

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday 13 July 1978

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. G. R. Langley) presiding.

The Acting Clerk (Mr. G. D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.12 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.42 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

**ABSENCE OF CLERK**

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)** moved:

That leave of absence be granted to the Clerk of the House of Assembly (Mr. A. F. R. Dodd) whilst absent overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary business.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** I inform the House that, during the Clerk's absence and under Standing Order 30, his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant. I have appointed Mr. D. A. Bridges (Second Clerk Assistant) to carry out the duties of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.44 to 2.15 p.m.]*

**GOVERNOR'S SPEECH**

**The SPEAKER:** I have to report that this day, in compliance with the summons from His Excellency the Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which I have obtained a copy, which I now lay on the table.

Ordered to be printed.

**PETITIONS: PETROL RESELLERS**

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN** presented a petition signed by 60 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that could cause petrol resellers to trade seven days a week until 9.30 p.m.

**Mr. MATHWIN** presented a similar petition signed by 31 electors.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN** presented a similar petition signed by 50 electors.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: SERVICE STATIONS**

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** presented a petition signed by 147 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would enact the report of the Royal Commission into Service Station Trading Hours in its entirety.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: MINORS BILL**

**Mr. CHAPMAN** presented a petition signed by 175 residents of South Australia, praying that the House

would reject any legislation which deprived parents of their rights and responsibilities in respect of the total health and welfare of their children.

**Mr. GUNN** presented a similar petition signed by 86 residents of South Australia.

**Dr. EASTICK** presented a similar petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia.

**Mr. EVANS** presented a similar petition signed by 92 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES**

**Mr. HARRISON** presented a petition signed by 21 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.

**PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY**

**Mr. EVANS** presented a petition signed by 41 members of the Stirling Country Women's Association, praying that the House would do all in its power to stop pornographic material coming into the community.

Petition received.

**Dr. EASTICK** presented a petition signed by 44 residents of the Eudunda area, praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce without delay stringent laws with appropriate penalties which would protect children from pornographic literature, film, and other material, and that the size of the Classification of Publications Board be increased to eight members, with representatives from the National Council of Women.

Petition received.

**PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY**

**The SPEAKER:** Recently, the President of the Legislative Council and I circulated to members, and to the media, a reminder as to the areas media representatives and other strangers are permitted to enter. There have been a number of complaints from the media, and some members, that the conditions as set out are too restrictive. However, I make the point as strongly as I can that these are the conditions that have always applied in Parliament House.

In the past, these provisions may not have been as strictly enforced as they should have been, but recent experience in other Parliaments indicates that, unfortunately, it is now necessary that these provisions be more rigidly enforced. In doing this, I make clear that there is no intention of restricting access to members of the media, and with the full co-operation of members access should, in fact, be easier. The suggested requirement will be for representatives of the media to identify themselves to any of the messenger staff, who will then contact the member concerned.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS**

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

Hillcrest Hospital (Assessment Unit and Psychogeriatric Ward Block),  
Whyalla Hospital Redevelopment (Phase II).  
Ordered that reports be printed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL PARKS

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister for the Environment):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** When introducing amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act to provide for the creation of trusts for the development of reserves in the last session of Parliament, I stated: "The formation of each trust for each individual park will have to be the subject of a separate Bill to come before the House." The member for Mitcham has drawn my attention to the fact that such a provision does not actually appear in the Bill which came before Parliament. Section 45b (1) of the Act provides for the Governor to establish a trust by proclamation.

It had always been my intention that this House should be informed of a decision to establish any new trust. I apologise to the House if any misunderstanding has arisen as to the nature and intent of the Bill as a result of my speech, but I wish to assure members that I was genuinely mistaken in my speech during the last session. As honourable members will recall, the recent amendment to the Act provided for the formation of the Black Hill Native Flora Park Trust. A unique recreational and educational facility is being developed at Black Hill. Through the establishment of the trust, additional loan moneys can be provided, so the development which is required for the creation of this park can take place within a reasonable period of time. These additional funds which can be injected into the development of our park system are extremely valuable at this time, when we are in a period of tight financial constraints.

During this year, I have visited a number of parks in and around Adelaide. When visiting these parks, one cannot help but be very impressed by the high level of dedication which the rangers and park keepers give to their work. What is apparent, however, is the need for substantially greater resources to be directed to these areas so that highly desirable development can take place. As honourable members will be aware, these parks have a special role in providing the major recreational and conservation amenities for the people of metropolitan Adelaide. All the parks have a very high level of visitors. It is estimated that, during the last year, over 1 500 000 people visited them.

In addition, at Cleland, we have a conservation park which provides a unique native fauna display. It is virtually the "front window" to native fauna conservation for interstate and overseas visitors. Cleland is also a major source of environmental education for South Australian students. I feel that the public generally recognises that these areas all contribute to the general character and quality of life in Adelaide. It is now proposed to establish two further trusts under section 45b (1) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1978.

The first of these trusts will be at the Cleland Conservation Park, and it is intended to create a world class native fauna display by redeveloping and extending the existing facilities. The second trust will cover the recreation parks at Belair and Para Wirra and their allied reserves. All these trusts will work closely with the Department for the Environment and are subject to the direction of the Minister.

The ability of each of the trusts to borrow money will provide a substantial injection of funds into these parks so that important development projects can proceed. The creation of the two new trusts, together with the trust already operating at Black Hill, will mean that, for the important high visitor use reserves, a new relationship will evolve between the Minister, the trusts, and the Environment Department. In these circumstances, the role of the present National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council has been re-examined.

As honourable members will be aware, the consolidation of legislation for reserve management and wildlife conservation into a single Act in 1972 meant that the various bodies previously responsible for these activities, such as the Flora and Fauna Board of South Australia and the National Parks Commission, were either abolished or reassigned responsibilities. To provide some continuity and to provide advice to the Minister, the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council was established under the present Act.

Discussions on the role of the advisory council have been held with the Chairman of that body, and I have spoken to a special meeting of members. The terms of office of the members of the council expired on 30 June 1978. The trusts established under the new arrangements give an additional source of advice to the Minister. I do not intend to make any new appointments, but rather to establish a smaller committee. This will be largely scientifically based and will advise on conservation and scientific matters.

This committee will examine and make recommendations on management plans, and public comments on the plans which is required under the Act. The committee will also make recommendations to the Minister on expenditure from the Wildlife Conservation Fund established under the Act. I wish to foreshadow amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act to enable this new advisory committee to be created. More specifically, I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for the dedication which the various members of the advisory council have shown over the years and for the advice which has been tendered to the various Ministers by the council.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Mr. J. J. O'LEARY

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** In a letter to the Premier dated 17 February 1978 John James O'Leary of Willis Drive, Normanville, complained that his standing and reputation in the private and business community had been seriously affected because of an incident which had occurred while he was a member of the South Australian Police Force. This whole matter arose as a result of an article appearing in *Nation Review* in 1972 naming Mr. O'Leary as being involved in property transactions beyond his means, the inference being that he was involved in graft and corruption. Further articles appeared in *National U* and *Wironi*, two student newspapers, which showed O'Leary's home and accused him of accepting bribes as well as implying that he was carrying out land and property transactions involving large sums of money. No evidence was produced in any of these articles to substantiate the allegations.

An inquiry into these matters was conducted shortly after that by Mr. N. R. Lenton, who was then Superintendent in charge of the Criminal Investigation

Branch. O'Leary revealed to him that he had been involved in minor investments in real estate, including the purchase of a block of six flats at Goodwood. He answered all questions satisfactorily with the exception of those in relation to a house at Penang Avenue, Daw Park. The contract note relating to the purchase of that property bore both his name and a signature identical to his own. He had claimed he had no knowledge of such a property.

O'Leary made his own inquiries. He went to Daw Park and saw a Sergeant Hassett in the yard of the Penang Avenue premises; he had worked with Hassett for a period of 18 months while in the uniform section of the Police Force. Further inquiries revealed that there was an account in the name of O'Leary at the Unley branch of the Commonwealth Savings Bank that contained a substantial amount of money. The signature on the bank records was identical to his. It was not, however, his account. There was also an account in the name of another police officer, Constable Brett, who had also worked with Sergeant Hassett. Brett had no knowledge of this account.

O'Leary further recalled that Sergeant Hassett had previously been involved in real estate activities whilst a member of the South Australian Police Force, and that a fellow policeman had rented a house from Sergeant Hassett in the Daw Park area. This policeman, who has now left the force, had indeed rented the Daw Park premises from Sergeant Hassett for about five months, was aware that Hassett owned them, and had paid rent to Hassett.

When O'Leary reported the results of his inquiries, Sergeant Hassett was interviewed by Inspector Kennedy on 29 August 1972. He admitted to being the owner of the Penang Avenue, Daw Park, property. He said that he had purchased the property in the name of John James O'Leary and had signed the contract "J. J. O'Leary". He informed the inspector that he had opened a bank account in the name of O'Leary during August 1967, and had also opened an account in the name of Brett. He had withdrawn money from the O'Leary account as deposit on the Penang Avenue property. He had purchased the property in the name of O'Leary because he had a bank account in that name. He said that neither O'Leary nor Brett was aware of the bank accounts; he had used those names because they were convenient names to remember.

Sergeant Hassett stated during his interview that he was not aware that he had committed any offence. The police report concerning the inquiry into the sergeant's activities was subsequently forwarded for an opinion as to whether any criminal offence had been committed. The Crown Solicitor advised that the sergeant had committed no criminal offence. However, he was charged with a breach of police regulation 36 (39), the actual charge being "conduct to prejudice the good order and discipline in the force". He pleaded guilty and was fined \$40 by the Commissioner of Police.

In his summary of findings delivered in September 1972, in respect of the investigation, Superintendent Lenton concluded that:

- (1) there was no evidence whatsoever to suggest that O'Leary had accepted bribes or engaged in any questionable conduct in his capacity as a police officer; and
- (2) his investment activities in a non-official capacity were quite consistent with his lawful rights as a private citizen.

Mr. O'Leary in fact continued as a C.I.B. officer for about 13 months after the inquiry was completed before submitting his resignation from the Police Force on 18 October 1973.

He himself is certainly aware that he was not dismissed

from the Police Force, nor was he ever charged with any criminal offence or any offence under the Police Regulations Act. His main concern is that various business acquaintances and personal friends are still under the misapprehension that he was involved in criminal activities whilst a member of the Police Force, and that he was forced to leave the Police Force as a result of those activities.

The only reason that he has reported the matter to the Government is in the hope that a public statement will be made that he was not dismissed from the South Australian Police Force, or ever involved in criminal activities whilst a member of that force.

I can tell the House that I have had this matter further investigated in the recent past, and there is no reason to vary at all the statements made by Superintendent Lenton. I want to tell the public of South Australia that, so far as the Government is concerned, John James O'Leary left the Police Force of his own free will and accord. There was never any allegation of any matter whatever against him.

Mr. Millhouse: This is a funny thing to raise in the House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It is an important matter. I believe it is a matter that should be raised.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why didn't you make a statement outside?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. The honourable Attorney-General should proceed with his Ministerial statement.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Every time a statement is made outside the House we are criticised.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Attorney-General is out of order.

**Mr. Millhouse:** But—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will cease interjecting. The honourable Attorney-General.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** From the point of view of the good administration of justice—and this is where it is a matter for the House—it is hardly satisfactory that a person who undertakes activities similar to those which Sergeant Hassett has undertaken appears not to be liable at law. I take this opportunity to advise the House that, whilst the Government does not believe that the type of conduct involved here is such as should warrant the attention of the criminal law, there having been no wrong suffered by the State, I believe that this is an example of where the law of defamation could be extended, and I bring to the attention of the House draft section 22 of discussion paper No. 3 on defamation published by the Australian Law Reform Commission.

I can advise the House that in due course, when the law relating to privacy, defamation and freedom of information is being dealt with, a provision similar to draft section 22 will be incorporated in the law of this State to take account of such circumstances as I have outlined to the House and to give people in Mr. O'Leary's position a right of action for damages.

#### MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act, 1971-1976, and to repeal the Mining Act Amendment Act, 1978. Read a first time.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Towards the end of the last session of Parliament a Bill to

amend the Mining Act was passed by both Houses of Parliament. The major provisions of the Bill related to the mining of radio-active minerals and the creation of a new species of lease. Unfortunately, the document that was submitted to the Governor for assent did not reflect the true text of the Bill as passed by Parliament: it did not contain an amendment made by the Legislative Council and agreed to by the House of Assembly. There is, therefore, some doubt as to whether the Bill, as passed by Parliament, was validly assented to at Executive Council on 6 April 1978. The present Bill is designed to put the matter beyond doubt. It is in the same form as the previous Bill, as passed by Parliament, except that it contains a provision that will repeal the former amending Act (if it is in fact an Act).

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** The Government contacted the Opposition when this error was first discovered. For that reason, and because it is a procedural matter, there is no point in canvassing again the argument proffered during the second reading debate when the previous Bill was before the House, except to say that the Opposition believes that the Government's uranium policy is ill informed and militates against the interests of South Australia. As it is a matter of procedure, to correct an oversight, we will not impede the passage of the Bill.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I got word that something as amusing as this was about to happen, and I want to say just a couple of words. It perhaps shows the error of rushing lots of Bills through the House—so many, in fact, that it is impossible for the Clerks to deal with them adequately in the time that is given. I shall say no more about that, because mistakes can happen, and I make enough of them myself, as everyone will admit. I do not hold a mistake against anyone, as long as it is not repeated.

It is amusing to look at clause 4 of the Bill and to see, "Act (or purported Act) No. 34 of 1978". I do not think that we have ever seen that before in any legislation passed by this Parliament, and I hope we will not see it again. No doubt it will cause questions to be asked by lawyers as they read through the Acts and wonder why it happened.

However, I would not have got up just to say that. It is an opportunity to say something about the member for Kavel and his views. He said that he did not propose to go over the arguments which were adduced when this Bill was before the House previously. Since then, of course, he himself has carried the argument a bit further, and I want to reply to him. I think it was only a few days ago when he was reported in the paper (and I then realised that he had been away) as saying that he was convinced that we should be selling our uranium overseas. I want to say to him and to members of this House that I do not accept that position. I presume that he speaks for members of the State Parliamentary Party when he says that; if that is so, I shall speak for myself and for the Australian Democrats, and say that I am quite opposed to the sale overseas of Australia's uranium.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Would you like to speak for the Government?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Attorney-General is inviting me to speak for the Government.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** If that's all you're going to say.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Attorney-General is out of order.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I notice he did not invite me to speak for the Government when I was referring to the amusing mistake that had happened in legislation, which gave rise to this debate.

**Mr. Chapman:** The Minister—

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

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The member for Alexandra tells me that the Minister of Mines and Energy does not support the Attorney-General.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Be that as it may, I hope, in case the Government is wavering at all in its policy on uranium as a result of some of the things that have been said, that someone in this debate will get up and reaffirm the policy the Government has espoused and explained in this House previously, because I think it is important for Australia, as we slide nearer and nearer to selling uranium overseas for mere commercial gain, that as many of us as possible should get up and say what we think and be counted on this issue.

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy)** moved:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** When I spoke to the second reading debate I issued an invitation to members of the Labor Party to restate their policies in the hope that I would find they were not running away from them. There was a stunning silence not only after I had spoken in the second reading debate and when the Bill was in Committee but apparently now in this third reading debate, because it was about to slip right through without anyone saying anything, and no doubt the Minister—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** On a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitcham is out of order. He must direct his remarks to the Bill as it left Committee.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** When you stopped me I was addressing myself to the way in which the Minister moved the third reading, and I thought we were in the third reading debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I was just about to declare the third reading carried when the honourable member jumped up, and I called him.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That is right. I was reflecting on the fact that the Minister did not take the opportunity in this third reading debate—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I take a point of order. The third reading debate has to be confined to the Bill as it left Committee. References to the second reading debate, Committee, or any other matter which the honourable member might care to make on other occasions are completely out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order, and I hope the member for Mitcham will contain himself in this matter.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I do not propose to make, or even try to make, any further reference either to the second reading debate or to the Committee stage. I am, though, referring to the fact that in this debate on the third reading the Minister did not take the opportunity he could have taken to speak on the policy of his Party as embodied in this Bill as it has come out of Committee. Earlier in the debate on this Bill I gave that invitation, and the fact that the invitation was not taken up confirms my fear that the policy of the Government is wavering.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Mitcham to order. He has been in this place for a long time, and he knows only too well that, under the Standing Orders of this House, when the Speaker stands he must resume his seat.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Later:*

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### QUESTIONS

**The SPEAKER:** Before Question Time commences I wish to inform honourable members that the Minister of Mines and Energy will take questions for the Minister of Transport, and the Minister of Community Welfare will take questions for the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Chief Secretary.

### BUDGET DEFICIT

**Mr. TONKIN:** How does the Premier excuse his Government's grossly irresponsible handling of South Australia's economy which has resulted in a record deficit of \$25 000 000 for 1977-78?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Leader never ceases to amaze me. At the moment the deficit in South Australia is about \$7 000 000 in effect and not \$26 000 000. The Leader has referred to what were the trading results on Revenue Account but it has always been the case that Governments have used money left carefully in hand for the purpose as against deficits when they occur.

**Mr. Tonkin:** You can't use that story for very long.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** When I had that money carefully kept in hand as against a rainy day, the Leader got up in Victoria Square and told me to spend it; he protested that it was the people's surplus and that I ought to be spending it immediately.

**Mr. Tonkin:** To relieve the burden on the people.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The extraordinary thing is that the Leader gets up here when there is the starkest of contrasts before us. South Australia has a deficit, even if we took the Leaders figure, which is a tiny proportion of the total Budget expenditure in South Australia. As a proportion of \$1 500 000 000, \$26 000 000 is a small figure indeed, but the Federal Government not only has a deficit of \$3 200 000 000: it is over \$1 000 000 000 more than budgeted for.

**Mr. Wotton:** That has nothing to do with this Government.

**The SPEAKER:** I hope the honourable member will cease interjecting. He knows only too well the Standing Orders of this House. During the previous session members of the Opposition claimed that they were not given enough time for questions. However, since this question has been asked by the Leader of the Opposition, there have been numerous interjections and I do not wish them to continue. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** How the honourable member can seriously come before this Parliament, or before the public, and put up a proposition which is so utterly disproportionate to the very position that is maintained by him and his Party federally is beyond my comprehension.

### INDECENCY OFFENCES

**Mr. GROOM:** Can the Premier say whether, in the light of the Mitchell Committee's fourth report on the reform of the substantive criminal law, the Government intends to introduce legislation this session amending the Criminal Law Consolidation Act provisions dealing with indecency offences involving children? The existing provisions of section 58 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act provide,

for a first offence, imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, and for any subsequent offence a term not exceeding three years. The Mitchell Committee's Report, in dealing with section 58, states:

It is probable that a person who takes pornographic photographs of a child could be successfully prosecuted under section 58 (1) (b) which makes it an offence to incite or procure the commission by a child of an act of gross indecency in the presence of the accused. In order to ensure that this is the position an amendment along the lines suggested by the English Law Commission in its Working Paper on Conspiracies relating to Morals and Decency is desirable.

The committee recommended an amendment to section 58 (1) (b) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to make clear that the offence may be committed where there has been no physical contact of the child by or with any one, and notwithstanding that no such physical contact was intended by the defendant.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Government will introduce a Bill to give effect to the recommendations of the Mitchell Committee. The Government is satisfied that the position in law is as the Mitchell Committee reported; that is, that the taking of a pornographic photograph, even though there is no physical contact, is within the existing offences of indecent assault and procurement of an act of gross indecency.

The Mitchell Committee has recommended that the matter be enacted to make certain that there can be absolutely no doubt upon this score, and I imagine it has probably done that since there has been something of a campaign in South Australia to the effect that, somehow or other, the law does not cover the position at the moment. It does. Since the Mitchell Committee has made that recommendation, the Government proposes to act upon it and will place it beyond any possible not only doubt but campaign to misrepresent the position in the law.

In addition there are other matters relating to indecency offences that will be dealt with during this session. They arise from some decisions which have been made by the courts. The Government moved against sex shops in South Australia that were showing to prospective customers pornographic films, which had no classification under the Film Classification Act but which were classified as classifications under the Classification of Publications Act. The Government believed, and its advice was, that it was not lawful for the proprietors of shops to show films for fee or reward, or indeed in any other way, within their shops. However, the Full Court, in a majority decision, dismissed a prosecution. As a consequence, an amendment will be introduced to ensure that a breach of the Film Classification Act cannot take place in that way, and that sex shops cannot be set up as mini pornographic film theatres.

The second matter to be dealt with is an amendment to the definition sections of section 33 of the Police Offences Act. Members will recall that we dealt with this section during the recent session, but there is a matter to which the Government's attention has been drawn by the Classification of Publications Board; that is, that one of the areas which concerns it most at present is the provision of very explicit material on violence and sadism.

The general policy adopted by the board is that where publications are giving explicit, pictorial representation of the commission of crimes of violence, then, in circumstances where the actual making of such a publication in this State would be a crime, it ought not to be condoned by allowing imported publications to be sold on that basis.

It is doubtful whether some of the publications on explicit sadism come within the definitions of "obscenity" or "indecent", because in some of them the genitalia are not explicitly depicted. In these circumstances, it seems advisable to amend the definitions so that those publications, which are refused classification now by the Classification of Publications Board, and which therefore it would be thought normally would fall within section 33 of the Police Offences Act and could be prosecuted, can get convictions in relations to them where they are matters of explicit cruelty, and so on.

### LAND TAX CHARGES

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Will the Premier investigate the obvious inequity in equalisation factors operating in relation to land tax charges, in which considerable percentage increases from last year occur in districts and range from 25.7 per cent in Enfield, 22.4 per cent in Burnside, 16.2 per cent in Torrens, 5.6 per cent in Henley Beach, to nil per cent in the Premier's own district of Norwood. These increases, in many cases, add further savage imposts to State taxation in an arbitrary fashion.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I will get a full report for the honourable member. I think, from what he said in his explanation, that he does not understand how the equalisation factors work. It is quite obvious that the honourable member does not realise that last year there was a considerable increase (not a nil per cent increase) in my district. That is because of what has happened historically.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members are still interjecting.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** The Premier doesn't understand this.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I will get a full report from the Valuer-General for the honourable member to assist him.

### PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

**Mr. BANNON:** What assurances can the Minister of Education, in his capacity as Minister in charge of community centres, give that the Parks Community Centre will be completed as scheduled and that finance will be available so that it can be adequately staffed? The Parks Community Centre, which is located in the suburb of Angle Park, around which there are other park suburbs, such as Ferryden Park, Mansfield Park, and so on, is a pioneering initiative in community development that has been undertaken by the South Australian Government with the initial, positive financial assistance from the Whitlam Labor Government.

It has attracted not only Australia-wide but international attention, and the building of the centre is nearing completion. News has now come that there are possible Budget cuts that will prevent that centre either being completed or operating properly, and this seems to be because of the failure of the Commonwealth Government not honouring its commitment made earlier, and it has caused grave disquiet among members of the community. This was made evident by people who gathered outside this House today.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member referred to people who were outside the House and I took the opportunity of speaking to these people on my arrival

at Parliament House this morning. They had earlier transmitted to my staff, while I was at Executive Council, a petition signed by many people associated with the centre. I take the unusual course of congratulating those people on expressing their concern. Of course, these are the first signs of the out-workings of the blood letting that occurred only recently in Canberra. I am afraid that many people are to be caught in this situation, and it is important they realise why these things have happened.

The honourable member referred to Commonwealth Government commitments. There was an earlier fixed commitment from the Commonwealth of \$3 100 000 but, because this was a commitment to a fixed amount rather than to a percentage of the total cost, with some escalation of costs in the building project, the State has had to bear an increasing proportion of the total cost. I have written to Mr. Groom, the Minister of all seasons in the Commonwealth Government, asking for an additional \$3 300 000 for the project, which would bring the Commonwealth commitment to somewhat the sort of percentage level that was originally envisaged when we discussed this project. We will see what success comes from that approach.

Concerning the total question asked by the honourable member, all I can say is that obviously the State Government gives a high priority to what is happening at the Parks centre. It is a significant feature in community development and one attracting a gratifying response from local people. I cannot guarantee that there will not be some problems concerning the staffing of some components of the centre at the time we originally envisaged them to start. The centre will be built as originally envisaged and we will try to adhere to the capital programme at the centre despite the money problems to which I have referred. Obviously, we will also try to give a high priority to staffing. We, in common with all other States, are suffering in this way for reasons that have already been widely canvassed, so I cannot guarantee all the components of the centre will be serviced with staff as quickly as we originally indicated. I will keep the honourable member informed.

### DEFICIT BUDGETING

**Mr. ALLISON:** Because other mainland States have balanced their Budgets for 1977-78, can the Premier say whether the South Australian Government intends to proceed with the outdated policies of deficit budgeting for the coming financial year and, if so, what reserves, if any, are expected to be available at the end of the year to help cover that deficit?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The South Australian Treasury has been, and remains, the envy of the other State Treasurers.

**Mr. Millhouse:** They probably all say the same thing about their own Treasurers.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the honourable member of for Mitcham.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member will find that, when the present Federal Government was elected, the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, said several things about the state of the South Australian Treasury and that we had far too much money. Indeed, it was the first thing he talked to me about when he saw me. The honourable member will find that the position of the South Australian Treasury at the end of this financial year will remain sound. I can assure him that, while I am radical in some things, there is one thing about which I am extremely conservative, and that is the Treasury.

### MORPHETT VALE WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL

**Mr. DRURY:** Can the Minister of Education say whether, when the Morphett Vale West Primary School was built, the population projections on which it was planned allowed this school to be used by students from the original Morphett Vale school two kilometres away, which is to be closed at the end of this year? In the *News* on 22 June 1978 an article appeared and, by implication, criticised the construction of the new school at Hackham West, and implied that the school at Morphett Vale West was nowhere near full capacity, and therefore that students ought to be able to go to the Morphett Vale West Primary School. It was further stated in the article by the Opposition spokesman on education:

Most schools are at least five years in the planning and the Government has obviously punted on a population explosion in the area.

Is it a fact that the Education Department works on punts?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The answer to the honourable member's specific question is "No". All the figures that we had available to us from developers indicated that the Morphett Vale West Primary School was essential and that the concurrent construction of the Morphett Vale South school and the construction in the following year of the Hackham West Primary School would be necessary. The enrolments at Morphett Vale West are now building up, as the inevitable filling of these houses that developers had problems in selling slowly occurs. I recently visited that school in the honourable member's district.

I want to say something concerning the Hackham West Primary School, which is a replacement school built to replace the Morphett Vale Primary School, which is on the boundary between the honourable member's district and mine. I saw the reference in the *News* made by the member for Mount Gambier. I hope that every elector south of O'Halloran Hill saw the reference, because I am sure the Liberal Party will not gain too many friends down there as a result of what its spokesman on education had to say.

This is a replacement venture similar to replacements that have occurred in many Liberal-held districts and replacements that are still going on. The Morphett Vale Primary School is on an extremely limited site: it has only one solid construction building; it has no proper play areas; and it is on the intersection of two very busy roads. It has been the ambition of the Education Department for many years to rebuild this primary school on a more propitious site and to provide better capital facilities. I believe that parents at the school have been very patient for a long time in putting up with facilities that exist there. Although we will have difficulties in the coming financial year in being able to run much in the way of the replacement programme, the honourable member for Kavel, on whose behalf one of his colleagues in the Upper House brought a deputation to see me not so long ago about the Lobethal Primary School, and the honourable member for Alexandra, whose enthusiasm for the Kingscote Area School is well known, would support the concept of a replacement programme in doing all we possibly can to renew the old capital stock. I condemn the honourable member who made the statement in the way he did, because people have waited overly long for the replacement of the Morphett Vale Primary School.

### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Can the Premier, as Minister responsible for the South Australian economy, indicate whether he expects that unemployment in South Australia

will continue to rise; what level will unemployment eventually reach in this State; when will the unemployment situation start to improve; and what new initiatives is the Government taking to reduce unemployment? South Australia now has the second highest level of unemployment of any Australian State. During the past 12 months, unemployment in this State has risen by 52 per cent, whereas unemployment throughout Australia has risen by only 18 per cent. This morning, we heard that the State Unemployment Relief Scheme was being reduced, so that new initiatives are now necessary.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** For a considerable period, the honourable member has apparently completely failed to realise that the basic question of employment in this country depends on the general state of the economy. As the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry, he must know that the products of South Australia in the industrial area are sold mainly on markets outside South Australia, and, in consequence, the stimulation of those markets is basically necessary to improve employment within South Australia. The South Australian Government is limited in its initiatives relating to unemployment to employment-generating schemes within the State and to the use of Government finance to stimulate the local economy, especially in the building industry, to try to get as high a local market and a multiplier effect as possible.

To this date the South Australian Government has consistently run such a programme, and it is because of that that for most of the time of this present economic down-turn this State has been better off than other States have been in the employment area for the first time in any economic down-turn in the whole history of this State. There is a limit to what the Government can do in that area if the Federal Government continues to take action actively to depress the economy, and that is what it is doing. It has depressed the markets for our products, and it has compounded the situation by the action it has taken specifically in relation to South Australian employment as, for instance, in the shipbuilding industry.

The honourable member complains about the increase in unemployment in South Australia but says absolutely nothing about the large contribution to that increase that was made by the closure of the shipbuilding industry as a result of the Federal Government's refusal to accept motions passed by this House or the recommendations of the Senate committee in relation to the shipbuilding industry. Also, the honourable member and his Leader have criticised the Government for using the reserves of this State to stimulate the economy locally through the building industry. I have been criticised for using the reserves of this State. The honourable member has asked where the reserves have gone. We used a considerable amount on housing in this State and for supporting a construction programme in the Loan programme, because the Federal Government had cut the real value of Loan moneys available to us, and we kept on doing that in an endeavour to stimulate the local economy. However, the situation has now been reached where I can no longer proceed to take money from the reserves of the State for that purpose.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** There are none left.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That is what the honourable member says, but he does not know much about the finances of the State, and this has been evidenced by what he said earlier this afternoon; nor does the honourable member who asked the question, who recently advocated that somehow or other I should take \$20 000 000 of Loan money and put it into the construction industry in South Australia. I do not know whence it would come, because the whole Loan programme was already committed. They

can drag figures out of the air in this way without any attention to facts.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** They don't have to worry about facts.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The way in which this economy can recover and the way in which this Government has urged it should be done (as has the majority of economists in Australia)—

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** And all other Premiers have done it.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes. There should be some addition to the money supply in Australia at present in a controlled fashion in providing additional moneys to the construction industry. If the honourable member would stop sniping at his own State and get out and talk to his Federal colleagues on this score, we might get some stimulation in relation to employment.

### MARITIME MUSEUM

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Marine say whether any consideration has been given to the provision of a site for the establishment of a maritime park at Port Adelaide? The National Trust and the Port Adelaide Historical Society have had plans for some time for a maritime museum or a maritime park. They have drawn plans of what they envisaged would be necessary to preserve the maritime history of Port Adelaide. A maritime museum or park is now urgent for Port Adelaide, because soon much of Port Adelaide's history will be lost. Various tugs that have been stored are deteriorating rapidly. The *Fearless* is in the water, and it will be necessary to beach it and to put it on concrete. The *Annie Watt*, which was one of the first ketches to operate out of Port Adelaide, is on land, drying out, and is greatly deteriorating. The tug *Yelta* is floating down the Port River, and this could be used.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think that the honourable member has explained his question very well.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Has the Minister considered the establishment of this project?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I appreciate the honourable member's interest in Port Adelaide's history, even if Opposition members do not. The honourable member was trying to impress on me the need for such a park, and he did it very well. There have been negotiations between the Marine and Harbors Department, the National Trust and the Port Adelaide Historical Society, and an offer was made some time ago to both of these bodies. The offer was not accepted, because they thought that the site was too remote. The matter was referred to me and, as a result, I sought to have the department make available a site much closer to the area that was thought suitable.

This is subject to information being made available by the Transport Department, because it is important to know, if possible, the location of the new bridge before a definite decision can be made on the site. The matter is under active consideration. I am still awaiting information from the Transport Department. In light of the question, I will contact the department to see whether I can get the information more quickly, and I shall be happy to advise the honourable member as soon as I can of what further action can be taken to cater for this most necessary facility.

### STATE TAXES

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Will the Premier explain how he can justify the current stamp duty rates applying to new vehicles and home-building purchases, boat and business

re-registration, pastoral and perpetual lease land search, transfer, and accounting fees in South Australia remaining at substantially higher levels than those in all other mainland States of Australia, and, at the same time, boast that South Australia is industrially, commercially, socially, politically, and, as of this afternoon, financially, more attractive than those other States? I have cited a number of areas, all of which have been researched. The material I have is not from "out there somewhere", as referred to by the Premier earlier in reply to a question. It is factual. I shall quote three brief examples. Concerning stamp duty, referring to the Holden HZ manual car, a popular car, the duty applicable to the purchase of that vehicle in Western Australia is \$51; in Queensland, \$68; in New South Wales, \$136; in Victoria, \$170; and in South Australia—out in front—\$212.

I have an example in connection with home purchases, reflected through the whole of the home-building system, taking a house valued at \$35 000. The stamp duty in Western Australia is \$500; in Tasmania, \$587.50; in Queensland, \$525; in New South Wales, \$612.50; in Victoria, \$700; and in South Australia—out in front again—\$730.

The third example refers to fees for the re-registration of a business name. The fees are as follows: in Queensland, \$14; in Tasmania, \$15; in Western Australia, \$15; in Victoria, \$15; in New South Wales, \$15; and in South Australia—out in front again, 25 per cent up—\$20 a year.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I should think that, if a business could not afford \$20 a year, it would not be in business. I cannot imagine any business in South Australia which finds it difficult to exist here because it has to pay \$5 a year more for re-registration of its business name than does a business in another State. The honourable member is being quite absurd in suggesting that.

**Mr. Chapman:** Deal with the others.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I shall deal with the other matters. The honourable member has pointed out that, in some cases, our taxes on some items are marginally higher than are taxes in other States. That is true. In some other matters, our taxes are marginally lower than are those in other States. There are areas in which our revenue is very much less per capita than is the revenue in other States. Gambling taxes are a case in point; royalties on mining are another case.

**Mr. Chapman:** What about Roxby Downs?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra. If he offends again, I will name him.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** There is no hindrance to the opening up of Roxby Downs in South Australia, and the company is proceeding to its investigations at Roxby Downs. The honourable member must know absolutely nothing about mining. If he knew anything about it, he would know perfectly well that there is no way in which Roxby Downs would be in operation at the moment in any circumstances. Where other States have revenues to support their services from areas other than we have, we have to balance that up as best we can in areas available to us. We endeavour to see to it that our imposts are just and reasonable in the circumstances. Actually, the payments out of pocket in overheads on a transfer of property in South Australia are somewhat lower, taking them all in all, than are those outgoings in other States. That is because we have a land broker system in South Australia and a fixed level of charges in respect to preparation of transfer documents. People in other States are not going to go off and say it is cheaper to buy a house there, because in fact it is more expensive.



**Mr. Mathwin:** Some people retire to Queensland, don't they?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes, and I think that would be a very good place for the honourable member to retire in due season.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Is that where you are going?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That is not true, either. I have absolutely no intention of retiring to Queensland, and I have never said that I did.

*Mr. Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am not doing that, either.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have warned the honourable member for Eyre. If he offends again, I will name him.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** When I retire from Parliament, it will be in South Australia.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** And it will not be for a long time.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That is so. I am afraid honourable members opposite will have to put up with me for a while yet. For the member for Alexandra to suggest that people would move to another State because they would have to pay less in overheads for the purchase of a property means that he has not been through all the costs in the purchase of a property. Since we do not have some areas of revenue that the other States have, we have to compensate in some way. Judgments have been made over the years in this Parliament as to the best way in which the incidence of taxation should fall within South Australia. Obviously, we do not have the poker machine revenue of New South Wales or the gambling tax revenue of Victoria, because they have a very much larger gambling tax base than has South Australia, and they get much more per head of population than we do. Taking the total area of taxation in South Australia, the whole of the revenues of the State levied in taxation, the revenue per capita in South Australia is the lowest on the mainland. Only Tasmania is lower per head of population in revenue raising than is South Australia. For the honourable member to say that, because in some instances we are marginally higher than other States and therefore we must bring every tax in South Australia down to the minimum level of taxes in other States, is being financially absurd, and I suggest that he should do a little more study.

#### PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I imagine I shall have to disappoint a certain Ross Story by not asking the Premier a question about the economy.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will ask his question.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Of course, Sir. Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say when a decision can be expected from Loan Council on the funding of infra-structure costs for the proposed petro-chemical development at Redcliff? All members would be aware of the importance of this project to South Australia, and I imagine they would be aware, too, of its impact on the cities of the northern Spencer Gulf. The people of that area are anxious to know the progress of the Loan Council decision, so that, in their view anyway, planning can start to overcome the growth problems that will eventuate.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I think, as many honourable members would appreciate, that the planning schedule for the Redcliff petro-chemical works is really quite tight. The liquids that are required for any petro-chemical scheme are thrown off as a consequence of the production of gas in the Cooper Basin, and at present the main gas for Sydney and Adelaide is being produced from

the relatively dry fields in the Cooper Basin, namely, Moomba, Gidgealpa, and Big Lake. Sooner or later, we will have to move into the so-called wetter fields and, as a consequence of producing gas to supply Sydney and Adelaide, we will be throwing off increasing volumes of liquids as well. Without a viable scheme, those liquids will simply have to be flared and wasted, and a valuable energy resource will be lost to South Australia and to Australia. I think the crude oil reserves in the Cooper Basin amount to 2 per cent of Australia's total reserves. It is likely that we will move into the wetter wells in the Cooper Basin by 1983. That means the petro-chemical scheme must be ready to operate by that date.

These points were made to the Federal Government, and it was pointed out that once the Loan Council had made a decision in principle on infrastructure Dow Chemical could then proceed with the further work that must be undertaken and a further expenditure of funds in order to carry out the detailed engineering work prior to making a final decision. A final decision by Dow needs to be taken by the end of this year but certainly no later than the middle of 1979. The longer the time before the Loan Council decision is made the more the project is being put at risk.

I am hopeful, and this point was requested at the Loan Council when we were in Canberra, that the decision on infrastructure should be made no later than the end of August but whether that time table will be adhered to by the Commonwealth remains to be seen. Certainly it is true that the working party that has been established met immediately after the Loan Council meeting, and the additional information that was required from all States and the standard form on all of their various submissions were forwarded by all States to Canberra at the end of last week. That material has now been circulated to all other States. Presumably, therefore, the working party should be able to meet again soon, and a preliminary decision on the priority of the projects concerned can then be made. If that is done by the working party then our hope that a decision in principle on Redcliff can be given by the Loan Council by the end of August has a good chance of being achieved.

I would like to emphasise again publicly just how vital the timing now is in relation to this project and to get a national appreciation of the fact that, once the decision in relation to a petro-chemical scheme is delayed too long, we will end up with the inevitable wastage of a valuable energy resource in the Cooper Basin. That is relevant not only to Australia's future energy supplies but also to our overall balance of payments position, because we have been able to demonstrate effectively that the net impact on the balance of payments, taking all things into account, of the Redcliff petro-chemical proposal exceeds \$200 000 000 a year. That is a net favourable impact of great significance that cannot be ignored in current circumstances.

#### TAXES

**Mr. WOTTON:** Will the Premier say whether the Government subscribes to the views put forward by Mr. Whitlam and Mr. Hurford in Perth last year and more recently in Queensland by Mr. Willis, the Labor shadow Treasurer, that taxpayers must be educated to the need to pay more tax to support an increase in the public sector and, if so, why?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I refer the honourable member back to speeches I made prior to the elections in 1968, 1970 and 1973. In each of those policy speeches I said that it was necessary for us to improve the services in

this State and that, in order to improve those services, we would have to have additional revenue, and I set out in those policy speeches the means by which that additional revenue would be obtained. The people supported that view.

I believe it was right then. At the time of the 1975 elections I made perfectly clear that at that stage of the proceedings, given the situation in the economy as it had developed, I did not believe we should proceed to additional revenue raising, and I outlined certain areas in which taxation would be reduced. This Government did reduce taxation, particularly in relation to the honourable member's area, and following submissions made by his constituents we withdrew the rural land tax in South Australia.

**Mr. Wotton:** Some of it.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** We withdrew all genuine rural land tax. Indeed, if the honourable member is interested in that particular area I suggest he have a swift look at the situation presently facing the Liberal Government in Victoria on the subject of land tax, because we have done much better by the people in South Australia in that area than it has. The attitude of this Government is perfectly clear. It was necessary to improve the services of the State; they were some of the worst in Australia before we took office. We have improved them, and they are now the best in Australia. We have set out to maintain them as such, but at the same time we have done that efficiently by having, as I have pointed out, the lowest tax raising per capita on the Australian mainland.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Not in the areas where it counts.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not want to warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition again. If he continues to interject I will take action.

#### BLUE ASBESTOS

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Has the Minister of Works any information on the use of asbestos in public buildings in this State? My question arises from a recent press report which said that the Minister was having examined the use of blue asbestos in public buildings because it had been claimed that working near this material was likely to be harmful to the health of the people concerned. I believe the Minister was having someone consider this matter even though I believe that this material has not been used in the construction of public buildings in this State for 10 years.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I did ask the Director of the Public Buildings Department to investigate the matter as quickly as possible because of the concern that had been expressed about the use of asbestos and the deleterious effect it could have on the health of people using it or people working in areas where it had been stored. On 10 July the Director told me that he would be taking action on an interim report received from the Manager for Regional Services along the lines I will now set out. A departmental instruction will be issued placing a complete ban on the specifying or use of any sprayed or fibrous asbestos material where the use of this material can cause asbestos fibre to be released into the air. I understand the statement that was made that no asbestos had been used in public buildings for 10 years was found not to be correct. The instruction will also ban the use of saws, or seek to ban the use of saws or abrasive cutting devices in conjunction with rigid asbestos cement in any form. The safety officer will naturally be consulted before this instruction is issued, but I imagine the matter is well under way now.

The safety officer will also carry out an immediate survey and will report on areas of the department where employees might be at risk through their proximity to asbestos fibre. For practical reasons this survey will be confined to workshops and building sites, and such a survey really should be linked with a similar survey proposed by the Occupational Health Branch of the Health Commission. The department and the Health Commission will co-operate in a survey, which the Occupational Health Branch may be undertaking soon, to identify the State Government buildings which may pose a hazard. The result of this survey will then determine what action should be taken.

The code of practice which has been developed by C.S.R. Limited for the safety of employees working with asbestos fibre will be distributed immediately to all parts of the department where employees might be affected, and this will be done until a better code of practice is developed by the Australian Standards Association. We will be asking that that code be adhered to. Liaison with the Health Commission will continue so that a means of treating existing buildings, where access to the asbestos fibre is difficult, may be developed.

The Maintenance Architect will continue with the research programme and will provide a more detailed report, probably within the next month or so. This, of course, may suggest a more positive approach that can be made. I think it is sufficient to say that we are concerned and are taking whatever action we can at the moment to protect people from harm if they come in contact with this material.

#### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Can the Premier say, in the light of the very great increases in expenditure in his own department, whether the Government is serious in its recent announcement that during the present financial year the size of the Public Service is not to be allowed to get even bigger than it is? I am prompted to ask this question by the plaintive tenor of the Governor's Speech that the State is not to get all the money from the Commonwealth that this Government thinks it should get.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Don't you think so?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Henley Beach to order.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I also remember that the announcement of the so-called cutback in the Public Service came only the day before I saw in the *Advertiser* advertisements for five new senior positions in the Department of the Public Service Board, which made the whole thing look pretty hollow. Finally, I refer, as I did in the preamble to my question, to the colossal increase in expenditure in departments under the Premier's control, as set out in the quarterly statements appearing in the *Government Gazette* of 1 June. The totals for the nine months ended 31 March 1977 compared with the nine months ended 31 March 1978 are interesting: they are \$10 931 000 in 1977 and \$15 095 000 in 1978.

I have three examples: the Economic Development Department figure is up from \$132 809 to \$797 330. The Department of the Public Service Board is up from \$1 916 620 to \$2 363 953. Finally, the biggest increase of all is not specified: coming under "Miscellaneous", it is up from \$4 951 931 to \$7 727 956. Those are not figures I dragged out of the air; they are figures in the quarterly statement of the Government.

The problem, I believe, so far as the Premier's

Department is concerned, lies in his own inner circle of advisers.

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

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am just about to finish, too, Sir. The Premier's inner circle is inefficient, and his office is a mess because of the lack of competence of those around him.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member cannot continue in that vein. The honourable Premier.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I will go on with that later.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member has seen fit to reflect on the competence of people employed in my office. I suggest that he pay a little attention to the matter of his own competence. The honourable member suggested in his explanation that the increases to which he has referred are, in fact, mammoth increases in staff. The largest item to which he referred was in the Premier's "Miscellaneous" line, which involves not the employment of staff but grants for various purposes.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Will you enumerate them?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member only need look at the Budget lines and he will see that there were transfers from some other areas to my department in addition during that period. The honourable member ought really to do his homework properly, instead of getting up and talking persiflage (I trust he understands what I mean)—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Vaguely, but I don't believe I'm talking it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham that if he offends again I will name him. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Regarding the Public Service, the provisions in the manpower budget are that there is a nil increase in the Premier's Department, and that includes a number of offices, presently unfilled, being left vacant. The same applies to the Public Service Board. They are the two particular items the honourable member mentioned. I suggest that the honourable member does not try to ride his horse off without putting the saddle on first.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Education indicate the effects on this State's education system of the Federal Government's recent decision to end the funding of the State co-ordinating authorities in post-secondary education?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** First, the announcement which was conveyed to the people of Australia in a statement made by the Commonwealth Minister for Education (Senator Carrick) in the Senate came as a complete bombshell to all of the States. It was something that nobody had expected, and something which I believe has made all of the States quite angry.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** The new Federalism.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I guess it is one of the out-workings of new Federalism. When I first heard about this matter, I assumed that the sort of body to which Senator Carrick was referring was the sort of body which has been recommended to this Government by the Anderson Committee of Inquiry: that is, a co-ordinating body which may be set up in the future and which would seek to co-ordinate activities across the universities, colleges of advanced education and the technical and further

education system, however it is organised in any State. But, oh no, on further examination we find to our dismay that no further funds will be made available by the Commonwealth for our Board of Advanced Education, a co-ordinating body which has operated now for some years and which, of course, has been funded by the Commonwealth in furtherance of the aim to fund all activities within the tertiary education sphere.

Now we are talking about a sum of money which is not far short of \$500 000 in any one financial year, and the funding for this, of course, since it goes on a calendar year basis, cuts out at the end of this calendar year and therefore impacts on the State Budget to be introduced shortly this session by the Premier. The justification for this decision is apparently that the co-ordinating authorities are there for the convenience of the States, and yet it is quite clear that the co-ordinating bodies have assisted to do much work at the State level for the Tertiary Education Commission and the various commissions that preceded it. I imagine that the Commonwealth would be in a proper mess if New South Wales and Victoria were to determine that they would do away with State co-ordinating bodies, because it would then mean that the Tertiary Education Commission would have to deal directly with about 70 colleges of advanced education and similar tertiary institutions in those particular States. That is the dilemma that the States face: they have suddenly been hit with a bill they did not anticipate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Question Time has expired.

#### BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974-1975. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

Its object is to provide remedies for certain undesirable practices which have arisen in relation to the licensing of wholesale tobacco merchants under the provisions of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974-1975. The Bill provides for:

- (a) Monthly licences for wholesale tobacco merchants with the licence fee payable being assessed on the value of tobacco sold in the month occurring two months prior to the month for which the licence will be issued;
- (b) group wholesale tobacco merchants' licences to cover the operations of related companies and to ensure that all sales are assessable for licence fee purposes regardless of changes in the composition of a group; and
- (c) various minor amendments to a number of provisions to facilitate the efficient administration of the Act.

Under the present Act licences are issued to wholesale tobacco merchants for a period of one year from 1 October

and the licence fee is based on sales made by the wholesaler during the previous financial year. It has been found that under this legislation it is possible for a wholesaler to avoid payment of a licence fee appropriate to the level of his turnover in the following ways:

- (a) A company obtains an initial wholesale tobacco merchant's licence on the basis of conducting a business with a small turnover thus attracting a minimal fee for the first annual licence. Subsequently the wholesaler proceeds to conduct a business with a substantial turnover and does not pay any licence fee during that year in respect of sales.
- (b) A company does not renew its licence, either by relinquishing its business altogether or by transferring or selling the business to another person or company or to an associated company already licensed as a wholesaler.
- (c) A company acquiring a business under paragraph (b) above does not pay a licence fee appropriate to the additional business acquired by it.

It is likely that one or more of these situations will arise in South Australia following the recent surrender of licences of four wholesale tobacco merchants. As a result of these surrenders substantial revenue will be lost and it will also provide an opportunity for profit making by certain wholesalers. The remedies proposed to be adopted are as follows:

First, to group associated wholesalers, and therefore provision is made for the issue of a group wholesale tobacco merchant's licence. The grouping provisions proposed are similar to those applying under the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1977.

Secondly, to reduce the currency of the licence issued to wholesale tobacco merchants to a period of one month.

There is no change in the principle underlying the issue of wholesale tobacco merchants' licences, namely, that the licence will be calculated by reference to the sales made by the applicant for the licence in an antecedent period, and the licence when issued will apply for a prospective trading period. Honourable members will be aware that when tobacco licensing was first introduced the price of tobacco was increased in recognition of the licence fee before the fee became payable. That increase was passed on to the consuming public. The person required to be licensed thus normally increased his collection in advance of being required to pay licence fees. In these circumstances the proposed change to a monthly licensing system will not adversely affect any wholesale tobacco merchant who has acted within the spirit of the legislation.

The Bill also includes some widening of the powers of inspection, an extension of two years of the time during which proceedings may be commenced for an offence under the Act, assessment of licence fees at any time if a person has not applied for a licence, elimination of the transfer of licences, recovery of unpaid fees from unlicensed persons, endorsement of invoices issued by licensed tobacco wholesalers and other minor administrative changes. The proposed provisions are similar to those applying under the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Acts of Victoria and New South Wales which were amended in 1976 and April 1978 respectively to overcome similar problems.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes various amendments to the definitions contained in section 4 of the principal Act. The most significant amendments relate to the definition of "relevant period". The amendments here reflect the fact that this licence is to be, in future, a

monthly rather than a yearly licence. Clause 3 inserts new sections 4a to 4f of the principal Act. These new sections deal with the criteria on which a number of tobacco wholesalers are to be regarded as forming a single group for the purposes of the principal Act.

Clause 4 provides that existing wholesale tobacco merchant's licences are to expire on 31 July 1978. Clause 5 amends section 8, which relates to the powers of inspectors. The amendments bring these provisions into line with the corresponding provisions of the New South Wales Act. Clause 6 makes a consequential amendment to section 9 of the principal Act. Clause 7 deals with the fee payable for a licence. The amendments reflect the introduction of the new "group wholesale tobacco merchant's licence" and the new basis for assessing fees for the monthly wholesale merchant's licence.

Clause 8 expands the powers of obtaining information necessary for the administration of the Act. The amendment is in line with the corresponding provision in New South Wales. Clause 9 makes a consequential amendment. In view of the fact that wholesale licences will in future be granted only on a monthly basis, the provision allowing payment by instalment is appropriate only to a retail licence. Clause 10 amends section 16 of the principal Act. This relates to the manner in which applications for licences are to be made. The amendments relate largely to the introduction of the new group wholesale merchant's licence.

Clause 11 deals with the duration and renewal of licences. Clause 12 deals with the surrender and termination of licences. Clause 13 deals with the reassessment of licence fees by the Commissioner. The amendments relate to the introduction of the new group wholesale merchant's licence. Clause 14 repeals section 20 of the principal Act. This section related to the transfer of licences. In view of the fact that wholesale licences are now to be issued on a monthly basis, it is felt that there is no further need for a provision providing for the transferability of licences.

Clauses 15, 16 and 17 make consequential amendments. Clause 18 enacts new sections 27a, 27b and 27c. These new provisions provide, first, for reassessment of a licence fee where the fee has been assessed on the basis of a false statement made by the applicant and, secondly, for the recovery of fees from unlicensed persons who have illegally traded in tobacco without a licence. A third new section provides that a wholesaler is to mark consignments of tobacco in a certain way so as to facilitate enforcement of the Act.

Clause 19 provides that proceedings for an offence may be brought within two years after the day on which the offence is alleged to have been committed. Clause 20 enacts a schedule. This relates to the new definition of "relevant period" in so far as it relates to wholesale licences.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PETROLEUM PRODUCTS SUBSIDY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Petroleum Products Subsidy Act, 1965. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:  
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The amendments proposed by this Bill are designed to complement a scheme formulated by the Commonwealth under the States Grants (Petroleum Products) Act of the Commonwealth. The scheme will subsidise country freight differentials to the extent that country consumers of products covered by the scheme will pay a price which includes a component of no more than 4c a gallon by way of transport costs.

The scheme will operate by means of grants made by the Commonwealth to the State pursuant to section 96 of the Constitution. These grants will be in amounts equal to moneys expended by the State in subsidising sales of eligible products by oil companies and other registered distributors, provided such payments are made in accordance with schemes formulated by the Commonwealth Minister. The scheme sets out the respective roles of the Commonwealth and the State in the implementation of subsidy arrangements and details the relevant administrative procedures.

The freight differentials to be subsidised are based on costs submitted by individual oil companies to the Prices Justification Tribunal and accepted by that tribunal. Rates of subsidy are calculated by deducting from these differentials that part of the freight cost to be borne by consumers, namely 4c a gallon (approximately 0.9c a litre). For example, in the case of a freight differential of 10c a gallon, the consumer will pay 4c only and the remaining 6c will be covered by subsidy under the scheme.

The scheme in relation to the State provides that claims for subsidy are to be made only by oil companies and other distributors registered under the scheme by the Commonwealth Minister. Before such distributors may be registered they must enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth that they will pass on to consumers the full benefit of subsidy received in respect of all sales made at locations in the schedule.

Members will appreciate that the proposal is directed solely to subsidising freight costs in excess of 4c a gallon. It will therefore have no effect on the prices of petroleum products in metropolitan and other areas where freight differentials do not exceed the 4c subsidy margin. In addition, I would point out that the scheme is not related to, and will have no effect on, present motor spirit discounting practices whereby resellers in some areas are prepared to operate on the basis of minimal margins and large throughputs.

The present Bill brings the provisions of the petroleum Products Subsidy Act, 1965, into conformity with the requirements of the new scheme. The definition of "Commonwealth Minister" is altered in view of the fact that the new scheme will be administered on behalf of the Commonwealth by the Minister of State for Business and Consumer Affairs rather than by the Minister for Customs and Excise. The definition of "registered distributor of eligible petroleum products" is altered to take account of the procedures for registration contained in the new scheme. The definition of "the scheme" is amended to encompass the new scheme or any subsequent amendment made pursuant to the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 makes the operation of the proposed amending Act retrospective to 1 July 1978. Clause 3 brings the definition provisions of the principal Act into conformity with the provisions of the new scheme. Clause 4 provides that the appointment of

authorised officers first appointed under section 6 of the principal Act after the commencement of the amending Act shall date back to 1 July 1978. Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 9 amend various penalties in the light of present money values. Clause 8 increases the amount that the State Treasurer may advance, in anticipation of receiving moneys from the Commonwealth, from \$50 000 to \$200 000.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this Bill be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1978.

Motion carried.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury) moved:

That the Select Committee on this Bill have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until 8 August 1978.

Motion carried.

#### CONTAINING, CONTROL AND REGISTRATION OF DOGS BILL

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier) moved:

That the Select Committee on the Report of the Working Party on the Bill have power to continue its sittings during the present session and to bring up its report on 8 August 1978.

Motion carried.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs. Dunstan, Eastick, McRae, and Russack.

Library: The Speaker, Mrs. Adamson, and Messrs. Allison and Simmons.

Printing: Messrs. Dean Brown, Max Brown, Harrison, Slater, and Wilson.

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Broomhill, Corcoran, Drury, Dunstan, and Groom be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report on Tuesday next.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): On this first occasion we have had in this session to ventilate concern in

what has traditionally come to be known as the grievance debate, I will speak on two related issues, namely, the Government's grossly irresponsible management of the State's economy and the way in which the Premier, in particular, has studiously avoided answering any questions put to him by the Opposition on that subject this afternoon. One might have been forgiven for thinking that this was a "bash the Federal Government day", because that is about all we have heard all afternoon. Whatever is going wrong with this State, there is no question but that the State Government will blame the Federal Government for every single thing. Let us look at the questions that the Premier has studiously avoided answering. His own back-benchers have been careful to ask long Dorothy Dixers of Ministers, who have been giving long Dorothy Dixier replies to use up as much of Question Time as possible. Nothing has changed.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will decide on those matters.

**Mr. TONKIN:** With every respect, I am certain that the Government made the decision on those tactics, not on any ruling that you, Mr. Speaker, might have given. Nevertheless, the tactics were important and deliberate.

The Premier was asked first how he excused his Government's grossly irresponsible handling of South Australia's economy, which has resulted in a record working deficit of \$25 000 000 for 1977-78. His answer was that there was no deficit of \$25 000 000, that that was only the working result, and that the deficit now had been reduced to \$6 000 000 by injecting reserves. We have heard that one before, but the people of South Australia know well that it is the working result that matters: it is the \$25 000 000 down the drain, and this is money from the taxpayers' pockets, regardless of whether they are paying it to the State Government or the Federal Government.

The working deficit is \$25 000 000, and the Premier does not accept or admit that this is a record deficit for this State. It is a larger sum than is obtained by totalling this State's deficits over the past 10 years. In one year, we have increased that record deficit. The total deficits have been \$20 900 000 over the past 10 years, whereas this year we have a \$25 000 000 deficit. If the Premier and his gullible and vocal back-benchers, who are mouthing inanities, really believe that this is evidence of good management in this State, all I can say is that the Government of this State is in shocking hands.

Let us look at the next question, the Premier having totally avoided making any excuses, other than that it was the Federal Government's fault, and this was what he said all the time. I thought it was only fair to give him a chance to offer excuses, but he was not prepared to do that. Let us look at one or two items, and get them clear. The Premier tried to suggest that a \$25 000 000 deficit in a total Budget of \$1 500 000 000 was an insignificant amount, but I do not think that South Australian taxpayers believe that. The \$25 000 000 would more than cover the income from land tax.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. The honourable Leader has the floor.

**Mr. TONKIN:** They are wasting their time, just as they do most of the rest of the time. That sum of \$25 000 000 would more than make it possible for the State Government to relieve much of the burden of State taxation which weighs so heavily on the people of South Australia at present. More particularly, rather than comparing it with the massive deficit that was left to this Commonwealth Government by the Whitlam regime, it would make a great deal more sense if we were to compare the working deficits of the other States.

The other States have had the same deal from the Commonwealth as has South Australia. South Australia has not had a worse deal than has any other State, and indeed the Premier can in no way point to any evidence to suggest that. Yet every other State, with the exception of Tasmania, which has budgeted for a deficit of about \$2 000 000, has finished with a balanced budget. What is so peculiar about South Australia in that it has a record deficit of \$25 000 000? South Australia, we are told, has had a worse deal from the Federal Government than has any other State. Once again, the Premier has been fudging on this, and indeed he has been describing the exact opposite of the truth, with great exactitude, in this whole exercise.

He has suggested that South Australia in some way has been disadvantaged by the Federal Government and that South Australia has been singled out for this attention. South Australia has had a particularly good go from the Federal Government. South Australia—and the Premier himself said this—was due to receive about \$800 000 000 over a period of 10 years as a result of the transfer to the Commonwealth of the country railways, a negotiation effected by the Whitlam Government. In that time, we have received funds in South Australia, as a result of the railways transfer, that other States have not received. According to the calculations, the formula for this year, and the sum that will be saved in not covering the country railway deficit, South Australia should have at least \$100 000 000 more available to it this year than any other State has available to it.

Yet we still have a record State working deficit of \$25 000 000. All the States received last financial year an increase of 12 per cent in funds. In that time, inflation was controlled down to about 8 per cent, and every State received an increase in real purchasing power of a considerable sum, because with the control of inflation purchasing costs went down. The real purchasing value of that 12 per cent increase went up enormously. Every single State received that benefit, including South Australia, and yet while every other State, with the exception of Tasmania, is running at a balanced budget, South Australia still has a record working deficit of \$25 000 000.

**Mr. Allison:** Both States sold their railways.

**Mr. TONKIN:** They both sold their railways—quite right. It seems to me that South Australia, if it wants to be, and South Australians, if they want to be, can be completely confused by the Premier's continually blaming the Federal Government for the present financial straits in which we find ourselves and for the \$25 000 000 deficit for the year 1977-78.

**Mr. Wotton:** It's called hoodwinking.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That is right.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows that interjections are out of order, especially from another member's seat.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Every State in Australia has got to suffer some cut-backs. Every State in Australia is suffering from the financial stringencies passed on to it by the Commonwealth Government. No-one likes that, but South Australia is in a worse position than is any State to look after this rainy day for which the Premier said he had reserves put away, when it should have been in the best possible position.

This Government subscribes to the theories propounded by Mr. Whitlam, Mr. Hurford, and only recently by Mr. Willis, in Queensland, that the taxpayers of South Australia, according to this Government, must be persuaded that they have got to pay more tax so that they can support an increased public sector. This is the sort of spending that has brought the rest of Australia to its knees

financially and, if this spending continues with this degree of irresponsibility, it will bring South Australia to its knees.

**Mr. DRURY (Mawson):** I draw attention to the attitude prevailing in Australia regarding trade with communist countries, and particularly to the attitude of the Liberal Party in this regard. It might interest the House to know that in the 1950's and early 1960's I grew up on a diet of anti-communism perpetrated upon us by the Liberal Party. In its mad lust for power in the Federal sphere, it exploited the fear of communism and everything associated with it in order to stay in office.

**Mr. Keneally:** Those red arrows coming down.

**Mr. DRURY:** Yes, the two red arrows coming down from Vietnam towards Australia. The phrase used by the then Prime Minister was, "the red thrust between the Indian and Pacific Oceans". We now seek trade with that nation, which, according to the Liberal Party in those days, perpetrated that red thrust between the Indian and Pacific Oceans. As an example (and this comes from the press, which is not generally on the Labor Party's side), Mr. Lynch was reported as saying several months ago that China wanted iron ore. A report in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 10 May stated that one such fundamental change (referring to the Foreign Minister's statement on foreign affairs) that could affect Australia more than it could most nations must surely be the increasing emergence of China as a world power. The report stated that China's leadership since the death of Mao Tse Tung has made it clear that it seeks greater involvement economically and diplomatically with the rest of the world.

Let us go back a little further to the early 1950's, when the Petrov farce began. The then Government took the Petrov affair and exploited it in order to get the maximum mileage from it. After some months of a Royal Commission (and I might add that the Liberals in this State are very good at slinging off about Royal Commissions), it fined two journalists £100 each. Fancy: £100 for putting the security of Australia at such great risk! In effect, the then Prime Minister reduced ASIO'S credibility to nil by identifying its major agent in the witness stand.

The second step was the formation of the Democratic Labor Party, which the Liberal Party supported both financially and organisationally. To try to stay in office, the Liberal Party used the D.L.P., the so-called Labor splinter group, to retain its majority in the Federal House. If my memory serves me correctly, for most of the time when the D.L.P. was relatively strong in relation to its preferences, the Liberal Party held on to 22 seats federally. When the D.L.P. bubble burst, I think in about 1972, that majority disappeared. I notice with pride the way in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition evinces his support for the D.L.P.

Then we come to the disgraceful episode, the Vietnam war, when the then Prime Minister (referring back to the downward thrust between the Pacific and Indian Oceans) sent Australian conscripts to die in that country for no reward whatsoever. We got absolutely nothing out of it, except a continuing bill. I might add that it was also an inflationary pressure on our economy. Even as late as the early 1970's, we had the merino ram issue bursting again. It arose when the Australian Council of Trade Unions decided to place a ban on the export of those rams to the U.S.S.R. What would that country want with a couple of hundred merino rams? I am sure that, with a population of over 200 000 000, it would not want them to eat. It did not want them for that purpose: it wanted them to breed better quality wool. With better quality they will not have

to buy as much from overseas, thus displacing Australian wool from that portion of the world market over a relatively short time.

Another matter that has been quietly kept under wraps was referred to by the Department of Foreign Affairs as early as January 1978, but the Australian Government did not even bother to make a fuss about it. The decision to return the crown of St. Stephen to Hungary has to be seen of course against a background of the recent improvement in relations between the Hungarian Government and the governments of western countries, including the United States. I seem to remember that, in 1956, when the Russian tanks rolled through Hungary, the Hungarian Government was considered to be one of the worst Governments in the world. It was described as being oppressive, dictatorial, and a murderous pack of scum, and other adjectives of a similar type were used to describe it. Now, we have ambassadors there and we are trading with these countries, and the money which we get from these countries derives from their economies in which, unless I am to be corrected, slave labour camps play an integral part, according to the reasoning of the member for Glenelg in the debate concerning the Fraser Government's rejection of the recognition of the Baltic States.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Which you did not agree with.

**Mr. DRURY:** We did not say that. When the much-maligned Whitlam Labor Government came into office in 1972, Dr. Jim Cairns, the then Minister for Overseas Trade, went to China and initiated a trade deal worth about \$760 000 000 of secondary products, but no-one in the Liberal Party bothered to protest. Because the dollars were rolling in, they did not care. So much for their hypocrisy. Now we find that the member for Coles has moved a motion dealing with the treatment of dissidents in the U.S.S.R.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Given notice, actually.

**Mr. DRURY:** All right. On 2 May 1978 the following article appeared in the *Advertiser*:

Soviet terror growing, says Ukrainian dissident.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** And I hope it doesn't continue.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has already been warned. I have been very kind to him this afternoon. I hope he will not continue interjecting.

**Mr. DRURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think you have been too kind. This is what the Soviet dissident has said:

The protest of politicians in the West amounted to little when they continued to trade with the U.S.S.R. despite flagrant breaches of the Helsinki agreement.

If we are going to protest we should take it seriously and not trade with countries against whom we are protesting. The following article appeared in the *British Journal of Industrial Relations* in March 1978. The article, referring to four contradictions existing in the Soviet type of managerial system, states:

Finally, the fourth contradiction is between the long-term interests of the national economy and the short-term interests of the workers. The Party elite gives priority to investment and social consumption. In contrast, quite a few workers are concerned mainly with their immediate incomes, and the allocated material rewards often do not meet their expectations to the rise of which the Party elite itself has contributed.

When we consider that, in relation to trade with the U.S.S.R., it means that workers in the Soviet Union naturally look upon their interests in the short term but the Party elite look upon the interest of the Soviet Union in the long term. Therefore, if something goes wrong with the production system of U.S.S.R. that discrepancy has to be made up by imports of wheat, of which Australia produces a significant amount, or meat, or merino rams.

The Liberal Party has been harping for 25 years or so that in communist countries their systems are inefficient, they cannot produce for the benefit of the workers, they are despotic, they are governed by tyrannical Governments, and so on, *ad infinitum*. We find that we are constantly trading with these countries. All right—trade with them, but if you are going to trade with them, do not turn around with blatant hypocrisy and say—

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

**Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Not only are the people of South Australia becoming alarmed at the consequences of the proposed paper mill to be built at Albury, particularly at the silence coming from the State Government at this stage, but it is becoming apparent interstate as well that there is a very real risk. In today's edition of the *News*, an article headed "Polluted Water Fear in the Murray" states:

River Murray townspeople fear their water supply will be polluted by the controversial \$155 000 000 paper mill to be built at Albury.

They claim an environmental impact study prepared last year on possible waste effects on the Murray—South Australia's main water supply—is not conclusive.

Not only is alarm coming from the people of South Australia who are concerned at the lack of activity shown by the State Government but that article also states:

Mr. G. Arkinstall, health officer at the New South Wales town of *Corowa*, downstream from Albury, said today discharge from the mill could deteriorate the quality of Murray water.

"We lodged an objection six months ago with the State Pollution Control Commission but did not even receive a reply," Mr. Arkinstall said.

That indicates just how determined the Government of New South Wales is to proceed with this project. It intends to proceed at all costs, no matter what the consequences, and, in fear of embarrassing the New South Wales Government, the Government of South Australia is remaining silent on the subject at this stage. That is completely contrary to what was said in South Australia a few months ago.

Another article, in the *Sunday Mail* of 9 July 1978, states:

The paper pulp plant is exactly the type of development Works Minister and Deputy Premier, Mr. Des Corcoran, has been attacking in recent years because of the potential harm to the river.

This is the type of project that the Deputy Premier has been attacking in recent times, but unfortunately at the moment the Government is quite silent on this matter. The attack launched on the project by the Opposition Leader, Mr. David Tonkin, is almost as significant as the thundering silence from Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Corcoran.

It has been said on many occasions in this House that the River Murray is South Australia's principal water supply. There is absolutely no doubt about that. Adelaide is anything up to 80 per cent dependent on this source of supply. Now we have numerous people in Victoria and New South Wales expressing the same concern. Returning to today's *News*, part of the article, headed "No proof", states:

In *Berrigan*, farther downstream, the shire council claims impact studies on the plant are not conclusive.

"They do not prove waste from the mill will not have a detrimental effect on the quality of Murray River water in the future," a council official said.

In *Yarrawonga* the shire secretary, Mr. Don Presley, echoed pollution fears.

There is growing concern about this project. I have no intention of trying to stop any development that will help employment in this country, but if it is going to affect the overall involvement and the lives and wellbeing of countless millions of people in Australia, then I am very concerned.

We know what happened in the South-East with the Millicent project and its effects on Lake Bonney. I am well aware that that is a different process from the one being proposed at Albury. The plant at Millicent was a chemical processing plant, while the proposed plant for Albury is a thermo-mechanical plant, which is quite different. However, the effects on Lake Bonney in the South-East have been enormous and everyone in this House is well aware of the consequences. At that time the South Australian Government accepted responsibility for any pollution problems that would occur. That was an ill-informed, ill-advised decision to take, because the Government did not visualise the implications of what it was letting itself in for.

In the study that has been carried out, it is stated clearly that the waste should not be disposed of into Eight Mile Creek, above Albury, because the flow in the creek is insufficient and, also, the creek discharges into the Murray above Albury. That clearly indicates that the people of Albury are not prepared to have that pollution in their water supply.

A member of the Australian Dried Fruits Association salinity committee has suggested that any effluent entering the Murray River, or its tributaries, should be discharged upstream from the domestic water supply installation of the town or city involved. The reason why the member of the salinity committee made that suggestion is quite obvious: it was for the purpose of reducing the overall pollution problem in the Murray River. The effect would be that the residents of each town would have a vested interest in ensuring that the effluent discharged was perfectly safe.

There is obviously no intention at the moment to discharge the effluent coming from the proposed paper mill at Albury into the Murray River above that city. I think that is the acid test. Is the company concerned, and are the people of Albury prepared to have the waste material coming away from that plant discharged two or three miles above the point where the city of Albury takes its domestic water supply?

Quite obviously, if the people of Albury are not prepared to adopt that suggestion, they have grave fears about the quality of the effluent that will come from that plant. Not only the people of South Australia, including members of the Opposition, are voicing disapproval at this stage, but also the people of Victoria and New South Wales. We have enough problems in the Murray River system now because of salinity.

The Governments of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales are in the process of submitting proposals to the Federal Government for the removal of salinity from the Murray River basin. This will cost many millions of dollars, and I am the first to admit that there is better co-operation about this at the moment than there has ever been in the past. The Federal Government has provided a water resources fund to enable much of this work to be undertaken. However, there is little advantage in proceeding with work of this nature when at the same time we are embarking on further industrial development which will worsen the situation and put into the river additional pollution that will be harder to control than the salinity problem.

Like many others in South Australia, as well as people in New South Wales and Victoria, I would like the State



Government to come out strongly on this industry now to make certain that no undesirable pollutants will be put into the Murray River. Until such time as we hear a hard-hitting statement from the Deputy Premier and the Premier, we can only assume that the Government of South Australia is prepared to put its Party loyalties to the Government of New South Wales before the future of South Australia.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 July at 2 p.m.