

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

QUESTIONS

Tuesday, November 15, 1977

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION BILL

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

PETITION: EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. **GUNN** presented a petition signed by 81 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to extend a reticulated water supply to all properties in the areas west of Ceduna and Penong.
Petition received.

PETITION: WAITPINGA LAND

Mr. **CHAPMAN** presented a petition signed by the Yankalilla District Council and 1 417 concerned citizens of South Australia, praying that the House would ensure that the portion of section 57, hundred of Waitpinga, not be acquired by the South Australian Government as an extension to the Deep Creek Conservation Park, thereby allowing the property to remain in its present use.
Petition received.

PETITIONS: TRADING HOURS

Mr. **WILSON** presented a petition signed by 500 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Shop Trading Hours Bill to retain the current trading rights of existing exempt shops.

Mr. **WELLS** presented a petition signed by 1 353 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would exempt the Valley View Foodland shopping centre from the provisions of the Shop Trading Hours Bill.
Petitions received.

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ROAD GRANTS

Dr. **EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What sums received by the Government from the Commonwealth specifically for allocation to local government as road grants have been or are expected to be received for 1976-77 and 1977-78?

2. How have these sums been allotted between the individual councils?

3. What sums for roads or any other purposes did the Government provide to local government in each of the years 1970-71 to 1976-77, and what percentage variation per annum did any variation represent?

4. Has the Government reduced its own funding of local government for roads or any other purposes in either of the periods 1976-77 and 1977-78, and, if so, by what amount, or if there has been no decrease, what has been the percentage increase?

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: The replies are as follows:

1. Commonwealth roads legislation provides for the payment of grants in various categories to the States and does not provide funds specifically for allocation to local government as road grants. However, expenditure by local government from grants allocated to the States is subject to the approval of the Commonwealth Minister for Transport.

2. See 1.

3. The following sums of money have been allocated to councils as grants for roads in each of the financial years 1970-71 to 1976-77:

Year	Allocation (\$)	Percentage Variation
1970-71	4 007 517	
1971-72	4 012 126	+0.12
1972-73	3 777 900	-5.84
1973-74	3 772 477	-0.14
1974-75	3 986 102	+5.66
1975-76	4 232 173	+6.17
1976-77	4 779 650	+12.94

The following sums of money have been allocated to local government for "other purposes" including common effluent drainage, public parks, pensioner concessions and tourism, recreation and sport grants:

1975-76	\$4 600 000
1976-77	\$5 300 000
1977-78	\$6 100 000*

*estimated expenditure for current year.

The above figures represent only a guide to actual expenditures because special loans and grants, as well as expenditures involving more than one department, obscure actual figures. The above figures should, therefore, be regarded as conservative estimates. Even so, over the past three years there has been an obvious marked increase in Government allocations of funds to local government. (It is not possible to give figures prior to 1975-76.)

4. The expenditure by the State in each road category contained in the Commonwealth legislation exceeds the Commonwealth grant for that category. Within the overall programme of the Highways Department, it is therefore difficult and possibly meaningless to attempt to identify expenditure on an individual project against either State

or Commonwealth funds. Commonwealth legislation has no specific category of roads under local government control. In broad terms, however, the Commonwealth Minister for Transport approved of programmes of works for 1976-77, including grants to councils of \$4 218 100. The programmes submitted to the Commonwealth Minister for the current financial year included grants to local government amounting to \$5 653 500.

RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

Mr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Railways Institute been without satisfactory premises since its home was demolished in 1970 to make way for the Festival Centre complex?

2. Did the Government give an undertaking to the institute that the part of the Adelaide railway station building occupied until July of this year by the Motor Vehicles Department would be modified for occupation by the institute and, if so, what is the estimated cost of the necessary work, when will it be commenced, and when will it be completed and the institute able to move in?

3. Is any such work now the responsibility of the State Transport Authority (Rail Division) or of the Australian National Railways Commission and, should responsibility now rest with the Australian National Railways Commission, will the Government do everything necessary to ensure that any undertaking to the institute is honoured, including offering to share the cost with the commission?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Undertakings were given to the institute that the space in the Adelaide railway building previously occupied by the Motor Registration Branch, would be available for institute purposes.

3. Responsibility rests with the Australian National Railways Commission.

KEITH TO CANTARA ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. What is the present updated estimate of the cost of completing the Keith to Cantara Road by—

(a) the route proposed by the District Council of Tatiara following the eastern boundary of the hundred of Laffer in a northerly direction to its junction with the Mount Charles Road and thence easterly into Keith; and

(b) the route proposed by the Highways Department extending the existing Cantara Road easterly from its junction with the eastern boundary of the hundred of Laffer and thence along an unfenced road which extends from the south-western corner of section 29, hundred of Sterling, to the eastern corner of section 7 where it would junction with Main Road 21 from Keith to Bordertown and thence in a northerly direction into Keith?

2. If the cost of alternative (a) is now less than alternative (b) does the Highways Department still propose to persist with its proposal?

3. What advantages other than cost savings are to be gained by persisting with alternative (b)?

4. In view of the present condition of the road surface on the Keith to Cantara Road west of its junction with the

eastern boundary of the hundred of Laffer, is the Highways Department prepared to approve road grants on this section if requested and given a suitable works priority by the council, or is it proposed to withhold further grants on the whole of the road until such time as the District Council of Tatiara has resumed the reserve and constructed the proposed sections of road from the south-west corner of section 29, hundred of Sterling, to its junction with Main Road 21 at the eastern corner of section 7, hundred of Sterling?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) and (b) Updated comparative estimated costs of completing the Cantara-Keith Road via the Mount Charles Road and via the route proposed by this department are not available. The comparison would be complex and time consuming because, apart from the varying distances involved, portions of the sealed length of the Mount Charles Road are of some age and are not to present-day standards, while the questions of improved alignment and intersections, acquisition, etc., would also have to be taken into account, particularly with the Mount Charles Road route. Under the circumstances, the work involved in making such a cost comparison cannot be justified. However, it is believed that such a comparison would favour the departmental proposal.

2. Not applicable.

3. The advantages, other than cost, of the departmental proposals are better alignment, better location in the sense of through road networks and lesser future maintenance cost.

4. No change is envisaged to the present situation under which no grants will be made for any part of the Cantara-Keith Road until the District Council of Tatiara has agreed to the departmental route and enforced the fencing of the existing road reserve followed by this route.

LEAVE PAYMENTS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): In relation to the payment of \$34 785 by the Premier's Department during 1976-77 as terminal leave payments—

(a) what was the work classification of each employee at the time of terminating employment;

(b) how long had each employee held this classification, and what was each person's previous classification, if a change was made;

(c) in each case, did the employee or the employer terminate the employment;

(d) were all the employees employed under the Journalists Metropolitan Daily Newspapers Award, and, if not, what award were they employed under?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

(a), (b), (c)—See attached table.

(d) 1. None of the employees listed were employed under the award mentioned in the member's question.

2. Two employees who were employed under that award left the department last year. They were Ms. A. Koh and Mr. K. Crease. They gave notice in accordance with the award but the Government, for reasons already stated to the House, terminated their employment immediately.

3. Similar payments have also been made to Mr. Tony Baker, Press Secretary; Mr. Peter Ward, Executive Assistant; and Mr. Peter Middleton, Press Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT
Terminal Leave Payments, 1976-77

Name	Classification	Period	Section	Reason for Termination of Employment	Act
G. S. Shepherd	Film Producer	1950-74		Voluntary	
	Visual Aids Officer	1974-76	Publicity	Retirement	P.S. Act
S. A. Martin	Office Assistant	1969-76	Agent-General	Resigned	P.S. Act
			Correspondence		
A. O. Standfield	Superintendent	1963-76	Immigration	Voluntary	
	Immigration Hostel		S.A. Rail	Retirement	P.S. Act
B. D. Porter	Steno. Secretary	1957-76	Ombudsman	Resigned	P.S. Act
G. Guldemeester	Office Assistant	1969-76	Immigration	Resigned	P.S. Act
G. Hooper	Office Assistant	1952-75		Voluntary	
	Social Worker	1975-77	Immigration	Retirement	P.S. Act
L. M. Wright	Stip. Magistrate	1965-74		Voluntary	Magistrates
	Senior Special Magistrate	1974-76	Justices	Retirement	Award
B. R. Crowe	Magistrate	1964-76	Justices	Resigned	Magistrates Award

FINANCIAL CONSULTING UNIT

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Can the Minister of Works explain why the proposals in the report submitted by the officer seconded from the Financial Consulting Unit of the Public Service Board to his department have not been implemented?

2. What are the proposals in the report?

3. When is it expected that such proposals will be implemented?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The report was referred to the Department for the Environment in June, 1977. The transfer of both the Chief Administrative Officer and the Secretary of the department at that time made implementation of the proposals impossible.

2. The report proposes a revised system of responsibility accounting incorporating budgetary control by division or unit basis; a new departmental classification of accounts; and the adoption of a financial information recording and reporting package for the production of timely financial management reports.

3. The financial control procedures will be implemented from July 1, 1978.

GLENELG TRAM

Mr. TONKIN (on notice): Are operating accounts for the Glenelg electric tram service kept separate from the accounts for the State Transport Authority's bus and tram operations as a whole and, if so, does the Glenelg service run at a profit or at a loss, what is the profit or loss figure per passenger or per passenger-kilometre and the comparative figure for the authority's bus operations?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Operating accounts for the Glenelg tram service are not kept separate from the State Transport Authority's bus and tram operations as a whole, and the information requested is not readily available.

LEAVE PAYMENTS

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it anticipated that an answer will be received to my letter of August 9, 1977, on behalf of Mrs. V. B. Crocker, of Whyalla, in relation to her claim for long service leave?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No letter has been received from the honourable member regarding Mrs. V. B. Crocker. However, as a result of representations made by the South Australian Institute of Teachers a resolution to this problem has been achieved.

HAWKER ROAD

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How much money will be spent on the Hawker to Leigh Creek road this financial year?

2. How many kilometres of bitumen will be laid during this financial year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. \$950 000 (estimated) on construction work.

2. 12 km (estimated).

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What are the procedures laid down for the appointment of people to become justices of the peace?

2. Are appointments made on a monthly basis, or at regular intervals throughout the year?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Applicants who qualify for appointment are interviewed by the Justices Appointment Committee in the case of those from the suburbs, and by special magistrates in the case of country nominees. Nominations are next considered by the Attorney-General who submits to Cabinet a list of those he recommends for appointment, after which appointments are made by the Governor in Executive Council.

2. No. Appointments are not made at regular intervals.

SLAUGHTERHOUSES

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government have any intention of reviewing the health requirements for country butchers operating their own slaughterhouses and, if so, what alterations will be made and when?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is studying the question of hygiene standards in slaughterhouses, and an appropriate announcement will be made in due course.

ROAD ALLOCATIONS

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice):

1. What amounts of money has the Federal Government allocated for the year 1977-78 for the categories—

(a) urban local roads;

(b) rural local roads;

(c) urban arterial roads; and

(d) rural arterial roads?

2. What amounts has the State Government allocated for the same categories and period?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) \$2 200 000*
- (b) \$6 700 000
- (c) \$4 600 000*
- (d) \$7 000 000*

* construction only.

2. Estimated expenditure as at September 2, 1977, by the Highways Department from State funds is as follows:

- (a) \$400 000
- (b) \$1 400 000
- (c) \$6 200 000
- (d) \$12 000 000

EGGS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is it anticipated that egg production in South Australia will exceed demand at any stage during the 1977-78 financial year and, if so, by what amount and when?

2. What measures have been or will be taken to rationalise production at the critical periods, if any, and has any measure proposed to be implemented been successful in the past, or is it an adaption of a previously tried measure?

3. Is any legislative alteration necessary in the interest of the industry?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, in accordance with the objectives of the Egg Industry Stabilisation Act, which aims at a surplus of between 10 per cent and 15 per cent a year. This surplus is usually at its highest in spring and lowest during autumn/winter.

2. (a) The "recycling" or forced moulting of layers over 14 months in age so that they come back into production in late summer and autumn. This practice is common in the United States of America and elsewhere.

(b) The release in March to June, 1978, of hen quotas held by the South Australian Egg Board. This concept was successfully applied by the board in the autumn and winter of 1977 to meet market requirements.

3. All producers have been informed of the importance of matching production to meet seasonal market requirements, and invited to attend meetings on how to implement 2 (a) above. In these circumstances amending legislation is considered unnecessary.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many buildings are currently owned by the Highways Department?

2. How many of these buildings are—

- (a) available for lease as a dwelling;
- (b) unsuitable for lease as a dwelling; and
- (c) currently occupied as a dwelling?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. A total of 1 140 includes buildings of all types acquired for road purposes.

2. (a) Nine are available for lease as at October 28, 1977; leases are under negotiation.

(b) A total of 23, which could be used as dwellings, are unsuitable for leasing.

(c) 809.

The above figures do not include dwellings purchased solely to provide accommodation for employees.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the difficulty encountered by aged and infirm persons entering Mount Gambier Hospital via the main entrance?

2. Will the Minister consider replacing the existing strongly sprung double doors with an automatically operated system?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No. The administration of the hospital is not aware of any incidents, and has received no complaints in this matter.

2. This matter will be considered after a report has been obtained.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Housing Trust adopted a policy excluding the use of Mount Gambier stone in future housing construction and, if so, what is the reason for this decision?

2. How many houses are currently planned for construction in Mount Gambier during 1977-78—

- (a) for sale; and
- (b) for rental?

3. How many of these are of solid construction?

4. How many are of timber/fibro construction?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. (a) 108; (b) 36.

3. 100.

4. 44.

MILL HYGIENE

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the grossly inadequate toilet facilities at the Woods and Forests Green Mill in Mount Gambier where two water closets and one handbasin serve 85 personnel?

2. Will the Minister give immediate consideration to providing additional facilities in accordance with modern concepts of worker hygiene and comfort?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Green Mill and departmental sawmilling complex at Mount Gambier are about to be upgraded at an approved cost of \$8 300 000. Connection of sewerage to the whole site is under way, and the provision of facilities will be reviewed as the new Green Mill redevelopment progresses.

NORTH GAMBIER SCHOOL CROSSINGS

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. Will the Minister give urgent consideration to the provision of school safety crossings near North Gambier Primary School?

2. Is the Minister aware that successive staff and parent organisations, representing this school, have been making similar requests since 1970?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. A survey of pedestrian and traffic movements will be carried out when school resumes in February, 1978.

2. The first approach to me was received in my office on September 23, 1977. The matter was first raised with the Highways Commissioner in September, 1976.

BREAD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Government established a bread industry advisory committee and, if not, why not?
2. If a committee has been established—
 - (a) who are the members of the committee;
 - (b) when was it established;
 - (c) how many meetings has it held; and
 - (d) what was the date of the last meeting?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No. Cabinet decided not to appoint such a committee.
2. *Vide* No. 1.

BREAD INTERIM AUTHORITY

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. When was the Interim Bread Industry Authority established and who were the members of it?
2. Who became Chairman of the authority following the resignation of Judge Murray, and when was this person appointed?
3. Who are the current members of the authority?
4. Is it still an interim authority and, if so, why and, if not, when was it given statutory authority?
5. Why has not legislation been introduced to establish the authority?
6. Does the Government still intend to introduce legislation to establish the authority and, if so, when?
7. What specific recommendations has the interim authority made during its existence?
8. How many meetings has the interim authority held and what was the date of the last meeting?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. September 22, 1975. The members were—Judge Kemerl A. Murray (Chairman), Messrs. R. H. Fidock and P. A. Mills.
2. No appointment was made when Judge Murray resigned.
3. There is now no interim bread industry authority.
4. *Vide* No. 3.
5. Cabinet so decided.
6. No.
7. The interim authority made no recommendations.
8. Nine meetings and three inspections. The last meeting was held on February 12, 1976.

BREAD INQUIRY COMMITTEE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. When was the second report of the Bread Industry Inquiry Committee presented to the Premier?
2. Have the recommendations in this report been made public, and, if not, why not?
3. What were the recommendations in this second report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. April 23, 1976.
2. No. The report was requested by Cabinet and made to the Premier and not released publicly.
3. *Vide* No. 2.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Will the Minister ensure that the southern boundary of the Belair National Park adjacent to the Upper Sturt

Road has an adequate strip of ground cleared of vegetation as a fire-break?

2. Is the Minister aware that many of the residents of Upper Sturt are concerned at the fire risk posed by the Belair National Park, especially when there is a strong northerly wind?

3. What total measures will the authorities take to minimise this fire risk?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Fire-breaks on the southern boundary of the Belair Recreation Park are being prepared with a "tritter" slasher to a width of 6 m.

2. Yes.

3. 1. Continuation of the maintenance of slashed fire-breaks.

2. Control burning (weather permitting) in the Melville Hill area.

3. Maintained internal access tracks for fire-fighting.

4. Fire-fighting appliances and equipment on standby.

5. Co-ordination of fire-fighting activities throughout metropolitan and near metropolitan parks.

6. An effective radio communications network.

SOLOMONTOWN CAUSEWAY

Mr. VENNING (on notice): What has been the cost of construction of the Solomontown causeway to date?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum of \$333 000.

PUBLIC SERVANTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware of an article in Vol. XXXVI, No. 2, June, 1977, of the Australian Journal of Public Administration entitled "Public Servants and the Briefing of Party Committees", and has it adopted a policy in respect of the views expressed in that article and, if so, what are they?

2. If no policy has been determined, will the Government address itself to determining a view and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is aware of the article referred to in the question. The Government has noted in particular reference in the article to a document tabled by the Prime Minister in the House of Representatives on December 9, 1976, entitled *Guidelines to Apply to Appearances by Public Servants Before Party Committees*. As the article makes clear and as the honourable member will know, access by Parliamentarians to public servants involves important principles, including Public Service neutrality and Ministerial responsibility as well as the right of members on both sides of the House to factual information. In South Australia it has not been necessary at this stage to make formal provisions concerning the access of members to information in the Public Service. If members opposite feel that the quality of their Parliamentary contributions has suffered because of lack of factual information held by the Public Service, they are invited to submit requests for such information through the Minister concerned, and each request will be treated on its merits. This provision is similar in many respects to those applied in Canberra.

2. The Government has studied the article with interest but has not determined a fixed policy on the matter. Unnecessary specifications of guidelines concerning access to public servants by members of Parliament and Party committees may lead to inflexibility. However, if

experience indicates that it may be desirable the Government will consider the formulation of appropriate guidelines.

HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many officers of the Housing and Urban Affairs Department were previously employed by Commonwealth departments?

2. When did such officers transfer to South Australian departments, and who are they?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of officers employed by the Housing and Urban Affairs Department who were previously employed by Commonwealth departments, totals five.

2. Particulars of such officers are as follows:

Mr. J. Mant—B.A., LL.B (Sydney); ex Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development; commenced January 27, 1977.

Mr. J. H. Hodgson—B.A. (Hons) A.N.U., Canberra; Master of Urban and Regional Planning (Adelaide); ex Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development; commenced August 26, 1977.

Mr. S. J. Baker—B.Ec. (Adelaide); ex Australian Bureau of Statistics (Adelaide); commenced November 7, 1977.

Mr. D. E. Hume—B.A. (Leicester); Master Urban and Regional Planning (Adelaide); ex Department Capital Territories; commences November 30, 1977.

Dr. R. N. Sexton—Dr. Philosophy—Econ. (North Carolina); ex Industrial Assistance Commission; commences January 3, 1978.

KARCULTABY SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the poor water pressure at the new Karcultaby school?

2. Has the Education Department approached the Public Buildings Department and the E. & W.S. Department to see if it is possible to have the pressure improved and, if not, will the Minister have urgent inquiries made with the view of improving the service?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The Education Department was advised by the Principal of the school who forwarded a copy of a letter which he had written to the Public Buildings Department on August 25, setting out the problems associated with the water supply.

2. An Education Department officer discussed the problems with the Public Buildings Department on September 12. The matter has been referred to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and to the Civil and Mechanical Section of the Public Buildings Department, and a solution to the problem is being sought.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. Was the new position of Deputy Director-General of Education (Museums and Botanical Gardens) advertised and, if not, why not?

2. What is the annual salary of this new position?

3. After this year which department will be responsible for the salary of this officer?

4. How many staff are directly responsible to this officer?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. No. It was created for the former Director, Environment Department.

2. \$33 305.

3. Education.

4. 223.

SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. DRURY (on notice):

1. What is the minimum number of allotments to be created by subdivision before 12.5 per cent of those allotments must be set aside as reserve?

2. If the number of allotments created is less than the minimum, how much money in lieu, per allotment, is paid by the subdivider, to which fund is this money paid, and for what purpose is the money so collected used?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. A plan of subdivision has to contain more than 20 allotments before 12½ per cent of the total area involved (not 12½ per cent of the number of allotments) is required to be set aside as a reserve. However, there have been a number of proposed subdivisions showing less than 20 allotments which have been refused by a council on the grounds that the proposed mode of subdivision was not satisfactory as provision had not been made for a reserve. In a number of instances the Planning Appeal Board supported the council and directed it and the Director of Planning to approve the plan subject to land (but not necessarily as much as 12½ per cent) being set aside as a reserve.

2. In cases where there are 20 allotments or less and a reserve has not been provided a contribution of \$300 in the Metropolitan Planning Area and \$40 outside that area is required to be paid into the Planning and Development Fund for every additional allotment created. The money is used to buy, develop and maintain the land shown as open space on an authorised development plan for the benefit of the public.

GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many inmates are at present resident at—

(a) McNally Training Centre;

(b) Vaughan House; and

(c) Brookway Park?

2. How many staff are employed at each of these institutions respectively, and of these how many are—

(a) females; and

(b) senior staff?

3. How many of the staff at each of these institutions, respectively, are residential care workers, and of these how many are—

(a) females; and

(b) senior staff?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) McNally Centre 51

(b) Vaughan House 6

(c) Brookway Park 23

2. McNally Centre—total staff 111

(a) 36 female staff

(b) 16 senior staff

Vaughan House—total staff 40

(a) 27 female staff

(b) 8 senior staff

- Brookway Park—total staff 60
 (a) 25 female staff
 (b) 9 senior staff
3. McNally Centre—total residential care workers 79
 (a) 20 female R.C.Ws.
 (b) 12 senior R.C.Ws.
- Vaughan House—total residential care workers 28
 (a) 17 female R.C.Ws.
 (b) 5 senior R.C.Ws.
- Brookway Park—total residential care workers 42
 (a) 11 female R.C.Ws.
 (b) 6 senior R.C.Ns.

KERSBROOK ROAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

- Are there any plans to upgrade and seal the Kersbrook to One Tree Hill road?
- When are funds likely to be made available for this purpose?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

- The Highways Department has no plans to upgrade and seal the Kersbrook to One Tree Hill Road. The road is under the care, control and management of the District Councils of Munno Para and Gumeracha.
- The Highways Department has provided assistance in the past for upgrading this road. The provision of further assistance would depend on the priority which the councils give the project, and its priority in relation to other road needs throughout the State.

PUBLIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

- Have management consultants appointed by the Public Service Board completed their review of the accounting and budgetary control of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and, if so, what were the findings of the report?
- If the review has not been completed, why not, and when is it estimated the report will be received?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

- Yes. Management consultants were appointed by the Public Service Board's Financial Management Advisory Committee at the specific request of the department to advise on the existing information and recording systems and to assist the new department to establish self-accounting. The accounting function was previously the responsibility of the Lands Department. The consultants have completed this review and recommended that:

A centralised accounting function be established to control and co-ordinate the principal accounting functions of the department under the direct responsibility of the Senior Administrative and Finance Officer.

The implementation of this recommendation has now reached an advanced stage.

- Not applicable.

ELECTION VOTING

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

- How many people failed to vote in each separate electorate at the 1977 State election?
- What action, if any, is being taken against these people?
- Have prescribed notices been sent to all persons on the electoral roll who failed to vote and, if not, when will such notices be sent?

- Has the Electoral Commissioner instituted proceedings against any person for failure to vote and, if not, when will such proceedings be instituted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

- The number of electors who failed to vote in each separate electorate is not yet known. Checking and investigating to establish this is proceeding.
- Any action considered necessary will be determined at a later stage.
- No prescribed notices have yet been sent out. It is anticipated that this will be done within the next 14 days.
- No. See 1, 2 and 3 above.

APPRENTICES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Are apprentices in Government departments and statutory authorities required to join the appropriate trade union?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No.

TOURIST OFFICES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

- How much State Government finance was allocated for the establishment of the Renmark Tourist Office?
- How much State Government finance has been allocated in 1977-78 for the operation of tourist offices in the following Riverland local government areas:

- Renmark;
- Berri;
- Loxton; and
- Barmera?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: A subsidy of \$17 500 was paid in 1976-77 to the corporation of Renmark towards the cost of construction of a new building to house the Renmark Tourist Office. Provision has been made in the Estimates for 1977-78 for the following grants towards the cost of operation of tourist offices:

	\$
Renmark	3 400
Berri	1 400
Loxton	1 400
Barmera	1 400

WHITWARTA BRIDGE

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice): Is it proposed to upgrade the Whitwarta bridge on Highway 23, eight kilometres north of Balaklava and, if so:

- what are the details of the work to be carried out; and
- when will work commence and be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

- It is proposed to replace the Whitwarta bridge with a new structure. In the meantime, a 20 tonne load limit will be imposed on the existing bridge to prevent its deterioration.
- It is hoped to commence construction in 1979. Preliminary examination indicates that the bridge will take approximately nine months to complete.

PROJECT GRANT

Mrs. ADAMSON (on notice):

- Is a Mr. Peter McCalker in the employ of the Government or any of its instrumentalities or has he ever

been the recipient of any grant of funds for a Government sponsored project and, if so—

- (a) what is the nature and purpose of his employment;
- (b) what is the project on which he is engaged;
- (c) what are his qualifications for this work;
- (d) when did such employment commence; and
- (e) what result, if any, has been achieved?

2. Is it anticipated that Mr. McCalker or any subsequent appointee will continue in this employment and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Would the honourable member be more specific?

WALKERVILLE SCHOOL

Mr. WILSON (on notice):

What is the latest installation date of the proposed four-teacher flexible unit for Walkerville Primary School?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Construction of the four-teacher Demac unit at Walkerville Primary School is scheduled to commence at the beginning of 1978 and to be available for occupation by the beginning of the second school term.

NORTH MALAYSIA

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. When is the next Adelaide visit to North Malaysia expected to take place?
2. In what town will this visit be held?
3. What will be the anticipated purpose of this Adelaide visit to North Malaysia?
4. Who will be invited to participate in this Adelaide visit to Malaysia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Proposed period is November-December, 1978.
2. Penang, Alor Star, Ipoh and Kangar.
3. To further the economic, trade, cultural exchanges which have been developed by the previous reciprocal visits between South Australia and Malaysia.
4. The basis of involvement will be a wide cross section of the community as in the previous visit to Penang during November-December, 1975.

TRAVEL AGENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it now proposed to introduce during the present session, legislation to licence travel agents and, if so, when, and what scheme of licensing is to be proposed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The proposal to introduce a licensing system for travel agents is currently under consideration by the Commonwealth Government. Each State has been invited to submit its own suggestions regarding the form and content for the licensing. The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport has already submitted proposals in this respect and is awaiting further advice from the Commonwealth Government when it has had an opportunity of considering and discussing each State's proposals.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Are the facilities of the School Dental Service available to children attending schools in the electoral district of Mitcham and:

- (a) if so, to children in which schools and what facilities are available; and

(b) if not, what action, if any, is to be taken to make such facilities available, and when?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows: Yes.

(a) a static clinic at the Clapham Primary School provides dental care for the following schools:

Clapham Primary School; St. Theresa's School, Colonel Light Gardens; Colonel Light Gardens Primary School.

(b) Current planning includes the establishment of a static clinic at the Mitcham Primary School in February, 1980. Primary school children from Scotch College, Walford C.E.G.G.S. and St. Joseph's School, Kingswood, will be offered treatment at this clinic. Primary school children from the Unley and Westbourne Park Primary Schools will be offered treatment at the Goodwood clinic which is scheduled for opening in February 1980.

ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce amendments to the Adoption of Children Act during the present session and, if so, when, and what is the nature of the amendments proposed?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes. In 1978 to implement recommendations of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Adoption Matters.

POLICE INFORMATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the nature of the "overt action" which leads the police to record information on persons who have not been charged and convicted of crime?
2. In what form is such information maintained?
3. Is such information maintained by the police or is it maintained by some other, and which organisation?
4. To whom is such information made available, and on what authority?
5. What "exhaustive research" would be required to give the numbers of such persons about whom such information is maintained?
6. For how long is such information retained?
7. What check, if any, is made, with what frequency and by whom, as to the accuracy of such information?
8. To whom is this information made available, and on whose authority?
9. Is any information maintained on persons who have not by overt action threatened or advocated violence or breaches of the peace or have been involved in organisations which have done so and who have not been charged and convicted of crime and, if so:
 - (a) on how many persons is there such information;
 - (b) for what purpose is it maintained; and
 - (c) are any of such persons eminent citizens in politics, education or the law?
10. Is such information maintained by the police on members of the Public Service and, if so, why?
11. Is such information maintained on the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, Mr. L. H. Baker, and, if so, why?

12. Is such information maintained about persons who have taken part in street demonstrations concerning the issue of whether Australia should exploit its uranium resources, simply because such persons have taken part in such demonstrations and, if so, on how many such persons?

13. Of what rank are the police officers in the special branch, are they supervised in the execution of their duties and, if so, by whom and, if not, why not?

14. Does the Government still have regard for the civil liberties of the citizens of the State?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Government has appointed a Supreme Court Judge to carry out an inquiry concerning records kept by the Special Branch of the South Australian Police Force. Mr. Acting Justice Michael White will inquire from and discuss with the Commissioner of Police and other officers of the Police Department concerned with Special Branch records: the criteria used to determine what information is currently being recorded; the rank of the officer responsible for the determination of what is recorded; how that information is recorded; and, who has access to such information. Specific criteria have been set down for an examination of files and/or other medium of recording information.

At the conclusion of this initial inquiry Mr. Acting Justice White will report to the Government as to "the conformity of the records then currently held with the criteria laid down and the suitability of the criteria as laid down". In these circumstances it would be inappropriate to pre-empt the inquiry by Mr. Acting Justice White by referring to the details raised by the honourable member. The Commissioner assures the Government that no information is held or maintained on the Commissioner of Prices and Consumer Affairs, Mr. Baker.

ROCKY RIVER SCHOOLS

In reply to **Mr. VENNING** (October 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under the CURB proposals, the Rocky River Electoral District covers an area within Northern, Yorke and Lower North boundaries, and a number of inquiries from schools currently serviced from the Clare Regional Office have been received. The prospect of many of these schools transferring from the old Mid-North Region to the new Northern Region, with headquarters based in Port Augusta, is the subject of greatest concern to the local school communities.

In accordance with the Cabinet direction that all departments shall adopt the uniform regional boundaries for planning and statistical purposes by January 31, 1978, plans are in hand to establish the new Northern, Yorke and Lower North Regions as soon as is practical. In this regard, timing and co-ordination is important, and full consultation with the regional directors is essential to ensure that a smooth and gradual transition occurs. Although it is difficult to locate a population centre that is central to a region and the natural focus for the attention of the major Government instrumentalities that operate within the region, it is expected that uniformity of regional boundaries will in the long term facilitate closer integration of planning and better co-ordination of services at the regional level.

In due course, the appropriate regional director will ensure that there is a continuation of the standard of service currently provided to schools in the Rocky River District. The administrative change-over process will be so arranged to effect transition with the least disruption to those school communities subject to transfer of regions. Past experience has demonstrated that close co-operation between regional directors and the schools involved has satisfactorily resolved the main areas of concern expressed by schools, and the procedures adopted are sufficiently flexible to cater for any special needs that may arise. The strategic placement of principal education officers (e.g. at

Port Pirie) at subregional offices will also assist in this process. Naturally, the regionalisation programme will be closely monitored after an initial settling-in period and action taken if major deficiencies are encountered.

INDUSTRIAL PREMISES

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (October 20).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The South Australian Housing Trust has provided 55 factory and 15 extensions with the approval of the Industries Development Committee. The following factory premises, still owned by the South Australian Housing Trust, are not being utilised for manufacturing:

1. Ceramic Tile Makers Limited, corner Hewittson and Ridgeway Roads, Elizabeth West, S.A. 5113. Actual final cost, \$1 021 000.

2. Menzel Industries Pty. Ltd., Cross Keys Road, Salisbury South, S.A. 5108. Actual final cost \$812 000.

In addition, there are three other premises not being utilised for manufacturing that are now not owned by the South Australian Housing Trust, as follows:

1. Petbow Pty. Limited, Hewittson Road, Elizabeth West, S.A. 5113. Actual final cost, \$256 800.

2. A.L.I. Castings Pty. Ltd., corner Philip Highway and Hogarth Road, Elizabeth South, S.A. 5112. Actual final cost, \$180 000.

3. Nylex Corporation Limited, Main North Road, Salisbury South, S.A. 5108. Actual final cost, \$1 345 600.

BIRKENHEAD RAIL CROSSING

In reply to **Mr. OLSON** (October 12).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Experiments with rubber inserts to date have not been successful due to the rigidity of the sections tried. An attempt is being made to develop a more flexible insert in the hope that the basic concept will prove workable.

BEER GLASSES

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (October 11).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The matter of altering the food and drugs regulations to provide a clean glass with each drink where liquor is dispensed in hotels and at sporting events will be referred to the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee for consideration and recommendation. Existing regulations make adequate provision for the washing and cleansing of glasses in hotels and at sporting functions, and the Central Board of Health will circularise all local authorities responsible for administering the regulations, bringing to their attention the need to ensure strict compliance with the regulations, and particularly at sporting functions.

BIKIES

In reply to **Mr. VENNING** (October 18).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The police use the following tactics to combat the problem of motor-cycle groups visiting country centres during long weekends and holiday periods. Through a special unit working among motor-cycle groups, they learn of probable locations to be visited and arrange police surveillance by members of the special unit or the local police attending in an endeavour to confine activities to an area where they will cause the

least inconvenience to others, or to restrict them to within lawful bounds. Police in country districts have been instructed to be on the look-out for meandering motor-cycle groups; to keep them under observation while they are in their district; and to pass on information when they move on to another district. When advisable, the police in neighbouring districts combine to provide sufficient coverage. When events likely to attract motor cycle groups are scheduled, local police resources are mobilised and further support is given by detachments from Task Force and Traffic Branch.

These tactics are achieving reasonable results but, unfortunately, they do not eliminate the problem completely, because there are many other demands on police services during holiday times and sometimes an incident like the one complained of does occur. When the police are not actually on hand to prevent these incidents from occurring, they are dependent on early reports from the public so that they can attend as soon as possible to prevent a continuance, or an escalation of the trouble. Sometimes the mere presence of a motor-cycle group in a country town disturbs local residents because of their unruly appearance and belligerent attitudes. While this in itself is not unlawful, the presence of such a group should be reported as soon as possible so that the police can attend in anticipation of trouble. If there is any change of pattern in the behaviour of these groups, the police will adjust their tactics accordingly.

MASSAGE PARLOURS

In reply to **Mr. WILSON** (October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Members of the vice squad have seen children in massage parlours on a number of occasions during the past 12 months. In all cases these children were the children of persons conducting or working in the massage parlours. When children have been found in massage parlours, the police have taken action according to the circumstances. Usually the parents were warned and this had the desired effect of having the children removed. The position is more difficult when only part of the premises is used as a massage parlour and the rest is the residence for the family of the proprietor. The overall position is that sometimes children are seen in massage parlours by members of the vice squad but this is not common. If children are found on these premises, police take appropriate action.

WHYALLA YOUTH PROJECT

In reply to **Mr. MAX BROWN** (October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has asked whether buildings originally used by the special school in Whyalla (Plum Street) could be used for a recreational youth project. My investigations have revealed that:

1. The buildings in question are timber transportables.
2. The buildings have been made available for use by the Road Safety Training Centre.
3. The buildings will remain on the present site but could be made available at certain times for use by youth groups by agreement with the council of the Whyalla Special School.
4. I suggest the honourable member discuss the matter with the Regional Director of Education, Western Region.

APPRENTICES

In reply to **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has questioned the ability of Marlestone Technical College to provide training to apprentices, with special reference to glass-working apprentices and apprentices employed by L. G. Abbott and Company in particular. In asking the question, he quoted part of a previous reply in which it was pointed out that an additional lecturer in glass-working needed to carry an extra load was being appointed. An extra teacher for the glass-working trades has been appointed and commenced duty on October 17, 1977. As a consequence of this all glass-working apprentices have been called up to begin their training in 1977 and all will have commenced by November 14, 1977. One of the two apprentices of L. G. Abbott mentioned by the honourable member has commenced his training whilst the other has been unable to do so because he has a broken leg. Whether he commences his training in 1977 depends on his convalescence.

RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (October 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Eligibility for unemployment benefits is the joint responsibility of the Commonwealth Departments of Employment and Industrial Relations and Social Security. As far as I am aware, primary producer eligibility for benefit, whether that primary producer is in a drought area or not, is now assessed on the same basis as a normal wage earner. Details are freely available at every Commonwealth Social Security and Commonwealth Employment Service Office.

MILLIPEDES

In reply to **Mr. CHAPMAN** (October 13).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The most recent request for assistance in the control of millipedes came from the District Council of Stirling during the time the RED scheme was in operation. The council proposed that Dr. Geoff Baker, a post-graduate student at Waite Institute and an expert in the biology of the millipede be financed from RED funds to study the predators and pathogens of millipedes in their area of origin, which is generally considered to be Portugal. The Stirling Council was aided in its approach for funds by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department but the plan did not eventuate due to cessation of the RED scheme.

Dr. Baker has since taken up residence in England and at Stirling Council's request visited Portugal to undertake a field study of the millipede in its natural habitat. The results of that study were not encouraging in that Dr. Baker was unable to locate the pest in the same high numbers as those observed in the Adelaide Hills; and he drew the preliminary conclusion that millipede densities are somehow linked to vegetation types or land use.

Throughout the whole discussion on this matter there has rightly been much emphasis on biological control of millipedes and the lack of early evidence of a natural predator of the insect is disappointing. Dr. Baker's recent visit to Portugal was financed by the District Council of Stirling which subsequently wrote to the Minister of Agriculture seeking financial aid for the visit. The Minister declined the request but offered his full support for any approach by the council to an adequately equipped research organisation such as the C.S.I.R.O.

NET FISHING

In reply to the **Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** (October 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Reports from fishing clubs and other interested organisations and individuals have expressed the opinion that angling catches from metropolitan jetties and beaches have improved. The fishing writers for newspapers and magazines are unanimous that the netting ban on metropolitan beaches has improved the quality of the sport. However, there are no current plans to amend or issue new proclamations until the completion of a full review of scale fish resources by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries. Under that review all netting operations will be investigated in terms of their effect on fish stocks; and the department hopes to ensure an equitable distribution of the resource to meet genuine recreational needs as well as those of professional fishermen. It is anticipated that the project will be completed by the end of 1978 and during this time there will be steady liaison with both amateur and professional groups to ensure that all points of view are ascertained.

TRAIL BIKES

In reply to **Mrs. ADAMSON** (October 19).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is an offence, under the provisions of the National Parks Regulations 1972, to drive, ride, lead or impel any horse or vehicle within a reserve except on established roads, tracks and areas set aside for that purpose, without the permission of the Director. Expiation notices are issued for alleged offences and a fee of \$5 is payable. The penalty for anyone convicted of an offence is \$200. Officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Environment Department constantly patrol national parks in the hills face zone and since June 17, 1975, 108 offenders have been reported for infringement of these regulations, and of these 48 have been prosecuted.

Staff of the Black Hill Native Flora Park have been appointed inspectors under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. It must be stressed that the Government only has control of the areas that are national parks and declared conservation areas in the hills face zone, and this will continue to be the case until off-road vehicle legislation is passed.

LIBRARY SERVICES

In reply to **Mr. WHITTEN** (October 27).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Library Services Planning Committee has already held initial discussions with councils in the Western Region concerning the provision of library services. The committee is meeting Woodville council on Wednesday, November 9, to discuss the particular needs of the Woodville residents. It is hoped to meet with the Hindmarsh council in the very near future. No firm decisions have yet been taken on what kind of library services will be provided.

Initial suggestions were for shop front libraries to serve the needs of the population. However, if councils feel that mobile libraries would be preferable then the committee would be happy to consider this viewpoint. The Planning Committee sees possibilities for the development of regional services in the Western Region. In this context it may well be decided that mobile services could be planned

between different council areas to serve the needs of specific groups such as senior citizens.

DRUG INTELLIGENCE

In reply to **Mrs. ADAMSON** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The expenditure of \$883 during 1976-77 for drug intelligence included payments to more than one drug informant.

DISABLED STUDENTS

In reply to **Mrs. ADAMSON** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Since the introduction of the flexible plan high school design in 1973, general considerations for access by the disabled has developed from the provision of basic paraplegic toilet facilities to the inclusion of specific site development features. These include ramped access to each school building block, at one point at least, with paths from block to block being of suitable paving and slope for wheelchairs and crutches. At ground level within each of these buildings, access from room to room presents no great problem because of the clear floor space of the flexible-open class areas.

Older, conventional school buildings present the problems of raised floor sections, steps, a greater number of doorways, and less flexible furnishings. Conversions and upgrading of these schools is undertaken to current flexible plan standards with the latest internal and site access design features being incorporated wherever possible. Totally new schools are planned to include paraplegic toilet facilities, ramped access from block to block and into as many building entrances as possible.

Depending on the extent of the site, every attempt is being made to make each type of educational facility available at ground floor level. In this way a full range of general and specialist areas can be readily available to wheelchair traffic or people using crutches. It is proposed that the two latest high schools will include provisions designed for disabled persons to whatever degree is possible according to Australian Standards A.S. CA52, 1968. The schools involved are Surrey Downs and Reynella East High Schools, which are at the design stage but are suited to offer a more extensive range of facilities for the disabled, on a regional basis. In addition to the features already listed for new schools, it is anticipated that the following will be taken into account:

- (a) Facilities should be identified clearly (symbols, signs, etc.).
- (b) Spaces should be carefully dimensioned for use by children or adults who may require to use hand rails, wheelchairs or crutches.
- (c) Special furniture requirements should be taken into account (seating, bench height, etc.).
- (d) Positioning of facilities such as drinking fountains, switches, controls and warning signals are to be considered.
- (e) Grounds development and associated elements should include suitable design features for pathways, ramp gradients, weather protection. Building entrances must obviate the need for wheelchairs to negotiate steps, mat well, etc.

Thus, it can be seen that the Education Department is very aware of the needs of disabled students and is attempting, by good design features, to facilitate their attendance at schools.

QUEEN'S MEDAL

In reply to Mr. GUNN (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There were 465 jubilee medals available for allocation by the State Government of South Australia and a smaller batch was allocated to South Australians by the Commonwealth Government. The State medals were allocated to His Excellency the Governor and ex-Governors and their wives, all Ministers of the Crown, ex-Ministers in office during Her Majesty's reign, Leaders, Speaker, President, Chairmen of certain Parliamentary committees, etc., heads of public service departments and a few other public servants, mayors and Chairmen of local government bodies, secretaries of unions associated with the Trades and Labor Council, Chief Justice and Puisne Judges, heads of five statutory authorities, teachers, police and railway officers.

In the private sector there was an allocation to people from the arts, hospitals, medicine, dentistry, law, banking, insurance, industry, churches, charities, ethnic groups and tertiary institutions. There was also a special supplementation in regard to women. Some of the above medals were awarded on the basis of the office held on February 6, 1977, which was the actual silver jubilee date, whilst others were awarded for service over a period. The recommendation of persons within groups was often made after consultation with relevant authorities. A list of recipients was published in the *Advertiser* on August 1, 1977.

EDUCATION OVER-PAYMENT

In reply to Mr. EVANS (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Auditor-General has declared that four secondary deputy principals presently in larger area schools were appointed in contravention to the Teachers Salaries Board award. The deputy principals involved are:

- Mr. Cookson, Ceduna Area School
- Mr. Graham, Oakbank Area School
- Mr. Tuck, Meningie Area School
- Mr. Roeseler, Maitland Area School.

At first the Auditor-General requested that the difference between these secondary deputies' salaries (\$19 477) and the area deputy salary (\$17 845) which he claims would have been appropriate to be repaid. The Education Department's response to this was that they were appointed from the secondary deputies list in the usual manner so that had they not gained a position at those schools they would have at a high school in the same year. In three of the four cases the appointments were made jointly to the school and the regional office because there was a component of their work which fell outside the school and that of the normal secondary deputy role.

The fourth deputy was appointed to Oakbank Area School where the secondary enrolments are of the order of 400. A number of high schools of enrolment considerably under 400 have a secondary deputy. All appointments were made after discussion with the South Australian Institute of Teachers. When the appointments were made, it was felt that these appointments were along the same lines as placing a secondary subject senior in an area school—the Teachers Salaries Board award uses the term secondary deputies and not high school deputies. Certainly these four people were placed for departmental reasons and not for their personal convenience, and therefore it would be unjust for any repayment, as requested by the Auditor-General, to be made by them

when they could equally well have been placed in a conventional high school at the same time. The outcome of the above was that agreement has now been reached that nothing will be done about seeking repayments from the deputies concerned.

UNITED WORLD COLLEGES

In reply to Mr. EVANS (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Applications for scholarships to attend the United World College in Singapore are called for by the Education Department of South Australia. A short list of applicants is selected by the Scholarships Officer of the department. These students are interviewed by a State panel which this year comprised—Mr. M. L. Strange, Superintendent of Schools Directorate, Miss Penelope Miller, the first student to win a scholarship, Mr. Ian Hayward, Mr. John Holden, Mr. Warren Bonython and Mr. Bruce Macklin (Chairman). The two applicants considered best by this panel are then interviewed in Sydney or Melbourne by a National Selection Committee. At least one scholarship must be awarded annually to a student from each State because of the financial support of the State Governments.

RETURNED SERVICES LEAGUE

In reply to Mr. EVANS (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The grant to the Returned Services League of Australia towards the burial costs of ex-service personnel has remained at \$1 000 for some years. That has been the amount requested in each case. It is pointed out that the Services Cemeteries Trust Incorporated, which administers the money, has experienced a surplus of over \$1 200 in each of the past three financial years, and no increase in the subsidy is considered necessary.

POLICE CADETS

In reply to Mr. EVANS (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Provision has been made to recruit 147 cadets in the 1977-78 financial year. The Police Department follows a policy of relating strength requirements to service demands and need for coverage of hours and ground. Predictions to 1985 would not be reliable but, based on trends over recent years, it is anticipated that an approximate strength of 3 500 will be required; however, this is dependent upon population movement, policing need, and policy. Within the overall increase, there will be additional females. The ratio will depend on qualification and capacity to do the jobs offering.

AIRCRAFT PURCHASE

In reply to Mr. EVANS (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The information previously given to the honourable member in relation to the sum of \$125 000 voted for the purchase of an aircraft was correct. At present, the Police Department operates

two aircraft, one of which is leased. Purchase of a new aircraft in 1977-78 will allow greater operational effectiveness.

WOMEN'S MEMORIAL TRUST

In reply to Mr. EVANS (Appropriation Bill, October 20).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Fields Trust has requested an increase in the annual grant to the trust for 1977-78, by an unspecified amount. However, in the light of the present economic climate and consideration of the other requests for financial assistance received by the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, the trust was advised that it will not be possible to increase the level of assistance over \$1 000 in the 1977-78 financial year.

SMALL BUSINESSES

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In addition to the advice offered to small business by the Small Business Advisory Unit of the Economic Development Department my Government has established a consultancy grant scheme to further assist small business to become more prosperous and efficient. The scheme is administered by the unit. The purpose of the scheme is to enable small business, in certain circumstances to obtain in-depth and expert advice on any business matter from consultants to:

- (i) Identify and resolve problems;
- (ii) Introduce changes that will improve efficiency and longer term viability; and in the process
- (iii) Improve the quality of management in the small business sector.

Each application for total or partial funding assistance under this scheme is considered:

- (i) on its own merit;
- (ii) in the light of the small business's own resources;
- (iii) in terms of its prospects for viability; and
- (iv) with regard to the effect of such funding on the public interest.

To illustrate the manner in which this scheme is of benefit to small business, the honourable member may wish to consider the following two examples:

In the first case, my Government approved a subsidy of one-third of the total cost of a project for the product and market development of a new concept in air treatment. The project, at its completion, indicated to the small business concerned the manner in which it would need to develop the product. This included product and prototype design, choice of materials, aesthetics, necessary market techniques, and aids. This small business clearly learnt from being involved in such an exercise, and now has a sound base from which to proceed further with the product's development and hopefully with its own prosperity.

The second case involved a small business involved in the metal industry. It was faced with the prospects of significant retrenchments unless it could increase its efficiency and return to its formerly profitable situation. My Government approved a total subsidy for the consultancy assignment to examine the business's general and financial management, costing, production planning and control, and marketing. Early indications are that this business is well on the way to recovery, and that proposed retrenchments have been averted.

ADMINISTRATION COSTS

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (Appropriation Bill, October, 18).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Under the contingencies heading of "Administration" for the Premier's Department, the \$239 900 proposed for 1977-78 against the line, "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries", represents an increase of \$66 989 over actual expenditure incurred in 1976-77. This increase is required to cover the following:

(a) *New items included for 1977-78*

<i>Canberra Information Service</i>	\$
To provide the Government, through the Policy Division, Premier's Department, with copies of Ministerial statements, press releases, Government reports, <i>Hansard</i> proofs, etc., from Canberra through the medium of a private information service used by all other States	10 250
<i>Government publication</i>	
Required primarily for the publicity of Government activities	25 000
<i>Staff college</i>	
Provided to allow departmental officers to attend nominated courses at the Administrative Staff College, Mt. Eliza, Victoria	5 500
<i>Staff development</i>	
To cater for staff development activities within the department	775
<i>Study leave</i>	
To provide financial assistance for one Policy Division officer, Mr. G. S. Lewkowicz, who is undertaking approved overseas study leave	4 300
	\$45 825

(b) *Net increase in amount for sundry other items for 1977-78 (after allowing for increased costs and expansion).....* \$21 164

2. The \$250 000 proposed for 1977-78 against the line, "Charges for Publicity and Design Services", represents an increase of \$193 157 over actual expenditure incurred in 1976-77. The 1977-78 provision is to cover requirements for 12 months while the actual payments for 1976-77 covered a three-month period only. The 1977-78 provision also allows for an expected increase in the cost and volume of work to be placed with outside contractors (including the Government Printer) by Publicity and Design Services, Premier's Department, on behalf of clients, namely, Government departments and statutory authorities. All expenditure incurred in this regard will be compensated under revenue from income received from the clients who are recharged for the cost of the total work performed.

TOWNSEND HOUSE

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has asked about future accommodation for deaf children at Brighton, suggesting that parents are unwilling for their children to be placed in ordinary schools. The situation is that, during the Centenary celebrations at Townsend House in 1975, a suggestion was raised that possibly the

small number of hearing-impaired students remaining on the site at Brighton could be better served by transfer to a more integrated setting. The committee of inquiry into the education of hearing-impaired children in South Australia recommended, *inter alia*, that parents should be given the opportunity of commenting upon this proposal. The report indicated that, in general, it favoured such a move from the point of view of the children's benefit.

The Assistant Director of Schools (Special Education) called a general meeting of parents of hearing-impaired children at the new school early in 1976, and the parents indicated overwhelmingly that they did not want their children to transfer, and that the school should remain in its present location. He accepted their view and indicated that the department would make no move in the other direction unless the parents themselves indicated that they wished that to happen. During 1976, and 1977, parents and the Principal, Mr. Richardson, agreed to a programme of increasing integration of certain of the children at the School for the Deaf within the Dover Gardens Primary School. Mr. Lasscock took no initiative in this: indeed, he has advised that he was surprised that such a move was undertaken in view of the strong reaction against it such a short time before.

Towards the end of second term this year, the considerable majority of children were working almost full time at the Dover Gardens Primary School. Mr. Lasscock therefore called another meeting of parents to coincide with a school council meeting, at which he asked what were their current wishes, and it seemed very clear that they now preferred the integrated setting into which most of their children had moved. Because a small group of children had not been moved and looked unlikely to move in the near future, Mr. Lasscock arranged a meeting of the parents of those children to discuss what would happen if the children at Dover Gardens were permanently transferred to what could become a speech and hearing centre there. It seems that the most likely arrangement would be that the remaining group would come under the Principal of what is now the School for the Blind, which itself is attracting an increasing proportion of multiply-handicapped, visually-impaired children, but with a continuation of programmes directed at the maximum possible integration of the children into as near normal an environment as possible.

It seems that there is now virtually unanimous agreement of parents of children at Dover Gardens that they would prefer their children to remain there—a complete reversal of their attitude of not much more than a year ago. The honourable member's comment that parents have "been adamant that their children should not be placed in other schools" clearly refers to the meeting of more than 12 months ago which he attended, and no longer applies. The Education Department through Mr. Lasscock, has been committed from the beginning, as expressed in the report of the committee of inquiry, to making no move without parent support. That support is now clearly in the direction favoured by the report.

Regarding the under-use of the facilities at Brighton, it is true that the schools now have more than adequate room for their present enrolments. Nevertheless, as with similar facilities throughout the world, they are attracting an increasing enrolment of multiply-handicapped children, and this trend is likely to continue and grow. The School for the Blind, additionally, has a greater enrolment than for some years.

It is anticipated that the facilities will be fully used as these trends develop. The pre-school already attracts a number of hearing children whose presence has had a considerable positive influence on the hearing-impaired

children. In addition, it is likely that it will soon be offering services to at least some hearing/language-handicapped children. I have no doubt that these very valuable facilities will continue to have an important contribution to make to children, particularly those with hearing and visual handicaps and associated difficulties.

DRUG SQUAD

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Drug Squad is already provided with equipment and facilities required for its day-to-day activities. The allocation of \$696 550 does not relate to any major items specifically intended for the Drug Squad, but purchase of sundry equipment for use of members is proposed.

The honourable member can be assured that the technical and other equipment required by this or any other C.I.B. squad is quite adequate at present, and is updated as technology provides more sophisticated equipment. The staffing of the squad compares favourably to interstate forces at present. Its needs are continually monitored, and any changes necessary will be attended to in the light of overall police manpower needs.

POLICE MOTOR CYCLES

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: At June 30, 1977, the motor cycle establishment was 171. Of these, up to 30 were fitted with radio. Motor cycles are not radio equipped at the time of purchase. Installation is carried out at the Police Workshops. Radio sets so far installed have been largely part of a programme of experimentation to find a suitable set for motor cycle use. Operational conditions have caused frequent malfunction but, when a satisfactory unit has been developed, more cycles will be equipped. "Wet weather" suits worn by solo motor cycle patrols were selected in the silver colour because the material required was unavailable in other colours. Ideally, a white colour is preferred and the availability of material having all the essential qualities is currently under investigation.

SURF LIFESAVING ASSOCIATION

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (Appropriation Bill, October 20).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The \$30 000 allocated to the Surf Lifesaving Association of Australia is an annual grant in respect of on-going administration expenses for the financial year 1977-78.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to Mr. BECKER (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of copies of the 1976-77 Report of the Auditor-General printed was about 1 000.

2. The gross cost of printing the 1976-77 report was \$36 445. This cost is offset by proceeds of copies sold. The Auditor-General's Department distribution lists comprise:

(a) Auditor-General's Department	149
(including four press copies and 18 copies for Ministers and tabling in Parliament)	
(b) Australian distribution list	110
(including State members of Parliament and permanent heads of all State Government departments)	
(c) Oversea exchange list	19
(d) Chief Secretary's mailing list	27

The remaining copies are retained by the Government Printing Division for sale.

PRISONERS

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Payment to prisoners is the subject of regulation 79 of the Prisons Act. In brief, prisoners are paid from 85c a day to \$1.20 a day based on the type of work they are undertaking. In addition, by diligence and quality of work, they may earn a bonus of up to 10c an hour. From these earnings they may spend 70 per cent, with the remaining 30 per cent paid into their resettlement allowance for payment on discharge from custody. Prisoners' earnings are reviewed each year on the basis of the Commonwealth c.p.i.

POLICE SEPARATIONS

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The separations from the Police Force (excluding cadets) for the year ended June 30, 1977, totalled 85. These consisted of:

Retirements (age)	20
Retirements (invalidity)	15
Resignations	49
Deceased	1

The strength of the Police Force for the same financial year increased by 166 members. An increase of approximately 120 is planned for in this financial year. The Police Department continually carries out recruiting activities and the results have adequately met requirements.

FURTHER EDUCATION

In reply to **Dr. EASTICK** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has made two allegations, namely, that further education is a new innovation, and, secondly, that too much of its budget was being used for central administration. The Further Education Department in its present form does, of course, date only from late 1971, but the component educational institutions and administrative divisions that make up the department existed within the Education Department as an identifiable branch or division from 1916. It does not seem entirely appropriate, therefore, to refer to the department as "the new scheme of further education".

The creation of the Further Education Department resulted from the Karmel committee's extensive review of education in South Australia during 1969 and 1970. The Karmel committee was impressed by the complexity and diversity of the demands placed on further education and recommended the establishment of an autonomous

department. This recommendation was reviewed as part of the investigation of the Public Service in 1975 (the Corbett inquiry) and, although that committee suggested numerous amalgamations of Government authorities, it specifically supported the case for a separate Further Education Department.

In devising an administrative structure for the department, use was made of the services of a management consulting firm, John Clements Proprietary Limited, the resulting organisation proposal was approved by the Public Service Board, and each individual position also needed board approval before its establishment. In establishing the department, it was decided to avoid any unnecessary duplication of functions with the Education Department by sharing resources. The sum of \$862 000 allotted for use of Education Department services is the current commitment resulting from this policy and, although it cannot be meaningfully split between colleges and administration, the major shared resource is the use of Education Department schools by colleges of further education.

In the 1976-77 financial year, it is calculated that 92 per cent of the department's budget was spent directly on college expenses and 7 per cent on head office. I believe these figures support my comment that the Further Education Department runs a very lean administration. It should be pointed out, in addition, that all head office expenditures are designed to provide necessary services to students and that many of the central branches provide direct services for students, for example, Educational Resources Branch, Curriculum Development Branch, Information Centre.

FURTHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

In reply to **Dr. EASTICK** (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Department of Further Education is developing programmes of three broad areas of rural and viticultural studies: on-farm training, wine industry training, and viticulture. Each of these programmes is being developed in consultation, and in some cases in co-operation, with Roseworthy Agricultural College. Courses for on-farm training, for example, are being devised by a development committee on which Roseworthy College is represented. Students in this course will attend four sessions of full-time study, of which one will take place at Roseworthy College. In the wine industry, a course "Winery Operations" has been developed by a committee, again including representation from Roseworthy College. It is aimed at the operator level and will be run as a pilot programme at McLaren Vale in 1978.

Similarly, in the field of viticulture a 30-hour operator level course "Vineyard Operations" has been conducted at McLaren Vale in 1976 and 1977. 50-hour courses in viticulture I and II have also been presented at the Riverland Community College. These courses do not overlap Roseworthy activity in any way and Roseworthy College staff were consulted in their preparation. The Department of Further Education sees a significant demand for rural and wine studies courses in the industry of a lower level than the general orientation of Roseworthy courses and such lower-level courses have been requested by the industry, particularly in wine studies. The department is conscious of the need to avoid unnecessary and wasteful overlap with Roseworthy, and steps have been taken to extend and improve liaison arrangements. Possible areas of overlap, especially in

equine studies, were recently discussed at the Board of Advanced Education-Department of Further Education Liaison Committee, with participation by Roseworthy and Panorama Community Colleges. After discussion, it became clear that the courses were of different levels and aimed at different client groups. It is hoped that discussions of this sort will prevent any difficulties arising from the work of the department and the college. Finally, I would remind the honourable member of the action which has been taken in the establishment of the Anderson Committee of Inquiry, which will, I am sure, comment on the parameters of the respective roles of Further Education and Colleges of Advanced Education.

FOOD AND CATERING SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. ALLISON (Appropriation Bill, October 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has implied that the wine stocks held by the School of Food and Catering contain many bottles that were bought at expensive prices. I am sure the honourable member will accept that it is necessary for the school to hold a wine stock. Wines, such as sherry, port and Madeira, are used in a large number of cookery, cake and pastry classes. Wine is an ingredient in cookery products in over 20 cooking subjects. The wines held at the School of Food and Catering are in two categories, namely (1) wines purchased by the school; (2) wines donated to the school. In the first category, the school has purchased 1 884 bottles of red, white and fortified wine over the past three or four years at prices lower than 1977 costs. The estimated cost of all purchased stock is \$3 500, thus making an average price of around \$2 a bottle.

All the vintage wines have been donated to the school. These total 1 985 bottles and include 29 bottles of vintage ports donated by Hardy's and D'Arenberg, and 840 bottles donated by Wynns. There is also a bulk wine stock comprising 60 flagons of Madeira used solely for cooking and 1 030 gallons either made by students or donated to the school in casks. These wines vary in quality; some are questionable, but are still useful in wine appreciation and wine chemistry classes. The wine stock at the School of Food and Catering is not kept in a cellar *per se*; rather, it is stored in a compactus 8 m x 3 m area of general storage set aside for locking up wines. In addition to wines being used in cooking, students in courses where knowledge of wine is basic (for example, waiters, supervisors, hospitality, industry staff) are taught to evaluate wines. In a number of lessons in the professional wine appreciation course, students study the age and maturation of vintage wines. The educational objectives cannot be met by a simulated product. Furthermore, in the training of wine waiters in wine service, handling and service of vintage wines is necessary. In summary, the school has been very responsible in its purchase of wines, and I think it is an indication of its status that companies have been prepared to donate vintage wines to it for training purposes.

CEDUNA AREA SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. GUNN (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 26).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The programme for the replacement of Ceduna Area School details are:

1. Documentation will commence in December, 1977.
2. Documentation will be completed in April, 1978.

3. 12 Demac modules will be sited in May or June to provide accommodation during phase 1 of the replacement.

4. Site works for the replacement school will commence in August, 1978.

5. Construction will be phased to ensure that the full educational programme can be maintained.

6. Phase 1 provides for secondary general learning areas, administration, resource centre, art and craft centre.

7. Phase 2 provides for primary general learning areas, science centre and activity hall.

8. The administration block will be available in February, 1979, if sewerage connection is possible.

9. Phase 1, which is 60 per cent of the facility, will be available in June or July, 1979.

10. Phase 2 will be available in November, 1979.

Detailed plans for the school have been displayed in public offices in Ceduna and the programme outlined in the Murat Bay District Council Chambers on October 4, at a public meeting arranged by the Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee.

HOUSING INSURANCE

In reply to Mr. TONKIN (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 26).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), the honourable member inquired as to the arrangements of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia concerning the insurance of homes subject to loans advanced by them. The State Bank does not require buildings on a property, against the security of which it approves a loan, to be insured with the State Government Insurance Commission. However, except in cases involving commercial and industrial buildings, it is a condition of approval of term loans under the State Bank Act and the Advances to Settlers Act and from Home Builders' Account funds that all buildings on relevant properties be insured with the bank's insurance fund constituted under section 78 of the State Bank Act, 1925-1975. The bank has advised the Trade Practices Commission of its procedures in respect to its insurance requirements and no objection has been raised. As a consequence of the economies the bank can achieve by operating its insurance function in conjunction with the normal administration of mortgages, the bank charges lower premiums than private insurers and at the same time secures a considerable contribution towards its traditional function of keeping interest rates to home owners of modest means to the lowest practicable levels. The bank's requirement that its borrowers insure with the fund is one term of an extremely favourable loan contract which could not be as favourable if borrowers had the option of arranging insurance elsewhere. Very few complaints have been received in respect of the bank's insurance requirements and to alter the existing requirement would result in higher charges to all the bank's customers.

The introduction of the present arrangements between the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Government Insurance Commission followed the announcement by the Commonwealth Banking Corporation in January, 1974, that it was introducing its own insurance scheme covering homes mortgaged to that bank at substantially lower rates than those normally available to the general public. The commission made an offer to the trustees of the bank, the main basis being that, if the bank would make insurance with the commission a condition of all future mortgages, the commission would

provide conditions of insurance to mortgagors at least comparable to those offered by the Commonwealth Banking Corporation. It was realised by the bank's trustees that, if the bank was to retain its competitive position in the savings market, which is influenced to some degree by comparative mortgage loan conditions, it should accept the offer. The proposal offered substantial advantages to the bank's borrowing customers. In 1975 the bank applied for authorisation from the Trade Practices Commission and an interim authorisation was received, which is still current. As a general rule, the bank requires new mortgagors for housing loans to insure with the commission. However, in instances where mortgagors have specifically requested that they be exempted from this requirement, the bank has agreed.

OODNADATTA BUILDING

In reply to **Mr. GUNN** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 27).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The building project at Oodnadatta involved the replacement of the single men's quarters with a prefabricated transportable building. The building project at Penong involved a new police office block and two residences of solid construction, which accounts for the substantial difference in expenditure. With the completion of the replacement second officer's residence, the building proposals for Oodnadatta will be completed.

BELAIR PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 26).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Provision has been made for funds in the Loan Works allocation to meet the costs of the major redevelopment of Belair Primary School. Sketch plans for the proposed additions and upgrading of the existing buildings are nearing completion. Because of delays during the preliminary design stage, it will be necessary to reprogramme this project, but is expected that the work will be completed by the middle of 1979.

MODBURY SPECIAL SCHOOL

In reply to **Mrs. BYRNE** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The work to which the honourable member referred is the upgrading of a quadruple timber classroom block to serve the needs of the special education classes. This work, which is practically completed, involved the provision of an open space 2-teacher unit, a withdrawal area, a wet area and an outdoor teaching space. Carpeting and vinyl tiles are laid where appropriate and the cost of the project also includes the complete repainting of the building.

LOBETHAL PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Preliminary sketches have already been prepared and approved by the Principal and school council. Final sketches are due for completion by November 18, 1977. While, admittedly, the preliminary planning of this project has been protracted, it should be

appreciated that the work will not now be staged, but will be completed in one programme at a total cost of approximately \$400 000. Although it is not possible to give a precise date with regard to availability, the redevelopment should be completed early in 1979.

PLYMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Details of the proposed upgrading of the Plympton Primary School are as follows:

1. Road Closure—Owen and Chapel Streets—Negotiations with appropriate instrumentalities and authorities have been completed and it waits only on the formal closure procedures.

2. Upgrading Proposals—

2.1. Solid Construction Buildings—

Old building—will be upgraded and added to to provide the equivalent of eight teaching spaces, with practical, withdrawal and teacher preparation areas.
Junior Primary Building—will be renovated and modified to provide—

Administration/staff facilities

Library/resource centre

Three teaching spaces.

2.2 Demac—

2.2.1 Activity Room

2.2.2 Four teacher unit

Associated with the above will be some site development and oval upgrading. In view of the overall estimated cost it will be necessary to refer the project to the Public Works Standing Committee.

GAWLER SCHOOLS

In reply to **Dr. EASTICK** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The growth of the Evanston-Gawler area has been noted by the Education Department and the enrolments of the three schools which serve Gawler are listed below:

	Year	71	72	73	74	75	76	77
Gawler East Primary	265	256	251	298	312	309	332	
Gawler Primary	254	245	246	234	220	204	215	
Evanston Primary	455	446	510	530	537	591	638	

The following action is being taken with regard to the Gawler Schools:

Gawler East Primary School: The school is on a restricted site of 2.1 ha. The site is steeply sloping and on a major road. The enrolment prediction for 1985 is approximately 500. It has therefore been recommended that a site of 4.6 ha be purchased in part sections 3074 and 3075, hundred of Barossa, and that a school be programmed for possible availability in 1981.

Evanston Primary School: This school has a steady growth rate but fortunately occupies a site of 4.2 ha. Additional accommodation could be provided on the site, but the Regional Director of Education is of the opinion that a site further east should be sought if development continues along the foothills. This matter is currently under consideration.

KINGSTON AREA SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr. NANKIVELL** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is the intention of the Education Department to replace the Kingston Area School as a community school on a new site. This site, adjoining an established recreation reserve, has been owned by the Education Department for some time and is some 300 m from the existing school. Preliminary discussions have been held with the school and its council, community representatives, and the District Council of Lacedpede as a first stage in the planning procedure. It is anticipated that more detailed design work will be undertaken early in 1978.

KINGSCOTE AREA SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr. CHAPMAN** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is hoped that work will commence on site during mid-December of this year. Some delay has been experienced by the Public Buildings Department due to the considerable logistics involved in this project. The initial work will involve some preliminary site preparation, which incorporates the establishment of a new sewer diversion and temporary toilets for the school. It is expected that the bulk of the earth works will commence in January, 1978. At this stage it is anticipated that the entire project will be completed in January, 1979, at a cost of \$1 541 000.

MUSEUM

In reply to **Mr. WOTTON** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The \$5 000 allocated for upgrading the South Australian Museum is to meet carry-over costs incurred by the upgrading of the west wing of the museum and the installation within it of new displays. This sum is not part of the programme for much needed new museum buildings. The new buildings depend upon the State Transport Authority relocating the Hackney bus depot. This has been delayed because Canberra has cut off the necessary funds, and the date at which the site will become available is now uncertain. Nevertheless, planning studies for the new museum are continuing and, in the interim, the existing museum displays and collections are being improved and reorganised in anticipation of a final resolution of the difficulties.

MANNUM AND WOODSIDE SCHOOLS

In reply to **Mr. WOTTON** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Regarding a primary school for Mannum, the design list for 1977-78 is, in part, prepared from priority lists submitted by Regional Directors of Education. The Regional Director, Murraylands Region, had identified Mannum as a project for consideration when State priority lists were prepared, but other projects within the region had been given a higher priority, and it was not possible to include Mannum. The Murraylands Region has the following projects on current planning lists: Meningie Area School; Pinnaroo Area School, Point McLeay Aboriginal School, and Narrung Primary School.

Major work recently completed or in progress in the region includes: Murraylands regional office \$173 000; Frazer Park Primary stage 2, \$163 000; Frazer Park Primary stage 3, \$191 000; Frazer Park Child-Parent

Centre, \$34 000; Karoonda Area School Library-Resource Centre, \$144 000;

These programmes are evidence of the efforts made to provide new schools and to upgrade facilities in the region. It is regrettable that funding does not allow a more extensive programme which would include Mannum but I can assure the honourable member that, having been listed, the upgrading of Mannum Primary School will be seriously considered when new programmes are being prepared.

Regarding Woodside Primary School, this matter was extensively researched prior to commencement of the redevelopment programme. Costs of the redevelopment are approximately \$300 000, including the proposed new four teacher Demac unit. It has been possible to spread this expenditure over more than one financial year. To establish a total new school on the other site would cost approximately three times that amount. It should also be realised that it would not be possible to programme a new school at Woodside for some years. Additional land had also been identified which would allow expansion of the existing site. Negotiations are proceeding for the purchase of this land and for the closure of an intervening road.

FISHER DISTRICT SCHOOLS

In reply to **Mr. EVANS** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 25).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has asked for details regarding the following schools:

1. Belair Primary School—Sketch plans for the proposed additions and upgrading of the existing buildings are nearing completion. Because of delays during the preliminary design stage, it will be necessary to re-programme this project, but it is expected that the work will be completed by the middle of 1979.

2. Happy Valley Primary School—Preliminary planning is proceeding with a view to providing a replacement school by 1980.

3. Eden Hills Primary School—At the request of the Education Department, the Public Buildings Department has investigated a number of possibilities concerning the provision of an activity room at Eden Hills Primary School. Unfortunately, none has proved feasible due to the physical restrictions of the site and the economies of such an undertaking. Arrangements have been made for two transportables to be located on the site in March, 1978, and for some of the existing timber accommodation to be converted to an activity room.

4. Heathfield High School—The proposed major additions to Heathfield High School have been the centre of a vigorous programme involving weekly meetings of officers of the Education Department, Public Buildings Department, the Principal and the school council. Final sketch plans have been approved, and evidence prepared for the Public Works Standing Committee hearing. Documentation will commence immediately after approval is given in an effort to achieve completion in term I, 1979.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JAM FACTORY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Questions have been asked in this House and elsewhere about the conduct of the overseas investigation of craft industry matters undertaken

last year by Dr. Earle Hackett (then Chairman of the South Australian Craft Authority) and Mrs. Karin Lemercier (Deputy Chairman). Associated questions have been raised about the operations of the Jam Factory Workshops at St. Peters. In providing information in response to such questions, I wish to foreshadow my intention at the end of this statement to seek leave to table a series of related papers, prominent among them being the 95-page report which has emanated from the investigation. At the request of the Deputy Premier, the information incorporates the material he undertook on October 25 to provide in response to a question from the member for Kavel.

The overseas travel by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier began on Friday, September 10, 1976, and ended on Sunday, November 14, 1976, a total of 65 days. A list of people and places visited by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier is included as an appendix to the report on the investigation. Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have stated that this is their full itinerary and that no side trips or other diversions were made. In addition to the overseas travel, Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier visited other parts of Australia to gather more information. Information on these visits is contained in Appendix I of their report.

The total expenditure associated with the investigation was \$34 795.51. This total was established after adjustments required for foreign exchange and after reimbursement of the Jam Factory Workshops Inc. for certain private expenses charged to it (as the South Australian Craft Authority) in the course of the trip. The total includes some amounts incurred in the course of travel within Australia for the purposes of the investigation. The total has been checked by auditors. Funds for the investigation were made available through the South Australian Craft Authority, although for the most part arrangements for the trip were made outside of the authority. To meet the expenditure, additional funds were provided to the authority, which has had accounting responsibility for expenditure. At its August meeting last year, the board of the authority noted the arrangements made for examination of craft matters overseas, and gave its approval for Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier to seek information regarding crafts and their future development in Australia.

As the Auditor-General said in a letter dated August 1, 1977, all the \$34 800 expended on the investigation has been accounted for. Copies of this letter and the accompanying statement of the Auditor-General were tabled on November 1 with the Jam Factory Workshops Inc. annual report for 1976-77. The expenditure statement checked by the auditor and referred to in the Auditor-General's letter is included with papers to be tabled today. As Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier did not provide vouchers for all items of expenditure they were required to make statutory declarations to cover payments made by cash and travellers cheques. These declarations are included with the papers. The statement breaks down expenditure by category, e.g. fares, accommodation, food, entertainment, but does not deal with all matters item by item.

A number of extravagant and ill-founded allegations have been made about the costs incurred by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier during the investigation. I bitterly resent the attacks on and innuendoes about people who have given considerable service, at expense to themselves, to this State. What has been said is grossly misleading. It should be noted as a matter of perspective that the direct costs of travel, accommodation and food were considerably less than the overall cost of the study.

The sum of \$14 300 was paid to Mrs. Lemercier's firm, the Design Centre, to cover her absence from duties with the firm for 13 weeks. This included four weeks for planning and preparation of the trip and the nine weeks of the actual trip itself. The rate of \$1 100 a week for a period of 13 weeks was recommended by the then Chairman of the Public Service Board, after negotiations conducted between the board and Mrs. Lemercier's firm.

In addition to the consultancy fees, Mrs. Lemercier received subsequently payment of the normal Craft Authority Board fees for the period of her tenure, including the weeks while she was overseas. Dr. Hackett also received fees as Chairman of the Craft Authority, and continued to draw his salary as Deputy Director-General of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science while away on special leave for the purposes of the trip. At the time, the board fee was \$500 a year.

Of the remaining \$20 500, \$1 858.55 was paid to Ms. Tarras-Wahlberg Boe, a distinguished international craft industry figure, as a consultancy for assistance in arranging meetings with top level designers, craftsmen and managers, and generally for advice on craft industry matters. A further \$1 509 was used for engaging interpreters and hiring vehicles necessary for the proper conduct of the examination. Of the remainder, \$7 208.81 was spent on fares. This figure will be reduced by approximately \$800 as a result of a refund due on air tickets for one leg of the journey. It includes the amounts referred to earlier for associated travel within Australia. Entertainment expenses amounted to \$454.90.

Accommodation accounted for \$6 334.68 and food for \$1 555.12. Other miscellaneous expenditure cost \$1 592.09. This latter amount included baggage insurance, excess baggage, airport taxes, the purchase of a tape recorder (now the property of the Jam Factory) and a gift in return for assistance rendered.

It is to be expected on an investigation of the kind undertaken by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier that expenses will be greater than normal as a result of the need to depart frequently from main direct international air routes on which concessional fares are available, and on occasions to use accommodation more expensive than would otherwise have been chosen because of changes in itinerary. Nevertheless, as I said in this House on October 19, I expressed some disquiet on being informed of the total cost of the trip. I am confident that the Auditor-General and his staff have done their work competently and that all moneys have been accounted for. Expenditures were, however, higher than would normally be incurred on a trip of this kind, and I have issued instructions to prevent this happening again. Indeed, there are now guidelines, and arrangements for these guidelines were in train long before this matter was raised publicly, which apply specifically to overseas trips of all public servants and authorities of the State.

The most virulent attack on the two people in question has come in the form of quite disgraceful and baseless insinuations that while on public business at public expense they pursued their own private commercial interests in connection with the establishment of the Chesser Print Shop. The shop is a private concern, a subsidiary of the Design Centre. Dr. Hackett has informed the Government that he is a director of the shop, which is not a limited liability company, but has no other financial or legal interests or rights in it. In March this year, before Dr. Hackett entered into this arrangement, he wrote to me, as Minister responsible for the Art Gallery of South Australia, offering his resignation if it was considered that involvement in the print shop might bring about a conflict of interest with his position as Chairman of the Art Gallery

Board. I saw, and see, no such conflict of interest and did not accept his resignation. Dr. Hackett also informed the board of the Art Gallery of the situation. The board recorded its confidence in his continuing chairmanship.

The texts of Dr. Hackett's letter to me, my response, and an extract from the minutes of the Art Gallery Board are included with the papers for tabling. Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have declared that the idea of setting up the print shop was not raised until this year, several months after the end of their trip for the Government.

In spite of these assurances and the open declaration of interest made by Dr. Hackett, however, I felt it was necessary to ensure that no doubt should be left in the public's mind about the unworthy allegations raised by members opposite. Accordingly, I wrote to Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier and asked them to make statutory declarations as to whether they had in any way pursued their private interests at public expense. They have made declarations, clearly and categorically denying any such activity whether in New York or anywhere else. Copies are included with the papers for tabling. I would hope that this would place these questions beyond doubt. Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier made the American purchases for their shop in May this year—months after the Government trip—and Dr. Hackett took special leave without pay from May 24 to May 27, 1977, to make the purchases. All expenses on this trip were borne privately.

Various attempts have been made by the Opposition to label the investigations into developments in the field of craft industry as some form of holiday. The member for Kavel has questioned the value of the trip and the consequent advice to the Government, and others have taken up his point and embroidered on it. I can only say what I said in this House before—that Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have now provided a long and informative report of considerable value to the State for consideration of the future direction of the development of craft-based activities in our community to ensure that we do not make the mistakes which have proved very expensive in Ireland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark.

Mr. Chapman: Is that report available to the House?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is being tabled with these documents. I have previously promised to table the documents. Indeed, the only reason I had not tabled that report was that Dr. Hackett had pointed out that there was certain confidential information in it, because it contained some criticism of people who had been quite helpful in the investigation. I had intended to take that out of the report. However, someone somewhere has stolen a copy of the document and leaked it and, in those circumstances, I intend to table the whole document.

Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have recorded the views and experiences of numerous prominent people in the craft, design, production and marketing worlds, and have presented a formed view of their own of the potential for South Australia in these areas. The proposals in the report for new activity have been considered. Conceptually they are sound, and have considerable potential. As members opposite may appreciate, however, the means of implementation must not only be developed carefully in practical detail, but their relationship to existing activities must be determined.

The Government, after considering the report, does not share Dr. Hackett's and Mrs. Lemercier's rather uncomplicated view that the approach taken at the Jam Factory is mistaken. As I have mentioned before in this House, there has been room for improvement in the operation of the Jam Factory Workshops. The Government has not been blind to this. This year in particular,

strong action has been taken to improve management and accountability at the workshops and to develop better working policies for training, production and marketing. The process is far from painless, but the Government has persevered.

The Government sees the road ahead to involve not abandonment of the Jam Factory Workshops, which have proved of great value and are very highly regarded throughout Australia, but improvement in their operations and complementary developments of the broad character—

Mr. Goldsworthy: By whom?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: By anybody who knows anything about crafts, which obviously you do not.

Mr. Arnold: Craft or graft?

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was referring to complementary developments of the broad character advocated by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier. In order to achieve these aims, a working party will concentrate on developing practical means of implementing the proposals in concert with continuing work based in the Jam Factory, the Further Education Department and elsewhere on advancing community appreciation of craft work of a high standard, improving the level of craft and design skills locally and developing appropriate production and marketing arrangements.

The energy of members opposite would be better directed to constructive assistance of this process than to attempts at point scoring against individuals involved in it. I shall return to the question of the Jam Factory statements, but I would earnestly suggest that before any more allegations, baseless as they have been, are made the report of the trip should be read thoroughly and thoughtfully.

Some attention has been drawn to the fact that Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier are no longer directly associated with the Jam Factory. At the time they undertook the trip they were Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively of the South Australian Craft Authority, as it then was. As has been announced previously, however, the structure of the Craft Authority and its operations were changed significantly earlier this year, after I had made some inquiries and visited the workshops personally to discuss matters with the board and others involved with the workshops. At that time, I explained that matter to the House.

As a consequence of these changes, the South Australian Craft Authority was succeeded by the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated, whose task is to see to the running of the workshops as a practical matter, and the South Australian Craft Advisory Council, whose task is to advise the Government generally on craft development issues without having any operational responsibility for particular activities. In order to achieve this, I revoked the appointments of the former board of the South Australian Craft Authority and invited all the members to become members of the South Australian Craft Advisory Council. Two of the board members were asked also to serve as board members of the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated and, as a reflection of my concern to lift the financial and general management of the workshops and to achieve high standards of accountability, I asked Mr. A. W. Richardson, Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission, to assume the responsibilities of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer for a period of reorganisation.

Mr. Richardson accepted this task and has been discharging it with determination and vigour. The decision not to appoint Dr. Hackett or Mrs. Lemercier to the board

of the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated was quite straightforward. The Jam Factory had gone through a period of turmoil in the latter part of 1976. Budgeting and financial control had not been satisfactory, production estimates were not being achieved—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier must seek further leave in order to continue his explanation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I seek further leave, Mr. Speaker, because I am trying to answer a series of questions, and I have not much more to add.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The situation came to a head in one respect shortly before Christmas last year, when the former Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Simon Blackall, had his contract of employment terminated by the board of the Craft Authority. The board had on its own account previously undertaken to give Mr. Blackall six months notice of termination. In view of the deteriorating relations between the Chief Executive Officer and the board, and particularly the executive committee of the board with specific responsibility for practical management of the workshops, and in view of his history in the workshops the board resolved to pay Mr. Blackall out in lieu of notice. I must say that, in view of Mr. Blackall's history in the place, that was very generous indeed, and I say that advisedly.

Mr. Dean Brown: Would you clarify that statement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will give the details later, if the honourable member so wishes.

Mr. Tonkin: I think that would be very interesting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall be pleased to do so. I have not previously proceeded to say the things about Mr. Blackall that could have been said, but, in view of the attacks he has made on the board after the most generous treatment from the board and the Government, I shall reply.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It won't be character assassination.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not go in for the sort of thing the honourable member does. He would know about that very well.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In response to questions asked about the compensation paid to Mr. Blackall on dismissal, a breakdown of payments made is included in the papers for tabling. Following a period of consolidation, during which Mr. Richardson acted as Chief Executive Officer, Mr. M. Wallis-Smith was appointed to that position in July.

In addition to the changes in management personnel and arrangements which were required, it was apparent that changes were also needed in the character and balance of the board to move out of a period of some conflict into greater harmony. Without in any way reflecting on the individuals involved, their capacities or their willingness to render public service in this way, it was decided to retain only two of the former board, one of them having been a member of the board from the inception of the authority, the other being drawn from among the crafts people working in the factory.

In the case of Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier, there was a further reason, which will become apparent from a reading of the report on their overseas trip. As both of them had come to the personal conclusion that the Jam Factory did not offer the scope for craft development the Government desired and therefore should in some way be abandoned or phased out, it did not appear appropriate to ask them to continue in significant roles at the Jam Factory.

These changes took place in March this year. Since then Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have developed their

report from earlier outline reports submitted. This has taken considerably longer than expected and, while this activity has been continuing, no action has been taken to call the Craft Advisory Council together, because the first work of the Craft Advisory Council was to deal with the report.

A further delay has been caused in this respect by a request by Dr. Hackett that he should not carry the office of Chairman of the advisory council. He gave as his reason the fact that he had given four years service on craft matters. His resignation as Chairman has been accepted.

It is abundantly clear that members opposite have attempted to blow out of all proportion the significance of questions relating to the overseas investigation into craft industry developments. They have sought to impugn the character of the two persons concerned not by presenting evidence to support reasoned arguments, but by insinuation and innuendo. They, and others outside the Parliament, have done their best to work up a scandal against these people, where no scandal exists. Apart from demonstrating a strained eagerness to throw mud indiscriminately in the hope that some might stick, they have shown in this matter nothing more than their own poor appreciation of the many complexities of this area of endeavour. They have made no positive proposals, no contribution which might further the interests of this State in diversifying the sources of employment in our economy.

Well before the Auditor-General's Report, the Government initiated strong and specific action to improve the operations of the Jam Factory. Under Mr. Richardson's chairmanship, and more recently with the assistance of Mr. Wallis-Smith, much effort has been put into improved budgeting, financial controls and other management matters. A resume of progress made is included with the papers for tabling. I make no pretence that everything is perfect, but I do say that budgeting and general accountability are improving steadily.

Difficult decisions remain, and can be expected to arise from time to time. The Government will face those questions as they arise and take the requisite action. It would serve the State far better if the Opposition supported those efforts with constructive criticism and positive proposals instead of attempting to bluster its way through with ill-informed and utterly misguided, baseless, scurrilous and disgraceful personal attacks on the integrity of two people who have given great service to this State. I will table the documents to which I have referred.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move a motion without notice forthwith, namely, that, because of the conflicting statements and proposed actions of the Attorney-General outlined in a speech given by him in Canberra last night, this House no longer has confidence in him and calls on him to resign, and that this suspension remain in force no later than 4 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

That, because of the conflicting statements and proposed actions of the Attorney-General outlined in a speech given by him in Canberra last night, this House no longer has confidence in him and calls on him to resign.

I have taken this action, which is serious at any time, because the statements which have been reported in the press and which I have since found to be accurately reported have been blatantly irresponsible and unfit for a Minister holding the portfolio particularly of Attorney-

General, the chief Crown law officer of this State. I think it is necessary to go through the details as they were reported in the *Advertiser* this morning under the heading, "Duncan warns of uranium-age police spies. N-industry 'could lead to Fascism'". The speech referred to was given in Canberra, and the report came from the *Advertiser* in Adelaide as the result of a copy of the speech which, I understand, was handed to that newspaper. The report reads:

A nuclear-power industry could lead to a Fascist State where "vast numbers" of police spied on political groups, the South Australian Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) said last night. Mr. Duncan said this in an attack on uranium mining interests during a speech to the Society for Social Responsibility in Science. He said some lawyers were "extremely concerned" about the potential ill-effects a uranium mining or nuclear power industry would inevitably have on the Australian legal system.

"It is arguable that the establishment of a nuclear power industry will almost inevitably lead to the death of civil liberties and the establishment of a Fascist State where vast numbers of police with unlimited powers spend their time spying upon political groups, who, it is thought, might conceivably be able to steal fissionable material and use it for terrorist purposes," Mr. Duncan said. "This is a realistic possibility in a State dotted with nuclear power stations or possessing a large uranium extraction and enrichment industry."

"It is my belief that there are major legal hurdles to be overcome before uranium mining and enrichment may proceed in Australia as now proposed. It may be the Federal Government is acting quite illegally in approving of the development of new uranium mines in Australia, using the Atomic Energy Act as a vehicle. Many lawyers have been working on ways of preventing the nuclear industry in Australia from going ahead."

Mr. Duncan said that if the Uranium Producers Forum revived its campaign of "paid, misleading advertisements" he would, as South Australia's Attorney-General, consider taking court action to prevent the advertisements.

That is a most significant and important part of the speech made by the Attorney-General. The report continues:

The advertisements had been stopped by a New South Wales action under the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act alleging deceptive advertising by the Uranium Producers Forum.

He went on to talk about the second Ranger report and the great disaster that mining would cause to Aboriginal and white people in the Ranger area. The report continues:

It was likely legal action would be taken to prevent the Commonwealth from violating the basic freedom of religion guaranteed to Australian citizens under the Federal Constitution.

I must say that I totally agree with that point of view, and it may well be that action would be necessary. I would hope it would not be necessary, because I hope that the necessary safeguards exist. Further on, the report continues:

"As people become more informed about nuclear power, they become more worried about it," Mr. Duncan said. "The miners are therefore correct in imagining that genuine public debate is to their disadvantage. It is my firm conviction that in the long term the uranium miners will lose, and the conservationists will win." He said Australian public opinion was clearly moving firmly against uranium mining and he was confident the voices of protest would become an "overwhelming and irresistible shout". "That the industry will misfire cannot be doubted by any realist who reads the papers, let alone anyone who reads the scientific journals,"

Mr. Duncan said. "For these reasons at least, it would be a brave, not to say foolhardy, capitalist who would spend vast sums of money in the nuclear industry in the hope of a respectable return on his investment. He might just as well— and this is a ridiculous statement also—

put his money into heroin smuggling, which is probably somewhat less dangerous to mankind but vastly more profitable."

Mr. Allison: More people have died from that.

Mr. TONKIN: Indeed they have.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: But all—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General will have an opportunity to reply. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN: The report continues:

Mr. Duncan said the anti-uranium movement was non-violent, wanting to express its views peacefully without riots, tear gas or street violence. Only the "ruthless Right" believed it could score political points by dividing the community over uranium.

That is a ridiculous statement, too. The report continues:

It was timely to warn all those in the anti-uranium movement to be aware of the possibility of a "dirty tricks" campaign leading up to the Federal election. "In demonstrations, genuine protesters must watch out for the stranger who starts throwing stones at the police, or deliberately attacks passing pedestrians," he said. "He may well be an agent of the mining companies causing provocation in order to bring discredit upon protesters and the anti-uranium movement generally. It would be tragic if the extreme radical Right-wingers were to manipulate events so as to bring discredit upon the mass of truly peaceful souls who only wish to stop uranium mining and avert the threat of nuclear war."

There is some truth in what the Attorney-General says, but the implication and the emphasis he places on it obviously are matters of value judgment and political belief, and nothing more. I find that that article has called forth a great deal of comment, not the least of which was that appearing in the second editorial of the same newspaper, the *Advertiser*. I think it sums the situation up extremely well. Under the heading "Heat but not light", it states:

The Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) is rarely one to understate his case or his commitment in an argument. He is deeply opposed to the mining and export of uranium, for example, and in a speech last night to the Society for Social Responsibility in Science he made his position vehemently clear. He did his audience an initial service by reminding them that many specialists and academic disciplines must be involved in an accurate and fair assessment of the consequences of exploiting uranium.

We would totally agree. The editorial continues:

It is therefore not sufficient for citizens to listen to physicists, chemists, human biologists, geneticists, or even lawyers alone in order to help them arrive at a responsible attitude. Mr. Duncan went on to state with some power the by-now familiar case against uranium—the risks are too great; the threat to Aboriginal tribal lands is unacceptable; the economics of the industry will not stand up to close analysis, and so on. But many will think he then damaged his case by a series of emotional and quite extreme statements which make his reasoned judgment questionable. He predicted that establishment of a nuclear power industry in Australia (which is not yet contemplated) would "lead to the death of civil liberties and the establishment of a Fascist State." He said "capitalists might as well invest in heroin smuggling as in uranium."

He warned that during the coming election campaign "strangers who throw stones at police or attack pedestrians

may well be agents provocateur employed by mining companies." Such utterances might be expected from young and callow students. But they fall oddly, to say the least, from the lips of an Attorney-General whose whole academic training would have encouraged him to recognise that there are invariably two sides to every argument and that justice demands that each be heard and weighed dispassionately.

Mr. Duncan is not merely unprepared to listen to any other arguments except his own. He went so far as to warn that if the uranium lobby's campaign of "paid, misleading advertisements" is resumed, he would act as Attorney-General to initiate a prosecution for deceptive advertising. This sort of zealotry would seem to come close to an act of censorship—under another name, of course. The uranium issue is indeed a highly charged one. But when an Attorney-General contemplates winning a case by moves which may muzzle his opponents, one can only question his wisdom.

That is a long extract, but it is the full editorial and I have read it in full so that I cannot be accused of taking anything out of context. It sums up the position very well.

Mr. Abbott: There's more of his statement. Haven't you got that?

Mr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the honourable member raise that matter, because several remarks have been made to me during the day. The *News* takes up the situation and quotes various people, as follows:

The Australian Uranium Producers Forum chairman, Mr. G. Mackay, of Melbourne, said Mr. Duncan's statements were typical of the exaggerated statements being made by the anti-uranium movement.

He also says that he does not believe that the advertisements referred to were misleading and that in any case, as I understand it, modifications are to be made to make certain that they are not misleading.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That proves the point.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: It is to make sure that they are not misleading. The report continues:

Mr. Mackay said Mr. Duncan's claim that a nuclear power industry could lead to a Fascist State was a complete exaggeration. "Nuclear power is used in more than 30 countries and not one is a Fascist State."

The Hon. Peter Duncan: How about a ban?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: Other messages have come in, too. I quote a typical one from a prominent citizen of this State who says:

It is a damn shame that, of all the excellent lawyers in Adelaide, this Parliament and this State have been lumbered with this emotional and irrational juvenile.

In one breath the Attorney-General is totally and absolutely inconsistent: we have heard at great length of his devotion to the cause of civil liberties and freedom of information, but in the next breath we hear that he is threatening to use his powers as Attorney-General to muzzle an opposing point of view. I will dwell on that matter briefly. It is an opposing point of view, and, because it is, the Attorney-General chooses to regard it as being misleading. In whose opinion is it misleading? In whose opinion were the advertisements that have appeared misleading? Was it the Attorney-General's point of view? Obviously, it was. The worrying and incredible thing is that the Attorney-General has given clear notice that he is prepared to use his position as Attorney-General not to support the freedoms that we have come to accept as part of the Australian way of life (which he boasts about and to which he referred earlier in the report when he spoke about freedom of religion) but to muzzle freedom of speech: that is what this amounts to. In whose opinion is this misleading advertising? Why was the Attorney-

General not more active during the last State election campaign when misleading advertisements occurred?

Mr. Chapman: He was muzzled himself.

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

Mr. TONKIN: Misleading advertisements on behalf of the Australian Labor Party appeared quite frequently in relation to State taxation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must inform the honourable Leader of the Opposition that there is nothing about State taxation in the motion before the Chair.

Mr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased indeed to hear that you intend to keep this—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide that.

Mr. TONKIN: Decide what, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Who is out of order and who is not.

Mr. TONKIN: I am pleased indeed that you are going to keep the House, as I would expect you to do, entirely to the motion before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the Leader does not stray, then.

Mr. TONKIN: I find it absolutely incredible that the Attorney-General in his speech last night should have been bringing this whole matter into the political arena when the Premier, his own Leader, is on record and constantly being exposed on television, I understand, on behalf of the Federal election campaign as saying that this matter should be above politics. I find that absolutely incredible, but I suppose, on reflection, it is no more incredible than the fact that the statement that it should be above politics comes from the Premier when in fact he is making political mileage out of it, or trying to do so. It is in fact, the Australian Labor Party which has brought the subject of uranium into the political field, although it did this at the Perth conference, obviously against the wishes of the Federal President, Mr. Hawke, and the Federal Leader, Mr. Whitlam, as became quite apparent at the time.

The Attorney-General's views on the uranium issue are well known. He was, as everyone in this House knows, one of the prime movers, with the Chief Secretary, in changing the official attitude of the Government on this matter. It was, as honourable members will recall, a Government that was enthusiastically behind the exploration, mining and enrichment of uranium. I do not intend to go into those matters, I do not think they are pertinent in detail, but I do know that the Minister of Mines and Energy went overseas and that part of his trip was very much promotion of the uranium that South Australia could provide. Such is the Attorney-General's enthusiasm and commitment to an absolute ban on uranium that he and his colleague have been able to change the Government's whole attitude on this matter so that we now have a blanket ban on uranium in this State.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Which you voted for.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: I am not going to respond to that red herring, either. I could also point out, I suppose, that the Premier, from having been an enthusiastic supporter who is now going nation-wide as an enthusiastic supporter of leaving it in the ground, has already advocated the mining of uranium at Roxby Downs and the stockpiling of it. If stockpiling does not mean that it is going to be utilised in some form or another, I do not know for what reason he is advocating it. It is a change of stance from pointing in one direction to pointing in the other direction, at the instigation of the Attorney-General and his colleague, and now coming around to the middle of the road and having a bob each way. That is something he will not be saying on his advertisement for the Labor Party for the forthcoming

Federal election. I repeat that, in spite of the views of the former Minister and the views of the Premier, the Attorney-General has been able to change the attitude of the Government.

However, the issue of whether or not to explore for, mine, or export uranium is not the matter under discussion now. I think you have already given a clear indication, Sir, that you appreciate that fact, and I am grateful for it. The issue is the Attorney-General's attitude towards his position and the powers he has as Attorney-General, but I have referred to uranium to emphasise his obvious and total commitment to one side of an argument. He holds strong opinions, and no-one denies his right to do so. He may hold them as firmly and forcibly as he likes, but we challenge his right to use his position as Attorney-General, or to threaten to use it, to muzzle the other point of view on any subject. If he is going to do this to stop the expression of a contrary point of view put by any party that holds opposing views equally as strongly as he does, he is abusing his position as Attorney-General of this State: that is the major point at issue in my motion.

I do not intend to go into any detail about the incitement, which, in my view, is contained in the somewhat Machiavellian approach in the later part of his statement as reported in the *Advertiser*, regarding protesters, demonstrators, and provocative actions. What I want to know is whether he is prepared to use his powers (or, should I say, abuse his powers) as Attorney-General to stifle debate and the putting of the other side of an argument with which he disagrees, and on what other issues he will take that action, too, or threaten to take it. That is not the attitude that one expects from the chief law officer of this State. It is his duty to be impartial, to uphold the principles of Parliamentary democracy and, as I have said before, to uphold the principles of freedom of speech. It is his duty not to use his powers as a Minister, and particularly while Attorney-General, in a partisan manner to inhibit the freedom of speech. His statements, as reported in this morning's press, were blatantly and totally irresponsible: they were scaremongering statements of the worst kind.

If he wants to champion a cause, that is one thing, and it is his right to do so, but to forecast action that would undermine the very principle for which he stands, namely, civil liberties and freedom of speech, is totally another matter. The issue of what the Attorney-General is saying is not whether we should mine and export uranium: it is whether he, as this State's chief law officer, in practice stands for the principles of upholding civil liberties for everyone, no matter what his viewpoint on specific issues, or whether he does not.

One thing is apparent from what we have seen of his activities hitherto on this issue: every single day that he spends as a member of this Parliament, as a Minister, or as the chief law officer of the Crown, he is living a life of hypocrisy, because it is becoming more and more obvious from his actions that he is working within the system which he obviously seeks to destroy. The inflammatory statements that he has made are obviously directed towards that end.

He is not worthy of the high office he holds. I believe that he does no credit to this Government, and he certainly does no credit to the people of South Australia. I commend my motion to the House and suggest that members consider it carefully. I believe that, on this occasion, they should support it, because South Australia cannot afford an Attorney-General who is prepared to use his office to inhibit freedom of speech while, at the same time, saying that he stands for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened to what the Leader has had to say. Normally, when a vote of no confidence is moved in this House one would expect it to be about a serious matter. I know that at times the Opposition has tried to get a motion of no confidence going on something that is not relevant to confidence in the Government simply in order to pre-empt the business of the House. The Government has not allowed that to happen. We gave the Opposition credit this time that it had something serious to say. The Leader has accused the Attorney-General of irresponsible, inflammatory and exaggerated statements.

Mr. Gunn: Ha, Ha!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what the Leader said. Having listened to the Leader, I can only say that, if ever there was exaggerated, idiotic and baseless rodomontade, it is what we have just heard. The accusations made against the Attorney were on two bases, the first of which was that he said that if a nuclear industry (as is advocated by some of the nuclear lobby in Australia that forecasts such development in this country) were to be developed here, in order to protect the industry from the thefts of uranium that have already occurred (and which were detailed in his speech) internationally, there would have to be great police surveillance, much greater than we have today in Australia, and that surveillance would have to extend to any political grouping that might seek for political and terrorist purposes to steal uranium.

The Leader says that that is an irresponsible statement. It is a perfectly truthful statement. It would be disastrous for Australia to face the kind of thing that would have to happen to try to prevent the thefts of uranium that are already recorded internationally. We can see what terrorists are doing now on the international front. Weekly, we read in the newspapers what is occurring internationally in terrorist groups. Of course those groups want to get their hands on what would be the greatest terror weapon of all times.

In order to protect that from happening, the most extraordinary surveillance of people would have to occur in order to see that the protection measures were effective. The Attorney drew attention to that and to the dangers to Australia and to the civil liberties that would be involved. It was a perfectly proper statement to make.

The second thing the Leader has accused the Attorney of doing is saying that investigation needs to be made in some circumstances in relation to misleading advertising. Action has already been taken before legal tribunals in Australia in relation to misleading advertising by the Uranium Producers Forum, and the advertisements have been withdrawn.

The Leader then said that the Attorney, because he drew attention to these matters of concern to the people of Australia, was somehow or other, by drawing attention to those matters, stifling opposition to them, and that the Attorney was misusing his position as Attorney-General of this State. All I can say about the Leader's statement this afternoon is that it is a disgraceful piece of politicking of the kind of character assassination that has become the stock in trade of members opposite.

Week after week we hear in this House a series of disgraceful, despicable personal attacks. I have just detailed one such attack this afternoon, and we have now heard another. We are sick and tired of them, and so are the people of South Australia.

Mr. Dean Brown: Ha, ha, ha!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is out of order. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): That is about the shortest outburst we have heard from the Premier in defence of one of the weak links in his Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the Deputy Leader will stick to the motion before the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In his last sentence or two, the Premier laid some rather shabby charges about the activities of the Opposition, and I hope, Sir, that you will allow me to reply to those scurrilous remarks. The Premier made three points that I recall (including the attack on the Opposition), the first of which was that the charges were not serious. Apparently the daily press and members of the public with whom we have had some contact do not share that view. In fact, the Leader referred to this morning's press, which we know that the Premier and the Attorney-General denigrate regularly. For the record I should like to recount what the editorial in today's *News* had to say. It is headed "Duncan's Outburst" and is as follows:

Even by the lax standards of political rhetoric, Mr. Peter Duncan's outburst on uranium mining yesterday was extraordinary. The Attorney-General's statements were totally illogical and the cause for concern about his intentions.

First he tells an audience of scientists in Canberra that he is worried that a nuclear power industry would somehow turn us into a Fascist State filled with police spies. Then he publicly supports action to prevent uranium producers putting their case before the public.

Let's not mince words. That is censorship, the hallmark of fascist societies. Also in the course of this tirade he lightly brackets heroin smuggling with uranium mining, finding heroin smuggling "somewhat less dangerous." It was a remark as offensive as it was silly.

Under the subheading "Disturbing", the editorial continues:

No-one can for a moment doubt the sincerity of Mr. Duncan's opposition to uranium mining or the passion of his commitment. As a private citizen he is entitled to be as fervid as he likes. But he is not a private citizen. He is Attorney-General of South Australia, a Cabinet Minister and the chief legal officer of Government.

For a man in that position to talk the way he did about looming fascism, about agents provocateur, and to advocate censorship is disturbing. He can hardly have been naive enough to expect such statements from a man in his influential position not to raise questions about his sense of judgment.

That is the matter that the Premier seeks to brush off as not being serious enough for the attention of the House. Other people in rather important positions of influence in this State do not share that view. The Attorney gets himself into these predicaments from time to time and occasionally likes to shrug it off by asserting that he is simply plain John Citizen. When he broadcast to Fretilin he said he was acting not as Attorney-General but as a private citizen.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not believe there is anything in this motion concerning the last statement made by the honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pointing out that the Attorney-General has not tried this time to slide out from under by asserting that he was acting as a private citizen. In this case he is willing to assert that he is Attorney-General in South Australia and, indeed, that he will use his position as Attorney to further his activities in stopping uranium mining in the country. That is why I raised that point. There are times when the Attorney seems to shrug off his responsibilities as Attorney-General. So much for

the Premier's first point that the matter is not serious. The matter is one of considerable moment when we get from time to time outbursts such as that made by the chief legal officer responsible for law and order in South Australia.

The Premier then sought to whitewash the Attorney-General, as we would expect him to do, and finished up with a short burst of abuse of the Opposition. That is the thinnest refutation I have heard from the Premier during my years in this place. What the Attorney-General said does not stand up in the light of the facts. The Attorney-General said that South Australia could turn into a Fascist State with police with unlimited powers. He said:

This is a realistic possibility in a State dotted with nuclear power stations or possessing a large uranium extraction and enrichment industry.

He conveniently forgets the fact that we are already in a nuclear age. Some 30 countries have established nuclear reactors (there are 300 reactors operating), including England, United States of America, India, Japan and Russia. What evidence has the Attorney-General that these countries are police States? Yet the Attorney-General has suggested that simply because nuclear reactors are built in Australia we will turn into a police State. The Attorney-General said that if the country were dotted with nuclear reactors and we developed an enrichment plant we would turn into a Fascist State.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You are wrong again; I didn't refer to—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not care what he is referring to; we are already in the atomic age. Nuclear reactors have been established in the major Western democracies. Britain has been in the field for many years, from the word go. Is the Attorney-General suggesting that those countries have turned into Fascist States because they have nuclear reactors? That is nonsense. The disturbing thing about the speech is the fact that the Attorney-General is prepared to enunciate this tripe in public before responsible people.

The next point he went on to make was that informed debate was a disadvantage to the miners. That is wrong. I believe that, the more people are cognisant of the facts of the debate, the more they see that Australia cannot escape being involved in the nuclear age, because the rest of the world is already involved in it. Our former Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, has serious doubts about uranium mining, but his concern is mostly in connection with weapons of war. That point has been answered effectively by Mr. Hawke, the leader of the Australian Labor Party, who is in favour of uranium mining. Sir Mark Oliphant said recently that he believes that the waste material can be competently handled. The question of waste material concerned me for some time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you see *Four Corners* on Saturday night?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I did not. Judging by the quality of some of the garbage that comes from *Late Line* on the A.B.C. and other programmes which are obviously politically biased, I would not be surprised what comes out of *Four Corners*, although I have not seen it recently.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You ought to.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Henley Beach is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have listened with much attention to the debates on uranium mining, particularly in relation to the handling of its waste material, and I, along with the former Governor, have concluded that this material can be handled safely. Those who are opposed to uranium mining seek (from what I have heard of the debate and the confrontations I have witnessed)

deliberately to confuse the issue and are not prepared to deal with solid scientific facts.

The Attorney-General, in his uncontrolled outburst, went on to talk about the right wing being the leader in relation to violence in this matter. He said that the right-wingers will incite violence. That is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. We know perfectly well that the people who become violent in street demonstrations in this country are the extreme left-wingers. We know perfectly well that the fellow travellers of people like the Attorney-General get out of hand, and this leads to violence. We know who threw glass under the feet of horses during the Vietnam demonstrations. We know whence the violence comes. I find the recent statement of the Attorney-General strangely at variance with his plea for greater activity on the university campus. I raise this point to illustrate the inconsistency of the Attorney-General about student activities of the left and right wings. He has talked about a right-wing takeover of the university simply because university students have gone quiet. In November last year, the *Advertiser*, under a heading of "Silent students a worry", contained the following report:

The new silent generation of ivory tower students was a disturbing phenomena, the Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) said last night. "It is an indication of the right-wing mood that Australia appears to be going through," he said.

In other words, if you are silent you are a right-winger, but now if you go in for violence you are a right-winger. His gyrations have been acrobatic since he has had this job and it is hard to keep pace with him.

Mr. Venning: Where has the Premier gone?

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney-General continued:

The universities have largely returned to the stupor and conservatism that they had usually displayed after the radical flirtation of the Vietnam period.

It was the left-wing radicals during the Vietnam period who stirred the Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing concerning Vietnam in the motion. I hope the honourable member will speak to the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, but there is a reference to the habits and attributes of the right wing as seen through the eyes of the South Australian Attorney-General, and the assertion is that the right wing is violent. Apparently, we have to look out for them during the uranium demonstrations, but during the Vietnam demonstrations we had to look out for the left-wingers. Not long ago the Attorney-General was bemoaning the fact that the university had gone silent because the right wing had taken charge of the show, and that the only time there was any action was during the Vietnam demonstrations when the left wing was stirring things up. I cannot be blamed for finding the outburst of the Attorney-General somewhat inconsistent.

The Federal President of the Australian Labor Party (Mr. Hawke) has made his position perfectly clear, and that points out the complete hyposcrisy of about half the Labor Party members in relation to uranium mining. Mr. Hawke said that we had an obligation to mine uranium because we have about 20 per cent of the world's reserves and, if we do not mine it, all we will do will be to increase the cost of energy to the developing world and make it more difficult to develop the under-developed world. He also said that, if we used the argument that we would increase risks of warfare by this type of mining, we would not mine coal or iron ore, which is turned into guns and weapons of war.

In fact, Mr. Hawke went on to give probably as rational an argument in favour of uranium mining as one would have read in the past few months. I think the Attorney-General should sort out some of the problems within the Labor Party before he goes on record with such outlandish, incorrect, and damaging statements as he made last night.

The fourth point I make is that he talks about interfering with freedom of religion. He said that someone would take action because uranium mining would interfere with the freedom of religion of the Aboriginal people. I doubt whether he has read the statements made by Ministers in the Federal Parliament in this regard.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It so happens that the Federal Government has accepted the Fox report.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Rubbish!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Federal Government has accepted the Fox report, and before the Attorney-General makes any more outbursts he would be well advised to read the statements of Federal Ministers on all matters affecting uranium mining. I shall refer briefly to the statement of the Hon. Ian Viner, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, in relation to the action the Commonwealth Government intends to take on the matter of Aboriginal land rights and the preservation of religious—

Mr. Kenelly: Would you tell me what they are going to do—

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall quote part of a statement made by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, and I commend to the Attorney-General this statement as well as other statements made by Federal Ministers, because I am sure they would open his eyes to the fact that once again he does not know what he is talking about. The statement of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in relation to mining royalties is as follows:

The grant of Aboriginal land claims means that Aboriginals will benefit financially from the development of the Ranger deposit just as they benefit from mining in the Aboriginal reserves which by the Land Rights Act become Aboriginal land. The equivalent of a royalty of at least 2½ per cent will be payable by the Commonwealth Government to the Aboriginals Benefit Trust Account for mining within the Ranger area and 30 per cent of these payments will go to the local Aboriginal communities affected by mining development in the region. Another 30 per cent will be available for advancing the general well-being of Aboriginals throughout the Northern Territory on the advice of an all-Aboriginal advisory committee. Forty per cent is to be used to meet the administrative costs of land councils, with money not needed for that purpose being available for distribution to Aboriginal communities.

The Minister further states:

As I have said, the Government has accepted the inquiry's recommendation that the southern boundary of the Ranger area should be moved north, farther from sacred sites at Mount Brockman. This decision should ensure that Aboriginals will have, in the words of the inquiry's report, "a comfortable satisfaction that Mount Brockman and the sacred sites on or near it are safe and secure". I will introduce an appropriate amendment to the Land Rights Act as soon as possible.

If the Attorney would take time out to do his homework, and if he did not feel impelled by primitive prejudices to make these outlandish statements from time to time, we would have a far more rational approach to the subject in this House and publicly.

I do not want to speak at great length. I could refer honourable members to the statement of the Prime Minister dealing with the matter of safeguards, and I could refer to the statements of the Minister for the Environment. I trust that some of the bigots opposite would take time out to read the material, because it would be quite informative for them. The latest outburst which has led to editorial writers condemning the Attorney-General is nothing new, either to us or to the South Australian public. We know what the editorials had to say when the Attorney-General misled the House to get through legislation regarding homosexuals. He denigrated the editorialists on that occasion. We know that he said he did not worry about swearing allegiance to the Queen, because he owed no allegiance to the Queen. That was his reason for not taking the oath.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Deputy Leader is now straying from the motion before the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This exercise is not new for the Attorney-General. We know that he is a callow youth in many respects; indeed, he has been referred to in that way today. We know that he is lacking in judgment and that he is to the hard left of the Labor Party. We know that he and other members of the left of the Labor Party who have been elected to this House have had their way on the uranium matter. We know that members of the Government, including the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy, have been forced to do a complete back flip on the matter. However, that does not give the Attorney-General leave to talk to the public in the way in which he has talked. It can only do damage to the State of South Australia, to his own credibility, and to the credibility of the Government. I support the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): It was not with any great surprise that I heard this afternoon that honourable members opposite were to move in this fashion, because a pattern has developed over the past two years or so involving motions of urgency and of no confidence. Whenever anyone does anything that stings Opposition members (or, more importantly, their backers, their friends, their controllers), we see them trying to vent the issue in this House. This afternoon, we have not seen members opposite vent the issue of uranium in any way at all. Nor did they refer to the matter of whether we should be mining or exporting uranium. They have not touched on those issues, which are issues—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you ruled that there would be no mention of matters other than those in the motion. As a wide discussion of that question is not in the motion, it would have been quite out of order for Opposition members to debate the matter in the way suggested by the Attorney-General, or for him to pursue that line.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. Although I called him to order when he strayed, the Deputy Leader continued in the same fashion in his remarks. It was a personal attack on the Attorney-General. I hope the Attorney, in defending himself (and this is a most important matter), will stick to the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall endeavour to do so, but I must refer you, Sir, to the terms of the motion. Thank you for your attention, Sir. As I said, I must refer you to the terms of the motion, which refer quite clearly to the "conflicting statements and proposed actions" of the Attorney-General. The whole of my speech last night dealt with—

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General will resume his seat. I thought that his remark concerning the Chair was not good. At the time, I was seeking advice from the Clerk, as I am entitled to do. I hope the

Attorney-General will retract those remarks, and I ask him to do so.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Which remarks, Sir?

The SPEAKER: The remark in relation to my attention. You indicated that I was not paying attention.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I certainly retract that remark, Sir, but the remark I made was to the effect that the motion before the House refers to the "conflicting statements" of the Attorney-General. The statements I made last night were on the subject of uranium mining and export. It is impossible for me to deal with the matter without referring to that subject. I should have thought that would be patently obvious. The situation is clear, and if necessary I shall read the whole of this speech into *Hansard* if that is the only way in which I can refer to the matter of uranium mining and export in this House this afternoon.

As I said, the extraordinary thing about Opposition members is that, whenever they get gee-ed up by their friends and controllers uptown, they come trotting here with these motions, determined to take the time of the House, to denigrate members (particularly in the past myself) in this fashion. Almost inevitably, in every instance their comments have been based on newspaper reports, editorial comment, and so on.

The Leader of the Opposition was charitable enough to say this afternoon that he understood that the comments in the *Advertiser* were based on a copy of my speech which had been supplied to that paper. That was perfectly true. However, instead of referring to my speech (if he has a copy of it) he referred to the *Advertiser* and to other reports. I deal briefly with some of these matters, because there are several issues in the editorials and the like that are incorrect and do not refer to the substance of what I said last evening. First, I refer to the *Advertiser* editorial, which states:

He predicted that establishment of a nuclear power industry in Australia (which is not yet contemplated) would "lead to the death of civil liberties and the establishment of a Fascist State."

Nowhere in my statement last evening did I specifically refer to Australia in that context. My fear is for the whole world and that fascist regimes will inevitably occur eventually in any country threatened by terrorism or by groups determined to get hold of uranium and its enrichment products.

Mr. Gunn: But you support the P.L.O.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is not correct, and the honourable member knows it. It is more of the lies that the honourable member likes to go on with. I have said and say again that, regardless of the country, whether it is communist, socialist, capitalist or otherwise, wherever there is a development of nuclear power I oppose it. I am not one that in any way differentiates between them, and the member for Eyre should be ashamed of himself for suggesting it. So that there can be no doubt of what I said in my speech last evening I seek leave to table it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept the honourable member's request to table it, and I do not think there is any reason for it to be laid on.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Thank you for your co-operation, Mr. Speaker. My speech is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I take particular pleasure in addressing you this evening.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have stated that I do not want the Attorney-General to lay the speech on the table. Does he intend to read it?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, seeing that I have no alternative.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: My speech continues:

I feel not at all abashed that I do so as a complete non-scientist. Indeed, Lord Snow may have had me in mind when he formulated his well-known views about the "Two Cultures". Of course, it may well be an exaggeration on my part to claim mastery of the non-scientific culture, but I am certainly no master in any scientific field. However, I assume it to be a basic proposition for your association that "relevant technical expertise", in inverted commas, should not be a prerequisite demanded of those who comment on and about scientific matters.

In my own field of law, there is a constant battle between those who place great—and, in my opinion, undue—emphasis on technical expertise, seeking to exalt the skilled practitioner as the repository of all legal wisdom, and those who see law-making and law reform as only possible where the needs and demands of ordinary people are actively taken into account. I class myself firmly in the second category—among those who recognise the need for social responsibility and social accountability in law. This kind of dichotomy is not merely verbal or intellectual—it is political. Those who adopt the mandarin approach, who seek to exalt technical expertise over social accountability, commonly attempt to claim for themselves an objectivity and intellectual purity which is in truth illusory.

For a highly paid Law Reform Commission to devote itself to tinkering with reforming trivial legal technicalities when a whole State legal system is riddled with major injustices would be in itself a political act, just as it is a political act for those responsible for the allocation of research funds in the sciences in the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. to spend vast sums on developing and refining vicious machines for mass destruction, but little or nothing on research in areas of major social importance such as solar energy.

Let me state clearly my belief that the mandarin myth of intellectual neutrality is one of the most pernicious influences in Australian, and indeed Western, cultural life. The term "objectivity" is grossly abused by lawyers, university academics, politicians and scientists by extending its primary meanings quite improperly. For example, all of us would like a judge to be "objective" if we were involved in a dispute with our neighbour. If we were to discover (after losing the case) that the judge was our neighbour's best friend, we would be unhappy, and justly so.

Most judges are "objective" in the sense that they would disqualify themselves from sitting on a case if such a situation arose. But they are not apolitical. They swear to uphold peace, order and good government for Her Majesty the Queen. They cannot dismiss a case because an accused person has committed a crime out of conscience. In this broader sense they are clearly political and, in a time of dissent and protest, this politicality (usually hidden) may become quite visible. So it is with scientists. The scientist who works, for no reward, as an environmentalist with Friends of the Earth is clearly taking a political position.

So it is with the Government scientist who works at a Government weapons research establishment. He may not be a member of a political Party, and he may protest that he is not concerned with politics, but in the broader sense he obviously is. His efforts contribute to a certain end which has to do with the distribution of power in society, and with relations between people.

In this wider sense, of course, almost all human activities are political. We are born, grow up and develop in groups, join religions, work for ourselves or others, either co-operatively or competitively, and contribute to the ebb and flow of history. But who are the experts in regard to uranium? Certainly not metallurgists alone, for their limited field of expertise relates to the behaviour of metals, so I understand.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Rulings have been given in this place that speeches are not to be read in the way the Attorney-General is reading now. I do not believe that the Attorney-General, by reading the speech, is debating the matter before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: It has been the practice of the House at all times that members may read from copious notes during a speech. I do not think that members have read speeches. I remind the Attorney-General that he cannot table his speech. I believe that he has read a part of it and, if he will use copious notes in between, I will allow him to continue.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a misunderstanding. I am not reading the speech that I intend to make concerning the motion. This is the one that I gave last evening which by your ruling you refused me permission to insert in *Hansard*. The only alternative I have is to read it, although I believe that Standing Orders would allow it to be inserted in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: It is not unusual for members to read from documents in this House; that has been done several times. However, I hope the Attorney-General will be as brief as he can be.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I seek leave to insert the remainder of my speech in *Hansard*.

Mr. Tonkin: You can't do it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: You can do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide that. The Attorney is out of order. In this case Standing Orders will not allow it to be inserted. I said that the Attorney could read it, but I hope that he will be as brief as he can be.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I went on to say:

I believe that the Fraser Government is probably acting illegally in giving approval to the development of the Ranger project, and it is important that the sensitive and concerned people who constitute the anti-uranium movement should use all means at their disposal, including court challenges, to stop the Government from acting illegally and to bring the facts concerning uranium mining to the public's attention.

I want to emphasise very clearly that the anti-uranium movement is non-violent. Indeed, it is precisely because we are non-violent that we are against uranium mining and export, leading as it inevitably does to an increased risk of nuclear war. The Australian Labor Party does not want fighting in the streets over this issue. Friends of the Earth, the movement against uranium mining, and other anti-uranium groups all want to express their views peacefully. They do not want riots, tear gas, or street violence. The anti-uranium movement has made this clear time and time again, and I repeat it here tonight.

It is only the ruthless right that believes it can score political points out of divisions within the community over the uranium issue. In the lead up to the Queensland election which was held on Saturday, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen banned street demonstrations in order deliberately to provoke what he no doubt hoped would be violent clashes between police and anti-uranium demonstrators.

But the voters saw through this ploy, and there was a considerable swing against Mr. Bjelke-Petersen. He only stays in power by virtue of an outrageous gerrymander of the Electoral Act in his favour. I hope that the right-wing proponents of "Law and Order" will have learned a lesson from the election in Queensland, but I doubt it. There are vast sums of foreign money behind uranium mining companies operating in Australia, and the people involved have shown little evidence so far of being hampered in their activities by scruples of conscience.

It is no coincidence that the most extreme right-wing politician in Australia, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, is heavily

involved financially with mining companies. The tactics he has employed in dealing with the issue of the right to demonstrate are typical of the tactics of those who are behind uranium mining in Australia. They are prepared to threaten the genetic inheritance of mankind, they are prepared to increase the risk of nuclear war, they are prepared to destroy Arnhem Land as the last remaining centre of Aboriginal civilization, all in the name of power and profits.

I think it timely to issue a warning to all of the people in the anti-uranium movement to be aware of the possibility of a "dirty tricks" campaign in the weeks leading up to the Federal election. In demonstrations, genuine protestors must watch out for the stranger who starts throwing stones at the police, or deliberately attacks passing pedestrians. He may well be an agent of the mining companies causing provocation in order to bring discredit upon protesters and the anti-uranium movement generally. So I say, be warned. The leaders of the anti-uranium movement must constantly reiterate their peaceful intentions and their conscientious concern not to permit violence or injury to others. It would be tragic if the extreme radical right-wingers were to manipulate events so as to bring discredit upon the mass of truly peaceful souls who only wish to stop uranium mining and avert the threat of nuclear war.

In conclusion, I should say again how pleased I am to be speaking to an organisation which espouses social responsibility in science.

Further, I want to deal with the *News* editorial of this afternoon because, Sir, in that instance the *News* came out with this extraordinary statement:

First he tells an audience of scientists in Canberra that he is worried that a nuclear power industry will somehow turn us—

again, that is limiting the comment to Australia, but I emphasise that my concern is with the whole of the human race and the whole of the world and not simply with the Australian context—

into a Fascist State filled with police spies. Then he publicly supports action to prevent uranium producers putting their case before the public.

Now, Sir, I am not saying that at all. The uranium producers are welcome to put their case before the public if they put it without any misleading statements.

One of the two advertisements to which I was referring when I spoke of misleading statements that they have made in the past was headed "Uranium: the management of waste", and it contained a statement headed "Conclusions" which stated:

Technology for the management of radio-active wastes is already available. It now remains for the nuclear industry to gain public acceptance by demonstrating ultimate disposal methods and their safety.

That statement is, at the present time (I am informed by scientific people), demonstrably not true. The second advertisement was headed "In a Morgan Gallup poll conducted in July and August 1977, Australians were asked to say how they felt about the mining and export of Australia's uranium." In that advertisement the following question was asked: "Do you think Australia should or should not develop and export uranium for peaceful purposes?" That advertisement was headed "Two to one in favour of mining and exporting uranium." That again shows a misleading use of the information they sought to produce to the public.

I believe that I, as Attorney-General, am given responsibility for this matter under the Trade Practices Act, and it is my responsibility to ensure that any advertisements placed in South Australia are not in contravention of the Trade Practices Act. As the Premier has said, this matter has already been subject to legal

action under the Trade Practices Act in New South Wales. I make the point that the advertisements have been withdrawn not because of any direction of the court, not because of any instruction, but because (and the Leader alluded to this fact) the Chairman of the Uranium Producers Forum, Mr. Mackay, has already made the statement they are going to change their advertisements. If that is not an admission of the fact that there is, at the very least, some doubt about the validity of the advertisements they have placed in the newspapers, I do not know what is. Quite clearly, if they have decided to change their advertisements that is an admission that there is, at the very least, some doubt about their content. That is very clearly expressed in the statement that Mackay has made.

The second matter of great substance of which great play has been made this afternoon is the question of civil liberties. One matter which has not been referred to here but which I intend to talk about in some detail is that the question of the denial and removal of civil liberties in Australia in the context of the uranium and uranium mining business has already proceeded. My comments last night were referring not to Australians specifically but to the world, although we can already see the way civil liberties are being reduced in this country. To do that one simply has to refer to two pieces of Federal Government legislation: The Approved Defence Projects Protection Act, 1947-1973, and the Atomic Energy Act, 1953-1973. In the Approved Defence Projects Protection Act, section 4 (1) (a) (iii) provides:

Any person who without reasonable cause or excuse . . . by speech or writing advocates or encourages the prevention, hindrance, obstruction of the carrying out of an approved defence project shall be guilty of an offence . . .

It then gives the penalties further down. In the notes to that Act it is stated quite clearly, as to the application of the Approved Defence Projects Protection Act, regarding works carried out by or on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission, one should see the Atomic Energy Commission Act, 1953-1973. When one looks at the Atomic Energy Commission Act one sees that it quite clearly provides the power under which the Ranger project is to proceed.

Accordingly, we have the extraordinary situation where, pursuant to Federal legislation, it is now an offence for any person by speech or writing to advocate or encourage the prevention, hindrance or obstruction of the carrying out of an approved defence project under this Act. The Ranger project, for example, qualifies as being under the Act.

That seems to me to be an extraordinary situation. It means that if a person stands up publicly in South Australia and opposes the building of the Ranger project that is an offence under the Approved Defence Projects Protection Act. That is a terrible situation, and it indicates the sort of slide we can expect in the future if uranium mining and exportation goes ahead as is now proposed, and particularly, if internationally, the whole question of the development of nuclear power is not decided in the negative—that we should not go ahead with it.

It seems to me that if we do not slow down and stop the development of nuclear power we will be in a situation whereby terrorists will inevitably get hold of plutonium or other enriched uranium, and the effect will be that Governments throughout the world will be forced more and more to introduce tyrannical legislation to try to control the activities of terrorist groups. The impact of that on freedom and civil liberties will be horrific. It was these sorts of consideration to which I was referring last night, and anyone who reads that speech can see quite clearly

that I was referring to the international situation. I gave international examples to back up what I said.

The most interesting aspect of this afternoon's debate has undoubtedly been the way the Opposition has carefully sought to avoid any reference to the mining and export of uranium. It seems to me that the reason for that is that we have a coalition of frightened people (the Opposition, its friends in the newspapers and the unnamed critic to whom the Leader referred and who I presume was the uptown heavy who rang him and told him what to do this afternoon). There is no doubt my comments of last night have been seen as a grave threat to capitalist interests, not only in this State but throughout Australia, because there is no doubt in my mind that the concerted attack by the newspaper editorials, in concert with what we have seen today, is directly related to their fears that the undoubted development of opposition to nuclear power and to the mining and export of uranium in Australia will be a very great hindrance in future to those who seek to make profits from the mining and export of uranium. There is no doubt in my mind that that is the motive behind the Opposition's attack this afternoon. This attack fits in poorly with its attitude, as expressed on March 30, 1977, that it prefers to forget. However, as members will recall, the following motion was unanimously supported by the Opposition:

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and, unless and until it is so demonstrated, no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

That was the Opposition's attitude then and, of course, we have not had the opportunity to have the Opposition express its attitude since, but it will be interesting in the future to see how its attitude has changed. I have no doubt that, as soon as the Opposition's masters in Canberra gave the directive that the Liberal Party's policy was to be hell for leather, all bent on the mining and export of uranium, the weak-willed members opposite caved in and agreed to that policy. It will be interesting to see whether the Opposition is prepared to stand by the policy it supported in this House on March 30.

The uranium debate can be fairly simplified to the extent that it is really a question to people who are concerned, who are humanitarians, and who are worried about the implications of the mining and export of uranium and the development of nuclear power, and those who say, "To hell with the dangers; let's not worry about that. There's a fast buck to be made out of it. Let's rip it out as quickly as we can." The Liberal Party has traditionally supported such an approach, and it is not surprising to find it supporting such an approach on this occasion.

The only other aspect to which I will refer in any detail is the question of the position of Aborigines. The Ranger uranium mining is to take place on a site that has religious significance to Aborigines. As I said last evening, I have had discussions with many people (both Aborigines and others) who have indicated their grave concern at the fact that this mining is proposed to be undertaken on sacred sites. To Aborigines, the destruction of sacred sites in this way is not dissimilar to the circumstances that would exist in our Western culture if someone decided to bulldoze a church; such a parallel could be drawn. I think that, for the Deputy Leader to dismiss that matter out of hand by saying that the Aborigines will get a few beads or a few dollars, is about as bloody disgusting as I can imagine. That really sticks in my stomach to hear someone say that.

Mr. Evans: Is that Parliamentary?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I heard the honourable Attorney-General say "bloody disgusting". If so, I hope that he will withdraw it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I realise that bad language is more preferred in the Parliamentary bar than it is in the Chamber, and I will withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Attorney-General to withdraw.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, I do, Sir.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Since the remark referred to me specifically, may I also ask for an apology?

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear the honourable Leader's name or position mentioned.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: There is only one other matter with which I will deal. Today's *News*, in its usual fashion of gilding the lily (which is the kindest thing I can say), states:

In a speech in Canberra yesterday, Mr. Duncan foreshadowed legal challenges by the S.A. Government which could affect the mining and export of uranium.

Anyone who has read the speech knows that I did not say that. I know that the *News* must publish this kind of sensationalism, but it is a pity that it did not stick a little closer to the truth.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I will be brief at this stage, because the Attorney-General, having filled in his time very effectively by mumbling his way through his speech, did not pay much attention to the points that had been raised. I intend, because there will be an opportunity for me to speak in the Address in Reply debate later today, to inform him about several matters on which he has asked for the Opposition's point of view.

The Attorney-General is obviously prepared to take legal action to protect religious beliefs, while, at the same time, he is prepared to take legal action, by virtue of his position, to stifle the presentation of any point of view opposed to his own. Yet he advocates freedom of information and support for civil liberties. Clearly, this is an abuse of his position as Attorney-General, and I believe that he should no longer enjoy the confidence of this House or of the people of South Australia.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan (teller), Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from November 3. Page 699.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): At the close of the last week of sitting, I was discussing Munno Para and the colossal expenditure that might be incurred in that area at the expense of the development of the inner urban areas. We simply cannot afford to have empty houses, schools half full, shopping centres in declining areas of falling population, and roads choked with traffic. That is what this Government's policy on Munno Para and its

development, as it is projecting that proposal, will produce. We are suffering a massive waste of our resources because of the Government's failure to plan properly for Adelaide, and its increasingly costly obsession with Monarto, because that expenditure has not yet finished. Now we are possibly faced with the position where expenditure will be incurred in Munno Para. We cannot afford that waste. The Minister must consider that matter carefully because he would earn himself much credit in the community and in this Parliament if he were to be frank and say that the Government had made a mistake in this matter and that he intended to rectify it.

During the recent election campaign I outlined Liberal Party planning policy, and was well reported in the press. That policy articulated a vision of an Adelaide where all suburbs could operate as living, multi-generational communities, where older suburbs were continually renewed through the influx of inner suburb house seekers, and where new suburbs were so designed as to minimise the undesirable effects of the urban sprawl. The policy outlined a future Adelaide that would be well placed to cope with the changes in the patterns of energy use that will be forced on us in the next 10 to 15 years. Capital resources for living should not be wasted as they are now, but should be used far more effectively and efficiently. As I outlined during the election campaign, we have a vision of Adelaide, we know what it should be and we know how to make it a reality. I would commend that policy to Government members.

I now wish to refer to one or two matters that have arisen as a result of a newspaper report that appeared this morning. Comments on that report have suggested that the Opposition has not in any way changed its stance on uranium mining since the House passed a motion on March 30 this year stating that some concern was expressed that it was not yet safe to provide uranium to a customer country. Government members who believe that that is so have no justification or basis for making that assumption. As members would know, that motion was amended by the Opposition to include "research into alternative energy resources". That amendment was accepted by the Government. The Government's use of that motion since indicates clearly, first, that it has been deliberately doing so for political reasons and that the motion was moved in the House for political, not humanitarian reasons; and secondly, that the Government is clearly behind the times because it has failed to account for the policy statements that were enunciated clearly by the Opposition during the election campaign.

The position was made quite clear in our policy speech and in the statement on uranium. All I can say is that the Government is way behind the times if it still believes that the Opposition supports that politically-motivated motion that was passed in this House on March 30. On March 30, I made the following statement (*Hansard*, page 3038):

If it does that, it favours proper safeguards so that mining can proceed when those proper safeguards are established. As I read the motion, that is one way that it can be interpreted and, as such, is very much a tacit endorsement of the Federal Government's policy as recently stated by Mr. Anthony, who gave qualified support for uranium mining, the qualification being that there are legitimate concerns regarding safety which need to be answered and that a decision should not be made without proper consideration by the Government after discussion by the public of the second Ranger report.

For the last time I would remind the Government (because I am sick and tired of doing so) that that motion was supported by the Opposition before the second Ranger report had been issued and before adequate safeguards

had been brought down. That, I hope, will be an end to the matter.

I wish now to discuss briefly what is known as the "police secret dossier affair", and I will discuss it only to the extent of saying that we have a fine Police Force in this State. The South Australian Police Force has the motto "Salus populi suprema lex", which literally means "The safety of the people is the highest law". The aims laid down by Sir Robert Peel when he started the Metropolitan Police Force are aims that have been adopted by virtually every police force in the world, certainly in the western world. The aims are five and are the preservation of life, protection of property, prevention of crime, detection of criminals, and maintenance of law and order. That priority is set deliberately.

The secret dossiers have been raised in the press and by way of question in this House. I welcome the statement that Mr. Acting Justice Michael White will inquire into all matters pertaining to those documents. Mr. Justice Hope, when inquiring into the affairs of ASIO, held that civil liberties must be balanced against the need to protect the community. That is a matter that must still concern this community. I am pleased that that investigation is being made.

The member for Mitcham must have known that a special branch of the Police Force existed. After all, he has been the Attorney-General of this State. The special branch has existed since 1939, and he was Attorney-General for, I think, at least two years. He must have known about the special branch and about the records. As such, I find his comments, as quoted, quite remarkable and I cannot reconcile them in any way with the holding of his former position as Attorney-General.

Finally I wish to refer briefly to the forthcoming Federal election. Deep issues are to be considered which vitally affect a State such as South Australia, which is currently in the hands of the Labor Party. It is appropriate to remind this House and the community generally of those issues. I do not think there is any doubt at all that Australians generally will not forget the three dark years of Labor and the massive and record budgetary deficit which was run up by the irresponsible and profligate spending of the Whitlam era. We must not forget how the State Labor Government, working in sinister collusion with its Federal Labor colleague, virtually handed the financial control of this State (and therefore the reins of Government) over to the centralist Federal Labor Government. This was done through the use of the tied grants system under section 96 of the Constitution. More and more State projects were decided on and priorities set in Canberra and not in Adelaide. Even now, the present Government of this State by its actions has made it abundantly clear that it cannot wait for those days to come again so that the Labor Party as a whole can continue with its grand plan of taking over the States and ultimately creating a bureaucratic monster with control centred in Canberra. We, as South Australians, have seen more of these devious manoeuvres than probably any other Australians and we have a clear duty to recall to their minds these circumstances.

I will not go into the way in which the Premier destroyed the wage-price freeze, the way in which Mr. Hayden and Mr. Whitlam, together with the Premier, tried to destroy the economic confidence of this country. I believe that it is a credit to the Fraser Government that these people have not been successful in their efforts to wreck the economy. If we want South Australia to retain its identity, we must do everything we can to ensure there can be no return to the dark days of the Whitlam era. There are many good reasons for supporting the Federal Government but if there were none other, I would support it for its positive

and determined recognition of the rights and responsibilities of the Australian States, and for its commitment to maintaining the Federal system. That it should be a Liberal Government that takes that stand is not surprising; that it is a stand that will be supported by the great majority of Australians, in whatever State they may live, will be a matter of record on December 10.

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is appropriate at the outset that I pay a tribute to the fine way in which the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Crocker, performed his functions following the illness and ultimate retirement of Sir Douglas Nicholls. His Excellency the Governor, Mr. Seaman, because of his wide community experience, will undoubtedly bring credit to the office of Governor. I congratulate other new members from both sides of the House on their election to Parliament. I am conscious of the honour of being the first member for the District of Morphett.

The district was named after Sir John Morphett who was born in 1809 and died in 1892. He arrived in South Australia in September, 1836. He held many official and non-official positions in the province, including that of the Speaker in the enlarged Legislative Council in 1851. He was President of the elected Legislative Council from 1865 to 1873. The District of Morphett was thus named after a distinguished local citizen.

I want to thank my campaign workers for their untiring efforts during the campaign, and I thank those voters in the district who supported and put their trust in me. The result in Morphett was close, the closest in the State. The result was not known until just over a full week after the date of the election. The final margin after the distribution of preferences was 112 votes. I also want to pay a tribute to my two opponents in that campaign. The Australian Democrats candidate came into the picture late in the campaign but nevertheless she polled extremely well. My Liberal Party opponent worked hard in the area; it was reported in the local press that he boasted that he distributed 100 000 pamphlets throughout the district during the campaign. Even apart from the effect of this in polluting the district, I would not make that boast. I do not think we circulated more than one-third of that number. Nevertheless, my Liberal Party opponent worked hard in the area. In fact, the Liberal Party as a whole worked hard. So hard did its members work that on one Saturday afternoon during the campaign, undoubtedly knowing I would not be at home, they called on my wife and asked her to vote against me. Unlike members opposite, I do not know how my wife votes. I do not dictate to her; she is an individual and can make up her own mind.

It is now becoming increasingly difficult to recall that only 12 years ago South Australia was known as the hillbilly State of Australia. Queensland has that distinction today. Up to 1965, South Australia had had 32 consecutive years of conservative Government. In 1977, we are recognised widely as being the most progressive and enlightened State in Australia. The Labor Party has governed for all but two of the last 12 years, between 1968 and 1970, when Steele Hall led his minority Government into office. During the years that the Labor Party has been in office in South Australia since 1965, we have seen in our State an unparalleled era of social progress and reform. I want to congratulate the Labor Party on its fine record in office in South Australia.

Until the Labor Government came to office physical education (which is one of the areas I wish to raise in this debate) was a neglected area. The situation about 1970 was characterised by a dearth of experienced senior people in physical education, schools with rather limited

playground facilities, an almost total absence of appropriate indoor facilities, severely limited centralised advisory services, a relatively slow growth in the number of swimming pools available to schools and little enthusiasm to cater for recreation and leisure needs of children. During the past seven years we have reached a much more impressive set of circumstances. Much of this has been brought about by Education Department funding and also as a result of Federal Government allocations. The RED scheme was instrumental in providing funds for development, especially in the playground area.

In 1970-71, there were only five secondary physical education senior masters in South Australian schools, and in 1976-77 there are 70 such teachers. In 1970-71, there were 266 secondary physical education teachers, and in 1976-77 there are 450 such teachers. In 1970-71, there were no primary physical education specialist teachers, and in 1976-77 there are 20. The past seven years in particular have been characterised by significant improvements in the quantity and quality of programmes offered to children in our schools.

School building facilities in particular, such as, gymnasiums, playgrounds, and swimming pools, have all multiplied in the past seven years and probably equally as important is the fact that vacation swimming, aquatic and recreation programmes have also been introduced and increased. One of the reasons for the upsurge in physical education activity in our community and in our schools over the past seven years has been the influence of the Physical Education Branch of the Education Department, especially in the past four or five years. The Physical Education Branch has been able to control the development of its special services, such as swimming recreation and camping, so that the experiences the children receive are of the highest possible quality.

Schools, as a consequence of the influence of the Physical Education Branch and the specialist attention, have become recipients of regular professional publications and resource material as a result of a generous budget allocation to the branch. They have been able to maintain regular swimming instruction from increasingly better-trained instructors and to provide recreational opportunities for the children during term time. They have been assisted in the development of after-school programmes by the appointment of salaried recreation officers.

In the Morphett District, recreation centres are operating at Camden Primary School, Morphettville Park Primary School, Glenelg Primary School, and Glenelg Junior Primary School. At present, in the Morphett District no school pools are available for schoolchildren or for the community. The closest is the Marion swimming pool, which is outside the district at Parkholme. The Camden Primary School Council wants to locate a swimming pool in its grounds. Through the efforts of the council and the parents and friends organisation, the council has been able to raise \$5 000 towards the cost of a pool. The cost of an unheated pool is estimated to be about \$30 000. The school council is looking for grants from local government, from the State Government, and from the Federal Government. I understand the council is able to contribute another \$5 000 to assist in the funding of the project, and I commend the school council and the parents and friends organisation on the manner in which this money has been raised, through raffles, fetes, cabarets, and other fund-raising activities. It speaks well for the community that the parents and friends can raise such a sum of money. The cost of \$30 000 covers an unheated pool, but I would prefer to see a heated pool in the area because I believe it would attract much wider

community use. I will be assisting the school and the council in their endeavours to see that the project goes ahead.

Another development in the Morphett District is the proposed indoor sporting complex at Rosedale Avenue, Morphettville. It is a tribute to the foresight of the Marion council. Its establishment will provide a tremendous boost for sport and recreation in the district; it will be the first major indoor gymnasium in the area. The centre is being funded by \$250 000 from the council and \$130 000 from the State Government, in approximate figures. This is an example of the role that can be played by local government in the community in the area of sport and recreation.

Several years ago, the Marion council appointed a recreation officer. No doubt the far-sighted appointments of such officers have led to the uncovering of the need for indoor facilities. The recreation officer of the Marion council has undoubtedly assisted in uncovering this need in the district. The Glenelg and West Torrens councils, the other councils located in the Morphett District, have shown a great awareness of the need for a co-ordination of resources to provide the maximum benefits to their respective areas.

Outside of the district, I understand the Kingswood oval, in the Mitcham council area, provides an excellent example of co-ordination of resources. The building of the new clubrooms and the social facilities on the top floor of the clubrooms has led to a greater community awareness. I am informed that people in the community are coming out to play tennis, softball, and hockey, and to make use of the facilities. Developments such as the swimming pool enterprise of the Camden Primary School Council and the Rosedale Avenue gymnasium enable far greater community awareness of and use of facilities.

Local councils have a role to play in health education. Local government participation in health education has never been extensive, and that situation is true for all States. At present, local government tends to concentrate on treating sickness, and not on preventive medicine. At present, State Health Departments and Federal departments are the only bodies with the financial capability of implementing State-wide health education programmes in the fields of mental health, nutrition, hydatid disease control, cancer, smoking, and drug education, and migrant health education, as well as conducting health research and surveys.

In the past five years, State Health Departments have received Australian Government grants to extend community health services but, because of the magnitude of the task facing central authorities, they cannot accurately identify and solve local problems. In this area local government has an important role to play, since many important aspects of health can be dealt with most effectively at the level of the local community. Councils are in the best position to identify the needs of their communities and to decide the priorities, because they are closer to the community than are central authorities.

I shall mention some of the ways in which local government can become more active in local health. Food hygiene is an obvious example. Millions of meals, snacks, and sandwiches are purchased daily from hotels, coffee houses, sandwich bars, and take-away food places. Most of the present inspection centres around the purity of public food supplies. A much more important facet of food hygiene is in the handling of the food, and it is in this area that basic education of food handlers is wanted. An excellent example of this is what happened at Alice Springs; the recent food poisoning of Prince Charles and others who attended a function there is a case in point.

Such situations might not occur if food handlers were properly trained, and this is an area in which local councils can become increasingly involved.

In local areas, snack bars and delicatessens have a high turnover of staff because of the casual nature of the employment. That is not an incentive for management to train people adequately in hygienic food handling. In a small family business the problem is accentuated because of the widespread use of relatives and friends. Local councils could provide food handling courses for the management of the food industry. The situation is not limited to small snack bars or sandwich bars, but extends to hotels, restaurants, and coffee houses, which have a high turnover of staff involved in food handling. Probably the episode involving Prince Charles and his party could have been due to a lack of proper technique in food handling. That is one of the areas in which local government could extend its activities.

Hygiene lectures could be given. That may be an alternative to legal action in the case of minor infringements, just as in the case of minor infringements under the Road Traffic Act people are notified that they should attend a lecture on road safety. In the case of minor infringements in hygiene matters, people could be given similar notice that they are required to attend a lecture conducted by the local council.

Some councils, especially the Marion council, have appointed a recreation officer who is a qualified physical education teacher. Part of the course involves nutrition and hygiene. A recreation officer, if properly qualified, could handle the preliminary venture into hygiene lectures on behalf of local councils, but ultimate specialisation is likely to be required.

Local councils can become involved in promoting community health through the control of hydatids and the blue tongue disease recently reported as plaguing Australian sheep and cattle. The hydatid disease control could result in far greater involvement for country health inspectors attached to local councils.

Hydatid disease is widespread in sheep and cattle, and it causes a considerable economic loss to graziers in the meat industry. Surveys published in 1972 in New South Wales showed that 20 to 25 per cent of farm dogs were carrying the disease and 60 per cent of full mouth sheep in New South Wales had cysts. Up to 60 cases occurred in humans, with a mortality rate of 20 per cent. Country councils can operate through local communities, veterinarians, graziers, doctors, and rural associations to control this disease and play a greater role. I think that the blue tongue disease is threatening Australian exports and \$70 000 000-worth of livestock. Although it does not affect humans, it kills sheep and is carried by cattle. Some cattle were infected by it at Darwin, and have found their way through the Northern Territory.

Primarily, local councils are involved in treating illness or sickness and giving injections. They are already involved in the immunisation programme, and this campaign should continue and have a high priority, although most councils have already given it a high priority. Councils could become involved to a greater extent in preventing home accidents. They could participate, for example, in assisting to prevent accidents in swimming pools. I know that there is adequate legislation covering swimming pools at present but, nevertheless, the community still has to be educated. Also, many accidents are caused in homes because of poor storage of poisonous substances and inadequate child-proof poison cabinets.

Local councils could use their health officer or recreation officer as a co-ordinator, because I believe they

have an important role to play in ensuring that community health is satisfactory. They have an intimate knowledge of the local area, groups, and agencies, and can assist senior citizens. The recreation or health officer attached to the council could assist in providing food care for aged persons, and also eye care, and could give lectures to senior citizen groups in the council municipalities.

Migrant health education is a similar area in which councils could become more involved. Even the local baby health centre could be the hub of a migrant health programme, and councils could also be involved in health programmes in schools by giving lectures on personal cleanliness, hygiene, and dental health. Health education is one of the main weapons of preventive medicine.

Local councils have a new innovative role to play, and probably some councils have carried out these suggestions, and I commend them for it. I hope that some of my remarks will find their way into council chambers and may provide a basis for debate on future activities of councils. I believe that the Australian Government should play a more active part and take a more positive attitude in fostering community health other than by using a media campaign. Many Australians over 25 are notoriously unfit, obese, and lack exercise. Because of employment many people cannot participate in sport, but they would make use of health studio facilities if they were available. The present cost of visiting a *bona fide* health studio several times a week would be about \$7 to \$10, which is a sum that the average family man cannot afford.

In addition to not playing sport at weekends because of his employment, he cannot visit a health studio because the family budget cannot afford it. The Federal Government should allow subscriptions and payments, to a certain level, to *bona fide* health studios as a tax deduction. This action would encourage people to improve their fitness without it being a financial burden. It would create a greater community awareness of the need to be physically fit, and would probably lead to the growth of a complete new industry.

Again, councils have an important role to play in this area, because the Federal Government, by granting tax deductions for persons wishing to visit a *bona fide* health studio several times a week, would gain because of the increase in the purchase of sporting goods. I believe that the number of *bona fide* health studios would mushroom in various parts of the State and, in turn, they would employ people who would in turn pay taxation.

Figures for 1974-75 showed that about \$68 000 000 worth of sports goods were purchased by Australians, but only 60 per cent of the goods were supplied by Australian producers. I do not have the most recent figures, because, I think, they are not available, but it would not be unreasonable to assume that the percentage of sports goods supplied by Australian producers has declined further since then. The Federal Government profits from the 15 per cent sales tax on sporting goods, although Australian schools are exempt from that tax. Hand in hand with promoting sport and recreation in the community is control by the Australian Government of inferior sporting goods coming from overseas.

I am suggesting that the Australian Government, instead of going to the media and paying for an expensive campaign for people to get fit (and I fear this campaign may have political over-tones, because it will detract attention during an election period from some issues from which the Government wants to detract attention, such as unemployment), should use the money in other ways, because when the media campaign is finished that is the end of physical fitness in the community. The Federal Government could play a much more positive role by

granting a tax deduction for subscriptions or payments to health studios to a certain level, say, \$100 a year, and it would profit by the employment of more persons in the studios and also because more sporting goods and equipment would be sold in Australia. If one calculates 15 per cent sales tax on the \$68 000 000 worth of sporting goods sold in 1974-75 (although schools are exempt), one sees that the Federal Government makes a tidy sum out of sports goods and equipment.

The great mass of Australians (about 80 per cent) are completely vulnerable to the pressure of buying inferior quality sports goods. This is a problem that faces the family man and the individual today. Schools are in a satisfactory position, because they have a bulk-purchasing programme to buy good quality sports goods. However, clubs, associations, and individuals (including the family man) are vulnerable to the pressure of buying inferior quality sports goods. These goods are usually priced just below the price of good quality sports goods produced in Australia.

Inferior overseas sports goods are purchased because they are well presented in stores and are low priced, and amateur sporting clubs are vulnerable to the inferior nature of these goods. They do not have ready access to funds but rely on subscriptions from members, annual fees, and raffles to try to keep running costs and fees to a minimum, and the management committees tend to buy equipment at the lowest price. The family man shopping at a supermarket, such as K-Mart, Coles, Target, and Woolworths, sees an attractive tennis racquet. When he gets it home he finds, after a few hits, the top of the racquet busts.

The spirits of these clubs, individuals and families when they buy inferior sports goods, which come primarily from the Asian region, deflate to such an extent that they lose interest in sport and recreation. It is hard on a working man who pays \$22 or \$23 for a tennis racquet for his child to find that a couple of days later it is broken; that is the end of that child's sporting career until he gets to school, if he is not already at school. There are tennis racquets arriving in Australia, which can be purchased at any of the stores I mentioned, for about \$US3.54 that are selling at \$A22.50 in the retail stores. They are low-priced, inferior quality sports goods from overseas and the buying public is being ripped off. The buying public purchase these goods because they are lower priced than good quality Australian-produced sports goods, they look nice in the shop and they are cheaper. They purchase these goods, get home and find, with one particular make of tennis racquet, that the welds break in the crucial support joints, strings break and the frame snaps. It is deflating for a child to have this happen after his father has paid out such an amount of money. That is, unfortunately, what happens to many wage-earning families.

There is a cricket ball that comes from India. It is a lovely four-panel ball that retails for \$6.80, but lasts about two practice nights and then comes undone. This can be contrasted with an excellent standard cricket ball that is 33-panel leather, is of excellent workmanship, and retails at \$12. This is an Australian-produced cricket ball. One can see why the inferior quality cricket ball is purchased: it looks nice, the purchaser does not know it has only four panels, and it costs only \$6.80. If the purchaser shops about and sees another cricket ball for \$12 he buys the cheaper ball, so unfortunately the South Australian community is being ripped off by the retail stores making mammoth profits through the importation of inferior-quality sporting goods.

This is not limited only to sports goods. There is also inferior sports footwear. Again, one can go to the same

retail stores and see these shoes, which look almost identical to the superior-quality footwear made in Australia or the good-quality footwear from overseas. I am sure that the retail stores in Australia are buying inferior quality sports goods in bulk at cheap prices and making exorbitant profits at the expense of the Australian community. It is the wage-earner, the family man with several children who suffers because, again, his wife shops at the normal stores such as Target, Coles, K-Mart and Woolworths (and I will not leave any of them out) and they see this footwear made in Taiwan that looks nice and is well presented, but the quality is not there. It is lower priced, so the housewife buys this footwear, gets it home, and then finds that the straps break, it does not last and it deteriorates, so that is money down the drain.

Also, with the inferior quality overseas sports goods that are coming into Australia, there is an almost total lack of after-sales service. Australian producers have a guarantee of some type in respect of their sports equipment, but with this bulk buying of inferior quality sports goods from a number of Asian countries one does not get after-sales service. It is certainly true that many sports goods cannot be produced at the same cost in Australia as they can be produced overseas, because overseas factories are able to run with cheaper labour costs and lower raw material costs. Local producers also face the difficulty in Australia of low demand and poor export markets. Slazenger, for example, has located a factory in the Philippines to take advantage of cheaper labour and material costs, and that is the loss of an industry to Australia. The Australian Government should give far greater incentives to producers in Australia in the form of direct assistance, tariff protection, even preferential tariff protection—

Mr. Slater: Sales tax.

Mr. GROOM:—and a reduction in sales tax. I agree with the comments of the member for Gilles, who shows perception. The Australian Government could even give preferential tariff cuts in respect of goods coming in from overseas based upon the quality of those goods so that, if they are of inferior quality, the manufacturer would have to pay a much higher tariff if he wished to sell them in Australia. If the goods were of good quality, a lower tariff would be paid. This would be one way not only of protecting Australian industry but also of ensuring that the purchasing public in Australia is not ripped off.

The Australian Government could give direct assistance to producers to encourage local firms to produce and market, in Australia and elsewhere, sporting goods of high quality. I fear that the present Federal Liberal Government is not up to the task of providing adequate incentives, other than a media campaign which diverges from the real issues facing Australia today so far as unemployment is concerned. The South Australian Government, through the Education Department (in particular, its Physical Education Branch), has made tremendous advances in a few short years. Recent cuts in Federal Government funding for the Education Department may set back that programme, a programme that has been vigorously encouraged by the South Australian Government. The estimated percentage drop in revenue grants from the Schools Commission's funds this year is 3.1 per cent, in capital funds 6 per cent, and the average total percentage drop of Federal funding in real terms is about 4.1 per cent. That is hardly conducive to a good atmosphere to encourage not only the growth of education in the community but also the further growth of physical sport and recreation programmes. The Federal Government is profiting immensely from the sale of sporting goods in Australia, and greater percentage of this revenue ought to go back into the community.

Coupled with the drop in Federal funding for education grants is a problem that is relevant not only to physical education teachers but to teachers as a whole and the community as a whole. Teachers will be facing an unemployment problem next year. I think that the fault for that lies quite clearly with a Government that has produced a record number of unemployed since the depression. I think the figure projected for 1978 is well over 430 000 people.

Mr. Evans: Who projected that?

Mr. GROOM: Those are the reports I have seen of the predictions of unemployment. I do not see the Federal Government denying that in February, 1978, the number of unemployed will be over 400 000 people. The Federal Government has pursued a deliberate policy, since coming into Government, of creating unemployment. This will have long-term effects on the community that will be felt for many years to come.

In the Education Department teachers, for the first time in many years, are facing the prospects of unemployment. About 80 fourth-year physical education teachers will be graduating, and it is estimated that only half that number will be able to be placed in the Education Department or in the community. What is to happen to the other 40 physical education teachers who will not be able to find jobs?

Mr. Evans: Is that the case in all western countries of the world?

Mr. GROOM: I am speaking only of South Australia at present. If the member for Fisher wants to debate other countries of the world later, I have no doubt that I will join him in that debate. In South Australia, physical education teachers and teachers generally are facing a crisis situation, whereas at the same time the Federal Government is cutting funding to the Education Department. What a loss to the community these 40 physical education teachers will be if they are unable to find jobs. People will view the physical education course as being an unstable one, and physical education will be set back for many years. These 40 physical education teachers could be sent out into the community to work for local councils if the Federal Government played its proper role as the Government of this nation.

Mr. Evans: It's the State Government's Budget—

Mr. GROOM: If the Federal Government properly funded the State Education Department and took a more positive role in promoting sport and recreation in the community, these physical education teachers and teachers generally who are facing unemployment would not be lost to the community. Although the Federal Government has an important role to play, I am sad to say that it is not playing its part. It will indulge in an expensive media campaign and spend several million dollars advertising "Life, be in it" on radio and television throughout the nation and tell everyone to be fit, but it will still keep the money it gets from sales tax. I believe that the coming keep-fit campaign has been specifically timed as a ploy to detract from the major election issues. I believe that, if the Federal Government were serious about a keep-fit campaign in Australia, it would grant taxation deductions so that people with limited employment opportunities and family men could attend *bona fide* health studios.

Mr. Evans: Do you have to go to health studios to keep fit?

Mr. GROOM: There is a section of the population which, because of employment, is unable to participate in sport at weekends.

Mr. Evans: What about running around park lands?

Mr. GROOM: The honourable member may have his running tracks through the Hills, but I am referring to people who, because of their family budgets, find it difficult to go outside their own area. It is all very well for the honourable member to say that they could run around the block, but the whole neighbourhood may think they were a little odd, and who would want that?

Mr. Gunn: People might think they were streaking.

Mr. GROOM: Quite. What I am suggesting is taxation deductions for subscriptions and payments to *bona fide* health studios so that people such as the member for Eyre would have ample opportunity to get fit at low expense. I seriously envisage this becoming an important local industry and, if it were properly encouraged by the Federal Government, it would lead to greater participation by local councils in sport and recreation programmes, to a greater degree of physical fitness among people in the community, and to a far greater co-ordination of resources, thus providing a means of employing people and taking up the slack caused by the Federal Government's policies in education. It would lead to physical education teachers, now facing unemployment for the first time, being used in the community, thus preventing their talents from being wasted.

I doubt whether the Federal Government is interested in coping with the needs of the community for sport and recreation, because it is not a profit-making industry. The Federal Government makes a profit out of sales tax, but it does not see sport and recreation as a profit-making industry in the same way in which it sees the mining and export of uranium as profit making. Sport and recreation is an important industry to the community, and I believe that it deserves maximum encouragement from the Federal Government, in much the same way as it is getting maximum encouragement from the State Government through its physical education department. Some councils are co-ordinating their resources in the community; I cite the Marion council, with the development of the Rosedale Indoor Gymnasium Centre, which is an excellent example of the way in which local government and the Education Department can co-ordinate their resources.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I take this opportunity to indicate my support for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in so doing, extend my congratulations and best wishes to the Governor of South Australia on his appointment to that high office. I believe that His Excellency will do a commendable job in that position and I think that the State will benefit considerably from his wide experience in and knowledge of public arenas.

The member for Morphett has just dealt at some length with the shortcomings of the education system, particularly as applying in South Australia, and I will add to some of the comments he has made in this regard, because I believe that the South Australian Government has much to answer for as regards the failings that have occurred dramatically in the past few months in education. In particular, I will highlight the situation regarding further education and technical education in South Australia. The member for Morphett gave various figures covering Federal cut-backs in education, but they cannot be compared to the cut-backs that have taken place in South Australia as a result of this Government's actions. Looking at further education and technical education, we find that the Federal Government has provided an additional 22 per cent in funding for further and technical education in South Australia this year. As we all know, this area of education is normally funded on an 80-20 basis, the State Government providing 80 per cent and the Federal Government providing 20 per cent. In addition to the 22 per cent extra funding for technical and further

education, the Federal Government has also provided additional funding for apprentice and migrant education this year.

Although we have a marked increase in funding by the Federal Government in the area of further education, if we look around the State we see the enormous cut-backs that have occurred as a result of this Government's administrative action. In particular, I refer to the cut-backs that have occurred in some of the various areas of further education and use as an example the Riverland Community College, based at Renmark, and the effects they have had on that college. The member sitting opposite can laugh his head off, but I point out that many people in the community do not live in the metropolitan area, although he believes they do not count. I will refer to a letter, dated October 11, that I have received from a constituent who is also a teacher at the college, namely, a Mrs. Sheehan, who writes:

Up until two years ago I was a private teacher of pianoforte and theory of music. As a result of an approach by the Principal of the then Riverland Further Education Centre, I accepted an offer to transfer my whole business, comprising approximately 30 students, to the Department of Further Education, whereby their enrolment was accepted as students and I was employed as a part-time lecturer.

Mr. Klunder: Did she lose on the deal?

Mr. ARNOLD: No, the students lost on the deal. That is precisely what I am getting at. If the honourable member would wait a moment he would see just how they have lost. The letter continues:

Because of the facilities available I was then able to extend to a maximum of 36 students for individual practical tuition, a one-hour theory class for students from first to fourth grade theory of music and a small piano group conducted on an experimental basis for young students as a preliminary to the formal private lesson.

Students who have studied during this period have been prepared for examinations in practical from preliminary to eighth grade and from first to fourth grade theory of music examinations as well as a fifth grade musicianship student. Because of the increased resource material available; namely, library reference books, records, percussion instruments, teacher aids, together with workshops—master classes—conducted by the Flinders Street School of Music, these students gained a much broader appreciation of their subjects studied in preparation for the Australian Music Examinations Board exams.

I was advised last week by the Principal of the Riverland Community College that, due to a cut-back in funds commencing from next year, the theory of music class could continue, but that only seven hours per week for individual tuition was available for a full term (14 students).

As I am concerned for the musical education of the remaining 20 students who are learning at present, plus six from the small piano group, plus 15 on the waiting list, I am asking for consideration to be given to the following:

(1) That further funds to enable the musical education of those wishing to study the piano be granted to the Riverland Community College; or

(2) That arrangements be made so that the pupils at primary and secondary school level be taught through the Education Department. In both these areas I am part-time teaching—i.e., in Renmark Primary School as an assistant and used in classroom music and one hour per week in Renmark High School for piano tuition, as well as one hour per week teaching recorder at Renmark West Primary School.

I am not prepared to revert back to the role of the private music teacher as I feel that so much more can be offered these students by being taught through the recognised

educational system. By working in this way it also gives an opportunity for children of widowed pensioners to study this instrument. One such case is at present enrolled in both the individual piano and in the theory class.

Kindly give this matter the utmost consideration as I feel there is a great need for a service of this kind to be continued in this country area of Renmark which takes in students from Renmark, Berri and Paringa, and students from Barmera are amongst those on a waiting list.

What is behind this? What is the reason for it? What has happened to the funding? If the Federal Government has provided an additional 22 per cent for further and technical education, we have only to consider the Auditor-General's Report to ascertain what the Government has done with the funds made available and where those funds are continuing to go. For example, we have the Regency Park Community College where about \$21 000 000, plus staffing costs, has been allocated. Gilles Plains is another area where a massive input of funds has occurred. That might be well and good, but what about students who are already part way through their tuition? They are studying for examinations and are suddenly left in the lurch. One might as well go to any high school or primary school, cut out two-thirds of the students and say, "Funding is not available; you'll just have to fall by the wayside". That is precisely what has happened as far as further education is concerned. I do not believe it has happened in the metropolitan area, but it has certainly happened in country areas.

On November 2, the President of the Riverland Community College wrote to the Minister of Education and forwarded to me a copy of that letter, which set out how the college council sees the situation. The letter indicated to the Minister that a copy had been sent to me and also to the Director-General of Further Education. The letter was as follows:

Dear Dr. Hoggood,

At the last council meeting of this college the budget allocation for hourly paid instructors, 1977-78, was further discussed and a greatly reduced programme for term 1, 1978, ratified. We would respectfully register our strong protest at the completely inadequate allocation made to the college for this budget line. Despite the additional funds made available by the Government, our final allocation of \$81 000 is a 4.7 per cent reduction in money terms of the \$84 775 that was available for this line in 1976-77. Despite rationalisation of our activities, a minimum allocation of \$96 000 was necessary to continue our existing programme, without expansion.

The effects of these cuts on the college programme and hence the community it serves, is very disturbing. Two examples to illustrate this are:

1. General enrichment programme—

Term 3, 1977—Over 80 classes taken by hourly paid instructors.

Term 1, 1978—Only 21 classes can be continued, and these will not be able to start until mid-term.

That is a dramatic cutback. Most of the students concerned are young people in primary and secondary schools. It would be bad enough if they were adult students trying to further their education, but these young people are being dropped. The letter continues:

2. Individual and small group music tuition (piano/strings /brass)—

Term 3, 1977—113 individual students, many of whom are music examination candidates.

Term 1, 1978—35 individual students. Many of these students are of school age, but there is no existing structure for them to obtain this individual tuition, particularly in piano.

The effect of the cut in funds for hourly paid instructors is further aggravated by the fact that we are serving a rural community, in that—

(a) Educational opportunities from other organisations that are available in the city are not available to country people.

This is the point I tried to make earlier that the Further Education Department has absorbed into itself virtually the total teaching in those areas. When it comes to an area such as this there is no-one else in the community to whom the students can go to receive tuition. The letter continues:

(b) Country colleges in general have very small full-time staffs (as compared to the city colleges) and so are heavily reliant on hourly paid staff for their very existence, and hence the educational service they provide.

The full-time permanent staff at the Riverland Community College is small. The college is staffed largely by hourly paid tutors. The letter continues:

We feel that it is our duty as a further education council to bring to your attention the adverse effects the budget allocation for hourly paid instructors, 1977-78, will have on the educational opportunities of the community we serve.

As far as I know no adjustment or reconsideration by the Minister or the Government has occurred in relation to this problem which, as far as country people are concerned, is a severe problem.

The two letters I have referred to are supported by numerous letters from individual parents of the students who have been dropped, right in the middle of their studies, from the 1978 classes. I only hope that some of the members opposite who have expounded at length on the subject of the education of South Australian students will highlight this position to the Minister.

Mr. Klunder: You have only talked about stream six courses, haven't you, or don't you know what stream six courses are?

Mr. ARNOLD: The honourable member knows the group I have been talking about. Does he believe they can just be dropped off, because they are a sectional group of students? A student who has natural ability in music should be given every opportunity to fulfil his potential in the same way as a student with academic ability is able to do. To me music is a profession, and it should be put on exactly the same plane as any other subject within the education system. To deny the students, who are now part of the way through their courses, the right to continue is an absurd situation. How any Government or Minister can justify the action that has been taken is beyond the majority of the people in this State.

A matter which is of major importance to South Australia and which has unfortunately not received much funding in past years is the problem of our water resource. Recently, the Minister of Works announced that he had attended the joint meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers regarding the problem of salinity build-up in the Murray River. This problem has been well known to a certain section of the people of South Australia but unfortunately it has not become a major issue to the majority of people in the State. I am interested in the press release issued from Canberra which was headed "Salinity and drainage problems of the Murray Valley: Commonwealth and State Ministerial meeting" and which stated:

A co-ordinated four Government approach would be adopted to help solve salinity and drainage problems in the Murray Valley on an overall catchment basis. As a matter of urgency, a report would be brought down within six months to outline action to be taken to remedy and mitigate the problems. The decision was made today at a meeting in Canberra of Commonwealth and State Ministers.

The four Ministers were the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for National Resources, Mr. J. D. Anthony; the New South Wales Minister for Conservation and Water Resources, Mr. A. R. L. Gordon; the Victorian Minister for Water Supply, Mr. F. J. Granter; and the South Australian Minister of Works, Mr. J. D. Corcoran. The President of the River Murray Commission, Mr. T. A. O'Brien, also attended the meeting. Mr. Anthony said that he was delighted that the four Governments have for the first time agreed to tackle Murray River basin problems at their source in a concerted effort. He said that the Ministers appointed a steering committee of senior Commonwealth and State officers to engage and direct consultants in the development of a plan of action. The cost of the consultancy would be shared by the four Governments and the study would be directed to a review of previous reports and updating them. The consultants would recommend priorities for the implementation of remedial works on an overall national basis.

Options to be developed by the consultants for handling these problems would have due regard to economic, social and environmental aspects and the linkage of remedial works to Murray River water quality. The impact of the action plan agreed to by the Ministers would complement measures which the River Murray Commission is now authorised to take on River Murray water quality within its area of responsibility. "This is indeed a momentous watershed in the approach to River Murray problems on an overall catchment basis. The outcome of this meeting will be received with considerable satisfaction by all interested in the future of the Murray River, Australia's most important water resource," Mr. Anthony said.

"The Murray Valley represents the nation's largest and most successful irrigated region with public and private investment in irrigation and associated infrastructure facilities totalling billions of dollars," he said.

"I am of the view, and I am sure the State Ministers share this view, that priorities in this region should be directed towards the consolidation of existing urban and rural settlement which has developed over almost a century. Salinity and drainage problems in the region represent the most serious threat to this development," Mr. Anthony said.

The consultants would work in close contact, as appropriate, with the River Murray Commission and will in no way duplicate work presently being undertaken by subcommittees of the River Murray Commission.

It has taken a long time to reach the basis of agreement for tackling this overall problem of salinity in the Murray River. Unfortunately, this point should have been reached many years ago, and just how long it will be before the necessary capital works are put into effect and the funding is provided will be a critical issue in South Australia's future. In this State we are almost totally dependent on the water resource of the Murray River. It was only this year when the waters from the Darling River came through the Murray River system and finally reached Adelaide that most people in South Australia realised just how dependent they were on this water resource for their total livelihood.

Unfortunately, we are facing a deteriorating situation. The overall salinity is building up year by year. At this moment as a result of flow rates dropping, there is a dramatic increase in the overall level of salinity throughout the total river system. Even now at Red Cliffs, well up in Victoria, there is a salinity level of more than 800 e.c. units. South Australia will face a severe salinity problem this summer, particularly in relation to horticulture and agriculture.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Will Dartmouth help?

Mr. ARNOLD: Dartmouth will not become effective for another three or four years. If it had not been for the

actions of the present Government, Dartmouth would have been effective today and we would have had a buffer which would have contributed greatly to relieving the severe situation we are now facing. However, the political actions of the present Government in 1970 denied Adelaide the construction of the Dartmouth storage for three years and now we are about to pay the price for the delay.

It looks as though we are facing a severe drought throughout Australia, and it is unlikely that we will have the flushing flow that has saved us so many times throughout the last five or six years. If that is the case, countless millions of dollars of damage will be done in South Australia because of our almost total dependence on this water supply. I was interested in the last option paper, Position Paper No. 5, which was put out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in South Australia and which sets out the many options which can be undertaken to overcome the salinity problems.

I am also pleased that at last the South Australian Government and the department have recognised that there is no cheap way out of this problem, which will require the expenditure of vast sums of money to reverse the situation which has been developing over the years. The salinity problem in the Murray River system is not unique: it exists in other river systems in the world, and the causes of the salinity problem are the same in other parts of the world as they are in Australia, particularly South Australia. Salinity results largely from irrigation and the draining back into the river system of ground water, principally because of vast area of the Murray Valley which was originally under the sea.

We can compare the Murray River system with the Colorado River system in America and Mexico. A considerable section of the Colorado River Valley was also at one time under the sea. Consequently, it carries a salt load in the ground water at the sides of the river and beneath the river. Irrigation causes a flow of groundwater back into the river, thereby creating the salinity problem in South Australia and also in the Colorado Valley.

Recently, while on an overseas study tour provided by the Parliament, I studied at some length the approach to this salinity problem adopted by the American Government. I wish to refer to the study undertaken and the proposals being put into effect to solve the problem there. In February, 1974, the Department of State was ready to report to the United States Senate and to make recommendations to the Congress on the work that should be undertaken and on ratifying an agreement with Mexico, so that it received water of reasonable quality.

Mexico is in exactly the same position in respect of the Colorado River as we are in respect of the Murray River. Mexico and South Australia are in the lower reaches of river systems. Whatever takes place in the upper reaches has a real effect on people in the lower reaches. The following letter was sent on February 2, 1974, to the Hon. Gerald Ford, who was then President of the Senate and Vice-President of the United States of America:

Dear Mr. President: There is enclosed a draft Bill which the Department of State recommends be enacted to authorise implementation of an agreement with the Government of Mexico to resolve the international problem of the salinity of the Colorado River waters delivered by the United States to Mexico under the Water Treaty of 1944.

The original water treaty of 1944 was very similar to the River Murray Waters Act that we have in Australia. The water treaty of 1944 guarantees Mexico an annual entitlement of 1 500 000 acre feet. Under the River Murray Waters Act, South Australia receives 1 250 000 acre feet and, when the Dartmouth dam becomes

effective, South Australia will receive 1 500 000 acre feet. So, the water allocations of Mexico and South Australia are very similar. The letter continues:

This treaty provides for the delivery to Mexico annually of 1 500 000 acre feet of Colorado River waters. There are also enclosed for the information of the Congress in its consideration of this draft Bill the supporting documents and reports listed at the close of this letter, as well as a section-by-section analysis of the draft Bill. The Environmental Impact Statement, one of the enclosures, was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (P.L. 91-190) and this department's guidelines. Public notice of the availability of this statement was included in the *Federal Register* of October 5, 1973.

Mr. Herbert Brownell, the President's Special Representative who negotiated the agreement, describes the Colorado River and discusses at some length its history and the history of the salinity problem with Mexico in his enclosed "Report of the President's Special Representative for Resolution of the Colorado River Salinity Problem with Mexico", dated December 28, 1972. Members of the Congress will recall that when the President of Mexico addressed a joint meeting of the House and Senate on June 15, 1972, President Echeverria referred to this problem as the most delicate between the two countries. This was one of the most important issues dealt with by President Nixon and President Echeverria at their meetings on June 15 and June 16. In their joint communique of June 17, 1972, it was announced that the United States would undertake certain actions immediately to improve the quality of the water going to Mexico, and that President Nixon would designate a special representative to find a permanent, definitive and just solution of this problem. The enclosed agreement of August 30, 1973, minute No. 242 of the International Boundary and Water Commission, is that definitive solution.

This agreement with Mexico brings to an end 12 years of controversy regarding the quality of water the United States may deliver to Mexico. Although the treaty contains no specific provisions relating to the quality of water delivered, it does provide for the settlement of differences with respect to the interpretation or application of the treaty by the International Boundary and Water Commission, subject to the approval of the two Governments. Minute No. 242 constituted such a settlement, which the Presidents of the two countries have approved, subject to the enactment by the Congress of legislation authorising the appropriation of the funds needed to carry out its provisions.

Implementation of the agreement will require a reduction in the salinity of the waters delivered at present to Mexico. Desiring to accomplish this reduction with the least burden on the United States and its water users, the Department of State, on the advice of Mr. Brownell, its technical advisers, and other departments, has provided in the draft Bill for the minimum works and other measures necessary for this purpose.

In this agreement the United States makes three major commitments. First and principally, we agree to adopt measures to assure that no later than July 1, 1974, subject to the authorisation by the Congress of funds for the necessary works, the approximately 1 360 000 acre feet of Colorado River waters delivered to Mexico above its Morelos Diversion Dam will have an annual average salinity of no more than 115 ± 30 parts per million over the annual average salinity of Colorado River waters arriving at Imperial Dam, i.e., those delivered to the lowermost major downstream users in the United States. This means that while Mexico will accept delivery of waters somewhat more saline than those used in the United States, the United States must remove from those waters the adverse effect of the highly saline drain

waters pumped and discharged to the river by the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District of Arizona.

It is proposed to attain this average annual differential by a combination of improvements to reduce drain flows from the Wellton-Mohawk project and by construction of a desalting plant. When completed, presently scheduled for 1978, the desalting plant would treat a major portion of the Wellton-Mohawk drain water, so that, in combination with the untreated Wellton-Mohawk drain water, it may be delivered to Mexico within the agreed differential. A detailed description of this plant as planned appears in the enclosed special report dated September, 1973, prepared for the department by the Department of the Interior.

During an interim period, while desalting facilities are being constructed, the United States would bypass all the Wellton-Mohawk drain water without charge to Mexico against its guaranteed treaty allotment, and would substitute higher quality water that would be delivered to Mexico in place of it. This better water would at first be borrowed from storage reservoirs and, later, be made up in large part of water saved by concrete-lining a 49-mile reach of the Coachella Canal, in southern California. The lining would save economically an estimated 132 000 acre feet of water annually, which would be temporarily available for use by the Federal Government until the amount borrowed from storage is paid back or the Secretary of the Interior reduces deliveries of mainstream Colorado River water to California to 4 400 000 acre feet annually. The water saved will represent a part of California's entitlement from the Colorado River.

The highly saline reject stream from the desalting plant, containing the salts removed from the drain water, would be kept separate and conveyed by a drain directly to the international boundary, and thence through Mexico to the Santa Clara Slough on the Gulf of California. Under the agreement the Government of Mexico would construct, operate, and maintain the part of the drain located in Mexico. As its second major commitment, the United States would assume the cost of building, operating, and maintaining of the part in Mexico, which must be concrete-lined to prevent the highly saline water from infiltrating into groundwaters of Mexico.

In order to keep the construction and operating cost of the desalting plant to a minimum, the volume of drain water from the Wellton-Mohawk district should be reduced. For this purpose, the Bill would authorise assistance to district water users in improving the efficiency of their operations, and authorise a reduction in the existing authorised irrigable acreage of the district.

The third commitment undertaken by the United States is to support Mexican efforts to obtain appropriate financing on favourable terms for the improvement and rehabilitation of the Mexicali Valley, where Mexico uses its Colorado River waters, and to provide on a mutually acceptable basis a grant for those aspects of the rehabilitation programme in the Mexicali Valley directly related to salinity, including tile drainage. When a mutually acceptable basis has been arrived at, the department will submit a report and recommendations to the Congress on this matter.

The Government of Mexico undertakes two major commitments. It accepts in effect as a part of its treaty allotment all drainage inflows to the river below Imperial Dam except untreated Wellton-Mohawk drain waters. This includes the delivery of 140 000 acre feet annually, consisting largely of drain water, near San Luis on the land boundary and in the boundary section of the river downstream from Morelos Dam. This water may be more saline than that delivered above Morelos Dam.

The Mexican Government also agreed to a mutual limitation of groundwater pumping within five miles of the

Arizona-Sonora boundary near San Luis to 160 000 acre feet annually on each side, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on ground water in border areas. Mexico is already pumping at this rate, and as a consequence beginning to draw on waters underlying the United States and to diminish the surface flow to Mexico at San Luis. The agreement was phrased so that the United States could without question pump a like amount on its side to reduce the loss of underground waters and surface flows caused by Mexican pumping. The department will continue to work with Mexican officials on a comprehensive agreement on ground water in the border areas.

Finally, the two Governments recognised the agreement as the permanent and definitive solution of the salinity problem. They agreed to consult with each other before undertaking any development of surface or groundwater resources in the border area which might adversely affect the other country.

The major point coming out of most of the negotiations and the final agreement reached between the U.S.A. and Mexico was a plan of co-operation between all parties using the water of the Colorado River. It is important that such an agreement be reached in Australia, especially in South Australia. The parties in America have agreed to negotiate before any further diversions, pumpings, or developments are carried out. That is not the case in Australia.

Victoria and New South Wales continue to develop their irrigation diversions and development along the various rivers and tributaries making up part of the total Murray River system. As the development continues, so the water quality, especially in South Australia, continues to deteriorate because of the increased ground flows going back into the river system. Whilst we have achieved a significant breakthrough in the agreement reached between the three States and the Commonwealth in an endeavour to find a solution to the overall problem, we have a long way to go. I hope that the Governments concerned will make every effort to carry out this work as soon as possible.

Once the necessary capital works have been determined, I hope the Governments will make sure that the allocation of funds from Loan moneys will be made available readily. The situation is deteriorating. In South Australia we are facing a severe salinity problem, which will become worse weekly. Our only hope is for summer rain in northern New South Wales and southern Queensland to bring down the Darling River in full flow, once again saving us from the severe effects of salinity. There is no indication at present that this will happen, and we could find ourselves facing the most severe salinity problems we have ever faced.

To conclude my remarks, I return to a subject that I have raised in this Chamber many times: pay-roll tax rebates for decentralised industry. Members will recall that this goes back to 1973, when the then Federal Government handed over the administration of pay-roll tax to the States. The Victorian Government introduced legislation enabling decentralised industries to apply to it for remission of pay-roll tax as an incentive to decentralisation and to assist industries which were in financial difficulties.

The *Murrumbidgee Irrigator*, a provincial paper produced in New South Wales, contains in its issue of October 28, 1977, an advertisement by the New South Wales Government. It is headed "Pay-roll tax rebate", and it states:

As a major new initiative to assist a wide range of decentralised industries, the New South Wales Government has introduced a pay-roll tax rebate scheme.

This scheme is to apply to decentralised areas of New South Wales as an incentive to assist those industries based outside the metropolitan area. The article continues:

Manufacturing and processing industries (other than those naturally occurring) located outside the County of Cumberland, the Cities of Newcastle, Wollongong, Penrith and Liverpool and the Municipality of Camden are invited to apply to be considered for registration as an eligible industry under the Country Industries Pay-roll Tax Rebate Scheme, which applies retrospectively to the financial year ended June 30, 1977.

I am interested in the fact that the New South Wales Government has now not only gone ahead and followed the example of the Victorian Government but also has made its legislation retrospective to the financial year ended June 30, 1977, so that in itself is a considerable boost to decentralised industry in New South Wales.

But the Government of South Australia still steadfastly refuses to budge on this matter. It has nominated isolated industries here and there where it believes it will be of some political significance and offered them pay-roll tax remissions; but those remissions are not going back to the companies concerned: they are going into a development fund, and the Government will direct how those moneys will be spent. They do not go back to the companies concerned, to the benefit of the growers or those people involved in that decentralised industry. In the long term, the scheme put forward by the Government may be of some assistance to the decentralised industries nominated in South Australia, but in the short term it does nothing to help the liquidity of the growers involved in those industries nominated by the Government. Using Riverland Fruit Products as an example, under the New South Wales scheme not only would Riverland Fruit Products qualify for pay-roll tax rebate but the other industries allied to it, such as Containers and United Packers, which produce the cans and the cartons respectively, and the transporters and the actual cannery itself would qualify, too; so, when we follow it right back through the industries allied to the cannery and take into account the new freight concessions as well, we suddenly find that we are talking about a flow-on to the grower of not some \$5 or \$6 a tonne but more like \$20 a tonne, and this is the effect of the Victorian legislation and the intent of the legislation now in operation in New South Wales.

Once again I bring this to the attention of the Government. It is some five years now since I first brought it to its attention. We have made limited progress in the field of pay-roll tax rebates but we have certainly not made any major breakthrough and, until the South Australian Government falls into line with the action being taken in Victoria and New South Wales, the operators and manufacturers in this State will be at a distinct disadvantage. We have wineries, canneries, and other processing plants and manufacturing industry based in decentralised areas of South Australia in direct competition with those industries in Victoria and New South Wales, and yet the industries in South Australia have to carry the burden of pay-roll tax, something that the industries in the other two States have been relieved of, which puts them at a distinct advantage; and, with the escalating costs and other disadvantages now associated with production in South Australia, it is just one more burden that industry in this State is being forced to carry, a burden that is forcing industry out of this State. Any reference by the Government to decentralisation or a policy of decentralisation in South Australia is not worth the paper it is written on, because a South Australian decentralisation policy does not exist so far as this Government is concerned—not when we compare it with

the assistance being granted in Victoria and New South Wales to develop decentralised industry in those two States.

There is no doubt there are certain industries that can produce only in the rural areas: for example, the logical place for a winery is in a wine-making district and, with the disadvantages that wineries and processors of primary products now face in South Australia compared with their counterparts in Victoria and New South Wales, that does not lead to a very bright future for the industries of this State.

Mr. Venning: Do you think they ought to move out?

Mr. ARNOLD: Many industries are moving out and will continue to move out.

Mr. Becker: Do you think the Government is concerned about the number of industries moving out?

Mr. ARNOLD: No, I do not think the Government is concerned about industries moving out, and particularly industries based in rural areas. The Government is not much concerned about country people, because it knows it can stay in Government so long as it panders to the metropolitan area. However, sooner or later the message will get through when the happenings in the rural areas and the disadvantages that rural producers face compared with their counterparts in Victoria and New South Wales start to flow through to the people living in the metropolitan area; then we shall see a change of Government in South Australia.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I open my remarks by offering congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, upon your appointment and saying that we are very pleased to see Mr. Seaman now in charge of Government House, after some deputy work by Mr. Crocker, following the unfortunate illness of Sir Douglas Nicholls. An early comment I make is that several Government members have drawn attention to the fact that Mr. Seaman is essentially a Christian and a man of peace. I was a little disturbed to hear one person speaking a little disparagingly, by inference certainly, about some previous Governors, who were essentially men of war. Admittedly, being a man of war is not the most desirable occupation, particularly in wartime, but many people join the armed services in peace time with little anticipation of a war coming along but, when one does come along, the fellows who earn their medals and battle honours, when they ultimately come into public service—we should not speak disparagingly about them.

Mr. Whitten: Are you talking of Menzies? He resigned his commission, didn't he?

Mr. ALLISON: I am referring to previous Governors of South Australia who were the subject of comment from at least one Government back-bencher. Perhaps if the honourable member stayed awake longer he might enjoy the debate more. While we are referring to men of war, I have no doubt that Mr. Seaman would have come into contact not infrequently with some very militant Christians, and I think that they, too, fight the marvellous fight in their own way, and they would do Christianity more good than those among us (and there are many today) who seem to be entering into a rather weak, wishy-washy, Marxist Christian dialogue which, in the long run, generally seems to see Christianity suffer. We do not see many Marxist Christian countries in which Christianity prevails, whether it is a social democratic country or a communist country.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They have even put Max Harris off.

Mr. ALLISON: I have not read Max Harris recently, but I accept that comment. That gentleman is certainly a perceptive commentator on public life in South Australia and in Australia. I must read his comments. An analysis

was made of the educational system in South Australia by one of the younger Government members. I say "younger member" because he showed considerable knowledge of what had happened in the past seven or eight years whilst the Labor Government has been in power in South Australia, and great in praise he was, too, but without being partisan I point out that the pre-1970 educational problems were not necessarily one Party's problems. They were a compounding of a situation that goes way back before the First World War.

That war was followed by a depression that extended through Europe and Australia into the 1930's. We were on the point of recovery in the middle to late 1930's, when we entered the Second World War. When that war started, many of the cream of the teaching profession either enlisted or were called up and they were taken from our schools. In the post-war situation from 1945 on, we had an immediate problem. There were insufficient numbers of elderly teachers returning to the profession to cope with the immediate situation, and also many teachers had been killed during the war. In addition, there was the post-war baby boom.

In Australia the situation was compounded, especially in South Australia, because here we had one of the highest migrant intakes and we had a high fertility rate, so that the baby boom in South Australia was so massive that it threw in to the South Australian education system the largest burden that was thrown on any State in Australia. It is unlikely, therefore, in times when we did not have galloping inflation and when we did not have tremendous reserves of public money to fund education, that there would have been any surplus funds, irrespective of which Government was then in power, to fund education as it was needed.

There were too few teachers; too few teachers colleges; and far too few schools for the rapidly increasing population. It was not until the 1970's, when we were faced with galloping inflation, which actually provided funds for a massive number of public works but which also made the economic situation worse in Australia (it was a double-barrel situation), that the massive spending on education managed to cope with the situation. Of course the situation also vastly improved because the Borrie report showed that the population of Australia was stabilising.

We have fewer primary and secondary students; we now have surplus teachers colleges, if one is to consider the various recommendations made in this House during the past year; we certainly have a surplus of teachers, including physical education teachers who were referred to earlier this afternoon, and too many other teachers across the whole spectrum of education. So the situation in education has considerably changed not necessarily because of the efforts of the Labor Party in South Australia but because, I stress, of a wide variety of circumstances stretching back to the First World War. To lay the credit or blame at the door of any one political party is not fair. I say that without being partisan but in order to try to set the record a little straighter than it was set earlier this afternoon.

On one of the main issues of the day and one which I had hoped to speak on but was precluded from doing so because of Government business and something of a filibuster speech from the Attorney-General, I tended to agree with the Premier on my first impression. The Premier said that it was rather a light topic to have brought up. That was the first impression I got on listening to the news yesterday and on reading the newspaper, because I thought that, unless we have a junior Machiavelli in our midst, our senior legal representative for the State could

not be belittling himself and the status of the law and South Australia generally by making the comments he was alleged in the press to have made. It seemed to be too one-sided, too biased, and too far out to be true, so I agreed with the Premier that, on the surface, it was a rather light topic.

It was not until I realised that not only the radio programme to which I was listening, and not only the *Advertiser* that I read, but also most of the national press and radio stations had picked up a few of the salient points from that address that I realised that it was not quite as light as I thought, and that probably this man was quite serious in what he had said. The Attorney-General tried to impose his full address on us this afternoon, and I realised that many of the things reported were reported correctly.

I will refer more specifically to that speech later, but we find that, instead of having a recommendation from the Premier that politics be kept out of this issue, we have politics well and truly being brought into it. This is the sort of lip service like decentralisation: you say one thing and do another. You say, "Keep politics out", and then do a political advert for the national election campaign. You say, "Keep politics out and don't stir", but then come up with an extremist point of view that is designed to attract the interest of the press and to have the issue raised in this House. We have the Federal Opposition Leader taking advantage of the situation, not to keep politics out but to bring politics as much as possible into the situation.

The one point that disturbs me is that I have here tens of thousands of words about the uranium issue from both sides of the fence. I pride myself on having collected a fairly sensible cross-section of points of view, and any member can look at my notes if he wishes. I did not see any extremist points of view there. However, the Attorney-General's remarks were really blatantly irresponsible and scare-mongering of the worst sort, and the man who states that he is championing a cause is doing his best to incite people to a particular line of action. Not only that, but in one part of his address he seemed to be condoning irresponsibility and riots on the ground that, if you say you are working for the uranium producers when you are caught, things will be all right; do not tell them who you are really working for, and the police may turn a blind eye. That is not on, but I thought that it was too funny to be true. However, it seems to be serious.

I analysed the situation, and that is why I have taken the opportunity to raise the issue in this debate since it is close to the relevant debate this afternoon. That is only the beginning. The real issue on what the Attorney-General was saying is not whether we should mine and export uranium but whether he as the senior law officer of this State stands for the upholding of civil liberties for everyone.

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

Mr. ALLISON: As I said before the dinner adjournment, the real issue this afternoon was not whether uranium mining should or should not be mined but whether the Attorney-General, as senior law officer in this State, in practice really stands up for the principle not just of upholding civil liberties but of upholding them for everyone, no matter what their viewpoints were on specific issues.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are your views?

Mr. ALLISON: If the Minister will hold on for a moment, he will probably hear. I will not shirk, as the Attorney-General accused me of doing this afternoon.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That'll be a change.

Mr. ALLISON: Listen to the Minister. Who poured dinner this evening? Goodness, he is insulting already; this is a little early for that to happen. The Attorney-General issued a challenge of sorts, saying that the issue of uranium mining had been ignored. However, as I said, that was not really the point of the censure motion. I do not mind admitting that I share some of his fears. I think we all do. However, the main issue is that he comes out extremely one-sided.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How come you favoured—

Mr. ALLISON: I will tell the Minister why. He asked for the issue to be debated and, if he will give me two minutes to debate the matter, I will do what I was asked to do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister does not realise that I am taking up the challenge that one of his colleagues issued. If he does not realise that, it is time that the Minister had a sleep. The fears that I hold are fears that everyone holds. However, there are certainly two sides to this argument. We cannot be absolutely one-eyed and biased like the Attorney-General was in Canberra.

My fears are on both sides of the spectrum, and one question that the Attorney-General and everyone else has tried to answer but has not yet answered is, "What will happen in the interim period?" We have no specific source of fuel that will definitely carry us over for the next 20 or 30 years.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The people of Mount Gambier approve. That's what you're saying.

Mr. ALLISON: Does the Minister want to put a power station in Mount Gambier? That was mooted. I know, because I brought up that matter a year ago. You were looking to Lake Leake for a source of water and saying, "Let us put a nuclear power station there." The Chairman of the Housing Trust asked the hypothetical question, "What will happen if we put a power station in the South-East?"

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Like a puppet on a string, you'll—

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister may be a sponge, but he finds it hard to dry up personally. The main issue is that, unless someone can come up with an alternative, the whole of mankind will suffer. At present, we are short of power for those under-developed nations to which one chooses to give lip service but which one then ignores. The real point at issue is whether we are going to have sufficient power over the next 30 years, or whether we will continue arguing about this problem on purely political partisan lines, because, whatever the Attorney-General says, that is precisely what he was doing in Canberra. The partisan Party line came first and foremost.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You'll put the people of Mount Gambier—

Mr. Tonkin: Do you think we could utilise this hot air to run some sort of turbine?

Mr. ALLISON: It would be a good alternative source of fuel, although I do not think it would last long. It seems to be an ageing wheezing machine, and it is probably destined to be withdrawn from circulation soon. I think the recent election saved it for a little while.

Mr. Klunder: Have you changed your mind since last March?

Mr. ALLISON: The honourable member was not here last March, so he should listen to what I have to say. Last March, the following motion was moved:

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and, unless and until it is so

demonstrated, no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

That motion was debated by and passed in this House. It is one of the ironies of life that only a few months earlier, in July, the following motion was moved by the Leader of the Opposition in this place. Honourable members can see how similar that motion is. It is as follows:

In the opinion of this House:

(1) The question of future uranium processing, enrichment and use in South Australia is a vital issue.

What is wrong with that? The motion continued:

(2) A detailed and informed public inquiry into the possible environmental, health, safety, moral and social effects of uranium processing and use in South Australia must be conducted before any such project is promoted by the Government either in Australia or overseas.

Honourable members will recall that that was triggered off by the glossy brochure that the Minister of Mines and Energy was hawking around Europe saying how good South Australia would be as a future source of uranium. The motion continued:

(3) The Government has been gravely irresponsible and contemptuous of public concern in promoting proposals for uranium enrichment at Redcliff to oversea industrial concerns and the Federal Government, without having first set up an independent public inquiry into the project, and is therefore to be censured.

That motion was surprisingly similar in import to the first motion, which was defeated. So, who is standing across the middle of the road? We have not assessed these points of view on the merits or demerits of the case: they have been assessed on purely Party political grounds.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What did you vote for?

Mr. ALLISON: Oddly enough, I supported both of those motions, which is more than anyone on the Government benches can say.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A typical Allison approach.

Mr. ALLISON: Not at all, because both of those motions were the same in import. I did at least err on the side of consistency. The following newspaper report appeared in the *Advertiser* (and I will not quote any of the other reports that have been referred to today):

"The nuclear power industry could lead to a fascist State where vast numbers of police spied on political groups," the South Australian Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) said last night.

Irrespective of whether the Attorney was talking about South Australia or about the world-wide problem, when we consider that there are about 900 nuclear power stations built, in the course of construction or under design, it is strange that we do not have far more of these threatened fascist States in the world.

The Premier was almost tearful in his concern this afternoon, when he quoted the establishment of a fascist State, where vast numbers of police with unlimited powers spent their time spying on political groups who, it was thought, might conceivably be able to steal fissile material. I should have thought the most sensible approach would be to keep a close watch on the fissile material rather than on the whole population. The American Government watches Fort Knox carefully without spying on its 200 000 000 people, and it seems to guard its gold effectively. The same principle might well be applied in this uranium issue.

When I look at the fascist State that is threatened there, and the powers of these inspectors who might be spying on us all, I had to smile when I thought of the recent legislation that we passed in this House, where we have inspectors appointed under the shopping regulations, for example, as well as inspectors under the surveyors'

regulations, which passed through this House last session. We also have inspectors appointed under the petrol legislation, which passed in haste at the end of last session, before the dissolution. When one looks at the sweeping powers of those inspectors, who might well, in the hands of an extremist Government, either left or right, do almost anything to the population, it seems grossly unfair of the Attorney-General to quote one situation when, in fact, he is legislating for that thing to happen in the course of normal Acts going through this House. This shows extreme bias rather than common sense. When one considers that most people in South Australia, or indeed Australia, tend towards moderation, it is a case of inciting fear in the minds of the majority, when a minority situation really applies. Perhaps the Attorney-General knows all about minority situations and power situations, because the Premier himself in the Shangri-La Hotel in Singapore said:

We believe no development and no major social change can occur without the work of an elite which acts as the activator of society.

I wonder who the "elite" would be that the Premier was thinking about, certainly nobody on this side of the House. If I know the Premier, he was obviously thinking of an elite on the other side of the House, which seems strangely at variance with accepted socialist principles, so perhaps that is the Premier's Achilles heel.

Does the Attorney-General think that he, as a minority elitist, can do anything he likes? When one examines the contents of that speech one sees that it was hypothetical. Look at the terms he used, referring to some lawyers being extremely concerned about the ill effects of uranium. Of course some lawyers are concerned about the potential ill effects of carbon dioxide from coal processing or sulphur dioxide from coal-burning power stations, but he does not mention that. He says, "It is arguable that many lawyers . . ."; "It may be that the Federal Government . . ."; "It is my belief that if this happens . . ."; it is all hypothetical, lacking substance and confirmation.

We find in today's newspaper that the uranium producers have, in fact, said that some of the claims were incorrect, that they did not stop advertising in New South Wales because of that State's action under the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act: they stopped because they had plans to have the items on a fixed session, and the advertisements were withdrawn some months before this court action was taken. Another thing that we did not learn this afternoon was whether that court action had, in fact, been successful. I would have liked to hear about that, even if it was only to clear the air, but we did not hear, we were just given these things without any further enlightenment. That is trying to convert people by fear tactics rather than by using plain common sense and truth.

Why stop publicity? Mr. Duncan says that as people become more informed about nuclear power they become more worried about it, so surely if the uranium producers, or anyone else, want to keep informing people the worry that those people experience will only play into the Attorney-General's hands, so he should be applauding people being informed rather than trying to stop them from finding out. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe this is a political ploy and a lead-in to the visit of the Federal Leader of the Opposition in the near future. If it has the same degree of success that the education action week tricks met with earlier this year, then it is going to fall on its face. I think the Australian population is sufficiently informed and perceptive not to fall for this sort of shyster trickery. Another interesting feature is that we have a minority representation in this Government. We

have certain people on the Government benches who are reputed to be left wing (whether it is Peking left wing, or Moscow left wing, I am not worried).

Mr. Harrison: Name one.

Mr. ALLISON: I am going by repute; I do not name people in the House.

Mr. Harrison: You are saying it. Name one!

Mr. ALLISON: If the honourable member admits to being one, I accept that, but I would not name him. One never hears any of these minority activists coming out in the open and saying, "Look, the western world should not be doing this, but nor should China or Russia." Yet we are all well aware that no-one has access to the amount of nuclear power produced in Russia, and we all know that the Communist countries would like to see the western world undermined and short of power, yet these minority activists deliberately play down that side. Let us be fair and have the full picture, the whole world structure on the use of atomic power. I am not looking for partisan arguments; I am looking for an all-embracing world picture, and then perhaps we can argue from knowledge instead of the abysmal ignorance continually coming from the Australian Labor Party political platformists.

We have had excellent items in the Australian press that have tried to give both sides of the picture. Unfortunately, the writers of those articles are accused of being reactionary if they try to publish the truth. Another interesting feature was that the Attorney-General announced in one of the early comments in that speech in Canberra that he was no scientist, yet he says sweepingly that there is no known method of storing nuclear waste. That is an interesting comment, in view of an article in the *Scientific American* of June, 1977, by Bernard L. Cohen, containing 10 or 15 pages of detailed arguments (not partisan—the Americans argue on both sides of the nuclear story; they are not completely biased, and at least they are trying to get a rational point of view so that they can come up with a more balanced answer).

That article I would recommend to the Attorney-General to assist him with his non-scientific background, because it at least indicates that there may be a solution. I do not necessarily accept the whole of the article, but I am prepared to examine this document and not sweepingly say that there is no possibility of salvation. We know that storing in tanks, the method of 20 or 30 years ago, was no good; the world was in far more danger from nuclear mishap then than it is today, because of sheer ignorance, and yet today we quote what happened 20 or 30 years ago rather than quote modern technology.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are we safe now?

Mr. ALLISON: I do not feel safe. I came to Australia because I lived in one of the dirtiest steel cities in the north of England and many people in industrial cities were dying of cancer. Oddly enough, this is the fearful thing that uranium is going to create, but, the carcinogenic agents in those industrial cities are those created by coal-burning power stations emitting sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide fumes and particulate matter, so that what gets on one's lungs is generally pure anthracite. Those carcinogenic agents are ignored by the people who say, "Let us ignore nuclear power and swing back to a coal technology; we have plenty of coal, so let us use nothing else for generating power". That way one stands a good chance, according to the American Persepolis conference, of filling the atmosphere with carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide, warming up the earth's atmosphere and increasing the cancer in the earth, not probably as in the case of nuclear energy, but with absolute certainty, because it has been the case in the past. This would gradually create drought by moving the western wind

systems away from South Australia into the ocean areas so that this State's currently marginal lands would become absolute drought areas.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you support nuclear energy and the mining of uranium, irrespective of what it will do to future generations?

Mr. ALLISON: I am asking everyone—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are typical of the Liberals.

Mr. ALLISON: If I am typical of the Liberals I am pleased that I have an inquiring mind rather than one that remains happy in crass ignorance.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Puppet on a string to Anthony and Fraser.

Mr. ALLISON: I am perfectly happy to be classed a Liberal in those circumstances. It is a pleasure that the Minister reserves his best speeches by way of interjection for when I am on my feet; I regard it as a compliment.

Mr. Groom: When are you going to tell us your view on uranium mining?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He hasn't got the guts to say.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to the unparliamentary language used by the Minister of Transport when he said that my colleague the member for Mount Gambier, did not have the guts to make his position clear. I ask you to ask the Minister to withdraw that remark, because the honourable member certainly does not lack that particular quality.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I do not hold that it is unparliamentary. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. ALLISON: My views were published about two years ago in a certain South-Eastern newspaper. I have reiterated them in the House, too, if the honourable member would care to go through *Hansard*.

Mr. Groom: Where are they?

Mr. ALLISON: In the uranium debate. I do not intend to reiterate them here. Members have probably heard enough of my point of view, but I certainly will not retract them. I told honourable members how I voted on the two previous motions. No-one on the other side of the House can say that he has not changed his mind in the course of a few months. Members opposite vote on Party lines rather than assessing the merits of the subject.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't talk about Party lines after the expulsions in Victoria.

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

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier will resume his seat. There is too much interjecting. Members should give the honourable member for Mount Gambier the right to have his speech heard in silence. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. ALLISON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As to the question of whether the German model for worker participation is adequate (as, indeed, it was two years ago when it was studied extensively by members opposite), or whether we have now swung over to a different model, I notice an interesting document of the Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party in 1975 which came out with several facts that tend to confirm my suspicions. We sent a football team over there not too long ago. It was an interesting football team because it was subsidised to the extent of \$5 000. As I said, it was not the normal football team because it had not played football together before. In other words, one could only conclude that it was political football that the team was playing. Where did the team go? It went to Yugoslavia. It followed Mr. Gnatenko. The Yugoslavs play an admirable game of

soccer, which I do not mind admitting, but for a team that comprised a sort of hotchpotch of players being subsidised to the extent of \$5 000 to go to a communist country (and that is what the report states) not to play football but to learn politics makes me wonder what will happen in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I fear that the debate in the House is degenerating because of the excessive interjections from both sides of the House. I am not pointing to any particular honourable member, but there is too much interjecting. I ask the honourable member to continue his remarks, and I hope that the House will treat him with some decorum.

Mr. ALLISON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The document in question states:

A number of lessons can be learned from the attempts at worker participation and codetermination in social-democratic countries and in Yugoslavia—

which obviously is not a social democratic country but a communist-based regime—

and the following conclusions are inevitable from such a study.

Among the conclusions are the following:

Workers-Directors in Sweden and workers-members of supervisory boards in Germany did not have an adequate communication with the worker on the shop floor—
a model rejected for obvious reasons—

The Swedish trade union organisation points out . . . that to give an opportunity to workers at the workshop level to participate in consultation about management decisions does not any more mean that the opportunity is taken than the giving of an opportunity to the electorate in Australia to take part in local government elections means that the opportunity is taken.

What does that mean? We can expect that workers generally will be apathetic. There is an obvious opening here for strong-arm unions to recognise that apathy, to move in and take control and for a minority voice to have what is ostensibly a majority voice on the workshop floor. It is clear that whatever structure is developed it must revolve around trade union activity; we cannot have competition. In no circumstances can worker participation be set up as a parallel body of activity to trade union participation programmes. We see that it is a democracy not necessarily by choice: industrial democracy can be imposed even at this level if we introduce a model. We are now studying the Yugoslavian model. Why did we reject the German co-determination law? The document states that it had a two-tier board organisation as compared with the traditional company structure in British companies, which has a one-tier board organisation. Why did we not like that in Australia? Because to set up a two-tier board system would add to the bureaucracy and lessen the direct effectiveness in management decisions of the various worker bodies within the organisation.

Within two years we have gone from Germany and Sweden to Yugoslavia. What advantages does Yugoslavia have? One of the advantages quoted in this document is that the problem is overcome in Yugoslavia by the influence of the Communist Party, which is able to dominate economic organisations politically in the community. Within Australian conditions it will be essential to provide three elements in the economic management of undertakings. Did the football team ostensibly go to play a \$5 000 round of football to look quietly at all the work these communist unionists are expecting in Yugoslavia, then to come back to their various workshops in South Australia and to disseminate the news that they gleaned over there? I ask that only

because this is the A.L.P.'s own document, one of the most interesting documents it has been my good fortune to read. It sets the record reasonably straight. My only question is which model we are to adopt in South Australia. The comments made about South Australia becoming increasingly socialised in the next few years are well founded.

Another issue which is part of this 1975 document and which was hinted at in the Premier's policy speech was that when workers faced the risk of being retrenched legislation was to be introduced by the present Government to provide for a minimum of four weeks pay for each year of service for those workers. If the legislation is to be introduced, all right; that is the Government's prerogative.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Would you oppose it?

Mr. ALLISON: I will not say which way I will go on this.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've no courage of your convictions.

Mr. ALLISON: I have not seen the Government's legislation, but I know about the fears that have been taken advantage of by employers. If this legislation hangs fire over industry, what will happen? Industry will wonder whether this legislation is to be introduced, and anyone who is not really needed in industry will be stood down before the legislation is introduced. I believe that single threat is militating against people remaining in work in South Australia. I believe that the Premier should reassure industry so that some of the people who have been retrenched in the past five or six months can be put back on the pay-roll again. The Minister of Transport can laugh all he likes, but I have brought up this matter twice in Parliament and it was not laughed at then, when more responsible members of the Government were sitting on the front bench. I am simply reading A.L.P. policy and wondering when it will be implemented, rather than have it hanging like the sword of Damocles over the head of industry and, even worse, the workers.

I am sure that employers would have that legislation in mind when they are considering whether to take on or retain staff.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Liberal Party—

Mr. ALLISON: If the Minister thinks that is wrong, he should get out in the community and ascertain how many people have been stood down in South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It seems to me that the Minister of Transport is interjecting just a little too frequently. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. ALLISON: Another interesting topic that is far less controversial is that in recent months I have been asked to consult the Minister of Education (and I did this) regarding the possibility of migrants of Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian and Serbian origin being given the right to conduct ethnic schools or ethnic courses in their schools, as well as the normal Australian education, rather than have a single form of education imposed on them through the Yugoslav Migrant Education Advisory Council. I admit that in some ways I have misjudged the so-called Yugoslav community, because I believed much of the literature that was published over the years and I imagined that many Slovenians, Croatians, Macedonians and Serbians were in constant conflict with one another.

I find, on personal consultation with religious and lay members of those communities in Adelaide, that they are surprisingly united in their desire to live peaceably in Australia. Many of them came to Australia in post-war migration and established themselves here. They have their own churches and education system to some extent, but they were a little fearful that the Yugoslav migrant education group would superimpose on them a more

nationalistic line, and all they asked was that this should not happen.

Happily, the Minister has advised me that the migrant groups included in the Yugoslav communities would not have that Yugoslav or nationalistic education superimposed on them, but I feel it incumbent on me, in the House, to give that additional background information and to say that I am delighted that the Yugoslav community is only a small minority. Of about 20 000 000 people in Yugoslavia, only about 220 000 actually call themselves Yugoslavs and follow a nationalist line. The remainder of the people tend to follow more ethnically-based rather than politically-based lines, and this is so in Australia.

I applaud the Minister for agreeing to support these people in their claims for an ethnically-based education rather than to have a politically-based education system imposed on them, not necessarily from Australia but possibly from outside, such as from Yugoslavia itself. These people are Australians who wish to be educated as Australians but also wish to retain some of their ethnic background, and it is not Yugoslavian: it is based on five, six or seven different regional cultures. I applaud the Minister for his commitment to uphold their request and to listen to any of their claims for ethnically-based education through the South Australian education system, under Mr. Jim Giles, who is at present in charge of that migrant education group.

I will now leave both sides of the Yugoslav question, the more moderate ethnic side and the political side, to deal with a more parochial issue. A recent tourist report criticised the Mount Gambier International Festival, which formerly was called the Mount Gambier Bavarian Festival, on the ground that it would be likely to expand, and the Apex Club and Rotary Club in Mount Gambier West, who have been organising that festival for several years, point out that year by year the festival attendance has increased. It has increased from about 1 500 in the first year to more than 10 000 last year.

Funds are being sought from the Government, which has set aside about \$40 000 for ethnic festivals, including the Mount Gambier International Festival, but the local committee believes that it has been grossly misunderstood by the committee that published the tourist report on the South-East. I refer now to the aims of the festival committee. The committee wishes to present the people of Mount Gambier with a festival of international flavour that will provide an opportunity for all to enjoy themselves in a manner not normally available, and the ethnic communities benefit here, too, because in normal circumstances they could not afford to get groups from another State or from Adelaide to perform locally and, by having a festival of this kind, the local ethnic groups and the traditional Australian population can share in something that normally would not be available.

Secondly, the committee wishes to engender in the community a spirit of participation in creative leisure and an appreciation of multi-cultural influences in our society. In Mt. Gambier, the South-East has a well integrated cultural group, with people from many different ethnic groups working together for the common good, as has been evidenced, particularly in the two most recent festivals. Thirdly, the committee wishes to promote Mt. Gambier by advertising extensively the festival and the cultural influence through all available media in Victoria and South Australia.

The last aim of the committee is to provide an amount of financial support for charities, including Heritage Industries, the sheltered workshop building fund during the most recent festival. The group has put forward a wide

variety of successful points. I raise this matter in this Address-in-Reply debate to point out to the Government that that tourist report should not be accepted at its face value, because the issues raised in it are not parallel to the aims of the festival. The report seems to be two or three years out of date as far as assessment of attendances at the festival is concerned. Already we have passed the predicted maximum attendance in the report, and there seems to be no limit. The committee also has pointed out that Mt. Gambier is unlikely to attract many additional tourists to the festival, because of its remoteness, and here again the committee wishes to take issue, simply because tourists represent a relatively small proportion of the people who have attended the festivals. It was mainly the local people who came from all parts of the South-East to enjoy that different cultural environment.

We hope that the tourist report will not be used as the main point of evaluation when funds are being allocated for the Mount Gambier International Festival next year. There was in the report an implication that there was a desperate shortage of manpower to work at future festivals, and here again the club points out that every service club in the South-East is anxious to help in administration of the festival, not only from Mt. Gambier but also from Millicent, Penola, and other South-East centres. There is no reason why that festival cannot go on from strength to strength.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is Penola in your district?

Mr. ALLISON: I have never questioned where people come from in my district for help. The Government has refused to leave the Millicent electorate office open, so people come from Kingston, Robe, Millicent, along the tracks to Mt. Gambier for assistance.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Every other member has one electorate office. Do you think there ought to be two for the District of Victoria?

Mr. ALLISON: I think the Government ought to help the people in that remote South-East area, but I do not mind people coming to my office. It is their inconvenience that they have to travel about 120 miles. I merely take their complaints and send them to the Minister or to the member for Victoria or the member for Mallee. We work excellently in collaboration.

Mr. Gunn: You share the job.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes. That is what Parliamentary representation is all about, as the Minister knows. My last point is regarding the recent visit by the Public Works Committee to Mt. Gambier to take evidence on the need for expansion into phase 2 and phase 3 of the South-East sewerage scheme.

One point which has concerned local residents considerably is that for some reason or other they missed the advertisements or failed to recognise their importance. As a result, only two pieces of evidence on the sewage disposal question were submitted to the Public Works Committee; one was from the member for Mt. Gambier, and the other was from the Mt. Gambier District Council. In addition, the Lower South-East Community Consultative Council Chairman, Mr. Don Cawthorne, recently presented an additional submission to the Port MacDonnell District Council expressing great concern.

The Eight Mile Creek community, the Port MacDonnell community, and several private bodies, including fishermen, surf clubs and others, are currently obtaining submissions from their members and the general public. These will be forwarded with a general petition to the Government stressing how important it is that not only should phase 2 be completed, which is recommended for commencement in 1978-79 at a cost of \$3 400 000, but also phase 3 should be put into effect as soon as possible.

Phase 2 involves putting in a pipeline of larger diameter which will still discharge raw effluent into the sea. Port Lincoln has a similar system. This practice is to the detriment of local residents, tourists, and the marine ecology. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has comprehensive reports on this matter. There seems to be every chance of a swimmer off the shore of Port MacDonnell getting his own back if he is not too careful.

The important decisions which the Government is soon to make relate to the possibility of extending that effluent system into phase 3. One proposal is that the whole of the beach area be declared out of bounds and that the sea itself be declared out of bounds to swimmers. This is a retrograde step which does not encourage tourism. The raw effluent moves along the coast north-west and south-east, because of the swirling nature of the water movements around the bays. The effluent is distributed extensively along the beaches and toward Victoria, and this is clearly undesirable.

I strongly urge the Government to consider the submissions that will be arriving from the South-East, in addition to those presented to the Public Works Committee, and also the petitions. I also urge the Government to provide for the planning and implementation of phase 7.3.4—alternative 4. This is contained in the book entitled *Disposal of Waste Waters from Mt. Gambier: Feasibility Studies* at page 23, released in July, 1977. This scheme is neither the cheapest nor the dearest, but it seems to be a satisfactory compromise which will clean up the effluent problem and at the same time leave the beaches and the sea relatively clean for the local people and tourists. I hope that similar filtration schemes will be implemented in other parts of South Australia that are adversely affected by the discharge of raw effluent into the ocean. I shall be availing myself of the invitation from the Minister of Works to send a personal submission summarising these viewpoints.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The Governor's Speech indicated to me that the type of government we are to witness in the next three years will follow to the nth degree the Labor Party's policy as laid down in its handbook. At this stage there has been no indication to the people of South Australia of the total contents of that handbook. Under the heading "Trading—Savings Bank of South Australia", the Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party, as amended to June, 1976, state:

Expansion of the State banking system to provide for the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of S.A. and placed under the control of a governor to be developed along the following lines:

- (a) A State-wide trading bank handling the ordinary business of the community.
- (b) A savings bank performing the ordinary function of such a bank.
- (c) A hire-purchase department, providing finance for the purchase of farm implements, industrial equipment, motor cars, and domestic appliances at reasonable rates of interest. Interest to be payable only on balance of loan outstanding at the end of each month.
- (d) A credit foncier system for the purpose of providing advances to home builders and primary producers.
- (e) All public instrumentalities to bank with the State banking system.

While that sweeping statement contains many innovations in connection with facilities provided by the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, I draw attention to the ramifications of the whole policy, particularly the last clause, which provides for all public instrumentalities

to bank with the State banking system. Various Government departments, instrumentalities and boards have been contacted by Ministers requesting them to make alternative arrangements in connection with departments and statutory authorities that do not bank with the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia. A slip of paper that was found in my letter box states:

Your attention is invited to the attached Premier's memorandum dated October 19, 1977, regarding the Government's policy requiring all Government departments and statutory authorities to bank either at the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia unless there are good and practical reasons for doing otherwise.

I would therefore be grateful if you take the necessary steps to transfer your organisation's banking to either the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia and advise me when it has been effected.

Dr. Eastick: That is "big brother" stuff.

Mr. BECKER: We have not yet got to the "big brother" stuff. The slip of paper continues:

If there are good reasons as to why your organisation cannot comply with the Government's policy, would you please let me know immediately. You will note that I am required to submit a report to the Premier on this matter by December 31, 1977.

Following that, the Premier's memorandum, dated October 19, and headed "To all Ministers: Use of State Banks", states:

Attached is a schedule showing where departments and statutory authorities under your responsibility are banking at present. The schedule indicates balances and gives the operating deposits held.

On October 11, Cabinet approved a policy that all statutory bodies should bank either at the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia, unless there are good and practical reasons for doing otherwise. In line with that policy, it would be appreciated if you would make arrangements for those departments and statutory bodies under your control to be contacted, and the transfer of banking to be discussed with the objective that, wherever practicable, this should take place in the immediate future.

The current Treasury procedure for clearing funds to the Reserve Bank will continue, and the State Bank has agreed to accept any existing concessions which present bankers may be extending.

If, for some reason, it is not practical to make arrangements to transfer any particular account, contact should be made with Mr. A. M. Smith of the Economics Division of the Department of Economic Development, so that the matter can be investigated further.

When a decision on the transfer has been made, departments and statutory authorities should contact the Manager of the State Bank, Adelaide Office, or the Chief Manager (Banking) of the Savings Bank of South Australia.

A report on what action has been taken in this respect would be appreciated by December 31 this year.

So, Cabinet has ratified the Labor Party's decision that all Government departments and statutory bodies will in future bank with the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia. It is difficult to obtain the exact figure of the funds at present held in private trading banks in South Australia, but I have had an indication that the deposits of local government and semi-government authorities with all trading banks as at May, 1977, throughout Australia amounted to \$39 700 000, and that the figure with the major trading banks at the end of May, 1977, was \$10 300 000.

I am told that, in South Australia, some large instrumentalities bank with the private trading banks. The figure given to me by bankers is that it is in the vicinity of

millions of dollars—probably \$2 000 000 or \$3 000 000, and perhaps more. Until we can accurately assess the amount, we can only estimate the amount of deposits. The deposits would run into millions of dollars at any one time because of the tremendous cash flow generated by organisations such as the South Australian Housing Trust, the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the Pipelines Authority to some degree, and many other Government organisations handling large sums of money.

These funds, placed in the hands of one bank, whether the Savings Bank or the State Bank, can give the Government a considerable sum of money at any one time. Accompanying the Revenue Account statement each month we receive a copy of the Crown funds figures. The latest figures show that at September 30, 1977, disposal funds totalled \$146 500 000, whilst \$112 000 000 was on fixed deposit and \$28 500 000 on short-term deposit. Advances in London totalled just over \$1 000 000 and the current bank account showed a balance of \$4 900 000.

Give that sum to a State Government pledged to socialist economic policies, a State Government pledged to upgrade the State Bank facilities and to provide certain facilities in South Australia, and we are immediately placing in the hands of one person and, as it says, under the control of the Government, a tremendous amount of money. This money will be pulled out of the private trading sector. In the short term it could affect the liquidity of some of the private trading banks; if that happened, the banks would have to look seriously at the current overdraft lending policies. For any State Government to require this position within South Australia at this stage would be absolutely foolish.

I believe that the Government could not care less about the ramifications, but the private trading banks must keep a level of liquidity. I understand that they keep well within the limit as recommended by the Reserve Bank, but any pressure on the private trading sector will affect the whole of the State, especially the small businesses that depend seasonally on overdraft arrangements, that may have to make overdraft arrangements from day to day, from week to week, or on a temporary basis. If that flow of funds is suddenly stopped, problems will be caused.

The State Government is also committed to certain policies to establish industries, and to run State controlled industries, whether in the fields of oil, gas or energy. We find the same position in the steel industry. If all the money which is currently on float through the Crown funds is put under the control of one person, who is responsible to the Treasurer, the Government certainly can carry out many of its policy undertakings. It could spend money in the short term in areas of the promotion of its Party, and that is what I believe it will do. I believe the Government will use all the funds generated within South Australia, keeping them within its own State banking organisations for the promotion of what we have been told by previous speakers is the Government's pursuing of its socialist policies.

If we look through the whole platform of the Labor Party, we see what is to unfold. No doubt it is a long-term project, but to get hold of the money now the Government can gamble on the future. The State Revenue Account shows that we are running at about \$16 900 000 in deficit. The Budget predicted a deficit of \$18 400 000 for the whole of the financial year, wiping out any surplus funds we had. I believe that the deficit in the State Revenue Account is far higher than was previously expected, and that South Australia could find itself in the red at the end of the financial year. Is it any wonder that the people of

South Australia are complaining? Extra pressures will be put on them.

The Government's history in relation to State taxes is further evidence of how the whole master plan is unfolding. The Government will be able to control the short-term money market, the surplus funds of the various Government departments and statutory authorities. Funds could be invested in the short-term money market for the development of the State could be used and taken up by the various Government departments and statutory authorities to meet their commitments on a daily basis. The State Government could easily step in and control the short-term money market in South Australia.

It must be remembered that the private trading banks in South Australia are controlled by the Reserve Bank, which acts as the lender of last resort, so that no South Australian depositor with the private trading banks has anything to fear in this regard, except that the State will control all the money it possibly can to carry out its policies.

If we look at State taxes, we find another story. A few days ago the Leader of the Opposition said that, when the Labor Government was elected to office in 1970, South Australians paid the lowest State taxes per capita on the Australian mainland. Because of Labor's policies since that time, South Australians now pay the highest per capita State taxes among the smaller States. The latest figures from the 1977 Grants Commission report, which is the best basis we can use and the most authoritative, show that Tasmanians contribute \$184 a head, Queenslanders \$195, Western Australians \$225, and South Australians \$240 a head. Furthermore, since the Labor Government came to office in 1970, per capita State taxation in South Australia has risen faster than anywhere in Australia. The percentage change in all States shows that in Victoria the increase was 243 per cent, in Tasmania 241 per cent, in New South Wales 236 per cent, in Western Australia 215 per cent, in Queensland 204 per cent, and in South Australia 317 per cent.

The present Government, in pursuing its policies, in having to meet the commitments of its extravagances, in a little over seven years has increased our taxation per capita at a rate considerably higher than that of any other State in Australia. This means that the Government, through taxation, is pulling in extra money out of the average person's pay packet. The average citizen is having to contribute more. This money is going into the State's coffers, and now the Government is going to wrap the whole thing up by insisting that Government departments and statutory authorities bank with the State Bank or with the Savings Bank of South Australia. Of course, the Government would like that because the Treasury gets back 50 per cent of the profits of the State Bank. Last year that amounted to about \$1 600 000. We can see that these matters are being brought under one control. Investigations have been made, and some time ago the Leader of the Opposition asked questions regarding the establishment of a South Australian banking corporation, incorporating the State Government Insurance Commission, the Housing Trust, and any other organisation having anything to do with State finances handling large sums of money. All this money will be placed under the control of one person called the Governor of this new State instrumentality.

It is a reality. The wheels are in motion. Cabinet approved it on October 11, and the various Ministers are now carrying out this request. We also realise that, if any board of any instrumentality refuses to transfer the banking arrangements, the heads will be counted and the board members will be replaced until the Government

forces its policy through, which is what it intends to do; and that is how it will carry out this dream on which it has been working so stealthily for so long.

The other point that worries me and can seriously affect South Australia relates to the beekeeping industry. I have been informed that in South Australia we have come across a disease that is affecting the larvae of the bees, known as European foul brood. For the information of honourable members, I should like to read an article written by Mr. Bob Winn, who is the Technical Officer of the Apiaries Section of the Agriculture Department, concerning European foul brood. In *The Australian Beekeeper* of June 15, 1977, he states:

European foul brood is a serious disease of honey bees capable of causing considerable economic loss in affected apiaries. The disease, which was confirmed in three South-East apiaries recently, is thought to have been present in South Australia and other States for some years, but this is the first time that the primary organism has been isolated in Australia.

The disease is generally more prevalent during spring and early summer but outbreaks can flare at any time if foraging conditions are poor. Its effects vary, depending on the severity of the outbreak and the seasonal conditions. In severe outbreaks there can be a high death rate in bee larvae and adults resulting in severe loss of colony strength and reduced honey production. In South Australia the highest prevalence can be expected to coincide with the flowering periods of salvation jane, blue gums and lucerne which are our top honey producing flora. The actual cause of the disease is the bacteria streptococcus pluton which gains entry to the hive either through infected bees or infected material introduced by the apiarist during hive manipulation. It is ingested with the larval food (royal jelly) and lodges in the mid-gut cavity of the young larvae where it grows to often fatal proportions. The larvae die at about 4-5 days of age and decompose rapidly. During cleaning out of the decomposing larvae, the mouth parts of the housekeeping bees become covered with the bacteria, which may then find its way to the royal jelly and so infect other larvae. Though primarily a disease of the young larvae, where the death toll may be as high as 90 per cent, adult bees can also be affected in severe outbreaks.

Symptoms, in the brood, uncapped larvae about 4-5 days old can be seen dead or dying in their cells. They do not lie flat along the floor of the cell as the American foul brood, but are twisted in different positions appearing as if they had died writhing in agony. They lose their pearly white sheen, turn brown and decompose rapidly, drying out to a dark brown scale. In severe outbreaks a greater number of dead adult bees than normal can often be seen in front of the hives, and live but obviously sick bees can be found crawling on the ground among them.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you going to read all of this?

Mr. BECKER: I am going to read it all because this is a serious problem and, if the Minister opposite and the Minister of Agriculture are not concerned at this stage to control the prevalence of European foul brood in South Australia, they should be ashamed, because this could really upset not only the honey industry but also the pollination of the various seeds that we depend upon. The article continues:

Control: No set control programme has been formulated and tested in Australia. Methods adopted in other countries vary and include complete hive destruction, destruction of infected comb, comb sterilisation, treatment with antibiotics, and requeening. None of these methods have completely eradicated the disease but the best results have been achieved through a combination of destruction of diseased material,

treatment with antibiotics and, where possible, providing better foraging for bees. The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries is currently carrying out experimental control programmes. Information on the progress of these programmes, or any other aspect of the disease, can be obtained by contacting the Apiaries Section.

Movement: To prevent the spread of European foul brood a proclamation was passed on March 31, prohibiting the movement of bees, hives and appliances used in apiculture, except extracted honey and new (unused) apiculture appliances, into or out of all that area of the eastern part of the State including and south of, the counties of Buccleuch and Chandos.

I am concerned about the honey industry. The problem is that in South Australia in the Agriculture and Fisheries Department there are just two inspectors to inspect the hives. If we look at the 1976 *Year Book*, at page 467 we find that for the season 1974-75 there were 978 beekeepers in South Australia; The productive hives numbered 89 464, and there were some 18 909 unproductive hives. Also, 5 510 000 kg of honey was produced, and I am told that at the current market price that would amount to about 70c a kilogram. The yield of honey from each productive hive was 62 kg, and the beeswax produced was 97 000 kg, which is worth \$3.50 a kilogram. With some 89 000 productive hives, it would be physically impossible for two inspectors to inspect all the hives in an attempt to check European foul brood, which can destroy 90 per cent of the larvae and, given time and if it went unchecked, could wipe out most of the bees in South Australia.

If we have no bees, we are in real trouble. Government members are not very concerned but I assure them that the beekeepers of South Australia are very concerned, so much so that the Honey Board financed a trip for a recognised expert from the United Kingdom, Dr. Bailey, who is at present in South Australia and is undertaking certain tests and preparing a report for the industry. What everyone in the industry is concerned about is, first of all, that there is no compensation legislation in South Australia, yet there is in Western Australia and Victoria. Secondly, the Victorians have been very difficult in the matter as well, because at one stage they would not take honey from South Australia, and as the amount of honey that is produced in South Australia is a valuable export, it is most important to the industry that the Agriculture and Fisheries Department now act quickly to appoint more inspectors, and that the Government, too, act promptly to set up a compensation fund. I understand that the beekeepers of South Australia would be prepared to contribute to such a fund. I understand also there is a levy of some \$5 a hive, worked on a sliding scale, and the registration fee is paid every three years.

It is important that the Minister acquaint himself with the whole situation and protect the honey industry in South Australia. Unfortunately, the effective hives are in the South-East of the State. There is a problem with the recent bush fire that swept through one of the national parks in the Adelaide Hills. There has been a request to move the hives back into the Hills area, and it is expected that the hives can be brought up from the South-East. If affected hives are brought into the Adelaide Hills, the damage that could be caused to other hives in those areas can readily be imagined. I hope that the Minister will pass on my suggestions to the Minister of Agriculture so that he will appoint additional inspectors so that all hives in the State can be inspected. It is a slow process with only two men stationed in the city. If they have to drive to the South-East, they lose two days travelling time and have only three days in the field each week. Practical experience in examining hives helps them, and a good

inspector could inspect 300 to 400 hives in a day, but with thousands of hives we obviously need more inspectors. If the Government does not care about the export of honey and the honey industry in the State, or about the health of people, or about the pollination of various crops that are required, it may as well give it away. It seems that all the Government is concerned about is having a good time and reaping taxes.

I am doing what any member should do, that is, to bring the matter to the attention of the Government. I was told of this matter on Saturday and this is the first opportunity I have had to let the Government know that there is a serious problem and that it is about time the Government considered this matter.

I turn now to another matter that concerns me, and that is the appointment of a new Director of Tourism in South Australia, Mr. Joselin. This booking clerk from British Airways was brought in, and no sooner had he arrived than he began to make comments. A report in the *Advertiser* of August 20 states:

South Australia's new Tourism Director (Mr. G. F. Joselin) says Adelaide Airport should become international to boost tourism and he does not think the anti-noise lobby has a case for opposing its use for overseas flights.

The member for Morphett will know that that statement could not be further from the truth, and I am sure that someone should tell Mr. Joselin the facts of life. The report continues:

Mr. Joselin, a former British Airways executive, began his new job this week after having arrived "wringing out like a rag"—

that is what some of my constituents would like to do with him—

following a tiring trip from Britain—during which he wished supersonic Concorde's were already in service to cut the journey time by half.

The member for Henley Beach will have to tell Mr. Joselin that he and I agree that we do not want Concorde's in Australia and certainly not at Adelaide Airport. The report continues:

Mr. Joselin said the development of quieter overseas jets—and the imposition of high landing fees for noisy planes were among factors to be considered when weighing the advantages of continuing to use near-city Adelaide Airport against the cost disadvantage of building a new airport in open country 30 to 50 kilometres away as apparently favoured by some people.

I can tell him that many people favour the resiting of the Adelaide Airport at Dublin.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Government favours that, too.

Mr. BECKER: I am pleased to hear that. Will the Minister assist me and the West Torrens council in arranging a deputation to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport so that we can tell Mr. Joselin what we think of him.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When you talk to him will you repeat what you said today under Parliamentary privilege?

Mr. BECKER: I am not frightened of him, and could not care less. A report in the *News* of November 1 states:

The State Government was investigating the possibility of attracting tourists to South Australia from the west coast of the United States, the Tourism Minister, Mr. Casey, said today. Tourism chief, Mr. Geoffrey Joselin, said today regular flights from overseas into Adelaide were essential to fully develop South Australia's tourist industry.

These statements followed the release yesterday of a report to the State Government on South Australian tourism in which several major developments to boost tourism, including an international hotel in the city area, are recommended.

There is not much being said about the redevelopment of Moseley Square, and nothing has been said about the \$80 000 that has been spent on a project that has now been scrapped. A report in the *Advertiser* of November 2 states:

Adelaide could attract United States charter airline companies to fly once a week into South Australia during the off-peak European winter season, the Director of Tourism (Mr. G. F. Joselin) said last night. "I'd be delighted if we could get just one flight in a week—we would have 400 Americans leaving here as ambassadors for South Australia every week", Mr. Joselin said.

God help us! The report continues:

"The companies have to find a use for their craft during the winter. It would be ideal to have them flying to Australia with charter tour groups", he said. The Minister of Tourism (Mr. Casey) said yesterday the South Australian Government was investigating the possibility of attracting United States tourists to South Australia. Mr. Joselin said plans to attract tourists from the United States West Coast were only minor compared with the campaign for the rest of Australia.

Mr. Joselin said it would "cost a fortune" to promote South Australia in the highly competitive overseas travel market. However, a new approach would be tried where tourism bodies could promote each other's projects.

A report in the *News* of November 9 under the heading "Centre backs charter flights" states:

Claims that noise pollution at Adelaide Airport would increase with the introduction of international charter flights were denied today by Adelaide Convention Centre chairman, Mr. Joe O'Sullivan. He said people who opposed the idea of charter flights from the U.S. and Europe landing at West Beach did not understand what it would involve.

That includes the Government, because it will not support having an international airport at Adelaide, and Mr. O'Sullivan will have to be told that. The report continues:

"I can't see any problems", he said. "The wide-bodied aircraft, like the Jumbo Jet, are not as noisy as TAA and Ansett's 727s or DC9s. And I'm sure arrangements could be organised to stick to Adelaide's curfew." Mr. O'Sullivan said the convention centre would welcome overseas charter flights landing at Adelaide Airport as planned by Englishman Mr. Freddie Laker.

Mr. Mathwin: He has whispering jets.

Mr. BECKER: Mr. Laker is not coming to Adelaide. The report continues:

Such a move would give the South Australian tourist industry an enormous boost. "It would make a big difference—not only increasing the number of people visiting South Australia, but also cutting costs for South Australians holidaying overseas", he said.

In Brisbane yesterday, South Australia's Director of Tourism, Mr. Geoffrey Joselin, confirmed that negotiations were under way for Adelaide Airport to be licensed to operate overseas charter flights. Mr. Joselin is convinced that Adelaide is the logical Australian headquarters for charter operations.

A report in the *Advertiser* of November 3, states:

The South Australian Government would not develop Adelaide Airport as an international airport, the Assembly was told yesterday.

That was in reply to a question by the member for Henley Beach, and I know how concerned he is. A report in the *Advertiser* of November 10, under the heading "Extra flights 'no worry' for airport", states:

Air traffic would increase only minimally if international charter flights operated from Adelaide Airport, the Adelaide Convention Bureau manager (Mr. J. T. O'Sullivan) said yesterday.

He was commenting on a report on negotiations to license the airport for charter flights between Adelaide and Europe and the United States. "We are not talking about a full

international airport but a few charter flights a week", Mr. O'Sullivan said. "At present there are 36 domestic movements daily". "The increase in air traffic would be very low if five or so charter flights left Adelaide Airport each week".

So, we are now up from one a week to five a week. The report continues:

Mr. O'Sullivan said the Mayor of West Torrens (Mr. S. J. Hamra) was "taking counsel of his apprehensions" and saw the problem of noise pollution as bigger than it was. "The 747 is a quieter aircraft than the planes used by Ansett and TAA".

We must remember all these things because, after all, we have experts making these statements. I refer now to a report headed "Plan for charter flights to S.A., Europe and the U.S." in the *News* of November 8, 1977, which states:

Negotiations are under way for Adelaide Airport to be licensed to operate charter flights from Europe and America. South Australia's Director of Tourism, Mr. Geoff Joselin, confirmed this here today.

Mr. Joselin is attending the seventh annual Australian Travel Seminar at Noosa Heads on the Sunshine Coast.

I am pleased that he is seeing a bit of the country. The report continues:

It is understood the State Government has applied to the Federal Government for a charter licence. He said Adelaide was the logical Australian headquarters for a charter operation such as those already planned by the British independent airline operator, Mr. Freddie Laker.

[Mr. Laker, who already runs cut-price flights between London and New York, has applied for permission to operate cheap charter services from London to Australia and New Zealand].

Mr. Joselin said Adelaide was centrally placed and an ideal destination for charter flights from Europe and America. Adelaide Airport was quite adequate to take the Jumbo-sized aircraft proposed by Mr. Laker.

"The strip is quite long enough—the only problem is aircraft would have to make a second refuelling stop in Australia, probably at Perth or Darwin, on the way home to Europe," he said.

I think we have had enough nonsense from Mr. O'Sullivan and Mr. Joselin. Let us see what the Air Transport Departments says about Adelaide Airport. I asked whether Adelaide Airport was of international standard. In reply, I was told that it was beyond the scope of the airport at present to handle international flights on a regular basis because of the size of the terminal. For an international flight, more room would have to be created in the terminal for a customs hall, or arrangements would have to be made elsewhere. International flights on a one-off basis can be and are occasionally handled through Adelaide Airport when there is no pressure on facilities from local flights.

So, if an aeroplane is coming in from overseas, whether from Singapore or elsewhere, weather conditions cannot be guaranteed, nor can the time at which the flight will land at Adelaide. So, when it is said that the aeroplane will land outside the curfew hours, that matter will be beyond our local control. Also, Adelaide Airport does not at present have the facilities, or indeed the room, to operate as an international airport. It has no customs hall or other facilities to handle international flights. One expert has said that it could handle one such flight a week, whereas the other has said that the airport could handle five a week. There is no way that could happen. There will have to be considerable reconstruction work, the cost of which would run into millions of dollars.

Dr. Eastick: It's bedlam down there now with local flights at peak periods.

Mr. BECKER: That is so. It is bad enough trying to catch a flight to go to Kangaroo Island.

Mr. Wotton: They've got a V.I.P. room down there. What's wrong with that?

Mr. BECKER: That would be all right, as long as there were not more than three people. Customs and quarantine would have to be handled through the Customs Department and, as mentioned, that would require a customs hall. There is no room for such a facility within the terminal at present. I asked whether Adelaide Airport could handle a jumbo maximum load, which would vary with the amount of fuel on board. We should remember one of the great learned gentlemen who, as Director of Tourism, said that they would have to refuel on the way back. The Jumbo maximum load could vary from 100 passengers to about 480 passengers. This would depend then on the cargo and the fuel. There is no way in which that could get into Adelaide.

If the return fuel must be carried to Darwin or Perth, the passenger load would probably have to be reduced to 100. Because it depends on the amount of fuel, this governs the limitations of the short runway. There is no aircraft at present that could operate off a short runway with a maximum number of passengers and a full load of fuel on board.

The main runway is 2 438 metres long, running north-east to south-west, roughly from Richmond to Glenelg. The people at Tea Tree Gully, who are right in that flight path, would be delighted to have that extra noise above them!

The subsidiary runway is 1 652 m long. The main runway is big enough to handle a jumbo jet, but not with a full load of fuel. The shortness of the runway and a full passenger load would require a refuelling stop at either Darwin or Perth before making the hop to Singapore. No aircraft currently operating would be capable of taking off on a short runway and flying direct from Adelaide to Singapore without refuelling. Unless the airline picked up extra passengers at either Darwin or Perth along with fuel, the proposition would not be economic.

That is the whole crux of the matter. We have experts running the convention bureau, and an expert running the Tourist Bureau, and they have not even done their homework! Would not one think that the booking clerk from British Airways would know something about the operations of the 747 and the amount of fuel and the number of passengers involved?

Mr. Mathwin: An expert is a person who knows more and more about less and less.

Mr. BECKER: I am beginning to believe that. Ideally, an international flight wants to collect all passengers at one stop and fly them direct, non-stop to their original destination. That is what Freddie Laker is all about: he wants to go from one point to another without stops. Let me now examine the emergency facilities. I should hate to think what would happen at Adelaide Airport in an emergency. I have been saying that for seven years. The Chief Fireman has said that they had facilities to handle the occasional oversea flight. The provision of emergency services is based on the 727-type of aircraft, which is the largest of aeroplanes to use the airport. If international flights were to come into Adelaide regularly, the facilities would have to be upgraded considerably. Such international aircraft would then determine or form the basis of the standard of emergency facilities.

I now come to the most important point in relation to international and charter flights and cheap tours, that is, security. The airline companies are responsible for security on the passenger side, that is, routine searches for weapons of any kind, and this is usually handled through private security firms.

There would not be the room or the facilities at Adelaide Airport to handle the full passenger load on a 747 jumbo jet. The Air Transport Department is responsible for "air side" security. This includes the provision of a security fence and traffic officers on the tarmac. These officers are directed by the airport director.

Then, of course, we can have the argument regarding noise levels. Many noise level tests have been taken around Adelaide Airport and, although these vary, no-one has ever taken them on consecutive days or over a considerable period. It depends on the velocity of the wind, the type of cloud (whether it is high cloud or low cloud), as well as many other factors. Apparently, most aeroplanes approaching and taking off from Adelaide Airport have a noise level of about 100 decibels. The big 727 100-type aeroplane, which is the smallest of the internal aeroplanes that are used here, gets as high as 109 dB on approach. On take-off, its noise level measures about 96 to 99 dB. This also depends on weather conditions. At Adelaide Airport the prevailing winds come from the south-east.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The prevailing wind is from the south-west.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, from the south-west. If the prevailing winds are over 14 knots problems are experienced at the Adelaide Airport, and this could involve a major safety hazard. If an international flight was coming in fully loaded, and there were extremely strong winds, heavy cloud or rain it would create a tremendous problem. It is on record in this House that we as a Parliament would not support extending the existing runways at Adelaide Airport, including a runway across Tapley Hill Road, and that we are very conscious of the noise factor at the Adelaide Airport because it concerns much of the metropolitan area.

A committee has been examining resiting the Adelaide Airport for about four years, but it still has not come up with a recommendation. We are bitterly disappointed that the Government had to go overseas to find a Director of Tourism whose first statement he made here was that he wanted to turn Adelaide Airport into an international airport. Now he wants to obtain charter flights using big aircraft bringing 400 people a week in on the one flight, and reference has also been made to bringing in five planes a week. It is time for some straight talking within Government circles.

I refer to two statements made by the Federal Minister for Transport about Adelaide Airport. One was made after I wrote to the Minister about low cost air fares, and he replied in a letter dated November 11, 1977, as follows:

The remarks I was quoted as making recently were made in the context that the Australian Government is currently reviewing its international civil aviation policies to investigate, among other aspects, the possibility of lowering air fares to and from Australia. I recently made a formal announcement of the commencement of a review of international civil aviation policy and I am attaching copies of my statements on the matter for your information. You will be interested to know that there have been some two hundred applications for charter flights from the United States of America to Australia over the last six or seven years. All have been approved by the Australian Government although not all were subsequently flown.

Companies applying for air charter are obviously unable to fully load the aircraft, or it is just not economic. The letter continues:

I can assure you that the Government will continue to actively encourage the international airlines to develop and maintain economically viable low cost air fares between Australia and as many overseas destinations as possible.

On October 20 the Federal Minister issued a press release, headed "International Civil Aviation Policy Review — Terms of Reference", as follows:

The Minister for Transport, Mr. Peter Nixon, today released the terms of reference of the Review of International Civil Aviation Policy, the establishment of which he announced on October 11. Mr. Nixon said the terms of reference indicated the comprehensiveness of the review and the Government's concern to ensure existing regulatory arrangements do not unnecessarily prevent the introduction of lower fares. Mr. Nixon also confirmed that the review would not preclude the Government's consideration of charter applications or changes to existing schedules and services.

"Applications will, of course, be considered in the normal way under the existing policy arrangements," Mr. Nixon said. Mr. Nixon said the terms of reference would be sent to all international airlines operating to Australia, major domestic airlines, the travel and tourist industries and other carriers who have expressed interest in operating to Australia. "The terms of reference will be freely available to the public and I encourage any interested person to make a submission to the review."

Having looked at all these statements made recently, we have to come back to the fact that the South Australian Government is applying for air charter rights. That would relate to the submission by the South Australian Government (or the tourist officer concerned) to the Federal Minister for Transport. So here we find an interesting and misleading situation, as I see it. Let us look at the press release made on October 11, 1977, as follows:

The Department of Transport is to begin a major review of Australia's international civil aviation policy, the Minister for Transport, Mr. Peter Nixon, announced today. "There is presently considerable public interest in the possibility of lowering air fares to and from Australia and of developing cheaper air freight arrangements through the variation of existing policies," Mr. Nixon said. "Lower fares would benefit both Australian travellers and tourist travel to Australia, and I am concerned to ensure that regulatory arrangements do not unnecessarily prevent these objectives being met.

"However development of alternative arrangements, which offer the promise of lower fares and freight rates, also present particular problems. For instance regular charter services, if well supported, could affect the level of frequency of scheduled services, the range of destinations they serve and the prices they must charge. Additionally, they could affect the frequency of flights and the number of destinations served from the smaller Australian international airports, as well as airport planning and development and the air services arrangements Australia has with other countries."

Surely Mr. Joselin, the officer concerned, would know that Australia is not going to create an international airport if it cannot get reciprocal rights in another country.

Mr. Nixon told me about 18 months ago that there had been no application from any other country for some considerable time seeking to establish regular flights to Australia. The Australian Government, no matter whether it is Liberal or Labor, will not approve of another international airport in Australia unless it receives reciprocal rights. Following such approval, we would want those rights for Qantas. However, Qantas is not interested at this stage, and 18 months ago when I saw the Minister it had made no representation to him. It is absolute nonsense for people to talk about making Adelaide Airport an international airport when there are so many obstacles in the way.

Even if it were desired to make Adelaide an international airport, it could not be done overnight; it

would take a considerable time. I understand that there are plans for moving the control tower at the Adelaide Airport and to upgrade staff facilities which will cost about \$2 200 000. Those plans have been laid aside until after the Federal election. There will be no other major development at the Adelaide Airport until the year 2000; nothing else is even being considered. A feasibility study was undertaken recently, and there were rumours sweeping the electorate (as there usually are at the time of every election) suggesting that there was going to be a north-south runway at the Adelaide Airport. I am told that this was considered and that it was not feasible to realign the runway. On September 22, the Minister stated:

There are two major physical problems associated with the realignment, viz: the effective operational length of the runway pavement and the effects on the approach path by the tall buildings in the central business district of Adelaide. If the runway was pivoted in a clockwise direction, away from Glenelg North, then the reduction in the effective operational length of the runway caused by its convergence with Tapley Hill Road would be unacceptable. Additionally, the splay angle of the approach path would be infringed by the tall buildings in the central business district. There are other problems concerned with realignment of taxiways and the consequential need for relocation of navigation aids that would make a realignment difficult, if not impossible. If a relocation was possible the cost of the runway and taxiway works would be about \$18 000 000, excluding navigation aid relocation costs, which would be substantial.

Again, it is not on to spend that sum to upgrade anything at the Adelaide Airport. In the *Advertiser* of Friday, November 11, under the heading "Laker Rejects Adelaide Flights", Laker summed it up as follows:

"I'm 100 per cent confident," Mr. Freddie Laker said today, referring to his application, now being studied by the British and Australian Governments, to operate low-cost flights to Australia. He wants Sydney and/or Melbourne as his terminals and believes, if there is only one, Melbourne is the most likely.

He entirely rejected the idea that he would be willing to operate to Adelaide if denied Sydney or Melbourne. Sydney and Melbourne are the most logical places, and probably Melbourne because the airport there does not have the problem of jet restriction, Mr. Laker said. "I can't see Adelaide is a sufficient centre in terms of numbers for the British or the Australian Governments to give us a permit.

The Director of Tourism was employed by a British airline company, which is Government controlled. The report continues:

If you are going to mount an operation of the size we have in mind, you have to have terminating or originating points of a size that go with it.

The next sentence is the most interesting part of the report, and is as follows:

"No one who has had anything to do with operational and commercial planning would have ever considered the possibility of operating into or out of Adelaide."

It amazes me that we had to go overseas to get a new Director of Tourism, when I think anyone in the department would have been better than this chap, who is a former British Airways executive. I wonder whether, to justify his position, the new Director of Tourism will say that he wants a casino in the city and Sunday drinking laws relaxed. They are about the only two other suggestions he has not made. I would be interested to know his attitude on those matters.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the motion. In doing so I want officially to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the Speaker's Chair. I hope sincerely that you enjoy your

stay in the Chair, even though it will be only for three years. I also congratulate your Deputy on his appointment. Members on this side at this stage do not have much to complain about regarding the manner in which you have conducted the affairs of the House. Indeed, we sympathise with you in the problems you have with certain members of the front bench. I will refer briefly to the remarks of the member for Ross Smith, who moved the motion we are now debating.

Mr. Rodda: The boy wonder.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, the person who wants to involve us all in a system that one could describe only as the Dunstan dragnet. He wants to drag the people of this State under the Dunstan socialist regime. It is interesting to note some of the comments he made. He referred to the brief Speech made by His Excellency the Governor. That is nothing for the Government to be proud of; it was rather obvious to members on this side that the Government did not have any plans then to put before the House, but that its attitude was, "We must get the House into session so we will think of something when the time comes." No doubt the Government can always refer to the book of rules that lays down the path that we must tread in this State. The member for Ross Smith said:

I was elected not in my personal capacity so much as a member and representative of the Australian Labor Party. He went on to indicate to the people of this State obviously that he does not have a view of his own. He comes into this House as a representative of the people. It is rather interesting that he has not complained about the nomination form that members must fill out. When they nominate for a Parliamentary seat, members do not state to which political Party they belong. The honourable member nominated first as an individual and secondly as a member of the Australian Labor Party.

It is obvious that he is not concerned about the wishes of the people in his area or the people of this State. He went on to explain clearly that if one becomes a member of the Australian Labor Party and is fortunate enough to be elected to Parliament, one does exactly what one is told. It does not matter what one thinks or what are the wishes of the constituents, as long as one carries out the dictates of the masters.

Mr. Mathwin: Toe the line!

Mr. GUNN: Yes. What a sorry state of affairs for one who aspires to become Premier of this State. Heaven help us if he does! Whether he will replace the Minister for Labour and Industry in his step up the long ladder, or whether it will be the Minister of Mines and Energy (who we understand is out of step with the uranium policy) remains to be seen. Nevertheless, the honourable member has indicated clearly to the people what are his views on Parliamentary representation.

The honourable member's speech would have been more applicable to a Marxist organisation than to a so-called democratically elected Parliament, whose members are supposed to speak on behalf of the people they represent. Nevertheless, I will not dwell on that matter any longer. The member for Ross Smith has made quite clear to the people of this State that he believes not in Parliamentary democracy but that the Labor Party should rule. It is the sort of speech that one would have expected from Dr. Soekarno when he explained his guided democracy.

I now refer briefly to my district and to my predecessor, Mr. Allen, the former member for Frome. It was a pleasure to take over his section of the new District of Eyre which he had looked after so well. Mr. Allen was a man who identified himself clearly with the needs and aspirations of the people he represented. I am pleased to

have had his support and assistance over the past few months during my time as the candidate for the new seat of Eyre. I look forward to representing the new seat for many years to come. It was a great pleasure to have represented the old District of Eyre. When I was first elected to this House I received about 56 per cent of the votes cast in that district, compared to 74 per cent old seat. I wish to place on record how much I appreciate the assistance many people gave me and how much I value the friendships I made in that district, especially in that area which I no longer have the privilege to represent but which is now represented by the member for Flinders.

I now want to say a few things about the new District of Eyre, which is by far the largest State Parliamentary district in South Australia, covering about 86 per cent of the land mass of the State. It will be a difficult district to represent. I appreciate the support I received at the most recent State election. About 7 300 people voted for me, which was more than adequate to defeat my two Australian Labor Party rivals. I hope that the Government is fully aware of the problems of representing a district as large as the District of Eyre. The Government must accept the responsibility of providing the necessary facilities, because it drew up the terms of reference that the Commissioners had to consider when they drew the boundaries. In my opinion the boundaries could have been drawn in a different way to achieve basically the same district but one that would have been far easier to represent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Didn't both the Liberal and Labor submissions—

Mr. GUNN: As the Minister knows, some terms of reference made it almost impossible for the Commissioners to draw the boundaries in any way other than the way in which they drew them. Regarding the recent election and some statements made by Ministers and the two candidates who opposed me, it was interesting to see the interest that the Premier in particular and certain Ministers suddenly showed in the District of Eyre, particularly Eyre Peninsula. In the 6½ years that I had been the member for the old District of Eyre, the Premier did not venture in to my district at all. Then he came to Upper Eyre Peninsula and said how much he enjoyed coming. It took him 6½ years to come, but we were pleased that he came.

Unfortunately, we were not treated as well as was the member for Mt. Gambier, who had \$35 000 000 spent in his district. I was telling people to invite the Premier, because when he was travelling in the country areas he was throwing a few lollies about, and we had some to ask for. The Government would not listen to the representations that the member for the old District of Frome and I had made, and we have a list of those representations. During the next few months, Ministers will be made aware of those representations and certain promises made. I told the people that, if they were unfortunate enough to have Mr. Dunstan as Premier after the election, funds would be cut off. I told them to get their applications in. Fortunately, some did and they got the money. An example is the caravan park at Venus Bay.

I wish to refer now to the Attorney-General. He was complimentary to me and to the member for Flinders. The only thing that I was sorry about was that his comments were not publicised enough, because the only speech that he made in which he mentioned me was not in the press. I was sorry about that, because every time the Attorney-General visited the area it was worth about 10 per cent of the votes to me, and I think it was worth about 25 per cent to the member for Flinders. I refer now to a thoroughly disgraceful action on the part of the Attorney-General

when he went to Leigh Creek in the course of a trip to the northern parts of the State. Before that, he had gone to Andamooka, and I understand that he did not get on there as well as he had expected, when he had some uncharitable things to say about me. I will quote now from a tape recording of what the Attorney-General said at a meeting that he addressed at Leigh Creek. He stated:

Certainly the Liberal candidate that will be running in this area (and that is Graham Gunn, who was formerly the member for the western part of the North of the State) is the person who, although I don't deny it for a moment that he works quite hard, certainly has nothing to do with the Government. He is so much opposed to the Government, that he is reluctant to send one letter to any Ministry, seeking to raise any matter on behalf of the constituents, and in fact today in Andamooka I ran across the most unsatisfactory situation of having somebody say to me that Graham Gunn took the matter up with you sometime ago and I know quite well that he didn't.

Graham Gunn had gone back to that particular person and had said to him, "I took this up with the Minister and the Minister refused to do anything about it." Now obviously he did that for political purposes and for political purposes only, but I think that is quite underhanded and as soon as I see him, I will be having a piece of him, I can tell you.

To this date, the Attorney-General has not said anything to me about that matter, and I have been waiting with baited breath, terrified of what he will do with me.

Mr. Whitten: Was it truthful?

Mr. GUNN: No, it was not truthful, as usual. One thing I will say about the Attorney-General is that he is quite consistent. At that meeting, he also stated:

Anybody who does that and takes politics to that extent, which is to the detriment of all the people that he is representing, particularly the person whose particular matter is involved—I think that it is quite underhanded and deceitful and wrong of him to do that. I think that that sort of thing is not fair and the person who raised that with me today, I am sure, will probably be having more to say about it publicly in the future.

The person has not spoken to me. It is my policy, if any person approaches me about a matter that is to be raised with a Minister, to immediately take notes and, when I get back to my office, I write a letter. If the matter is urgent, I telephone my secretary and ask her to contact the department immediately. The Attorney-General said nice things about Mr. Allen, because he knew how highly Mr. Allen was regarded in the area. However, he thought he could get away with attacking me. I checked on the amount of correspondence that I had had with Ministers and found that, from February 1 until that matter was brought to my attention, I had written more than 100 letters to State Ministers. I also had written 14 letters to Federal Ministers and about the same number to Senators. I also had had several contacts with State and Federal departments.

Mr. Dean Brown: I'll bet you hadn't had 100 replies.

Mr. GUNN: No.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is out of order. He is interjecting from out of his place.

Mr. GUNN: Regardless of who the constituent is, when that person comes to me I try to rectify the matter. I send a copy of the Minister's reply to the constituent concerned. So, no-one can say that I attempt to turn a problem into a political issue. I try to give the best possible service to my constituents, and I resent the gutter tactics employed against me by the Attorney-General, who owes me an apology. If I have failed to bring a matter to a Minister's attention, I do not recall it, and I would like to know about

it. Regarding the misrepresentation that occurred during the Labor Party's campaigning prior to the recent State election, I refer to the Coober Pedy sub-branch of the Australian Labor Party, headed by Mr. Andrea. A pamphlet was circulated in Coober Pedy a few days prior to the election; it is headed "Australian Labor Party Coober Pedy sub-branch newsletter". The pamphlet states:

Who has been getting things done in the electorate of Eyre in the last couple of years? Not the sitting member! The following is a list of programmes that have been initiated by the Coober Pedy A.L.P. Sub-branch.

1. Trench diggers have become undeclared mining equipment.
2. Electricity supply to be taken over by E.T.S.A.
3. Price of explosives placed under Government price control.
4. Visits by officers of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Public Trustee Office.
5. Access to South Australian Government funds in the form of grants: \$48 000 for the Town Hall, money made available for sport and recreation facilities.
6. Visits to the town by Dunstan, Duncan, Whitlam and Government members of both Houses of State Parliament have created an awareness of our community's needs.
7. Steps taken to improve the town's water supply.
8. Management of the hospital has approached the sub-branch concerning provision of child dental care in the town.

What's our Liberal member of seven years been doing?

On Saturday elect a member who will give Coober Pedy a real voice in Government.

We know what sort of representation the people have been receiving, because the member for Ross Smith has said that Labor Party members are not allowed to represent the people: Labor Party members have to do what they are told. The first matter referred to in that pamphlet is that trench diggers have become undeclared mining equipment. A letter, headed "Attention: trench digger operators", from the South Australian Mines Department states:

The information in a newsletter published on behalf of the Australian Labor Party, Coober Pedy Sub-Branch, which states: "Trench diggers have become undeclared mining equipment" is a mis-statement. Trench diggers are still declared equipment, and each claim must be registered before mining by a trench digger is carried out.

Working with a trench digger on a claim which is not registered may be considered as unauthorised mining, and the operator could be prosecuted. The matter of trench diggers being not declared equipment is being discussed between the C.P.M. & P.A. and the Department of Mines, and some action will be taken in the near future.

That letter, signed by an inspector, completely corrects the lie in the Labor Party's pamphlet.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are a bit enthusiastic.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will cease interjecting.

Mr. GUNN: Some Coober Pedy residents were perturbed about the document. They regarded it as an attack on the progress association and other community groups which had been working for the benefit of the town over many years. Because the Labor Party was taking all the credit for the work done by those groups, one of the residents wrote the following letter, headed "Attention to all in the Coober Pedy community" and dated September 16:

The newsletter published by the Coober Pedy sub-branch of the Australian Labor Party and authorised by Mr. J. Andrea is entirely incorrect.

- (1) This statement is entirely incorrect—any person using

a trench digger in this manner is liable to a fine of \$2 000 or imprisonment.

- (2) The approach to E.T.S.A. for improved town power was never made by the Australian Labor Party.

At least three years ago I took a deputation to the Electricity Trust. At that time the Minister of Mines and Energy was Acting Minister of Works. He had a lot on his plate at the time. I discussed the matter with him, and he said it was all right for me to discuss it with the Electricity Trust. The whole basis of the deputation was a complaint by local residents that the operation was not satisfactory, and they wanted something done about it. A group of business men in the town was willing to purchase the undertaking and guarantee to improve the service; they had equipment standing by in Adelaide. The gentleman I took along was the most successful business man in Coober Pedy. He made clear to the Electricity Trust that, if it did not snap to it, he would rip the main street, lay the cable, and supply power. Only a few days later the trust had officers in Coober Pedy examining the problem. That proves that what was in the Labor Party's pamphlet was incorrect. The resident's letter continues:

- (3) This has always been so.

- (4) Accepted.

- (5) Thanks here go to the great efforts of the local Progress and Miners' Association.

- (6) Who cares?

- (7) So did your Progress and Miners' Association who originally got the existing E. & W.S. set-up.

- (8) No approach by hospital management was ever made to the Australian Labor Party for school dental service. The Community Health Centre had already arranged this (through the offices of Mr. John Wyatt).

Why tell lies? The Progress Association is a non-political body and has done its job well—don't be a party to "blood-sucking".

Some complaints were made about the activities of the group that was claiming credit for work done by other people in Coober Pedy. I would like the Attorney-General to explain how a particular person can be made a justice of the peace within only five weeks of his being nominated; I refer to Mr. Andrea. Mr. Stutley's application had been in for six months. Some people suggested that we should organise a petition to have Mr. Andrea taken off the list. He could not even win a seat on the progress association at its annual general meeting to elect a committee. Perhaps the Attorney-General will explain Mr. Andrea's appointment. I do not recall being asked whether he was a suitable person, which is the normal course of action.

When the Liberal Party announced its policy for northern areas, it was ridiculed by the Premier and other Labor Party spokesmen, but later the Premier issued a statement saying that he would set up an Outback Areas Development Trust which would borrow \$1 000 000 for the purpose of completing projects which the former member for Frome and I had been bringing to the Government's attention. We are delighted that the projects will be completed. There was an initial blare of publicity, but very little has happened since. I am aware that the former Speaker of this House has been appointed Research Assistant to the Minister of Local Government.

Mr. Becker: Jobs for the boys!

Mr. GUNN: I did not say that. I do not want to be uncharitable. My constituents want to know what is going to happen and when the money will arrive. We have had this initial appointment, and we want to know how the trust will operate. I have had letters from organisations seeking information because they have projects which will qualify. For instance, people would like money to clear up the rubbish dump at Copley and at Marree, to establish

lights in the main street of Copley, and to assist with the upgrading of the airfield at Coober Pedy, something which was ridiculed by Government members, particularly the Hon. Mr. Dunford, who made uncharitable remarks. I look forward to the establishment of the trust, although I believe it should be under Ministerial control. I also look forward to receiving the money.

In the huge district which I have the honour to represent, many things need to be done. I can assure the Ministers concerned that I have taken note of all the issues raised by their two candidates for Eyre in the recent election, and I intend to make sure that they account for those promises. Already, I have raised many issues with the Ministers concerned. I am not entirely satisfied with the answers I have received, and I intend to persist in bringing these matters to the attention of the Ministers.

For some time in South Australia we have had a policy of managed fisheries, which has been accepted generally by those involved in the industry as a matter of principle. I do not quarrel with the principle of managed fisheries. I believe it is probably essential, if we are properly to conserve our resources and to protect the people involved in the prawn, abalone, and rock lobster industry, that they must be properly managed. However, the present administration leaves much to be desired. The treatment the abalone divers have received from this Government is scurrilous.

If a person has a rock lobster permit it is attached to the boat and the boat can be sold with the permit. That can be done, too, in the rock lobster industry. However, if a person wants to get out of the abalone industry he cannot do that. It can be done in Western Australia or in Tasmania, but, because the abalone group has been fairly vocal, our Government, particularly the Minister, will not listen to reason.

For many years we have had a system of licensing people who wish to enter scale fisheries. We have a policy which appears, to anyone looking at the industry with an open mind, to be designed to discriminate against those professional fishermen who want to stay in the industry or who wish to enter or to re-enter it. The policy appears to discriminate against them in favour of recreational fishermen. Obviously, the State Government could not care less about the few scale fishermen. A few votes from them do not count, but the Government will pander to the recreational fishermen.

I quote from the explanation supplied to people who apply for licences and who are refused. The document reads as follows:

Administrative policy for the conservation of certain species of fish and the proper management of certain fisheries pursuant to the provisions of section 34 (2) (b) of the Fisheries Act, 1971. Whereas it is necessary, for the conservation of the species of fish specified in the schedule hereto and the proper management of their related fisheries, to limit the number of fishermen licensed to take fish for sale, the following considerations are to be taken into account by the Director in the exercise of his discretion to grant such fishing licences:

- (a) the experience of the applicant in the fishing industry;
- (b) the resources of the applicant;
- (c) the equipment proposed to be used by the applicant in the conduct of his fishing operations;
- (d) the fish resources of the fishery;
- (e) the numbers of fishermen operating in the fishery;
- (f) the needs of recreational fishermen with respect to the fishery;
- (g) the economic returns to existing class 'A' and class 'B' fishermen operating in the fishery.

Some people in my district wish to obtain class A fishing

licences. In one case, the father of the person concerned was one of the first fishermen in the area. The whole family has been involved in the industry for generations. The applicant qualifies on all the criteria laid down, but his application was refused, and one of the grounds for refusal related to the needs of recreational fishermen. I advised the applicant to exercise his rights under the Act and to have the matter heard before Mr. Harniman, who was appointed by the Minister to hear appeals under the legislation. He is a most reasonable person, with a knowledge of the fishing industry.

When one goes before the tribunal, one must listen for half an hour to an officer of the department giving a long explanation of why the applicant should not have a licence. He dwells at length on the needs of recreational fishermen. When I asked the officer representing the Minister and the department to explain the needs of recreational fishermen, there was a deathly silence. The department does not know, so how could it decline an application on that ground? It is nonsense. If one goes to the department, one finds nearly as many officers as there are scale fishermen in South Australia. When I suggested that a survey should be conducted, the officers looked at me blankly. I suggested they should get themselves organised. The Minister does not know, and one is not surprised by that. Now we have a new Assistant Director of Fisheries, and I fear the worst under his guidance, because he is another academic, not a person with any practical knowledge of the industry.

We hear talk of economic returns to the industry. However, it is necessary to take into consideration that the price of whiting, for example, has increased almost threefold in the past 18 months or so, so it is not necessary to put in the same effort to get the same return. The fishing industry in upper Eyre Peninsula has reached a critical stage. So few people are involved in the scale fishing industry there that one of the largest processing organisations in the State may have to close. That is not a story that I have dreamed up. It has been documented, and the information has been sent to the Premier. The Government is prepared to let recreational fishermen take as many fish as they like, completely ignoring the economic well-being of young people who want to enter the industry.

If the industry is to be successful, new people must come into it. Those who have been brought up in the area and whose families are involved should be the people to get into the industry. I know of 12 people in the Thevenard area who want fishing licences and who are entitled to them. I know of some people at Port Kenny who are in the same position. The member for Flinders would know of other people, as would other members. We have 40 000 recreational fishermen, and I have nothing against anyone catching a feed of fish.

I have nothing against that but I strongly object to that section of so-called recreational fishermen who are exploiting the situation, by going out fishing, catching more than their bag limit of whiting and then selling it to fly-by-night operators. That can be documented. If the member for Stuart doubts me, I suggest he talk to a few people in the industry.

Mr. Keneally: It is illegal in the industry.

Mr. GUNN: Of course it is. The honourable member has had a brainstorm: he has suddenly woken up to it! It is illegal but why have not the department and the Minister done something about it?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What evidence have you got of that?

Mr. GUNN: I have a pair of eyes. I suggest that the honourable member, who was once the Minister of

Fisheries before he got the bullet, go down and talk to the professional fishermen; that is all he has to do. Until yesterday, I think it was, two prawn boats were operating out of Port Adelaide without licences under the nose of the Fisheries Department, which did nothing about it. It was complete incompetence on the part of the Minister.

Mr. Whitten: You are not being truthful about it.

Mr. GUNN: I am. The member for Alexandra and I have evidence to reinforce that. The current Minister of Fisheries in this State has the audacity to criticise Mr. Sinclair when he grants a few more permits on a three-months basis so that the prawn fisheries in Investigator Strait can be properly assessed. The situation will not be rectified while we have the present Minister of Fisheries in this State. We saw what happened to the Department of Environment and Conservation when we had an incompetent Minister who did not know what he was doing. He got pushed sideways, and it is about time that the Minister of Fisheries got pushed sideways. It is ridiculous the way the Fisheries Department is attached to the Agriculture Department. It should not be attached. If the honourable member likes to research the position, he can see what his colleagues in New South Wales have done: they have recently established a fisheries department in its own right in that State. It should be under the control here of the Minister of Marine. People have to get their boats and they should be involved in that department.

We may be taking the first step towards getting some commonsense administration by the department. I am sick and tired of having to make representations on behalf of my constituents, knowing they have no hope in hell of getting a licence.

Mr. Keneally: Why should they come to you if they have no hope in hell?

Mr. GUNN: How many people has the honourable member taken to the tribunal? Has he taken any people to Mr. Harniman? The member for Alexandra and I are at least making a genuine effort. We do not agree with the way the department has been administered. Unfortunately, at this stage there is not much we can do about it but in future we will take some positive steps.

Mr. McRae: How did you go with the tribunal?

Mr. GUNN: I won some cases.

Mr. McRae: You should tell the truth.

Mr. GUNN: I have always told the truth. If the honourable member likes to look at the transcript, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries will give it to him so that he can see what Mr. Harniman said about the way in which I had represented the people appearing before him. He was quite complimentary. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I want to say something about the present dog population. I do so because there is a grave concern in the minds of many people in the community not only because of the damage done by marauding dogs to sheep flocks on the—

Mr. Hemmings: Adelaide Plains?

Dr. EASTICK: No; we go further than that; we go into the hill country adjacent to the metropolitan area, described in other places as the metropolitan farming area. These are places in which there are real difficulties in maintaining normal farming activities.

I refer now to a matter raised earlier by the member for Fisher. At the time we had an assurance by the Government that it was working towards a reassessment of the Registration of Dogs Act and the introduction of an Act that would overcome many of the present difficulties. In the Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler, Munno Para *News Review* of October 28 this matter was brought home with some force in a report that states:

Reckon we've got a dog problem? Maybe we have, but spare a moment to absorb some of the doggie figures from New South Wales. Bankstown, with a population of 112 000 people, boasts of no fewer than 23 517 pooches. Large, small, mediums, mongrels, and pure-breds are all included in the count. Of these 1 189 were nabbed by the local dog catcher last year and only 119 were reclaimed by their owners.

I know that several members have been involved in local government, and they would know that when a dog catcher is active the number of reclaimed dogs is minimal, and that situation is a disgrace to those who initially become the owner of the dog. The report continues:

The RSPCA in Sydney had 14 243 dogs surrendered to its kennels last year, and in addition suburban councils bobbed up with a further 6 277. From this total of 20 520 the RSPCA destroyed 14 066. One Sydney council received 1 225 complaints about dogs last year.

Bankstown council alarmed by its canine statistics, conducted a survey on why people keep dogs and the results showed the following: "Dogs provide the affection and support needed by alienated children and adults. Dogs are a link with society for many people, who would otherwise be alone—pensioners, widows, handicapped and disturbed people, and childless couples." Come on dog owners. Into which category do you fit? A friend of mine placed me in the "disturbed" group and based his findings on the fact that I was foolish enough to comment on that sacred cow Salisbury's library services.

P.S. The survey also showed that the average dog lives to the age of 10 and the food bill during that life span would be between \$2 000 and \$3 000.

This is in New South Wales, but let us further consider the matter. We find that in New South Wales the Minister for Local Government convened a meeting of interested people, and that is recorded in the most recent edition of *Comment*, which is published by the Uncle Ben's of Australia organisation and which has a wide circulation among people associated with dogs. The report indicated that about 900 people crowded Sydney's Seymour Centre to attend a seminar on dog control organised by the New South Wales State Government. In other words, there is a real issue, and in a city such as Sydney 900 people were involved in the seminar. The report continues:

Hosted by Local Government Minister, Harry Jensen, the seminar looked at registration fees, incentives for desexing, leashing of dogs, and fouling of public places.

Let us not be unaware that the fouling of public places puts a real strain on many councils because of the inherent health danger and the aesthetic appearance.

In the discussion that took place, one of the Kennel Club spokesmen, Dr. H. R. Spira, said that irresponsible dog owners were the main problem. He said, "We must teach the owners in this minority group to control their dogs." Mr. T. Price, Secretary of the Animal Welfare League of New South Wales, proposed that there should be higher registration fees for breeders.

It is a fact (and I stress this, because it applies in this State as much as it does anywhere else) that many animals are bred to die. One of the real problems associated with this whole matter in this State and in the other States is that so many people indiscriminately breed dogs. So many

people accept a dog as a family pet without giving prior consideration to what it will grow into or what their responsibility should be towards the maintenance of that dog.

Within the profession of which I am proud to be a member, one refers to it as the big brown eye syndrome. The children or parents involved, seeing a cuddly dog with big brown eyes that look sorrowful, immediately become attached to or interested in it, and take it home, forgetting that it will grow into an adult dog and that it will have a natural roaming characteristic unless it is properly trained. They forget that it will know no bounds in relation to neighbours' properties unless they take steps to control it. They also forget that it will be a danger to children or people on bicycles and road users. These are real issues that are attracting the attention of more and more people, and they should quickly and urgently attract the Government's attention.

I refer back to the problem that has been highlighted in this place many times, not the least by the member for Fisher. I refer to the number of stock lost adjacent to township areas, which is quite fantastic. In the Gawler area recently between \$3 500 and \$4 000 worth of damage to sheep has occurred. Many of the sheep were not actually attacked or mouthed by dogs, but were rushed by the dogs into the North Para or South Para Rivers and drowned. This involved playing and gambolling about, and the consequences were the same. It involved a major loss to a large number of people.

The *Living City* document to which I referred previously and which was put out by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works indicated that one of the issues that was well to the fore in the survey conducted by that organisation was that there was an urgent need for amendments to the Dog Act, so that compensation was available to owners for stock losses caused by marauding dogs on the urban fringe.

We need to respect and appreciate the value of metropolitan farms, because of the assistance they give in relation to our fodder requirements. We will have to ensure that some control exists so that these people can continue with their activities.

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

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): I wish again to draw the attention of the House to a problem that has confronted my constituents: the purchase of houses under the low-deposit deferred mortgage scheme. In the electorate I represent a number of people have found themselves in dire financial trouble because they have signed the contracts for sums exceeding \$400 a month. On signing those contracts they have been told that they are required to pay only \$169 each month. Of course, the balance is what is euphemistically described as a "deferred mortgage". The interest rate for such deals that I have seen on contracts is quoted at 17 per cent: 17 per cent—can members imagine it?

It happens like this: the purchaser goes to the company that is selling these houses and land as a package deal. The purchasers sign up, in many cases at 7 o'clock at night. They are not given the required number of documents to take away with them during the cooling off period. They therefore think that the \$169 a month is all they have to pay. One contract about which I know and which I saw involved a constituent of mine. He had contracted to pay \$436 a month. However, the selling company required him to pay, in cash, only \$169 a month. The difference of \$267, unbeknown to him, was accruing month by month. At the end of the bridging finance period (that is normally a two-

year period) he will be up for a sum of money which approximates \$6 400, in addition to a first and second mortgage. For the first mortgage he would naturally expect to go to the State Bank and receive a loan of \$18 000, which is the current limit, and to either a finance company or a building society for the second mortgage.

As the time for completion of the bridging finance period came near he was informed that he was required to pay this \$6 400 in a lump sum. He did not have it. The situation is that he has been induced to sign a contract, I believe under duress, and at the moment there is nothing, I believe, that this Parliament can do to assist. About 70 people in one estate alone have been affected and many of them have placed their affairs in the hands of a solicitor. That is their only hope of extricating themselves from this situation.

The trouble with having a deferred mortgage of \$267 a month, which accrues to \$6 400, is that they will have to find a sum of money from some lending authority or institution and therefore be saddled with a third mortgage. As soon as they do that they automatically exclude themselves from a State Bank loan. In this instance the purchaser was given short shrift by the finance company and the building society to which he went. His only hope then is to take legal action on the grounds of misrepresentation. I think I would be failing in my duty, having been elected to this Parliament, if I did not suggest to the Government that steps be taken to prevent this sort of thing happening in the future.

Not all companies that sell houses and land on a package deal basis are so hard. One company supplies purchasers with a schedule which lays down what the purchasers will be required to pay in cash each month and what they will have owing at the end of the bridging finance period. I suggest that amendments be made to the Land and Business Agents Act to require that a salesman or a selling company writing such a contract present to the purchasers such a schedule laying down specifically what the purchaser has to pay in cash each month, what is the deferred mortgage accruing each month, and to what extent deferred interest will accrue at the end of the bridging finance period.

I suggest a schedule similar to that which one gets when one purchases a motor vehicle from a finance company where one puts down, say, \$1 000 on a \$4 000 motor vehicle and the \$3 000 plus the interest is worked out and placed at the top of the schedule. Each monthly repayment shows the principal and interest being reduced by that monthly payment until at the end of the period one has a zero repayment and the car is paid off.

When one considers the social strain that is placed on the families I have mentioned, because some of them have become unemployed in the meantime and some have found that one pay envelope has been stopped as the result of losing a job or a child has arrived, one realises that they face real financial trouble.

A Happy Valley couple took the selling company to court and won. Not every case, however, will be the same. It would be difficult for all those couples to prove that they were induced to sign a contract under duress. The problem arises simply because, being lay people, they do not understand what they are signing.

Therefore, to allow this situation to continue (because it no doubt will occur again if we do not do something about it) is morally wrong. I urge the Government to amend the Land and Business Agents Act and also to amend legislation governing advertisements in the daily press by which these properties are advertised and sold. Also the sum required each month should be stated clearly so that it can be clearly seen. The deferred amount of the mortgage

should be clearly stated with the sum total also stated at the end of the bridging finance period. Only in that way will people be protected from doing a rather rash thing.

I can understand their situation if they are living in a flat and see little hope of ever owning a house. These people might see an advertisement in a newspaper that states "\$500 deposit—be in your own home by Christmas". If they sign a contract, as some of them do, before too long they find themselves in trouble. I commend the Government to this course of action.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This evening the member for Eyre brought to the attention of the House his concern for the fishing industry. Among other things, members will recall his criticism, especially of the Minister of Fisheries in this State for his mishandling of his department, and also of some officers of the department. I will concentrate on my understanding of the Minister's administration. First, I deal with his attitude.

On October 21, for the first time I attended a fisheries council meeting in Adelaide. It was the annual general meeting of that council and the function was opened by the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Chatterton. I was amazed at the ignorance displayed by our State Minister. He was welcomed at the meeting of about 70 or 80 representatives of the industry. When the welcome was extended to members of the industry and the Minister, a welcome was likewise extended to visitors, one of whom was the member for Flinders, Mr. Blacker, and me.

Neither the member for Flinders nor I was recognised by the Minister when he addressed the meeting and officially opened it. It is apparently the Minister's practice to ignore other political Parties or representatives of those Parties at such meetings. I have attended several public functions since becoming a member of Parliament with Parliamentary members of both sides of the House present, and I have never experienced such ignorance from any Minister of the Crown as was displayed on that day. However, not only did the Minister ignore the State members present but he set out in his opening address to slander the Minister for Primary Industry, his Federal colleagues and their administration.

I was unable to absorb or note the remarks that he made, so immediately after that function I telephoned the department and asked the newly-appointed Director (Mr. Kirkegaard) whether he would give me a copy of the Minister's speech, bearing in mind, as I have said, that the Minister had made, in the absence of the Minister for Primary Industry, quite slanderous remarks he would not dare to make in his presence. However, Mr. Kirkegaard said that he did not think I could get a copy of the speech, notwithstanding that, whilst it had not been made in a fully public place, it was made at a meeting of representatives from the coastline of the State. He did say that, if I read the next Fisheries Bulletin, I would see a report of what the Minister had said.

I stated that, in those circumstances, and being the Opposition spokesman on fishing, I considered it was important that I read the statement before I referred to it here or in any other place. With that, Mr. Kirkegaard reluctantly agreed to get me a copy of the Minister's speech and send it to Parliament House.

A few weeks have elapsed and that speech has not arrived. I do not know whether that is the policy of the Minister or whether it is the attitude that he takes, but I suggest, in all fairness, as he is a Minister in another place, that his colleagues here refer this matter to him. I believe

that giving me a copy of the speech is not only a courteous act but is also a reasonable and practical approach. It is preferable to make his statements available and not cause members to have to read press releases as reported in some news media later.

To show further how the Minister reacts to responsible administration in the fishing industry, I draw attention to a report in the *Advertiser* of Friday, November 11. It was an announcement that certain interim prawn licences had been issued in the State by the Minister for Primary Industry. The report, headed "Prawn fishing war on again", states:

The battle between the Federal and State Governments for control of fishing rights in South Australian Coastal waters flared yesterday, following a partial lifting of the prawning ban in Investigator Strait, north of Kangaroo Island.

Again, the State Minister has reacted angrily to a decision by the Minister for Primary Industry regarding waters that clearly are the responsibility of the Commonwealth. Recently we have heard of the results of a case where it was clearly announced that waters north of Kangaroo Island and outside those boundaries of the State were clearly Commonwealth waters and were directly under the care and control of the Commonwealth. Despite some agreement between the Commonwealth and the State that a certain degree of policy uniformity would be adopted, the control and the issue of permits or licences in regard to that area are the responsibility of the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair), who has upheld those responsibilities.

He has announced the issue of permits to about 10 prawn fishermen, and Mr. Chatterton states in the report to which I have referred that the move had been made without consultation with the South Australian Government. I know that there has been consultation between the two Ministers about this matter and, because the Minister of Fisheries in South Australia has hesitated, prevaricated, and sat on the fence as he does in all decisions of this kind, finally the Minister for Primary Industry, acting responsibly on behalf of the applicants, has gone ahead and declared who may fish the waters, but only on a temporary basis and with conditions.

I draw to members' attention those conditions to demonstrate how responsible the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry has been and will continue to be in his role as Minister in charge of fishery activities. He said that the fishermen listed (Messrs. Hagen, Lewis, Maher, Crombie, Swincer, Alexander, Antoney, Smith, March, and Mancer) will be required to survey the area and report to the department on their catches and also undertake to do survey work under the control of, and in company with, appointed inspectors from time to time.

The Commonwealth Minister's approach to this matter ought to be at least a pattern for our State Minister to adopt, not only in respect of prawn fishing and lobster fishing but also in respect of scale fishing. People who are anxious to get into the industry ought to be given the chance. The average age of our fishermen is increasing year after year and there are no recruits, no apprentices.

It is incredible that the department, by the Minister's direction or otherwise, has adopted this freeze of licences in the scale fishing industry. As the member for Eyre has pointed out, that will send some processing factories in this State to the wall. The factories at Port Kenny, Streaky Bay and Thevenard are all on the market. Those people are not getting into their processing works the supplies they require in order to continue to employ their men. The

number of men employed at Port Lincoln is between 15 and 20. Without the tuna (10 000 tonnes a year is going to that factory), it would also go to the wall. It is a long and pitiful story which I will follow up at the earliest opportunity. The Government ought to give it urgent attention.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, at 2 p.m.