union control or the traditional freedoms which have always made up our Australian way of life. I have no doubt at all that they will make the right choice, because everyone, even Labor Party supporters in the past, values his freedom, and that is exactly what they will be voting

for. This State can no longer afford a Labor Government. It is a tired Government, a Government that has run out of steam.

It has been said that the Dunstan Government came in at the right time. I do not know: I am just reporting what has been said. Maybe it is a good thing for Governments to change every now and then to keep them on their toes. Having examined His Excellency's speech in great detail and having looked at the legislative programme put forward, I say that it is obvious that this is a Government devoid of new initiatives. The only initiatives it has left are ones it has announced before on industrial matters, and on compulsion and conscription into unions. Those are the matters it is deliberately not referring to now. I believe that it is a most insidious and dangerous thing that these measures have now been ignored. I repeat: the people of South Australia will have an opportunity to express their total opposition to those measures at the next election through the ballot-box, and I am confident that they will express their opinions and throw this Government out of office.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I support the motion. I join with the mover and seconder in expressing regret at the premature vacation of the office of Governor of this State by Sir Douglas Nicholls, and I wish him and his wife a long and happy retirement. I express my sympathy to the families of members who have passed on during the last recess. For almost the past hour we have put up with a speech from the Leader in which he continued in his usual way and justified his name "Ocker the Knocker", because he did nothing but knock, knock, knock. It is the usual thing for the Leader to knock South Australia and knock anything that is at all progressive. I am particularly concerned about his attitude towards uranium. I am sure that the resolution passed in Perth at the Federal conference of the Australian Labor Party was the correct decision and completely in line with the decision that the Leader supported in South Australia in this House, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. Dean Brown: But your own Premier admitted today that he was for it in every way.

Mr. WHITTEN: The member for Davenport also supported it, and I was pleased at the time and thought, "At last he is showing a bit of sense", but unfortunately he has thought it over during the past two or three months, or he has come under the influence of Anthony. There was talk of a decision being made. If that decision had not already been made (and made for quite some time) before Fraser went overseas in an endeavour to sell out Australia and to sell our uranium so that they would buy beef, I think I would have to be a Dutchman—and I am an Australian.

Mr. Dean Brown: But your own Premier said today that he was going ahead with the enrichment plant. He is proceeding with the feasibility study.

Mr. Langley: He didn't say that, and you know it.

Mr. Dean Brown: He did say it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: It appears that the member for Davenport wishes to have a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia before there are any adequate safeguards whatsoever.

Mr. Dean Brown: Your Premier has taken the same stand.

Mr. Langley: He didn't say that, and you know it.

Mr. Dean Brown: He didn't deny a thing I said.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: It appears that Opposition members' opinions have changed remarkably since March 31 when they all supported the resolution in this State. Surely they are not going to come out and say that they do not want a moratorium on uranium until there are adequate safeguards. That is what the resolution says; before we mine, enrich, or sell uranium we have to be satisfied that there are adequate safeguards for the people of Australia. I am disgusted; I have never heard such rubbish, drivel, and knock, knock, knock from the Leader as I have heard in the past hour or so. The Leader did say that South Australia needs this sort of mining because of the great employment it would create. Surely his great research staff of which he is so proud could have told him that less than 2 per cent of the work force in Australia was employed in mining and industries related to mining, so to say that it would help the unemployment situation in South Australia is absolute drivel: he is living in fantasy-land. I will not dwell on that drivel any longer.

I am very proud of what has been happening in Port Adelaide in the past 12 months or so. With the advent of the Labor Government, there has been much development in the western region of Adelaide. I refer particularly to the new Government building under construction at the corner of St. Vincent Street and Ocean Steamers Road. It will cater for sections of the Marine and Harbors Department, the Hospitals Department, the Public Buildings Department, and the Labour and Industry Department. In other words, it will cater for most of the Government departments that need office space in Port Adelaide. The eight-storey building, accommodating more than 300 people, will have a floor space in excess of 7 000 square metres and there will be parking facilities for more than 200 cars.

Those members who are aware of the inadequate accommodation that the Marine and Harbors Department has had at Glanville will realise what a wonderful improvement the new building will be. Only last Friday, on inspecting the building, I was pleased to find that the construction was up to schedule. It is due to be opened in late September, 1978. The contractors and the site engineer are proud that they are about one month ahead of schedule as a result of worker participation—another thing that Ocker was knocking some time ago. Hansen and Yuncken, one of the greatest private enterprise companies in the South Australian building industry, is responsible for the building. One of the subcontractors is Formfast. The form of worker participation that is applied at the site means that the workers elect members to a board, which makes recommendations to a director of the company; this is on a progressive basis. Most of the workers have been working for the company for up to seven years. So, there is a good relationship between the employees and the employer. One of the main unions involved is the builders labourers organisation, which the Opposition knocks all the time. It is a left-wing union certainly, but the Opposition would be very surprised at the measure of co-operation between the union and the management; there is complete endeavour to do a good job. All the planning and the architectural supervision for the building have been carried out by the Public Buildings Department.

Last Friday, when I asked the project manager whether there was any conflict, he replied, "We are extremely pleased with all plans and the lack of industrial disputation." The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners is also involved in the work. The member for Semaphore and I talked to the shop stewards for the two

unions to which I have referred. Those shop stewards said that this sort of job is the best sort to work on, where there is co-operation between the Government and the contractor. Another construction job in the Price District has been the centralising of workshops for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. That department's depots were originally scattered throughout the metropolitan area, but they have now been centralised at Ottoway, and workers on the job are extremely happy there. An amenities block has been erected for the workers, and the office block really caters for the staff and workers on the job and also whilst they are off the job. That building was also constructed by the Public Buildings Department with complete departmental supervision.

Referring again to the building for the Marine and Harbors Department, there has been only one complaint by workers on the job, and that has concerned odours drifting in from Wingfield. I am sure that the member for Ross Smith would support my remarks because, unfortunately, the Wingfield dump is situated in a noxious trades area, and these odours float from the dump. We thought we could control it, but the High Court had other ideas, and that is unfortunate, because the odours are still drifting in and will continue to do so until we are able to control completely the various trades in any specific area.

Also in Port Adelaide is a fishing berth at Princes Wharf, near what was the Jervois Bridge. It has been there since there has been a Port Adelaide, and it berths all of the small fishing fleet using the port. Unfortunately, it has outlived its usefulness, and there is now not enough room or sufficient facilities for berthing. I am also concerned about hygiene while fish is being sold on Sunday mornings at this wharf. However, I am pleased about the new fishing berth that is being installed on the North Arm opposite the Torrens Island power station. That berth will cater for all of the fishing fleet using the port area, and will cost \$1 100 000. This work is well on schedule, and we inspected it during the past week. The sheet piling has been driven for three parts of the length of the long jetty, and the floating crane is busily lifting in sections for the decking of the jetty. Small fishing vessels will be catered for at three pontoons, which go right out into the North Arm of the river, and I assure members that, whilst some fishermen at present do not like to shift from Princes Wharf, when they realise what a wonderful site this is on the North Arm of the Port River in good sheltered waters, I am sure they will be pleased, especially with the adequate provision for car parking, which can cater for hundreds of cars.

Also, there is a large paved area for drying nets, and provision has been made for a fish works and for the sale of fish. I think the fishermen of Port Adelaide will be extremely pleased when the berth is finished, and it is expected to be completed in the first half of next year. All of this work has been done by employees of the Marine and Harbors Department, and workers on the job have been extremely happy. I am also happy with the quality and standard of work at the new fishing berth. Also, whilst I am talking about the waterfront, I should mention the new container berth at Outer Harbor, which is perhaps wrongly named: it is actually at Outer Harbor but it is called Port Adelaide. That container berth, which is completed (and many members went to the official opening this year), cost nearly \$9 000 000, but I am sure South Australia will get much benefit from it because it will bring a lot of trade to South Australia.

It has one of the largest cranes of its type in the whole of Australia and the turn-round of ships will be speedy. This is one of the advantages that will accrue to South Australia—container shipping in South Australia instead of unloading in Melbourne or Perth and railing it over here or, as sometimes happens, the containers are unloaded and opened in other States and the goods come across by road transport. The container berth will bring much trade to Adelaide, and in particular to Port Adelaide. The berth has been dredged to an adequate depth to be capable of berthing any of the largest container ships likely to come to Australia, and the facilities are of world standard.

Another structure that has gone up recently in Port Adelaide (and bear in mind that all these are in the last 12 months) is the Western Region depot of the Public Buildings Department. Previously, the department had to come from Netley or Pennington but now in the Western Region the new depot has been built, and what I am so pleased about is not only is it so close to the Port Adelaide area and can serve all that area along the seafront to Outer Harbor but also the building has been built to blend in with the new West Lakes development. The roof tiles are much the same as those used in the development of the West Lakes area and I am sure the depot will be of great benefit there, now that it has been completed and opened. Let me turn briefly to what the Leader had to say about worker participation. He seemed to want to knock worker participation.

Mr. Max Brown: He knocks everything.

Mr. WHITTEN: That is not unusual; he has well earned his name as "Ocker the knocker". When he talked about worker participation, he condemned those people who would go to a certain country and cast a slur because it was not a capitalist country. Yesterday, mention was made of a member of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union going to that country to look at worker participation and industrial democracy, but members opposite want conveniently to forget that an employer representative is going as well. I do not know what they are afraid of; if they mention an employer representative, they fear there may be some sort of wash-off that the employers are supporting.

Mr. Allison: Let's hope not.

Mr. WHITTEN: You would hope not. You would hope that no money would be spent in the South-East, too. How wrong you were! Let us look at other people being wrong as well; let us look at the greatest South Australian Federal knocker, Mr. McLeay. What did he have to say on July 14 of this year at page 14 of the *Advertiser*, where we see the heading, "Minister slams South Australian factories plan". The article states:

The South Australian Government was depriving private builders of nearly \$1 000 000, the Minister for Construction (Mr. McLeay) said yesterday. He was referring to a statement on Tuesday that the Housing Trust would build nine factories for lease at a Womma Road, Elizabeth West, site. The factories would cost \$750 000. Mr. McLeay said the move had been made despite the South Australian Government's professed concern for the private building industry.

"This is an example of the difference between the philosophies of the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments", Mr. McLeay said. "It is also an example of the hypocrisy of the South Australian Government". He said the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) on one hand had expressed grave concern for the building industry and criticised the Federal Government and its economic policies for damaging it. On the other hand, the Dunstan Government was competing against the industry and using public money to construct its own buildings.

Mr. Olson: At least the buildings would be better quality.

Mr. WHITTEN: Yes, but he showed a complete disregard for the facts and did not bother to check them. Probably all he does each night is to look under the bed for a red carpet. There is no greater red baiter than is McLeay.

Mr. Keneally: What about the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. WHITTEN: He only knocks South Australia, whereas McLeay goes all over the world.

Mr. Max Brown: How many communists has he found?

Mr. WHITTEN: I think he is still searching. In the *Advertiser* on the next day at page 27, near the notices about births, deaths and marriages (and this shows how the press will place some articles—

Mr. Keneally: On the sports page?

Mr. WHITTEN: No, amongst the ads. The headline of a small article is "McLeay wrong—builders". I would not have thought that Mr. West, the Executive Director of the Master Builders Association, would have been a great supporter of the Australian Labor Party or that he would have wanted to condemn McLeay, but here he speaks in terms of the strongest condemnation. The article states:

The building of nine factories by the South Australian Housing Trust at Elizabeth West would not deprive private builders, the executive director of the Master Builders Association (Mr. K. C. West) said yesterday.

That is a direct negation of what was said by McLeay, supported—

Mr. Olson: By the member for Davenport.

Mr. WHITTEN: —by the member for Davenport. Mr. West went on to make the following comments:

A statement by the Minister for Construction (Mr. McLeay) that the project would deprive private builders of nearly \$1 000 000 was "totally erroneous".

Mr. Dean Brown: They accept what he says when it suits them.

Mr. WHITTEN: He would be right one time in 10. The member for Davenport does not get anywhere near that average. The report went on to say:

"The South Australian Housing Trust will in fact be calling tenders, as it always does for such projects and the factories will be built by private builders," Mr. West said. "I cannot understand how someone can make such an incorrect statement."

Perhaps he has not dealt much with McLeay, who thrives on incorrect statements. The article continues:

Mr. West contacted the *Advertiser* after a report of Mr. McLeay's statement was published yesterday.

Mr. Hudson replied and commented that Mr. McLeay's remarks were a shocking display of ignorance.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you referring to the Minister?

Mr. WHITTEN: Let us look at what McLeay had to say in relation to a report that he was looking to get out of the job, that he could not do the job he was doing and wanted to get out of Federal politics and wanted Ocker to take his place. He denied that he was quitting politics. The article states:

The Minister for Construction, Mr. McLeay, denied yesterday that he was thinking of leaving Federal Parliament at the next general election and said that he would expect to remain there for the next 10 years.

Probably he will. With the new redistribution of boundaries it would appear that Boothby will be saved for the Liberals, but we will make inroads in other districts, just as we will at the next State election. Some time in the next nine months the member for Davenport and the member for Chaffey, who is now deputising for Ocker—

Mr. Max Brown: Do you think he will get back?

Mr. WHITTEN: I would not have thought the member for Davenport would get done, either. However, I will guarantee that his majority will be sadly reduced and that the majorities of members on this side of the House will be greatly increased.

Mr. Dean Brown: I bet that my majority at the next State election is much higher than it is already.

Mr. WHITTEN: If the honourable member would like to take a little side wager on that, I will accommodate him.

Mr. Dean Brown: Very well. I am sure the Speaker would witness that.

The SPEAKER: Order! Wagers are not the business of this House. I ask the member for Davenport to withdraw that remark that the Speaker would witness it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I withdraw my remark that you, Sir, would witness it, and I will see the honourable member later.

Mr. WHITTEN: I think I had better leave Mr. McLeay alone for a while, because it seems to be a sore point with the member for Davenport. I refer now to unemployment, and repeat what the Leader said about wanting to mine uranium at Roxby Downs. He said that that sort of development was needed to counteract unemployment in South Australia. That is utter and complete drivel, and I am surprised that even the Leader could make such a statement.

Mr. Gunn: What about the copper there? What will you do with that?

Mr. WHITTEN: I will answer that interjection for the member for Eyre.

Mr. Mathwin: You will be out of order if you do.

Mr. WHITTEN: The member for Eyre knows as well as I do that there is copper at Roxby Downs, and that Western Mining Corporation has the complete exploration rights there. There is uranium in that area, and it will be extremely difficult to extract copper without extracting uranium. It seems that the Leader of the Opposition wishes to extract the uranium, although he did not seem to be particularly interested in the copper, talking as he did about an enrichment plant.

Mr. Dean Brown: Under your policy, the copper can't even be touched.

Mr. WHITTEN: I intend hereafter to ignore the member for Davenport, and to treat him with the contempt that he deserves.

Mr. Dean Brown: Under your policy, you can't even touch the copper at Roxby Downs.

Mr. WHITTEN: Regarding relieving unemployment, I repeat that less than 2 per cent of the Australian work force is employed in mining or related industries.

Mr. Gunn: So it doesn't count.

Mr. WHITTEN: I am not saying that.

Mr. Gunn: Yes, you are.

Mr. WHITTEN: I will ignore the honourable member as well for the present.

Mr. Dean Brown: You just ignore mining. Leave it in the ground!

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much private conversation.

Mr. WHITTEN: Regarding unemployment, let us look at the attitude of members opposite as well as at Mr. Fraser and his policies. One is not even allowed to have a mind of one's own. One must say, "Yes, Mr. Fraser, it will create more unemployment, and we will back you up on it."

Mr. Gunn: Did you sign a pledge when you joined the A.L.P.?

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the honourable member finished? At the beginning of this year, when the State Government allocated \$17 000 000 for unemployment relief—

Mr. Dean Brown: Did you sign a pledge to give away your freedom when you joined the Labor Party?

Mr. WHITTEN: I said that I intended to ignore the member for Davenport and I do not intend to answer that stupid sort of interjection. At the beginning of this year, when the Premier announced a \$17 000 000 allocation for unemployment relief, he asked Mr. Lynch, the Federal Treasurer, to inject some sort of money into South Australia to alleviate unemployment. He asked for only \$3 000 000, which was the sum of money it was estimated the Federal Government would save in unemployment relief payments, as well as the taxation that it would receive from those workers' wages. However, does one think that the Federal Government would help the South Australian Government to alleviate unemployment? It has a deliberate policy of creating unemployment. I believe it is for two reasons, the main one of which is to try to get the workers of this country a bit further down on their knees than they are now. This seems to be the attitude of the Federal Government. The *South Australian Institute of Teachers Journal* of July 20, 1977 (and one could not get a greater condemnation of the Federal Government, because these people usually do not enter into political arguments), states at page 11:

There are 320 000 people out of work in Australia at the present moment. Predictions for next year are around the 450 000 mark.

A late correction is made to those figures which, since the report was originally written, have risen to 332 793 at the end of June, 1977. The report continues:

One group which is clearly suffering disproportionately is unemployed school leavers. According to the *National Times* (July 4-9, 1977), while the under 21's make up only 15 per cent of the work force they account for 39 per cent of the unemployed. In May this year 38 031 school leavers were registered as unemployed. The latest Commonwealth Employment Service figures (May, 1977) put the ratio of unemployed juniors to junior vacancies at 32:1.

That is, 32 unemployed school leavers are out of work for every job available to them. In September, 1974, the great Malcolm Fraser (the man held up as the knight in shining armour), when shadow Minister for Labour said that the Labor Government should pay the minimum wage to the unemployed if the number of people out of work reached 250 000. Now the number of people out of work has reached 332 000 what about a little money for these people, rather than depriving them, as Fraser has done to school leavers?

Mr. Gunn: What about Clyde Cameron?

Mr. WHITTEN: I am sorry that the member for Eyre is getting so upset by my talking about his dear leader. The report continues:

The Federal Government has clearly not followed Mr. Fraser's proposal. On the contrary it has decided to deny one group unemployment benefits completely! It has chosen to discriminate, unlawfully and inhumanely, against young people entering the work force for the first time by refusing them unemployment benefits during the Christmas vacation. This, despite the court ruling on April 15, 1977, which established the right of unemployed school leavers to benefits during the school holidays!

That is the sort of Government that is in power in Canberra: it is the sort of Government that the Opposition supports completely. I am talking about the deliberate policies of this Federal Government to create unemployment.

One of its reasons for creating unemployment is to bring down inflation. If the Government is to stand on its record, it should get out now, because it has not reduced inflation. Inflation is still around the double figure mark and many more thousands of people are unemployed. It seems it is intended that further people should become unemployed. I now again refer to Port Adelaide. I know honourable members opposite are disappointed about that, and I can see them squirming. Even the member for Davenport had to go out of the Chamber, because he could not take it any more.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WHITTEN: If members opposite want me to carry on, I will do that, and they will be sorry. The South Australian Labor Government was the first in Australia to introduce any form of unemployment relief work. It was the leader in the field. If members of the Opposition consider that the people of South Australia, by supporting a Federal Liberal Government, are to blame and should be punished, that is up to those members. However, I assure them that the South Australian Government has not done anything like what the Federal Liberal Government has done. We have tried to assist the unemployed, contrary to what the Federal Government has done.

Mr. Gunn: How many jobs did you create at Monarto?

Mr. Slater: Eighteen.

Mr. Gunn: \$1 000 000 a job.

Mr. WHITTEN: Let us look at what the Monarto Development Commission did in Port Adelaide and let us also consider how well the Liberals at Port Adelaide are behaving. Let us also look at today's *Messenger*, which I will keep for next week. At Port Adelaide, we have an organisation called Comskil. It has been established to assist young people who have some commercial training but who, through the actions of the present Federal Government, have been unable to get a job. The Further Education Department, at the Le Fevre College, with other Government departments such as the Labour and Industry Department, as well as with the youth work unit in the Premier's Department and with volunteers, has established ways and means to help young people retain the skills that they may have acquired. However, the Federal Government has said "No" when it has been asked for funds.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It won't even give us the money we save it on unemployment benefits.

Mr. WHITTEN: We save it \$3 000 000 in unemployment benefits, but the Federal Government will not even channel that money back. I support the motion.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I want to speak of the vitriolic attacks made on the trade union movement by Opposition members. These attacks are of much concern to me. These attacks are made purely and simply to fall into line with Fraser and company's attacks on the trade union movement in an attempt to draw the attention of the voting public away from the mismanagement of the

affairs of Australia by Fraser and his Government. We saw several examples of this in the House today, when the Leader and the Deputy Leader made attacks on the movement. The Deputy Leader said that housing costs in South Australia were high for certain specific reasons. However, the Premier exploded that argument. Nevertheless, the Deputy Leader said that the trade union movement was largely responsible. He indicated this by quoting high wages, long service leave and annual leave payments, compensation payments to a degree he did not accept, and sick leave payments.

Although the Leader made a vicious attack on the trade union movement, he could not prove his assertions. He merely made contemptuous remarks, without attempting to justify them or to produce proof of what he was saying. The reason for these attacks, as I said earlier, is a well-conceived idea to divert the attentions of the Australian voters (in this case, South Australians) away from the mismanagement of the Fraser Government. We all recall the most peculiar way in which Fraser assumed power as the Leader of the Government in Australia and how he was going to reduce unemployment. That was one of the first things he was going to do, but unemployment has increased to a frightening degree. It frightens Fraser, the Leader, Deputy Leader and all Opposition members in the House because they know that all South Australians are aware of what has transpired and of the fact that this Opposition is frantically trying to cover up the misdeeds of Fraser and company. In order to divert the attention of the public away from Fraser's activities, they attack the trade union movement. However, the whole smoke screen disappears when the position is correctly examined.

All members who have had anything to do with the trade union movement know that in South Australia it always tries to assist the Government in power (it has done so even when a Liberal Government has been in power in this State), and I recall Liberal Party officers often going to trade union leaders when there was a dispute or when there was some trouble causing concern and begging them to use their good offices to assist them to settle the matter. How they can expect support from the movement if, by any misdeed, ever in the future they gain the Government benches in this House is beyond me, because they would be faced with a strong attack on all occasions. The Liberal Party has demonstrated, and is demonstrating almost daily in this Chamber, its contempt of the worker in this State.

In its attacks on the trade union movement, the Opposition has seen fit to single out leaders of certain unions. It has thrown in the old bogey of communism. For many years this was effective when used by the Liberal Party, but that ploy has now gone by the board because workers in South Australia, and workers throughout Australia generally, now know that what Liberal Governments want to ram down their throats is false. Trade union leaders are elected by their membership to control union activities and they do not and cannot act in a unilateral manner. Union leaders are the servants of the union, and they do as the union membership instructs them. This will continue to happen.

Mr. Dean Brown: Is Pat Clancy a communist?

Mr. WELLS: Of course he is a communist, and there are many other communist people that I know of. However, there are members of the Communist Party who are damn good trade unionists. South Australian trade unionists are not so gullible and stupid that they will be guided and led by the nose by a person elected as a union officer, if that person attempts to deviate from the policies of that

union (in most cases Australian Labor Party policies) and lead them into some communistic sidetrack. That is just not on and it never has been on. The Liberal Party seeks the complete annihilation of the trade union movement, but it will never attain that. We will see that Party planted long before the trade union movement collapses.

True, after the next election some members of this House will lose their seat as a result of the new electoral boundaries. Much has been said about which member will be in what seat but, to my knowledge, no-one has referred to the A.L.P. in this regard. We have heard the Liberal Party saying that Mr. So-and-so will be elected and opposed by another person, that both candidates are good members of the Liberal Party, and as such they will get the support of the Liberal Party. That is good stuff, but I can tell all members that in most cases the A.L.P. will decide who will be the successful candidate. If we cannot win a seat ourselves, our preferences will determine who will be in that seat; it will not be determined by the Liberal Party or its cohorts.

Mr. Dean Brown: What seats are you referring to?

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member knows of seats where his Party has dual candidates—an endorsed candidate and another candidate who believes he was hard done by—I really do not care who stands for any seat at all, but I merely reiterate that in the final outcome A.L.P. preferences will determine who we want there, and it will not be decided by the Liberal Party.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to grieve on a matter which was raised earlier today by you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your intervention today in pointing out to Ministers of the Crown that there was a problem at Question Time because of long answers to questions. In saying that, I acknowledge that members asking questions have been forced to attempt long explanations in an effort to counteract the situation. Today, the Minister of Education took eight minutes to answer a question. He is experienced and knowledgeable enough in politics to know that, at the time it was agreed to change the time allowed for Question Time from two hours to one hour, it was agreed, particularly by the then Attorney-General (now Mr. Justice King), and other senior members of the Labor Party, that explanations would be short and there would be no abuse of the system.

The Minister of Education is a man who preaches the principles of Christianity and, I think, fair play. He, for one, should know that what he was doing today was deliberately breaking a promise given at the time members agreed to the change in Standing Orders.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What do you say about the number of Questions on Notice?

Mr. EVANS: I will come to that. Originally, a member could explain a question before asking it. Some of the journalists who report the proceedings of this House may not remember that period. I am not opposed to the criticism that was expressed yesterday; it was fair criticism of us by a person or persons who believed we were not active enough yesterday. I want those persons to understand the history of the situation and how the Government has set out to exploit that situation. At one time a member could explain a question and then ask it; that was the practice in this House for half a century and more. In giving an explanation a member could debate a matter and talk about other things than were covered by the question he was really asking. In fairness, it was agreed that that system would change. It was an opportunity that an Opposition has lost for all time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You've got this grievance debate also, remember.

Mr. EVANS: I will come to that, too. That is what happened to Question Time. At the same time, Question Time was reduced from two hours to one hour. It was also the practice, especially when the Australian Labor Party was in Opposition, for members to direct questions to members of the same Party. If one looks back at the records, one will find that several of those questions were asked. You, Sir (and I do not object to your ruling), have made an interpretation of Standing Order 123 in relation to "other members". That Standing Order reads, in part:

. . . . and to other members—

in other words, members can direct questions to Ministers and also to other members, including members of one's own Party—

—relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

It is interpreted that "concerned" means that they have some power over that situation. That is not how I would interpret it but I do not say I am right. There is also reference to a Bill or motion before the House. That eliminates any opportunity to deliver information to the House from one's own Party by that method. Moreover, if a Minister decides he will not answer Questions on Notice (and that has happened quite often), they are not answered. Then, there is no way, in asking the question, of putting in any detail about why one wants the question answered. That is an important aspect that has been lost. Ministers have said recently that members should write a letter to the Minister involved. I point out that that system has failed so badly that the Opposition has instances where letters have not been answered in less than six months.

Dr. Eastick: Except in a newspaper by a Labor Party candidate.

Mr. EVANS: Yes. An Opposition member may write a letter about a matter, and a Labor Party candidate will make a statement about the matter before the Opposition member receives a reply from the Minister. The Government is deliberately doing everything possible to destroy any chance the Opposition has to be effective. The news media can report that how they like, but the terms of the game have changed. Politics is rugged, but in the past there was some semblance of fair play and of acknowledging rights for the other side; I do not think even the Labor Party can deny that. However, that sense of fair play has been destroyed.

We have been given the opportunity for a grievance debate at the end of most sittings. On Tuesdays and Wednesdays, because the grievance debate usually takes place late at night, there is very little coverage of it in the news media; that is part of the game, whether we like it or not. The Government has destroyed the chance of the Opposition to operate as effectively as the Opposition was able to do in the past. Yesterday, Dorothy Dix questions were asked. I stress that I am not opposed to Government members asking questions; that is their right. Further, I do not oppose giving a Minister one of his back-benchers a question to ask because he wants to get a matter before the House but, when a Minister deliberately sets out to give long answers, I must voice my strong objection. Yesterday, four questions took 22 minutes to answer during the hour allowed for Question Time. In those circumstances, what chance have the 23 members on this side to get in their questions? It has been submitted to me that

many questions (and I say this about the broad news media) deal with parochial issues and are not newsworthy. I stress that a politician is elected to represent a particular area, and it is no good writing letters, because members do not get answers, unless there is an opportunity for Ministers to kick the Federal Government in the stomach. Answers may not be received for months. Putting a question on notice is no good because we cannot explain it. So, we are very limited.

The Government has a responsibility to honour the promise given some time ago. If the Government wishes to make long explanations on issues, it has the right, which we do not have, to give a Ministerial statement. You were right today, Mr. Speaker, to say what you said. I have never known an instance where the Opposition has refused leave for a Minister to make a Ministerial statement. Parochial issues are important to certain sections of the community, and it is sometimes important to raise them here because members may then realise that other areas have the same problem. If that is not part of a Parliamentarian's responsibility, many of us have been misled. I am not objecting to the criticism that may have been made yesterday; that criticism may make people a little more alert, but I am objecting to abuses of the system.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I refer to the matter that has already been spoken about by the member for Price and the member for Florey. This problem facing us at present and causing the greatest hardship to people of this country is one of the greatest problems that one could refer to, and I mean the present mammoth unemployment figures.

Mr. Venning: You know how to overcome it, don't you?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, I do.

Mr. Venning: Sack the South Australian Government for a start.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The first thing I would do is get rid of Fraser. However, without discussing that question, I say that, of the more than 300 000 people unemployed at present as revealed by the latest figures, I believe sincerely that most of those unemployed people really want to work. If by chance any Opposition member does not believe that, I suggest that he should talk to the young people who are unemployed and who have not been employed since they left school. Most of those youngsters desire one thing in life, and that is to work. The funny part about it that occurs to me because of its peculiarity is that we have a situation in which people are unemployed and which has been mainly caused by the bad policies of the Fraser regime. Being a past and present member of the trade union movement and a past leader of that movement, I remember occasions when there were strikes or disputes in industry and the Opposition members and people like Fraser were quick to say to the people of this country that trade unions were stopping people from working, and they would bring in the penalties that go with it. We are seeing now that the present Federal Government only seems to be concerned, but it is really most unconcerned at the downward trend of the manufacturing industry. That Government has stood idly by and shown no concern to take any action on the question of retrenchments in those industries. I remind members that Whyalla has now the highest rate of unemployed in this State. Arising from those figures, I

point out to the House, as I have done publicly in my own city, that one reason for those figures, and one of the first things that brought them about, was the decrease in the availability of apprentice opportunity in the shipyards.

Mr. Gunn: That is the fault of the Dunstan Government and the local member.

Mr. MAX BROWN: If the honourable member wants to have a go, I can say that at present the member for Eyre represents a small section of the city of Whyalla, and if he wants to state publicly that he approves of the present unemployed figures in this country, let him say it publicly in Whyalla.

Mr. Gunn: We would make a far better go of it than this Government.

Mr. MAX BROWN: For the guidance of the member for Eyre, I point out that the Whyalla shipyard is now putting off between 20 and 30 men a month. I am not dealing with the real crux of the situation, because that will affect Whyalla in October or November this year, and God knows at that time how many decent people who want to work and cannot, and how many who are married with responsibilities in this country, will be without jobs. I bring to the attention of the House a recent statement appearing in the local press of Whyalla attributed to the member for Davenport when he was speaking in Kimba, I think, or somewhere near that town, in which he said that the answer to the problem was that workers must work harder because we want more productivity.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And get less pay: why didn't he say that?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Let me say this to my colleague: the thing that concerns me is how the member for Davenport goes to the 700 people retrenched at Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park and tells them to work and produce more. How does that happen? In the next breath, we find that cars are being stockpiled. Perhaps, therefore, we should be examining the over-production aspect of the situation. Let us examine the answers that have been supplied so far by the Fraser regime regarding unemployment. We saw a classic example of this this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition changing face on uranium mining. I am sure the present Fraser regime believes, perhaps stupidly, that the answer to unemployment in this country is mining. Anyone with even half a brain, which

covers all members opposite, could work out that mining is not labour-intensive. How do we do away with shipbuilding, which did employ directly about 1 800 men and indirectly, in the city of Whyalla, about 600 other people, not counting those people employed by the experts manufacturing the parts that go into a ship? How do we replace that situation with mining?

I have yet to hear any plausible answer to how we get a lower unemployment figure in this country by mining, and not one member opposite has even the remotest answer to that problem.

Mr. Gunn: Would you answer one question?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The only other thing I want to speak on briefly (I said this publicly in the city of Whyalla and I think I have said it in this House) is this. What happens with unemployment, of course, is that members of the Government know, quite rightly, that, when young people in particular become unemployed, they may land themselves in a situation where they get into mischief; that is unfortunate. Of course, the unemployed young person is now becoming a problem from the point of view of vandalism, etc. How does the Opposition answer this question? What has happened is what we predicted would happen: it now announces a campaign of law and order. I do not forget that people like Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, and even Nixon when he first attempted to become the President of the United States based their campaigns on law and order. If that is what we want in this country, you can count me out.

We can look at the programme transcript of *This Day Tonight* as regards the advertisement that the Opposition has put out on television (although I notice it has withdrawn it) on law and order. The experts are saying that in all the figures for law and order in this State there has been a decrease.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't be silly.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Look at the experts! In other words, if we look at the members opposite they say they are correct in this situation. I only hope sincerely that the Federal Government will look seriously at the problem of unemployment.

Motion carried.

At 5.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 26, at 2 p.m.