

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 17, 1977

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

Petition received.

PETITION: "PANCAKE MAN"

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT presented a petition signed by 715 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to instruct the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to issue Mr. Bob Brown-Parker with a permanent permit and withdraw its charges against him so that he may continue with his advertising as the "Pancake Man".

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HORWOOD BAGSHAW LIMITED

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On Tuesday, November 1, the member for Davenport made allegations in this House regarding Horwood Bagshaw Limited. Because the Government regarded the allegations as serious it quickly instituted an inquiry within Government departments and statutory authorities. On Wednesday, November 2, I made a Ministerial statement to the House and denied that any instructions had been given to the State Bank, the State Government Insurance Commission and the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation.

I denied that any discussions had taken place with unions associated with Horwood Bagshaw. I also denied that any discussions had taken place between Government officers and representatives of Horwood Bagshaw Limited in which any mention was made of a share price. Furthermore, I quoted from a statement by that company, as follows:

To the company's knowledge, there is no foundation to the suggestions of Mr. Dean Brown that any proposal was being considered for the purchase of any part of the company by anybody.

These denials were not taken seriously by the member for Davenport because the next day, under the guise of making a personal explanation to the House, he persisted with his allegations. In particular, he claimed the discussions to which he was referring had taken place during the last few weeks and that "These discussions involved a representative of Horwood Bagshaw Limited and senior representatives of the South Australian Government who are not a part of the Unit for Industrial Democracy; financial matters were raised in these discussions and involved a possible price to be paid for the shares". The member for Davenport went on to say:

A figure of 60c a share for up to half the issued ordinary shares and involving up to \$2 100 000 was involved, although that figure may not be final. Although the Government may claim that these discussions were unofficial, they were treated as significant and meaningful discussions by those involved.

The member for Davenport then went on to draw certain conclusions to which I will return later. I have been advised by the Executive Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy that a figure of \$2 100 000 was mentioned in a confidential letter from a Director of Horwood Bagshaw Limited to the Premier. The Director, acting in an unofficial capacity, outlined various advantages of an employee share ownership trust scheme. This letter initiated the discussions between the Director and the Unit for Industrial Democracy to which I referred in my statement to the House on November 2. The relevant part of the letter states:

The amount to be guaranteed would be of the order of \$2 100 000, and it should be emphasised that the commitment by the Government is only in the form of a guarantee and not a cash outlay.

That letter was dated August 25, 1976, and in any case the member for Davenport has made clear that he is not referring to discussions involving members of the Unit for Industrial Democracy. I wish to make perfectly clear that no discussions of the kind described by the member for Davenport have taken place during the past few weeks, or for that matter at any time prior to that. Since the honourable member appears to be reluctant to accept my word (indeed he has accused me of grossly misleading the Parliament), I have conducted an exhaustive inquiry among all the Government departments which could possibly have had any discussions or dealings with Horwood Bagshaw and within the three statutory bodies that he named.

I am in a position if required, to table affidavits from the following people: the Chairman of the Board of the State Bank, the General Manager of the State Government Insurance Commission, the Chairman of the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation, the Under Treasurer, the Director-General of Economic Development, the Director-General of the Premier's Department and the Director of the Labour and Industry Department. While the member for Davenport has indicated that the discussions did not involve the Unit for Industrial Democracy, in case he changes his mind once again I can also table, if necessary, an affidavit from the Executive Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy. All of those people have informed me that they are prepared to swear that neither they nor any persons responsible to them have ever taken part in any such discussions. The discussions are the figment of the member for Davenport's weird and poisonous imagination.

Having established quite categorically that no such discussions, or indeed any discussions similar to the ones alleged by the member for Davenport took place, I wish to take up a few other matters. The practice of members of Parliament being able to speak their minds within the House without inhibition and without being subject to any laws which inhibit other citizens to speak their minds is known as Parliamentary privilege.

The term "Parliamentary privilege" is used advisedly because it is a privilege that Parliamentarians have which no other members of the community possess. When people enjoy special privileges they should surely exercise those privileges in a responsible manner. Wholesale abuse of Parliamentary privilege would lead to demands by the community for an abolition of that right. The member for Davenport is notorious in South Australia for the way in

which he shows no interest in the truth and uses Parliamentary privilege to spread all kinds of rumour and to make all sorts of serious allegation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Get your own house in order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am putting it in order, don't worry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House gave the Deputy Premier leave, and I hope that honourable members will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the member for Davenport speaks outside the House he is more circumspect in what he says for fear of offending libel and defamation laws. However, that does not stop him from peddling false and malicious stories. For example, it was only five weeks ago that the Premier was forced to make a Ministerial statement in the House denying allegations made by the member for Davenport, who on that occasion alleged that firms who adopted or were prepared to adopt the Government's industrial democracy policy received favourable consideration for Government tenders. In response to this, the Premier made clear that inquiries conducted by the Chairman of the Public Service Board established that the allegation was false. The Premier added that it was not Government policy to give preference to firms that adopt the Government's industrial democracy programme. The Premier concluded by saying:

I believe it is vital for the well-being of the House that the honourable member take the earliest opportunity to withdraw publicly and to apologise for his allegation.

The member for Davenport has neither withdrawn nor apologised. When confronted with an opportunity to put up or shut up, he has shut up, thereby admitting his guilt. In typical fashion, he had not had the courage to publicly acknowledge his guilt; he has indulged in spreading another false story.

There was an incident that occurred before the recent State election when the member for Davenport had received a document which had been compiled by the Unit for Industrial Democracy for consideration by the Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee. The document came in two parts: the first part was seeking the advice of that tripartite committee regarding how companies might be invited to take part in industrial democracy programmes; the second part contained a list of companies that might be approached. There was nothing sinister in that document; it had been drawn up to seek the views of the people on the tripartite committee. However, the member for Davenport chose to refer only to the second part of the document. He claimed that a list of companies had been drawn up and that these companies were to be subjected to pressure and forced to introduce industrial democracy programmes against their will. These allegations were outrageous and an obvious distortion of the truth. I now table the first part of that document and members can draw their own conclusions as to the purpose of that list.

The second part of the document consists of a list of companies that are presently engaged in industrial democracy initiatives or have indicated their willingness to become so engaged, or who might be receptive to an invitation to become engaged. The Government has no right or prerogative, nor does it intend to publish the names of those companies; to do so would be a breach of confidentiality. Presumably, the next untruth we will hear from the member for Davenport will be along the lines that he did not receive the first part of this document and was therefore left to draw inferences about the real purpose of the list of companies. Even if that was true, there would be no excuse, because in August last year the Premier announced that he had instructed the Executive

Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy to give regular briefings to the Leader of the Opposition or someone delegated by the Leader. The fact that this privilege has not been availed of is worth examining. The Executive Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy has met the member for Davenport twice since the Premier gave that instruction, the Leader of the Opposition having assigned industrial democracy matters and discussions to the member for Davenport.

On the second occasion on which discussions took place, the member for Davenport informed the Executive Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy that he did not want to receive any information which he could not openly discuss or debate in Parliament. On the surface, this may seem a reasonable position to adopt. However, the member for Davenport knows, as do other members opposite, that industrial democracy programmes within organisations proceed through various phases of delicate negotiations. It would be wrong for the Government or the Opposition to interfere with or debate matters that are the subject of genuine concern to organisations and must, by their very nature, be regarded as confidential.

The real reason why the member for Davenport adopted his position with regard to receiving briefings from the Executive Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy is that by not taking up that opportunity he would be able to continue to spread false and malicious stories about the Government's industrial democracy programmes. He did not want to hear the truth, as he would have to breach the necessary confidentiality to debate some matters publicly. He therefore denies the receipt of the truth so he can spread his false stories and stir up public debate about matters which have no substance in fact.

Mr. Gunn: Who's abusing Parliamentary privilege now?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will say it outside, too.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have spoken once about interjections, and I hope that they will not continue.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I point out that the Deputy Premier, in the guise of a Ministerial statement, has made imputations of a grave character against the member for Davenport. Among other things, he has used the term "poisonous" and imputed that the member for Davenport has admitted his guilt because he has not taken certain action. I believe that this is unparliamentary. I did not raise the matter earlier, because I hoped that the Deputy Premier would get it all off his chest and be done with it. I take strong exception to the terms he has used.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader had the opportunity to raise that point of order at the time, as he did the other evening when the honourable Attorney-General was speaking.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To date I have confined my remarks to why this Parliament should be concerned about the activities of the member for Davenport. However, the business community and the public at large are also concerned about his activities. It is most unusual for a company to issue a statement critical of a member of the Liberal Party. Yet, this is what Horwood Bagshaw has done, and other business leaders have expressed concern as to where the member for Davenport will stop in his pursuit of glory and power.

It is outrageous that a member of Parliament should use Parliamentary privilege to spread stories about the share prices of companies. Such behaviour can cause instability within companies, it can cause a run on the Stock Exchange, and it can lead to significant amounts of money changing hands from one person to another. I cannot

recall an occasion on which any member of this House has discussed the share prices of a company while it is still listed on the Stock Exchange and has not been the subject of any investigation. It is no wonder that sections of the business community are concerned about the behaviour of the member for Davenport.

The taxpayers of South Australia also have a right to be concerned. Each time the member for Davenport makes an allegation, the Government has a duty to direct senior public servants to investigate the matter. On occasions this can take considerable time and naturally it means that the talents of those people must be diverted away from other important business to investigate allegations.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has exceeded his time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I seek leave to complete my explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The result of this is that each investigation costs many thousands of dollars. To date (and, unfortunately, I have no reason to believe that the behaviour of the member for Davenport will change in the future), the South Australian public would be justified in concluding that the honourable member wishes to waste taxpayers' money by raising false or imaginary issues.

The last part of the personal explanation of the member for Davenport read as follows:

Two important aspects now arise from the Acting Premier's answer. First, the Acting Premier obviously admitted to the earlier discussions in an attempt to divert attention from these recent and much more significant discussions. Secondly, by omission the Acting Premier has grossly misled this Parliament. I now challenge the Acting Premier to reveal the other details of discussions and planning by Government officers in relation to Horwood Bagshaw Ltd.

The member for Davenport has issued a challenge during the course of his so-called personal explanation to Parliament on November 3. During the course of my statement I believe I have responded to it. I have indicated that I am in a position to table statutory declarations from the heads of every Government department or statutory authority that could conceivably have been involved. Furthermore, the company concerned also supports the denials I have made. On Tuesday, November 8, I received a statement prepared by the board of Horwood Bagshaw Limited. The statement reads:

Mr. Brown's assertions in the House on November 3 are completely untrue, misleading and mischievous. The recent sequence of inaccurate statements by Mr. Brown is detrimental to the company, its employees, its customers and its shareholders.

It should be clear to all members of the House that the discussions to which the member for Davenport referred did not take place. It is not I who grossly misled this Parliament: it is the member for Davenport who has grossly misled this Parliament. The honourable member is telling untruths. His ambition has caused him to have a vested interest in peddling false and damaging stories. He has abused Parliamentary privilege. He has caused concern to the business community and he has caused taxpayers' money to be wasted. The member for Davenport, in my view, is a disgrace to this Parliament.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ELECTRICITY WORKERS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In answering a question from the Leader of the Opposition yesterday regarding the agreement between Electricity Trust of South Australia and a number of trade unions, which involves a 37½ hour week for some employees of the trust based on increased productivity, I incorrectly stated that the S.E.C. of Victoria had been interfering in the agreement for 18 months.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It was only a technical error. In fact, 18 months is the time that has elapsed since the Electricity Trust of South Australia made its original offer to the unions on reduced hours in return for increased productivity. To be precise, the offer was made on March 31, 1976, which is 19½ months ago. The S.E.C.V. did not intervene until September 19 of this year, on which date representatives of the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the unions concerned appeared before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission seeking its approval to the agreement.

QUESTIONS

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

RACING INDUSTRY

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (October 26).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: As from January 1, 1977, the Government has provided financial assistance to the South Australian Totalisator Agency Board and the racing industry, as follows:

South Australian Totalisator Agency Board

Resulting from a 0.5 per cent increase in off-course totalisator turnover deduction, additional funds will be used for capital development including computerisation of off-course betting services.

(Turnover for 1976-77—\$97 474 795)

Racing Industry—Horse Racing, Galloping, Trotting and Dog Racing

1. Resulting from a 0.5 per cent increase in on-course totalisator turnover deduction, additional funds are retained by the respective racing clubs. Turnover for 1976-77—\$19 433 597).

2. As a result of reduction of Government tax payable by clubs on on-course totalisator investments, effective on January 1, 1977, tax payable from this date is:

1¼ per cent of total turnover where the total turnover does not exceed \$10 000.

3¼ per cent of total turnover, where the total turnover exceeds \$10 000, but does not exceed \$20 000.

5¼ per cent of total turnover where the total turnover exceeds \$20 000.

The Government tax payable in respect of on-course totalisator investment prior to January 1, 1977, was:

1¼ per cent where the gross takings do not exceed \$4 000.

2¼ per cent where the gross takings exceed \$4 000 but do not exceed \$6 000.

3¼ per cent where the gross takings exceed \$6 000 but do not exceed \$8 000.

4¼ per cent where the gross takings exceed \$8 000 but do not exceed \$10 000.

5¼ per cent where the gross takings exceed \$10 000.

3. Up to 50 per cent of Racecourses Development Board funds for the development of public facilities at

racecourses can be applied towards operating costs of clubs for a period of three years. (Income of the board in 1976-77—\$626 000.)

4. An annual Treasury grant for 1976-77 and 1977-78 of \$200 000.

From the above, the honourable member can obviously see that the Government recognises the importance of the racing industry and has, in fact, been giving it special attention. The new Racing Act, which was before this House last year, and the Estimates of Expenditure for both that year and this, reinforce that fact. The standing of Messrs. Sattler and Hayes in the racing industry is well known and the fact that Mr. Sattler has taken an appointment with the new racing company in Tehran and that Mr. Hayes has also given advice in that area is a recognition of the standing of the racing industry, including its breeding aspects. Finally, suffice to say that the Government is fully aware of the value of the racing industry.

DEPOSIT CANS

In reply to Mr. GUNN (November 2).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has considered exempting northern parts of the State from the control of the Beverage Container Act but is not yet convinced that it is desirable or necessary. The three manufacturers of canned beverages have been given the names of parties in Coober Pedy, Kingoonya and Marree who, following visits by officers of the Environment Department to these areas, indicated their willingness to establish can collection depots. The manufacturers were advised that the department felt it was necessary to have depots in these towns. The only other town of major consequence in this area which does not have a depot is Oodnadatta, and an inquiry has been received from someone in this town, but no firm indication was given as to whether they are willing to establish a depot. Further, it has been suggested to the management of tourist resorts at Blinman and Arkaroola that they establish depots in an endeavour to resolve their problems.

A telephone inquiry was received from the Yalata Mission which indicated that it also was interested in setting up a depot. They were advised to contact the manufacturers who are now responsible for establishing depots. The names and telephone numbers of three representatives of the manufacturers were given. Claims made that littering by glass containers is increasing are currently under investigation by officers of the Environment Department.

UNIONISM

In reply to Mr. RODDA (October 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No records are kept within Public Service departments that show the number of officers and employees who are members of trade unions. Although the number of officers and employees who have union subscriptions deducted from their pay can be ascertained, this number is misleading because it is known that some persons pay their subscriptions direct to their union.

DARTMOUTH DAM

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), the honourable member requested me to give a progress report on the reservoir, when it is expected to be completed and when the State will benefit from its construction. The diversion tunnel at Dartmouth dam was closed in the first week of November, which has enabled the commencement of water impoundment in the reservoir. Construction of the main embankment will still progress as water is impounded, and all works are scheduled for completion in late 1978. South Australia will receive an increased entitlement under the terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement when the River Murray Commission declares the reservoir to be operational. This will be dependent upon the rate of inflow to the storage as from November.

WOMEN'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

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

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: During 1977, the minimum number of inmates at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre was seven during the period March 23-26, and the highest was 22 from July 22-24. The highest number ever held was 48 in 1970. The staff must be taken as a total, and does not mean that 23 people are on duty at all times. There is annual leave, which means that three are off at any one time. Four officers are required for the two night watches and one for the swing shift which allows evening activities. As the organisation operates 24 hours per day for seven days per week, at any given time some staff are on rostered days off. In fact, staff rosters allow for eight to nine officers per day shift, from which must be drawn escorts for courts, dentist, hospital treatment and any other activity conducted outside the prison.

The small numbers in prison undoubtedly contribute to the high cost per prisoner, but during the period where 22 people were in prison, the cost approximated the men's prison. I do not know how serious the honourable member is in the suggestion of a personal prison officer in the home, but an approximate cost of this service, including shift rates, penalties, weekend work, etc., would be \$1 000 per week per prisoner.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: During the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill, the honourable member inquired as to the reason for the reduction in funds advanced to the State Bank for the purposes of loans to producers. The reduced funding for loans to producers in 1976-77 was sufficient to meet the demands made on these funds through the State Bank.

STATE BANK LOANS

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: During the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill, the honourable member inquired as to the waiting time for State Bank loans to buy an established house and whether the waiting list is greater for lower-interest money loaned on new homes. The bank ceased listing names of persons requiring housing loan finance for the purchase of "established" houses on June

7, 1976, and at this date it is estimated that persons who listed in June, 1976, will have a further waiting period of 42 to 48 months before being invited to lodge a formal application for a loan. This compares to a waiting period of 30 to 33 months for persons currently listed as intending applicants for new house finance. In each type of loan, there is a further waiting time of three to six months after formal applications are lodged before approvals of loans are issued.

The number of loans approved by the bank varies from time to time, and is largely controlled by the availability of funds. Currently, applications for 10 established home loans and 100 new houses are approved every two weeks. I should point out that the limit of income earnings applicable at the time of listing is adjusted with average weekly wage variations as published quarterly by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and applicants are required to meet the means test at the date applications are lodged. Because of the complexities which have occurred concerning the eligibility for loans, it is not possible to differentiate between the concessional loans and ordinary loans which may be advanced by the bank.

DENTAL CLINICS

In reply to **Dr. EASTICK** (Public Purposes Loan Bill, October 27).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The dental clinic at Evanston was completed in February, 1977, and has been functional since that date. The financial provision in the Appropriation Bill was for a final payment required to be made in this financial year in connection with the construction of the clinic. A dental clinic is currently under construction at Clare and is due for completion early in June, 1978.

NARACOORTE CAVES

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The provision of \$45 000 on Loan Estimates refers to the completion of the Visitor Centre Building, which is to house fossil displays now being prepared under supervision of museum staff, and it is expected that the building and the interpretation display would be completed and opened to the public in the first half of 1978. A Commonwealth tourist grant of \$167 500 has been received for the development of Naracoorte Caves.

In addition, a provision of \$40 000 has been made on Loan Account national reserves for 1977-78 to meet further costs of the development. Also, the State has made considerable contribution to the project through the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. As at the end of October, 1977, an amount of \$47 000 had been already expended, with the further provision of \$41 000 for the next four months. In brief, the total expenditure on the Naracoorte Caves Conservation Park matches the scientific and tourist importance of the area.

EAST

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier ask the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity urgently to investigate the script of the punk rock show *East* and to advise whether the presentation of this show would contravene the Sex

Discrimination Act in any way or the spirit of that Act, since it denigrates and degrades women? Will he also immediately ask the Board of Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts to over-ride the decision of the Artistic Director to include *East* in the Festival programme for next March? The script of *East* has not been easily available in South Australia, and it seems that it was not read by the Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts before the programme was announced. The Premier has stated that he has not read the script of the programme.

The portions which have become available and which I have examined have shocked the people who have seen them. Their comments are that it denigrates and degrades women in the most obscene way. The Government in 1975 finally supported the principles contained in the sex discrimination legislation, which I first introduced in 1973 and which prohibits discrimination against people because of their sex, and has set up machinery to implement that Act.

Although there are no specific provisions in the current legislation, *East*, by its degradation of women, would seem to require some action by the Government, if it is to uphold a generally held stand against discrimination against women. Those who have commented to me unanimously agree that it is not at all an appropriate production for a festival of the standard of the Adelaide Festival of Arts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not read the script. I do not believe that it is proper for the Government to interfere in decisions of the Board of Governors of the Festival or in the recommendations made to the board by the Artistic Director of the Festival. Specifically, I point out that I have to approve a contract for the Artistic Director of the South Australian Theatre Company, and one of the things that I have absolutely insisted on is that the contract includes a provision that gives him absolute artistic autonomy so that he cannot be interfered with by anyone on a political basis. I believe the same situation should occur in relation to the Director of the Adelaide Festival of Arts. I do not intend to censor the Adelaide Festival of Arts. As to the suggestions of the Leader that this somehow or other contravenes the Sex Discrimination Act, I find it rather difficult to conceive how it may be so.

Mr. Tonkin: Read the script.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader believes that there is something that is a contravention of that Act, he is as much in a position as I am to make a complaint to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. I do not direct the Commissioner, and the Leader can make his complaint if he so wished.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: There's no basis, of course.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find it difficult to conceive any such basis but, if the Leader believes that there is, as a concerned citizen and someone who had much to do with the introduction of that Act, he has the opportunity to put such a matter forward. I do not intend to direct the Commissioner, because I do not believe that is my Ministerial duty.

Mr. Chapman: Having read the document, aren't you concerned?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not read the document, but I point out to honourable members that the basis of theatre is often to present views and opinions which are not acceded to by the author but which are characterised by the author. If the honourable member chooses to go back to all the debates concerning the censorship of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, which was one of the major cases concerning censorship in this century, he will find that the final wash-up of it was that extremely responsible authors such as T. S. Eliot (a man of

outstanding religious quality) characterised that novel, which had previously been considered obscene and degrading of women and persons, as one of the most moral documents the community had ever seen. It is not the purpose of the Government to censor, and if honourable members consider that they would be shocked or upset by something that is presented publicly they have a simple remedy: that is, to stay away.

Mr. Chapman: That's a pretty negative sort of approach.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not negative—it is positive. I make clear that the Government does not intend to enter the field of censorship. We believe that there should be artistic autonomy for people who are involved in artistic events and that they should be able to present things publicly that they believe worthwhile in theatre. I have always had, and have had reason to have, great respect for the views of the Artistic Director of the Adelaide Festival, Mr. Steel, who has done an outstanding job for South Australia. The other officers who recommended this, recommended it as a piece of extremely vital and important theatre. Those recommendations having been made and the Festival Board of Governors having made its decision, it is not for the Government to intervene.

URANIUM KITS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Has the attention of the Minister of Education been drawn to the fact that a Liberal Party Senator in South Australia has been mailing Commonwealth Government pro-uranium kits to many schools in South Australia? I understand that many of these kits, which comprise a dozen or so pamphlets and maps, together with printed remarks on the issue by the outgoing Prime minister, Mr. Fraser, and other Ministers setting out that Government's attitude to mining, milling and exporting Australian uranium, have been mailed to schools. The material is printed at the taxpayers' expense on high quality paper, it is produced elaborately, and it presents a strong pro-uranium case. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will take steps to ensure that this kind of propaganda is balanced as much as possible by indicating to schools that the Australian Labor Party also has available a kit of books and films designed to promote a balanced presentation of the case for and against uranium mining.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am sure that the A.L.P. is well able to put forward its policy with much clarity and force in this matter. My responsibility, of course, must be to point out to schools that the document to which the honourable member refers is biased. Despite its pretentious title "Uranium—Australia's decision", it is, in fact, an apology for the temporary occupants of the Treasury benches in Canberra who have made their own decision without reference to the Australian people. If one peruses the contents of the publication, one finds that these statements are from such unbiased sources as the Right Honourable Prime Minister, the Right Honourable J. D. Anthony, the Right Honourable I. McC. Sinclair, and so on. Therefore, people should certainly be concerned about this matter.

Some time ago I had this kit referred to my attention, together with a letter that had been written by Senator Harold Young to a school inviting its installation of the material into the school library. I take the opportunity that the honourable member has given me to indicate the biased nature of this material and also to share with honourable members one or two words from the *Sydney*

Morning Herald of November 8 this year. I am sure that members opposite would not wish to characterise the *Sydney Morning Herald* as being some sort of pink rag. This is what the *Sydney Morning Herald* among other things, had to say:

It is certainly unwise—

and the paper is talking about another matter of which members opposite would be aware—

for the New South Wales Teachers' Federation to write to the principals of New South Wales schools with details of a Labor Party project to involve schoolchildren in the uranium debate. It was equally unwise of Dr. Harry Edwards, a Liberal M.P., to send pro-uranium pamphlets to school principals.

It is this document to which, of course, the *Sydney Morning Herald* is referring. The report concludes with these words:

The ultimate responsibility, therefore, must lie with school principals, doubtless with assistance from experienced teachers. The public, and especially parents, must rely on the professional judgment and integrity of these principals and teachers. They may have strong views, as do other members of the community, on the contentious issues of the day; but there is an obligation on them, as Mr. Bedford (the New South Wales Minister) said some months ago, to ensure whatever their personal views, that all aspects of a debate are made known to pupils. Political Parties cannot be trusted to do that. They should cease to tout their wares in schools.

I hope that the Liberal Party will take notice of those words.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier state the Government's intention in relation to the programme of the sittings of this House for the remainder of this session? I would like to explain the question because it is a matter of considerable concern to the Opposition and I would believe to the public of South Australia. The traditional debate that follows the opening of Parliament is the Address in Reply debate in which members are given their longest opportunity (one hour) to mention any of a wide range of subjects. It is one of only a few wide-ranging debates. Discussions about this were held with the Government earlier this session. The Opposition realised that the Budget had to be passed, and it had no objection to that debate being brought forward. We then began the Address in Reply debate. During the last sitting week the Deputy Premier said he would like some idea of how many Opposition members would be involved in the debate, and that information was given to him. At the beginning of this week a programme was presented to the Opposition and some discussion took place between the Whips, who agreed to the House sitting late Wednesday evening so that the Address in Reply debate could be completed this week. It now transpires (and the position is far from clear) that that arrangement was altered. The House did not sit past the normal sitting time last evening, and it has been suggested that the Address in Reply debate will be deferred. If the Address in Reply debate is deferred, no private members' business will be transacted. This is a matter of considerable concern to the Opposition, because that is one of the few opportunities it has to raise matters of interest to it.

The Hon. John Burdett, a member of another place, wrote to the Premier about his private member's Bill to outlaw pornography involving children. There was no time last session to debate this private member's Bill. This matter is of considerable concern to Mr. Burdett, as it

could be that no opportunity will be afforded during this session to debate his Bill. In the absence of the Premier, the Deputy Premier replied as follows:

I have considered your request dated November 4, 1977, seeking time in the House of Assembly for your Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill, but unfortunately your request could not be granted in view of the time needed for the Government's own legislative programme.

That Bill has passed the Upper House. The Opposition would normally expect that that Bill would be introduced by, in this case, the member for Torrens during private members' time. If one is to believe the rumour about the arrangements being made by the Government, there will be no private members' time, let alone the traditional opportunity for members to take part in an Address in Reply debate at the start of the session. Will the Premier clarify the situation so that we know where we stand?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As Leader of the House, I was not aware of any arrangement that had been made about a late sitting last evening. My Whip explained to me that he had some discussion with the Opposition Whip (the member for Fisher), who could have inferred that it was intended that the House should sit late last evening to complete several speeches in connection with the Address in Reply. However, I told the Deputy Leader last night (and I thought I was clear and unequivocal) that the House would not sit beyond the time specified in the paper which was circulated at the beginning of this week, as is the normal practice, and which states quite clearly that it may be anticipated that the adjournment of the House will be moved not later than 10 p.m. I did not alter that, as the Leader of the House.

I told the Deputy Leader last night at about 8 o'clock, or maybe a little later, that, unless it was necessary for the House to sit beyond 10 p.m. in order to deal with amendments from the other place concerning the shopping hours legislation, the House would not sit beyond 10 p.m. The Deputy Leader pointed out that there was still a number of speakers on his side of the House who were each entitled to speak for an hour. I did not disagree with that, and they will still be able to talk for an hour if they so desire, but the Government points out to the Opposition that prior to September 17 there had already been an Address in Reply.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That was a different Parliament.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was about the same subjects. If the honourable member looks at the Speech with which the Governor opened this Parliament, he will see that it involved all the matters covered in the previous Address in Reply.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In addition, they have had the opportunity both in the Budget debate and in the Loan Estimates debate (in fact, the whole of the current session of this Parliament has been taken up by the Opposition)—

Mr. Mathwin: That's not right.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Practically: there are certain members on this side who spoke in the Address in Reply.

Mr. Evans: Is that our right, or not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Of course it is, but it is also the right of the Government to get the business of this House done.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. This is the third occasion I have had to rise concerning the matter, and I hope it ceases.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Deputy Leader of the

Opposition is not, unfortunately, in a position to know the number of Bills that must pass this House before it rises at Christmas. If I am to get those Bills through in reasonable sitting time, I must start those Bills next Tuesday, and that is what I intend to do.

The Opposition will not be denied its right for its members to speak in the Address in Reply, and to speak for the hour allocated to them; that will be given to them at some future time. The Deputy Leader speaks as though it is almost with the co-operation of Opposition members (certainly, they did not oppose it) that Standing Orders were suspended in order to enable the House to deal with the Budget and Loan Estimates prior to the Address in Reply. The Government, or course, was capable of doing that in its own right, and it was necessary to do it in order to secure Supply so that the State could carry on. The Opposition was aware of that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That is why we didn't argue it; you can use your numbers to do anything; we know that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member said that! I did not.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said it last night.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Oh, did I?

Mr. Goldsworthy: You sure did.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There again, from the honourable member, the usual stuff.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Yes, and you said it again.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel knows that when the Speaker is on his feet he must be quiet, and I hope he ceases interjecting. The honourable Deputy Premier.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Come on, Adolph, let's hear the rest.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Deputy Leader knows that, if he is anxious to get on with private members' business, the ball is in his court. The Address in Reply can be completed this afternoon and we can get on with private members' business in due course. So far as the sittings of the House are concerned (and that was part of the question the honourable member asked), the House will rise on December 8 (I think I indicated before that it might be December 15), and, so far as I am aware at the moment, it will recommence its sittings on February 7.

As I have already said, the Government has a responsibility to get a number of Bills passed prior to Christmas. The ball is in the Opposition's court: if it wants private members' business to be debated, it can conclude the Address in Reply debate as it was scheduled to be completed on the paper circulated at the beginning of this week.

Mr. Mathwin: Why didn't you sit late last night?

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, and I assure honourable members that I will warn the next member who interjects.

UNSWORN STATEMENTS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Attorney-General say whether an amendment to the legislation is required in order to prohibit the publication of unsworn statements in reports of court proceedings and, if it is required, will he consider my request? My question arises from a report in the *Advertiser* of November 5, under the heading "Husband convicted of manslaughter". The report states that an unsworn statement was made from the dock in the course of which much damaging material was used against a person who has unfortunately died. One of my

constituents saw me and later wrote to me on this matter, and I draw the Attorney's attention to some of the points made in the letter, which states:

I draw your attention to the article in the *Advertiser* of November 5 under the heading, "Husband convicted of manslaughter".

The article makes the victim appear in a very bad light . . . The defendant made these claims in an unsworn statement, and I understand under present law there can be no cross-examination to test the veracity of the statement . . . I know that the unsworn statement vilified an innocent victim and wonder how many other such statements have added to loved ones' grief by having the world at large believe what they have read of victims.

This matter is of grave concern to me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will not continue to comment.

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Attorney-General obtain a report on this matter?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This matter was reported on by the Mitchell committee, in its third report, I think, although its recommendation on the matter has not yet been considered by the Government. The unsworn statement has, for a long period, been an important part of the protection provided to defendants in criminal trials and, before it would be open to the Government to abolish the unsworn statement, we would want to examine the matter long and hard before taking any such step. The Government's intentions at this stage are that we will introduce amendments giving effect to the Mitchell committee's third report in the latter half of next year, during which time these matters will be considered by the House. The committee, which was set up by my predecessor (now Mr. Justice King), has reported on the matter and I hope that, at an early time, we will be able to introduce legislation to give effect to the recommendations. When we do that, the question of unsworn statements will receive further consideration, but, at this stage, I am unable to say whether or not the Government intends to abolish them.

BANK DRAFTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier ask the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia to investigate the possibility of extending their oversea agency arrangements, especially in the United Kingdom and in Ireland? The effect of the new policy of the Savings Bank and the State Bank is that oversea drafts to the United Kingdom must be paid through the State Bank, which deals only with Barclay's Bank outside of London, and Barclay's Bank does not have branches in Ireland. The policy is causing much concern to people with parents in the United Kingdom who do not live within miles of the various outlets. I am informed that four outlets are located in London, and that all the rest are Barclay's Banks at Birmingham, Bristol, Bradford, Liverpool, and Manchester. These centres are miles apart.

Scotland has only two branches of Barclay's Bank, one at Edinburgh and the other at Aberdeen. As the population of Scotland is about 15 000 000, this is an extremely small number of outlets for the handling of drafts sent to local residents by their relatives in this country. Previously the banks dealt through the private banks, especially the Commercial Bank. Under those arrangements, the recipients could go to any bank in any village or township in the United Kingdom or in Ireland, and cash the draft. The present situation is causing hardship to people receiving such drafts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was not aware of the difficulty. I shall take up the matter with the bank boards.

SEATON LAND

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Works inform the House of the use to be made of land recently vacated by the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Tapley Hill Road, Seaton?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The land in question, I believe, has been earmarked by the Industrial Development Department within the Premier's Department for future industrial expansion. I do not know specifically what type of industry it involves. I shall make some inquiries for the honourable member, but that is the information I have on the land in question.

STAMP DUTY

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier, through his stamp duty officials, take action to recognise the signing of a contract to purchase a new house as a valid claim for the present stamp duty remission, which is to apply until December 31? Earlier this year, to help new house buyers and also to help the building industry, the Government allowed stamp duty remissions on properties up to a value of \$50 000. That has been of benefit to many people, but a problem arises on the signing of the contract in cases where the titles on new home units have not been issued. The delay that takes place in the processing of the documents through the Lands Titles Office and to the point of the transfer of the property after the signing of the contract is considerable. It is usually several weeks, and sometimes it takes as long as six to eight weeks.

A case in my district has been brought to my notice recently. An intending purchaser is becoming concerned in case the titles are not issued in time to make a claim for the remission. I am sure many similar cases exist where such delays do occur, apart from the signing of the contract and waiting for the papers to be prepared. I think it would be reasonable to recognise the signing of a contract as a valid claim. It would not involve much money for the Government and, at least until December 31, people would be able to enter into an agreement to purchase, knowing that they would not have to pay the stamp duty on the new house, thus also helping the building industry.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There would be a real difficulty about using the date of contract, as the honourable member would be aware of the way in which the real estate industry works. The contract can mean that there is a very protracted delay in settlement, and this could be a device used for future sales without any guarantee that we are giving a benefit, which was designed to occur to the building industry, that is that there were effective sales of houses within a limited period. Once the benefit is extended, the real benefit of saying that people will get it if they get in within a specific period then disappears. On the other hand, the Government appreciates that there are some difficulties of the kind referred to by the honourable member and that there are genuine cases seeking to get in before the cut-off date, but there are difficulties about completing papers. We are examining the matter, and I believe that the department has devised a means by which problems can be overcome. I hope to make an announcement about it soon.

BEER MACHINES

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport whether the present regulations covering the operation of beer card dispensing machines are being amended and, if so, when the proposed alterations are likely to come into effect? In my question I am alleging in some instances these

machines are being misused by some hotelkeepers. It is generally accepted in the hotel trade that these machines will increase the sale of bottled beer in any hotels by about 20 per cent, and I allege that in some instances it would be more than that. In some cases I believe that the full profit arising from the use of these machines in dispensing tickets does not go to the club or association, which is legally responsible to pay a turnover licence fee to the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. I am aware that some hotelkeepers have been using the machines, in my opinion illegally, in the name of so-called social clubs supposedly existing in the hotel. For these reasons I am anxious to obtain a copy of these regulations to ascertain whether any changes have been made.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am aware that the regulations covering lotteries and so on are now being revised, and I believe amended regulations will be introduced soon. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member from my colleague.

FOOD ADDITIVES

Mr. BLACKER: Because many people are aware that there is an increasing number of children adversely affected by food additives, will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether legislation can be introduced to ensure a full disclosure on labels of packaged foods as to the type of artificial flavouring, colouring, or preservatives used? This measure would enable consumers to make the choice themselves as to what additives they consider acceptable. Many people are using the Fiengold diet, which eliminates many of these food additives, to control the symptoms of hyperkensis. Concern has been expressed in the community that artificial colourings and flavourings have an effect on some children, and many parents have told me that, if they could identify the colourings themselves by their being marked on the label, they could make the judgment and try to assist in the welfare of their children. I therefore ask the Premier whether the Government intends to introduce such legislation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from my colleague for the honourable member.

EDUCATION REPORT

Mr. KLUNDER: Is the Minister of Education aware of the contents of the report of the so-called Williams committee of inquiry into education and training set up by the Federal Government? In the Address in Reply debate on November 3 (page 693 of *Hansard*) the member for Torrens referred to the report, which he said the Federal Government had received. He then quoted some figures from it. In view of the Fraser Government's alleged commitment to federalism, it is extraordinary that a back-bencher in the State Opposition should be privy to information—

Mr. Becker: Comment!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KLUNDER:—which has not been discussed with the State Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I was just about to mention that to the honourable member, but there was an interjection from the other side. The Chair will decide these matters. I hope that the honourable member will not comment in his question.

Mr. KLUNDER: I had no knowledge that the report has

either been published or so discussed, and I should like to know whether or not the Minister has.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I wonder whether the honourable member may have confused this report with the fourth report of the Henderson inquiry in to poverty. I recall the comments made in the Chamber by the honourable member and his quotation of some figures in relation to unemployment of youth. Those figures are strongly reminiscent of figures contained in the Henderson report.

I have made inquiries since the statement was made in the House and I can find no evidence that the Williams committee has reported to the Commonwealth Government. If it has done so, the State Ministers would be anxious to obtain the content of the recommendations, because they are likely to have a substantial impact not only on tertiary institutions and the Further Education Department but also possibly on future forms of funding from the Schools Commission to schools.

It is clear that Professor Williams's terms of reference are sufficiently broad for him to make certain recommendations as to the transition from school to work, the relationship between courses in schools and in technical and further education areas, and so on. Whereas I believe that probably a genuine mistake has been made in this case, if, as I say, Senator Carrick is in possession of the report from Professor Williams, then I am sure the State Minister would be pleased to be apprised of the fact.

WALLAROO MISHAP

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Marine say what progress has been made and what information is available regarding the replacement of the bulk-loading facilities at Wallaroo, the emphasis of my question being on the completion date of the replacement and compensation to all people affected by the mishap? The House would be well aware of the disastrous moment at 0720 hours on Monday, October 24, when the Chinese ship *Wuzhou* in the twinkling of an eye caused about \$1 000 000 damage to the jetty and bulk-loading facilities at Wallaroo.

A fortnight ago this evening a meeting was held at Wallaroo at which 200 people were present, including officers from the Minister's department and representatives from growers' organisations, the Wheat Board and the Barley Board. It was a well represented meeting of all concerned. As a consequence, everyone expressed his concern about the mishap and is awaiting information from the Minister regarding the progress that is being made for the replacement of the damaged facilities.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member approached me and requested that I meet a deputation to be led by him of members of the Wallaroo council. I believe the Mayor of Wallaroo and people representing interested bodies will be present. Today I have asked my Secretary to contact the honourable member to arrange a suitable time and place for the meeting during the early part or middle of next week, when I hope to be able to give him and the deputation full details of the progress that has been made.

Possibly, it would be better for me to leave the details until then, but I can assure the honourable member that absolutely no time has been wasted; every step that has been necessary has been taken in order to hurry up the completion of the necessary work. A project manager has been appointed, and everything possible is being done to rectify the results of this unfortunate accident. Regarding compensation and other matters, I shall be pleased to hear from the deputation about those matters and about the

various claims, and the nature of those claims, so that I can have them investigated thoroughly.

The honourable member would be aware that the ship has left Wallaroo and is now loading at Port Lincoln. I am not certain that the detention order has been finally lifted, because some formalities involving the South Australian Supreme Court had to be finalised. I would expect these formalities to be finalised by this afternoon. If and when they are finalised the detention order will be lifted, because that will indicate that a satisfactory arrangement has been arrived at regarding the guarantee on the part of the shipowners or their agents that will be enforceable in the South Australian Supreme Court.

That situation is satisfactory to me, although it is not strictly in accordance with the detention order, which provided that \$1 000 000 in cash had to be deposited. I point out to the House, however, that the need for that cash deposit has disappeared because the shipowners have indicated that they are likely to contest liability. The only way in which I could use that money would be if liability was not contested. Therefore, a guarantee serves the same purpose that money that must remain in trust would serve.

It is a most unfortunate affair not only for the people of Wallaroo but also for the shipowners. I can assure the honourable member that by next Wednesday, or whenever the deputation is received, I will have much information for him. I therefore believe it would be appropriate at that time to give that information both to him and the deputation he intends to lead.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT

Mr. DRURY: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to amend the Land and Business Agents Act so that schedules in relation to purchases of land and houses under package deals can be supplied to intending purchasers and, if it does, will the Government also legislate to bring it into force as far as advertisements applying to these purchases are concerned?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member's question relates to a matter which was raised yesterday in the form of a question and to which I replied concerning Preston Real Estate. I stated that the Government was considering legislation of this type to ensure full disclosure in this type of transaction. I imagine that, as soon as my department has concluded consideration of that matter and has received a report from the Consumer Laws Advisory Committee, the Government will make a decision about which I can inform the House.

UNREGISTERED VEHICLES

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the situation regarding the legality of towing an unregistered vehicle behind a registered vehicle? Has the interpretation of the relevant section of the Act been altered recently? If it has, will the Minister take steps to overcome the difficulties that now confront many motorists, especially those involved in motor sports? I have received the following letter from a constituent:

I am a member of the Maitland All Cars Club and have built a "buggy" to compete in their events. Previously I have towed it using an "A" frame rigid connection, but a new law is in effect which makes it illegal to do this, since all towed vehicles must now be fully registered. This is impossible, because of the specifications of my "buggy", and the cost, but the only alternative is to obtain a special permit each time I want to move it, which is most unsatisfactory. I have

inquired about registering it as a trailer, since I only tow it as a trailer on roads, but apparently this cannot be done. As my member of Parliament, I was hoping that you could help me and the many other people in similar situations by trying to obtain some special provisions for vehicles like mine, or changing the law in this regard.

I have also received the following letter from the committee of the Maitland All Cars Club:

We, the members of the Maitland All Cars Club Incorporated, would like to see an amendment to the law regarding towing of unregistered vehicles on public roads, the amendment being a minimum registration fee permit for a period of 12 months to cover registration and insurance of a towed vehicle as a trailer. As members of the club we own specials which are used for Motorkhanas, etc., in club events held monthly, and in some cases it is impracticable and expensive to use trailers when a simple annual fee could suffice.

Although this matter has been brought to my attention by a constituent, I think the matter affects many people throughout the State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know the particular instance to which the honourable member refers. If he will give me details of the specific case I will certainly have it examined. I rather suspect that the problem is not a question of registration but rather one of insurance. The question of towing unregistered vehicles is being considered presently, and I shall be happy to look at the point raised by the honourable member.

OVER-PASSES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Transport say which over-pass of the main northern railway line will be the next to be constructed? It was announced recently that the Grand Junction Road over-pass would be opened this weekend. A report made by the Minister some time ago listed seven areas where over-passes are required. I understand some action is to be taken on the Cavan Bridge, but I do not believe that construction was considered in the same way as were the over-passes providing access to the western districts.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The next over-pass to go into service will be the Cavan over-pass (although actually it is about a mile from Cavan). I do not know whether the one after that will be the Regency Road or Torrens Road crossing, but I imagine that it would be one of the two. I am afraid I have to say exactly what I have been saying for a long time about the Federal funding. I know the member for Light likes laughing about this but the hard cold facts are—

Dr. Eastick: I am laughing at you.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Do not laugh about it. The day that members opposite lean on their Liberal friends to get funds from Canberra, instead of having a reduced figure year after year, we will start getting the over-passes referred to by the honourable member.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SHOP TRADING HOURS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m., if necessary.
Motion carried.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Classification of Publications Act, 1973-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this Bill is to enable the Classification of Publications Board to revoke a classification where the publication concerned is no longer available. The board maintains annual volumes of all classified material, and, as time goes by, these volumes are becoming increasingly cluttered with defunct publications. Furthermore, a power of revocation will clearly enable the board to render a previously restricted publication open to prosecution under the Police Offences Act, if the board considers that it is appropriate to do so. As the Act now stands, the board has power only to refuse a classification initially, or vary an existing classification.

The Bill also seeks to remove the obligation upon the board to publish lists of classified publications, and of publications it refrains from classifying, in a newspaper circulating throughout the State. In actual practice, vendors find it much easier to consult the consolidated lists made available by the board through the State Information Centre, and individual newspaper notices are therefore of not much value. Also, in view of the lurid titles many of the publications bear, it is appropriate that the requirement of publication should be limited to publication in the *Government Gazette*.

As the remainder of the explanation is formal, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.
Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 seeks to clarify one of the conditions that the board may impose in relation to the sale of a restricted publication. It is made clear that the word "personally" in paragraph (d), as it now stands, means in effect "while physically present in the shop". It has been alleged that this condition may not prevent a person from requesting a publication by post and thus may mean that a vendor can negotiate a sale by post. It is not intended that this practice should be permitted where the condition specified in paragraph (d) has been imposed by the board.

Clause 3 empowers the board to revoke any classification or condition assigned or imposed by the board. Clause 4 provides that the revocation or variation of a classification or condition must also be published by the board. Publication is restricted to publication in the *Gazette*.

Mrs. ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Film Classification Act, 1971-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has two objectives. First, it seeks to increase the maximum penalty for exhibiting an unclassified film from the present rather low \$200 to \$1 000. It also seeks to widen the Minister's power to prohibit the exhibition of certain R films in drive-in theatres. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

Unfortunately, some time ago certain sex shops in Adelaide were abusing the freedom they had been allowed in the exhibition of films that had not been classified under the Film Classification Act, 1971-1974. It was the practice to allow sex shop proprietors to exhibit such films to prospective customers who were genuinely interested in purchasing the film. But some shops virtually operated as theatres, and the various subterfuges employed made it extremely difficult for the police to establish whether or not the audience were prospective customers. Proprietors have been advised that the concession by virtue of which they exhibited films not classified under the Film Classification Act has been withdrawn. It is essential that higher penalties be imposed so that it will be unprofitable for offenders to exhibit pornographic films.

There are some R films that are, in my Government's opinion, far too explicit in matters of sex and sadism for exhibition in drive-ins. At the moment the Minister has power to issue notices to individual drive-in theatres prohibiting the exhibition of a particular R film where he considers that the film may be seen from outside the theatre. This necessitates issuing approximately 40 notices. The Act has been widened so that the Minister can issue general or particular notices of prohibition in relation to drive-in theatres, whether or not the drive-in theatre is constructed in such a way that people outside can see the screen.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 increases the penalty for an offence against the section from an amount not exceeding \$200 to an amount not exceeding \$1 000. Clause 3 enables the Minister to prohibit the exhibition of all R films in all drive-in theatres or any specified drive-in theatres, or of any particular R film. The prohibition may be imposed by a general notice in the *Gazette*, or by individual notices served on drive-in theatre proprietors. Clause 4 enables the Governor to prescribe fees in respect of an application for classification of a film and other related matters. There is, of course, a good deal of work involved in assessing a film for classification, and the imposition of a fee seems entirely justified.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1973; to repeal the Oats Marketing Act, 1972, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to—

- (a) arm the Australian Barley Board, established under the principal Act the Barley Marketing Act, 1947, as amended, with the necessary powers to engage in the "statutory marketing" of oats;

- (b) grant the board power to market other crops but without any powers of compulsory purchase; and
- (c) grant the board certain additional powers to borrow money under a Treasury guarantee.

As the remainder of the explanation relates to the clauses, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 formally amends the long title to the principal Act. Clause 4 repeals the Oats Marketing Act, 1972. This measure was never brought into operation and will no longer be required if the amendments proposed by this measure are agreed to. Clause 5 amends the definition section of the principal Act by inserting such additional definitions as are necessary. It is felt that these definitions are self-explanatory, but I would draw members' attention to proposed subclause (2), which is consequent on the definition of "proclaimed produce" and would emphasise that the new function of the board in relation to proclaimed produce does not carry with it any right to acquire that produce.

Clause 6 inserts a new section 8a in the principal Act and this section provides for the licensing of receivers of oats. This section corresponds almost exactly to the present provision relating to licensed receivers of barley. If other amending legislation is agreed to the principal licensed receiver will be the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company. Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act which sets out the general function of the board by arming the board with the statutory marketing powers adverted to above. In addition, the capacity to receive a guarantee by the Treasurer against liabilities arising from borrowings is provided under these amendments.

Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act by extending the inspectorial powers of the board to matters relating to oats. Clause 9 amends section 12 of the principal Act to provide for the keeping of accounts in relation to oats. Clause 10 is formal. Clause 11 inserts a new clause 14aa in the principal Act. This clause confers the statutory marketing powers in relation to oats and is the prime function of the measure especially at subclause (2), which is commended to members' particular attention. Further it is pointed out that this provision is, as it were, dormant until the "appointed day", as to which see subclause (3), is fixed. Present indications are that that day will be fixed so as to encompass oats of the season 1978-79.

Clause 12 amends section 14a of the principal Act to extend the regulating powers of the board to cover oats. Clause 13 amends section 15 of the principal Act to cover the receiving of oats by licensed receivers, and clause 14 is consequential on this provision. Clause 15 inserts a new section 17a, which relates to oats and almost exactly corresponds to section 17 as at present applies to barley.

Clause 16 inserts a new section 18a in the principal Act and this clause, together with new section 19a, inserted by clause 17, sets out the scheme for the marketing of oats and exactly follows the existing scheme for the marketing of barley. Clause 18 makes some drafting amendments to section 20 of the principal Act and, in addition, extends by six months the time within which prosecutions may be brought for offences against the Act. Clauses 19 and 20 are, it is suggested, self-explanatory. Clause 21 extends the life of the principal Act—

- (a) in relation to barley until the season 1982-83; and
- (b) in relation to oats for five seasons from and including the season 1978-79.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1959-66. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for amendments of the principal Act, the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1959-1966, that are consequential on the amendments of the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1973, provided for by the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill, 1977. The Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill, 1977, provides for the extension of the statutory marketing powers of the Australian Barley Board to the marketing of oats. This Bill extends all the powers, rights and duties of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited in respect of the handling of barley to the handling of oats. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by applying the definition of "warrant" to "grain" instead of wheat only. Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act to extend the exclusive right of the co-operative to the bulk handling of wheat and barley to the bulk handling of oats. Clause 5 amends section 14 of the principal Act and is consequential to the amendment provided for by clause 4. Clause 6 extends the right of the co-operative to be a licensed receiver of bulk wheat and barley to bulk oats. Clause 7 amends section 30 of the principal Act and is consequential to the amendment provided for by clause 6. Clauses 8, 9 and 10 are also of a consequential nature only.

Mr. VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from November 16. Page 864.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. This is the second Address in Reply debate that we have had in a short time. I object that this Address in Reply is not to be completed, as we were warned by the Deputy Premier, until the end of this session, because he claims that the Liberal Party has taken most of the time in the debate, yet four Labor members have spoken. Since my entry into Parliament it has been the custom for the Address in Reply debate to be completed and presented to the Governor before we proceed with other business, but already several Bills passed through this Chamber before the Address in Reply was commenced, and I think that is most unfair to the Opposition.

I congratulate the new members on both sides of the House. Their speeches have been interesting, to say the least. I pay a tribute to past members who have retired voluntarily from this place; the former member for

Torrens, who was a great friend of mine over many years and a great advisor to me when I first came into this place; and the former member for Ross Smith, who has been a friend of mine for a long time and was probably one of the first members of Parliament I met when I came to this country and was residing at the Gepps Cross Hostel. I always had a great respect for Mr. Jennings and for his manner and his oratory in this place. The member for Frome retired voluntarily. I have known him only since I entered Parliament, but I have a deep respect for the way in which he carried out his duties in his large electorate and for the hard work he did during his time in this place.

The previous members for Millicent, Murray and Goyder are no longer here, but they were met with an unfortunate situation in which the Opposition had six members for three seats, and somebody had to go; unfortunately, those members had to retire from this place. I place on record my appreciation of the work they did. The member for Millicent was not here long, but he did his job conscientiously. The member for Murray was well known, because he entered this place by winning what was formerly a Labor seat, holding that seat and enhancing his majority at each election. The member for Goyder was not here long, but he equipped himself well while he was here, and I appreciate the work he did whilst in this Chamber.

While congratulating members of the House I must congratulate the Deputy Premier (not on the stand he took today in respect of the Address in Reply debate) on the way in which he handled his part in the recent visit of the Prince of Wales to this State. During the previous Royal visit the Queen came into my electorate and close to the electorate for the member for Hanson, and we were completely left out. We were given no opportunity to meet the Queen, although she came into our districts; we were kept out of the way in the background. When, at a reception at the Playhouse, an opportunity arose for both the member for Hanson and me to be introduced, we were sidestepped neatly by the Premier and given no opportunity to meet her. During the recent visit of the Prince of Wales the Deputy Premier went out of his way to introduce all members of Parliament, whether Government or Opposition members. I appreciate the job that he did and the gesture he made, particularly to the Opposition, unlike his Leader, who ignored us on that previous occasion.

Mr. Becker: Even the member whose electorate includes the airport did not get the chance to meet her.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, he did not. I mentioned earlier the contributions made by a number of new members of this Parliament. I mentioned in particular the new member for Ross Smith, who dealt at length with socialism, its benefits, and how proud he was to be a member of the Labor Party and a socialist. If anyone should know, one would imagine that that member with his intelligence would know that socialism comes about only by high taxation; that is the only way it can work—by putting the people's dollar into the Government's pocket. The socialist Government can never get enough. The idea is to create a welfare State, if possible, similar to that in the United Kingdom, where it is welfare from the cradle to the grave.

I have been waiting for the Minister of Community Welfare to come into this place and tell us about the release of the secret report for which we have been waiting for months, but he is not in the Chamber today. I see in today's *News* that, according to the member for Ross Smith, Mr. Whitlam, the past leader of this country—

Mr. Abbott: The next leader.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member said, "The ex leader", and I thank him for correcting me.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Turn your hearing aid up, Grandpa!

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all right for the Minister of violence, the Minister of Transport, who threatens that if anybody upsets him he will punch members on the nose (which he knows he cannot do)—the honourable member should know, because he has mixed in the world enough.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. McRAE): I trust that the honourable member for Glenelg will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. In apologising, I point out that I was sidetracked by some Government members.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: If any challenges like that are made, the Minister should first remove his glasses and, secondly, ensure that he is covered by third party workmen's compensation, because he would be in trouble and would have to draw it. Today's *News* carries the front page headline "Whitlam asks: Give up Tax Cuts for Jobs". That is a great area in which the Federal Opposition Leader (Mr. Whitlam) has undertaken to abolish pay-roll tax if the Labor Government is returned to office on December 10. Obviously the Premier does not agree with that, so I think that it is about time that he got closer to his senior socialist Leader (Mr. Whitlam).

Mr. Groom: What's a socialist?

Mr. MATHWIN: That is difficult to define, because it is difficult to find out where the pink ends and the red begins. The ultimate aim of socialism and communism is the same, except that the communists will achieve it more quickly.

Mr. Groom: Give an example.

Mr. MATHWIN: Karl Marx had the same problem himself. He could not tell the difference between the two, so I agree with the new member for Morphett that it is difficult to define the difference between socialism and communism.

Mr. Groom: Why don't you try?

Mr. MATHWIN: The new member for Ross Smith spoke at length about the welfare State and how good socialism would be, but he did not tell us that it creates a disincentive for people to get on and prevents them from thinking for themselves. The socialists do not want people to think for themselves, thus leading to eventual Government by regulation. Everyone would be protected whether or not he liked it.

The Premier and the Attorney-General made a great play of false advertising. In a previous debate, I explained the false advertising by the Premier and his Party during the most recent election campaign. The Premier often talks about South Australians paying the lowest prices for housing in Australia. That is a complete myth and, if we examine the comparison between the States, we will realise that it is far from the truth. Since the Labor Party came to office in 1970, the Premier has been fond of campaigning in State elections almost solely on the subject of comparisons between the States.

Mr. Hemmings: Very successfully, though!

Mr. MATHWIN: He may be able to convince some people about some things, in the way in which he has convinced people that a certain shocking play we are about to witness in South Australia is good theatre. That is how good is the Premier's judgment. If any member would like to read the script, or if any Government member shows any decency, I will let him read part of the script and ask for his opinion on it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've read it, have you?

Mr. MATHWIN: I have read part of it. It would make the Minister ashamed of himself and it would make him blush.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Then why are you going to see it?

Mr. MATHWIN: The only way I would see the Minister is if he were far east and I were far west.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You said you were going to witness it. Why are you doing that if it is so bad?

Mr. MATHWIN: I did not say I was going to witness it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Yes, you did.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, and I trust that the honourable member will ignore them and address the Chair.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, for your protection. In the recent election campaign we saw the Premier's clear tendency to use fabrication rather than fact, as follows: in the 1970 Australian Labor Party policy, the then Leader promised to control prices of land and houses. He said that perhaps the greatest area of Liberal and Country League failure in this regard, apart from the increase in costs for staple foods, was the spectacular rise in building materials. He said that, in the Liberal Government's term of office, building materials had risen 8.3 per cent. The Premier also said that the Labor Party would administer the Prices Act to protect the purchasing power of money in this State and change the present disastrous course. Undoubtedly, the Premier has changed course in the opposite direction from that required to maintain the State's traditional low-cost advantage which it had had for many years. On the matter of building costs, the State Government seems to be in complete disarray and suffering from the embarrassing aftermath of the 1970 election promise. The Premier advises us to look at the trends and not to make absolute comparisons.

The Minister in charge of housing advises us to look at absolute comparisons and to ignore trends. We do not particularly care what comparison is made, because either way South Australia has produced the worst performance in building, land and housing costs since Labor came to office in 1970. The Opposition first raised the question several months ago in order to generate awareness throughout the community of South Australia's declining performance. It considered that, by doing so, successful debate would ensure the ultimate cause of the decline to be identified. However, the effect of our initiative has been quite the reverse. The Premier, for reasons known only to himself, has persistently disputed the facts, which have been verified by industry itself, by reputable bodies, and by data sources within them. I cite the Master Builders Association, the Housing Industry Association, the Institute of Quantity Surveyors, *Cost Commentary*, and the Australian Bureau of Statistics. With all this opposition, the following question must be asked: why does the Premier refute all of this available evidence?

We claim that the best measure of comparative costs of building a house is the table produced by the bureau, reference No. 36, table 25, which sets out an average commencing value, the average size in square metres, and the average value per square metre of houses in all capital cities. The Housing Industry Association and the Master Builders Association both agree that we are using the most reliable information and that the Premier's use of bank figures is misleading.

The September issue of *Cost Commentary* states the view in the following straightforward manner:

Since this publication in March, 1976, commented on the average sizes of houses in Adelaide and the average value per square metre compared with other States, there have been several comments in the press concerning this topic.

The statistics quoted in the various issues of *Cost Commentary* are taken directly from the publications of the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which must be regarded as the most reliable authority on statistics of this type. The table shows that in Sydney a house with a commencing value of \$25 300 and an average size of 134 square metres costs \$139 a square metre. In Melbourne, the cost a square metre is \$202. In Brisbane, a house valued at \$24 200 with an average size of 134 square metres costs \$181 a square metre. A house valued at \$30 400 in Adelaide, with an average size of 141 square metres, costs \$215 a square metre. In Perth, a house valued at \$28 100 with an average size of 146 square metres costs \$192 a square metre. The figures show that there can be no argument about the matter: without doubt, it costs more per square metre to build a house in Adelaide than in any other mainland State capital.

It is there in black and white for all to read, and no member on the other side can argue with that. The cost in Adelaide is considerably above the national average figure of \$196 a square metre, and the table shows conclusively that people are paying more on average to build a house in Adelaide than in any other mainland State capital. The Adelaide figure of \$30 400 is higher than the Sydney figure of \$25 300, the Melbourne figure of \$29 700, and the Brisbane figure of \$24 200.

The latest figures available from the Housing Industry Association in Melbourne show that land prices in Adelaide have risen faster during the period from 1971 to 1977, during the term of office of the Dunstan Government, than have those in any other mainland capital. The increases are as follows: Sydney, 100 per cent; Melbourne, 163 per cent; Brisbane, 39 per cent; Perth, 119 per cent; and Adelaide, 232 per cent. Here again is proof of the situation.

In reply to a question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on October 20, the Premier made the following claim regarding housing costs:

The fact is that the South Australian housing package is by far the cheapest. The completed total cost of a house to a purchaser in South Australia is by far the cheapest of any State capital, and we are keeping it that way.

The Premier's statement, of course, was not only misleading but untrue. The latest figures from the Housing Industry Association are dated October 21. They are the best figures available, and they show that the average housing package (land plus house) in Adelaide now costs \$38 700, \$4 800 above the Brisbane average of \$33 900. Although the figure for Adelaide is still marginally below those of Sydney, Melbourne, and Perth, we should follow the Premier's advice and look at the trends rather than at absolute comparisons. Since 1971, Adelaide has had the fastest increase in building costs (155 per cent) and the highest increase in land prices (232 per cent), but quite clearly the total package has increased also by 169 per cent. In the period from 1971 to 1977, the increase in the housing package (land plus house) in Sydney was 84 per cent, in Melbourne 150 per cent, in Brisbane 86 per cent, in Perth 127 per cent, and in Adelaide 159 per cent. Adelaide has the highest building cost of any mainland State capital at \$215 a square metre.

People in Adelaide pay more to build a house (\$30 400) than do those in any other mainland State capital. They have to pay the fastest rising building costs since 1971 (155 per cent), and the fastest rising land prices (232 per cent). The figures I have quoted are a clear answer to the Premier and what he says about housing in this State. The Premier claims that South Australians pay the lowest tax per head in any mainland State. That is untrue. He means that we did that in the past; we do not do it at present. It is

quite a simple matter to check that, and any Government member who wishes may do it.

I should like to deal briefly with tourism and to quote from a book received last week, published by the Government, entitled *Vantage*, a book to be issued periodically to the people in this State. It contains some interesting items. Like everything else in South Australia, whether we go to a play, to the opera, or whether we have a book put out by a Government department, the first thing one sees is the face of the Premier. I got a shock today when I went to my mail box, in which I found an envelope bearing a photograph of the Premier. I did not know whether it was a new South Australian stamp, but it was not franked on the forehead, so I suppose it was just a picture of the Premier. The Premier's letter in *Vantage* states:

Vantage magazine provides readers with their own armchair vantage point of South Australia, the most dynamic and progressive State in Australia.

We know where we are going in this State regarding the arts. The Premier has said that the new punk rock is art and has great value. On the one hand, he said he had read the script; on the other hand, he said he had not. The letter continues:

Other magazines follow the traditional journalistic process of reporting on events, places and people through the eyes of a "middleman". Not so with *Vantage*. The basis of this magazine is to provide first hand information from the people most intimately concerned with the things that make South Australia a leader in economics, science, art and culture, tourism, . . .

On the subject of culture, we all know what is going to happen at the Festival Theatre about that.

In referring to tourism, I noticed that the Premier took on that portfolio when he thought it was the "in" thing, but has now given it to another Minister. Tourism in this State has a very poor record, but the foreword to *Vantage* by the Premier states that we are the leader in tourism. What about our wineries and vineyards? Many times the Premier has said how proud he is that we have so many of them in and near the metropolitan area, but the Premier's Land Commission that has taken over the land of wineries in the south and on the outskirts of Adelaide. His Transport Department got rid of the oldest vineyard in the State at Morphettville Park, yet the Premier boasts about the advantages and beauty of having vineyards and wineries close to Adelaide.

He and his departments are raping these areas. I believe a tourism policy should aim at extracting the maximum benefit but not at an unacceptable high cost to the environment. No-one would deny that tourism is a major industry, especially concerning employment. In these days one would think that the Premier would do something about the sorry condition of tourism in this State. A summary of findings from the Australian Tourism Commission concerning travel within Australia states:

Between July, 1973, and June, 1974, a total of 27 000 000 trips were made within Australia. Of these trips, over 26 000 000 or 98 per cent were made by Australians. A total of \$898 000 000 was spent on these trips, \$736 000 000 or 82 per cent being generated by Australians. On a per capita basis, international visitors spent an average of \$321 compared to \$28 for Australians. Nights spent away from home totalled 152 000 000, with the majority (87 per cent) again being attributable to Australian travellers. Almost half of these nights were spent in private homes.

Whilst Australians were most likely to travel for holiday reasons, more international visitors came to Australia to visit friends and relatives than for any other purpose. New South Wales and Victoria were the most frequently visited States,

receiving respectively 37 per cent and 26 per cent of all visitors. December and January were the most popular months for travel, accounting for one-quarter of all trips. April-May and August-September were also popular.

A list of visitors to each State shows that New South Wales had 9 920 000; Victoria had 6 897 000; Queensland had 4 653 000; and Western Australia had 2 396 000. This great State of South Australia came a sorry fourth with 2 747 000, but we must remember the words of the great Donald Allan Dunstan, the Premier, in *Vantage*, when he said that South Australia was a leader in tourism, amongst other things. How on earth can he say such a thing when any of his 16 press secretaries should be able to find out the true position? I obtained these details from the library. Perhaps the Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Sport should check the figures so that the Premier can correct them in the next issue of *Vantage*, and say how wrong he was and how he did not mean to say it.

We have a shortage of caravan parks in this State, and most of our caravan parks, but not all, have a standard far below that of parks in other States. In an article in the *Advertiser* of March 4, 1977, Mr. Franklin (who is a great expert on caravans) states:

One in every 6.5 Australians stays in a caravan each year, and thousands of others use tents and other forms of outdoor accommodation. There are about 150 000 registered caravans and 800 000 trailers in Australia. This includes 31 113 vans registered in South Australia at the end of January.

We have 31 113 vans registered in this State.

Mr. Evans: How many in Australia?

Mr. MATHWIN: There are 150 000 registered in Australia plus 800 000 trailers. We have many registered in this State, but I suggest, with due respect, that most of our caravan parks are below the average of Australian parks, and it is about time the Government spent more money on tourism, which brings a benefit to all people and provides employment.

I refer to a Glenelg tourist bus operator who uses a mini-bus. This gentleman applied for a licence in 1975, and in 1976 I tried to help him, and have done so since then. He wished to operate a tourist bus from Glenelg to the Barossa Valley, but the State Transport Authority has imposed a tax on any person who travels on a private bus. This gentleman used to pay \$40 a month, but he now has to pay \$116.16 a month to carry tourists, because every tourist on his bus is taxed.

I asked that this gentleman be allowed to operate a tourist bus from Glenelg to the Barossa Valley. Glenelg has more tourist accommodation available than has any other part of this State, and there are many elderly tourists and senior citizens who are not as mobile as younger people. These tourists who visit the Glenelg or Brighton areas and wish to visit the Barossa Valley have to use public transport or a taxi to travel to Adelaide in order to use a State Government tourist bus to go to the Barossa Valley.

The Government will not allow this man to operate a bus tour from Glenelg, an area that holds the greatest percentage of tourists in this State. The Minister of Transport has said, within the earshot of a friend of mine, that, as far as he is concerned, he wants all private operators off the road by 1980. I have referred to a way in which he is trying to force this operator out of business.

This State is promoting tourism, especially to the Barossa Valley, but tourists who visit the Barossa Valley and return at various times during the evening must get back from the city to Glenelg to their accommodation using taxis, buses and trams. That is a ridiculous situation.

If the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport will do nothing about that situation perhaps Donald Allan Dunstan, in line with his writings in *Vantage*, should do something about the situation fairly quickly because tourism is important to this country and to this State.

The Premier presented his policy speech at the Festival Theatre on August 29, 1977, as a one-man-band when he got up on the stage and his underlings sat in the audience. I have much to say about the policy speech, but I have time to bring only one point forward. Regarding Australia's banking institutions in that policy speech, the Premier stated:

The State Bank and the Savings Bank are of vital importance to our development. They will be protected and given every opportunity to develop full and competitive banking services.

I brought up a matter in relation to overseas drafts which the Premier said he would investigate, and which I hope he will. What is the Premier's concern in this regard? Obviously he is concerned that the banks register a profit, a profit that is taken by this Government and put into State revenue. The most recent annual report of the State Bank at page 7 states:

Provision for payment to the Treasurer of the State, \$1 661 407.

In other words, a tax is being paid by every person who deposits money in the State Bank. That tax, when combined, amounts to \$1 661 407. On top of that, I understand that the Savings Bank of South Australia pays half its profit to the Government. Therefore, every person who deposits with the State Bank and every person who does business with the Savings Bank pays tax for the privilege of giving the Government money to put into revenue to do with as it wishes. I hope that people in this State realise what is happening in that regard. If they do not mind giving their money to the Treasurer so that he can put it into the Government coffers, that is their problem. I wished to draw the attention of the House to several other matters, but I will leave them until I have another opportunity in another debate. I support the motion.

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): I support the motion. I congratulate the new members of this Parliament. The election result in this State on September 17 shows clearly that the Labor Party, with 51.9 per cent of the vote, is definitely the winner of that election with its 27 seats. That result was as nearly equitable as one Party could get. The Liberal Party, with 41.1 per cent of the vote got as close as possible to the number of seats it deserved. When one considers election results since 1970 one sees that the success of Labor Governments has been equitable each time and that the percentage of votes obtained has almost corresponded with the number of seats won, except for the august Chamber—the Legislative Council.

It was necessary in this State to institute electoral reform, but it took a disgraceful episode in this State's history to bring it about. That episode was the defeat of the Dunstan Government in 1968. True, Premier Hall of the Liberal Government instituted electoral reform to the grief of his comrades, and no doubt that precipitated his removal from the premiership and eventually from the Liberal Party.

Since 1970, electoral boundaries have been redrawn only once—last year. Before 1969, when Mr. Hall redrew the electoral boundaries, we had the ridiculous situation whereby 26 members in a 39-seat House came from country areas and 13 members came from the metropolitan area. That system, I think, is euphemistically called a gerrymander and enabled that Government to

stay in office for 27 years, winning only the 1944 election. Consistently after 1944, that Government received a reduced vote at each election.

The Premier, in his policy speech delivered on August 29 this year, stated that he would introduce optional preferential voting. He stated:

The Government seeks a specific mandate to introduce optional preferential voting for House of Assembly elections. I wholeheartedly support that, because under the preferential voting system minority groups that are tightly disciplined can create havoc with election results. I need refer only to the existence of the Democratic Labor Party on the Federal scene for 15 years to show how a group that controlled 6 per cent of the vote was able to keep—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. DRURY: For 15 years the D.L.P. kept in office the Federal Liberal Country Party coalition, 15 years longer than it should have done. Preferential voting was, I believe (I am not old enough to have borne witness to its beginning), introduced in 1919 by the then Prime Minister, the Right Honourable William Morris Hughes, who was a former Labor Party leader but was coerced into the Tory camp on the issue of conscription. During the second reading debate on that Bill, Mr. Hughes said that if two conservative candidates opposed each other under the system at least one of them ought to win, which is a lovely state of affairs. Therefore, I support that portion of the Premier's policy speech that will bring in optional preferential voting, which will be another electoral reform for South Australia.

In addition, the Premier's policy speech also mentions that the Upper House elections are to be synchronised with the Lower House elections. Over the last three or four years we have seen on the Federal scene a state of affairs that has brought on an election almost every year. We had a Federal House of Representatives election in 1972, and a double dissolution in 1974 when both Houses came up for election. We had another double dissolution in 1975. Between 1963 and 1974, House of Representatives elections and Senate elections were out of step, with the result that the democratically elected Government in 1972 had to face a hostile Senate, when in fact if that vote had been reflected in the Senate that Government would have gained control of that House. However, that is history. I definitely applaud that part of the Premier's policy speech that refers to Upper House elections being synchronised with Lower House elections.

The Premier's policy speech makes quite plain what will be the prevailing attitude of this Government over the next few years. Stable economic conditions will prevail. We will be going through a period of bread and butter politics. We need this type of policy because of the parlous situation of our economy. I have no doubt whatsoever that the economy is in its present state because of the present occupants of the Federal Treasury benches. In the policy speech the Premier has pointed out that the policy of the present Federal Liberal Government is wrong. He said:

The money paid to this State over the past two years has increased only slightly, and by nowhere near enough to take account of rising costs. As a result we have had in practical terms a reduction of 7 per cent in funds.

I do not see how members opposite can possibly question that statement because the main thrust of the Federal Liberal Party's campaign in December, 1975, was the reduction in Federal Government spending, and reduce it it did, savagely, to the extent that we now have about 367 000 unemployed, with a prediction of more than 400 000 next February. In a country as wealthy as

Australia this is preposterous. We find that projects for which the State Government needs funds have to be deferred or simply set aside indefinitely. Nevertheless, I believe the Premier has been able to counter this problem partly by introducing the idea that statutory authorities can borrow up to \$1 000 000. The Premier said:

There is another way in which we can get limited access to additional Loan funds. Statutory authorities can borrow up to \$1 000 000 a year each without the permission of Loan Council. Each \$1 000 000 borrowed costs \$100 000 a year for the State Budget to service, and so does not create a heavy burden on revenue as compared with the immediate benefit of capital expenditure. New authorities will be created and some additional borrowing powers for existing ones will be provided.

Mr. Becker: Where will the money come from?

Mr. DRURY: In answer to that interjection, in the *News* of November 16 it was pointed out in the financial pages that the Victorian Government was able to borrow \$300 000 000 from West German banks. I point out that in Victoria there are 279 local government authorities. I believe the Premier's policy statements concerning economic conditions are practical. It will be possible to carry them through.

If we had not had reserves from the sale of the railways to the Commonwealth Government, we would be in dire straits now, yet the Opposition forced this Government to the polls over that issue. We are now receiving the benefits of that policy. We have been able to finance a deficit this year of \$18 300 000 with the last of the reserves from that deal. The *News* yesterday contained an article commenting on the Australian and New Zealand Bank survey that the number of jobs advertised continued to fall in October. In fact, the number of advertisements for jobs was 3.4 per cent lower than in September and 14.8 per cent lower than in October, 1976.

I believe the Government is to be applauded for its action in increasing its expenditure in the Mines Department so that we can continue to search for alternative sources of energy and also additional supplies of energy, particularly natural gas. Whilst natural gas is a boon to our industrial development, we must diversify our efforts. One alternative fuel being developed in Brazil is the use of ethanol alcohol as an additive for motor vehicles. A report in the *Motor Trade Journal* of August, 1977, states:

Brazil turns to alcohol: The Brazilian people are noted for their deep-seated national pride, great spirit of enterprise, and a happy knack for extricating themselves from difficulties by unconventional solutions. All these characteristics have a bearing on Brazil's determination to beat the problem of rising oil costs and find a viable alternative to the use of petrol in internal combustion engines. For Brazil, that alternative is alcohol.

This year, Brazil's oil bill will hit the \$US4 billion mark; that is, about 40 per cent of the value of Brazil's exports will have to be set aside to buy oil.

The report continues:

Should this situation be allowed to continue, it is clear that the strain on Brazil's balance of payments would reach a point where all economic growth would stop.

That situation would apply to almost any of the Western industrialised nations that have come to rely not only on Arab oil but also on Venezuelan oil and oil from other sources. The benefits of ethanol as an alternative fuel are as follows (and I refer again to this report):

Let us list some of the advantages Brazilian planners see in ethanol over petrol, in spite of the fact that ethanol has only 62 per cent of petrol's energy content and that slightly more energy goes into producing it than into producing petrol:

(a) It is a totally renewable resource, a combination of two atoms of carbon, six of hydrogen and one of oxygen blended by solar energy.

(b) It is non-polluting, since its combustion will only return to the environment what solar energy has taken from it.

(c) There are highly desirable by-products of the production process in the form of fertilisers and high-protein cattle-feed.

(d) The production of ethanol is a self-contained economic cycle, the production chain commencing and ending in Brazil, with the result that a vast amount of resources that would otherwise be sent abroad to buy oil will be pumped back into the economy, creating many more jobs—

and this is where it is relevant to Australia—

(e) With a blend of up to 25 per cent of ethanol in petrol, no changes in the design of conventional internal combustion engines would have to be made; the use of pure ethanol will entail only an increase in the compression ratio and a reduction in the carburation factor.

However, if it is used as an additive on the 25 per cent basis, no alterations at all would have to be made. The report continues:

(f) The cost of one litre of ethanol is around 1.4 cents cheaper than a litre of petrol.

Obviously, we must also consider that not only now but also in the future, especially in the light of the Federal Government's savage petrol price increases to which I referred in my Budget speech; I am at a loss to understand how it could justify this increase. It is, in fact, a subsidy for oil companies to look for more oil. The final benefit of ethanol is referred to in the report as follows:

(g) The technology of ethanol production is simple and can be easily mastered by any developing country with enough idle land and abundant sunshine.

In Australia, we have both: idle land and abundant sunshine. The method of production is from sugar cane. I see from the book entitled *Energy for Survival* by Wilson Clark that in Java the yield from sugar cane is 35.2 per cent. Java has a climate similar to that in the North of Australia: it is close to the equator, as is the North of Australia. We should be examining the development of some alternatives, preferably this one, although others may be developed later.

I wish now to refer to several matters concerning Mawson District, which I represent, the first of which relates to education. In the new Mawson District there are two high schools and about eight primary schools. One of the problems that has emerged is that, because of the influx of population, several of the primary schools do not have sufficient land available for playing areas. I refer to Braeview Primary School and Morphett Vale East Primary School. Extra units have been placed at the latter, and extra temporary units will be placed at the former. At each school, the playing area has been taken up. Three transportable buildings have been placed at Braeview Primary School, and another four are still to be put there. By May next year, phase II of the building programme will provide a permanent building large enough to accommodate several classes.

However, it could conceivably happen that the seven transportable classrooms will have to remain. Therefore, the children suffer from a lack of playing area. At Morphett Vale East Primary School there are six temporary buildings, which have taken up playing area, and obviously additional playing area must be provided. I intend to take this matter up with the Minister of Education to find out whether he can make a suggestion and assist those schools. In addition, the Morphett Vale

West Primary School is built completely of Demac units and is situated near the boundaries of the Districts of Mawson and Baudin and, eventually, should the shift of population reach a stage where the number of children attending that school lessens, the whole school can be moved. That seems to be the trend now, and it seems to be common sense. In the suburbs within a radius of two or three miles of the General Post Office in Adelaide, all the schools are of old construction; architecturally, they would date to the early 1900's, or in some cases earlier, and being of fixed construction they are difficult to modify for use by different numbers of classes. From the point of view of education, whilst a number of schools has been provided by the Labor Government (and this record, I am pleased to say, is to be applauded throughout Australia), nevertheless additional thought ought to be given to the case where sudden increases in class numbers necessitate the use of transportable units, and action should be taken to compensate the school for the loss of playing area available for the children.

I refer now to housing. The District of Mawson comprises a rapidly expanding area. I suppose I should say that it suffers from rapid urbanisation, like so many other outer areas near the capital cities of Australia, and in the process we have had mainly privately developed housing. However, only recently some Housing Trust dwellings have been provided, and they are in big demand.

I mentioned, when I spoke in the adjournment debate recently, that there had been attempts to sell houses on a low deposit, with a third mortgage, which had been disastrous for most people buying them, because they were really only rented. The third mortgage interest is such a burden that these people are excluded from obtaining a State Bank loan and a second mortgage at reasonable interest rates. In speaking of housing, one cannot ignore the development of the Land Commission and the introduction of urban land price control, because the cost of land is a significant factor in the cost of housing, and we must look at the final cost. To me, using average figures for a house and land is not a good way of dealing with the matter, because, being a valuer by profession, I know that this often leads to anomalies, and one can often arrive at ridiculous answers.

There is no doubt that the Land Commission, in buying up peripheral land around Adelaide, has created a land bank, giving the Government a weapon to control the speculative forces in the market place. If these forces are allowed to remain unchecked, obviously land prices will skyrocket. I recall that whilst studying for my land valuer's diploma we used calculations for subdivisions, carrying profits ranging from 80 per cent to, in one instance, 140 per cent; that is, profit on the development of land into subdivisional land to be sold in allotments.

With urban land price control, I believe that the profit margin now is about 20 per cent to 25 per cent, which is still a comfortable profit. One can hardly say that with a 20 per cent or 25 per cent profit margin, one is being hard done by. In addition to the Land Commission, urban land price control has enabled couples to buy a block of land often under \$6 000. The member for Glenelg suggested that the Land Commission was gobbling up all the vineyards of the State: I do not entirely agree with that, although I do agree that some vineyards in the south should be retained, which could easily be done by the owners having them declared under—

Mr. Mathwin: Do you know anything about grapes?

Members interjecting:

Mr. DRURY: If honourable members shut up I will explain how to get over the problem. If the owners of vineyards declare their land under section 61 of the

Planning and Development Act they need have no worries until such time, of course, as they are approached by a private developer.

Mr. Nankivell: You make it sound so easy.

Mr. DRURY: That is why that provision exists. The member for Glenelg stated that half of what people paid to the State Bank was profit to the Government as a form of tax.

Mr. Mathwin: I referred to the Savings Bank.

Mr. DRURY: I am sorry, I misheard the honourable member. This is an important matter regarding housing. In the past three years the State Bank has received only \$54 600 000 from the Commonwealth Bank under the appropriate Act. In this financial year it has received \$56 800 000 which, in effect, is a real reduction and which (I refer to the Loan Estimates) has forced the State Government to advance to the State Bank \$9 000 000 of State funds. That is \$9 000 000 more that we have to find.

Mr. Evans: Who finds the Commonwealth money?

Mr. DRURY: The Commonwealth Government raises it through loans.

Mr. Arnold: Who pays the interest?

Mr. DRURY: A concessional interest rate has been in force since about 1946. It was introduced after the Second World War to provide low-income earners with sufficient funds to buy a house.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DRURY: I see nothing wrong with that. For many years the Menzies Government took the profits from T.A.A., the national shipping line and the Commonwealth Bank and put them into general revenue, so what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

Mr. Becker: Who supplied the capital for those instrumentalities?

Mr. DRURY: The Federal Government. They were introduced, I might add, by a Labor Government—those very socialist instruments that the Menzies Government in its successive years of Government took the profits from and put them into revenue, so that it could produce money for wars it could not win and planes that did not fly, and could sign open-ended contracts to American arms firms for planes with swing wings.

Mr. Mathwin: You're one of those who said—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DRURY: The employment situation in Australia today is deplorable; it should not be. We are a wealthy country. This situation has been brought about by the Federal Government. It boasted openly in December, 1975, that it would reduce Federal Government spending, and reduce it, it did.

Mr. Mathwin: It got us out of the red.

Mr. DRURY: We do not seem to have reduced inflation much. What about the 367 000 unemployed, the highest number since the depression? I move now to the subject of crime and associated subjects. I was pleased to hear the Premier move amendments to the relevant Acts today so that pornographic films and publications will be restricted. I believe this is a move in the right direction. Members opposite seem to think that they have a monopoly on morality and that nobody on this side of the House ever bothers about what people read.

Mr. Mathwin: You created a monster you can't control.

Mr. DRURY: The honourable member would find, if he was honest, that it would be printed whether it was legal or not. In addition to films and publications having restrictions placed on them, in the past six months three of the sex shops in Adelaide have closed. That is another indication that the Government is reflecting community thinking.

Mr. Mathwin: Would you like to read this bit of script out for me?

Mr. DRURY: No, because I have no great desire for it; my own thoughts on the matter are that we can do without it.

Mr. Mathwin: I should hope so, too.

Mr. DRURY: I am glad we can agree on something. I apologise for that remark to the member for Glenelg. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit (as mentioned in the Premier's policy speech) to purchase Deep Creek National Park. I have been to that park, and I think it is an asset to this State and its citizens. I hope that the Government will consider establishing recreation centres other than the regional recreation centres planned at the moment. For instance, the Happy Valley Recreation Centre is planned for an area extending through Happy Valley, Aberfoyle Park, O'Halloran Hill, Reynella and beyond. I think, because of the nature of that area, with the Happy Valley reservoir and the C.S.I.R.O. farm providing a natural break, and the Hills face further to the west providing another natural break, that the effect is one of suburban fragmentation. I hope that the Government sees fit to provide smaller, local types of recreation centres so that people who are disadvantaged will not have to travel so far to carry out their forms of recreation, whether it be active participation in sporting activities or undertakings such as needle work. I support the motion.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion. As this is a traditional speech in which many members take the opportunity to cover many subjects, I will not depart from that practice, particularly as I was denied the opportunity to speak in the Address in Reply debate before the election.

First, I express my sorrow and that of my family at the sad resignation of Sir Douglas Nicholls earlier this year, and truly wish him and Lady Nicholls all the best for the future. In saying that, I reflect for a moment and say that the circumstances which forced his resignation were unfortunate. It is also unfortunate that many people in the community believe that the Premier used Sir Douglas Nicholls' appointment for a political purpose.

The comments that have been made in this House that the medical history of intended viceregal appointees should be considered are very important. If there were any doubt whatsoever about the health of the person being considered, in fairness to that person and his family the appointment should not be made, as then the possibility of future embarrassment could be avoided.

At the same time, I express my sincerest approval at the way in which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor carried out his duties whenever called upon. We were fortunate that we had a man of his capacity to carry out the duties, particularly in the absence of Sir Douglas Nicholls at the time of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen.

To the present Governor, Mr. Seaman, I offer my congratulations on his appointment as Her Majesty's representative in South Australia, and wish him and Mrs. Seaman a successful and healthy future.

I take this opportunity of recording the appreciation of the people of my electorate for the services that have been given to our State by several ex-members who died during the past year: first, Sir Glen Pearson, with whom I was fortunate to be a member of the last Liberal Government in this State; Mr. Tom Stott, who was the Speaker at the time of the last Liberal Government in this State and who gave long service to South Australia; and Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, who was not known to me but I am told that he represented the people in an honest and dedicated way.

I also express sincerest sympathies to the families of the late Mr. H. H. Shannon and his wife. I was fortunate to follow Mr. Shannon in representing the Onkaparinga

District after his 35 years as a member. Mr. Shannon held the position of Government Whip from 1938 to 1941, he was a member of the Public Works Committee from 1941 to 1968, and its very active Chairman from 1954 until his retirement in 1968. In 1960 our Queen bestowed on him the Order of the Companion of St. Michael and St. George, which all of those who knew him acknowledge that he richly deserved.

All who have served in public office would realise, as you do, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, that any person who serves his community for any reasonable length of time is helped immensely by a steady rein at home, with a heart of gold and attitude of kindness and forgiveness. Mrs. Shannon, who predeceased her husband by a short time, had these qualities, which are so rare today but which are so important to family life. On behalf of the people of the Hills, and I am sure of the State, I express thanks for the sacrifice and service that were given by Mr. and Mrs. Shannon.

Within any electorate, voluntary community service is a vital link in the chain of community success and satisfaction, and I am thankful that within my electorate we have many voluntary community workers. Those who serve on what was previously known as the Emergency Fire Fighting Service (now Country Fire Services) are one group that is giving untold service and personal sacrifice in saving lives and millions of dollars of material assets, and the community from much personal stress, mental trauma and family suffering.

It seems a pity to me that so many of the people who are served by these volunteer fire fighters do not understand that their household and building fire policies are 25 per cent to 40 per cent cheaper because they have a volunteer service as an alternative to the South Australian Fire Brigades Board. If every household in these areas gave only \$10 a year to this wonderful service, it would mean the Country Fire Services would have better equipment with which to prevent and fight fire, and it would be cheaper than having the Fire Brigades Board push another tentacle out to help support its very expensive operation.

Other service groups such as Apex, Kiwanis, Leos, Lions, Rotaract, and Rotary have played a major part in service work. The people on hospital boards, St. Johns, R.S.L., Red Cross, youth clubs, sporting clubs, Girl Guides, Boy Scouts, elderly citizens organisations, Meals on Wheels, school committees, kindergarten committees, church organisations, Good Neighbour, National Trust, Aged Cottage Homes, civilian widows, schoolchildren acting as traffic monitors, tree planting groups, and a multitude of other volunteers have given so much to our area in the Adelaide Hills, and they are a great asset to us.

I might say, Sir, that after serving as Chairman of the steering committee for Stirling District Meals on Wheels and still holding the position of Chairman after some eight years, it really has been very pleasing to me to experience the dedication of volunteers within our community. We should set out to encourage voluntary service, not to destroy it as is the attitude of the Australian Labor Party through its left-wing supporters and activists. It is pleasing to me to know that only this week the Stirling District Branch of Meals on Wheels has delivered its 100 000th meal.

Likewise, I would have to recognise the person who has been my representative on the Heathfield High School council for many years. He has also actively participated as President of that council and as caretaker of that school. To Mr. Les Lewis I extend thanks, on behalf of the community, for the magnificent work he has given, well beyond what one would term his normal duties. I wish him and Mrs. Lewis a healthy and successful retirement. I

know that both appreciated the magnificent dinner that was given by the high school last Friday evening. I felt privileged to be there for a short time to enjoy the company of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis and to pass on my personal thanks to them.

At the last election some members were not returned or did not seek to return to the Parliamentary field. Mr. Claude Allen, the member for Frome, retired; I am sure his honesty and dedication were appreciated by the people of his electorate and all of those who were fortunate to make contact with him. Mr. John Jennings, member for Ross Smith, gave many years of service to this House, and even though my philosophy is not very closely aligned to his (and I am sure he would agree with that statement), his good humour and friendly mannerisms were always appreciated and still will be in the future. Ill health was one of the reasons that caused his retirement, and I trust that, with the pressures of Parliament no longer upon him, he will return to good health and enjoy a long and happy retirement.

To Mr. John Coumbe, former member for Torrens, who served for many years as a prominent Liberal member, I extend my thanks for the help and advice he gave me and other new members when we entered the House. Mr. Murray Vandeeper, member for Millicent, and Mr. David Boundy, member for Goyder, both served only a short time in this Parliament but were dedicated politicians, and their work was appreciated by those of us who were fortunate to be associated with them. I am sure we will hear of both Mr. Boundy and Mr. Vandeeper in political circles in the future.

Mr. Ivon Wardle, the former member for Murray has also faded from the scene. I was fortunate to be elected on the same date when he achieved the winning of Murray from Labor. This was the straw that gave the Liberal Party the opportunity to govern in 1968, as unfortunate as that may have been. In saying "unfortunate", I should explain that I have always believed that, if the Liberal Party had disregarded the support of the Independent at that time and allowed the A.L.P. to continue to govern, the political history of this State would have been entirely different, and at present we would have had a Liberal Government in South Australia, instead of a Labor Government.

Greed for the spoils of office in 1968 possibly was a deciding factor in turning our attention away from the real political consequences of losing credibility by attempting to survive with an Independent. Mr. Wardle continued to work hard for his district, and I am sure that Mr. Wotton, the present member for Murray, appreciates the good work that Mr. Wardle has done in stabilising the Liberal vote in that area. We of the Liberal Party should be thankful for the sacrifices Mr. and Mrs. Wardle made. Mr. Wardle may not have been a dynamic speaker in the House, but there is no doubt he gave his time to his district, and I am sure he will continue to give good support to my colleague the present member for Murray in the years to come.

Talking of Independents, I refer to another victim of the recent election, the ex-A.L.P. Independent and then wooed A.L.P. member, the Hon. Edward Connelly, the member for Pirie, who was given the spoils of Speakership not just to stay in Government but also to force him to rejoin the socialist Party that expelled him—the Australian Labor Party. More than any other man, Mr. Connelly convinced me that the appointment of an independent Speaker is the ideal method of bringing some sanity and credibility back to the operation of this Parliament.

I appreciate that the present Speaker is desperately attempting to correct some of the problems that have been

created. But I believe it is now beyond a member of Parliament to bring back the standards that would be considered desirable, because of the political Party taint that will stick regardless of who takes the position in this House. I appreciate the comments made last evening by the member for Davenport, and I am pleased I have one supporter for the concept that the Speaker should be appointed from outside the House.

We have recently seen Mr. Connelly given a grand job of more than \$30 000 a year with very limited expertise for the duty he has been given. There must be scores of excellent public servants without any real prospects of promotion sitting back wondering what they have to do to be given the opportunity of putting into operation the expertise they have acquired. I suppose the best advice one could give them would be to join the A.L.P. and kiss the boots of the Minister at every opportunity, and they may be given some recognition.

I refer now to tourism. We heard much about broken promises in the last session's Address in Reply speeches. I now turn to a matter which is perhaps better described as forlorn promises. It concerns a report which was made in 1970, soon after the Premier of this State took office. In that plan on tourism, the Premier painted great schemes of what his Government was going to do for this State.

It was a grand vision but, unlike the more effective vision of Colonel Light, this visionary plan has failed to come anywhere near fruition. The plan visualised Adelaide bristling with multi-storey international hotels. Our streets would be jammed with Japanese and other visitors. Our sidewalks would overflow with eating facilities, and above this jostling throng would come the sound of horses' hooves, as they clip-clopped their way around the streets of Adelaide, carrying the many happy visitors in horse cabs from place to place.

In this vision, we could see giant jumbo jets stacked up awaiting landing instructions from the tower at our busy international airport, while commuter aircraft zoomed away with their American passengers being transported to destinations far and wide throughout the State. This picture, painted seven years ago, is certainly far from reality now. I refer to the first section of the Premier's plan on tourist development in South Australia, as follows:

In this briefing I propose to deal with the development of tourist facilities for the next 10 years during which time we will see a marked change in the nature of our tourist market.

There will be an enormous increase in the number of oversea tourists to Australia as a whole once the larger airlines start flying into Australia.

There is increasing interest in the United States of America in tourist activity in Australia, and there will be a marked stepping up of visits to this country by the Japanese.

I do not believe many of us have seen many oversea people wandering around lately. Have we seen many Americans? Have we seen many Japanese? No! Perhaps they are in the Eastern and more populous States. I do not believe they have come in droves to our State as yet, and at this stage there may be a doubt as to whether they will be coming.

Certainly our high penalty labour costs, which reflect in our accommodation and restaurant services, do not encourage visitors from overseas, regardless of how rich we may think they are. Anyway, in 1970, the Premier's Industrial Development Branch was preparing a brief on an international airport for Adelaide. The report states:

We are, as yet, the only mainland capital without an international air terminal. A number of oversea airlines are writing quite good business out of Adelaide now, and are anxious to obtain terminal rights for Adelaide.

Particularly is this so in the case of American Airlines,

which sees the Sydney and Melbourne markets largely tied up by Qantas and Pan American but which is looking for its own terminal area where it would own a number of the accommodation facilities. Japan Airlines have also expressed interest, and we have received a request from Swissair to prepare material for them on which they could base a request for terminal rights in Adelaide. (It should be noted that there are considerable industrial advantages to be obtained from having an international airport here entirely apart from tourist development. As it is, South Australian industry suffers a severe air-freight differential in air freight through having no international terminal, and this could change quite markedly with the development of such a terminal here.) D.C.A. have plans for development of Adelaide as an international terminal, and we should plan to bring pressure to bear in the right quarters to see that these come to fruition.

Obviously this airport was an important part of this overall tourist promotion plan but, alas, we do not see the international jets here yet, and I will return to that later. Although this terminal appeared vital to our tourist efforts, we must not be too swift to blame the Federal Government.

After all, a Federal Labor Government which we have been led to believe had, at least initially, mutual and common ground with its socialist State counterpart surely in three years would have agreed and gladly footed the bill. But no such luck. Mr. Whitlam was not interested at that time. That was one other grand scheme which never eventuated.

Returning to the report, we find the briefing claimed that there are six major areas for tourist development in South Australia. They are: the metropolitan area, the Barossa Valley, the Murray River, the crescent linking the Coorong to Goolwa and Kangaroo Island, the Flinders Range, and the old Cornish mining towns.

I believe I may have missed something. Let me go through the list again: the metropolitan area, the Barossa Valley, the Murray River, the crescent linking the Coorong to Goolwa and Kangaroo Island, the Flinders Range and the old Cornish mining towns.

Where is mention of that area in the lower part of the State? I refer to the South-East. Yes, we find the report does eventually mention the South-East in this way:

Eventually it may be possible also to make considerable use of the facilities in the South-East of the State, but for international tourists at this stage it is unlikely that we will be able to include the South-East in the kind of facility which they (the international visitors) are looking for.

Who in his right mind would suggest that the South-East is not the sort of area which tourists should visit? This seems a pity when one considers just some of the attractions of the South-East, including the Blue Lake, the Cape Jaffa ruins, old oil wells, the Tantanoola and Naracoorte caves, working lighthouses, museums, fishing, the Jip Jip National Park, old inns, the Mount Scott Park and Bullocky Bridge Memorial, historical homes, historical railway stations and post offices, the old gold route, the Desert Camp National Park, bullock tracks, and coach roads, fauna parks, water caves, old telegraph stations, old telegraph tracks, coastal caves, the Coorong Granites, Mount Monster, the Papenue Rocks, the Coorong Game Reserve, lagoons, Chinaman's Well, the Christmas Rocks, the beautiful cities and towns, and industries like the pine and ancillary industries, plus all forms of rural production, to name just some of the attractions in the South-East.

The South-East has every type of rural production, so there is good tourist potential there. With the effective way the Victorians have gone about regional tourism, perhaps they would be prepared to incorporate the Lower South-East. I am sure the Victorians show more

appreciation of the South-East tourist potential than the author of this report in 1970, the Premier. They already have Tatiara, Naracoorte and Mount Gambier local government areas affiliated with the Victorian tourist regions and are contributing money to the Victorian tourist regions.

It may be some comfort for South-East people to note that, if the Government continues to buy out private enterprise there, it may rearrange its list of tourist priorities. If the people of the South-East were disappointed about their lack of recognition, it takes little imagination to know the feelings of people in an area such as Port Lincoln. I am sure members of the House would be well aware of what Port Lincoln and many other parts of Eyre Peninsula have to offer in terms of tourism. Port Lincoln's beautiful bay is very well renowned among boating and fishing enthusiasts as well as those visitors who just want to enjoy the scenery and the restful atmosphere.

The omission of this part of the State from this tourism document is another example of foolish planning, to say the least. The report goes on to cover the city of Adelaide, with much emphasis placed not only on the international side of things but also on Adelaide as a major convention centre. When one glances through the Adelaide Convention Bureau's listings, one can see some success, but we have not achieved the targets set by the report, by a long shot. In terms of accommodation initiatives, just what have we seen in the past seven years? Not that much really, and certainly private enterprise is too afraid to come to the party with our international-type hotel as suggested in Victoria Square.

There is the Gateway Inn, of course, a logical extension of Ansett accommodation efforts. But even completion of that building looked touch and go at one stage, with all the union muscle being used to destroy our State's building industry resulting in costs far exceeding original estimates. I will return to that point later. The study mentioned development over the tracks in the Adelaide railway station yards, but we can see there has been little action in that direction. Proposals for Victoria Square included the provision by the Government of a small convention theatre on the site of the old waterworks building. One senses that there is some more water to pass under the bridge before this project comes to light. Conferences and conventions may have been placed in the proposed hotel-motel at the corner of Pulteney Street and North Terrace but, alas, no building as yet.

Ayers House, the Old Legislative Council building and Government House were clearly earmarked for tourist development. Ayers House was to be set up for chamber music, concerts, State dinners and State receptions, but very little seems to have eventuated. It was, of course the setting for a princely reception not long ago, resulting in yet another excuse for our globe-trotting Premier to travel overseas. There was a suggestion of a horse-drawn vehicles display near Ayers House. The report states:

Some provision for horses somewhere in the area would also have to be made because use could then be made of the historic vehicles in transporting people from hotel facilities to Ayers House, giving the same sort of fun trip around the city as occurs with horse cabs now still running in Rome.

The cost of wages for employing drivers in Rome for horse-drawn vehicles is much less than it is in Adelaide; I think horses would be out of the question.

I imagine this could have been incorporated in some sort of "dial-a-horse" scheme, or maybe "dial-a-cab" would be a better expression. According to the report, the Old Legislative Council building was to become available last year and plans were to have been made on how that

building and any contents should be set up. The report states:

The Old Legislative Council building will not become available apparently for use as a historic museum until 1976. However, plans should now be made for the development at that time of the building and how its contents are to be set out. The historic exhibits at the Art Gallery could then be transferred to the Legislative Council building and the unique history of this Wakefield settlement more effectively displayed.

The transfer of the Governor's residence to Carrick Hill was another vision which was accompanied by plans for use of the present building for larger receptions and dinners by the State Governor, plus the use of the gardens by young children, and for such shows as pop concerts.

The malthouse at Kent Town was the subject of another plan, and once again we learn of specialised craft and hardware shops (we have all heard about the Jam Factory), eating houses and maybe pop concerts, which the report informs us are now features of tourist activity in the refurbished warehouses around San Francisco. The report continues:

The restaurant facilities in Adelaide at the moment are quite inadequate for international tourist standards. The majority of our restaurants are run by Hungarian or Italian migrants. Sometimes their cuisine starts off at somewhere near adequate standards, but as is the case with Deccas it can then markedly decline.

The Minister of Works has spoken about attacking people from the privilege of the House, yet the Premier put out that statement to his departmental heads in 1970. I have dined at Deccas many times and the standard has been high, as it has in many of the restaurants managed by people from other lands such as Italian, Greek, German and Chinese. For political capital, the Premier has been a past master at hanging his hat on the peg of our great variety of restaurants when it suits him. It must have given the Premier great joy to state his real feelings behind semi-closed doors about some of our migrants to some of his departmental heads. He should be ashamed about that. What a rotten slight to cast at people behind their backs, without any chance of their knowing. The report by the Premier continues:

... the grave fault of most restaurants in Adelaide is an enormous menu of supposedly individually cooked dishes which it is not economic to cook individually and we do not get good food at low cost.

I want to examine that point about low cost for a moment because relatively recent changes to legislation regarding the lowering of the age of majority to 18 years, and equality of pay for the sexes have certainly not helped the problem of costs. It seems a great pity to me that facilities, such as restaurants, cannot be classed as a service industry, and therefore be able to engage staff at more reasonable wage costs than the present penalty rates, particularly those that apply at weekends. Certainly this would help young students and others to obtain employment and ready cash to spend.

Still it was pleasing to see a move in this direction in another State, according to a report I read recently in one of our newspapers. New South Wales is advocating this move. The following is an interesting part of the "great plan":

I believe that we should use the State Government's facilities to prime the pump here (in terms of better food, etc.) and this can be done by the development of a restaurant at Ayers House and the building of new restaurant facilities at Waterfall Gully and Morialta.

Has any member ever known what is the total rent for the Ayers House restaurant or how much people's money the

Premier spends there? We have never been told and are never likely to know. It is a secret that is kept from the representatives of the people and from the people who pay taxes.

What's happening at Morialta? Hamburgers and steak sandwiches are sold there. What about Waterfall Gully? That is still conducted in the old house that served Devonshire teas. By the way, it is open from 12 noon to 2 p.m. and 6.30 p.m. to 9 p.m. every day except Tuesdays. They do not sound much like new restaurant facilities to me. I would be interested to know just where that \$500 000 profit we made on the sale of the Sydney Tourist Office went—certainly not to Morialta or Waterfall Gully. That was the money the Premier said he would spend in those areas.

To be charitable, the report also refers to an open-air restaurant at the rear of the Art Gallery. I am pleased to report that there is a very pleasant little open-air court at the rear of the gallery where it is possible to buy a hot drink. But that is the extent of it: it is certainly not a restaurant costing \$500 000.

That massive hotel, planned for the corner of Grote Street and Victoria Square, would have contained 800 rooms. Perhaps the Premier, who has a very good view of this site from his office, would be able to confirm current progress on this structure. There is mention of extensive secretarial services for Asian and Japanese businessmen, but once again our restaurants cop it, because we were told that none of the Chinese restaurants was of adequate standard to attract Asian tourists.

I now move a little away from Adelaide and head in a southerly direction and, in doing so, give the Japanese and other Asian folk a rest, and concentrate on the Americans. It is suggested that an exciting package, comprising a central resort hotel (which is still to come, of course), from which people could visit the Coorong and Kangaroo Island by plane and also take in the vineyards at Langhorne's Creek, could be implemented "to do all the things [the report states] that particularly American tourists like to do and, that is, snap themselves in a number of quaint, unusual and beautiful places. They will then be able to say that, having travelled over this small distance in Australia, they will really have seen all it has to offer".

That is a slur on the American tourist. I do not think anyone would suggest that that was the attitude of any tourist, be he American, Australian, or any other nationality. We all like to see as much as we can, and we do not just take a few photographs and then move on. Well, at least as far as the Premier is concerned that solves any further efforts concerning the Americans.

I will not go into all the details of the proposals for the Coorong: suffice it to say that the proposed Aborigines' cultural centre has failed to materialise, as has a massive motel, cabin, boating, fishing and sporting centre along the lines of a project developed by the White Mountain Apaches in Arizona. The writer of the report says that he thinks we can do better than some of the American efforts. At least the Americans have got the whole thing well and truly under way; we have not even looked like starting on our project.

Tying all this together are plans for a resort hotel at Goolwa, which could include a gambling casino without, of course, poker machines. The report states:

It is will be necessary for us then to plan for a resort hotel at Goolwa. An examination should be made of how this could incorporate a gambling casino with all normal forms of gambling in casinos other than poker machines.

It was subtly suggested that Mr. Liberman of Liberman and Associates (I have heard that name before) was to be consulted on all of this as it was proposed to involve American Airlines in the development.

Provision must be made for an airstrip because it would be essential to fly people into the Goolwa area and then on to Kangaroo Island. An airstrip near Goolwa was established privately 12 to 18 months ago, and it services about a dozen light charter aircraft. Kangaroo Island was down to have two or three new resort hotels of a standard, we are told, of the Fijian Hotel on Yanuca Island in Fiji.

The Premier's report asked for the immediate provision of a prospectus for each of these proposed developments (from the Coorong to Kangaroo Island) so that selling to investors could begin immediately. I wonder what happened to the investors. Possibly, there were too many "neighbours" in the swim. I know there certainly has not been much development, and I do not believe we have seen much evidence of a prospectus, either.

The report now switches to the Flinders Range. There is no mention here of our American friends, by the way, for we all realise that many of them like to head to the more unique areas of Australia such as Arkaroola, Wilpena and further afield to the centre. Two projects, we were told by the Premier in 1970, were of immediate importance.

The first was a study on the possibility of developing a spa resort at Paralana Springs, claimed by the report as the only known hot springs in Australia. The managers at Arkaroola planted grapes at this spot, and were doing quite well until wild life, which they had difficulty keeping out, got at them. However, it is a point worth mentioning that wine could have been produced in that part of the Flinders Range. Sir Thomas Playford mentioned the idea of using springs as a tourist attraction back in 1944, but the hot springs scheme has been dropped because, I am told, of a fear of meningitis.

Another possible idea was the use of Mount Remarkable as a holy mountain by the artist William Rickets, but this has also failed to come to fruition. The report concludes with some description of various developments in the Kadina, Wallaroo, Moonta area and with a remark that local Chambers of Commerce lacked imagination. There did not seem to be too much lack of imagination at the last Cornish Festival I attended. It seems to me that the people in that area have done remarkably well by their own efforts in their own way.

Perhaps it may be worth mentioning an announcement in 1973 of a copper coast project on Yorke Peninsula to cost \$3 000 000. I, for one, have not heard the words "copper coast" mentioned since, except by the immediate past member for Goyder. There is mention also of grand seaside developments along Adelaide's beaches.

There is not much of that either, but there is certainly one major problem, and that is the chronic shortage of boat launching ramps. These may not have had major tourist appeal, but they would have appealed to our many frustrated boat owners.

So, I end as I began. Where are all the exciting developments? Where are all the tourists? Where, indeed? Certainly they are not here in South Australia in the time of this Government's administration. I know there are still three years left for this 10-year scheme, but I wonder whether this administration will be any further advanced. It has at last seen fit to release the South Australian Tourist Development Study report commissioned by the State and Federal Governments and submitted to them by Urban Planning and Research Proprietary Limited in February, 1976.

I am at a loss to understand why this Government refused to release it earlier. The few valid criticisms of present tourist promotion are outweighed by the useful suggestions it gives. To have panicked into withholding the report is the sign of a fearful Government, a Government over-reacting to constructive criticism. If the department

gives the lead to tourism initiatives taken voluntarily by local government, private tourist agencies, and interested citizens, we may see some improvement in this field.

I attack the Government strongly for not releasing that report, because it is not a damaging one. We can all read it now. Any Government department would expect some criticisms, and it was foolish of the Government to create doubts and fears that the report might be damaging to organisations. It amazes me that the document was held for 18 months, and denied to public and industry scrutiny. I think the Government was over-reacting in not releasing it.

I said that I would refer to two other matters. One of them is in relation to air traffic and oversea traffic. I have taken the opportunity earlier to point out the great visions the Premier had regarding an international airport. I personally doubt the merit of creating a new international airport for Adelaide but, if it is possible, as I believe it is, for international charter flights to operate in and out of West Beach airport, we as a Parliament should support that proposal vigorously, because it is an important aspect of our tourism future. I can understand some of the comments made by the member for Hanson about increased aircraft activity near his electorate, but curfews for hours of operation would still apply and people could be guaranteed reasonable protection from over-use.

Perhaps this is another one of those areas where a minority may have to suffer inconvenience for the benefit of the majority, and where the minority is inconvenienced the majority may need to pay compensation. If, for instance, the noise level over our West Beach airport becomes intolerable for nearby residents (and there is much evidence to suggest that the larger international aircraft are in fact quieter than some of those used on interstate routes), perhaps we need to buy those houses and allow those people to move.

This has happened in many other parts of the State where people have been forced to move because of some Government activity that has affected their area. There will always be people, as there are world-wide, who are willing to live in what others consider a noisy area. In fact, they live quite happily and seem to condition themselves to the environment around them.

This would not be the first time that a minority has suffered for the benefit of the majority. The South-Eastern Freeway is just one example where the provision of speedy access to Hahndorf, Murray Bridge and thence to Melbourne virtually destroyed the community of Crafers, and adversely affected some parts of Stirling and other Hills villages.

Family homes have been demolished and rural lifestyles changed in areas such as Scott Creek, Cherry Gardens and Longwood, and the whole settlement of Chain of Ponds was acquired and turned into a ghost area to preserve the quality of water for the people of Adelaide.

The establishment of the Morphettville bus depot is another instance. If private enterprise had attempted to establish this sort of venture it would have been stopped overnight, not only because of noise pollution but also because of visual pollution. It could hardly be regarded as being as beautiful as the vineyards which were destroyed. Yet a minority of the community had to grin and bear it regardless of the protest they made or the apparent justification of their argument.

There is now a possibility that the Raywood nursery on the South Coast will revert to a conservation park. For the supposed good of the majority, the product of one man's foresight and industry is likely to be compulsorily acquired leaving him to start again, if he has the enthusiasm and drive to do so.

Where community centres have been established to provide recreation facilities, residents nearby have been inconvenienced by lack of parking and constant noise. Where institutions such as the Flinders Medical Centre, universities and colleges attract large numbers of people for many hours of the day and night, the peace and quiet that existed is lost forever for the remaining residents.

These are but a few of the many areas where Government action for the good of many has affected the environment for the minority. In some instances, the servants of the people (the Government) have recognised the disruption to people's lives and have paid compensation but, as I have stated on many occasions, the amount for disturbance in many cases is far too low. We as a Parliament should recognise that.

If we have disrupted the lives of so many for the supposed advantages of the majority, how much more important is it that we encourage tourism to this State by the establishment of international air services to West Beach? Tourism is one of our hopes because we have lost our price advantage to encourage other industries to this State. We are still losing industry—and we have had examples recently—industry hampered and belted by the never-ending stream of legislation to protect the employee from everything but the possibility of losing employment because employers no longer are willing to take the risks. They know the community cannot afford the end price.

Yet tourism could be described as a small gold mine. We should do all we can to attract tourists to South Australia, especially international tourists.

How much easier it would be to attract tourists if, instead of landing in far off Sydney or Perth, some landed here in Adelaide. They could then enjoy the attractions of South Australia and continue on to more populous cities afterwards, if they wished, and if they still had any money left. How much more convenient for the many new citizens of South Australia who might wish to visit their former homelands, or for the many relatives who come to visit them, if some of the international flights left directly from Adelaide.

No more rising at dawn for an early morning emotion-charged departure from West Beach followed by a four-hour lonely wait in Sydney before departing finally from the country of one's loved ones. How much easier for our South Australian Convention Bureau to attract conventions if jaded world travellers did not have to face the prospect of yet another aircraft transfer, with its resultant hassles and delays, before they reached their ultimate destination. Even without an international hotel, which may one day be built, Adelaide has convention facilities suited to many conventions, and pleasant, relaxing, picturesque and exciting places to visit.

Most importantly, if only a small percentage of the overseas travellers, who land in yet another concrete jungle on their jet-setting tour, could be attracted to South Australia our ailing tourist industry could provide job opportunities and prosperity to our ailing State. These travellers could then see a way of life which may be foreign to them—a life spent in one-family homes (if we can continue to afford to buy them under this present Government), close proximity to beaches, bush and the outback. Who knows, they may even leave this State saying, "Praise the Lord for South Australia."

Mr. Groom: Would you support it then?

Mr. EVANS: In my electorate, I have had more people adversely affected by Government agencies than has any other member in this Chamber. If the honourable member would like to go and see how people have been adversely affected by Government regulations and departments, he would understand that people have to live with some of the problems.

I mentioned earlier that I would refer to building unions and their muscle. A matter of great concern to me is the ever-increasing gap between the deposit young people can find for their first family home and the cost of that home. It depresses me when I realise that that goal is being pushed further and further from their reach by the actions of militant unions whose leaders owe their allegiance not to Australia and the well-being of their fellow Australians but to ideologies based in Peking and Moscow.

In other words, the solidarity of our family unit, which owes a great deal to the family housing we have been able to enjoy, is threatened by foreign-inspired union action. Of course, there are responsible unions which have campaigned for a fair day's pay for a fair day's work and satisfactory working conditions, without threatening the capacity of private enterprise to continue to function and without undermining the political and social system of Australia. But, in the pursuit of redundancy payments, retrenchment payments, severance pay, site allowance, penalty payments, and transferable long service and sick leave entitlements, unions have seriously threatened the opportunity of young people, now and in the future, ever to own their own shelter, a home.

Also, because of the continuous successful union demands we have seen many smaller family firms forced out of the industry because of insolvency. They have, in fact, been the back-bone of the industry in this State in the past. Several of the larger operators also have only just been able to remain outside the hands of receivers, and I think it is fair to say that some of their businesses have ended up in the hands of the receiver. Worse still, we have seen guerilla tactics employed by unions such as the Australian Building Construction Workers Federation, which follows a publicly stated policy of "most harm to the bosses, least harm to the workers".

It is worth looking at the composition of the four main unions representing the largest percentage of building workers in this State. The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (note that it takes the name of a society, and I think quite rightly so) is under the national leadership of Jim McLaughlin and the State Secretary, Jock Martin. Jim McLaughlin would be an A.L.P. supporter, but in the main this union is a responsible union, and to this point in the State's history has been a non-militant union, and should be given credit for its attitude to the industry.

But it is a different story with the other three. The Australian Building Construction Workers Federation is one example. The State Secretary, Mr. Ron Owens, is quite well known for his activities in making it as difficult as possible for the industry to continue if his union's demands are not met. This union covers builders labourers, steel fixers, scaffolders, crane drivers, concrete finishers and riggers. Its national leader is Norm Gallagher, who was, and I believe still is, a senior official of the Communist Party of Australia whose tendencies are Marxist Leninist. This must be considered a left-wing union with dangerous intent, an intent to destroy the industry here as much as it can.

The Building Workers Industrial Union, under the State secretaryship of Frank Gosden, covers bricklayers, carpenters, painters and plasterers. The national leadership here falls into the hands of Pat Clancy who was, and I believe still is, President of the Socialist Party of Australia with a Moscow-based ideology. This is a radical left-wing militant union, as with the previous one, and this union, like the Australian Building Construction Workers Federation can be considered to have been responsible for some of the upheavals we have had in the building industry in recent times.

They have been hell bent on destroying the opportunity

for people to obtain their own homes, increasing our commercial and industrial building costs substantially. The Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union, with Bob Fairweather as State Secretary, covers plumbers and gasfitters on construction and maintenance. George Crawford was, and still is, I believe, the national leader. He is an A.L.P. supporter and a strong leftist. The union generally is a militant socialist union, and there is no doubt in my mind that the Executive of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners supports the A.L.P. and the continuation of Australia's existing political structure. It is prepared to work within a democratic system for its goals and to act responsibly within that field of operation. There is also no doubt in my mind that the other three unions are committed to a policy of destroying Australia's current political system.

The Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union uses the electoral process to achieve A.L.P. Government and social change through the legislative process, but it also uses industrial disruption to discourage private capital from supporting the free enterprise system in the building industry. The Building Workers Industrial Union leadership's objective is to convert Australia to a communist society. It hopes to change socialism to communism, with Russia as its model. The Australian building construction workers have a similar long-term objective, with China as their model. It adopts a policy of confrontation and disruption to cause economic, industrial, political and social chaos. It believes that continued disruption, threats and brutality will wear down community resistance until the mass of the population will accept any political system to gain relief from these disruptive elements.

The strength of these militant unions lies in their ability to maintain discipline. They have done this, because members are not always capable of dissent, and are sometimes fearful of job security and actual physical violence. We have seen recently two men charged for bashing people who wanted to work. Most members of unions are happy on the site doing their job, are not interested in attempting to learn meeting procedure or attending meetings, and are not necessarily experienced enough in expressing their views at meetings to counteract the dictatorial approach of the advocates who work their way to the top. Some of them are migrants from other than English-speaking countries who experience some difficulty with the English language.

That, added to their lack of knowledge of meeting procedures in Australia, gives some of them real difficulty in expressing themselves, and it may reduce their incentive to attend meetings. The trained and experienced advocates who have entered industry with the sole purpose of destroying it are fully aware of this situation and exploit it to their own political ends. The building unions have used their strength to exploit the competitiveness between building contractors. They have demanded payments as incentives for work to be done at a reasonable speed, without dispute. They even operate on clients of builders to attempt to get the clients to agree to their demands in order to keep the siteworks rolling, and this, I believe, is a despicable practice. This practice is suitable only for large industrial or commercial complexes. Clients and builders who speak out against them are likely to get rough treatment if they want work done in the future.

Other clients for a "one-off" proposition are seldom approached, because these blackmailing tactics are less likely to work. These radical leftist union leaders are now forcing the issue of pay for members while on strike. They seek this as a condition for returning to work and, once the demand is met, a precedent has been set for these militant

groups to encourage striking again for longer periods. Striking is more acceptable to members once a guarantee of no loss of pay is established. Little consideration is given to the rest of society that has to pay the cost. It does not worry the militant unions what they do, as long as their attempts to destroy industry succeed in the long term. Employers might, for instance, pay for two hours of an unwarranted four-hour strike to avoid the possibility of an extension of the strike and, with it, an extension of the strike-pay claim.

We have heard, and we all know, that there have been violent verbal attacks on company personnel, which at times make some of the less resistant operators bend to demands, and often industrial actions are reactions which appear to be out of all proportion to the issue. These unions have the employer on the defensive simply because of the fierce manner of the union attack. There has been a recent development which has been a direct approach to the client offering "peace" in return for a financial "deal" on a chosen project. To me, that is another form of blackmail: "If you pay up we will finish the job on time; if not, we will cause you all the trouble in the world."

Often, the union action involves a small key group of workers taking direct action involving vital aspects of a project, which makes it impossible for the project to continue in a proper and economic manner. Again, the end result is a higher cost end-product to society. With the threat of inconvenience and expense through penalty for late completion clauses, builders have often been forced to meet the demands of the union bosses. It is now a fact that contractors, when tendering, feel obliged to add margins for industrial or possible industrial disruption. Inevitably it is the client, whether the struggling industry, the struggling shopkeeper, or struggling homeseeker, who foots the bill. It is not the unionist and in many cases it is not the employer, unless he is sent insolvent. With its policy of union preference, which is in effect none other than compulsory unionism, our State socialist Government is helping these militant unions swell their membership, strengthening their hands in slowly destroying our private enterprise system.

We know the Government must do this because the unions are the monetary lifeline of the A.L.P. It is impossible to see us reverting to the industrial conditions of the past without changes in the attitudes of everyone, including Parliamentarians on both sides of the House. There is a real possibility that our present economic system will collapse if we continue to follow the present disastrous path. If the present economic system did collapse, it would provide the opportunity for a radical socialisation of the economy to emerge. Some would argue that this political-economic system might stabilise in a form of socialism with a mixed economy, but I predict that, once the rot has started, as it has, it is more likely that we would degenerate or develop, as some people would class it, into some communist system.

Few Australians would argue that the trade unions have moved a long way from their initial philosophy of a "fair day's work for a fair day's pay". They have gone beyond a "larger slice of the profit" and "a share of an industry's capacity to pay" to action which ultimately must destroy industry's capacity to pay and, indeed, destroy any incentive for other than State-owned industry to continue. A rightful concern about conditions, too, has gone beyond the need for meal breaks and work safety. We are now looking at payments for not working; job security for employees in an industry which at present offers no security for employers; and at the same time some unions are looking at worker participation on boards and in management.

If the moderates ended up in these positions, working for a better industry and a better product at better prices for the end user, there is no doubt that, while on management, they would realise the difficulties which their radical union leaders had created by asking rank and file members to take actions that are in effect destroying the industry. Yet, significantly, the Building Workers Industrial Union and the Australian Building Construction Workers Federation remain silent on this issue. There is no doubt that this understanding could put their ultimate objective of a communistic social-political system in jeopardy.

I would hope that individual management and unions would urge a realistic understanding of the real responsibility and rights of both labour and capital. I believe the news media will have to play an important part in this development, in attempting to bring about the balance. If not, our children and their children will live in a much worse kind of society than many of us have been and are experiencing.

For the building industry, our main objective must be to have leadership which looks at the long term as well as the short term of the industrial system, and democratically represents the labour force. The news media could help quite dramatically in this area, by taking every opportunity it could to encourage genuine unionists to rise up in their union and take control, so that those who seek shelter for their families in the future and the union members at the same time would receive a reasonable return for their work under reasonable conditions: as for example, the Society of Carpenters and Joiners does at present.

We should worry about the future of the building industry, and what three unions have done to it. Housing prices have been pushed to the highest ever in this State and are the highest in Australia per m², and there is no doubt that we need to be conscious of these conditions. I support the motion and, because there was not much to say about the Governor's Speech, I have referred to other matters.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): In supporting the motion, I express allegiance to the Crown, and congratulate Her Majesty's representative in South Australia, our new Governor, Mr. Keith Seaman. I wish both His Excellency and Mrs. Seaman a very happy and successful tour of duty in our State.

I express appreciation to those members who at the recent election retired from their duties in this House, and wish each of them well in his new sphere of activity. I am certain that each one will find new interests in the community in which he lives and works. Also, I congratulate those members on both sides who have come into this Parliament for the first time, especially the member for Coles and the member for Torrens.

The District of Goyder has changed, as have many other districts that bear names similar to those used before the redistribution. Goyder has changed considerably in area. To me, the whole area that covers Yorke Peninsula, and the mid-North to Snowtown, Brinkworth, Blyth, River-ton, Hamley Bridge, and Balaklava, and south as far as Virginia, is not new, because I represented this area as a Legislative Councillor from 1970 to 1973. Although conversant with much of the area, in recent weeks I have found that there has been a population development in the Virginia area and a change in other parts of the new Goyder District.

Generally, it is a rural area with mixed farming and grain producing mostly on the peninsula, the mid-North, and the Adelaide Plains, except for vegetable growing in the Virginia area. It is with regret and some sadness that I

realise that this whole area has been affected seriously by drought this year. In yesterday morning's country and city editions of the *Advertiser* appeared photographs of the area around Balaklava showing a farmer and his small daughter playing sand castles with sand that had accumulated on land that should be carrying standing crops.

The other picture shows a road covered with drift so badly that, to hold it in some way, the road has been covered with a cereal crop, which has just come up through the ground. There is a serious drought not only in the Goyder District but also, as I heard on a radio programme, in 85 per cent of South Australia. South Australia is clearly more seriously affected by drought conditions than is any other State. The article, referring to drifts, states:

One, at a hill-top junction near Kallora, south-west of Balaklava, has been sown in barley to try to hold the drift. I wish to show the difference in yields resulting from the drought in the counties of Fergusson and Daly. Fergusson covers most of Yorke Peninsula, while Daly covers the Snowtown and Bute areas. In Daly county in the 1975-76 season, 141 221 tonnes of wheat came from 84 217 hectares, with an average yield of 1.68 t a ha. This year it is expected that there will be a yield of only 66 400 t from 83 000 ha, with an average yield of .8 t a ha. A similar story can be told in connection with barley and oats.

In the county of Fergusson last year, 52 320 t of wheat came from 29 507 ha, with an average yield of 1.77 t a ha. This year it is expected that there will be only 18 400 t of wheat from 21 000 ha, with an average yield of .9 t a ha. This shows what a decline there has been this season compared with last season.

This is the third successive drought year in the Nantawarra and South Hummocks areas. The sheep population in Daly county last year was 535 145, and this year it is expected that the sheep population will be only about half of that figure. In Fergusson county the sheep population has decreased from 581 222 to 500 000. I stress the need for providing assistance in these areas.

I turn now to the serious question of water supplies in the Virginia area. An article in the *News* of November 3, headed "Big dry hits bore quotas", states:

Hard-pressed gardeners of Virginia fear drought conditions over the next few months to such an extent that they may have to risk fines for using more than their quota.

"If we don't have rain over the next two or three months, we'll be slugging the bores like hell," grower, Mr. Darrol Clark, said today. "If the Government regards the North Adelaide plains worth keeping, then it should do something about the situation." Mr. Clark was referring to the useful Bolivar sewage plant water, which most growers want to be piped to Virginia to supplement their water supplies. Would the Bolivar water be suitable for all vegetable crops—even lettuce? Mr. Clark wiped his brow and smiled . . . "We'd mix it—a shandy if you like."

Mr. Clark said there had always been a worry about the underground basin, not so much with the basin drying up, but with the constant taxing of the supply, resulting in a higher salinity content in the water. "A drought could see us going over the quota, but for the moment we're okay," he said. Mr. Graham Harris agrees with Mr. Clark that a dry couple of months could be disastrous. A grower who exceeds his bore quota in any one year must cut back the following season or face a fine or have his bore shut down.

Mr. Harris said he had already used 4 000 000 gallons of his 16 000 000 gallon quota. Mr. Harris said a mixture of Bolivar and bore water would be of sufficient quality to spray on any crop. The manager of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association, Mr. W. R.

Miller, said it was appalling that the useful Bolivar water—about 90 000 000 litres a day—has been flowing into the sea for the past decade.

I have here a schedule of the production of vegetables in this area—tomatoes, cucumbers, capsicums, egg fruit, rock melon, beans, flowers, lettuce, carrots, etc., and it

amounts to an industry in South Australia that last year anyhow, to June 30, 1976, was worth \$15 294 350. As this is statistical data, I seek leave to have this table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

S.A. Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association Incorporated: Vegetable Production in the Northern Adelaide Plains

Total Glasshouses in the Northern Adelaide Plains

	Houses	Estimates	Total
			\$
Tomatoes	9 463	120 ½ case per house	6 813 360
Cucumbers	500	150 ½ case per house	375 000
Capsicums	400	60 ½ case per house	120 000
Egg Fruit	60	\$300 per house	18 000
Rock melon	10	\$150 per house	4 500
Beans	450	\$350 per house	157 500
			\$7 488 360
	Acres		
Flowers (outside)	37	\$4 000 per acre	146 000
Flowers (glasshouse)	2½		70 000
Beans (outside)	20	\$1 500 per acre	30 000
Tomatoes (outside)	30	\$1 500 per acre	45 000
Melons	10	\$600 per acre	6 000
Pumpkins	100	12 tons per acre	96 000
Celery	70	800 crates per acre	392 000
Lettuce	240	700 crates per acre	336 000
Carrots	267	15 tons per acre	801 000
Bunch	25	\$1 200 per acre	30 000
(Silverbeat, Spinach, Endives, Radish, Parsley, Spring Onions)	60	\$2 000 per acre	120 000
Cauliflower	330	5 000 per acre	907 500
Cabbage	218	6 000 per acre	588 600
Onions	878	12 tons per acre	1 843 800
Potato (winter)	578	8 tons per acre	786 080
Potato (main crop)	1 018	11 tons per acre	1 343 760
(Other Vegetables, Sprouts, Broccoli, Artichokes)	10	\$1 500 per acre	15 000
Mushrooms			20 000
Capsicums (outside)	20	\$2 000 per acre	400 000
Strawberries	4	\$1 000 per acre	4 000
Stone Fruit, Citrus			15 000
Almonds	1 250	\$500 per acre	625 000
		Total	\$7 805 990
		Grand Total	\$15 294 350

Growers in Virginia Area

Onion	98
Cauliflower	49
Cabbage	46
Potato (main crop)	88
Potato (winter)	49
Tomato (glasshouse)	640
Sprouts	2
Flowers	12
Celery	7
Mushroom	2
Strawberry	2
Total tomato	640
Others	160
	800

Mr. RUSSACK: In the few moments I have left at my disposal on this point, may I say I have been in discussion with growers in the Virginia area in the last week and also with others who would have a profound knowledge of the situation in the Virginia area. I understand that, if a grower uses more than his quota in a year, for example, if he has a quota of 20 000 000 litres and he uses 2 000 000 litres over that quota, that is taken off his next year's quota. However, if he uses 18 000 000 litres of the 20 000 000 litres, he has no credit for that, and he starts off the next year with the normal yearly quota.

This is unfair, unjust and not right. It has been suggested there should be a new system so that a person could budget his consumption. Everyone realises that each year has a different rainfall: some years are wet and some are dry but, as in taxation matters a primary producer has a five-year cycle in which he can budget and determine what can be done, so the vegetable growers on the Adelaide Plains at Virginia would find it helpful if there could be some such system, so that they could budget for their use of water. I have noticed that, in the notices that have been distributed to the growers, and particularly those who have found it necessary to use over their quota in any one year, it has been suggested that they apply their growing methods to suit the water available.

Those producers do not operate on the normal seasonal basis on which a normal producer who sows his crops in April or May and reaps them at the end of the year operates. Potatoes consist of a main crop and a winter

crop. Some onions are sown so that they can be harvested and marketed according to market requirements. The gardeners who grow these commodities must indicate weeks ahead what produce they will have available and when it will be available so that they can supply the market in time. Carrots and celery are a full year job: it is not just a seasonal occupation as it is with cereal growing.

I earnestly ask the Government to consider the allocation of water as it relates to this matter. I know that years of research have gone into this matter and that people responsible for that research have considered it over the years but, from the practical viewpoint, those who grow the produce (the people who I consider have gained experience over the years and have the necessary technique and technical knowledge) are the people who should be considered. I ask that a five-year cycle for water allocation be considered. I am sure that all people involved in this area would find such a scheme beneficial.

Dr. Eastick: It's the Nankivell suggestion.

Mr. RUSSACK: I do not know whether that scheme has ever been considered. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, at 2 p.m.