

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 9 August 1978

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

## PETITIONS: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. **BECKER** presented a petition signed by 31 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community.

Mr. **TONKIN** presented a similar petition signed by 572 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. **HARRISON** presented a petition signed by 38 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.

## QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## EDUCATION POLICY

In reply to Mr. **ALLISON** (19 July).

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: The honourable member asked this question of me in the House on 19 July, without at that time specifying the school to which he referred. He quoted from the South Australian *Teachers Journal*, which at that time I had not perused. I now find, however, that the honourable member is referring to a matter which was brought to my attention some time ago. The departmental action which was taken in this instance was with my knowledge and support.

It has long been understood that the Education Department can intervene where disputes occur between parents and schools. Such disputes may occur in relation to the wearing of "compulsory" uniforms, alleged victimisation of children, progression of children through the school and the charging of particular fees.

Schools have freedom and authority to resolve these questions without reference to the department, but where no resolution is possible, the department clearly has a role to monitor and arbitrate. Departmental policy E.D. 809/3/80 of 12 January 1977 was not a new departure, but merely a formalising of a long recognised state of affairs.

It would appear, in view of the matter to which the honourable member has drawn my attention, that there remains some confusion in schools about these matters. In order, therefore, that these matters may be made more clear and guidelines established for them, the Director-General has established a School-Parents Relations Committee to report to him by early October on procedures to be followed in cases of confrontation, indecision, or disagreement between parents and schools.

Guidelines will then be promulgated in order that schools and parents may act more confidently with each other where good will and local endeavour fail.

## NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE

Mr. **TONKIN** (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith and that such suspension remain in force no later than 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. **TONKIN**: I move:

That, in view of the Government's continued failure to provide adequate information and its suppression of reports vital to the public interest, this House condemns the Government for its secretive attitude towards the Parliament and taxpayers of South Australia and, no longer having confidence, calls upon it to resign.

In January this year, the Premier summarily dismissed the Police Commissioner for a crime, as he described it, of misleading the Government. He said that the Police Commissioner had withheld information about the activities of Special Branch and that, as a result of this, the Government had misled Parliament and the people. For that, he destroyed an honourable man's career, and the repercussions of that event will be felt in South Australia for many years.

The irony of it all was that at the same time the Premier was guilty of doing exactly that for which he dismissed the Police Commissioner, namely, withholding information from Parliament and the people. The Government has been withholding reports, failing to answer questions, and dodging issues, and of this there are many examples.

Indeed, obviously if one reads the report by the member for Ross Smith in today's *News*, the suppression of information is a part of the Labor Party's style of Government, because, he says, the people of South Australia are too immature to have information given to them. I am appalled by that report. I have heard many times before a quotation by a former Premier of this State that one would not put poison into the hands of children, and I suspect that the member for Ross Smith will now go down in South Australia's history tagged with the statement that he has published today.

There are many examples of where reports have not been released, statutory reports have not been made to Parliament, consultants' reports have not been released and acted upon, and questions have either been sidestepped, or indeed not properly answered or answered at all, by Ministers. These will be detailed this afternoon.

Opposition members do not intend to speak at length on these matters, but a general widespread concern and anger exists. As many Opposition members as possible wish to speak on the matter and discuss examples of the Government's failure to provide information to the people and taxpayers of this State. Government members could filibuster for their full time in this present debate to stifle the issue and prevent matters being raised.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Chair will decide on matters in the House. It is not for the Leader of the Opposition to speak in that vein.

Mr. **TONKIN**: Thank you, Sir. I warn Government members that any talking for the sake of talking—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Leader of the Opposition knows the Standing Orders of this place, and I hope that he does not continue in that vein. Otherwise, I will withdraw his speech.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I say simply that the debates in this House will be scrutinised most carefully by the people of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TONKIN:** The most recent example involving the non-release of a report is still fresh indeed in people's minds. I heard the Premier speaking on the subject on radio this morning. I refer to the police report on pilfering at hospitals.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TONKIN:** I point out, with great respect, that, if I am not permitted to comment about the nature of debate in this place, it may be difficult indeed for me to reply to interjections.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition has most likely, during this session, been the most outstanding interjector in this House. I hope that he will not continue in that vein and that interjections will cease.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Thank you, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I must go further and say that this is the third time that I have had to call the Leader to order today.

*Mr. Gunn interjecting:*

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

*Mr. Mathwin interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Glenelg to order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. TONKIN:** True to form, the Premier called a press conference for, I think, about 3.15 p.m. yesterday. The press conference had to do with the report which had been obtained from the police about pilfering in hospitals. That report was not released in this House; indeed, it was not released at the press conference. All that happened at the conference was that the Premier gave an assurance that no evidence of pilfering had been disclosed. He said he could not release the report because it could reflect on people named in it.

The Premier was asked if he could edit the report and he replied that he could not. Now, there is some talk that it may be released in an edited form, but that has not yet been confirmed. The report has certainly not been released in this House this afternoon. I understand that there are suggestions that it is to be released to the media. If it is, that is because the Government has been forced by public outcry to take that action. It has been shamed into doing that. If it has not been and if it has no sense of shame in this matter, then its reputation must be even lower than I thought. The Premier said, as part of what must now be seen as a massive attempt to cover up, the following:

The report showed up the Liberal Party allegations about pilfering for what they were "sausage gate". There is nothing in it whatever.

Here again, his actions require close scrutiny as they totally affect the validity of his assurances to the media. The Public Accounts Committee was already examining the problems in the Hospitals Department when the Corbett Committee was set up and cut across the investigations that were already proceeding.

To make sure that there was no misunderstanding in the community, the Premier made a public announcement that a police investigation had been ordered. Having given due public warning of the investigation, he expects his announcement of yesterday that no pilfering was detected to come as a surprise and to be accepted without question as the true state of affairs. What a performance! The Premier ignores the Corbett Committee comment that the

discrepancies found were so large that, in its opinion, pilfering alone could not account for them, and he ignores the frequently repeated criticisms of the Auditor-General.

The Premier tried to hide the scope and nature of the investigation from the public. We still do not know, because we have not yet seen the edited report, what the scope and nature of the inquiries were and what his assurances of yesterday are really worth. He has further tried to influence the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee by forwarding both these reports, which in my view are of questionable value unless they are made public. The entire situation is a disgraceful reflection on the Premier and the Government, but it is typical of the style of this Government, a style which has been so aptly summed up by the member for Ross Smith today.

A further example of grossly misleading information was when the Attorney-General said in Whyalla on Monday that at the most only a couple of hundred people would be employed in a uranium enrichment industry.

That remark was totally misleading and inaccurate and could only have been made publicly because a vital report has been suppressed. This is a far more serious matter than the pilfering of food in hospitals; it involves all the people of South Australia. It is probably one of the most important and significant matters to have ever faced them; indeed, it could affect significantly the entire future of South Australia.

The Government has been withholding the third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee (it is still withholding it) since March 1977. This Government, totally divided as we know it is on the subject, has had a shameful record of deceit and hypocrisy in its attitude to the mining and enrichment of uranium, and the suppression of a report that should be available to the people of South Australia—

*Mr. Whitten interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Price to order. I hope he does not continue in that vein. The honourable Leader.

**Mr. TONKIN:** —is a further example of this Government's duplicity. The Premier's reasons for withholding the report are not based on rational attitudes; they are unacceptable from someone who has formerly advocated open government. Again, it does not take a great deal of thought to recognise that they are totally consistent with the present style of Government in South Australia; they are very revealing of that style.

On Wednesday 7 December 1978 the Premier answered a question on this matter, and included in his answer was the following:

The third uranium enrichment study report has not been to State Cabinet . . . It has been presented to the Minister of Mines and Energy and to me. Various aspects of the report have not been accepted by the Government— I suppose that was an accurate remark since he said a moment before that the Government had not received the report—

as actually the position which the Government can take on this matter particularly in view of the Government's policy on uranium. Consequently, the report has been sent back to the committee for revision on that score . . . The Government will not publish a report that is contrary to the policy it holds and expresses.

My colleague, the Deputy Leader, said:

You're telling them what to write.

The Premier said:

Of course we are telling them what to write, because we have a policy to which we adhere.

Later, he said:

The study will be published when the Government is

satisfied that the contents of it, first, reflect the factual information which is concerned with uranium enrichment, and, secondly, on policy matters contain the policy of the Government.

That sums up the basic contradiction of this entire matter and is evidence of the dishonesty of the Government, because the report contains factual information concerned with uranium enrichment. It is a matter of expert advice that has been carefully prepared, so why should it be suppressed? There is no question here of any policy raised in that third interim report. The fact that that report is extremely favourable to uranium mining and enrichment is no reason for the Government to suppress it. As a factual report, it is very much a matter of public interest and should be released.

The report does not suit the Government's attitude at present, and that is quite clear from an examination of the report. The Premier last week accused a journalist in this State of "thieving" a copy of that report, a totally unjustified accusation. Several copies of that report are circulating in the community; they were issued to people from the Premier's own department without any restriction placed on their circulation.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** You mean people asked for copies?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Davenport to order.

**Mr. TONKIN:** They did, and received them from the Premier's Department. That may have been a mistake; obviously, it was an error, but the Premier's remarks were totally unjustified. That is how portions of that report have reached me; it may have been the result of an error, as I say, but I can quite understand the Premier's obvious desire to suppress the report: it is totally contradictory to his Party's stance on the uranium issue. His Party is entitled to adopt a policy, however misguided, on a particular issue, but I totally dispute his right and his Party's right to suppress any factual report relating to that policy.

The letter of transmittal in the report is dated 23 March 1977. I will not read it all, because I do not believe we have time. It is addressed to the Premier and, among other things, states:

The concept of a uranium enrichment centre in the Spencer Gulf region of South Australia, which was the subject of the committee's second interim report, is now expressed in the form of an industrial and chemical complex that would be set up as a national industry to produce enriched uranium for export . . . It would not be concerned with the handling of nuclear waste, reprocessing of spent fuels, or the handling of plutonium . . . Multi-national participation is also desirable to enhance international safeguards that will be required for approved sales to be in accordance with the International Atomic Energy Agency procedures and to countries that are parties to the non-proliferation treaty—

Later, it states:

The Australian Mineral Development Laboratories have prepared a comprehensive report on the environmental requirements that have to be taken into account in actual site selection and process technology.

The South Australian Environment Department has supplied an environment study plan for guidance in the detailed feasibility study . . .

The committee is not recommending any specific site for the plant but its study has been centred on the logistics of the Redcliff site concerning which considerable information for planning and environmental safeguards is already known and which is of such dimension that it can still remain the preferred site and accommodate as well a petro-chemical industry utilising common services, housing and community

facilities.

The letter is signed by the Chairman (Mr. W. L. C. Davies). There is "An outline of a Report" as follows:

Based on the conceptual study in the Second Interim Report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, February 1976, a development plan for a uranium enrichment centre in South Australia is now presented for examination by potential private enterprise participants and the Commonwealth Government.

The studies leading to this presentation have included a further inquiry into technological aspects, including the availability of labour, material, supplies and services and the compilation of financial statements indicating the order of magnitude of income and profitability from the proposed enrichment plant in South Australia.

The economic, technological and social benefits to Australia and South Australia, in particular, remain in much the same form as expressed in the committee's second interim report, but these are expanded in detail to emphasise the importance of this proposed industry in the world energy supply scene.

A detailed summary contains 16 points, and I am not going to cover all of them, but I will mention the headings briefly. A development scheme for a uranium enrichment centre in South Australia is presented. It involves greater use of Australia's uranium resources by the export of Australian uranium in enriched form.

When fully developed, export earnings from enrichment can be expected to exceed \$500 000 000 annually in foreign exchange. The scheme overshadows in importance any other major industrial development activity in Australia in terms of new employment opportunities, technological advancement, and of industrial benefits to be reaped.

Establishment dates have been set to conform with production schedules submitted to the Ranger Environmental Inquiry. These dates may need modification in relation to Government policy decisions, but 1985 is considered to be a reasonable one for the centre becoming fully operational. It goes on with the detailed analysis of cost of each modular unit and the way in which the infrastructure costs for the whole scheme are made up, estimated at that stage at less than \$50 000 000, chiefly for the housing of construction workers and employees. The scheme could be put into operation with a capital expenditure of \$350 000 000, but the total expenditure would require about \$1 450 000 000 spent over an eight-year period.

Recommendation No. 11 is important, because it states that the industry has particular attractions to South Australia because of availability of labour in most categories necessary for plant construction and operation and for the support services. The industry will have a long operational life, and markets are expected to become substantial in 1985, but the development programme requires decisions in 1977.

One of the reasons the Premier outlined for not releasing the report is that it is outdated and outmoded. It is obviously not outdated, because it looks toward an operational date of 1985. It is very carefully researched; it is an exciting report; it is a feasible report. It is economically viable, and it is particularly efficient, inasmuch as it proposes sharing the infra-structure with a proposed petro-chemical plant. How can the Premier say that the report is outmoded, out of date and not relevant to today? The report, as I understand it, also covers general subjects, such as the energy crisis, and the current well-established use of nuclear power in more than 30 countries embracing over half the world's population. More than \$1 000 000 000 annually could come to

Australia through mining and enrichment, and South Australia could get a fair proportion of that.

Adelaide and Whyalla are ideally suited to centrifuge manufacture, while Port Pirie can supply sulphuric acid for hydrofluoric acid manufacture. Employment opportunities from mining operations are estimated to be between 4 000 and 5 000. South Australia is, or should be, particularly interested in the 5 000 jobs involved in the construction phase of an enrichment plant, and the 2 000 jobs involved in permanent operations.

It is estimated that further employment indirectly generated in the community could ultimately amount to 25 000 jobs. The possibilities to the Iron Triangle, and to South Australia as a whole, are limitless. In spite of the classic remark of the member for Ross Smith, that people are too immature to be given this information, all these facts should be made available.

*Mr. Bannon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr. TONKIN:** All these facts should be made available to the community to be weighed and balanced. As I have said, the Government is entitled to a policy; it is even entitled to change its policy; but it is not entitled to suppress such vital information from the South Australian people. If we are to participate in such a scheme, when will the decision be made? Which demagogue in the Australian Labor Party will make that decision and decide exactly when it will be safe to set this scheme in motion? Will we miss our chance? Will some other State or country take over what is presently waiting for South Australia to move into? There is nothing surer than the fact that someone will move into this area if we do not.

Obviously, the Government is well aware of the dangers, because it is keeping up with technology, exploration licences are still being issued, and its Uranium Enrichment Committee is still pressing for an urgent decision from the Government as recently as a couple of months ago. However, the Government is still continuing with its present policy. It seems to be determined to keep away from the people of this State any material that is adverse to its own attitude and its own policy stand.

This is particularly important in South Australia at present. I will not go into details, because the South Australian people are only too well aware of the drastic state of our finances, our wasteful expenditure and our industrial stagnation.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable Leader will link up his remarks.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I think it is extremely pertinent, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I hope that the Leader will link up his remarks.

**Mr. TONKIN:** The Government has emphasised in debates the question of employment opportunities. In fact, we have heard of nothing but employment opportunities across the Chamber in the past few days, and yet here is the perfect chance; this report, which has been withheld and suppressed from the people of this State, gives us an opportunity by demonstrating clearly the prospect of about 25 000 jobs in the next eight years. Yet the Government has suppressed that report. It has deliberately presented only its own Party-line policy. It has suppressed the report of its own experts in the field, and it has kept its own options open in a most hypocritical way.

It would be far less hypocritical if the Government were to release the report. People have a right to know all the facts. The Premier has made great play in this House on this matter, and has used it in some way to justify his suppression of the report of the motion that was passed in this place on 30 March 1977, one week after the third

interim report was submitted to the Government.

I seem to remember a motion in this place rejecting a need for a Royal Commission into the Salisbury affair, too, but the Government did not find that motion too binding. The Government has been totally unwilling to look at developments since March 1977. Indeed, it would probably like to suppress those developments, too, but even its propaganda machine is not up to that task. There have been major developments since 30 March 1977, and I do not intend to go into detail over them, because they are in fact peripheral to the motion before us.

I refer to the second Fox Report, the safeguards of the commission and the Federal Government, the requirements of the non-proliferation treaty, and the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Federal Government has fought two successful elections since publicly announcing its attitude, and the results of those elections are only too well known by members opposite. The Federal Government has taken the advice of its expert advisers, but the present State Government is not prepared to do so, nor is it prepared to stand up and justify its decision. The decision reflects the view of the left wing and is generally inconsistent and irrational.

Uranium is being mined and enriched and it is being used to generate power: this has been done for years. The world faces an energy crisis, with demands for energy increasing. The potential disaster from continuous consumption of fossil fuels is a real threat, whilst a technology hiatus in the development of efficient alternative energy sources is plaguing us. Nuclear energy, if not in Australia, must be used elsewhere in the world until alternative sources of energy are discovered.

The practical and responsible members of the Labor Party have recognised these points; I refer to Mr. Whitlam, Mr. Hawke, the Minister of Mines and Energy, and his predecessor (now the Minister of Education), but they have been forced to toe the Party line because of a decision made at the Perth conference of the Labor Party.

The Premier, by suppressing this report and holding to the irrational attitude that he takes, is fighting a rear-guard action. The Labor Party's attitude is typified by the attitude of the Dunstan Government: "Keep the uranium in the ground, and keep the public in the dark."

I believe that the Government will not release this report because it is afraid that the public will examine the facts and may decide that the Government's attitude is wrong. I believe that it is wrong. The continued suppression of the Uranium Enrichment Committee's third report convinces me that the Government, too, is increasingly aware that it is wrong, but it is not prepared to allow the public to see what its expert advisers think it should do in the interests of South Australia's future. How can members of the public ever be expected to know the facts or to make proper judgments, if the Government continues to keep information from them and treats them as mindless illiterates?

Let people decide for themselves whether the Government's policy is the correct one. I have dwelt at some length on this example, because it is a disgraceful example. It is a matter of extreme importance to South Australia. While the Government continues to ignore its experts, the people of South Australia are missing out on what could be potentially the most exciting and important opportunity ever to come their way. The time has come for the Government to stop equivocating, to stop being hypocritical, and to stop having two bob each way. The Government should decide "Yes" or "No", and it should let the people have all the facts, so that they can take part in that decision. The Government has a moral obligation to do these things.

Its attitude toward the third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee inevitably raises other serious doubts. What other reports are there that have never seen the light of day because they reflect on or conflict with Government policy or because they expose Government ineptitude, mismanagement, or wasteful extravagance? There are numerous examples.

The Juvenile Court Report is one example that I can recall from early in my time in this Parliament. The annual Juvenile Court Report was suppressed by the Government because that report did not coincide with the views and objects of a Bill being introduced by the Government. I refer, too, to the Duncan Report. People have largely accepted the Government's word for it until now that release of that report would be improper, but questions now arise, in the light of the Government's attitude, concerning its stated policy, if the heir apparent's word can be taken as stated policy.

I begin to wonder whether, in fact, the release of the Duncan Report might not be justified after all. Why is it being suppressed? In whose judgment should it be suppressed? Is it self-interest which is involved in this case, too? I do not know, but these questions have been raised in my mind again following the suppression of various reports of the Government: the Industrial Opportunities Study of 1971-72; the reports of forward planning in further education; industrial affairs; mining; the Land Commission; tourism; the Environment Department; the Agriculture Department; the transport authority; the general attitude to Questions on Notice; community welfare; and the refusal to provide proper answers to questions on that department.

There are many examples that I could give, but my colleagues will do that. It is quite apparent that the Government will release only reports that are favourable to it, or at the worst that are not unfavourable. The Government is quite prepared to refer an unfavourable report back for modification, and it is totally prepared to suppress a factual report not favourable to its policy, regardless of its responsibility to consider the general public interest. That is exactly what has happened with the uranium report. It is yet another example of the totalitarian attitude being adopted by this Government, and those people who still believe that we are not heading towards a totalitarian State had better examine these examples, too.

I raise briefly the question of consultants' fees. Last week I put on notice questions relating to this matter. A Budget line appears regularly in each department showing the fees that are being paid, and considerable sums of taxpayers' money are being spent. I have a statistical table of Extracts and Estimates of Expenditure 1977-78, with actual payments and estimated expenditure for various departments. I seek leave to have this table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

**The SPEAKER:** Is it purely statistical?

**Mr. TONKIN:** It is, Sir.

Leave granted.

**EXPENDITURE DETAILS**

Extracts and Estimates of Expenditure 1977-1978	Actual Payments 1976-77 \$	Estimated Expenditure 1977-78 \$
<b>ADMINISTRATION:</b>		
Payment to consultants for services .....	6 937	4 000

**UNIT FOR INDUSTRIAL  
DEMOCRACY:**

Payments to consultants for  
services ..... 642 40 000

**DEPARTMENT FOR  
ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT:**

Payments to consultants for  
services ..... 52 913 50 000

**PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD:**

Payments to consultants for  
services ..... 44 840 129 230

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

Payments to consultants for  
services ..... 48 828 120 000

**ENVIRONMENT DIVISION:**

Environmental studies—con-  
sultant fees ..... 8 659 44 000

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN AFFAIRS  
POLICY DIVISION:**

Payment to consultants for  
services ..... — 100 000

**STATE PLANNING OFFICE:**

Payments to consultants for  
services ..... 71 525 22 000

Total ..... 234 344 509 230

Additional cost of consultants  
1977-78 ..... 274 886

**Mr. TONKIN:** The actual payments in 1976-77 totalled \$234 344. The estimated expenditure on consultants' fees for 1977-78 is \$509 230. I know we have not yet seen the actual expenditure for the time, but the table shows that in this past financial year the amount estimated to be spent on consultants' fees exceeded the amount spent last year by \$274 886. This is a considerable sum. Mr. Jeffery, a former Auditor-General who gave distinguished service to the State, frequently said in his reports and elsewhere, "It is not how much money is spent which measures success in Government administration, but how well the taxpayers' money is spent."

If consultants, which are firms employed by the Government, produce reports that will lead to increased efficiencies and provide better value for the taxpayers' dollar, then I will say, "Yes, well done." I would support the use of consultants. Anything that saves the taxpayers' dollar is well worth while, but very few of these reports ever see the light of day. We have no way of telling what action, if any, the Government takes on these reports.

It was for that reason that I asked the Questions on Notice that I did ask. It is not good enough to be told that the cost of researching this material is too great, because if those reports were being used efficiently, if they were really being used by departments to increase the value for the taxpayers' dollar, there would be very little research needed in providing the information which I sought.

The expenditure is totally wasted if the reports are not acted upon when they contain positive recommendations. Just a few come to mind: the report on the amalgamation of the Engineering and Water Supply Department facilities several years ago, that has never been acted on; the report on the dental hospital; the report on Samcor; and the report on the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which still has not seen the light of day and which still has not been acted upon. These reports, I understand, have recommended changes that would have saved taxpayers of this State millions of dollars a year.

I repeat: there is no sign at all of their having been acted

upon. The question must then be asked: why not? We have every reason to ask for details; it is a matter of public concern and interest, and I repeat that, if those reports had been acted upon, the Government would have been able to supply details. If the money spent on getting answers helps bring those reports to the attention of the Government again and helps avoid waste, then the money is well spent.

Questions without notice are becoming basically a farce, as they are not answered adequately by Ministers. I believe that the Ministers, by dodging around the subject and by not giving answers, are in fact misleading the people of this State. This is something the Government of this State seems to have forgotten: it is the servant of the people, the servant of Parliament and it is responsible to the people, through Parliament. In misleading members of this House the Government is misleading the people of this State. Every bit of money that the Government spends is the taxpayers' money, not the Government's money. But it seems to me that the Government is totally unaware of that fact.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** They like to think it's their money.

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

**Mr. TONKIN:** Any examination that shows wastage, extravagance, improper practices, or any other matter in a Government department should be welcomed by a Government, because it will help that Government to get better value, proper value, for the taxpayers' dollar. The present Government does not care. It is afraid of what such investigations will show.

I believe there should be a far more detailed examination of Government spending. We should consider seriously the question of committee examination of Budgets, so that heads of departments are required to answer questions in far more detail than we are able to get through questions in this House at present. I believe that the Public Accounts Committee should be public wherever possible, and that it should hear evidence in public where that is possible. The Liberal Party would welcome a closer scrutiny of our Government's expenditure, because we believe that, in so doing, we can ensure that the taxpayer does get value for his money. This is the approach we intend to adopt.

Many other examples are covered by this motion: my colleagues will deal with them in the time available. In the meantime, I can only condemn the Government for its secretive and oppressive attitude in this matter. It has been guilty, on its own admission, of suppressing reports vital to the public interest, and of dodging and avoiding answering questions. I do not believe that it has the confidence of the people of South Australia in this matter and, as it lacks that confidence, I call upon it to resign.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):** The Leader rose to his feet to embark upon this speech. He gave us forecasts of awful, dreadful things for the future. His voice was tremulous with dread and dire forewarning. So, I listened carefully to what he had to say. First, he delivered himself of some great revelation on the subject of the member for Ross Smith, to the effect that that member had supported secretive government on the grounds that people were too immature. The Leader did not quote one word from the article of the member for Ross Smith.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** He said—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In that respect he was being unduly secretive because, had he revealed to the House and the public the contents of that article by quoting it, I

am afraid that his whole argument would have fallen completely to the ground. There is no such statement in the honourable member's article as that to which the Leader alludes.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** He's always careless with the facts.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable Attorney-General to order.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Warn him.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the honourable member for Glenelg and if he continues in that vein I will name him. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It is not surprising that the Leader does not take a great deal of care about the facts that he presents to the House, because that has been his mode, and we have seen examples of it in the past few days. Indeed, it was only last Wednesday that the Leader rose in this House, in the course of one of his usual diatribes on the subject of Government waste and inefficiency, secretiveness and failure to provide efficient government, and revealed to the public (and got a good deal of publicity about it—he was on all the television news services and on the front page of the *Advertiser*) that there was a 40 per cent higher cost for Government in providing frozen food to hospitals through the Frozen Food Factory than would be the case if that food had been provided through an independent wholesale outlet in South Australia, whose prices he cited. He again said that the Government was being grossly inefficient and was concealing the facts of its inefficiencies from the public. I have had his statements tested. The statement that I made on Thursday 3 August clearly established that any comparison between the prices of vegetables sold by the Frozen Food Factory and the prices charged by wholesale outlets was invalid. The Frozen Food Factory vegetables are cooked, processed and packed in trays ready for reconstitution and serving. The wholesale outlet's price is for frozen raw vegetables in bulk that require packaging for resale and cooking before consumption. There was no comparison at all.

I now have an analysis of the meat prices. The comparison between the meat prices is also invalid. Roast beef and roast lamb supplied by the Frozen Food Factory is 100 per cent meat. The product supplied by the independent wholesaler is described as roast beef and gravy and roast lamb and gravy. A laboratory analysis has been carried out on the two roast beef products and the results reveal the following: roast beef supplied by the Frozen Food Factory—meat 96 per cent, liquid 4 per cent; roast beef and gravy supplied by the independent wholesaler—meat 47.5 per cent, gravy 52.5 per cent (it should have been labelled "gravy and beef"). This means that the customer pays \$6.16 per kilogram for meat in the roast beef and gravy packs supplied by the private outlet, not \$2.93, and the price per kilogram of meat in the roast beef pack supplied by the Frozen Food Factory is \$5.20—below the cost of the actual meat supplied from the private outlet.

Whilst no supplies of roast lamb were available for analysis, it could be assumed that a similar result would be obtained. No comparison could be made with the steak and kidney because basic variations in styles occurred. The Frozen Food Factory product contains diced meat and sauce, whereas the product available from the private outlet had a considerable content of minced product. Of the samples available, no curry dishes were of a comparable nature. Curried prawns, curried chicken and curried sausages are not produced by the Frozen Food Factory. That is the sort of information that the Leader tends to put out at the moment, and he then accuses the

Government of being secretive, inefficient and wasteful, and of misrepresenting the situation to the public.

Let me turn to the Leader's first ground of complaint, which was in relation to the publication of the police report on investigations into losses from the Hospitals Department. Yesterday, I published in the House the results of that inquiry. I was sent a confidential minute from the Commissioner of Police through the Chief Secretary, and that minute contained the report by the Officer-in-Charge, Region K, on allegations of misappropriation in Government hospitals. That report contained, because it was written as an internal report, material concerning certain individuals some of whom had come under suspicion as a result of inquiries, some of whom had actually been named in the inquiry by the member for Mitcham, and all of whom were investigated. It was obviously improper for me to reveal those names or identities, and significant numbers of the paragraphs in the report referred to these people. I therefore published the results of the report, which were undoubted. The Police Commissioner's conclusion was as follows:

The conclusion of police investigations is that there was no evidence of any misappropriation but that deficiencies have resulted from wastage. This aspect has been inquired into by members of a special committee headed by the Public Service Commissioner, Dr. D. Corbett.

I have sent a full copy of that report to the Public Accounts Committee to assist it in its inquiries, because the police evidence should be available to the committee. The Leader of the Opposition says that the Public Accounts Committee should not have the evidence and that my giving the evidence to the committee is somehow a secretive action on the Government's part, although there are Opposition members on that committee.

I offered the inquiry report in confidence to Opposition members because the contents of the report could have defamed certain individuals. The Leader of the Opposition adopted the stance of some frightened lady, drawing his skirts away from the report and saying that he had absolutely nothing to do with it because somehow or other it could have led to secrecy in the matter.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** It stops him telling lies.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Minister to order. He is interjecting out of his seat.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Certainly, the difficulty of the report for the Leader is that it completely disposes of the headline after headline that has occurred, with his saying that there was some major fraud, misappropriation and theft of food from Government departments. It is clear from the report that there is nothing at all in that allegation. So, in view of the attitude of the Leader and his friends in certain sections of the press, I have excised from the report the paragraphs in which there could be any reference to certain people. Unfortunately, this truncates the report a little because it means that certain inquiries are not referred to in detail, simply because to do so would identify those people. However, for the rest I have already published the report to the press and, if the Leader wants it—

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Is this the edited edition?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That is exactly what I expected the honourable member to say.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Davenport. If he continues in this vein, I will name the honourable member.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member has the opportunity, through members of the Public Accounts Committee, to see whether this report has been edited in any other way than to remove from it the identity of the people to whom I have referred. Otherwise, it is as

it was. Undoubtedly, it does not matter what the Government says in this area. Immediately it does anything regarding the publication of material that knocks down what members opposite say, they say that somehow or other it is not honest material. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition went off on another tack this morning. He had the effrontery to say publicly that I had prevented a proper police investigation by giving to the people who would be investigated prior knowledge of such a police investigation by making a public announcement. There is absolutely no truth or basis in that allegation. I did not do so.

The fact that there was a police investigation was already public knowledge through the press before there was any announcement from the Government at all upon the subject. No announcement was made to the press by the Government, the press found out from the Hospitals Department that there was a police investigation under way, and published it. That was public knowledge before there was any statement from the Government, and the Government simply replied to the question whether there was a police investigation, "Yes", there was. If we had said to the press, "Oh no, we cannot tell you whether there is a police investigation," we would have again been told that we were covering up.

Let me now turn to the question of other reports, to which the Leader has referred. He would like the public to confuse various kinds of report that are available, lump them all under one heading, and say that, if any report is made by anybody to Government at any stage of proceedings, then in that case if the Government does not publish the report it is being secretive and guilty of a failure of open government. The Leader has never been a member of a Government.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** He's never likely to be, either.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I do not think, whatever the Leader's hopes are, that there is much sign of any sincere belief upon the part of his supporters that he is ever going to be.

Indeed, the dolefulness of members opposite on that score is constantly evident. If the Leader ever did have the responsibility of Government he would know that there are different kinds of report with which Government has to deal. First, there are reports which, by the construction of the bodies concerned with making those reports, are written for public purposes and are required to be made public. They are reports such as those of Royal Commissions, Select Committees, statutory authorities that are required to make annual reports and present them to Parliament, and the Auditor-General's Report. These people are required to report publicly and to write their reports for publication.

Government committees of inquiry are set up, from time to time, whose terms of reference are such that it is clearly intended that they will, as an independent body, write a report that will be published. In addition to those, however, there are reports of quite a different kind, and those are reports to Government which will be published by Government and for which Government will take responsibility as putting something forward as a position supported by Government.

Furthermore, there are reports from time to time on specific aspects of administration or of working parties looking at particular areas to be pursued in policy, and those reports are internal to Government and not intended for publication; they are intended simply to be working documents in the course of administration, and they occur inevitably in any organisation. When, in fact, reports are prepared internally in economic organisations in the community they are not, if they had not been intended



originally for publication, published. I have yet to find that the newspapers in this State publish internal working documents, either to shareholders or to the public, let alone to their workers: they do not. Nor, in fact, does any other executively-run organisation do so, because the ultimate responsibility for the publication of material must concern those who are responsible publicly for the material published. Where there is anything to be published for which the Government directly takes responsibility in putting it forward, then in that case—

*The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will have to warn the honourable Minister that if he continues in that vein I will have to name him. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Let me deal with the uranium report to which the Leader has addressed himself at some length. A draft third interim report—and it was a draft—

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Printed.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** What if it was printed? It was a draft.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I intend to name the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition for wilfully and persistently obstructing the business of the House.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** May I make an explanation?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the honourable member may make an explanation.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** My explanation is to the effect that interjections have been part of the Parliamentary scene for as long as I have been in this House, namely eight years. Members have been known to interject on numerous occasions in debate, and interjections have been welcomed on occasions as giving some life to the debate. Today, I believe, I have interjected twice, which would be a minimal number of occasions when one considers past practice. It is my firm belief (and I advance this quite sincerely) that it would be a disgraceful situation if I was to be named and excluded from this House today for interjecting twice during the Premier's speech. The Minister of Labour and Industry interjected twice within three minutes, and I am quite sure he would be man enough to admit it.

If I am to apologise to the House or to the Chair, I am willing to do so because this debate has been very much circumscribed this afternoon, but in all honesty I do not believe I have done anything by interjecting twice in this House in a fairly calm fashion in a procedure which has been followed in this House for at least the eight years that I have been here. I do not believe I have done anything to warrant my exclusion from this debate and this Chamber; I am willing to apologise, Mr. Speaker, if that is what is required in these circumstances.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I move:

That the honourable member's explanation be accepted. What has occurred has been nothing more or less than common Parliamentary practice. It was not an interjection made in the heat of the moment; it was not inflammatory. It is the sort of activity that goes on in every session of this Parliament, and has done in every session I have been a member. The honourable member has apologised to the Chair, but members must understand that this debate is of considerable moment and importance, on which considerable feeling has been generated in members of the Opposition. The Premier has been heard in relative silence, and certainly in far more silence than I was heard. In saying that, I am not reflecting on—

**The SPEAKER:** I hope the leader is not reflecting on the Chair.

**Mr. TONKIN:** No, I am not; I am trying to put this on a firm and sensible basis. The honourable member having

apologised, his explanation should be accepted by this House.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not accept the honourable Deputy Leader's apology. Since this session started, he has been consistently interjecting. I call on the Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I oppose the—

**Mr. TONKIN:** On a point of order, I have moved that the honourable member's explanation be accepted. I do not think that is anything upon which you, Mr. Speaker, have any jurisdiction in ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I rise to speak to that motion, which I do not support. The Speaker has for some time been warning members and I have indicated to members on this side that the Speaker's ruling must be attended to. He has persistently warned members in the House that he will take action if they persist in refusing the directions of the Chair. Those warnings have been given this afternoon.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Yes, but on one side. Talk about a disgraceful turn out!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

**Mr. GUNN:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask under what Standing Order you warned me and for what reason?

**The SPEAKER:** I warned the honourable member for interjecting.

**Mr. Gunn:** But I didn't.

**The SPEAKER:** When the honourable Deputy Leader was walking out of the Chamber, the honourable member for Eyre interjected. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Speaker has given, since the beginning of this session, repeated and consistent warnings to members and, unfortunately, they have been consistently ignored. If it had been a Government member who again transgressed after being warned, he would have received the same treatment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have already warned the honourable member for Davenport and, if he continues in this vein, he will receive the treatment. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Members must have seen me this afternoon speak to Government members and say that they—

**Mr. Mathwin:** You told—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have already warned the honourable member, and he will be named, also.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Of course I did, because I believe that the authority of the Chair must be upheld. The Speaker gave consistent warnings to the House. What has been happening here (and the honourable member who just interjected has been a prime example of it) is that when an honourable member is warned, he just sits and grins at the House and defies the Speaker. The Speaker's authority is to maintain order within the House, and that is required of him. He has carried out his duty. He had given due warning to the honourable member, who defied it. Where the Speaker's ruling is defied in that way, he has only one recourse. He has taken that recourse, and his authority must be upheld in this House.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I second the motion, because I believe that this House has traditionally seen a limited amount of interjection and that, if it ever has got out of hand, the Speaker certainly has called the honourable member concerned to order. This afternoon the Deputy



Leader has certainly not interjected excessively. Furthermore, compared to other interjections that have been made in the House today, the Deputy Leader has interjected no more than has any other member. Quoting an example, the Minister of Mines and Energy loudly interjected when standing in his place, and he received no caution from the Chair. I looked to the Chair and waited, but there was no caution from the Chair. In fact, you had your mouth carefully covered at the time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order in saying that, concerning my hand over my mouth.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Furthermore, the Minister interjected from the chair in which he is now sitting, implying that what the Leader of the Opposition had said was all lies. Members know that when a member is accused of lying in the House, that statement should be retracted, but no attempt was made to have the Minister retract his statement or to prevent him from interjecting. He was certainly called to order because he interjected when he was out of his seat, but not because of his interjection as such. The Deputy Leader has not interrupted excessively during the Premier's remarks this afternoon. His interjections, at best, have consisted of only one or two words. Earlier this afternoon, we had typical remarks from the Government front bench. You, Sir, stopped interjections later, but there were typical interjections from the Government front bench as the Leader rose to his feet, and there was no attempt then to stop them. I have no course other than to support the Leader's motion. The Deputy Leader has carefully apologised to the House. He has explained himself, and I believe that this House in its dignity should accept that apology.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

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

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN** moved:

That the member for Kavel be suspended from the service of the House.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood the Premier to say "The member for Glenelg."

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No. I said "The member for Kavel".

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Regarding the uranium report, as I said when I was so rudely interrupted, this was

a draft report and there were numbers of reasons, some of which I have given to the House, for not accepting the report, because it was a report which was to be published with Government authority and support, to involve people in due season who might be interested in this particular area, and therefore the Government had to take responsibility, not simply for publishing a report from people who might be advising the Government, but it had to be a Government report which the Government was fully supporting and putting forward.

There was within the report unsatisfactory information and interpretation of economic questions. The matter was referred back to the committee, and the committee has subsequently done further work and revised its estimates of demand for maximum down by more than 30 per cent. So the report was inaccurate in a vital respect of that kind. There was insufficient information on supposed employment implications, and the report was very much more optimistic than the Government believed, from its information, could be justified.

Further work was needed on international arrangements, and, indeed, a final report has been held up by the Federal Government's slowness to answer questions in this area. It has been repeatedly requested to do so. Members opposite protest about our failure to release information. The Federal Government is claiming that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country, but refusing information to our committee upon the safety basis of that supply.

There was inadequate analysis of the environmental impact statements and, in fact, it was never made available publicly. Indeed, I am informed by officers of the department that, far from the Leader's statement being correct, Mr. Knuepffer says no copies of the draft or later version of the report were given to individuals who expressed an interest in knowing more about the project. Mr. Knuepffer, the officer responsible, adamantly denies what the Leader has said on that score.

It is now apparent that, given reduced demand for uranium, world requirements for enrichment facilities have been moved back in time. Some members of the committee have subsequently said that changes in circumstances have been so great over 1977 and into 1978 that perhaps the original draft is not worth revising; it needs to be completely rewritten. The committee has also suggested the report should not be made available to private interests who could participate, as it could now be completely inappropriate for such purposes. The committee is not pressing the Government for an urgent decision on the release of the report at all. That is the position about that committee report, and for the Leader to say that somehow or other vital information for the public is being withheld from it has absolutely no basis whatever.

The Leader's next citing of a case goes back to the Duncan Report, a report of two Scotland Yard officers, an internal report to the Police Commissioner, concerning investigations into the murder of Dr. Duncan. The reasons for the non-publication of that report have been given often to this House. It was offered to the honourable member's predecessor as Leader when he queried it at a previous election. I said that he could come and look at it on a confidential basis, that we were not going to hide anything from him, but that the contents of the report were such that it could not be published. It contains material which was written for internal provision of the police, and it contains only one item of new evidence, not previously known, that refers to the change of statement by one witness.

For the rest, a great deal of the report relates to the

views of the Scotland Yard detectives about the veracity of particular witnesses who had already given evidence before an inquest and who, in any case that could ever be brought on this subject, would have to be witnesses for the Crown. The publication of the report would destroy any hope of our ever being able to bring a case of any kind, because it would call in question whether vital witnesses of the Crown, in fact, were already guilty of perjury. The allegations of possible perjury are again simply matters of opinion, and not matters of fact. How could any Government responsibly publish a report of that kind?

All that is known to the Leader of the Opposition, and he has the disgraceful effrontery to get up in this House this afternoon and impugn members of this Government by saying—and here is the imputation, the kind of evil which he is prepared to propound in this community—that perhaps it has been suppressed from self-interest. The Leader of the Opposition has made it a practice in this State to traduce people's characters, without care, without concern, and without basis. He has done so again this afternoon in this House, and it was a disgraceful action. But it is what we have come to expect of him.

As to the matters of the consultants' reports, consultants' reports have been a normal process of government for some time. I do not know whether the Leader wants us to have more consultants' reports or not. He has, as a matter of fact, gone around the State saying that any competent management consultant could cut 3 per cent from the running costs of any organisation. That view is very severely contested by the Public Service Board of this State, which is acknowledged throughout the Commonwealth as being the most efficient Public Service Board in operation in the whole of this country. It has just received encomiums from Dr. Wilenski as being by far the most efficient Public Service Board that he knows in this country. He is a man of very considerable competence in this area, and his competence in the area of Public Service organisations is widely acknowledged by Governments of all political persuasions.

There is nothing in this motion of the Leader's. It is simply the hope that the Leader has that he can grab a headline this afternoon and divert attention from the fact that his recent statements do not bear the slightest analysis.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Dr. EASTICK:** In the contribution just made by the Premier, he indicated that a certain document in respect of—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Light will resume his seat. He will have an opportunity to speak in this debate.

**Mr. TONKIN:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we have put a strict time limit on this debate, at the Government's request, of 6 p.m., and I am not sure the honourable member will have an opportunity. Standing Orders, as I understand them, say that such a point of order or explanation must be made at the time, otherwise it is not admissible.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is not a point of order. The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak in this debate.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Oh!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader knows better than that.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Yes, I do.

**The SPEAKER:** He will have an opportunity to speak during the course of the debate. He will be able to make a

personal explanation later.

**Mr. Chapman:** Why later!

**The SPEAKER:** I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. My comment then was simply that the member for Light is unable to make a personal explanation following an attack on his person by the Premier. To me, it seems not only perfectly reasonable, but indeed perfectly proper that he should have that opportunity forthwith.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The Opposition has the opportunity to name its speakers. If the Opposition member so desires, he will have an opportunity to speak.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Because the Opposition provides a list of speakers as a matter of courtesy to the Speaker, there is nothing in Standing Orders about a list of precedence for speaking. I still maintain that the member for Light in this debate may not necessarily have an opportunity to reply to the charges made against his personal character by the Premier.

**Mr. Chapman:** That's all he seeks.

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable member does not have an opportunity to speak during this debate, he will have an opportunity at the end of the debate.

**Mr. EVANS:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. I believe that you put the question to the House that the honourable member for Light have leave to make an explanation. I believe that that leave was granted and that the member for Light started to give that explanation. I believe that leave was granted by the House for the honourable member to give his personal explanation, and that he should now be entitled to complete it because this House decided that he should be given that right.

**The SPEAKER:** Is it the wish of the House that the honourable member be granted leave?

*Several members:* Yes.

Leave granted.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I simply wanted to put the matter in proper context. The Premier indicated that the Duncan Report had been offered to me when I occupied the office of Leader of the Opposition on the occasion of the 1975 election. For my own benefit it is necessary that it be indicated that the offer was not accepted for the very real reason that any subsequent leak of information from that report could then have been directed at me. I believe that any person who accepts a report with a proviso of the nature that was placed on me on that occasion, or was placed on any member of the Opposition in respect of the report yesterday, places himself in the position where he could be duly indicated as the source of any leakage in the future of that information.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** At the outset, may I say that it is in the most regrettable circumstances that I am having to speak second to the—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member will stick to the motion before the Chair.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** In fact, I am, Mr. Speaker. I am saying that it is in the most regrettable circumstances that I am having to speak second to this motion.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member to order. He knows that when the Speaker is standing he must resume his seat. I hope he will not continue in that vein.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. Could I ask why you called the honourable member to order and under which Standing Order you make that ruling? The honourable member was simply expressing the view that it

was regrettable that, this afternoon (and he may have been referring to this debate, the order, or anything else)—I am sure we all regret it, Sir—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader knows better than that. The honourable member was reflecting on a vote in the House today. The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not intending to reflect on a vote of the House.

**The SPEAKER:** I hope that the honourable member will not continue in the same vein as he is now.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I intend to speak on the industrial aspects of this matter later, but I point out now that the member for Kavel was to enlarge on the points developed by the Leader. I am gravely disappointed that I could not hear the speech of the member for Kavel this afternoon. I think that that speaks for itself. The Premier, in giving his reply this afternoon, simply tried to cloud the entire issue of wastage from Government institutions. He did absolutely nothing to justify the withholding of reports, as he has done on frequent occasions recently. He very much reminded me, as he has in this entire issue of wastage in Government institutions, of a man struggling in quicksand.

This afternoon the Premier dealt with a number of issues, which I shall come to shortly. The first point was that he tried to defend the member for Ross Smith who, he claimed, had not made the statement attributed to him by the Leader. In fact, I quote from today's *News* about what the member for Ross Smith has said. It is on page 31 in his weekly column, and is as follows:

All of these should be making democracy more real, widespread, and enduring, but experience suggests that we still lack the maturity to conduct rational community debate on controversial issues.

He continues in the article and says that the community unfortunately does not have the maturity to receive Government reports. Frankly, I believe that that is a sad reflection on our South Australian community, and an even sadder reflection on this House.

The Premier also tried to make some play of the Duncan Report and of the fact that that report had not been released. As the Premier said, the Duncan Report would have been released only on a confidential basis. That was the very issue that was at stake over the police report that we are debating here today. No responsible Opposition would ever accept reports from a Government on a so-called confidential basis. It could not do so. The Opposition would be compromising its position. That is why yesterday the Opposition flatly turned down the Premier's offer of reading the police report on a confidential basis.

The Premier's other main attack was to accuse various companies of not making information available to their employees, and hence trying to justify the position of his own Government. Despite what organisations do (and we know how vocal the Premier is on matters of freedom of information) and despite what the Premier talks about, the facts stand that the Premier has refused consistently to make available reports that this Parliament and the people of this State have a right to have.

I come to the report that has partly caused this motion to be moved today. It is the report from the police. Yesterday in this House I asked the Premier whether he had received the report and, if he had, whether he would table it in this Parliament. He said, "No". He offered the Opposition the right to see it on a confidential basis, but said that it could not possibly be released because certain names were involved and that those people might be incriminated, although there was insufficient evidence to

take legal action against them.

Now, we find that the Premier has changed. However, I point out that yesterday I challenged the Premier to release the report with those names removed from it, but he said then that he could not do so. Yet today, only 24 hours later, the Premier has changed his mind completely.

I now refer to the report because, when one reads it, one soon sees why the Premier refused to release it yesterday. The report is, to say the least, incredibly damning of the Government concerning its inefficiency and its incompetence to deal with the waste that is occurring in Government institutions. I intend to read to the House extracts of the report. First, I refer to paragraph 2, on page 1, as follows:

Early findings from the Hospitals Department report revealed that wastage was a governing factor, but did not appear to account for the full discrepancy. Consequently, pilfering on a large scale, even to the extent of a criminal conspiracy, was suspected. For this reason, the services of the Criminal Investigation Branch were sought in an endeavour to verify this suspicion.

In other words, the police were called in because there was sufficient evidence to suggest that there was widespread pilfering. In fact, let us call it theft, because that is what it really was. I now quote from page 2 of the report. This is the part that I find astounding, and is the very reason why, I believe, the Premier would not release the report yesterday. He did not touch on it or quote from it in his speech. The Premier has not told us in the House what is in the report, and one can see why. It is as follows:

This test . . . revealed that there could be a wastage of meat in the vicinity of 50 per cent through the cooking of more meat than that which was required by patients.

In other words, there could have been a wastage of up to half the meat bought by hospitals, this wastage occurring between the buying of the meat and its eventually being eaten by patients. No wonder the Premier did not touch on this matter today but went off on his gravy train and spoke about something else. He would not return to what the basic evidence shows. This evidence comes not from the Opposition but from the police, an independent authority.

The police say that there is evidence that up to 50 per cent of the meat bought by hospitals and other institutions has been wasted. What a disgrace! That is the real reason, that we now see, why the Premier yesterday would not release this report. Fortunately, the media and the Opposition put pressure on him, and, finally, we were successful. That success has shown that there was much to reveal in the report that would acutely embarrass the Government. I refer now to paragraph 10.1 of the report, as follows:

This examination helped to confirm the early theory that wastage was the major cause of the deficit, rather than the suggested criminal conspiracy.

Incidentally, paragraph 10.2 is missing, having been extracted: perhaps it contained a name. In the light of what is contained in paragraph 10 generally, I should like to know what was in that paragraph. Certainly, across the floor of the Chamber, I accused the Premier of possibly putting out a carefully edited and censored report. Having read the rest of paragraph 10, I suspect that my interjection was correct: I suspect that we have had a carefully edited report from which not only the names but also other parts thereof that may have been acutely embarrassing to the Government have been removed. I refer now to paragraph 12, as follows:

Hillcrest Hospital was checked in a similar manner to that of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the result was the same with waste the problem and not criminal activity.

Paragraph 14 states:

From inquiries conducted at Port Pirie, it was apparent that wastage of meat occurred to a large degree. For instance:

- (1) The head cook volunteered the information that the number of hospital staff who dined in the staff dining room varied between 10 and 45 persons, but on each occasion meat for the maximum number was cooked, and any attendance less than 45 constituted a wastage in cooked meat.
- (2) A physical check of cooked meat for patient consumption by detectives and staff administrators also disclosed wastage.

The point is that the hospital staff itself is admitting that at least for the meals prepared for it there was a wastage of up to 75 per cent or more: perhaps it involves 80 per cent of the meals actually cooked for the staff. It is stated that they prepared meals for 45 persons but sometimes 10 or fewer persons actually turned up to eat those meals. I now refer to paragraph 17, part of which states:

Certainly the deficits earned by the hospitals resulted from gross wastage caused to some degree through mismanagement by hospital supervisors. Evidence of wastage was examined briefly during the inquiry by detectives to further confirm that this was the major cause of hospital deficits in meat supplies, and not criminal acts as first alleged by the Hospitals Department.

Paragraph 18 states:

However, as lack of effective supervision is the reason for the meat wastages, it appears likely that areas of temptation may exist for individuals who are inclined to abuse weaknesses in the system. To frustrate any future attempts in this area the Police Crime Prevention Unit could be utilised in an advisory capacity to hospital supervisors on the employment of security methods, particularly in the physical handling of consumables.

The facts in this police report stand for themselves. The Government stands condemned for trying to hide one of the most gross examples of wastage that one could ever detect within government. This is illustrated by the fact that more than 50 per cent of the meat that arrived at Government institutions was wasted, and that meals were prepared for 45 persons when only up to 10 people turned up to eat them. These are the sorts of fact that the Premier was trying to hide yesterday, and it has been left to the press and the Opposition to bring them out.

While dealing with this matter, I should add that a lady telephoned recently to say that her neighbour, who worked at a Government institution, had recently catered for the guests at her daughter's wedding with food taken from the Hospitals Department. The lady who telephoned gave her name and said that her neighbour had largely catered for her daughter's wedding with food taken from a Government institution.

**Mr. Bannon:** Did you give her name to the police?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** That is the sort of wastage and pilfering which has been occurring in Government departments and which this Government has been trying to hide.

**Mr. GUNN:** On a point of order, Sir, why has the honourable member who just interjected not been named in a fashion similar to that in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was named? Exactly the same thing has occurred, and it seems that there must be two different sets of Standing Orders.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The Chair will determine when to call an honourable member to order.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** That is why Opposition members

have sceptical smiles on their faces.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Is the honourable member reflecting on the decision taken by the Chair?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** No, Sir, I am reflecting on the Government of the State.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** As long as the honourable member does not reflect on the Chair, he may continue with his contribution to the debate.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I am reflecting on the Government's inability adequately to operate Government institutions and to manage Government funds. What the Premier has consistently said and his refusal to release reports show that he has a complete obsession with keeping as much information as possible strictly confidential. This is not the only time that this sort of debate has occurred here: there was a similar debate in 1976. The Premier's obsession regarding confidentiality results from a phobia that he has about any public dissension regarding what his Government does.

Dissension brings into question the Premier's self-appointed position of grandeur and infallibility. We know the arrogance of the Premier. We know that he believes he is infallible. His attitude and performance in the House suggested that this afternoon. The Premier has consistently told this House and the people of South Australia that there is nothing to worry about concerning the wastage of food from Government institutions; it just is not occurring. He has told us that his Government has the situation under control and that what the Opposition and the press are talking about is absolute trivia. The police report suggests that up to 50 per cent of the meat is disappearing or being wasted; I would not call that trivial.

I think it again shows that the Premier will not accept any criticism of his Government. He believes he is infallible and acts like a peacock to maintain that position. In fact, he is paranoid about any public dissension with his Government, and he treats personal criticism almost as though it is a criminal offence. The Premier is egotistic and arrogant. He has imposed upon this State a different meaning for the word "democracy". He has implied that everyone should consult with the South Australian Government but the South Australian Government apparently has no responsibility to tell anyone what is going on. Compare that with some of the Premier's statements about companies and how they should release information to shareholders, employees and trade unions. Look at the Government's own industrial democracy policy:

Disclosure of information in the following areas is of major concern to trade unions.

They talk about costs, pricing structures, plant and product breakdown where applicable, turnover, financing and development. That is the sort of information disclosure with which the Government is threatening private companies, yet it is not prepared to apply the same principles to itself. The Government is hypocritical. Let us look at some of the other examples of the Government's failure to release information. I refer, first, to the monthly report presented to the Premier which is a summary of the state of the South Australian economy, and I have a copy of the May 1978 report. This report is prepared by the Economic Development Department, and it goes to the Premier. The Premier has refused to release copies of this report.

**Mr. Millhouse:** He says it has confidential material in it sometimes.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** He says it is confidential material, but let us look at what this report contains. The reason the Premier classes it as confidential is that the report is extremely critical of the economic state of South

Australia. It points out the gloom that this State is likely to face. I suggest that the Premier's definition of "confidential" is any information that may be against the best interests of his Government. The report summary states:

For South Australia the prospect is even less bright as building activity in both the housing and non-housing areas remains depressed, and the motor vehicle industry faces further declines in employment. . . . Even so, South Australia can experience a protracted period of above-average unemployment at a time when unemployment nationally remains high.

This report, which the Premier has refused to release, clearly states that this State will have above-average unemployment. It states that the building industry, both in the housing and non-housing sector, is on the decline. That is the kind of information that the Premier consistently refuses to release to this House and the public of South Australia. At page 8, dealing with the employment section, the report states:

In the 11 years for which the division has collected end-of-quarter-employment levels in South Australia for 20 major manufacturers, the fall of 1 065 in their level of employment in the latest period is the third worst March quarter result. Excluding the two motor vehicle manufacturers, the fall in employment in the 18 other firms was 474, the second worse March result since 1972.

Economic data is given to the Premier which damns not only the statements that he has made to the press and to this House, but also his confidence in this State's economy. Things are going bad and the Premier will not admit it. Page 14 of the report (and I repeat that this is a confidential report that the Premier will not release) states:

On a State basis, South Australia had the highest proportion of respondents experiencing poor trading and profit results in the March quarter, and expectations for the June quarter's trading results in this State are worse than those held for the March quarter.

Again, that is evidence that things are getting worse in this State, yet the Premier tries to hide that sort of documentation, treating it as confidential and not releasing it. I believe that manufacturers and the people of this State have a right to be told what is happening. If they were given that sort of information, perhaps some action could be taken to retrieve the situation. There is nothing more dangerous than a Government that boldly strides on irrespective of what is happening, because eventually it will be boldly striving through a place of industrial ruin.

I turn now to the Industrial Opportunity Study of 1970-71. Only two weeks ago I asked the Premier to release the report of this study, which was prepared for the industrial section of the Premier's Department. This is what one would call a gap study; in other words, it proposes ways to broaden the industrial base of South Australia and fill the industrial gaps. The Premier refused to release a copy of the report, saying that the study was not a good one and that he had now ordered another study. What the Premier is really admitting is that the Government has failed to attract new manufacturing industry to this State.

It is not that that study was not a good one, but it told the Government how to proceed, and the Government tried and failed. If what the Premier claims is true, why did the Economic Development Department go to the trouble of interviewing 44 of the 190 companies listed in the report as companies that should be invited to establish in this State? Those are not the actions of a Government which has rejected a report. I suggest that the Government, in fact, carried out the instructions in the report and failed. It failed not because of the report but because of other

factors—because of the cost structure it has built up for manufacturing industry in this State and because manufacturing industry can no longer compete with interstate industries.

That is the real reason why the Premier will not release the report. I was fortunate to get a copy of the report (it was not thieved, as the Premier so readily likes to say), which clearly indicates the strategy that should be adopted by the Government. There is no reason in the world why that strategy should not work; it simply earmarks the 190 companies that should be approached to establish manufacturing facilities in South Australia. Most of those companies concerned were approached. As the report was brought down in April 1972, the Government has had six years either to reject it and have another report prepared or to try to carry out the strategy set out in the report. The Government tried to carry out the strategy and failed miserably. Now, six years later, the Premier is trying to stall by saying that the Government is obtaining another report.

There are other important areas on the industrial scene where the Government has refused to release information. The Premier, on a number of occasions refused to release the agreements relating to O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited despite the fact that the Government injected \$1 000 000 of both loan and guaranteed fund moneys into that company. I asked for the agreement between the Government and the new company, Golden Breed Proprietary Limited; I also asked for the agreement involving Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, and the taking over of stock from the old company, O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited. Those requests were refused, because they exposed incompetence on the part of the South Australian Government.

Now that the South Australian Government has established this new company, in which it has a 50 per cent shareholding, Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, it has not tabled in this House or released publicly the annual report or any information about that company. So, we have the Premier abusing companies for failing to release information beyond what they already release to their shareholders and to the public, and yet a company which is half owned by the Government and in which the public owns half the funds through the Government has not released any report either on its financial status or on any future development. That is the sort of hypocrisy the Premier and his Government carry on with.

Many other similar reports have not been released by the Government. It has failed to release the report presented to the Premier in July of this year, prepared by Cheesman, Doley, Neighbour and Raffin Proprietary Limited, on the development of a convention centre in South Australia. The member for Fisher asked a question about that and received an answer only yesterday. The Government again refused to supply the information he requested. These are just some of the many examples where the Government has failed to keep this State and the public fully informed on what is going on. It has been a Government of secrecy, despite its public utterances to the contrary. In the *Advertiser* of 1 November last year, the Attorney-General, a man who must feel very uncomfortable at this stage, released details in a press statement that he intended to legislate for freedom of information in this State. He has made that as a public utterance and yet his own Premier continually refuses to release information from his Government, especially if that information embarrasses the Government in any way.

This Government is arrogant; it is scared of public criticism and is obsessed lest anyone should get any information and dissent from what the Government

believes. The Leader of the Opposition clearly pointed out that over the third uranium report the Government is embarrassed, not because the report criticises the Government but because it is a factual report and it embarrasses the Government because the Government will not face the truth. The report has outlined development opportunities for South Australia, and the Premier would rather have the people of this State not know what those opportunities are. Why? Because he is completely hung up on the Federal Labor Party policy that uranium mining and enrichment will not go on in Australia, let alone in South Australia.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** It's also the policy—

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I thought interjections were out of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! That is a matter for the Chair to decide. The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr. Abbott:** You should be saying that of your own colleagues.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Spence is out of order. The honourable member for Davenport.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The Government stands condemned for its failure to release information on reports vital to this State. The Government has now released the report on the Hospitals Department, and that report will acutely embarrass the Government. It has released it only because of public pressure and pressure from the Opposition. It stands condemned and it certainly will not have the confidence of this State when it is prepared to try to hide facts that reveal up to 50 per cent of wastage of meat in Government institutions. That is why we, the Opposition, have moved this motion today; we have no confidence in the Government, and the public has none, either.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before calling upon the Chief Secretary to speak, I should like to point out to the House that earlier today the Speaker set a standard for the House in connection with interjections. I seek the co-operation of all members of the House to cease interjecting while members speak to the remainder of this debate between now and 6 o'clock.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary):** This motion, like the person who moved it, is a complete sham. How sincere the mover's own members regarded his speech to be was shown by the almost complete lack of attention they paid to it while he was making it. They gave far more attention to the Premier when he was replying than to their own Leader, and with very good reason. It shows they are not completely stupid. If they are prepared to listen to the Premier, they may learn some facts, but they had no chance of learning when their own Leader was speaking.

The motion purports to deal with the Government's failure to make reports available. Actually, most of the Leader's speech was devoted either to canvassing the merits of uranium enrichment, which is a matter that has already been decided by the House, or to making misrepresentations such as those he made in relation to an article in today's *News* by the member for Ross Smith. It may be opportune to look at that article because it goes to the nub of this debate. I congratulate the member for Ross Smith on a very succinct summary of the position of democracy in this State. I have been in the House for some eight years and I have come to much the same conclusions as the member for Ross Smith has. He has, in his first year, summed up the unfortunate weakness in democracy as practised in this State by members of the Opposition and by the press. The honourable member said:

Greater freedom of information and open government are talked about and widely supported.

There is no greater supporter of that than I am. He continued:

All of these should be making democracy more real, widespread and enduring, but experience suggests that we still lack the maturity to conduct rational community debate on controversial issues.

That is not just a wild statement. The member for Ross Smith went on to give examples of it:

A prime example of this is the North-East transport route study.

I urge members of this House and of the public to read this speech because it draws attention to a serious weakness in our democratic processes. He went on to talk about the report that was issued relating to the control and registration of dogs. I have never seen such a pathetic response on the part of the public and certain groups of it, aided and abetted by the Opposition, as in this case. It was a report prepared by a committee that had some expertise in the area. It was put forward by the Government as an essay in open government for the public to debate the suggestions and controls put forward in that report; and the response to it has been enough to destroy anyone's faith in the democratic process, because we have had cases of people immediately shooting or disposing of valuable Afghan hounds because they were not prepared to pay the possible increase in registration. We have had more misrepresentation about this than about almost any issue I have seen in the last three years in this House. So I think the member for Ross Smith's point was borne out by that example. He then went on to say:

Again, a sane and reasoned discussion of the facts about the drug—

he was referring to cannabis—

and a whole range of options for its control has not resulted in rational debate but in the strident voicing of fixed positions, and the attempt (regrettably endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition) to turn it into an attack on the Government for daring to allow the release of such a report. If attempts at public consultation are turned into partisan attacks—

which is what the Leader of the Opposition is trying to do constantly in this House—

one can understand a reluctance by a Government, whatever its political colour, to release details of its policy options. Firm and final decisions after internal consideration at least seem to shorten the period of controversy and political acrimony. Can we develop a more mature response? Unless we do, open government will never become a reality, and our democratic process will suffer accordingly.

I think that that sums up the position well, and I suggest that the Opposition might well consider what part it is playing in destroying the democratic process in this State. Certainly, it is far more to blame, because of the attitudes it has taken on many of these things, than is the Government. I do not often make speeches of this kind, but I think the media in South Australia, as generally in most of Australia, is one of the worst enemies of democracy, instead of being one of its protectors. So much for that article, but I think that it is important.

If we take out the misrepresentations that the Leader voiced concerning that article and take out his canvassing of the merits or demerits of uranium enrichment, there is almost nothing left in his speech. I have sat through many of these debates, particularly in the past year. I think that, as a result of the most recent election, someone in the Liberal Party must have got on to the Opposition and said, "You'd better look as though you're alive and in Opposition, and as though the Government is worthy of



censure, and move some motions." At one stage last year there was a veritable spate of motions of censure moved by the Opposition and we could not get on with the business of the House because of them. I have sat through many of these debates, and I have come to have a feeling of sorrow for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Let us put ourselves in his place. First, the Leader made a so-called attack on the Government that was pathetic in its weakness. The Premier answered it and, almost in one speech, he achieved over-kill. The Deputy Leader somehow has to support what has already been destroyed completely. I have often felt sorry for him, and I believe that he felt sorry for himself today and decided to opt out. He entered on a course of action that at least got him off the hook in this debate.

The consequence is that, to some extent, I am now feeling sorry for myself, because again I have to support a case that has been so well put by the Premier that there is little left for me to say against a motion so weak in the first place that it has not been worth four hours of the time of the House to debate (if we include the Question Time we have lost this afternoon).

First, the Leader is still trying to get the utmost out of the horse that has already been flogged to death. I refer to his comments about the dismissal of the former Commissioner of Police. The Leader of the Opposition, in the Address in Reply debate last week, made the same attempt to raise this issue, and talked about Mr. Salisbury's dismissal. He repeated it again today, in an attempt to show that it is somehow related to an unwillingness by the Government to make reports available.

In fact, I think that the incident should be put to death completely. I hope that the whole regrettable thing will now be decently buried. I will read, for the Opposition's benefit, the answers to the specific questions before the Royal Commission, as set out at page 47 of the Commissioner's Report, as follows:

Whether Harold Hubert Salisbury, the former Commissioner of Police, misled the Government by his communications to it as to the nature and extent of the activities of the Police Special Branch.

The Royal Commissioner's answer was "Yes". The second question was as follows:

Whether the decision of 17 January 1978 to dismiss Harold Hubert Salisbury from the office of Commissioner of Police was justifiable in the circumstances.

Again, the Royal Commissioner's answer was "Yes". I think that it is about time the Opposition accepted those findings. There was a full inquiry. Yesterday, the member for Mitcham complained about the cost of Royal Commissions. The Royal Commission set up into that matter investigated thoroughly, and the Commissioner brought down those unequivocal findings; yet, the Leader of the Opposition, in order to try to make political capital out of the whole business, is still bringing it up and trying to attack the Government over it. It is about time that he showed the maturity which the member for Ross Smith says is lacking in public debate on some of these issues. When he attempts to do that, he will begin to look like a possible alternative to the Premier, but as it is there is no chance of his getting there, thank goodness.

The second matter he canvassed at some length was the matter of the uranium enrichment plant. The Leader criticised the Premier for saying, "We have a policy to which we adhere." Certainly the Opposition cannot be accused of that fault, if it is one, because the gyrations of the Leader on this issue are well known. The policy to which we are accused of still adhering was set down in the House on 30 March 1977. I am surprised that the

Opposition raised that date and decision because I would have thought that, at this stage, the last thing it would want to do would be to have that matter raised. The motion the Premier moved on that day was as follows:

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

The Leader, speaking as though it was a simple matter to adhere to this policy, said:

It is difficult to find fault with this motion.

They were the opening words of his speech in the debate. He concluded by moving an amendment to the motion by adding certain words to it, but there was no denial of the sense of the motion itself. He moved an amendment to add the following words:

and further believes that the South Australian Government should give the greatest possible financial support to research into the use of solar energy and other alternative energy resources as a matter of extreme urgency.

The Minister of Mines and Energy said:

First, I find nothing offensive in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition . . .

That is the truth of the matter. The motion was moved by the Government and the Leader said that he found it difficult to find anything wrong with it, except for the addition of his amendment, to which the Government readily agreed. The motion was adopted unanimously by the House on 30 March 1977, and is the basis of the policy to which the Government has subscribed ever since, but we are accused of doing something wrong by adhering to it. I have never come across a more sensible or rational motion in the interests of humanity than that, and I hope that it will get unanimous support until it has been demonstrated that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country. That is the tenor of the resolution adopted by the House, and I think that it should stand. If it can be demonstrated that it is safe to sell uranium to a customer country, well and good, because we could use Australia's resources.

To introduce such wild allegations about 25 000 new jobs is again a complete misrepresentation of the matter, because the whole process by its very nature will not provide anywhere near that number of jobs. To raise such red herrings is absolutely disgraceful, especially as the motion carried in this House is in the interests of mankind generally.

The Leader, because of pressure from the Deputy Leader of the Government in Canberra, which he supports, and because big mining interests in Australia desire to make money out of uranium, brings up red herrings in the way of the enormous amount of employment that we are supposed to be forgoing.

True, whatever employment we are forgoing as the result of adhering to this policy is much regretted by members on this side. I assure the House of that, but the job prospects are nowhere near 25 000. That number is a mere figment of the Leader's imagination, and he would certainly be more responsible if he were more honest in this area.

The Premier has dealt with the deficiencies in the report that he returned for reconsideration. He referred to the considerably reduced demand for uranium and inaccurate employment prospects. Surely, if we are to put this matter forward as a basis for public discussion, and as a possible basis from which industry can plan, it is desirable that, apart from the possibility of industry being established, the public has accurate information to work on. The Premier was justified in sending back the report for further



consideration because of the errors in it.

The Leader has also referred to the Duncan Report. I think he said something like this, "The public has accepted the desirability of the suppression of the Duncan Report, but now doubts are raised in my mind." That is because of the doubts that he has deliberately tried to raise in the mind of members of the public over this last episode.

The truth is as the Premier has pointed out, not once but many times, the release of the Duncan Report would be unfair to people who were named in it, and who were properly investigated, but against whom it was not possible to sustain a charge. It is just not good enough for the Opposition to say, "You have to release the report, regardless of whether it harms individuals and of whether it is a fair report."

I am not saying that the conclusions were not fair; I am saying that its release would be unfair, given that people were named in it. It is about time that the Opposition adopted a more mature attitude on this matter and stopped raising it as though it was something that the Government was trying to hide. Certainly, I can assure members opposite that, from the discussions I have had, I know that, if we could bring the people involved in that area to justice, we would be happy to do it.

I now refer to a matter that has been one of the reasons for this ridiculous motion; that is the police report into the alleged pilfering of meat from Government hospitals. First, I believe the same principle applies in this case as applied to the Duncan Report. The Premier has made clear that the police quite properly carried out an investigation into all the leads that they could follow up. I received the report originally from the Commissioner of Police and I am satisfied that those inquiries were thorough.

In order to make those inquiries the police followed up all the possible lines of investigation. Naturally, if there are allegations or rumours of people pilfering meat, especially on a large scale, it means that specific people and their actions have to be investigated. The conclusions of the Commissioner of Police, as the Premier has told us, were that there was no evidence of any large-scale criminal activity in this area, that there might (and it was no more than that) be cases of petty pilfering, but that there was no evidence that anything criminal had been done by the various people concerned. In these circumstances, are we to agree that a report that names specific people, who have been found innocent, should be released for public discussion? If that is the standard of the ethics and morality of members of the Opposition, it is a good thing that they are the Opposition.

The member for Davenport attempted to build on this campaign by referring to paragraph 10.2 of the report. However, just to put his mind at rest on that, there is no paragraph 10.2 in the original report. All the elaborate hoo-hah that he put up about things being cut out by the Government in this version edited to protect innocent people is just so much nonsense.

Yesterday, the Premier, at the beginning of proceedings of the House, said that he would make available to the Public Accounts Committee a copy of the report. Surely, if Opposition members on that committee do their job, they will carefully examine the report and compare it to the edited version that has been released for the public, so as to see for themselves whether the Premier was deliberately trying to withhold information. I hope those honourable members then will have the decency to admit to this House that the Premier was acting in good faith when he made that statement.

The member for Davenport raised two or three matters about which he was upset, that he has not been able to get

his hands on to misrepresent. He alleged that a monthly report earlier this year points out the gloomy economic state of South Australia. We have heard much nonsense from the Opposition at various times about the need to maintain confidence in the private sector.

True, investment decisions are largely dependent upon the confidence of private entrepreneurs. In these circumstances, and given the persistent knocking of South Australia by the Opposition, their confidence would suffer. Because of the Opposition's decrying our economic future, it is not surprising that a confidential report, which was issued as a guide to the Government, has not been made public. Making it public would only compound the damage already being done by the Opposition. It is proper that the Government's advisers should give it the facts, even if the facts may not be palatable to us.

We have to know what the likely state of the economy will be. From my reading of those monthly summaries, I believe that they do give a valuable and reliable guide to the Government on what the state of the economy is likely to be in the future. As far as we can, we try to meet the prospects that are set out in those reports, but it is obviously impossible to do that when the Commonwealth Government is deliberately pushing this country into the worst economic mess it has been in since before the Second World War.

The powers of the State Government are limited, given this sort of situation. Again, there is no reason why these reports should not be kept confidential. If they were to be released with such information, we would have a scream from the Opposition that the Government's own economic advisers were forecasting gloom, etc., and that would compound the problem.

The member for Davenport also referred to economic development reports. I think he referred to a report dated April 1972. It so happened that, as Chairman of the Industries Development Committee, I was a member of the Industrial Development Advisory Council. I was the only politician on that council, the other members being captains of industry and top public servants. The Premier, in a non-partisan way, set up the council to get the co-operation of private enterprise in making the economy boom as much as possible. I remember well that in that period the council members in private enterprise soundly condemned the attempts then being made by one of the Leader's predecessors to knock the future of South Australia. Those attempts only made the problems of private enterprise more difficult.

Those council members were genuinely interested in developing the economy, and their efforts were not helped by the Opposition's trying to knock the State in the interests only of the Opposition. The report referred to was commissioned, and I was part of the decision-making process which set that up. I know the result, and I know very well that this report, commissioned at the Premier's initiative to make the State as prosperous as possible, was thoroughly investigated by the Premier's Department, but unfortunately its results were abortive in most cases. However, that does not mean that the attempt should not have been made, and it is no criticism of the Government that that report was not made public. The O'Neill Wet Suits issue has been referred to by the member for Davenport. I must say that I am getting sick of this one. The honourable member has tried to make as much capital out of it as possible, but he is not succeeding too well. It is about time that he let that one go.

Another criticism from the Leader is the alleged failure by the Government to reply to some of the multitude of questions on the Notice Paper. These questions run into many hundreds at any one time. The

number of questions separately numbered on the Notice Paper would be considerable but, when one looks at the detailed questions within each Question on Notice, one would not be surprised if the number was closer to 1 000 than 500. At this time, when we are hard pressed and when the Government has announced a policy of no growth in the Public Service to contain public expenditure, we are being pressed to waste the resources of the Public Service on answering questions which are put on the Notice Paper only to give the Opposition's research officer a job and to make it appear that the Opposition is trying to contribute something towards governing the State.

**Mr. Wilson:** Are you denying us the right—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** No. All I am doing is asking Opposition members to show common sense in putting questions on the Notice Paper. At present the number of questions on the Notice Paper imposes an impossible burden on the Government. A prime example is the question of the member for Hanson relating to leases. His question relates not only to leases in the past year but also to leases between the years 1971-72 and 1977-78. It was estimated that answering this question would take several officers many days and also week-end overtime at a cost of about \$1 700; that is not the proper way to go about this matter. That is only one example from several hundred questions. It is intolerable that this strain should be put on the Government's finances and on the Public Service to make it look as though the Opposition is doing its job.

**Mr. Chapman:** Can't you think of anything else to talk about in order to waste time?

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

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** Replying to this motion is a waste of time, because it was a waste of time to move it in the first place. I have taken the last 30 minutes to prove to the House and the public that it is a waste of time.

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

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** The Minister has put up a most illogical, cynical and inadequate defence of his Government and his Premier. The motion was certainly not moved because of any external pressures either on the Leader or on the Opposition as a whole. The motion was moved because we wished to demonstrate our deep-seated concern at the Government's continued failure to provide adequate information not only to the Opposition but also to the people of South Australia. We are disappointed that so many reports have been suppressed that are vital to the public interest.

**Mr. Chapman:** And the Government talks about open government!

**Mr. ALLISON:** Yes. The motion has been moved in the name of open government and democracy. Further, reports that have been released may have been released several years too late for anything effective to be done about them. I will refer to one of those in a few moments. Some of the Minister's points must be answered immediately. He referred to the Salisbury case. The Opposition repeatedly stated that it considered the terms of reference to be such that a whitewash would ensue, but no reflection was intended on the Royal Commissioner. The degree of culpability of the former Commissioner of Police was certainly not something for which Opposition members would have sacked him. Democratic processes are not being evolved at all in this House. We see legislation repeatedly introduced under which democratic

powers are removed from members, who have no powers of deliberation in connection with many things which are thrown into the regulatory provisions of legislation introduced here. This is a form of suppression of information. The regulatory powers are thrown open not to members but to public servants—Government appointees. A result is that each year we have before us a mini Budget in the form of increases in Public Service charges; for example, water charges, power charges, car registration, and insurance fees. So, when the true Budget time comes, the Premier in typical fashion says to the public, "We are not going to put up taxes this time."

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member gets back to the motion.

**Mr. ALLISON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am rebutting points made by the Chief Secretary. Regarding the meat issue, which was raised by the Chief Secretary, in one public hospital in the Iron Triangle more than half of the meat was not reaching patients. Whether this meat was wasted or whether something else happened to it, it is a significant amount when only 10 people turn up for a meal out of 45 people for whom the meat was meant. Any number of examples like this should have been brought before the public long before the Auditor-General pointed these things out. The Government has been tardy in accepting advice from the Auditor-General; or, if the Government accepted his advice, it has been tardy in bringing the relevant report before the House; so much so, that we almost have to get the reports out of the Government with a shoe horn, instead of having them presented here as they should be.

I intend primarily to deal with education questions that have been troubling Opposition members for some time. I could go back three years in giving examples of inadequate answers, but I will deal only with what has happened over the past few weeks. On my behalf the member for Hanson inquired about the staffing of the Further Education Department. We understand that the Public Service Association or some equally responsible body (and I put "responsible" in quotation marks) has recommended substantial proposals for staffing increases in the Further Education Department.

The member for Hanson simply inquired whether such proposals had been brought forward, and yet there was no statement from the Minister. He merely said, "You will have to wait until the Budget when the Premier will tell you all about it." It is not an adequate reply to say "wait until the Budget comes along", because at the time the question was asked it was very relevant to matters of the day. A freeze had been imposed for several weeks on all Government departments, especially on education, where there was a threat of a strike if the freeze was not lifted, yet the Minister chose to sidestep this issue, when in fact people within the Further Education Department itself are critical of the fact that recommendations have been made for substantial increases at the administrative level, and not at the grass roots level where education is being dispensed by the troops over the desk—where the service really is. So the answer to that question would have been very relevant, had it been given at that time. We are still waiting for it.

Many things in further education have not been brought to the public notice. We know that this is an extremely important field, possibly the most important area of education. Certainly, the State and Federal Governments are spending a lot of money on it. We would like to know whether this money is being effectively spent, whether the forward planning is adequate, and whether plans which have been made for the construction of vast monolithic colleges are, in fact, not already obsolete, because

certainly the attitude towards apprentice training and towards further education is undergoing a very important and radical change at this very minute. For example, the Regency Park college, which has been completed at—

**The SPEAKER:** I hope the honourable member can link his remarks up with reports.

**Mr. ALLISON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am wanting information. We believe that inadequate information has been provided, and this is one area that I can develop. There are several more instances arising from this one. The Regency Park college, built at a cost of \$23 000 000, absorbed Kilkenny. Was that because Kilkenny was a superfluous college when, in fact, only three years before planning had seen that it was in the expansionary stage, or was it to show that the Regency Park college was really viable? Now I understand (although we have not been told) that the Regency Park college may already be overcrowded, and that possibly it was a premature move to have closed down the Kilkenny section and to have absorbed it.

Another question of critical importance is whether the Panorama college is due to be scaled down and phased out, and whether, because of inadequate planning (and we have not been told about the planning), that college may not become an essential part of the Further Education Department structure in a year or two. Questions arise out of the multi-millions of dollars which have been predicted for spending for Noarlunga, Tea Tree Gully, and Gilles Plains, all of them large buildings, all of them absorbing very large amounts of money, and all of them with the potential for absorbing funds that are currently being spent on colleges more decentralised in country areas.

A relevant comment comes from the Minister of Education, as reported in the Whyalla newspaper on 31 July 1978, that the new \$8 000 000 extensions to the Whyalla college may not be fully staffed. It is exemplary that perhaps we are not being given the information which we would like in order to assess whether these colleges are necessary, whether the funds are being wisely spent, or whether the forward planning has been worked out on the correct basis. For example, are the new colleges being planned on an essentially recreational or industrial training basis? Has the forward planning already been done by the department or by the South Australian Council for Education Planning and Research decided what the future industrial needs of South Australia will be? Has any planning been done at all, and, if planning has been done, how relevant is it to the immediate situation? What population figures were used?

We tried to get this information only a few days ago on another matter and did not receive a satisfactory answer. Were they the Borrie population figures, or were they the same figures used in predicting the construction of the Morphett Vale West Primary School, which is still largely devoid of students? There are so many questions in the Further Education Department area, which should have been put before the House. We should have evidence of the planning so that we can all as responsible members of the House, responsible for multi-million dollar projects, assess how worth while they are to the public and to the future students of South Australia.

**Mr. Chapman:** Especially after spending incredible amounts of public money on having those reports—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. ALLISON:** There are, in fact, vast sums of money being expended for D.F.E's, and there are also schools, secondary and primary, which are empty in the evenings, which the South Australian Council for Education Planning and Research might have recommended for alternative use. There is the question of whether the

Anderson Committee report on further education, which is still to be released, may not simply be a blueprint of Ministerial recommendations, just as have been chapters 9 and 10 on advanced education. Until the Anderson Committee report is released it ill behoves Government to go ahead with all of its Further Education Department expansion when we still do not know what will happen to the 2½ surplus Colleges of Advanced Education which we have in South Australia, and whether these buildings may be integrated into one or other of the educational systems in South Australia.

As I have said, there are so many things about which we have not been informed, and yet they are most certainly relevant to the expenditure of literally tens of millions of dollars in capital works alone, plus the fact that the staffing for all of these huge enterprises in Adelaide still has to be adequately catered for. Many people within education itself are dubious as to the Government's ability to carry out the capital works and the staffing, so that the whole situation needs considerable attention and public debate.

Several questions were raised in the House, and one that was brought up only a couple of days ago referred to the establishment of a gay teachers group in South Australia. I asked the Minister two things: first, whether the Minister had any personal objection to the formation of a gay teachers group; secondly, whether I could be assured that such a group would not be encouraged to promulgate its abnormal lifestyle among impressionable and captive audiences—the children attending South Australian schools.

**Mr. Chapman:** What do you—

**Mr. ALLISON:** I was disappointed in the reply of the Minister, because he sidestepped the personal issue. He would not give the information that I sought. He said that his own attitude towards this group, as towards any group, would depend not on its membership but on its aims and the methods it adopted to carry out those aims. I would have thought that the formation of such a group would obviously be aimed to promote homosexuality. I cannot see that it would be formed for any other reason, and, therefore, the Minister's opinion and the Minister's personal philosophy towards such a group is important to the public, to the students, and certainly to the Opposition in this House.

**Mr. Chapman:** How many votes on that issue—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! On three occasions the honourable member has interjected. I warn the honourable member that I will take action.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I was hoping that the Minister would confirm what we on this side believe. We oppose any overt or covert actions by such groups to promote their lifestyle in our schools. The Minister referred us to a circular that he said was widely publicised. It was sent to all schools about 12 to 15 months ago, covering the whole question of proselytisation as to ideologies and lifestyles in schools. But referring the House to a circular does not make it public, and the South Australian public is entitled to more than a reply such as that from the Minister. In fact, he said very little to reassure me personally.

The South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research is the organisation to which I referred when I said that I would mention a report. That organisation, like other statutory bodies, is expected to furnish a report annually. It is significant that we will spend more than \$1 000 000 towards that institution this year. The report tabled a few weeks ago, in April 1978, was the report for 1975-76. We are already two years behind in assessing the efficiency of that institution, the relevance of its research to the pressing problems that are before all members of Parliament, both State and Federal, on educating our

students, whether education is providing adequately for their future needs, and so on. We cannot assess the productivity and responsibility of such a council, which has a substantial budget, when the reports we get are two or three years overdue.

I fail to see why a statutory body with an expenditure of \$1 000 000 or so cannot find time to give the House a much more prompt assessment of what it has been doing over the past 12 months. After two years, it is far too out of date even for any opinion to be responsibly expressed in this House on the report. It is already irrelevant.

A point that makes me wonder, too, is that, on reading the amount of work published by the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research, I find there are few substantial titles. Some of the work was wasted, obviously, on the Monarto issue, and some comes out in the form of what I would call grossly inadequate papers for school discussion. I have analysed three or four of these, and probably I shall take to them in a grievance debate as a more responsible way of dealing with them. If this is the work of a \$1 000 000 planning organisation, perhaps that is one of the reasons why the reports are delayed as they are.

I asked a question recently (page 259 of *Hansard*) about the savings to the Government on student teachers. Probably, I need not have asked this question, because, looking at the Auditor-General's Report, it is obvious that about \$3 000 000 was spent last year on allowances to student teachers who were paid by the Government to be trained as teachers. There would be a few students who were paid \$150, this being the maximum amount they can receive without forfeiting the Federal Government allowance, the Federal Government having taken a leaf out of the Labor Party's policies in seeking to level opportunities rather than to give some an imbalance of opportunity by letting them get more than others. It has been criticised by the Government for that. When I asked the question, since it was relevant to the cuts in pre-school education, I thought that we might have \$2 000 000 or \$3 000 000 to spare that the Government might earmark for a special purpose, pre-school education, since it was looking for a place to prune. We have not had a reply. The Minister said he could not give a reply at that stage, and still I have not received it. What will happen to that \$2 000 000 or \$3 000 000? Will the Minister make any reference to it at all?

I turn now to a matter that really concerns me. We have not had any formal statement from the Education Department or from the Minister, other than to say that it is being researched by competent people on the professional staff. I refer to the question of sexism in education. Books are being produced in schools by people who do not seem to be responsible to anyone in particular for what they do (if they are, we have not had any report on their activities), for the SEMP and MACOS schemes which have been criticised widely by some and praised by others and of which I have made a cursory perusal. It was cursory in the sense of more than a swift appraisal, because I cursed when I saw the amount of immoral, almost pornographic material in some of the articles and in films. What is the Government's policy on SEMP and MACOS? There again, the Minister has not criticised any of it, even though the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal carried quite an extensive critique by Dan O'Donnell, a former lecturer in education, who headed it "SEMP pornographic and unsavoury elements"—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows the provisions of Standing Orders.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I do not propose to refer to that report

in depth. I urge the Government to do more than just sit back and let these things roll along. There are people in the community who want to know more about what is happening to students. The Minister can tell a former schoolteacher with some 15 years or 16 years experience that parents have constant access to schools, but I do not think that even one teacher knows literally what is happening in the next classroom all the time. It is quite possible for subversive things to be done in the name of education. I believe that a much firmer Ministerial policy should be established on many of these things: not in the name of the Labor Party or the Liberal Party, but in the name of education, and certainly to keep our children away from things where they seem to be increasingly dished up with the more sordid side of life in the name of reality and humanism. I am suspicious of the motives of people who use such terms.

On page 93 of *Hansard* appears another question put to the Minister on policy statement E.D. 809/3/80, and the Minister said that he was unaware of the incident referred to, and that he would bring forward a reply. That reply was given to me today in the House, so I will not make the issue of it that I had intended to, but I reiterate that this is a case where an Education Department circular was not promulgated. It was dated 12 January 1977. Parents, the Institute of Teachers, and staffs of schools all denied any knowledge of its existence, but it was suddenly invoked by a senior departmental official. Irrespective of the answer which I received today and with which I am not completely happy, the question must be asked: how many more Education Department policy circulars are sitting around in secret just waiting to be invoked when the time comes? We do not know. It is possible that there may be a substantial number, and it certainly puts the institute, staff, and parents completely offside when these are produced out of thin air and when the answer comes from the Minister to say that this was purely a formalising of a long recognised state of affairs and was not a new departure. He said that there remained some confusion in schools about these matters, and that guidelines would be promulgated to clear the issue. After an edict that has existed for 18 months, belated information comes forward.

One of the first questions I asked in this session was of the Premier. I asked whether his Government intended to follow the outdated deficit funding policies and what reserves were available for 1978-79. The Premier took the usual ploy of diverting the question immediately into the Federal realm. He referred to the deficit funding of the Federal Government, and attempted to ridicule the question by implying that that was a massive deficit and that we should not worry about \$27 000 000. However, the Federal Government inherited that deficit, and the question was relevant, because we have another hidden factor.

We referred in debate to the deficit of \$27 000 000. The Premier sidestepped the issue. I had intended the answer to be related to a subsequent question on the total public liability of South Australia, which has increased, according to the Auditor-General's Report, from \$1.3 billion in 1968 to \$2.1 billion in 1977—an amount of \$0.8 billion over 10 years. We do not have the 1978 public debt available to us until the Auditor-General's Report comes forward.

However, even in the Auditor-General's Report there has been a change of method of advising us of the public liability. It used to cover a 10-year span, which I found handy because it was working on the decimal system and it was easy to add up the 10 years and get the average. Now, to stop people comparing those figures, it was reduced to a five-year span, and some of the information on overseas and intranational loans has been removed from the

statement.

It is the gradual removal from the various reports of significant pieces of information which used to be in public documents and which precluded the necessity of members of the Opposition from going to the Government for information like we do now. I will not accept the criticism from the Chief Secretary or anyone for putting Questions on Notice, when the Government itself is responsible for suppressing the very pieces of information that used to be more readily available. One has only to go through previous Auditor-General's Reports to realise that.

We have increasingly to go cap in hand to the Government. It is making a rod for its own back by suppressing the information. Perhaps it is also benefiting itself, but I thought that it was trying to keep South Australia's community like a mushroom community: they keep them in the dark and feed them on bull dust. That will not suffice. The Opposition is here to inquire.

We have, I believe, pointed out so far several matters of concern in which information has not been readily made available. We will keep questioning, either in this form or making the Government aware of our concern by placing Questions on Notice, or by asking questions in the House. It is also significant that, in the answers that I and other members on this side have so far received, two points emerge: one is that Ministers are frequently unable to respond instantly to a question but say that they will bring down a reply.

What is the reason for this? Is it lack of knowledge on the part of the Minister, or is it simply an intention to keep the information from the public? After all, we are inquiring for the public. Secondly, in case there is any misapprehension in the House, how is it that Ministers are frequently able to acknowledge questions from the Government side and, from the air, pull out screeds of statistics in the form of answers to Dorothy Dix questions? That has happened several times in this present session.

When we have asked a question relevant to education, for example (and the Minister has given an answer taking up a column of *Hansard* in reply to a Government member), he says to us, "I will obtain a reply." The Minister, on the occasions that I was asking about the Education Department circular, coyly indicated that he was not aware of that incident, when, in fact, he had been dealing with it over the past two or three months. That is just not good enough.

It means that Government Ministers leave themselves open to criticism if they deal with the Opposition in such a double standard way, and deal with their own members much more readily and fairly. If the Government would like us to do as Government members do (that is, give it pre-warning of questions), surely that is only what we are doing when we put Questions on Notice. The Government never complains about a pre-warning of a question from a member on that side. The Ministers simply say, "The member was kind enough to inform me yesterday that he was going to ask a question on this matter today."

If information is not going to be suppressed from the Government's members, I suggest that the Government should not suppress information by whingeing about the amount of questioning that comes forward from this side. The Government is dealing in double standards. The public will not stand for that and the Opposition, frankly, cannot afford to.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General):** This is a most extraordinary debate. I have been sitting here patiently from the time I sat down following prayers this afternoon. I want to get on record that I was here for prayers—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the Attorney-General will stick to the motion before the Chair.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Most certainly, Sir. I have been waiting for the Opposition to reveal the basis upon which this no-confidence motion has been moved. I have sat here waiting patiently whilst speakers opposite have put forward their contributions, and so far I have heard nothing upon which any reasonable person would support such a motion. In fact, if anything, the debate has, rather than warmed up as the afternoon has gone on, cooled off considerably until we reached the contribution of the last speaker, which can be described as nothing more than trumped up triviality.

If anything, the member for Mount Gambier's contribution showed a touch of paranoia. All he did in his contribution was to give a potted history of his activities in this House over the past few weeks: an attempt to justify what he has been trying to do since the House resumed. It was a particularly appalling performance on his part, as he raised nothing that would in any way support the motion.

I detail again what this motion is all about, because it has not been quoted by any of the recent speakers. It is as follows:

That, in view of the Government's continued failure to provide adequate information and its suppression of reports vital to the public interest, this House condemns the Government for its secretive attitude towards Parliament and the taxpayers of South Australia and, no longer having confidence, calls upon it to resign.

Well, well! We on this side have been mystified for some weeks now as to what seemed to be a change of tactics on behalf of the Opposition. Surprise, surprise! We came back to Parliament and the Opposition apparently thought that the Government's performance had been so good that there were no matters on which it felt able to move either an urgency or a no-confidence motion on the first day of the sittings. Since then a similar situation has existed until today.

Then we find this damp squib being moved in the House. It is all the more lamentable since it was moved by the Leader of the Opposition, because we on this side frankly do not like to see the Opposition Leader putting himself into the embarrassing situation he had put himself in this afternoon with his quite lamentable contribution. We on this side believe that he is a good Leader, and we want to see him stay Leader for a long time. It does not please us to see the way he embarrasses not only himself by his contribution as he has in this debate but also embarrasses severely his colleagues.

It is hardly surprising to us to hear rumours that constantly emanate from the other side about the future of the Leadership. When one reads this afternoon's *Adelaide News* and sees the front page headline, "Moves to bring back Withers", one can hardly but speculate when the *News* might be carrying banner headlines "Moves to bring back Eastick".

If that is all the Opposition Leader can contribute to a debate of this sort it will not be long before we will see the member for Light back in the Opposition Leader's chair. I can say, for members on this side, that we will not be pleased to see that. We believe he would be a much abler Leader than the present incumbent.

I believe that this debate has produced nothing new, nothing of substance, and nothing that in any way supports the carrying of this motion by Parliament. The Chief Secretary has dealt in some detail with reports that allegedly have been concealed by this Government, so I want only to deal in any depth with the report concerning the death of Dr. Duncan, by the two Scotland Yard detectives who were brought especially to South Australia

to examine the matter.

It would be completely irresponsible for Ministers of this Government to release that report. Members of Parliament are elected by the people of this State to form a Government, and some of them to become Ministers to exercise responsibility; that is exactly what we have done.

The Government would be irresponsible in the conduct of its office if it was to release such a report that contained information on individuals in South Australia who have not been charged with any crime, put on trial, or found guilty of any offences in this State. Those people should rightly be able to expect that their names will not be dragged through the mud in those circumstances.

The police must have the power to investigate any leads that they come across in relation to a crime. They must be able to interrogate any persons whom they believe are suspects of a crime or who may be able to give them information regarding that crime. However, those people have a right (and I put it that high) to expect that their privacy will be upheld and not jeopardised because they have come forward and given information to the police inquiring into crimes such as the murder of Dr. Duncan.

What a sorry state of affairs it would be in this State if people in possession of such information were put in fear that, if they gave information to the police, that information and their names would be made public, notwithstanding the fact that no persons had been charged, put on trial, or convicted. Then, people generally would be afraid to come forward and give information to the police. The public co-operation that the police and the Government are always seeking would be put in jeopardy.

The Government and particularly I, as Attorney-General, have a deep responsibility to ensure that the confidence of the public in this respect is not jeopardised in any way. When I became Attorney-General, I took it on myself to read the Duncan Report in order to familiarise myself with its contents and, having done so, I was fully satisfied that the decision that had been made by my predecessor, the Premier, previous Chief Secretaries and Cabinet was the correct and proper one. That report contains detailed discussions of the relative merits of the evidence that has been gathered either for or against certain individuals, and it would be a gross infringement of their privacy if that information was to be made public.

Opposition members should be roundly condemned even for suggesting that such information should be made public for newspapers and other ghouls to seize in order to make public spectacles of innocent citizens. The Opposition has been completely irresponsible in this matter, and I think many Opposition members share that view. I do not believe that most Opposition members want reports such as the Duncan report published.

The then Leader of the Opposition was told that he could examine that report in order to satisfy himself that the Government had acted properly and had exercised responsibility in the way in which it approached the matter. However, the offer was not taken up, for the reasons given by the member for Light this afternoon. I respect his right to make that decision, although I do not agree with it or believe that it was the correct decision. Nevertheless, I can understand why he would have made it.

I have spoken of the irresponsibility of members opposite. However, I think their irresponsibility reached an all-time peak with the comments made by the member for Davenport. He said this afternoon that he had information and personal knowledge of a felony. However, he refused to say whether he had given that information to the police or whether he intended to give it to the police, and I take this opportunity to remind him

that he may have committed several criminal offences in having that information and not making it immediately available to the proper authorities. The most serious of those offences is misprision, a felony, and, because of the way in which the member for Davenport conducted himself this afternoon and the information that he put before the House, I believe it is likely that he has committed that offence. I therefore suggest to the honourable member, even at this late stage, that he should as soon as possible make that information available to the police.

The honourable member would do well, if he is not familiar with the provisions of the Constitution, to familiarise himself with them, because I believe that, by withholding that information, the honourable member is placing himself in serious jeopardy. It is not surprising, however, that the honourable member is withholding this information, because this afternoon we have had a whole series of generalities and completely unsubstantiated allegations. I have already referred to the member for Davenport, who made allegations that were not substantiated by names, facts or anything of that sort.

He was only the second Opposition member to do that this afternoon. The Leader of the Opposition, when referring to the member for Ross Smith, completely misquoted that honourable member and did not bother to give the House the benefit of the quotation on which he was relying. Subsequently, having been reminded of this fact, he did not even seek in any way to put right the facts before the House; rather, he simply left the matter up in the air. As soon as the Leader had been caught out making half-cocked allegations, he dropped that matter and went on with something else.

Then, the member for Mount Gambier referred to a question that he had asked the Minister of Education concerning homosexuals or some "Gay" group going into schools, or something of that sort. He criticised the Minister for refusing to answer a question until that Minister had all the proper facts before him. This illustrates well the different approach between Opposition and Government members. Government members are careful and cautious about the way in which they exercise their responsibilities. They do not go off half-cocked, as do Opposition members. Government members seek to ensure that they are in possession of all the facts before they put matters before the House, ask questions, or make statements, unlike the Leader of the Opposition and the members for Davenport and Mount Gambier. That is the approach which the Opposition takes in matters such as this.

Basically, this motion is a lot of nonsense, and members opposite know this. The real truth of the matter is that the Government is providing such good government in this State that Opposition members can find nothing except something as trivial as this on which to move a no-confidence or urgency motion. That is basically all that this motion is: a lot of nonsense.

No responsible Opposition would agree to have confidential reports published, as the Opposition has called for this afternoon. If that is the sort of responsibility that the Leader of the Opposition displays in this matter, I can say only that there are few terrible things in this world but one of the most terrible things for South Australia would be a Government led by the Leader of the Opposition. It seems to me that this Opposition has little about which to complain.

We have heard this afternoon a whole series of unsubstantiated allegations and, as the Attorney-General of this State and one who has been showing a considerable amount of interest in questions relating to freedom of



information legislation, I was amazed to hear the member for Davenport, in his contribution, make some caustic or critical remarks regarding my position in relation to freedom of information. The honourable member then went on to say that the Government was hypocritical in talking about freedom of information legislation and then refusing to make available certain confidential reports. That shows how little he knows about freedom of information legislation generally.

All Freedom of Information Acts existing in the world at present contain exemptions. Even the legislation in the United States of America, which is, to my knowledge, the most advanced freedom of information legislation, contains exemptions relating to such matters as internal working documents, privacy of individuals (the matter to which I referred in relation to the Duncan Report), and documents that could adversely affect the legitimate economic interests of a country. Surely that relates to the report on the uranium enrichment plant, which is a draft document, and should not be released until such time as it is in its final form and has been checked to ensure that it does not in any way cut across the economic or other interests of the State.

No piece of freedom of information legislation could possibly function without proper exemptions, because without proper exemptions how would the Government be able to function? There is a whole range of matters in which the Government is involved and which must, by the very nature of those matters, be and remain confidential. If members opposite are suggesting that all documents, all Government matters, should be thrown open to scrutiny it just shows how totally irresponsible they are as a group. There would not be another group of politicians in the world who would make such an irresponsible suggestion.

The Opposition's Federal colleagues would certainly not make such a suggestion, and I think the Federal Government will be severely embarrassed by some of the contributions made this afternoon. I have no doubt that when the Federal Freedom of Information Bill is being debated in Federal Parliament the contributions of members opposite today will be quoted at great length by Labor members in that Parliament, because most members opposite have little idea of the very restrictive nature of the Federal Freedom of Information Bill. It is so restrictive that some people refer to it as the Secrecy Act. It is commonly and widely referred to by people in all sections of the community as the Freedom from Information Bill. For members opposite to preach freedom of information shows how incredibly hypocritical the Liberal Party is about this matter, as it is about many other matters.

**Mr. Venning:** You are repeating yourself.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I do not think that the message has got through sufficiently to the public as to just how hypocritical the Opposition is. Members of the South Australian public are gradually becoming more and more aware of the hypocrisy of members opposite particularly on the question of uranium, which is one of the matters raised in this debate. Members opposite are on record in *Hansard* (as they all well know) as having voted for the policy that this Parliament still stands by regarding uranium. Not one of them has moved a motion to try to change that policy, so this Parliament is still bound by the policy that was voted for by all members of this Chamber in March 1977.

**Mr. Venning:** You'd have to be—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The member for Rocky River was one of the persons who voted for that; the oldest member of the House was still here voting on that occasion, and he cannot deny that now. That is the

fundamental hypocrisy of the Opposition, that it has changed its mind entirely, simply because the Federal Government came out with a firm policy in favour of the mining and exporting of uranium, regardless of questions of safety, international terrorism, waste disposal and all the other issues.

The Federal Government, in its great search for profits for its private enterprise friends, is hell-bent on a policy of economic exploitation of our uranium deposits. That is the decision that has forced the Opposition here to change its position on this question. As I have said before, many members opposite are acutely embarrassed because they are bound by the policy of their Federal Colleagues. That is not the case on this side of the House. This Government and this Party nationally are committed to one policy; a moratorium on the mining and export of uranium and the development of uranium in this country or State until matters concerning safety, international safeguards, international terrorism and, above all, waste disposal have been resolved to the satisfaction of this Government or the Federal Parliamentary Party. That is the situation so far as the South Australian Government is concerned. All members of this Party believe in that policy and are committed to it. That is a very different situation from the one in which we find the Opposition. I do not want to spend any more time dealing with this matter because I think it has been satisfactorily dealt with here and elsewhere previously.

In conclusion, I come back to the lamentable performance of the Leader today. It is hardly surprising that he promotes emotions which show such little knowledge of the fundamental workings of Government, because he has had no experience in Government, and does not know the problems that arise in Government. He might be described, I suppose, as a "tenderfoot" in this area.

**Mr. Venning:** He'll know soon, though, won't he?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The honourable member knows full well that the present Opposition will be the Opposition in South Australia for many years to come. The people of this State show no inclination whatsoever to change this Government, and that is hardly surprising. I wish to spend the next few moments referring to a document which I believe shows some courage and honesty on the part of the Leader and which also shows an incredible naivety in that he would put his name to such a document. I refer to the Australian Constitution Convention 1978 Standing Committee A, Second Report to the Executive Committee, dated 21 April 1978. At page 23 of annexure F, appears a reply written by the Leader of the Opposition to Mr. J. C. Finemore, Chief Executive Officer, Australian Constitution Convention at an address in Victoria, as follows:

Dear Mr. Finemore,

On 27 September 1977 you wrote regarding the work of Standing Committee "A" and invited me to make submissions as to the adverse effects of section 92 and proposals for amendments to the Constitution to facilitate regulation of interstate trade while preserving the essential freedom of that trade. After discussion with a number of my colleagues and former Parliamentarians,—  
and there, I suppose, we see the dead hand of Ross Story at work again—

I have come to the conclusion that a meaningful submission must be dependent on some recent experience in Government. My Party has been in Opposition since 1970, and those of my colleagues who served in the 1968-70 Liberal Government had limited Ministerial experience. In these circumstances I must decline the invitation.

Yours sincerely, David Tonkin, Leader of the Opposition



I think the Leader was being honest there, but it shows how basically incompetent he is in carrying out his task. He says there, clearly and openly, that he does not believe he has sufficient expertise to comment on matters appertaining to Government, yet he has the cheek to stand in this House this afternoon and move this motion which involves, by its very nature, some criticism of the workings of Government.

The Leader does not have the necessary knowledge to know to what extent documents must remain confidential and to what extent those documents must be published. He has shown himself this afternoon to be a dismal Leader of the Opposition and, as I said earlier, I think this has done him no credit. We on this side of the House do not crow over that. Frankly, I am disappointed to see him making an idiot of himself again; it is most unfortunate, although it only brings forward the day when he will be replaced and when the more effective former Leader will inevitably regain leadership of the Opposition.

I believe that the motion and the matters that have been produced by the Opposition allegedly in support of it have no substance. I also believe that the motion has been used by the Opposition simply as a vehicle for turning this place into a talking shop this afternoon. It ought to be thrown out, and I urge all members to do just that.

**Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I support the motion and the comments of my colleagues. The motion is one that is not only fully justified but also, in my view, long overdue. The speakers so far have referred to the need for the publishing and tabling of reports commissioned by the Government as a result of pressure from the public, on a request or demand by the Parliament, or, as in some cases, at their own discretion.

At no time this afternoon has there been any reference to the disclosure of public reports by the Government in accordance with the law. Therefore, in the few minutes I have in which to address the House in support of the motion, I will draw to the attention of the House a report which the relevant department and the public of South Australia have been denied for up to several years in recent times.

On 6 October 1977, I directed a question in the House to the Minister of Transport, asking him why he had not tabled the reports by the State Transport Authority for 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977, those years being all the years then subsequent to the date on which the authority's Act had been approved in the Parliament. Until October 1977, no public reports had been tabled in the House in relation to the activities of the authority, bearing in mind that the authority was responsible for the administration and provision of public transport at that time for the whole of the State, and at this stage is responsible for all the bus and tram activities and for the metropolitan rail activity that costs this State millions of dollars each year.

Progressively over the years mentioned, it has cost this State in straight-out losses sums amounting in 1972-73 to \$1 370 000 (that was the first year prior to the State Transport Authority being commissioned) and in the year 1974-75 (the first full year after the authority was commissioned—and these losses are in the Bus and Tram Division alone), \$5 900 000; in the year 1975-76, \$8 800 000; and in 1976-77, \$12 300 000. For the immediate past year, 1977-78, it has been indicated that the losses will be at least \$20 000 000 in that division alone. That department has a loss factor greater than that of not all but certainly most of the other public institutions and departments in South Australia.

However, for years, despite the requirement of section 18 of the State Transport Authority Act, 1974, we have

been denied that information. On 19 July 1978, a report on the authority's activities was tabled in the House in the name of the Minister. I agree that, in accordance with the Act, he has finally provided the House with the reports for those previous years to which I have referred. On 19 July, he supplied to the Parliament a report on the authority's activities, not for the last year we were hoping to get one for but for 1976-77. The documents reveal the tenor of losses to which I have referred and information on all the activities of a public department to which the public is entitled each year as it relates to the previous year. We are already within weeks of receiving the 1976-77 report a year and several months behind the time when we should have had last year's report.

Whilst the criticisms directed by my colleagues at the Government this afternoon are well justified because of the cover-up and refusal to disclose a whole host of reports on activities within departments and studies done on various authorities, etc., this particular criticism is directed to the Government for its failure to table reports which are ours not by desire or for the purpose of simply seeking information but by virtue of the law of this State. Section 18 of the State Transport Authority Act is in two parts. The first part requires the authority to draw to the attention of the appropriate Minister the activities of the authority as soon as practicable after 30 June each year. Then the section requires that the Minister, not at his discretion or at whatever time he may feel inclined but, in accordance with the Act itself, within 14 days of that date, shall (not may) table in the Parliament the document that belongs to the people.

We have been deliberately denied that material in past years. We are currently denied a report on all last year's activities within that department, which has incurred not just a simple substantial loss but a massive loss of public money. It is that sort of information that I suggest is not only required and desired, but is demanded. On behalf of the people interested in the losses applicable to that department, I demand that that sort of report should be tabled, not in accordance with the practices adopted by the Minister in the past several years, but in accordance with the Act.

I fully support the motion moved by the Leader. He has full justification for doing so and has the full support of the Opposition, and I know that he has the support of the people outside the House. On that note, I challenge the Government to put under the carpet and to cover up again a responsible presentation of a subject this afternoon as it has come from the Opposition. I condemn the Premier for his attitude towards the motion and I condemn subsequent speakers from the Government side and their contributions.

**Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith):** At last today we have the first no-confidence motion of this session: the first motion of any kind of urgency or criticism of the Government's overall policies. We have taken several sitting days to get to it. That shows commendable restraint on the Opposition's part perhaps or, as some of us less kindly think, sheer lack of having been able to find an issue on which to sensibly mount a no-confidence debate. Today's events have shown that it is still looking for such an issue.

I think that the most significant thing about today being the day chosen to bring on this no-confidence motion was the remarks made last evening by the member for Mitcham, apparently the Leader of another Party that is not connected with the Liberals, although he sits on their side of the House. The strictures he directed at the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues took root overnight, were watered and fertilised, and this morning the no-

confidence motion duly appeared. I suppose congratulations are once again in order for the member for Mitcham for laying down the tactics the Opposition should adopt in the House.

I have been referred to by the Leader and other Opposition speakers in relation to an article that fortuitously appeared today in the *Adelaide News*, dealing with the question of open government and access to information, and linking it to the idea of Ministerial responsibility and our current system of government. In that article, I expressed disquiet about the way in which attempts at public consultation seemed to be foundering on the rocks of partisan political activity. Although I phrased the article as neutrally as possible by talking about the community generally, I was, I believe, on reflection, and particularly when I heard the interpretation placed on my remarks by the Opposition, far too kind to the Leader and his colleagues, at whom I would point the finger as being in a large degree responsible for the partisan treatment of matters of public interest and controversy in our community.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. BANNON:** Yes, I will stick by that statement that there is immaturity in relation to these matters, and I say definitely that that immaturity lies close to the Leader and his colleagues, because they behave in an immature way when public consultation takes place in these areas. On the other hand, they come back to us and demand that we release more reports and opinions, and expose more options merely for them to treat in the same partisan/political manner that they treat almost every matter at present.

It is odd for the Leader to accuse me of calling the public at large "immature" (and, in doing that, he completely misrepresented what I said) when he, in his speech in this House on 19 July, made a number of sneering references to what he called the democratisation of our community. What he was objecting to in that speech was attempts at getting the community involved in decision-making, to get it more knowledgeably informed about public issues. That is the sort of thing that our Premier has been talking about when he talks of democratisation, whether it be industrial democracy, community development or whatever.

Yet the Leader knowingly claims that that is some kind of socialist plot to democratise the community. We are proud on this side of the House to stand by the word "democracy" and support that concept. The second aspect of that speech that makes his remarks about the immaturity of the electorate seem somewhat odd is his characterisation of the electorate as fools. In response to an interjection, the Leader readily agreed that the people must be fools, and must have been fooled by this Government to keep electing us. If that is his view of the electorate, as I have said earlier, I hope that information is spread abroad as much as possible, as it indicates how the Opposition regards anyone who does not go along with the sorts of attitude that they have.

Open government and freedom of information is a difficult issue with which any Westminster system has to grapple. Because we have a system of Ministerial responsibility and because we have an anonymous apolitical Public Service, whose job is not to enter the realm of public debate but to supply material by which the Government makes its decision, it is difficult, as the Attorney stated, to bring in any kind of freedom of information without hedging it with some kind of restriction. I say that in our current political situation, with the attitude currently adopted by the Opposition, it is almost impossible to do that.

I turn now to the reports referred to by the Leader.

First, he referred to the Salisbury situation. Let us consider its chronology. When the Commissioner of Police was sacked, the Leader said that there was no point in having a Royal Commission. That was his first reaction. I think his words were that it would not get Harold Salisbury back his job. His reflection over the next few days and his gauging of what he saw as public opinion suggested that he should get solidly behind the idea that there should be a Royal Commission, so he duly tore up his earlier press releases and said so. The Government agreed to a Royal Commission. Suddenly, that did not suit the Leader. That was no good. His next attack was not on the fact that there was not a Royal Commission, because there was one, but was on the terms of reference, which he said were too restricted.

But the terms of reference, as subsequent debate in this House showed, were close to the terms of reference proposed by the Leader in one of his earlier calls for a Royal Commission. He said that the questions that the Royal Commission should consider included whether the Government should have the sole power to dismiss the Commissioner. That was covered by the third term of reference announced. His second question was whether the sacking of Mr. Salisbury was justified given all the circumstances. That was covered in the Commission's second term of reference, almost exactly word for word as the Government had laid it out.

Having been refuted on that argument, the Liberal Party employed counsel to represent its view before the Commission, to make submissions and cross-examine witnesses, so I should have thought that, when the report appeared, it would have been willing to accept it: not a bit, that was not the case at all. As soon as they discovered that the Royal Commissioner was supporting the Government's action in this issue, the report became something which, in the Leader's words, "would do nothing to reassure the people of South Australia."

What about the uranium report? Apparently, it involves the Government in a shameful record of deceit and hypocrisy according to the Leader. What then is the attitude of honourable members opposite, who in March 1978 voted for a motion supporting the Government's policy on uranium? That was a unanimous vote. Not once has the Opposition brought on a debate or moved a motion seeking to alter or refute their attitude of that time. In fact, the Leader gave us long quotes from the report. For a while it seemed as if what he was intending to debate was purely the uranium issue as such. It is significant that he was doing that in a context not of some firm Liberal Party policy on what we should do with uranium but of our being secret about some report on uranium. Their attitude is hypocritical and deceitful on this issue.

The policy of the Government in this matter has been set down clearly and was supported bi-partisanly last year. Incidentally, it surely is not inappropriate for any Government committee to take into account the policy of the Government when it makes a recommendation, yet the Leader suggests that there is something scandalous if that occurs.

Turning to the present issue concerning the meat report, the Leader claimed that it should be released in full. It was pointed out that this would be severely damaging to individuals who are named in the report as part of a police investigation. However, the Leader is reckless of those consequences. He wanted the full works, and that aspect did not matter. As reported in *Hansard* of 16 November 1976 in relation to a matter before the House, the following words were said:

... privilege brings with it a very heavy responsibility,

which most members in this place learn very soon after they enter it, that is, that one does not make statements and, particularly, name names in this place unless one is absolutely certain of the facts and unless those facts are well based and, indeed, true.

There is a heavy responsibility, not to mention names unless we are sure of the facts. The Leader of the Opposition has done yet another of his handstands because it suits his short-term political advantage, for he spoke the words I have quoted. The Premier decided that he would release the report. First, he said that the Leader could see it in confidence. "In no circumstances," said the Leader; "that is an outrageous suggestion."

The member for Light said one should always reject such an offer from the Government because one could be accused of leaking the contents of the report. Does that mean that no confidences can be shared between the Government and the Opposition, that in times of national security or security disturbances, where briefings are required, that the Leader of the Opposition will reject the idea of having anything to do with it? Of course not. It suits his purposes not to see it now, so he does not.

We are therefore in a situation where the report was released with those names excised, and we get the despicable allegation, because it did not suit the Opposition to have anything to do with this report that favours the Government, that in some way the substance of the report has been doctored or affected in some way by the Government. That was claimed categorically by the member for Davenport. That sort of claim has been made constantly in this debate, and it is the kind of stirring of the public over issues of such importance which I think we should really be concerned about and about which I was writing in the *News* today.

I am glad that we have had an opportunity to debate this motion, because the Opposition has shown itself to be not interested in open Government, freedom of information, or the problems that they pose, but purely in the short-term day-to-day political advantage to squeeze every drop of controversy out of any issue that they can lay their hands on.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** The acute embarrassment suffered this afternoon by the member for Ross Smith has been quite apparent in the past few minutes. If I may give him some advice, having been in this House a little longer than he has, attack is not always the best form of defence, especially when you have got your facts wrong. Acute embarrassment is something that he will learn to overcome in time. Unfortunately, I suspect that the size of his gaffe today in the *News*, published for all to see, will take a lot of living down.

**Mr. Bannon:** So long as you keep—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has already spoken: I call him to order.

**Mr. TONKIN:** As long as we can all treat that with a bit of amusement: it is necessary to keep one's sense of humour.

*The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:*

**Mr. GUNN:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. I ask why you failed to name the Minister of Transport when he interjected, but earlier this afternoon you named the honourable the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for doing the same thing.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member knows that the Chair will decide that. I did not hear the honourable Minister of Transport. I was in the throes of writing, but the honourable member for Ross Smith was called to order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. TONKIN:** The only contribution that I think the

member for Ross Smith made to the debate was, in some way, to call into question the Opposition's attitude on the mining and enrichment of uranium. I take this opportunity, which he so kindly provided, to say again, for I do not know how many times, that quite categorically the Opposition firmly believes that uranium should be mined and enriched, and that the developments that have occurred since 30 March 1977 make that proposition quite acceptable and feasible.

Other Government speakers in the debate have been singularly unimpressive. The Attorney-General spent some little time saying that the Opposition should be sure of its facts before it launches into any statement whatever. That is an amazing remark from someone who, as recently as two evenings ago, said to the people of Whyalla that only a couple of hundred jobs would be provided if a uranium enrichment plant were established in South Australia. That statement is totally and absolutely misleading, and very much a proof of the case that we have been putting this afternoon. If the committee's third interim report had been released, the Attorney-General would not be able to make grossly and blatantly misleading statements of that sort to the community. So that is a perfect reason (one of several), why this report should be made available for public scrutiny.

The Chief Secretary took plenty of time (indeed, almost 30 minutes, I believe) and said virtually nothing. He had no real answers or rebuttals. The only thing that he did was to show quite clearly that the Government has an arrogant attitude, which seems to indicate that Parliament is an unnecessary impediment to the affairs of the Government and that the Government would get on much better without Parliament: in other words, that Parliament, representing the people, is not important. That attitude demonstrates clearly the argument that the Opposition has been putting forward today: that is, that the Government has totally lost sight of the fact that it is responsible to the people through Parliament.

The Premier said very little, other than to have another go at the Frozen Food Factory, and I am grateful to him for giving additional publicity to that matter. I understand why the Premier was reluctant to release the police report yesterday. It simply means that it contains statements which, in my opinion, emphasise and reinforce the arguments that the Opposition has been using during the past several months. For instance, the report stated that there could be about a 50 per cent wastage of meat because of cooking more meat than was required by patients; that the kitchen of a hospital cooked for 45 persons, regardless of how many people were to dine; and pointed out that it was likely that areas of temptation existed in the present situation.

The Premier had no reason for not releasing an edited report, and the member for Ross Smith is guilty of misrepresentation when he makes those statements in his speech. I have heard nothing from Government members or from the Government benches today that in any way has answered the charges that have been made by this Opposition, that the Government is deliberately suppressing matters of public interest about which it would be right and proper for the people and the Parliament of this State to know. The uranium issue is just one. The attitude of the Government is in question: it is an attitude of total arrogance and total disregard for the welfare of the people.

In conclusion, I must say that it is a matter of some considerable regret to me that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was not able to participate in this debate. I think that it was a great shame that he was denied that opportunity, but it will undoubtedly come later when he

can put his point of view, and put it, I hope, quite strongly.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

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

Majority of 8 for the Noes.  
Motion thus negatived.

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

#### LEVI PARK 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.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 8 August. Page 403.)

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I had referred to statements made by the member for Alexandra (I am pleased to see that he is in the Chamber this evening) and what I thought was his uncalled for attack on the assets of the Minister of Fisheries. It ill behoves the member for Alexandra to make such an attack in this place. When we look at members opposite, and think about people having two jobs, two salaries, or even three salaries, I think the member for Alexandra fits into that category very well. When I was on Kangaroo Island, I did not hear that he was a pauper. Any person in public life who has to make certain decisions makes them on the basis of what information is before him, and not on his personal situation. The member for Alexandra has come out publicly through the newspapers as the saviour of B class fishing licence holders.

**Mr. Whitten:** Would you call him a moonlighter?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I would call him many things, most of them unparliamentary. The point is that the member for Alexandra has suddenly decided to get on the band wagon and to become the saviour of B class fishermen, when the Government has decided that, if a B class licence holder receives a financial return of more than \$210 a week, he will lose his B class licence.

**Mr. Chapman:** Are you sure of that figure?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I am sure of it, yes. If the member for Alexandra wants to be the saviour of those people, he had better consider again what he is doing.

**Mr. Chapman:** Do you fully support the Government in all its doings on this issue?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Yes, I do.

**Mr. Chapman:** In every respect?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I am not saying that; I am talking about \$210 a week income.

**Mr. Chapman:** Do you believe there should be a means test?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The other point the member for Alexandra wants to interject about arises from something

I saw in my local newspaper, the *Whyalla News*, on 7 August, under the heading, "Bid to tighten fish laws meets strong opposition." I do not like the implication of the heading. It implies that the Government is tightening fishing laws, when all the evidence of the article arises from a recommendation of the fishing committee. It is not the recommendation of the Government.

**Mr. Chapman:** Aren't they one and the same?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Of course they are not. The member for Alexandra is saying that suddenly there is a committee on something—

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** He's a dill.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I agree with the Minister of Transport. He is also a dill when he deals with matters under the Minister's jurisdiction and says he would give all public transport back to private enterprise. I wonder whether he would go to Whyalla and try to give public transport in Whyalla back to the previous private enterprise owner.

**Mr. Whitten:** What about the *Troubridge*?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I suggest that the previous owner of the public transport system at Whyalla would not have a bar of it. What perturbs me is that the *Adelaide News* (as well as the *Whyalla News*), as it invariably does, wants all committee reports that come to the Government made public, so that it can make a headline and accuse the Government of intending to do something it is not going to do, thus allowing the Opposition to have an easy ride in the editorials, letters to the Editor, and so on.

**Mr. Chapman:** Are you criticising the country press now as well as the metropolitan press?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I am reading from my local paper, the *Whyalla News*. In the past two years that paper has been nearly as bad as the Murdoch press. If the member for Alexandra wants that in *Hansard* to send it to the *Whyalla News*, let him have it, by all means. It was the fishing committee that made the statement. The article states:

Mr. Adrian Fletcher, who represents more than 800 A and B class fishermen on the management committee of the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, said he thought the imposition of size limits for fish caught from the jetty was ridiculous.

I do not know that the Government has made any decision on this matter, but from what I have seen I agree with the statement. I believe it is ridiculous. However, we shall see what the Government does about it. The article continues:

The latest moves appear to have little support from either amateurs or professionals, but have already reached the stage of being tabled as recommendations to the Government.

That is quite correct. The article continues:

The response of amateurs regarding the bag limit proposals was obviously a factor which led to their being dropped.

I do not remember that it was ever taken up, but that is beside the point. The innuendo in this article is similar to what appears in the Murdoch press. Suddenly, the press takes up a question, and because an article is written and nothing is done about it, it wants to take the glory of deciding the issue. The press, in other words, is coming out glaringly and trying to control people's minds. The printing offices of the Murdoch press decide what opinions people should adopt. The final paragraph of the article states:

The *Whyalla News* will welcome readers' comments on the proposal in the hope that public opinion is fully aired before the law is amended.

**Mr. Whitten:** It sounds like Murdoch's tax revolt.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Exactly. What happens is that we have a front page story, a denial, and then we have letters to the Editor.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Whyalla will resume his seat.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** On a point of order, Sir, I am somewhat surprised that the member who has just interjected has not been questioned by the Speaker, and I wonder whether we are allowed to interject this evening.

**The SPEAKER:** During the course of the Address in Reply debate, interjections have come from both sides of the House, including some from the honourable member for Davenport. If interjecting is overdone, I shall certainly call members to order, but during the present debate both sides have been more free with interjections. The honourable member for Whyalla.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I am pleased to know that the member for Davenport is so interested in hearing my remarks. I now want to turn to another member of the Opposition—

**Mr. Chapman:** Don't tell me all this preparation is finished and you have now run out of puff.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has made nearly half the member for Whyalla's speech.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I thought, Sir, for a moment that you were going to suggest that the member for Alexandra was finished. I want to turn to the member for Eyre because he made a statement that I should answer. He said:

We all know that the Port Pirie council supports the establishment of a plant in that area—

he is talking about a uranium enrichment plant—

I understand that the Mayor of Whyalla today supported the building of a treatment plant in Whyalla. I would support the building of a treatment plant in that area because it would certainly help that city. I wonder whether the member for Whyalla would support that plant?

I am aware that the Mayor of Port Pirie has come out in opposition to the member for Stuart on this question. I think it was about 12 months ago that the Mayor of Port Pirie showed grave concern about a slag dump that was causing a radiation problem in that area, and it seems strange to me that he should now suddenly support such a proposition.

I was rather intrigued by a statement made by the Mayor of Whyalla. She was obviously rung up from Adelaide and asked to make a statement about the plant. Her original statement was "Yes, we will have a uranium treatment plant, my very word we will," yet 48 hours afterwards, on the back page of the *Whyalla News*, she altered her statement and said, "As long as safeguards are okay." In answer to the member for Eyre's question, "I wonder whether the member for Whyalla would support that plant?" let me make it clear that I do not support the establishment of an enrichment plant until those safeguards can be met and the uranium treated safely.

**Mr. Chapman:** You're not concerned in your area about unemployment?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The member for Eyre, the member for Alexandra, and their colleagues apparently think that mining will solve our unemployment problem in Australia. Let us consider the mining industry in the member for Eyre's district in regard to employment.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** What Robert Dunstan said is just so true.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is out of order.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The honourable member mentioned Radium Hill, which I believe does not exist now as far as labour is concerned. He also mentioned Iron Baron (that is going backwards) and Iron Knob (which is also going backwards). He also referred to Coober Pedy. We

are talking about labour intensification, for God's sake!

**Mr. Mathwin:** How's B.H.P. going; is that going backwards?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Dealing with unemployment, I have already moved a motion, and I intend to debate that matter. I am raising the question at this time only because of the attitude of the Opposition. Let us not forget what the Leader of the Opposition said in Whyalla during his election campaign. The headline in the newspaper was, "Minerals hold key to future of Whyalla, says Tonkin". In the first paragraph of that report it is stated:

Minerals to the Far North hold promise for Whyalla's future, according to the Opposition Leader, Dr. Tonkin, who visited the city on Friday. The coal, oil, copper and uranium, when we are sure of the safeguards, must be exploited.

Even on 5 September last year that is what the Leader of the Opposition was saying to the press, yet we went through this fiasco this afternoon.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** The Federal Government told him he must change his tune.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable Minister of Transport to order.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The member for Eyre and the member for Alexandra talk about employment, but what did the Leader say in Whyalla on that day as far as the clothing factory is concerned? Incidentally, this factory, although it is not fully utilised, now employs more than 40 people. The report states:

In an interview with the *Whyalla News* Mr. Tonkin said he could give no assurances that the Government clothing factory for Whyalla announced by Mr. Dunstan would go ahead under a Liberal Administration. "We would have to take a closer look at the situation," he said.

As far as the Leader was concerned, it was not a goer. It is a terrible pity that the member for Alexandra, along with many of his colleagues, does not see every day of the week the hardship that I see due to unemployment. If he did, perhaps he would not laugh so much. I want to point out some of the aspects of unemployment that I am experiencing—

**Mr. Gunn:** They tell me that Councillor Murphy is going to make you unemployed in Whyalla.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I hope that the member for Eyre will not lose any sleep over that remark. The problem of unemployment in our community is the most degrading and certainly the most inhuman thing that can be experienced. Many people who are now unemployed in my district simply want the right to work. When I walk down the streets of Whyalla I see many skilled people who, having originally been brought to the city of Whyalla to work in manufacturing industries, are now unemployed. Let us not forget that when it was convenient for B.H.P. to want skilled labour it was recruited from all over the world; there are no fewer than 61 nationalities living in Whyalla, and these people live there because they were brought there to perform skilled or semi-skilled work. Houses were built in the area, and water, schools and hospital facilities were all provided for these people who were working in a labour-intensive industry.

When you take away a manufacturing industry that directly employs 1 800 men and indirectly, within the same community, another 600 men (that is, 2 400 men in all, excluding those working in subsidiary and other spin-off industries from that of shipbuilding), it must have a disastrous effect. I do not know, for the life of me, how the Opposition, including the member for Alexandra, can sit there and laugh about the situation, saying that it has arisen because of our economic position.

**Mr. Chapman:** All I want you to do is tell us your policy

regarding those fishermen.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** You can say what you like. There is no doubt in my mind at present (if ever there was any doubt) that the people of Alexandra have no interest at all in the question of people being unemployed.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That's a ridiculous statement.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** You can say what you like.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member should say "the honourable member", not "you".

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Very well, Sir. I accept your ruling. Unfortunately, under the present Federal Government, the unemployment position will not improve one little bit. Certain people are trying to create the impression that somehow we must accept and live with the unemployment position. However, I find it distasteful, as do many other people in my district, to have to live with it.

**Mr. Chapman:** Will you tell us your policy about B-class fishermen? You started to tell us, and you backed off like a crayfish.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must cease interjecting.

**Mr. Chapman:** I am respectfully asking the honourable member to go on with what he started.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is not Question Time.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I should now like to refer to another matter. The member for Napier yesterday asked a question about a *News* report headed "Jobless should earn dole on farms." I never cease to be amazed when I hear statements like that emanating from the rural industry. We talk about the jobless earning money on farms. I take it that those involved will work on farms for nothing or for the dole. I make perfectly clear, as every honourable member knows, that a person on the dole cannot earn more than \$5 a week; otherwise, he loses the dole. If members opposite do not know that (the member for Alexandra looks like a stunned gosling at present, so he obviously does not know), they should. I tried once to get the Social Security Department to make allowance for young girls to enable them to do catering. However, as soon as I got further into the matter I found that those young girls could not earn money, either. Although that sort of thing happens, suddenly the farmers say, "Let them earn the dole by working on a farm." What a ridiculous statement! On that basis, I support the motion.

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** I, too, support the motion and add my condolences to the family of the late Frank Potter. Indeed, I support other honourable members in the remarks they have made in the debate regarding the late Frank Potter. It is obvious from the speeches made by Government members that a well concerted plan has been implemented in their preparation for this Address in Reply debate. In His Excellency's Speech, the name of the Fraser Federal Government was mentioned, I think, about every third line. We have had that continuously carried through all the speeches by the Government members. So, the name of the Fraser Government has been referred to *ad infinitum*. It is obvious that the Premier has told Caucus, "We are in trouble. We are under pressure. Our ratings are falling. We are not going so well, so we must attack."

**Mr. Chapman:** Get the heat off.

**Mr. WILSON:** That is so. The Premier says, "The only way that we can do that is to attack the Fraser Government."

**Mr. Mathwin:** The Premier even chants it in his sleep, they tell me.

**Mr. WILSON:** That must be so, as the member for Glenelg says. So, we have had this incessant reminder about the Fraser Government, all because of this

Government's fighting a rearguard action. I should like to refer to two or three things said by Government members during the debate.

**Mr. Gunn:** What about the member for Whyalla?

**Mr. WILSON:** I do not want to talk about that honourable member. I think the House has made its judgment on his contribution. However, I should like to refer to one or two things that the member for Newland said. In his usual, high-handed way he made an attack on the member for Mount Gambier and Senator Carrick. I remind the honourable member that most education spending is done by the States. In fact, 88 per cent of education funds are provided by the State, and education is primarily a State responsibility. Despite what the member for Newland says about Senator Carrick and the Federal Government, it is up to the State Government to allocate its priorities. If it wishes to spend more on some section of education, such as, for example, pre-school, primary or secondary education, it is up to the State Government to decide how to spend its money, according to its own guidelines.

**Mr. Chapman:** Are you saying that the Minister of Education in this State failed to get his message across to Cabinet? In other words, he missed out?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WILSON:** I am indebted to the member for Alexandra for that interjection, because he has taken a keen interest in this matter. He is quite correct because, if education in this State is failing, it is because the Minister of Education has not convinced his Cabinet colleagues of the priorities of the situation. In fact, if the State Government wanted to allocate more funds to education, it could do so from its untied grants. This financial year, untied grants have increased by 10.7 per cent from \$506 000 000 to \$566 000 000. In other words, if the Government wants to allocate more money for education (I hope that the member for Newland will see in *Hansard* tomorrow what I am now saying) it has the means at its disposal to do so. However, in line with the Commonwealth Government's federalism policy, that is a decision for the State itself. I should like now to refer in passing to one or two things mentioned by the member for Ross Smith. He said:

I suppose as a starting point one must ask the member for Davenport and his colleagues just precisely what is wrong with the concept of public employment and the fact that the State does employ people. The member for Davenport and his colleagues assume—

The member for Ross Smith often criticises the member for Davenport. Indeed, he seems to have a paranoid fixation about the member for Davenport. What the member for Ross Smith says in this Parliament is important, because he is an aspirant to the front bench. Unfortunately, the Minister of Transport will no longer be a Minister in this place after the end of this Parliament. I am tipping that the member for Ross Smith will be on the front bench.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Do you think that is a good thing?

**Mr. WILSON:** I am saying that he is an aspirant to the front bench and that therefore what he says is important and of interest to this Parliament. I would rather have the Minister of Transport here, because otherwise I would miss his smiling face across the House. Despite the fact that the Minister of Transport maligned me before I came into this House—

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What did he say?

**Mr. WILSON:** I will tell the House. When I was the Liberal candidate for Torrens, he was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that I had advocated that a freeway be



built through the suburbs of Prospect and Walkerville.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Which you had.

**Mr. WILSON:** I had not. If I had advocated that, the electors in my district would not have elected me to this Parliament, and the Minister well knows that. However, I forgive the Minister for that untruth. I was able to deny that, and the voters of Torrens realised that that could not be so, that I could not have said that, so they did not believe the Minister.

Returning now to what the member for Ross Smith said in his Address in Reply speech, I quote:

... in fact, any work undertaken by people in public employment involves some wasteful or inefficient activity and bad administration.

To be fair to him, he is saying that that is our view of public servants. That is plainly nonsense. We have a high opinion of public servants in this State. What the member for Ross Smith does not seem to realise is that we have a mixed economy and that the crucial thing is the balance between public servants and those employed in the private sector. The member for Ross Smith cannot have it both ways, because later in that speech he said:

There is nothing basically wrong with an increase in public employment and the Public Service in the community today. At the very same time, the Deputy Premier is telling the State that this State Government is cutting back and that there will be no increase in the Public Service for the coming year.

Then the member for Ross Smith took pride in the fact that, according to his figures, there had been an increase in private sector employment in this State. He cannot have it both ways.

**Mr. Bannon:** I say that the two go together.

**Mr. WILSON:** Yes, we have a mixed economy. The difference between the Opposition and the Government is that the balance in that mixed economy is crucial and once the balance gets out of kilter the Government loses revenue and it cannot govern the State efficiently. In another part of his speech, the member for Ross Smith criticised the Opposition (the Leader, in particular) about its attitude to the Pecuniary Interests Bill relating to members, and he said:

It is interesting that all this huffing and puffing about slush funds and credibility funds comes from people, such as the Leader, who oppose a Bill to try to deal effectively with the disclosure of interests of members of Parliament. Let us get rid of this hypocrisy.

The hypocrisy is the Government's, because we know very well (and the member for Ross Smith knows very well) that the Opposition supports a disclosure of interests policy and it, in fact, supported the report of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives. The hypocrisy is with the Government, because the Disclosure of Interests Bill was rushed in before the Federal election on 10 December 1976. The Bill was hastily drafted and took no account of public servants and many other facets of the House of Representatives Select Committee. That Bill was rushed in in its hastily drafted form to try to fool the people, so the hypocrisy lies with the Government. As the member for Coles has reminded me, we did get the fifth Senate seat.

Before the State election on 17 September 1977 the State Government had a record around the country for some sort of efficiency. The Government had built up a public relations bubble that surrounded it and many people, especially people in this State, believed that the Government was doing a good job. At that time the Government had a majority of one in this House. At the election on 17 September the people of South Australia obviously thought that the Government was doing a

reasonable job, because it was returned with an increased majority. This was because of the public relations aura which surrounded the Government and which had been built up by the Premier's media monitoring unit. In the past, the Government had had reasonably good relations with the media, and by means of the media monitoring unit had inundated the media with press releases of all types. If the media had only accepted half of what it received (and it was at saturation point with that material) there still would have been the false impression that surrounded the Government.

However, things have changed since 17 September 1977 and the Government does not any longer enjoy the relations with the media that it did, because of the Government's performance since that time and because the media is now questioning the Government's performance.

**Mr. Chapman:** According to the member for Whyalla, they are not doing too well at all.

**Mr. WILSON:** Indeed. The media is now showing a degree of independence that it was not showing previously. The Premier's public relations machine has broken down. The Government has become hypersensitive about the media. It has become hypersensitive to criticism of any kind, not just by the media. The Minister of Transport is sensitive to the criticism I am making now.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You're not making any.

**Mr. WILSON:** If you bear with me, I will get to him.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You were talking about your neighbour, the member for Ross Smith. Can you spell that out?

**Mr. WILSON:** The member for Ross Smith and I have a working arrangement about people who cross our boundaries. I was talking about the Government's public relations exercise and how it is not working. The media has become disenchanted with the Government. The Government, because of its hypersensitivity, has become paranoid about the criticisms that emanate from the media in particular.

There has been a series of attacks on the media and media personalities, the first of these having occurred a long time ago, before the election, when Mr. Ian Steele left the *Advertiser* and went to the United States because of the Premier's remarks about him. The Premier was incensed because Mr. Ian Steele took a line of independence in an article he was writing at that time. I will not go into the details of the SDN fiasco, when Mr. McEwen and Mr. Ryan resigned, and Mr. Bidstrup's resignation was offered and not accepted. All that was because they had dared to criticise the Premier and show a degree of independence.

Even among the Premier's own media people there have been defections from the group surrounding him. We have seen Mr. Crease, Mr. Peter Ward, Mr. Tony Baker and Mr. John Templeton leave the Government's service. It is not for me to postulate what the reasons were; perhaps it was because they were bored with the Government. In any case, the Government showed this extraordinary sensitivity to criticism, and I will give some examples of it.

The Premier has made constant attacks on Mr. Stewart Cockburn, starting at the time of the Salisbury affair. He has also attacked Mr. Cockburn in this session of Parliament. At the press conference at which the Premier announced the findings of the Royal Commission into the Salisbury affair, he said, among other things, that dismissal was not the only course open to the Government. Mr. Terry Hehir, of the Australian Broadcasting Commission, asked, "Why was the report released to the press so late?" The Premier replied, "To help you, Mr. Hehir. I would have been perfectly justified



in walking in here and releasing the report directly to you." The Premier was sarcastic because a journalist had tried to criticise or even question him on the small point of why the report was released so late.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You got the "late" and the "early" mixed.

**Mr. WILSON:** I did not. Then, he was told by a young woman journalist, "Mr. Tonkin claims that the press conference was staged." The Premier replied, "Well, gentlemen and lady, if there is any staging, it has only been done by you." Once again, the Premier was sensitive over a somewhat minor point. Then, he was asked by a young woman, "Why was a South Australian judge called in?" The Premier replied, "We normally appoint South Australian judges to Royal Commissions in this State." One can imagine how the Premier said that.

He was asked by the same woman, "Would an outsider have probably given a far fairer hearing?" The Premier exploded, saying, "I resent that bitterly. How dare you suggest that in any way the judge in this matter has been unfair." The reporter then tried to explain herself and said, "I don't feel that myself." However, that did not matter to the Premier, who went on to say, "That is what you are advocating. It was a disgraceful allegation to make against a senior and respected judge of this court." That was a disgraceful exhibition towards a young female reporter who was only trying to get at the truth of the matter, and it shows the Premier's entire sensitivity on the matter.

After the 17 December election, the Premier, when interviewed, predicted a period of stability in the State. He said that the Government had achieved most of its major reforms. In particular, he referred to social reforms and consumer-protection legislation, most of which he had introduced and implemented when Attorney-General, and later by Mr. King, as Attorney-General (now Mr. Justice King). The Premier made it plain that he thought South Australia was in for a period of stability and a settling down period, now that it had achieved most of its major aims. However, the Premier reckoned without the Attorney-General's ambitions. The Attorney-General is not content to rest on the actions of his predecessors, particularly his immediate predecessors, but has decided that he will become Australia's great reforming Attorney-General. His philosophy is well known.

In relation to his recent Chifley Memorial Lecture, he replied to a question from me. I asked whether he said that the Government should look to gain some measure of control over supply, especially those industries which were profitable. He replied "Yes". I asked, "Is this the policy of the State Government?" Again, he replied, "Yes". I then asked whether he also advocated the investment by the State in new industries and ventures and, if so, whether he would give some examples. Once again, the answer was "Yes", although he did not give any examples.

Also regarding the Attorney's philosophy and the recent State Australian Labor Party Conference, I asked whether he supported a motion by the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union reaffirming the Party's union and socialist foundations, and whether he was opposed in this motion by Mr. Harold O'Neill and the Deputy Premier. The Attorney-General replied "Yes".

During the same weekend, at A.L.P. conferences in New South Wales and Victoria, the movement among the A.L.P. was going the other way. The A.L.P. was trying to disown its union and socialist foundations. I have a copy of an address given to the New South Wales Labor Party conference by Mr. John Ducker, a Federal Vice-President and State President of that Party, who is now involved in the intervention in the affairs of the Queensland A.L.P.

Branch. Mr. Ducker was accused by the left at the conference of trying to split the Party. A debate centred on Mr. Ducker's presidential address, in which he said that:

Labor had to show the electors that it was a better economic manager than the Liberals. He said, "There is no other way Labor could be elected to Government."

In his printed address, Mr. Ducker attacked bogus militants within the Party and said:

One of the Party's bugbears was the word "Socialism", which was thrown around like holy water.

A report in the *Age* of Monday 5 June states:

Australian Labor Party has made the first formal move to rid itself of the socialist bogie. The Party's platform now says that the A.L.P. stands for control by democratic process, including, where necessary, social ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

Finally, I want to compare the Attorney-General's attitude to the attitude of the Federal Leader of the Labor Party (Mr. Hayden). In the *Age* of January 1978 the following report of Mr. Hayden's views on nationalisation states:

I'm totally opposed to nationalisation. I think it's a clumsy, unnecessarily provocative tool. It brings more political ill-will than benefit. We're very limited in what we could nationalise—if indeed anything.

He then makes the following comment about the Australian Labor Party in the 1980's:

It's got to be concerned to support and encourage the private sector, because that's where three out of four jobs are. It's got to clearly define what it wants to do in the public sector and what it wants to do in the private sector, so the community knows what it is about.

**Mr. Venning:** Who are you quoting?

**Mr. WILSON:** Mr. Hayden. The Attorney-General has introduced a series of consumer protection legislation and social legislation, which this Party agrees has much merit, in part. However, the Attorney-General has tried to transfer the American system of consumerism to this country when, in fact, we have a different type of economy from the American economy—

**Mr. Venning:** And other countries, too.

**Mr. WILSON:** True. This legislation has caused much uncertainty in the community, and has been one of the main reasons for the instability of the past nine months. The method of introducing this legislation is evidence of the Government's incompetence and failure to learn from the Whitlam experience.

During the Whitlam years the Federal Labor Government tried to do exactly the same thing: it moved far too fast, it moved too quickly, and that was its main undoing. Certainly there was merit in much that was done, but it was done all at once, all in a hurry, and all at great cost to this country.

I now refer to two or three matters before commenting on the NEAPTR scheme. I am not going to deal with the options of the scheme, which I am sure the Minister will be pleased to hear, but the way the matter has been handled. First, however, I refer to the Salisbury dismissal: not regarding the files or even the Commissioner's report, but about the method by which the dismissal was made. There was no greater evidence of the Government's arrogance and incompetence than in the handling of the Salisbury affair, and nothing did more to burst the Government's public relations bubble than that.

The dismissal of Salisbury was arrogant and a naked abuse of political power. Once again, the Government did not learn from the Whitlam experience, because it was the dismissal by Whitlam (once again a naked abuse of political power) of his Ministers—Cairns, Connor, Crean

and Cameron—that started the Federal Labor Government on its downhill slide, and the Minister well knows that. The Government should have learned from that experience that it was a naked abuse of political power. The dismissal of the Commissioner of Police will live in the memories of the people of this State for a long time.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Was it justifiable?

**Mr. WILSON:** Of course the dismissal was justifiable. "Justifiable" means capable of being justified. I do not know who drew up the terms of reference; perhaps it was the Minister for Planning who was responsible, but of course it was justifiable. That means it was capable of being justified, and almost anything is capable of being justified. It is not that point that will live in the memory of the people of this State: it is the method of dismissal that is important. As a sidelight of the Salisbury dismissal, Mr. Salisbury admitted before we had the Royal Commission that he had not provided the Government with full information.

When the Premier released the Commissioner's report he stated that the Government had misled Parliament, but he said nothing about the Westminster system of democracy in which, if a Minister misleads Parliament for whatever reason, the Minister should offer his resignation. The Chief Secretary would have been the Minister involved. I would not blame him for misleading Parliament if he was given wrong information, but the Westminster system of Government demands that a Minister, who misleads Parliament for whatever reason, should offer his resignation. There is no way that the Government can deny that.

Another subject showing the Government's lack of grip on its job is its handling of the Environment Department. This matter has been ably canvassed in this House by the member for Murray. The Premier shifted the previous Minister for the Environment and replaced him with the Deputy Premier, who made an extraordinary statement in this place in answer to a question. He said that, under the previous Minister, his own colleague, the department had no purpose and did not know where to go. That was an extraordinary statement to make about a colleague.

Morale in the department is low. Loyal public servants in the department are worried because of outside appointments, and the present Minister for the Environment has been no more successful than was his predecessor in operating the department. Perhaps the Government should bring back the member for Henley Beach because he was probably the best Minister that the Government had.

The Government found itself incapable of taking action during the live sheep dispute. The Minister of Labour and Industry went to Melbourne for three weeks, and the dispute was left in the hands of the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, a Minister who does not have the confidence of the rural community. The Government claimed repeatedly that that dispute was a Federal affair, and industrially it was, because of the unions involved. However, South Australian farmers and workers were involved and a South Australian institution, Samcor, was involved. It was a State matter, and it needed the good offices of a Minister like the Minister of Labour and Industry, who has a reasonable following in this State and who does a reasonable job in arbitration; it needed his presence here. The least the Government could have done was to have ensured that he was here. The Government should not accuse this Party of *laissez faire* politics. When it comes to the live sheep dispute, the Government was a pastmaster of *laissez faire* attitudes.

I will not go into the details and options in relation to NEAPTR. I merely wish to say a few things about the way

in which it has been handled.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You have one minute.

**Mr. WILSON:** If the Minister wishes to go, I shall still continue. First, I refer to an article written by the member for Ross Smith, reported in today's *News*. I do not make a habit, nor will I, of commenting on articles written by the honourable member, because it could get to the ridiculous situation in which we comment on each other's articles each week.

I am sure that is not desirable, but he did say something about the NEAPTR scheme, and I cannot refrain from commenting. He gives an example of what he means by immaturity, and how the public reacts with immaturity to public involvement schemes, and then states:

A prime example of this is the North-East Transport Route study. For 18 months surveys, leafletting and consultations took place—but it was only at the last minute that those in the inner suburbs organised meetings and petitions of protest, often making it appear as if the proposals which had been formulated over a long period simply had come out of the blue.

The first reason is that the residents of the inner suburbs did not realise the implications of NEAPTR, because the Government had not, at that stage, produced the options.

**Mr. Bannon:** There were pamphlets in letter boxes.

**Mr. WILSON:** Yes, but are you referring to now or a few months ago?

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** They were provided.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WILSON:** What people did not realise at that time was that the Government had already made up its mind—

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** That's a lie.

**Mr. WILSON:**—about which way it wanted the transportation corridor to go.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** That is completely untrue.

**Mr. WILSON:** It was when they realised that the Government had made up its mind that people objected.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You know that is untrue. You and your predecessor had been provided with all the working papers.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WILSON:** In 1968 the Steele Hall Government released the MATS plan.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** What a bloody disgrace that was.

**Mr. WILSON:** That was paid for mostly by the previous Labor Government: the study was carried out by that Government.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** It was not.

**Mr. WILSON:** It was released by the Steele Hall Government. The Minister of Transport learned well from the public reaction to the MATS plan. He was not going to be caught in the same way as the Hall Government was caught with that plan. He was not going to be caught with a violent public reaction that, in some respects, could have been responsible for the defeat of the Hall Government in 1970. The Minister learned his lesson well: he introduced NEAPTR as a public involvement exercise—

**Mr. Mathwin:** He had a practice run first.

**Mr. WILSON:** As the honourable member for Glenelg reminds me, he had a practice run with the Morphettville bus depot.

**Mr. Mathwin:** He put it over the public, right, left and centre.

**Mr. WILSON:** This was to be a public involvement plan. Of course, that is a good thing; public involvement is necessary.

**Mr. Bannon:** What about the way it is twisted politically?

**Mr. WILSON:** This public involvement exercise, NEAPTR, was undertaken by a group of dedicated public

servants. It has taken 18 months to two years to complete, and it had cost nearly \$1 500 000 a few months ago, and it could cost about \$2 000 000 by completion. With this plan the Government has tried to involve people of the north-east areas and of the inner suburbs affected by the plan in studies, interviews, and meetings, and then to produce recommendations from those reports. The initial reports came out halfway through last year, and maintained that there were seven primary options of transport for the relief of residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

The member for Newland smiles. Let me tell him that I agree that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs need a rapid transit system. The trouble was that by the time these reports were released, half of the options had already been precluded by the Government. In other words, the public servants had been working under a misapprehension or under false guidelines, because the Government had already precluded some options that they were investigating.

**Mr. Chapman:** Had the Government precluded them before or after they were looked at?

**Mr. WILSON:** They were precluded halfway through the study. We were promised the decision before last Christmas. At that stage NEAPTR planners had issued their papers with the seven primary options. Because of the rumblings of opposition from people in the areas to be affected and by local councils, the Government deferred a decision, as in fact the Minister of Transport has deferred most of his decisions.

Concurrently with this scheme an imaginative study commissioned by the Deputy Premier was under way, conducted by Hassell & Partners, for the Torrens River committee, on a future plan for that river. Amidst a great deal of confusion Hassell & Partners reported, but had grave reservations about the question of a rapid transit system along the river itself. So not only was the Government faced with rumblings of opposition from the areas concerned but also with opposition from its own Torrens River committee, and from Hassell & Partners, the study team.

The situation is to be further complicated by the fact that the Deputy Premier, who is in charge of the Torrens River planning, is also Minister for the Environment. We reached the stage in the past two or three months when the Government made a decision. What was that decision? It commissioned yet again another study to provide alternative options for that section of the scheme that ran between Lower Portrush Road and Park Terrace, and also for entering into the city of Adelaide.

There is no question that the Government had no intention of accepting any of these options, except the original Torrens River option. It referred to modifications, but the decision had already been made. The Premier's letter to his constituents stated that he favoured the Torrens River option. Who has ever heard of a Premier, especially one with the ego of the present gentleman, accepting a decision of his own Cabinet to publicly disagree with him. In other words, the whole of the present operation has been a public relations cover-up, designed to set council against council, environmentalists against people whose houses were to be acquired, and inner suburbs residents against outer suburbs residents. Divide and conquer was the Government's policy. Unfortunately, the policy failed because, except for a small number, the people, the councils, and the environmentalists, were all united in opposing the scheme.

So what did the Government do next? It commissioned an environmental impact study, a further study no less, into its partial decision for use of the Modbury corridor. Who carries out this environmental impact study? Is it the

Environment Department? No, it is the Transport Department, which is carrying out the environmental impact study upon its own scheme. There has been a crashing silence from the Minister for the Environment and his department about the whole of the study, with which, one would suppose, they would be deeply involved and deeply concerned.

**Mr. Evans:** Who could they give it to?

**Mr. WILSON:** The Government has decided on this scheme, and the handling of the public relations has been abysmal. It has caused heartbreak and unnecessary concern to many people. It has aroused the ire of the environmentalists as well as of the local councils along the Torrens River. It has aroused the ire of the general populace of South Australia by introducing a route into the City of Adelaide across the parklands and up King William Street. It has changed the issue from a local one to one of general concern.

When a Government is elected to govern, if it makes a decision it should say so, and test public reaction. How many studies can we afford to have into any one project? Of course, the people have to be involved in the decision-making process, and they have to be consulted. The Government has become tangled in a web of studies and public involvement and ineffectual publicity. It has not been straightforward with the people of this State, and it has tried to cover up the worse aspects of this scheme by dividing the people concerned.

The past nine months has been a period of dismay for the people of South Australia, who have been faced with not only arrogance but also muddling and indecision by the Government. The people of South Australia have not realised until now that the Government is intent upon its socialist objectives. They know now, and they will understand well before the next election. More importantly, they realise that, even in pursuing its objectives, the Government is completely incapable of achieving them with any degree of competence.

**Mr. OLSON (Semaphore):** In rising to support the motion, I congratulate the member for Morphett and the member for Mawson, the mover and seconder of the motion, on their contributions to the debate. Before proceeding with my remarks, I must correct the member for Torrens on two matters he raised. First, I think he said that members on this side had received instructions from the Premier that they were to speak on unemployment. I assure him and other Opposition members that we are under no instructions from anyone in speaking in this debate. We have heard the speeches made by honourable members opposite, not one of which referred to the plight of the unemployed. We hear from time to time that there should be a combining of the Parties so that we can work in the national interest of Australia, but not one of them will support the very people we are here to defend, the underprivileged in our society.

The other point I must correct refers to growth in the Public Service in this State. We have heard speech after speech from members opposite saying that we have in South Australia more public servants than other sections of the community.

The Liberals fail to grasp that, without the expansion of the public sector, the private sector is unable to flourish. The Government is criticised and told that it is actually making it harder still for private enterprise in the community to function because, without grants being made for public projects, those who are dependent upon contracts through the various departments are naturally adversely affected.

When we look at this accusation of the Opposition in

relation to the growth of the Public Service, we see an interesting situation, especially as it applies to all States. The figures I shall quote have been provided by the Public Service Board, and they cover the period for the past five years up to 1977. Victoria has a Public Service growth rate representing 51.5 per cent of the population; Western Australia, 51.4 per cent; South Australia, which we are always told is the highest, 47.5 per cent; Tasmania, 46.2 per cent; Queensland, 45.7 per cent; and New South Wales, 38.7 per cent. The most remarkable thing is that the two States, Victoria and Western Australia, with the highest percentage, have Liberal Governments. So much for the suggestion of those people who come into this House and criticise us when Liberal Governments in other States have higher percentages. It is nothing more than a lot of rubbish.

I shall confine my remarks now to the growing unrest within the electorate towards the attitude of the Federal Government and its lack of sympathy for the lower income groups in the community. The only item of credibility flowing from the Prime Minister's speech in 1975 is simply that life was not meant to be easy. The present social and economic system is in a state of collapse. If total collapse takes place, the succession will go to either the forces of democratic socialism or totalitarian communism. Any right-wing coup will be short-lived and will be overthrown, with horrific violence and bloodshed. We hear of isolated instances of this at present, particularly within the ethnic community. If some of those people are in arrears with time payment and attempts are made to repossess goods, they do not sit down and let the bailiff take those goods away. As people's homes are repossessed—and we have had illustrations already—they are not going to be idle and take what is meted out.

It is not a pretty picture, but nevertheless it is not going to disappear. It is like expecting a physician to be able to cure cancer by refusing to diagnose the problem. It is something we cannot get away from, and the sooner it is faced up to federally, the sooner people in the community will perhaps be able to relax a little and continue to overcome the difficulties.

We often hear that savings bank deposits have never been higher than they are at present: that is because people do not know their future from day to day. Obviously, they are not spending their savings if they think they will be out of a job tomorrow. We have heard of the number of unemployed when Labor went out of office, and we have been criticised for creating that situation. Members opposite fail to say that the main problem is due largely to the increased price of oil, which affects so many countries throughout the world. Further, Australia is progressing at a slower rate of recovery than are many overseas countries.

Instead of unemployment being reduced, we find that the number has escalated to about 500 000 registered unemployed, not to mention those who wish to work and are unable to register for social services, mainly because they are ineligible to register as unemployed. If they were taken into consideration, the total number of unemployed would be nearer 750 000 than the 500 000 at present claimed. Already the cost of providing social services for the unemployed exceeds \$900 000 000 annually.

What sort of project could we implement with that sum to put people into jobs? Criticism is made of what is happening regarding the moneys spent on providing meals at our public hospitals, yet some people think nothing about the \$900 000 000 in social security payments being made to people who cannot find a job. If a little common sense was used, what sort of programme could that sum provide to retrain people? I understand that, through

technological change and automation, retraining of people is possible, but instead we find that nothing is being done in this regard.

Programmes funded by State Government resources have been curtailed simply because of cut-backs from Canberra. Of the 8 553 000 voters enrolled at the last Federal election, 7 275 000 were employees in receipt of less than \$204 a week, and this included people who were dependent on or were recipients of social services or repatriation benefits. Some people have tried to paint a pretty picture by saying that the average weekly earnings are \$204, but not many working men are earning anything like that sum. Those people do not constitute the so-called middle class, they are not the fat cats of our society, nor do they even belong to the so-called lower middle class: they are workers and people who have retired or are disabled, as well as, to a large degree, people who are jobless.

Many of those people receive incomes below the poverty level fixed by Professor Henderson in his report on poverty, yet members opposite wonder why savings bank deposits have never been higher and why people are reluctant to purchase consumer durables. As I have said, the reason is perfectly clear: they are afraid to spend, because they do not know what the future holds for them. A glowing illustration of that appears in a report in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 2 August, as follows (and this affects my district):

Oldfields Bakery Pty. Ltd. is to become a wholly owned subsidiary of D. and J. Fowler Ltd. as part of plans to reverse the bakery loss situation. Finalisation of the deal was expected in a few days Mr. Fowler said. Other subsidiaries were trading profitably but finding the going tough in the difficult economic climate, particularly in South Australia, where Fowler's major manufacturing activities are located. Mr. Fowler referred particularly to lack of confidence affecting South Australian manufacturing industries—and this is the part that grossly concerns me—

The deluge of legislation emanating from the South Australian Parliament inevitably brought in its wake greatly increased administrative costs, both to the public and private sectors, he said these ultimately must be borne by the consumer.

That in itself is somewhat surprising, because the former owner of the bakery, Edgar Oldfield, when he sold the bakery some time ago was able to inject into the community many thousands of dollars to fund projects involving, for example, Mothers and Babies Health Association centres, various community halls, such as one to house the Port Adelaide band, and he even supported the Port Adelaide Labour Day celebrations committee to the tune of about £4 000 or £5 000. He considered that it was his responsibility to plough back into the community money he had received from profits made in the baking industry.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** That just shows the extent to which your Government has wrecked the South Australian economy and the profitability of companies.

**Mr. OLSON:** It does not show the extent of what the Government has done at all. It shows that the unions were right in demanding a bigger share of the national cake. Mr. Fowler does not believe in demanding equal pay, a higher minimum wage, the appointment of more arbitration inspectors, the appointment of more sympathetic judges and conciliation commissioners (where previously a claim lodged in the court took five years to be heard), the right to six years retrospectivity on wage claims instead of only 12 months, better right of entry provisions, stronger protection against victimisation, laws to resolve the problems associated with Moyle and Doyle (and we all know what those problems were), support for the 35-hour

week, four weeks annual leave, an annual leave loading, or wage indexation.

We can have cheaper commodities if one brushes all those things aside. What astounds me is that one can walk into a supermarket and see the difference between the prices of goods left on the shelves from last week and the prices of some of those more recently put on the shelves. Some prices have been marked up by 10c and are in many cases D. and J. Fowler lines. Can an increase of 10c on, say, an article costing 78c be justified?

**Mr. Abbott:** It happens every week.

**Mr. OLSON:** Exactly. When someone starts criticising the unions because workers are getting better conditions, he should realise that it is in his interest for the workers to get those better conditions, because he is buying commodities that they are manufacturing. True democracy is government of the people by the people for the people. Until 11 November 1975 it was reasonable to expect that reform could be achieved by the Federal Government.

I now doubt this, because I no longer believe that the forces of privilege will ever accept the legitimacy of an elected Government that challenges the legitimacy of the entrenched privileged. We find here that this minority will tolerate the Parliamentary system only as long as it can be manipulated for its own selfish ends. It will allow a people's Government to gain office in times of world-wide economic crisis, as it did in 1929 and when it needed the real people's support as it did during the two world wars of 1914 and 1939, when its property and privileges were in danger. Otherwise, it will always deny power to the people's Government.

However, if Parliament is to survive (and I hope it does), there will have to be an urgent and radical change in the present policies of the Fraser Government. The Australian Labor Party platform calls for restoration of Parliament as the principal organ of democracy, and demands the maintenance of effective Parliamentary supervision over the executive branch of Government.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Your Premier acts as dictator, Speaker, and everything else.

**Mr. OLSON:** I will deal with what the honourable member has said in a moment. Anti-Labor Parties in office can be distinguished from the Labor Party because they will tolerate dictatorial leadership. Once elected, an anti-Labor Prime Minister can be almost as much of a dictator as was Hitler, Stalin, or Franco. Whatever he wants, he gets, and this has been proven by the reports in today's press regarding Senator Withers. Such a Prime Minister can subvert the authority of his Ministers.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Don't you think that Senator Withers' conduct was reprehensible?

**Mr. OLSON:** Definitely; that is only too true. Such a Prime Minister can subvert the authority of his Ministers by giving orders to their permanent heads. He can interfere in the affairs of departments that other Ministers have been commissioned to administer. He can dismiss or reshuffle Ministers at will and, in fact, this is happening. He can personally appoint ambassadors, Royal Commissioners, and inter-departmental committees to report on matters that are under the jurisdiction of his fellow Ministers, without reference to Cabinet.

Australians will not tolerate a one-man dictatorship; nor should they. Like a feudal King, an anti-Labor Prime Minister can play favourites. He can be party to or close his eyes to a serious breach of Westminster convention by one Minister, and he can capriciously ask the Governor-General to dismiss another for a relatively minor indiscretion.

Without reference to Cabinet, such a Prime Minister

can give himself extravagant junkets overseas, while at the same time refusing to permit his Ministerial colleagues to attend important international conferences of vital concern to their own portfolios. He can blackmail his colleagues with the threat of a dissolution or double dissolution of Parliament whenever he cannot win his way by the normal means of persuasion.

**Mr. Venning:** To whom do you refer?

**Mr. OLSON:** I am referring to the present Government in Canberra. The Liberals also take the view that dictatorial leadership must be willing to accept the consequences of failure. On that score, I could probably refer to the South Australian Parliament. If a person does not win on the first occasion, he does not get a second chance. They believe that power is too important for that. So, when a person becomes a political liability, he is replaced by someone who will not lose votes. The Liberals sacked Mr. Gorton as soon as it seemed that he was an electoral liability. They will do the same with Malcolm Fraser when it becomes evident to a majority that he has become too heavy to handle.

**Mr. Harrison:** That won't be too far off, either.

**Mr. OLSON:** The circumstances are such that I wonder how long it will be before Mr. Murdoch embarks on that course. After they have created the chaos that is being wrought upon us at present, they will then go to the electorate and say, "Look, we have got a new Leader. Things will be different from now on. You owe it to Australia to give him a go. At least give him a chance so that he can prove himself."

**Mr. Slater:** Whom do you think it might be?

**Mr. OLSON:** I would not like to say. So many donnybrooks are occurring over there at present that it could be one of many people. I should like to conclude by referring to His Excellency's Speech, paragraph 11 of which states:

Particular attention will continue to be paid to matters arising in the area of community development. My Government is considering proposals arising from the Inquiry into Community Development and Assistance relating particularly to the role of the many organisations involved in community development activities.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Community Welfare for his interest in and the financial assistance given to the under-privileged sections in my district. I should like particularly to mention Mr. Jim Kilgour, the Community Development Officer, who has done a magnificent job and used his skills to solve many of the problems experienced by the people in the Port Adelaide area. I am sure that my colleague, Mr. Whitten, who is Acting Speaker, will be well aware of the way in which this gentleman helped to ease the burden of many unfortunate people. I trust that out of the Corbett Report will come recommendations to enable Mr. Kilgour's employment to continue. At present, provision exists for community development officers to be employed until only 31 December 1978. I sincerely trust that the way will be paved to permit Mr. Kilgour and other people like him who are doing this sterling work to continue working within their various communities.

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

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

Motion carried.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I support the motion, and join other members in expressing condolence to the members of the Potter family on the loss of their husband and

father. I accept the remarks made by so many other honourable members regarding the tremendous service that the late Frank Potter gave over a long period, not only in the Parliamentary sphere but also in the marriage guidance area.

I deprecate in the strongest possible terms the way the position of His Excellency the Governor, and indeed the position of Governor of this State, was prostituted by the Speech given to that gentleman as the Speech with which to open this session of Parliament. It is no good the Minister of Mines and Energy giving a wry smile; the smile will be taken off his face and off the Government's face if the Government continues in this way to try to prostitute the position of Governor by putting into his hands the type of document which we were unfortunate enough to have to listen to on the occasion of the opening of this session.

I would like to briefly mention the contributions by two or three members on the other side. The first is the contribution early this afternoon of the member for Ross Smith. I ask just how naive he is to suggest what he did about the attitude expressed by me that it was dangerous to handle a document which was offered with provisos. I accept the issue that he raised, namely, that it is important for a Leader and a Premier to be able to have discourse on a number of matters one to one. That situation has occurred in this Parliament, but not necessarily in this session: I speak only of the period between 1972 and 1975.

There were occasions then, and there needed to be occasions, when there was a one to one dialogue between the Premier and me. I believe that was a completely correct procedure and that it should be adopted. It was one that was respected, as I understand, on both sides, and it always should be. However, the proposition put forward and commented on by the member for Ross Smith is entirely different.

When documents are in existence, or when people have had access to a document, it becomes a dangerous situation for a person in the Opposition, or a person in the Government, to accept a document from a member of the other side with the proviso he can look at it but cannot say anything about it and it cannot be divulged under any circumstances.

We in this Parliament have seen, over a period of time, the divulgence of information which was given personally and the divulgence of information contained in documents which were given on a confidential basis. People have found themselves in quite invidious situations when, for some cheap political purpose or personal spite, some third, fourth or fifth party has made that information available and directed the information back to an opponent. That is not a situation that I believe is tolerable. I do not think that the member for Ross Smith, on reflection, would make a similar statement to the one he made earlier this afternoon.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You would agree that certain documents have to remain confidential?

**Dr. EASTICK:** I have always believed that certain documents have had to remain confidential. I have said so, and I fortify it by the comments I made earlier this afternoon and those I have made now.

The member for Semaphore talked of going into supermarkets and seeing constant price mark-ups. No-one denies that that situation exists. No-one denies that the wage situation has constantly improved, or that wages have increased. No-one denies that the cost of petrol, services, transport and a whole range of inter-related costs have increased, reflecting upon every service and every commodity that we purchase.

**Mr. Olson:** To the extent of 10c a week per item? Come off it!

**Dr. EASTICK:** The honourable member is suggesting that we would be so foolish as to believe that every item he so glibly referred to goes up 10c each week. That is quite a ridiculous statement. The reality of the matter is that there are increases, and there will be increases while there is a price spiral associated with the cost of production and associated wage structures.

**Mr. Olson:** Why didn't you support price control?

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Some people put prices up in order, at a later stage, to announce a discount.

**Dr. EASTICK:** Some Governments have been known to do the same thing and suddenly have retracted their position immediately before an election. The Minister would know all about that, because he is a member of such a Government. Earlier this evening while in my room I removed from a calendar, which happened to be open at September 30, 1977, a short quotation from Plutarch, which I direct to the Minister, namely:

Know how to listen and you will profit even from those who talk badly.

That typifies a situation that the Minister may well dwell on.

During the course of this debate members have referred to unemployment. I have consistently (as I believe other members have) deplored the fact that it is a continuing blight upon society today. It is not only a blight affecting South Australia or Australia; it is world wide. It is not a matter which members on the opposite side can suggest is one in which they and they alone are interested. It is a problem which affects every one of us and one to which each and every one of us has directed our attention in various ways.

That leads me to the comments made here on 20 July, as reported at pages 142 and 143 of *Hansard*, by the member for Stuart. He suggested that the only place in South Australia where misery existed was the area of Port Augusta and the Stuart District. I interjected on that occasion, and I have no hesitation in pointing out that, if the member for Stuart believes that misery occurs only in his district, unemployment and the problems associated with it cause misery in every district in this State. All members of this House have had people calling on them seeking assistance. It is unfortunate that the relief which is available to a number of those people is discounted or less available to them because, regrettably, there are those in the community who are "foxing" on the rest and some who are feathering their own nest and who are not interested in the bloke next door.

That situation is recognised: it is a feature I have criticised about this Government's unemployment relief scheme programme; not because there is a programme, but because it is employing five for the value of six, and because the State Government Insurance Commission is being allowed to charge between 15 per cent and 17 per cent for workmen's compensation in connection with the programme, whereas people employed by councils or those working alongside council workers can be covered by the council's insurance company for between 6 per cent and 7 per cent. It is those problems, caused by people who are too hungry and not over-interested in anyone else but themselves, which lead to the misery to which the member for Stuart referred. Those people are a blight on the nation and wherever else they might exist in the community.

I indicated to my colleagues that I would be talking about the weather in this debate—I mean the weather in the sense of the sun and the rain not the wether that is everlastingly a lamb's uncle.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You're just jealous.

**Dr. EASTICK:** I suggest to the Minister that he be wary, otherwise my professional skills might be used. On



examining the dictionary I find that "weather" is defined as the condition of the atmosphere at a given place or time with respect to heat or cold, quantity of sunshine, presence or absence of rain, hail, snow, thunder, fog, etc. It is also the condition of the atmosphere regarded as subject to many vicissitudes.

In the broadest sense, when talking about the weather in the sense of climate, we see that the definition of "climate" is the condition of a region or country in relation to prevailing atmospheric phenomena as temperature, dryness or humidity, wind or dullness of sky, etc., especially as these affect human, animal or vegetable life. More especially, I will consider climate in the broadest sense of mental, moral and environmental situations and, indeed, the attitudes of a body of people in respect of some aspect of life and policy and in respect of the climate of opinion or thought.

Many issues are drawn to our attention in His Excellency's Speech, so that we need to examine and recognise the present climate of opinion and thought. Certainly, we do not want to consider matters only as do many Government members, by living in cloudland and looking down from above, but we should study the hard reality of many of these issues. I refer to the type of situation explained by none other than the Prime Minister of Great Britain in a statement of 19 July 1978, when he said:

We recognise that the long-term problems of the world economy will only yield to sustained efforts over a substantial period.

Obviously, the economic climate, the unemployment climate, and the trading climate of the whole world is a global issue. It is not related to the South Australian scene or isolated in relation to the Australian scene, but is one that we must accept and consider in the total sense. I know that the member for Napier has forsaken that Prime Minister and come to a land with an even better one, but let us see what the Prime Minister whom he has forsaken had to say. He said:

Our first concern is that the world-wide level of unemployment is too high.

That opinion is held by the Fraser Government, which has accepted that situation, as, indeed, did the Government before it, even though it was responsible for creating a large mass of it. Before anyone suggests that that is not so, I ask him to reflect on the revaluation fiasco and the destruction of some industries (especially clothing and shoes) inflicted on the Australian public and work force by the Whitlam Government.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** I believe that 5 000 people lost their jobs because of tariff cuts.

**Dr. EASTICK:** That is correct. The quote continues:

We agreed on the need to reduce the general level of inflation still further and that higher growth and reduced inflation will contribute to greater currency stability.

In this regard, we are not called on so much to consider the stability of the currency scene, but let us not fool ourselves, because it is important and it has a major part to play in relation to our everyday life, the whole of our trading attitude, and the whole of our local trade, as well as on the Commonwealth and the global stage. There are people of the same political persuasion as Government members who are prepared to face reality and to accept the climate and the situation, who look for better things and who realise that it will be improved and be more bearable only so long as there is a concerted and total attack.

I am pleased to align myself with the comments made by the member for Semaphore; namely, of the need to look more positively in total at so many of these issues. I

believe that the opportunity exists but, regrettably, there are some on all sides who find it convenient for cheap political gain, or because they do not really recognise the responsibility they have on behalf of the community in which they live, to back away from accepting any of that responsibility.

I have no doubt that the member for Playford would agree with me, because he has said in the House, as has the member for Fisher, that there is real purpose in continuing the Constitution Convention. It is a fact that people are around the table and talking. It is a fact that, at the plenary sessions, one does not always obtain the direct result one would like to achieve, but at least people are talking and, while they are talking, they are obtaining a consensus. They are examining various issues and, hopefully, as they have already done, they will find answers which will be capable of implementation and which will enhance the future of the whole Australian scene.

It is all very well for members on either side to be critical of the slowness of the Constitution Convention. The point has been made, and I repeat it, that the cost of holding a plenary session of the convention with all of the committee work leading up to it, is only a small fraction of the cost of putting forward items by way of referendum, especially when there has not been adequate discussion. The cost of referendums is five, six or seven-fold the cost of the plenary sessions and, because there has not been a consensus or proper regard given to the whole issue, there is no earthly chance of the referendum's being passed. I believe there is a need for this type of dialogue to continue because, in my experience in the House, worthwhile legislation has been promulgated by the House as a result of bi-Party participation in Select Committees.

It is to be hoped that the bi-Party situation associated with the working party's report concerning dogs will come forward with a solution that will advance the situation in South Australia. Although the Health Commission is still in its early days in this State and is having teething problems, the Act is better legislation because of the discussions that were held around the table. I refer especially to the evidence and the information received, which subsequently went into that legislation.

To further illustrate my point that everyone is involved, I draw members' attention to the editorial of the *Motor Trade Journal* (June 1978) under the heading "It's somebody else's problem", which states:

How often do we hear the statement . . . "But that's his problem"? It appears to become more common day by day and lacks the concern for the other fellow which the good natured "Blow you Jack, I'm alright" of yesteryear implied.

I commend that editorial to members of both sides, because it comes face to face with the reality and the importance of everyone recognising that they cannot live in a cocoon. In no way can they be isolated from the rest of the community around them; in no way can one State be isolated from the rest of Australia; and in no way can Australia be isolated from the global situation. "I'm all right, Jack, blow you", no longer has a place if we are to achieve the type of economic and other results that we all seek.

Again referring to the weather, in the *Western Australian Daily News* of 26 July 1978, under the heading "Focus", there appeared Mr. Fraser's forecast, as follows:

Continuing cold and gloomy, with chill winds for public servants.

That report was prepared after an interview in Melbourne with Mr. Laurie Oakes. The report is identical with the report that appeared in the *Adelaide Advertiser* about 24 to 48 hours after it appeared in Western Australia. One or



two matters are raised that set the pattern of the type of advancement that we claim we seek. Certainly, I know that members on this side are committed, and it behoves Government members to recognise the importance of these features in precisely the same way as the British Prime Minister has recognised them. The report continues:

Mr. Fraser was even unenthusiastic about the results of the Bonn economic summit the weekend before last. "I don't really believe the Bonn summit is altering the situation," he said.

He recognises the problem that we have on a global situation. The report continues:

Out of the total scene I don't really see any dramatic uplift in world trade or world markets generally.

Because he does not see those, we have to accept the fact that we really have no opportunity to obtain immediate relief beyond our shores. Therefore, we become more reliant upon recognising the situation that we have at home, and the manner in which we have to resolve it at home. The report continues:

That means that if Australia is to improve her position overall, we have got to do it by getting a better share of our own domestic markets and, to the extent that we can, increasing our share of world trade.

We have to show the initiative. We have to recognise that it will be difficult, that we have to work at it. The report states:

Then a faint ray of light in the gloom. "I think we are well placed to do the latter so long as we get inflation down further, especially since in some other countries inflation is increasing."

There is other detail in this report, which is the same as the report which appeared in the *Advertiser*, and which members could consider. In the *News* of 26 July 1978 under the headline "A public disservice" the following editorial appears:

Like most politicians Mr. Fraser has said some silly things in his time. But yesterday he said something that was simple, sensible and which should be heeded by every one of Australia's seven other heads of government: "If a Government is short of money, the first thing to do is to look to its staff ceilings and its own employment policy." The Prime Minister also intends to practise what he is preaching by reducing the Public Service some 3 per cent. About time, too.

Other statements in the editorial come face to face with reality, suggesting that we can make progress only so long as we are willing to cut our coat according to our cloth. It was put more succinctly by the person who claimed that the best climate in which one can live is the one just within one's income. Members should consider that situation.

If we want to live in a situation of spending beyond our means, we have to accept the consequences that follow. If we are willing to take the amount that is available to us and adjust our spending accordingly, we will be in a much happier climate than would otherwise apply. To achieve that result we must all give attention to expecting a reasonable return for our tax dollar spent. The tax dollar comes from each of our pockets one way or another, be it directly or indirectly, and it is necessary that the tax dollar be spent properly if we are to live within our means and within a climate favourable to us all.

We have growing public concern among people who are unhappy with the way in which the tax dollar is being spent and with the wanton waste associated with that spending. Although there has been much ridicule by members opposite when reference is made to primary industry or, more especially the rural industry, they should realise that about 50 per cent of Australia's total export income is

derived from rural products.

Further, 73 per cent of our export income is derived from primary exports, which comprises the rural situation plus mining. Going one step further, we can say that about 89 per cent of the total export income is derived from our primary industry; that is, the rural industry plus mining, plus alumina, because alumina is a processed ore product that is sent overseas as a processed product and does not naturally come within the area of primary production. We should reflect on the fact that primary products, plus the processed alumina, are responsible for about 89 per cent of our export income.

There are those in the community who recognise that there has been a definite gain from the attitude or the action taken by the Fraser Government. I refer to the comments made by Sir James McNeill (B.H.P. Chairman), when, in a recent address to the Confederation of Australian Industry, he said:

Some of us may find this hard to believe with competition seemingly more bracing than ever. But that, I would suggest, is essentially the result of the low level of demand which still exists.

He had just said that the competitiveness of many Australian industries had greatly improved in the past two years. He went on to say:

People who talk as if the whole of manufacturing is under threat are spreading quite unnecessary gloom and despondency. Analysis would show that of 1 100 000 people employed in manufacturing, 16.5 per cent are in the food, beverage and tobacco industries, which are largely immune to import competition. The same applies to the 4 per cent in non-metallic minerals; and substantially to industry groups such as newspaper printing, timber milling, oil refining and much of the fabricated metal group, from bridges to containers . . .

In the longer run, though, Australia's economy should be able to sustain a growth rate of 4 per cent. This should mean "quite favourable" conditions for manufacturing industry, subject *inter alia* to restoration of a more traditional relationship between profits and wages.

I make those comments because at least some of the colleagues of members opposite (Mr. Hawke and other leaders) have recognised that profit is not a dirty word but, indeed, an important factor in the overall approach to a country's manufacturing and industrial base. Much has been said from the opposite side of the House about the marked deficit which was sustained by the Federal Government for 1977-78. It does not hurt to recall that included in that deficit is about \$44 000 000 in payments for natural disaster relief.

I ask any member opposite: who would want to withdraw one dollar of that \$44 000 000 from those unfortunate enough to find themselves in such disastrous circumstances? We also find that large sums have been made available to disadvantaged persons in the community to allow them to maintain a lifestyle that at least permits them to purchase certain goods, thereby generating at least some flow-on benefit for other areas of the community, including the service and production industries, schools and post offices, etc.

Furthermore, several post-Budget decisions had the effect of adding to expenditure in 1977-78, including the provision of \$85 000 000 in assistance to beef producers, \$12 000 000 in connection with mining operations at Mary Kathleen and Mount Lyell, and \$8 000 000 for the introduction of the sole fathers' benefit. I have not gone through the total list of extras, but I ask any member opposite who has complained about the attitude of the Federal Government to this and to other States to tell me which of those activities responsibility undertaken by the

Federal Government would they deny? I hazard a guess that there would not be one.

Money was made round to go round, and the infusion of funds into those areas of need has been of far greater benefit than I have indicated and has given an impetus in many areas, improving the employment situation considerably. Reductions in taxation, the impetus that has been given, and the various other initiatives being introduced, as well as reduced interest payments which will have a marked effect on industry and commerce, reflect a very responsible attitude by the Federal Government. This cuts right across the mis-statements to which I have referred and which, as I have indicated, prostituted in my opinion, the Governor's role in the opening ceremony.

As a result of our laudable Parliamentary Library service, members will see on the most recent reading list a reference, "Can the community afford superannuation?" based on the text of a speech given to the 16th National Conference of the Association of Superannuation Funds of Australia, in Sydney on 14 October 1977, by Mr. C. J. White, F.I.A. The article in question, reported in *Superfunds*, June 1978, is quite revealing; it indicates the very problem which industry, government at all three levels, and other organisations are facing in respect of the massive increase in the superannuation Bill.

It picks up a point which has been known but which, to my knowledge, has not been grasped by the Government of this State: that, unless the position regarding funds is revised, there will come a day when the Government will be seriously embarrassed by having to make increased superannuation payments. One of the very real problems associated with the Australian National Railways take-over of the railway system was the difficulty of determining the portability of superannuation involving those people who were transferring from the State railway system and the payment of the superannuation entitlement.

That has been an exercise which the Government should heed closely, because situations of that nature will unfold in the years ahead. More particularly, the article points up the markedly changing population and age of the population. A statistical table is associated with this document on page 12, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without by reading it.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member assures me that it is purely statistical?

**Dr. EASTICK:** Yes.

Leave granted.

Year	Proportion of Population			Total	(4)/(3)
	Aged	Aged	Aged		
	0-14 %	15-64 %	65+ %		
1972.....	28.4	63.2	8.4	100.0	13.3
1982.....	25.1	65.8	9.1	100.0	13.8
1992.....	23.7	66.4	9.9	100.0	14.9
2002.....	22.8	67.5	9.7	100.0	14.4
2012.....	21.7	67.7	10.6	100.0	15.7
2022.....	21.4	66.2	12.4	100.0	18.7
2032.....	21.1	65.3	13.6	100.0	20.8
2042.....	21.0	65.3	13.7	100.0	21.0
2052.....	21.0	65.3	13.7	100.0	21.0

**Dr. EASTICK:** The conclusion of this document is as follows:

... I set out some suggestions for what we might do about the likely long-term rise in the real cost of the community of retirement benefits. First, we should argue for moderation in the extent of improvements at the more generous benefit levels. We should publicise the likely population trends and their effects on superannuation schemes over the next few decades. Secondly, we should argue for the adoption of one

standard of maximum benefit provision in all schemes, whether public or private sector, and that that standard should take account of the age pension or national superannuation benefit available. Thirdly, we should accept the introduction of vesting requirements, provided there is a significant measure of preservation to retirement age of any amount that is at all substantial. This would help reduce waste of retirement provision, and claims for improved benefits because the final career is shortened. Fourthly, we should argue against general reductions in retirement ages as a way of solving problems caused by technological change or unemployment. Selective early retirement in particular situations may well be appropriate, but moves to make this universal should be resisted. Finally, we should resist the temptation to make every change in benefits a "best of all worlds" change. No-one likes to tell someone something the hearer may find unpleasant, but the effects of not doing this in the superannuation case may be expensive, and regretted for a long time to come.

I sincerely suggest that this is an issue to which the Government should address itself in great detail, because it is the Government today but there will be another Government on another day. Each and every Government in future is likely to find itself hung up on the problems associated with superannuation if it does not face the reality of the situation as quickly as possible.

I mentioned earlier that people, by and large, are looking for a much improved usage of the tax dollar. They want a return that is commensurate with the amount spent, and nowhere has this been more apparent than in the area of education. On occasions I have pinpointed the difficulties I have seen in my district of gross over-expenditure in education, and I have highlighted extravagances and wastages. Whilst there has not necessarily been a direct acceptance by the responsible Minister of the statements I have made at the time, there have been alterations of regulations and of normal procedures within the school system to correct a number of those matters. One I mentioned particularly is associated with the right of the school to determine its own purchasing policy, and not to be the recipient of handouts from some central store because someone somewhere believes that the school should have one of this, two of that and three of something else.

I previously mentioned the position of the small rural school that had on its shelves two microscopes, and I was criticised in this House by the member for Newland for being so critical. However, let me tell him that it is not only I, as representative of the district, but large groups of teachers, groups of parents, and indeed the public at large who are looking critically at the whole education system. The attempt made in some quarters to blame cutbacks in Federal expenditure for the present situation has fallen flat, because the vast majority of people in the community recognise that the Government has not fulfilled its proper role of making certain that we get value for the tax dollar in the area of education.

I do not deny the advantages that accrue to any child or any adult who makes use of an education system that allows them to better themselves or to improve their knowledge. However, the wanton waste that has gone hand in glove with it is something that we can and must criticise and something that I know is receiving far greater attention today.

The scenario that I am about to read arises out of just such a situation as I have explained, but relates more particularly to the end product, the student product. The document is headed "A sign of the times" and is a dialogue between an employer and a school leaver. We might accept that it is an over-dramatisation of the

situation but nonetheless there is a great degree of merit in the comment that is revealed. It states:

Employer: (talking to prospective employee who is about to leave school) Tell me how good you are at figures. How well can you add?

School Leaver: I have explored addition for several years in different number bases and in different algebraic structures. I have—

Employer: (interjecting) That hardly answers my question.

School Leaver: Well, I know that addition is commutative and associative. For example, I know that  $5+7$  is the same as  $7+5$  and that this property does not apply to all binary operators.

Employer: (wondering what goes on in schools these days) Do you know the result of adding 5 and 7?

School Leaver: (pensively) No, it's not important. I could work it out, the principle is the same for all addition. My teacher, who recently left college, told us that techniques did not matter and that we should only bother with ideas.

Employer: (wondering what to say next) Did anyone in your class learn to add?

School Leaver: A few. Some boys did it as a special project, but not everyone. We could choose anything that interested us. We were encouraged to develop as individuals. Some decided to do no mathematics at all, others made patterns or played cards. The important thing is to be flexible and to understand what you are doing. It's bad to force anyone to do anything; it crushes their personality.

Employer: (having decided that although the candidate is not quite what he requires he may as well find out more) When I was at school we didn't make patterns. We used to do geometry with proofs. We had to learn by heart about 40 theorems. (With feeling) We had to work jolly hard; there was trouble if we didn't. In comparison you seem to have been to a sort of holiday camp. Didn't you do any real geometry?

School Leaver: I did a little work on the isometrics of plane figures—things like reflections, rotations and translations. We looked at the symmetries of flowers and wallpaper patterns.

Employer: (by now visibly shaken and putting questions with the utmost caution) Sounds a bit different to the geometry I did. Didn't you even prove Pythagoras?

School Leaver: My teacher said you could prove it with notations but she didn't remember how it went, but in any case the important thing is the experience of playing with shapes. She often said that we ought always to remember the saying "I do and I understand", and so we always did practical work. We discovered for ourselves and it was considered cheating to use any facts that we hadn't discovered ourselves.

Employer: Does that mean you didn't read much or do written exercises?

School Leaver: Yes. Books are old-fashioned. We used television, overhead projectors, teaching machines, 8 mm cineloops, tape recorders, cameras, 35 mm slide projectors, structural apparatus, expanded polystyrene tiles and lots of other equipment. You soon get tired of books; they're so limited. The acquisition of techniques is bad. It clutters up the mind. Mathematics must be ongoing and purposeful, not fossilised in books.

Employer: (wistfully) We used to do algebra, too. I enjoyed manipulating symbols and solving quadratic equations. I'm sure it also gave me a better understanding of arithmetic.

School Leaver: (condescendingly) Of course these days we look at lots of different kinds of algebras: Boolean algebra, vector algebra, group algebra, and so on. Algebra is just another name for structure.

Employer: You seem to have had a very different

schooling from the one I remember. (Having decided to end the interview and looking through the papers in front of him). I notice that you didn't fill in an application form but telephoned my secretary for an interview. Can you tell me why?

School Leaver: I can't read or write.

I admit that this is an over-dramatisation of the situation that exists, although regrettably it contains a strong grain of truth. There is in that scenario a situation that exists in today's education system. A problem is associated with the lack of learning, and this is regrettably playing a major part in relation to so many people who are unemployed or who are unsatisfactory for the employment that is available. That is a damnation of our system and of all members of Parliament, as well as of parents. Certainly, it is a damnation of the Government, which has permitted such a situation to evolve.

There are some very dedicated teachers, and the way they have been willing to come out and align themselves publicly with concern for their students is commendable. There are more of them than we have recognised. I believe that we will see an education explosion or "happening" (call it what we may) and that it will be a change for the better. There is a recognition that we have not done the right thing by our young people in giving them the type of background necessary to enable them to improve their lot in society.

I now return to my earlier point, namely, that the climate in which young people are expected to find employment requires them to have a basic knowledge of the three R's; they need more than a smattering of some of the finer details of the technological skills that surround us; and they must be able to return to basics.

If I can do no more, in highlighting this situation in the House, I believe it is necessary for all of us to realise the climate that we have created and to correct it so that the winds that blow in future will blow more to the advantage of our young people.

In the remaining brief time available to me, I should like quickly to refer to certain aspects of the existence of the Land Commission. I recognise that it was brought into being during the Whitlam regime and that it has spent some Commonwealth funds that might not otherwise have been made available to South Australia. I recognise, too, that much money is tied up in Land Commission land and, more particularly (and this is what worries me), in developed blocks which are not selling and in relation to which there is a real liquidity problem from a State viewpoint.

I am not suggesting that the Land Commission is not liquid in relation to its finances. Indeed, it has the assets and, in the total sense, it will not deteriorate. However, this money is required urgently in other areas and cannot be recouped, because sales are not proceeding as well as they might. As a result, many of our housing problems and our ability to house young people and the elderly who are looking for houses is a direct reflection on this unavailable money. The following statement appears on page 10 of the South Australian Land Commission's report for 1975-76:

The commission had 1 128 fully serviced residential allotments available for sale in 1975-76 at Happy Valley, Morphett Vale, Salisbury North and Bolivar. Of these allotments, 1 075 were sold or allocated to private individuals, licensed home builders or the South Australian Housing Trust.

It then provides a diagram and a table of information showing how those blocks have been disposed of. We must recognise that the first report of this organisation was in 1974 for 1973-74. It is quite a new function. At page 14 of the 1976-77 report it states:

The Commission released a further 1 175 fully serviced residential allotments in the northern and southern areas of Adelaide—an increase of 30 per cent over the previous year. Together with 63 allotments carried forward from last year and seven allotments offered back to, and repurchased by, the commission there was a total of 1 245 allotments available for sale during 1976-77.

The problem which has subsequently arisen is that there has been a marked increase in the number of blocks in the pipeline, which are not reflected in those figures or in the sales I have indicated. We find, for example, that in the Craigmere Estate in the member for Napier's district adjacent to my district, about 1 900 blocks are ready for occupancy, but a poor sales rate means that large sums of development money are tied up with no immediate likelihood of recovery.

We have a situation in which areas adjacent to Smithfield, just down the road, are being developed by the same commission. Blocks in many areas are being developed by the commission far in excess of market needs. I am criticising (if I am criticising at all) the lack of proper planning in the sense that the Borrie Report clearly indicated a massive downturn in the number of people requiring housing or, more especially, requiring serviced blocks.

At the same time there has been a lack of planning, and many of these blocks are not selling because of a lack of public transport. There was a promise of public transport, but it does not exist. There has been (and I suspect we will see this as other reports come forward) a massive build-up of an empire, although the population of the State is reducing. I believe that the comment by Professor Borrie in Canberra two weeks ago, when he apologised to the public of Australia for having been so optimistic in his initial figures, should cause the South Australian Government much concern, because it laughed at the Borrie figures and said they were too pessimistic when they were released three or four years ago.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I support the motion, and I, too, join His Excellency in expressing condolences to the family of the late Hon. Frank Potter. Frank Potter was known to me during my 10 years as a member of this House and, during that time, I learnt to appreciate his quiet, unassuming approach to life, and in particular the independent streak that he maintained at all times.

I also express condolences to the family of the late Alec Ramsay, General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust, and express my appreciation, which I believe all people of the State would share, for the magnificent contribution he made to all sections of our society, and not just in the role in which he worked as an employee of this State. There are very few men who have given as much time voluntarily to so many worthy causes. It is a pity that he was not given the opportunity to enjoy at least some time in retirement, although I am sure he of all men enjoyed using his great ability to serve and help others.

Within my district we lost a grand citizen in Mr. Clarrie Newson, who had served our community on many committees, the Lions Service Club, and as a member of the Stirling District Council. In recording my condolences in *Hansard* I do so with the knowledge that his family are also proud, and rightly so, of the great effort he gave to our community.

The "knocker rabble" of our society, especially Government members, have continuously attempted to denigrate the responsible and proper approach the Fraser Federal Government has been forced to take because of the wanton waste of the previous A.L.P. Federal

Government, especially its unbending attitude that we could go on printing money, throwing it into circulation, and hoping for the best and creating inflation as high as 20 per cent a year—that attitude destroyed the savings of retired people, encouraged people to enter into contracts they had little hope of meeting unless the 20 per cent inflationary trend continued indefinitely, and developed a concept within society that it was better to spend all you had and mortgage your future and, at the same time, mortgage the country's future.

I trust that, even though Labor members do not like the Fraser Government, they realise the necessity for that Government to return our country to stability and giving security to its people in the long term.

The comment has been made that no Opposition member has attacked the Federal Government about the unemployment problem. There is no benefit in doing that unless we can offer an alternative that can guarantee the country's future as well as long-term job opportunities. I want members to know that I am not divorced from the unemployment situation, as two of my sons have had to face the consequences in the building industry at a vital time in their life. They are not running around whingeing about whose fault it is: they know that it is to their long-term benefit that this country control inflation. They have been prepared to go out and seek work, and in fact have obtained it with other employers.

Those who are close to the scene can see that our education system needs a complete overhaul. The gold that has been promised many young people at the end of an education rainbow is just not achievable. I believe it would be better if many of them did not seek that rainbow but were taught that there is a need for technicians and trades persons, and more should be encouraged to move into that at an earlier age.

I question the benefit of making 18 years of age the age of majority for all things. I successfully led a campaign to retain the drinking age at 20 years of age in this State, and it was that age for about one year in 1969-70. Many people are now having second thoughts about the drinking age being 18 years. It is interesting that in the United States of America many States are increasing the drinking age, in licensed places, to above the age of majority.

Likewise in the work force, what employer can afford to employ persons who have never done practical work before but who turn up at the age of 18 years and expect a job, knowing that the laws of the land state that, if the employer gives them a job, he must pay them adult wages?

It would be interesting to have a referendum of people between the age of 16 years and 20 years to ask them whether they believed that they should accept full adult wages at 18 years regardless of their experience. I believe they would have more common sense than those who sit in arbitration courts and those who sit in this Parliament or any other Parliament of Australia about what the position should be.

One industry that has had its problems in recent times is the building industry. The problems are not uncommon to the industry, as it has suffered similar setbacks, to my personal knowledge, at different times since 1945. During the boom periods all the go-getters got on the band-waggon. Trades persons who have little experience in finance have moved into the general construction field, some buying blocks of land and "spec" building.

Because of the high inflation rate that was occurring in the early and mid-1950's, finance companies readily made money available at interest rates of between 15 per cent and 20 per cent, thereby exploiting that industry and encouraging others to do the same. The more responsible builder was placed in the impossible position of having his

tradespersons bled off him because of the exorbitant rates that the get-rich fly-by-nighters offered.

This automatically creates over-production, the inevitable slump, and who goes? In the main it is not the established and properly managed builders: it is those who have exploited the industry. Some of them move out of the industry with their pockets well lined but continue to make steady progress in their previous practice. Others have thought it was a gold mine. They have drawn high directors' fees, bought expensive cars, travelled over the world, and have caravans, boats and holiday shacks—all by exploiting the industry. Suddenly, their financiers say that things are a bit tough and, "We want our money." These people then have their companies declared insolvent. They do not lose their personal assets, but they have made it very difficult for the proper operators in the industry, and often they have created much human suffering. Of course, it would be wrong to argue that any one factor or section of the industry or Government is totally to blame for the problems that arise in the industry, and there is no doubt that the present situation is one of the most distressing that has faced the industry for many years.

If we look back, we recall that immediately after the Second World War displaced persons sought to make a home in our country where they believed their freedoms would be protected. Servicemen returned hoping to build homes and establish their families. Until that time many of their loved ones had been living with families, and these factors caused a boom.

We had crash training programmes for returned personnel to learn trades. Most of them have been very successful. Money was not really a major factor in the first 10 years but materials and, to a lesser degree, labour were. In fact, in the early stages, as a continuation from war-time measures, Governments found it necessary not only to have price control on some products but also to have a permit system for building materials. In the allotment market there was much subdivision immediately prior to 1960. Many developers were condemned for their over-indulgence in this field, even though local government and the State Government were prepared to allow it to happen. With hind-sight, I believe the practice was not that unsatisfactory. If one looks at those suburbs now, one sees a mixture of architecture. There is a community involvement and the areas in question are far from ugly. The houses would compare with any standard of housing in the world.

The benefit of that system was that we had an over-supply of allotments at all times, so that competition kept prices in control. Facilities such as water, sewerage and telephone connections under that system were gradually completed as people demanded them. Of course, there were some difficulties, but the initial entry into the allotment and home market was cheaper by that system.

Then we went into the 1960's when Governments, both local and State, and Federal to a lesser degree, started to interfere with the system. This resulted in developers being forced to supply all the facilities necessary for a community such as rates, kerbing, drains and underground power, etc. Automatically there was a huge increase in the cost of each block: a cost which has to be borne by people in the most difficult financial stage of the lives, that is, when they are setting up a home. I remember reading comments by the late Frank Walsh, the ex-Australian Labor Party Premier in the early 1960's, when he said: "Home ownership is the cornerstone of our democracy." What an attack his A.L.P. successors have made upon that statement. It is interesting to note that the services that have to be installed when creating allotments now average

more than \$5 000 for each allotment. One cannot help but think that we are attempting to establish a Utopia and set the standards too high in the goal of housing our society.

Then, in the 1970's we saw the advent of the Builders Licensing Board, which in my opinion does not serve the purpose for which it was established. When debating amendments to that Act in recent times I argued that there should be a broader representation of people on the board, and that suggestion was accepted by the Minister. But I would have expected that the Minister would select persons with real knowledge of the industry. Yet on 21 January 1977 when the new board was appointed, we found that a Mrs. Philips, who had been a regular participant on the Humphrey Bear Show, had been appointed to the board. She stated at the time that, like many others, she had bought a house, but she did not think she had any special attributes for the position. Mrs. Philips went on to say she did not know a great deal about the role of the board but she believed it was a consumer protection thing. If that is the sole purpose of the board, then I can understand why it has failed so miserably. We have all heard plenty of examples in recent times of that failure.

I would have hoped its purpose was to be a regulatory organisation for the industry which would have resulted automatically in better quality work being done and a better understanding of what should be expected as quality work.

Then we had the Land Commission, which has set out to acquire all the land available for subdivision within the metropolitan area or likely to be required for subdivision up to 1990. This was established and announced with great gusto, and it was claimed the commission would solve all allotment supply and price problems. We have an organisation which has set out to create the smallest possible allotment in every area in which it operates. It now has allotments down to an absolute minimum, and that is one-eighteenth of a hectare. It is an organisation which appears to have no real concern for the variety of consumer demands or any real knowledge of the market place. Proof of the latter, of course, is that it recently had to employ private selling agents because it found the task impossible through its own organisation.

The Land Commission has in excess of \$60 000 000 tied up in its investments and is embarrassed by its inability to quit its stocks, yet it still refuses to allow allotments to be sold to any individuals, regardless of when they wish to build upon the allotment. Surely it would be better for us, the people, if our agent, the Land Commission, recouped its money by selling to individuals who are prepared to pay the costs the commission requires. This would reduce the interest burden that we have to pay through the Land Commission, because in the end result it is the overall society that foots the bill, and we should not condone bad management in this area.

This Government claims to be an open Government, not withholding information. I believe it is a deceitful Government: deceitful because, when questions were asked of the Minister about how many allotments were available for sale, it was necessary to ask supplementary questions, as the answers only gave the number of allotments that were placed on the market, not the number of allotments that were already completed and available for sale, if the commission were prepared to put them on the market. It is a fine point in answering the question but it has happened in so many other fields that there is no doubt it is an attempt to mislead the Parliament and the people. So much for open or honest government.

I personally would hope that the commission did not give this answer in the first place, but that it was a typical

A.L.P. Cabinet decision to have it given in a deceitful form. If the commission did support that type of answer then my assessment of those individuals in the commission, for whom I have held a lot of respect, would not be anywhere near what it has been in the past. I wonder about the real benefit of the Land Commission in the actual development field. Yes, it could be used as a land bank, then an offer made to developers to quote for development of its land in a correct sequence to meet demand for land in the private sector, so that much more private money would be holding the land and paying interest than is the case at the moment. If a private developer held the amount of land which the Land Commission holds now, that developer would have to pay in excess of \$1 500 000 per annum into State revenue in land tax. There is no land tax paid by the Land Commission, so in real terms we are losing \$1 500 000. The commission would also have to pay interest on the money it borrowed to buy and develop the land. But it is strange: even with this type of burden, when one looks at private developments adjacent to Land Commission developments, the private developer is still selling land at as low or lower prices than is the Government agency. Where are the benefits the Land Commission was supposed to bring?

It is also worth noting that private developers pay council rates on all the land they hold. The Land Commission, in the main, avoids paying local government charges on its broadacres. In other words, it moves into a community, buys up large tracts of land, and then says to the local ratepayers, "Bad luck, you will have to pay more because we have protection of the Government, and we do not need to contribute to your community."

Let us imagine what a boost it could be to the housing industry if the \$60 000 000 that the Government has helped and encouraged the Land Commission to obtain had been turned to finance for the housing industry. What a stimulus it would have been during this slight down-turn if it were used as a gradual monetary boost to the very important building industry. There has been a continual knocking of the Fraser Government by Ministers opposite, but each of them realises that what the Fraser Government is doing is right and proper and that it must lower inflation to a stable percentage under 8 per cent, preferably under 6 per cent, so that interest rates can drop accordingly.

The real benefit of such a drop can be seen in the following comparison of payments, excluding mortgage insurance. For a person who has borrowed \$30 000 for a 30-year term from a building society, the present monthly repayment is \$290, at about 11.5 per cent. At an interest rate of 7 per cent, which is possible with a lower inflation rate, the monthly repayment on that same amount would be \$200. Instead of repaying \$75 a week, as is the case at the moment, the borrower would have to repay only \$50 a week. I believe that is quite significant, and that is what Fraser is driving at. Just imagine how much easier it would be for people to pay for their homes, the stability it would bring back to our economy, and the job opportunities it would create. We are having to suffer in the short term because of the folly of a Federal Labor Government that was in power from 1972 to 1975.

We must remember that people will not invest money at an interest rate below the inflation rate, because in real terms they are losing their purchasing power. We must also remember that a large percentage of the people who invest money are not filthy rich, but are battlers who believe in trying to put something aside for the future just in case, whether it be for retirement security, in case of illness or accident, or for some acquisition.

This State Government, and, to a degree, the industry,

are asking that the Federal Government should subsidise interest rates, when the Federal Government has been running at a deficit exceeding \$3 000 000 000 a year. It is not the Ministers who are losing money, it is our Australia, our club to which we pay taxes as a membership fee that is going down the drain financially.

Is the Government prepared to go out and say to the South Australian and the other Australian people, "Your taxes have to increase, so that we can subsidise housing interest rates to a greater degree, because we don't believe the Federal Government should control inflation"? If the State Ministers are not prepared to do that, they are hypocrites and political shysters.

The Minister in charge of housing last week accused the Federal Government of "screwing" the housing industry. I do not blame him for that, because we have learnt to recognise that that is his way of playing politics, but the truth of the situation is (and the Minister is aware of it) that during 1975-76 and 1976-77 we built more purchase homes than the market could handle.

The Minister is aware of the Indicative Planning Council's recommendation that a total of 12 500 homes a year be built; that this was the right level for building to make proper use of the monetary, material and labour resources. In fact, we reached a peak of more than 15 000 homes a year. It was only natural that the prices would soar, and then there would be a glut.

The Minister, who complains about a lack of money coming from the Federal field, is well aware that, from the time I entered Parliament, I often emphasised the importance of helping those in need of shelter, and strongly emphasised the necessity to make rental accommodation available for those people who had physical, financial or other handicaps, but also that when those with financial limitations moved into a better monetary position they should pay the prevailing market rates for rent and interest. Had that been done back in the 1960's (I know that was in the time of the Liberal Government), we would not have had the need, as we have at the moment, for three to four years waiting time for rental accommodation or State Bank finance. When I expressed these views members opposite used to jump with delight because they could use them in the electorate as a method of winning support.

What they did not say was that I believed strongly that those who were disadvantaged should receive concessions with their shelter, whatever concessions were necessary to provide the opportunity to lead a respectable life. In fact, on many occasions I was condemned by people in my own Party, not because what I said was wrong, but because they believed we would lose support electorally.

I think it is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, when we allow the improper use of public money for political support, and I am sure that the more responsible people recognise the need for the proper use of their money.

It is only to be expected that I am pleased that, at the instigation of the Fraser Government, of Mr. Newman, the immediate past Minister, and of the new and very capable Minister, Mr. Groom, the State Governments, including this State, have accepted a most responsible decision that interest rates on the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money should gradually increase on loans. The extra money returned from those persons who can afford the ½ per cent a year increase, to within ½ per cent of the long-term bond rate, will provide funds to supply homes for those who, in real terms, are now in the same financial position as were the previous applicants at the time of application.

I will give an example of the injustice we have perpetrated in the past, and all Parties lacked the intestinal



fortitude to take action to correct the situation until the Fraser Government came to office.

At the moment a person earning \$181 a week or less can qualify for a Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement loan through the State Bank at 5½ per cent. A couple may be just completing their education, for example in law or teaching, or they may be moving into a very successful business. They may never want to have any children.

Another person who may have a wife who remains at home, with two young children, may be a tradesperson earning \$200 a week. His salary may vary slightly from year to year, but he would probably never be able to get out of that purchasing bracket because, as a tradesman, there is little opportunity for promotion or other form of salary increase. He would be forced to go to a lending institution and pay from 10 per cent to 11 per cent for a loan, yet the couple who qualified for a State Bank loan may be earning \$600 a week within five years. That has happened on many occasions and it is unjust and unfair.

The cheap money that has been available has been exploited by many people. It is not that they were wrong in doing it, but it happened because Governments allowed them to do it. I say "praise to the Fraser Government" for having the courage to attack the problem, and congratulations to the State Governments for accepting and implementing an appropriate principle. Maybe they were forced to do so, but that does not matter, because the decision is correct.

In the rental field, too, whether or not we like it, people in this State (even members of Parliament) are living in subsidised Housing Trust houses when they could afford market rents, and in some cases the total family income exceeds \$40 000 a year. These people get their houses repaired at no cost to them and get many other benefits that other persons trying to pay off their houses do not get. It is a real advantage, and I believe that they should be encouraged to pay market rentals on the value of the house as it is today and not when it was built. Society does not ask for favouritism in Government decisions; all it asks for is honest and just decisions. I believe that, what has happened regarding interest rates is just, and that what is happening gradually in the rental field is also just.

Again, I do not blame those people for complaining when they find that the ball game has changed suddenly and that they have a bigger commitment to meet. Often those in the higher income groups, who have had these benefits in the past, have set out to buy cabin cruisers, holiday shacks, or even hobby farms in the hills. Others have bought homes and flats for investment, gone on trips around the world, and so on. They may not have budgeted for the changes, and I think that the approach that has been taken with these matters in the initial stages to gradually implement the provisions will be considered as a wise and satisfactory method.

Has the State Government done all it could to help the situation? The answer is "No". I think the facts show that it has done many things to hinder and, in fact, destroy the housing industry. Consider how workmen's compensation premiums have thumped the building industry and pushed costs up! Since the Workmen's Compensation Act was amended to provide for payment of full wages, including overtime, the percentage cost has increased 100 per cent. It is no good saying that the contractor should foot the bill, because he does not. It is the person having the house established who foots the bill.

Then the Government set out on its other goal of putting another nail in the coffin of the building industry by imposing long service leave for casual employees. Builders are compelled to pay into a Government fund, 2½ per cent of the sum that they pay in salaries to their

employees. If an employee serves in the industry for five years, drifting from one builder to another and giving no real loyalty to any or to the industry, and then moves out of the industry, the money does not go back to the builders: it stays in the Government-controlled fund. That person would have given no real service and would have insufficient length of service to qualify for long service leave, but the industry and the house purchaser would contribute towards the scheme.

Another example is the Land Commission, which I have mentioned earlier. Then there is stamp duty. When the average stamp duty on the transfer of a property in the A.C.T. valued at \$40 000 is \$400, in New South Wales \$590, and in South Australia \$1 090, how can this Government claim it is concerned about people and trying to find shelter for people? How can it say it is concerned about the building industry and wants to help it? How can it justify such an imposition on persons setting out to acquire shelter for their family? It is what one might call a tax on responsibility.

We have a Land and Business Agents Act, which denies the builder the right to sell his own product. It also forces him to employ an agent to sell the home. In the case of a \$30 000 home he must pay \$1 317, so he adds it to the cost of the home. Not only do we have the high cost of stamp duty in this State, but we force the home owner to pay an extra \$1 300 on a \$30 000 home, or \$1 692 for a \$40 000 home because he is compelled to go to an agent. That is not the fault of the industry. It is the fault of this Government, which promoted and had that legislation enacted.

The unions also have systematically, effectively, and, I sometimes suspect, gleefully helped this State socialist Government to decrease job opportunities in the building industry as much as possible. Their continual demands for increased wages, better on-site conditions, travelling time, meal allowances, and a multitude of so-called benefits have placed such a cost burden on the employment of people in the industry that hundreds of job opportunities have been removed.

The Government and the trade union movement may be proud of that, but it depresses me to see many quite capable semi-skilled and skilled workers unable to get a job because, according to the law, the cost of gaining their services is beyond the capacity of society to pay.

Proof of that at the moment is that established houses are selling at considerably below the construction cost of new houses. People are leaving this State believing that we will not get out of the serious situation into which the State Government has got us. Between 12 000 and 15 000 established houses throughout the metropolitan area are now available for purchase. I am not saying that all the houses in that list are available solely because people are leaving the State. However, because there are so many established homes for sale, one realises that the State is in a serious situation, especially if one adds to that figure the 1 500 new homes and home units that are also available for sale. The figure of 12 000 to 15 000 houses far exceeds the number of houses and home units on the market and, in fact, it involves more than 12 months' productivity of new houses.

Thus, the trade union movement and the Australian Labor Party keep on screwing and bleeding the industry. Let them keep on doing it, as long as they are prepared to accept a few more people out of work on each occasion that they ask for more. Because of these actions, there is also the problem of servicing the industry. During the exceptional boom of 1973-76, many business houses took their travellers off the road. In their view, there was no need to spend large sums of money to have a

representative racing around with an air-conditioned car and all the other allowances associated with that person's employment, when we were building at such a rate that builders could not keep up with the demand; automatically, of course, supplies could not keep up with the demand, either.

Now that there is a slump, there is a different problem. Is there enough in the market to meet the cost of a representative with a large salary, an air-conditioned car, fringe benefits, and so on? The answer is "No". So, the suppliers are in another quandary. They want to go out and seek business, but they cannot afford to send out their representatives to try to find it when there is very limited work in the field. Persons in the construction section of the industry have found that while the boom was on they remained in offices telephoning and chasing up materials, which was almost a full-time job in itself, and this was paid for by the purchaser. However, now they are out on the site themselves making sure jobs are being erected properly, effectively and as rapidly as possible. They are not able to keep in contact with suppliers as readily as before, and are not being serviced by representatives. Of course, this affects not only builders, engineers, architects and other professional people in the field, but also supervisors and trades persons, because the boss is now replacing them on the site.

Then, there is the Housing Trust, whose main role should be to create shelter for the needy. But it is not content with that now. It is setting out deliberately to compete with private enterprise. This is happening not only with housing but also with industrial work.

I recently asked a question regarding Penfolds. I do not wish to reflect on Penfolds, which is a successful organisation. However, it amazes me that a private enterprise organisation can ask a public authority like the Housing Trust to carry out the design and consultant work for it when its own sisters in private industry are struggling to survive.

It was interesting to look at the reply to that question and to see that the number of projects on which the Housing Trust had worked in that field with private and public companies, outside of the public sector, amounted to 31, and that the sum of money involved was \$16 113 988 (page 174 of *Hansard* last week). Here, we have the Housing Trust deliberately going out to take work from and destroy the private sector. But, even worse than that, the Housing Trust can undercut anybody in the private sector if it wishes to do so, because there is no way that we as a Parliament or individuals in the street can assess whether all overheads are taken into consideration, and whether prices being charged are the real costs to the trust.

There is no way to ascertain whether the trust is doing a project at below cost just to keep some of its staff occupied while its own industrial buildings are not required by the depressed industry in this State. In other words, it can deliberately set out to do jobs under cost in order to keep its people employed and, at the same time, destroy private consultants, architects, and others in the field. Thus, this Government has set out deliberately to create problems with which the industry cannot cope, and it has created its own share of unemployment through these actions. I know that the Premier and his cohorts would be proud of that, but it is no real help in producing cheaper houses and facilities for those many thousands of people who will require shelter in future.

What of the Builders Licensing Board? It came into operation and was going to solve all problems in the industry. But, has it? I say it has not. What could it do where companies were promoting those third mortgage

deferred payment schemes which have caused so much heart-break, in many cases family breakdown, and in some cases death. Their has been at least one suicide in my area because of that scheme.

I was frightened of the schemes when they started to become popular. I mentioned that to the Minister responsible for Housing in private. I do not wish to relate any more of my discussion with him, but the Minister was aware of my concern. I think deep down, he was not enthusiastic about the schemes.

I then arranged to meet separately with board members of two of the companies. I told them I believed what they were doing was dangerous and could be disastrous. They went into much detail explaining how it was operating and said that they would not allow people to suffer if inflation rates dropped to a point where the schemes might cause embarrassment to some people.

I think, in hindsight, I was foolish to accept this guarantee. It would have been better for the industry, and I am sure for many people who have suffered since, if I had come out strongly with a public statement at that time, so that the Government would at least make some representations to encourage the companies to get out of that form of financing.

In 1974 this Parliament gave the Government the opportunity to establish an indemnity scheme, along the lines of that operating in Victoria, protecting people from faulty workmanship or bankruptcy by builders. The Government accepted an amendment from the Liberal Party to have that in the Act and it was inserted by the Liberal Party in the Upper House.

The Government deliberately, and I mean deliberately, chose not to implement the provision to fully protect house owners from faulty workmanship, material, or from bankrupt builders being unable to complete the work. The result has been much heart-break and suffering for many families and also, to a lesser degree, some operators. On that base alone, I believe the Government stands condemned especially when it is the responsibility of a man like the Attorney-General, who claims he is interested in consumer protection.

To its credit the Housing Industry Association has decided to take up the challenge independently, and has introduced a voluntary scheme of protection. I hope that the State Government backs this voluntary scheme by having implemented similar legislation to that introduced in Victoria. If not, the cries of wanting to protect the disadvantaged or the unfortunate, that we so often hear, are nothing more than political grandstanding and gimmickry.

We have recently seen the Government move to control rental accommodation. I am pleased that the Liberal Party was able to have the Bill modified substantially before it became an Act. There is still a deep-rooted fear in the community that the Attorney-General will appoint his own socialist stooges to the tribunal, to kick private enterprise and tread it into the earth as much as he can through his bureaucratic system.

If the tribunal he appoints has a hate of the private sector, and if the industry is right in that assessment, that will be a further nail in the coffin of private enterprise. It will be an indication to those who have not moved to another area of Australia that the writing is on the wall and that it is time to get out while some of their capital investment can be recouped. The number of flats that have been strata-titled by people fearful of the Attorney-General and this Government's legislation is worrying in itself. I have contacted every metropolitan council to get figures, and there are more than 2 000 units which were previously available for rental which have already been

strata-titled with a view to selling. Some councils have reported an increase in inquiries about strata-titling more rental accommodation since the Bill was first introduced so that that accommodation can be sold, if need be. Some members may say that that does not matter but, if they read today's *News* they will see that the Government's actions in New South Wales of interfering harshly in that market has created a high increase in rents and a shortage of accommodation. People are getting out of the rental accommodation because it is becoming too expensive as a result of Government controls being implemented.

The bondage system for rental accommodation seems to be on the way out, and there may not be the \$1 000 000, \$2 000 000 or \$3 000 000 in the proposed fund of bonds being held, as the Attorney-General first thought.

An insurance scheme is now available that provides for \$24 a year a cover of \$5 000 for house contents and damage by tenants. A cover of \$40 000 is available for a premium of \$113. This same fund covers rental payments of \$35 a week for a premium of \$40 a year, rising to a weekly rental cover of \$120 for an annual premium of \$150.

Landlords will now be able to insure against tenants damaging or thieving from their property or not paying their rent. If that occurs, there is no need for landlords to have money paid into the tribunal fund. I believe that the Government scheme may suffer some disadvantages in that area.

There are many matters I wanted to raise in relation to tourism, recreation and sport but, because we want to finish the debate tomorrow, at the Government's request, I will not say much more. However, I have received a reply to a question which shows the sort of deceit to which the Government has resorted over the Jam Factory and goods sold to the South Australian Museum.

I asked the Premier what articles had been bought by the museum from the Jam Factory over the past four years and what price was paid for each item. The Premier replied that detailed records containing information on items sold prior to 1976 were not kept (and I accept that) and that, therefore, a complete answer could not be given. I have been informed that, since then the museum has purchased 67 items at a cost of \$4 557.06. My point is that the Premier could have told me the price paid for each item bought since 1976. The reason I asked the question was that I believed that the museum had paid \$2 500 for a silver teapot the Jam Factory had made, and that is a ridiculous sum for something made in this modern era and not an antique. To pay that sum would be outrageous.

Today, the Premier referred to food prices in hospitals and claimed that the Frozen Food Factory prices were 40 per cent cheaper than those charged by the private sector. I challenge the Premier to call tenders. The facts he gave today were inaccurate, because I happen to be the one who was doing the checking through. The information he has given is wrong, and his attitude was arrogant. I challenge the Premier to allow the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Royal Adelaide Hospital, or Flinders Medical Centre the opportunity to tender from the private sector, whose price, I guarantee, would be 25 per cent below for the same type of food, method of handling and quality as that at the Frozen Food Factory.

Traditionally, this is a debate during which a member can speak on any subject. The time for speaking used to be unlimited, although recently it has been reduced to one hour, which may be long enough, although the mover of the motion is allowed to speak for longer if he so wishes. We have suddenly been told that we must conclude the debate tomorrow afternoon. On two nights since the session began, the Deputy Premier has said that we would

not sit. Suddenly, his Whip and I were placed in the position of saying to members, "We want you to reduce the time for which you will speak," although we lost at least five or six hours as a result of not sitting on the nights in question.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** We lost a lot of time this afternoon.

**Mr. EVANS:** The Opposition has that right to move a no-confidence motion, and it was not time lost as far as we were concerned. We lost two night sittings, but not at the Opposition's request. The Government made the decision, and should recognise that it made the decision. It placed me, as well as, I am sure, the Government Whip in an embarrassing situation, and I hope that in future more consideration will be given to the rights of members than to the authority of the Government.

**Mr. VENNING (Rocky River):** I support the motion. The second session of the Forty-third South Australian Parliament is well under way. His Excellency the Governor, Mr. Keith Douglas Seaman, O.B.E., had a little more to say when delivering his Speech than he did when opening the first session of the same Parliament on 6 October 1977. On that occasion, his Speech consisted of four brief paragraphs, or about one-third of a page. However, despite its brevity, it was far in advance of the Speech prepared by Executive Council for the Governor to present on this occasion. The Speech, from start to finish, was a blast at the responsible Federal Government, for which the public has in the past few months demonstrated its overwhelming support.

I take this opportunity, despite your performance today, Mr. Speaker, to wish you well in carrying out your duties in this House. I hope that your injuries will be minimal and that your other arm will not yield and be twisted by the vagaries of your position.

Along with other honourable members, I express my sincere sympathy to the family of the late Frank Potter. I also refer to the passing of Sir Robert Menzies, one of the greatest Prime Ministers Australia has yet seen. Mrs. Venning and I were in the United Kingdom when word came through of the death of this remarkable statesman, and we will ever treasure the sentiments expressed to us by the English people, revealing their warmth and love for Sir Robert. Sir Robert, I was told, loved to return to England, especially London, where it was said that he had a wonderful admiration for the women and children and their fortitude during those anxious war years. I was told that he was one of the very few who were able to influence the thinking of Sir Winston Churchill.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. John William Hurtle Coumbe, the past member for Torrens, on his Australian honour. I also congratulate one of my constituents from Carrieton, Mrs. Elaine Byerlee, who received an Australian honour as well.

One notes that members opposite have been whingeing with repeated monotony about some of the problems being encountered by the citizens of this State, but those members fail to recognise the causes of those problems. They are not willing to recognise that union demands are responsible mainly for the closing of many factories in South Australia and the subsequent unemployment.

Unions have usurped the purpose of their existence, and here I refer not to the rank-and-file members but to the many militant heads who, in co-operation with Labor Governments in Australia are stirring and trying to grind this country into the ground, so that they will then be able to implement their communist philosophies.

For some time I have heard the member for Whyalla whingeing about unemployment in his district. True, he

has every reason to express concern about people not having work, but it is about time that he did something about its cause.

Only recently in this House my colleagues have mentioned the possibility of establishing uranium enrichment works in this State, and the policy of the Government has been that it does not support its establishment. I was interested to read in the *Recorder* recently a report of a statement by the member for Stuart, as follows:

"No" to project: Member for Stuart, Mr. Gavin Keneally, is adamant he will not support the building of a uranium enrichment plant in his electorate.

Speaking from Parliament House yesterday Mr. Keneally said he agreed wholeheartedly with the Government's policy on uranium, and added that it was quite clear there was nothing to give an absolute guarantee there would be no harm come from such a plant.

I will not support a project which could bring disaster to my electorate, he said.

Of course, the ideal place to establish a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia would be Whyalla, which has housing and which is close to the steelworks. We believe that this would bring sufficient employment over a period of years for about 25 000 people, so I should have thought that the member for Whyalla would get behind members on this side of the House, despite his political allegiance to the A.L.P., and push for all his worth to have the works established in the northern part of our State. We know that a move is afoot for the establishment of those works in Western Australia and also a move to establish them in Queensland. If we do not wake up in this State it will be too late to ever contemplate the works here in South Australia.

The way things are going many more businesses will go to the wall because union demands will price them there. I was told years ago that a so-called good unionist was one who was never satisfied. That comment can be applied at the present time. Unionists have not sufficient sense to see that if you kill the goose that is laying the golden egg, that will be the end of the eggs. They kill the goose and then whinge. They blame Fraser.

This South Australian Government has never been concerned in its administration to get value for money. They spend it as though there was a spring of supply. South Australia would have been a different State if modern equipment from private enterprise had been brought in to complete the building of our roads, not just to put the finishing seal on. Money is spent with little to be seen for it. It is interesting to note that on many of our roadworks many hours of day labour go into the preparation of roads, and then private enterprise is brought in to put the final seal on. Private enterprise has efficiency and equipment and the equipment is no better than Highways Department equipment, but private enterprise can put it to work and seal anything from 10 to 12 miles of road a day.

If a country is to succeed, it will not do it under socialism. The militant unions and the A.L.P. Governments in Australia are doing their utmost to sabotage this wonderful country. There was a time when I, with my rural industry colleagues, expressed concern about Australia's isolation. Long distances from markets made our competitive position more difficult. However, having had the opportunity to visit countries like Africa, Egypt, Turkey, Israel, Europe and South America, I am now not concerned about our isolation. We are away from many problems, and the only problems we have are brought on by the people within this country.

We may have missed out on markets in the European

Economic Community, but there are many markets still available to Australia, provided we can keep our ports working and not have overseas vessels held up for weeks on end. You would know, Sir, of the reputation that our Australian ports have in countries overseas regarding our industrial strife.

**Mr. Harrison:** You're knocking South Australia again.

**Mr. VENNING:** The honourable member all the time has the attitude that one must not criticise. Our criticism is always constructive.

**Mr. Groom:** You're always downgrading the State.

**Mr. VENNING:** The honourable member has got a lot to learn. He has been brought up in the shadows of the tall city buildings.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think the honourable member for Rocky River has a lot to learn.

**Mr. VENNING:** Honourable members opposite have much to learn. Some have been brought up in the shadows of the tall city buildings.

**Mr. Mathwin:** With silver spoons in their mouths.

**Mr. VENNING:** No, some have been brought up with silver shovels in their mouths. While I was visiting South Africa and the various ports running down to Cape Town, I had an opportunity to inspect the shipping at those ports. It would be nothing to see 10 or 12 vessels going in various directions. I went into the ports. I was interested in the bulk handling facilities at the ports and terminals. The turn-around of vessels opened my eyes and made my heart ache, thinking that back here in Australia, although we had everything going for us, we did not have the common sense to wake up to the situation we were in.

You, Sir, will recall the live sheep issue and the picketing of the movement of sheep from the holding paddocks to the ship. You will recall, too, the silent demonstration of farmers in Adelaide on 4 April and the massive congregation of farmers and sympathisers in Adelaide who gathered in Victoria Square to hear what I consider to have been some of the best speakers and the best speeches I have heard for some time. Those industry leaders came from all over Australia to take part in the demonstration of concern.

We remember also the mighty efforts of the farmers who came to Adelaide and shifted the sheep to Wallaroo in preparation for loading. We recall the comments by the Minister of Labour and Industry and the part he played in the dispute. So concerned was he that he took a holiday on the Gold Coast, up in Bjelke-Petersen country. It must have been a relief to the Minister to be able to relax in a State that knows where it is going.

I was interested to read in the *Advertiser* of 22 July that the Premier of Queensland planned to get tough with the unions. Yesterday, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen celebrated 10 years as Leader of the Government in Queensland, and I noticed in today's paper a report that a woman and her family were going to march in recognition of the wonderful efforts Joh is making in Queensland. Under the heading, "Joh gets tough with unions", the article states:

The Queensland Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, said yesterday that his Government was considering taking a tough new line with militant trade unions. The abolition of union levies for political purposes, conscientious objection to union membership, deregistration rules, and new industrial sanctions were being considered, he said. He described Australian trade unions as industrial dinosaurs which had not changed in organisation since the 1890's. Many of their aims had been achieved, and many unions today were little more than vehicles for professional trade union secretaries to ride into Parliament. This was done with A.L.P. pre-selection by courtesy of Trades Hall or, even more seriously, as the tool for revolution by the Communist Party.

He said the metalworkers', waterside workers', seamen's, miners' and building workers' unions were controlled outright by the Communist Party. "The miners' union and the seamen's union in Queensland are trying to get control of Queensland's export industry for the communists," he said. The Premier said he proposed a new grievance handling procedure. Sanctions would be imposed on unions which flouted arbitration decisions. "We also propose secret ballots for union elections," he said.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen may have his faults, but he will do me. I like his intestinal fortitude and the way he handles things in Queensland. Militant unions must be handled with a firm hand, and the sooner we clean things up in this country the better.

It was interesting to see in South America how that country is being governed. If we are going to put up with militant unions in this State, the situation must be countered with a comparable Government. It is almost reaching the stage where one will need a militant Government here to counteract militant unions. There are no similar problems in South America.

I well remember a couple of years ago when unions in Australia said that they would not permit the Wheat Board to load wheat for Chile. The growers could have demanded that the wheat be loaded because, once it got to Chile, there would have been no problems there with the unions unloading it. I know that the trade union system today throughout the world could cause trouble in some countries overseas if they were pushed here to load vessels, but that would not happen in South America, especially in Chile.

I believe that a democratically elected Government, irrespective of its colour, must be allowed to govern the country; not the communist infiltrated unions, as has been the case in the main at present in Australia. In many areas of our socialist A.L.P. Government the chickens are coming home to roost.

In the *Advertiser* of 20 July some details of the State Transport Authority Report was published. The losses of that authority are momentous. The loss in 1976-77 was \$63 400 000 and the year before that the loss was \$51 800 000. I suppose there will be another loss now when the books are tidied up. If the loss is at the same rate of increase as it has been in the previous two years, it will mean more than a \$70 000 000 loss for the authority. What a fine record for our Minister of Transport and the Government of which he is a part!

When one thinks back to the days when the actions of this Government squeezed the private bus operators out of business, and one remembers the dishonest way in which it was done. This Government would not allow the private operator to increase his fees to cover ever-increasing costs. In the end this socialist Government seized the opportunity and took over the buses and the services, the result being losses and more losses and a lack of services, and the Government couldn't care a darn about it.

Many of our non-metropolitan railway lines have problems. The biggest disaster our State has encountered has been the selling of our non-metropolitan railways. The Premier has talked about what that deal means to South Australia. The deal ranged from \$10 000 000 to \$800 000 000. The South Australian Government's selling of our non-metropolitan railways reminds me of the chap who sold his wife for a bottle of beer and was asked by his friend, "I suppose you are sorry now," to which the fellow replied, "No, but I'm thirsty again."

That is the position in which we find the South Australian Government. It would never have enough money for its wasteful administrative requirements. I feel sorry for Mr. Nixon, the Federal Transport Minister, for

having to deal with this type of administration. I refer now to our own Minister and his efforts to tidy up the shonky deal undertaken by the last A.L.P. Government in the Federal sphere. Many of the demands have been unrealistic, particularly regarding retirement benefits and retention of personnel. In many areas, I am told, we have a duplication of staff, one State and one Federal. What a lot of nonsense!

I think we all believed that, before any non-metropolitan lines could be closed, the State Minister of Transport had to agree to such closure. I do not know what is happening at present with the Gladstone-Wilmington and Peterborough-Quorn lines. Rumour has it that the Federal Minister is to close them while the State Minister stands by and watches him. It was not until a deputation waited on the Minister last week that he came out and said what he was going to do. What he said sounded all right, if one can believe what he said. I should like now to refer to what the *Advertiser* reported the Minister as saying. On 4 August, under the heading "South Australian Government to fight two rail closures", the *Advertiser* report states:

The South Australian Government will oppose Federal Government moves to close two country rail lines in the State. The Minister of Transport, Mr. Virgo, said yesterday the Federal Government wanted to close the Gladstone to Wilmington and the Peterborough to Quorn lines.

He said the closure move by the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon, followed an economic viability study of the lines by an economist from the Tasmanian Transport Commission.

Under the terms of the transfer of South Australian non-metropolitan rail services to the Commonwealth, it cannot close any rail lines without the agreement of the South Australian Government.

If South Australia refuses to agree to a closure, the matter has to be taken to an independent arbitrator. Mr. Virgo has written to Mr. Nixon asking him to reconsider the decision. If he persists in his present attitude, then the matter will most certainly go to arbitration," he said.

Mr. Nixon's attitude to the closure is based on cold, hard economics and totally disregards the social effects that the closures would have.

That is not true, as I shall show by reading another document soon. The *Advertiser* report continues:

South Australian officers have conducted our own examinations into the viability of the two lines. Our study showed clearly that there is definitely a public need for both lines, if not for their full length, then for at least certain key sections of them. Both lines are essential—at least over their key sections—for the bulk movement of wheat as well as for the movement of barley, wool, general freight and superphosphate. If the lines are closed it will be a bitter blow for towns in the area.

I agree totally, for many reasons, with the retention of these lines. Until the Minister can prove to me that he can upgrade his Highways Department to equip the area with better roads, I will support the retention of these lines.

Regarding the Minister's comments about Mr. Nixon, and the latter's attitude being based on cold, hard economic facts and totally disregarding the social effects involved, I should like to read the following circular that the Minister sent to me on 9 March last year:

Dear Mr. Venning, I refer to previous correspondence regarding the possible closure of the railway lines between Peterborough and Quorn and Gladstone and Wilmington. Following my negotiations with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Hon. P. J. Nixon, M.P.) I have been advised recently by Mr. Nixon that he has established a committee of three to investigate the proposed closure. The committee will

be chaired by Mr. K. M. Barclay, Regional Director, South Australian and Northern Territory Region, Commonwealth Department of Transport; Mr. R. Wyers, who will be representing the Bureau of Transport Economics, Canberra; and Mr. P. D. Keal, an officer of the State Transport Department.

This is a point I want to make, because Mr. Virgo criticised Mr. Nixon saying it was based on "cold, hard economic facts". The terms of reference of the Committee were as follows:

- (1) The committee shall investigate proposals put forward by the Australian National Railways Commission to close the Peterborough to Quorn and Gladstone to Wilmington rail lines in South Australia, and prepare a report on this matter for the Commonwealth Minister for Transport.
- (2) The Committee's report should take account of the social effects as well as the availability and suitability of alternative means of transport should the closure be effected, including the costs involved, for example, for necessary road improvements.
- (3) In carrying out these tasks the committee may consult or seek submissions from interested parties, for example, local authorities or resident groups, State or Federal departments and authorities, and the unions and should make themselves available to persons or representatives of organisations who may wish to put forward a case.

That is totally different from the report by our present Minister in the paper last week, when he said Mr. Nixon was going to close these lines on "cold, hard economic facts" and totally disregard the social effects the closure would have. That is incorrect from start to finish.

I refer now to the official opening of the Eyre Highway that took place two or three years ago. It was an embarrassing occasion for many South Australian's who were there, because our Minister in a speech he made referred to Western Australia as "the land of sin, sand, sweat, sore eyes, and Sir Charles Court", and of South Australia as "the State of dancing, dining, drama, and Don Dunstan".

Last Saturday fortnight, when the Western Australian footballers came to South Australia, they not only gave the South Australian team a stouching but showed to the people of this State an example of the initiative and fight that now exists in Western Australia. South Australia, under a socialist Labor Government, has lost its incentive, because it knows that the ultimate aim of the South Australian Government is to socialise everything from sunrise to sunset.

The Governor said in his Speech that the South Australian Government expects to spend about \$97 000 000 in this present financial year extending and improving the State's network of roads. I hope that the Government will consider completing the sealing of the Merriton to Port Broughton Road and the Laura-Appila Road. These roads are important links in the northern network of roads. There is still about 7 kms or 8 kms of the Merriton-Port Broughton Road, and about 25 kms of the Laura-Appila Road, to be sealed. At the present rate of sealing, about 1 km a year (and sometimes 1 km in two years), it will be at least seven years before the Port Broughton Road is completed and about 25 years before the Laura-Appila Road is completely sealed.

This is despite the fact that my predecessor, Mr. Jim Heaslip, was told in this Chamber in 1968 that the Laura-Appila Road would be sealed that year. That means that 10 years have passed since my predecessor was told that that would be done. I believe that 1 km of that road has been sealed since and that was done recently. These roads

carry superphosphate traffic from Wallaroo to the north of the State, and holiday traffic to the peninsula.

I suggest to the Minister of Transport that, if he wants to get real value from the expenditure of this \$97 000 000, he seriously consider bringing in private enterprise contractors in order to push many urgent road projects to fruition.

One of the important projects is the overpass at Cavan which has been under way for many months. When I went overseas, the project had commenced, and I expected that, on my return, it would have been completed. However, there has been wet weather which pleased me but which means that it will take a long time at the present rate to complete the overpass. I draw the Minister's attention to the building of the new bridge over Rocky River, at Wirrabara, that was undertaken by a private contractor from Angaston and completed in record time by a work force comprising four men and a dog.

The story of the Dunstan Administration in South Australia is a sad one and, unfortunately, it has not yet all been told. Events are snowballing, and the end of the line is not far away. A fortnight ago, we saw some smart tactics by the Minister of Education but they backfired. The Institute of Teachers last week put the Minister under pressure and said that, if he did not remove the freeze on education appointments, the teachers would strike. We all heard the weak reply given by the Minister, who said to the institute, "It will take you some time to arrange a referendum of your teachers on strike action and, by that time, the freeze will probably be off." We now know that the freeze has been removed. I should like to see the Minister show some sign of strength in these matters and not succumb to making such weak statements on serious issues. He was as weak as could be. The institute really got him in its hands. Over the past eight or nine days we have heard the Minister once again condemn the Federal Government and say that many areas of education would receive the chop because of the reduction in Commonwealth funding. In the *Advertiser* of 31 July, under the heading, "Spending cuts hit S.A. schools", the Minister is reported as saying:

A number of Education Department commitments for 1979 would be scrapped, the Minister of Education, Dr. Hoppgood, said yesterday. This was because of the Commonwealth Government's "stone-age economic outlook" during the recent Premiers and Loan Council conferences. Funds for Government school programmes in South Australia in 1979 would be almost 2 per cent less than in 1978 because of this "miserly and misguided attitude," he said. The major loss would be in the school-building programme and details of the cuts would be given in the State Budget.

The following appears in the same report:

The President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, Mr. J. F. Gregory, said last night he regarded education as a State responsibility rather than a Federal Government one, and the State Government was now going back on its word on several of its own initiatives.

It is interesting to note that the responsibility for 88 per cent of education needs is that of the State Government, the balance of 12 per cent being that of the Commonwealth Government, and it is believed that there will be a 1 per cent reduction in that 12 per cent, so there is no real reason for the Minister to be belly-aching and blaming the Commonwealth for curtailing the building of schools in our State.

In the past 12 months schools have continued to be burnt down, while still the Government takes little action to remedy this wicked waste and devastation. It is about time that the Minister, despite the protestations that may arise, built teacher housing on school properties, as was



the situation in the past. Why should teachers not be encouraged to live on a school property, and keep an eye on that property? The trend now seems to be to build teacher housing as far away as possible from the school.

**Mr. Chapman:** Why is that?

**Mr. VENNING:** I know whence the pressures are coming, but it is only common sense that there should be some responsibility on the profession to look after the asset in which the teaching is done. Instead, these valuable assets are left to the actions of irresponsible people, the result being that many schools yet to be replaced on the regular planning scheme cannot come to fruition.

The Port Broughton Area School was promised in 1970 by the then Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson), but we have had four subsequent elections and a change of Minister in the intervening period, and the people of Port Broughton wonder when their new school will become a reality. Despite the political actions of the Premier, when he was at Port Broughton last August, campaigning with Mr. Connelly during the election campaign.

**Mr. Rodda:** Who's Mr. Connelly?

**Mr. VENNING:** He is a has-been. The new school at Port Broughton still seems to be some time away. A problem I see with the A.L.P. Administration is its fanciful sophistication concerning what is required to educate children. Only when the Government shows some signs of strength and acts truthfully in the deliberation of matters of real need in education and corrects priorities in Government spending will the rank-and-file of the State sympathise with this Government or any other Government in the course of its administration.

Another matter that has aroused the indignation of my district has been the recent outburst by the Minister of Agriculture, when he opened the Rural Youth Australia Convention at the Hotel Australia on 12 July. Much has been stated in the press about that situation. The theme of the convention concerned the dilemma of communication. Certainly, if anyone did not have a dilemma about the Minister before hearing him, they certainly had one afterwards. The *Advertiser* report of the Minister's statement is as follows:

Mr. Chatterton said that as a politician and a working member of Government the dilemma of communication was one with which he was surrounded. "It is, unfortunately, in the area of agricultural policy that our communications in Australia are most seriously lacking," he said. "I believe it is a pity that most policy-makers are content to use the media as the major communicator when both seeking farmer opinion or when informing farmers of policy decisions or programmes. I say this because, with some notable exceptions, our rural media journalists have no training or understanding of the political and bureaucratic structure of policy formation."

**Mr. Chapman:** Are you joining hands with the member for Whyalla in his criticisms of the media?

**Mr. VENNING:** No. I am quoting what the Minister of Agriculture said when he addressed that convention. The report continues:

Most journalists have Diplomas in Agriculture or similar disciplines, but rarely do they have units in government administration or political science. Because of this their reporting is only half informed, and because of this lack of understanding, the resulting report is often muddled and occasionally gratuitous. Reporters do not seem to understand that Ministers, Cabinets and Parliaments do not suddenly make decisions based on personal whim, but only after careful investigation and sounding out of those who will be affected.

The Minister goes on to state:

It is always disappointing to see the same old slick

judgments, tired clichés and stereotyped gossip . . . printed as reactions to the latest attempt of governments to arbitrate, on, or supply the needs of the rural community.

"Australian journalists had a lot to learn from countries such as India where informed reporting was of a very high standard," Mr. Chatterton said. Mr. Chatterton said Indian reporters were not only better educated in politics and government but were prepared to work hard at understanding and reporting committees of inquiry and committees similar to the Industries Assistance Commission.

"Indian reporters still maintain the tradition of reporting facts, not hasty opinions," he said. Speaking on the problems associated with dissemination of technical information, Mr. Chatterton said: "Departmental officers acquire degrees or diplomas which require considerable skills in writing and reading."

This is the part that insulted me.

**Mr. Rodda:** Is this the punch line?

**Mr. VENNING:** Yes. I am proud to be a man of the soil. The Minister goes on:

Farmers on the other hand—  
talking about the food producers of this country—  
usually have a much lower standard of education (in Australia it is rarely above high school standard) and they do not necessarily use the written word to acquire information. For instance, the departmental officer's reaction to a problem is to write a fact sheet or bulletin, while the farmer seeking information will usually listen to *The Country Hour* for answers. Within the South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries we are attempting to bring these two sides closer together.

That was an interesting article in the *Advertiser*. The one in the *Stock Journal* is significant also, stating:

Mr. Chatterton has painted himself into a corner. If it was the sole purpose of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chatterton, to draw some response from the accused parties by his attack on the rural media at the weekend, then he has achieved his aim. And when his speech is analysed, there does not really appear to be any other reason for his outburst. Admittedly the theme of the convention at which he was speaking was "communication", which certainly opened the gate for him to comment on the rural media. But to do so in the manner in which he chose was a pointless exercise. As far as being a constructive contribution in helping the problems involved in disseminating information to the primary producer of South Australia, it was a complete waste of time and effort. And as a public relations exercise it scored very poorly.

The Minister's salvo at the rural media in general and rural journalists in particular, could not be expected by Mr. Chatterton to go unanswered. He would surely be expecting some return flak—so here goes. In the case of the *Stock Journal*, which is the only rural newspaper in South Australia, our editorial policy has always revolved around trying to help South Australian farmers be better farmers. This policy has been pursued to much greater effect in recent years by a genuine attempt to throw off the stigma which has existed in some minds—and still does in the minds of a few—brought about by our ownership. Because we are owned by the major stock and station and woolbroking firms in the State, we have been looked on in some sectors of rural industry purely as a mouthpiece for these people.

Anyone who cares to read the *Stock Journal* properly each week will know that it is not true. It will be readily apparent, the fact that our paper goes to great lengths to present a properly balanced view on any subject of importance.

That is an editorial article in the *Stock Journal*, something we will remember for some time.

In the past, we have had some excellent rural officers in the department and also in the A.B.C. My mind goes back

to John Evans, Jon Lamb, and many others over the years, who did an excellent job in their varying fields. The deterioration set in when the Australian Labor Party came into office in Australia. Soon after the A.L.P. came into office in South Australia, financial restrictions were placed on officers in the country. Their travelling allowances were cut back, their petrol allowances were cut, and they were not able to carry out the work they had been able to do under a Liberal Government.

Funding for Rural Youth was reduced, and the reduction of advisers caused a low rate of success. The impression given by the State Government at the time was that it was not much in sympathy with the Rural Youth movement, because that was believed to be a training centre for future Liberal Party candidates.

In the Federal sphere, when Gough Whitlam came to power in the early 1970's, the activities of rural officers in the A.B.C. and the sector of their operations to the benefit of the rural community, was slashed to a low level. A.L.P. Governments clearly are not very concerned about rural people.

Jon Lamb was a most capable journalist. At the height of his success with the A.B.C. he was commandeered into the office of the Hon. Tom Casey, then Minister of Agriculture. That was the last we heard of Jon Lamb for a long time until recently, when he left the employment of the socialist Government. He is now working with the *South Australian Stock Journal*. I congratulate him on having seen the light and on having acted accordingly.

At this moment, I am reminded of the wailing tone of the presentation of the programme and the comments at the opening of Parliament, and I think of the wonderful efforts of achievement by the South Australian socialist Government! One thinks of Monarto, with an annual interest bill of \$1 858 000, or \$35 750 a week. The commitment to be repaid on Monarto is about \$19 000 000, and every week the interest bill of \$35 750 is accruing. Samcor is there, too. We heard of the dominating action of the unions. Much has been published in the press in the past few weeks about new works without freezing facilities for export, at a mere \$14 000 000. I have read that the works are recommencing after being shut down, but at a standard of operation below that of the Deputy of Primary Industry.

The metropolitan abattoirs has a shocking record of low production and high cost. My boys have vivid memories of their losses at the Cavan works. Speaking with people who work there, I was told of the gurgler award, presented to the person who made the biggest bungle in the works over a period. The person who received the award held it until someone made a comparable blunder, and then it was handed to the new bungler. A chap received the award because he sent a consignment of lamb interstate and forgot to switch on the electrical equipment that operated the freezing works and a full consignment of lambs was lost.

I now say something about the white elephant at Port Pirie—the \$500 000 bridge to nowhere. It is quite likely that many of the newer members in this Chamber are not aware of the interesting history associated with that political venture. The story as I remember it is as follows: The Premier, on the eve of the 1975 election, when in Port Pirie supporting the endorsed A.L.P. candidate (and it was not Ted Connelly), announced the building of a bridge across the causeway at Solomontown. Such an announcement was not sufficient to gain support for the endorsed A.L.P. candidate, and the seat was won by the short-time

independent candidate for Port Pirie, Edward Connelly. Both the bridge and Mr. Connelly remain interesting figures in the political history of Port Pirie.

The Government has found a use for Mr. Connelly but, to the present, has not found a use for the bridge, just a mere \$500 000-worth. It makes one's heart bleed when one thinks of the many urgent needs requiring funds in the northern country areas of our State. For instance, the Crystal Brook Institute Committee met the Premier at Crystal Brook on 1 March 1977, when he was campaigning with no other than Mr. Connelly, concerning the urgent need for facilities at the Crystal Brook hall. Plans were inspected by the Premier and on this occasion everyone was hopeful of the outcome.

However, on June 6 this year, and following yet another deputation to the Premier, he announced that he could only rake up \$12 800 towards this urgent community project, which amounts to just 2½ per cent of the value of the bridge that was constructed for no good purpose at this stage.

I now read the comments made in the local press by the member for Stuart, Mr. Keneally, he being the member for the greater part of Port Pirie. I was interested to read in the *Port Pirie Recorder* of 12 June where and when the Port Pirie City Council asked the member for the area, Mr. Gavin Keneally, to comment on the bridge and also on the future of Redcliff. I think the House would be interested to hear the response. The report was headed "Council just as well informed—Member for Stuart" and is as follows:

Member for Stuart, Mr. Gavin Keneally, has said he is no better informed than members of the Port Pirie City Council in relation to two matters affecting the city, the completed Solomontown Bridge and Redcliff. Mr. Keneally was asked to comment on both questions at a Port Pirie City Council meeting by councillor Rodger Smith. Councillor Smith fired the questions at Mr. Keneally when he attended the meeting to hear proposals for a revolutionary new refuse collection and disposal service for the city. Regarding the \$500 000 bridge off the main road, Mr. Keneally said he had seen large numbers of people fishing from it, but he knew nothing further regarding its usage.

"The bridge was built to open up a section of land to develop industry. You must give people access to this land, and the fact that people haven't gone there to set up business is disappointing. On the future of Redcliff, all I can say is that the Government is playing its cards close to its chest this time around. I don't try to gouge information from the Minister and I am no better informed than the members of this council on either of these matters," he said.

I should like to pay a tribute to the Marine and Harbors Department and to the Minister associated with that department. Honourable members will recall the mishap that occurred at Wallaroo last year involving damage to the jetty, repairs to which cost about \$1 000 000. Perhaps, in the circumstances obtaining at Wallaroo and the drought season, no real problem was experienced by growers who were delivering grain.

I should like to pay a tribute to the Minister and the officers of his department, as well as to the workers at Wallaroo, for the way in which they have worked to reinstate the jetty and loading facilities there. It is believed that the replacement works will be ready to ship grain by mid-September.

With the Minister, I inspected the replaced equipment at Wallaroo the day before the commencement of this session of Parliament and, to the manager of this House,

---

despite the Party to which he finds himself attached, I say, "Thank you for sparing time at the eleventh hour to come to Wallaroo before the opening of the present session." I support the motion.

Mr. **HARRISON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 11.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 August at 2 p.m.