

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 19 October 1978

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

PAY-ROLL TAX 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.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 781 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility to adequately control pornographic material were presented by Messrs. Dunstan, Bannon, Russack, and Blacker.

Petitions received.

PETITION: VIOLENT OFFENCES

A petition signed by 114 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences was presented by Mr. Nankivell.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT

A petition signed by 40 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 was presented by Mr. Whitten.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

A petition signed by 50 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible was presented by Mr. Russack.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: MARIJUANA

Petitions signed by 67 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not pass legislation seeking to legalise marijuana were presented by Messrs. Nankivell and Dean Brown.

Petitions received.

BANKSIA PARK PRE-SCHOOL

In reply to **Mrs. BYRNE** (10 October).

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: The Kindergarten Union is

erecting a pre-school in the grounds of the Banksia Park Junior Primary School. The building is due for completion by the beginning of first term 1979. Currently, the preliminary site works are being carried out.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:
PRE-APPRENTICESHIPS**

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: Yesterday in the House the member for Newland asked whether there was any pre-apprenticeship training through the Further Education Department or otherwise for unemployed school leavers who wanted to become apprentices but had not been accepted in present intakes.

I am now in a position to outline to the House some details of an initiative which will be undertaken at the Goodwood Boys High School in 1979, in regard to this matter. I am pleased to announce that an intensive trade course will commence at Goodwood Boys High School in 1979 for students in both years 11 and 12. The course, which will cater for about 50 year 11 students, is designed in such a way that it will provide experience in a wide range of skills related to apprenticeships. It will place emphasis upon and further develop the basic literacy and numeracy skills needed in trade courses.

Students completing the course will have had experience relevant to various types of apprenticeships and it is intended that one half of their time will be spent on technical studies, which will include link courses at further education colleges and experience in the work situation. Year 11 students will spend the remainder of their time on English, Mathematics, Science and Social Science courses which have been written with apprenticeship requirements specifically considered.

The opportunity will also be provided for a smaller group of 15 year 12 students to spend half of their study time on intensive trade units, taking in addition three secondary school certificate courses—English, Science and Mathematics. The syllabuses for the course have been written by the staff at Goodwood Boys High School after consultation with the school council, students, trade union officials, employers, teachers of apprentices, and appropriate officers of the Education Department and the Further Education Department.

It is appropriate that this development should take place at Goodwood Boys High School, which since 1932 has had a reputation in the field of trade preparation. The excellent technical studies facilities at the school provide a suitable learning environment for this project.

QUESTIONS**DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION**

Mr. TONKIN: Are members of the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs exceeding their terms of reference by participating in public seminars, meetings, and media interviews before the release of their final report, and, if so, what action does the Government propose to take? It is an accepted principle that any court, judicial inquiry, or Royal Commission must not only be scrupulously impartial but also must be seen publicly to be so. A wide programme of public meetings and media interviews has followed the release of the latest interim report and concerned citizens have expressed to me the

view that these activities before the release of a final report are contrary to this accepted principle and outside the terms of reference of the Royal Commission. They state further their belief that a particular point of view favouring the decriminalisation of marijuana is being promoted in the community by members of the Royal Commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is strictly against the Standing Orders of this House for any imputation to be made against members of a Royal Commission. The honourable member clearly is doing that at the moment and I ask that Standing Orders be strictly applied. I have had a bitter complaint from the Chairman of the Royal Commission on the score of the behaviour of members in this matter.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order, and I hope that the Leader of the Opposition does not continue in that vein.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is "No", they are not acting outside their terms of reference.

ALLEGED POLICE CORRUPTION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Chief Secretary say whether senior police officers have made inquiries into inferences of police corruption allegedly made following a meeting at Streaky Bay, addressed by Dr. Nies, one of the members of the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs? What was the nature of the allegations, were local residents interviewed, and what were the findings of that inquiry?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am not sure that the same point of order is not involved in this case as it was in the previous question.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order. The Deputy Leader has asked whether a police inquiry was conducted into allegations made following a public meeting at Streaky Bay. That has nothing to do with the Royal Commission.

Mr. Millhouse: They were about the Royal Commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Chief Secretary may be asked a question, but that does not mean that he must answer it.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It seems to me that the Deputy Leader is trying to get in, in an indirect way, the same sort of question as his Leader was just posing, commenting on the activities of Royal Commissioners.

Mr. Tonkin: In fact, he didn't.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. The question is simply whether police investigations were carried out as a result of inferences following a meeting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that the Chair has no control over the answering of questions, except that I can remind a Minister that he is speaking for too long. The Minister spoke and, as far as I was concerned, he answered the question. I have no control over how a Minister answers a question.

FOSTER CARE

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether he has had investigated allegations against his department contained in the September 1978 issue of the Foster Parents' Association of South Australia newsletter

Parliamentary Special? In a report on page 10, headed, "The other side of our fence", Mrs. Strehlow, the speaker, makes quite scurrilous attacks on departmental officers that I find very hard to believe. The report states:

Mrs. Strehlow makes the point that the abnormal in our society now have rights that are not so freely available to the normal.

The report quotes an incident concerning parents of a 13-year-old child who contested what they considered to be several lying, libellous and malicious reports from D.C.W. officers. The article also claimed:

All subsequent requests for an inquiry were not only refused by the Minister and his officers, but the parents were warned repeatedly from several different sources that Mrs. X (who had the child) was so far above the law that they had better look to their own safety if they persisted in trying to get Mrs. X brought to justice, or the child removed from her clutches.

On page 11 of the newsletter it is stated that the results quoted by Mrs. Strehlow dealt with the behaviour of the child, its becoming a criminal, and its truancy. I find it very difficult to believe. It is a scathing attack on the credibility of the Minister's department and I am concerned that the report was published.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter, as I believe that he has correct motives for doing so. I wish that it was as simple to answer the question by saying that an investigation into the matter would put an end to it. However, the honourable member would realise that continued general allegations, such as occur throughout the newsletter and as have already occurred in relation to other matters concerning adoptions, are difficult to answer because the specific information is not given.

I wonder whether the honourable member and other honourable members realise that to some extent the Minister, whoever occupies this portfolio, is asked to enter the contest with his hands tied behind his back, and probably rightly so, as the requirements of the various Acts insist on the Minister's maintaining aspects of confidentiality when we are talking about young offenders or persons placed in foster homes, and so on. I would not like any member to think that I regret this, because this is a proper requirement for the Minister and the department as a rationale for the best interests of the child concerned. However, I suggest that on occasions it makes for difficulties in one's answering the general types of allegation that are made.

The best way in which I can answer this question is to state that the newsletter has been received by the department and has been referred for examination. At least some of the matters contained therein are almost hoary chestnuts that have been trotted out previously, and the names of one or two of the persons who may well have been associated with the allegations made in the newsletter have not been unknown to members in this place for some years. That is not to say (as I said previously) that I categorically dismiss out of hand allegations made about the performance of my officers or, for that matter, those made about my performance in relation to child care matters.

However, the interests of those concerned would be best served if I did not go beyond that in discussing this aspect. Probably all members will understand that fostering children is a difficult occupation (if that is the correct word). Personally, I have much admiration for the many people (at the last count, about 800 parents in South Australia were involved) who are fostering more than 1 000 children. It takes a certain kind of person with much selflessness that is perhaps not present in many other

people to do this. I doubt, for example, whether I would have that quality needed to perform all the tasks and duties associated with being a foster parent.

The net result is that over a period and with many placements occurring, some inevitable mistakes will be made in placements, whether it involves the child's being placed in error, whether parents are not selected sufficiently carefully, or whether it merely involves human nature. Whatever happens, incidents will occur and claims and allegations will be made. On the other side of the fence (I think that was the title of one of the reports to which the honourable member referred), I remind all members and the public that the Government respects this tremendous activity. It is indeed a vital one that is needed to provide the best kind of alternative family care that has thus far been devised for children who need such help and care. Whenever disputes or other matters arise between individual foster families and the department, I understand (and I have certainly instructed the department to this effect) that every effort consistent with reasonableness will be made to assist in this matter. I am sure that the honourable member will accept the outline that I have given to him.

Unfortunately, in some cases, of course, this will not satisfy some people. I have in progress an effort within the department to improve the services and back-up to foster parents in general in South Australia, and I expect that the results of that effort will begin to be seen during the next year or two. I have taken the trouble to outline to the honourable member, as I respect the way in which he raised the matter, the way in which the Government views this whole area. We are not in a position to be, nor should we be, nor do we want to be, critical of foster parents generally or specifically. Often, people from the best of motives offer for this activity but they may not necessarily be suitable; this becomes apparent only after a period of the actual activity. No-one should be blamed for this.

WHYALLA INDUSTRY

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Premier say whether the firm Pacific Salt is likely to be established in Whyalla and what the proposed establishment of this industry would mean in regard to future employment requirements within Whyalla? A radio announcement this morning stated that the Federal Government would be giving about \$500 000 assistance to this firm, and I think it was by loan for a re-establishment proposal. As the possibility of obtaining the industry for Whyalla is likely, I would be most interested in any information the Premier may be able to give concerning the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Negotiations have proceeded for some time with Pacific Salt. Negotiations were undertaken by the South Australian Government in conjunction with the special committee that we established, the Whyalla working party. Officers of the working party and officers of the Economic Development Department have discussed the matter with Pacific Salt, and so have I. Negotiations are proceeding. If they are concluded satisfactorily, and I hope that they may be, it would mean a useful and substantial industry in Whyalla. Offers have been made to Pacific Salt by the Government as to support for the relocation of certain of its works to Whyalla and as to various other matters associated with support of its establishment in Whyalla. I am surprised, at this stage, that there has been an announcement, because I have not been informed that complete finality has been reached in the arrangements to be undertaken by the company. I do not know where the radio announcement

came from today. I can only say that negotiations have been proceeding, and I think they are going well.

Mr. Millhouse: I think the announcement came from the Federal Government.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am aware that there has been a proposal for a provision of funds from the Decentralisation Board for Pacific Salt; that is subject to certain conditions, and I have not been informed that Pacific Salt is, as yet, prepared to take up that particular proposal: it may be. I have not been informed of that, and I would have expected to be. It would depend upon the specific conditions that were attached to the proposal as to whether it was in a position to take that up. The State Government has made alternative proposals to the company in a fall-back position to cover it in some other events, but at this stage of proceedings I think negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.

DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier confirm that the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs was set up by the Government as a result of a serious division within the Labor Party on the effects of marijuana, as demonstrated by the proceedings at the 1976 A.L.P. convention?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

PRE-APPRENTICESHIPS

Mr. KLUNDER: Following his Ministerial statement, will the Minister of Education indicate whether students from other schools can transfer to the course at Goodwood High School if the course seems more attractive to them, and can he indicate whether ex-students of other schools can enrol at Goodwood High School for this course and, if they can, what is the age limit for their enrolment?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, yes, and there is no age limit. However, we would expect that existing students at Goodwood High School would have the right of first refusal for the courses. If all the indicated places were filled by students from the existing school, the ability of people from other schools to transfer would not exist. However, there is no reason why people from other schools could not transfer to the school or why people who have left school for a year or so should not take up the course. However, if a person had been out of the school environment for a reasonable period, it might be better to enrol in an appropriate Further Education Department course rather than in this course, since most of those doing it will be of school age. However, there is no reason in theory why people cannot go back to the school or transfer from another school as this school is unzoned.

COUNTRY SHOWS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry intervene and use his offices to stop the reported practices of Mr. Jack Phelan and/or any other organisers of the A.W.U. who seek to disrupt the long-standing practices of country show societies when conducting sheep shearing competitions for the benefit and entertainment of their patrons, and also the very real training benefits and opportunities that result for those farmers' sons, learner, and professional shearers who seek to compete and display

their skills in the vital Australian wool industry? It is reported in this morning's news that seven country show societies (all voluntary bodies) have been disrupted and disorganised by the activity of Mr. Jack Phelan, of the A.W.U. His actions have been described to me as the most petty, bloody-minded and stupid seen in South Australian union circles since the issue surrounding Mr. Jim Dunford's infamous black ban in 1972. My informant also made the statement that, "It is this type of activity by small-minded union organisers that brings the whole trade union movement into public ridicule." The question has been raised that, if employees of the local bakery exhibit in the cake-making competition, then all the exhibitors—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will not debate or comment while he is asking the question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am reporting strictly what has been brought to my attention.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make the decision.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The question has been raised that, if employees of the local bakery exhibit in the cake-making competition, then all the exhibitors, including the farmers' wives, must join the appropriate bakers' union. Also, concern has been expressed on behalf of those who volunteer their labour at the refreshment bars at such shows where members of the Liquor Trades Union may be present; the flow on from Mr. Phelan's action could lead to all other volunteers on the show day being challenged to join the respective unions.

Finally, it is claimed that this action would destroy the whole harmonious concept of voluntary effort and public willingness that prevails at our country shows.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the question. He did that several times, but I hope he will not do it in future.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: During the debate on the Appropriation Bill, this matter was raised quite wrongly under my lines by the member for Eyre.

Mr. Gunn: Quite properly raised.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has the opportunity to ask a question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It was quite wrongly raised, and I have already commented on that matter. I have since discussed the matter with the Secretary of the Australian Workers Union. My answer may take some time, as I will answer in my own way. I was not informed this matter was to be raised when I last spoke on the subject; therefore, I had no information available to give a sensible and proper answer.

Mr. Gunn: It would be the first time in your life—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Eyre to order. He has already interjected.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is always difficult to answer a question which is not sensible, and this sort of question often comes from the member for Eyre. Now that the matter has been raised in a question, I will elaborate on the views which I have previously expressed when speaking off the cuff. The constitution of the Shearing Competition Federation of Australia states:

CONSTITUTION

1. The name of the Federation shall be the Shearing Competition Federation of Australia.

AIMS AND OBJECTS

2. (a) To preserve the fine Australian Shearing tradition by promoting and maintaining interest in public sheep shearing competitions.

(b) To encourage active participation in shearing competitions.

Mr. Venning: Read on.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You will not be pleased when I have finished.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The constitution continues:

(c) To obtain uniformity of competitive shearing rules and regulations throughout Australia.

(d) To assist new centres and committees in promoting better competitive shearing competitions.

AREA OF CONTROL

3. The effective area of control of the S.C.F.A. shall include the Australian mainland and Tasmania.

AFFILIATION FEES

4. (a) Each committee conducting a competition or competitions and providing total prize money of over \$100 shall be required to pay an annual affiliation fee of \$4.40. Committees with programmes up to \$100 shall be required to pay an affiliation fee of \$2.10 annually.

(b) Affiliation fees shall be paid to the S.C.F.A. prior to the allocation of the shearing date.

OFFICERS OF THE S.C.F.A.

5. These shall consist of the Executive Council of the Australian Workers' Union, who have power to appoint further officers if deemed necessary.

6. The Executive Council have the right to appoint an executive control council to administer the workings of the Federation.

I notice the member for Alexandra has gone to sleep.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not part of the reply to the question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The constitution continues:

BANKING

7. All moneys received by the S.C.F.A. shall be paid into the account at the Federation's bank, such account to be operated by authorised officers of the S.C.F.A., who shall pay such sums as instructed by the S.C.F.A., to carry out the aims and objects of the Federation.

PUBLICITY

8. It shall be the policy of this Federation to at all times endeavour to publicise the shearing competitions and the activities of the S.C.F.A. The appointed publicity officer of the Federation shall be empowered to use whatever channels he may deem necessary.

The next part is very interesting. The constitution states:

MEMBERSHIP

1. Membership to the Shearing Competition Federation of Australia is \$1 per annum or part thereof, commencing on 1 January each year.

Rule 2:

All members of the S.C.F.A. must be financial members of the A.W.U. and must have in their possession the A.W.U. membership ticket which operates as from the rising of convention and must produce same on demand to the steward in charge of the competition or an official of the S.C.F.A. or A.W.U.

I told members opposite that they would not like what I was going to say.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister is out of order.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move on now to the next important point, namely, the insurance of these workers who participate in these competitions. The booklet states:

It shall be the Federation's responsibility to take out an insurance policy to cover members injured during an approved shearing competition. Any competitor injured whilst giving exhibitions or demonstrations shall not be eligible to any benefit from the insurance fund.

COMPETITORS' RESPONSIBILITIES

All competitors must remit full entry fees with their entries in any shearing competition. All entries and entry fees must

be in the hands of the secretary named on the entry form by the closing date given. No competitor has any claims against the Control Committee conducting the competition for expenses incurred when his incomplete or late entry has been refused. It is the duty of members who are in doubt to inquire if their entries are in order.

I think that I have said enough. I seek leave to have the remainder of the information incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: It is not statistical information.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, I will read it, because it is important to have it incorporated in *Hansard*. I am in no hurry. I warned the honourable member what would happen.

Mr. Dean Brown: You're trying to filibuster Question Time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. The honourable member for Alexandra was heard in silence.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The constitution continues:

No member of the S.C.F.A. may compete in a shearing competition when the controlling organisation is not affiliated with the S.C.F.A.

That is an important point. The constitution continues:

Lists of competitions will be published in the official organ of the A.W.U., *The Worker*, and the onus is on the competitor to check with the State office of the A.W.U. to ascertain if an organisation not mentioned in *The Worker* is affiliated, under penalty of disqualification.

I will not take up much more of the time of the House (although there are more facts and figures), as I believe that would be unfair to other members who want to ask questions. Seeing that this matter has been the concern of three Opposition members, I thought is necessary to place it in proper order. I pose the following question back to them: are the organisations to which they have referred affiliated with this body, which has registered rules? What is even more important, I have received no complaint about Jack Phelan or any other organiser from any show organisation or person concerned. I will investigate any complaints that come along, but only on the basis of what the situation really is, and not on the basis members would like. Is every person appearing in the competition insured against accident in the case, for instance, of cutting a hand or leg or in the event of a machine locking? I suggest that they are not all insured. I suggest that the first thing all country show societies ought to do is to join the federation so as to ensure the protection of competitors, and then allow an A.W.U. organiser to ascertain whether they are union members, thus ensuring workmen's compensation coverage.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Mr. GROOM: Will the Premier comment on the significance of the latest consumer price index figures released this morning?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly will. The c.p.i. figures reveal that, contrary to statements from the Opposition about inflationary policies of the State Government, this State had the lowest inflation rate of any capital city by far for the past 12 months.

Mr. Tonkin: When was there talk about inflationary policies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is backing off now. The inflation rate in Adelaide was 7.2 per cent between September 1977 and September 1978, compared to Perth 8.4 per cent, Sydney 8.1 per cent, Brisbane 8 per cent, Canberra 8 per cent, Melbourne 7.8 per cent, and

Hobart 7.5 per cent. The statement that South Australia is cost inflationary in relation to industry and prices is simply not borne out by the facts.

ALLEGED POLICE CORRUPTION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Chief Secretary say whether residents of Eyre Peninsula have been interviewed as part of a recent inquiry into allegations of police corruption elsewhere in South Australia? If they have, what was the nature of the allegations and what were the findings of the inquiry?

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member whether this matter concerns the Royal Commission.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member can guarantee that.

Mr. Dean Brown: The question relates—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am asking the honourable member whether he can guarantee that his question has nothing to do with the Royal Commission.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, it is to do with the Police Department.

The SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable member a simple question: Is it or is it not to do with the Royal Commission?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No.

The SPEAKER: That is all I wanted to know.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I would be interested to hear what has occasioned the question by the honourable member, if he says that it has nothing to do with the Royal Commission, in the light of the questions asked by his two immediate seniors (if they are his seniors still). I believe that the police have spoken to citizens on the West Coast of South Australia. A report has been supplied to me and there is no occasion for any action to be taken in respect of the comments which were made.

Mr. Dean Brown: Which comments?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The comments which were the occasion of the inquiries being made of the citizens on the West Coast.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. DRURY: Will the Minister of Education say whether time tables for school buses which are operated by the State Transport Authority and which take children to and from school can be altered so as to synchronise with times when teachers are present at school to assume responsibility for the children? It has been brought to my notice that the school bus that takes children to Braeview Primary School drops the children at the school before teachers arrive. Consequently, the children are unable to enter the school and some parents consider that they may be in a position of potential danger.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will take up the matter with the Minister of Transport, who is always as helpful as he possibly can be about these matters.

TELEVISION COMMERCIAL

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government proposes to conduct a further series of commercials, warning consumers not to spend beyond their means, similar to the series of commercials that featured the Attorney-General on television before Christmas last year? If it does, will the Attorney seek

independent legal advice to ensure that the State Government commercials do not run the risk of incurring legal proceedings, as has been alleged to have occurred last year? Evidence given to the Broadcasting Control Tribunal hearing into the granting of television licences, as reported in today's mid-day news, indicates that the General Manager of channel 7, Mr. John Doherty, claims that channel 7 refused to show those State Government commercials on the ground that he believed that by doing so the station could risk incurring legal proceedings by one of the retail stores that featured in the background of the commercials which were made in Rundle Mall and which featured the Attorney-General.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: First, those commercials were, in fact, run at Christmas time in 1976, not last year. The Government has in hand a programme of education for consumers. I have not seen details of it yet and I cannot say whether it will include further television commercials of that type. I did not see or hear the news item at lunch-time, but I know the facts surrounding the banning of the commercial concerned by the three commercial television channels. As I recall, the commercial concerned showed me walking along Rundle Mall and saying to the camera, "Those two little words 'Charge it' could give you a happy Christmas but a not so happy new year." There was then an explanation that people would have a few extra consumer durables at Christmas if they charged goods on account but that they would have to pay for them in the ensuing period.

It just so happened that during that Christmas John Martin's had decided that as part of their Christmas advertising campaign they were going to use a slogan saying, "Come to Johnny's and charge it". John Martin's, which has spent a lot of money on its advertising campaign, is one of the largest shareholders in channel 10, and has considerable influence over the amount of money it spends on commercial television stations in this State. Accordingly, it was able to bring sufficient pressure to bear to ensure that the television channels concerned cracked under the pressure and did not run that commercial.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you any evidence of that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has interjected on several occasions. I hope interjections will cease.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: There was nothing illegal about the advertisement at all. I understand that there was some veiled suggestion by John Martin's that it would seek an injunction of some sort. No suggestion was ever made about the basis of the injunction, but I presume that that was the suggestion of legal proceedings to which the honourable member referred. It is interesting that the television channels caved in so quickly on this occasion, if in fact they were threatened with legal proceedings, because I can recall various other circumstances where they have defended their right to take various matters to air and have been able to fight in the courts for the right to do so. It would have taken more than the mere threat of the issue of proceedings before they would have pulled out in other circumstances. There is no doubt that in this instance it was their commercial interests that they saw as being more important than the interests of endeavouring to educate and protect the consumers of this State.

BORES

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether permits are being granted to drill for underground water in the western region of metropolitan

Adelaide? If so, are there any restrictions on the amount of water that may be used by individuals from the resultant bores? Restrictions are placed on the amount of water that may be used in the Virginia and Two Wells area, but I am not aware of the situation that applies in the western suburbs. An advertisement appearing in this week's *Weekly Times*, which is a Messenger publication circulating in my district, states, under the heading "End all excess water rates":

Adelaide, especially the western suburbs, contains a large supply of underground water that is most suitable for watering lawns and gardens. With excess water rates so high and the ever-decreasing water allotment, it could be an advantage to your pocket and to our water supply to have a backyard water bore sunk. The only requirement is a water bore permit that is issued free from the South Australian Mines Department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get the necessary information for the honourable member and bring him down a reply as soon as possible.

ROLLING STOCK

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the current stage of design, tendering or construction in connection with the new suburban rail rolling stock? Further, when is it expected that the first unit will be delivered, and will the delivery be according to the schedule that the Minister originally announced? The Minister has indicated that it is necessary to replace with faster rolling stock a number of the rail cars or rail units for the suburban area. As yet, no replacements have been evident, and the basis of the question is to determine precisely what is the current position.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Soap powder and dog food are obtainable off the supermarket shelf, but railcars and buses are not. The order has been placed, as I have publicly stated. The successful tenderer is presently engaged in the manufacture of those vehicles. The last report I had was that the anticipated schedule was being adhered to and that the railcars would come into service. At this stage we have every reason to believe that they will come into service on schedule. From memory, I think that they start to come off the delivery line in about September next year. The last report I received was that the programme is on time. Although it is too early to make any other predictions, because we are still a long way off, certainly we have no reason to doubt that the anticipated delivery date will be adhered to.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport tell the House whether the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) has now changed his mind and made \$1 000 000 available as funds for construction work on the Stuart Highway? The Minister previously informed the House that no additional funds for this purpose were forthcoming from the Federal Government. However, today's *Advertiser* states that an extra \$1 000 000 of funds was made available last week by the Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon), who allegedly made that announcement in Parliament. The report goes on to say that a deputation of Liberal and National Country Party members had argued that the extra money should be in addition to the set sum that the States received for national highways under the present funding system. We would all say "Hear, hear!" to that, but can the Minister tell us where is that extra

\$1 000 000 of funds?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When I saw that article in this morning's paper I was delighted to think that Mr. Nixon had at long last relented and provided the additional funds that we had sought from him, both in my area as Minister of Transport and in the area of the Premier, who has written to the Prime Minister. Regrettably, the newspaper report is incorrect: no additional funds have been made available, despite the fact that Senator Jessop, who is the Leader of the Liberal and National Country Party Government Committee on Transport, wholeheartedly supports the view that South Australia must be provided with additional funds if we are to build the Stuart Highway within a reasonable period. I am not sure whether Senator Jessop got mixed up or whether the *Advertiser* did not understand him.

Regrettably, the report stating that South Australia has received an additional \$1 000 000 for the Stuart Highway is not true. We certainly need that money. South Australia was promised additional funds by the Deputy Leader of the Country Party (Mr. Sinclair) who, prior to the last election, sent a telex message to the Mayor of Alice Springs (George Smith), promising that the Federal Government, if re-elected, would provide additional funds to South Australia, over and above the allocation in the national roads legislation, solely to build the Stuart Highway. However, having won the election, Mr. Sinclair will not have anything to do with his promise, saying that it is Mr. Nixon's problem. However, Mr. Nixon takes the view that he is not to be held responsible for irresponsible promises made by his Deputy Leader, Ian Sinclair. So, the net result is that South Australia is still getting no additional funds to build the highway, and I sincerely regret that the people of South Australia have again been misled into thinking, quite rightly, that they are entitled to believe the newspaper report that additional funds are forthcoming, when in fact they are not forthcoming.

TOXIC MUSHROOMS

Mr. WILSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to notify the Classification of Publications Board of the dangers inherent in ingestion by the public of certain toxic mushrooms, so that the board may be better able to apply stricter classifications to certain books currently on sale? In the *Advertiser* last week, the following report appeared:

A man had become ill after eating a large amount of "magic" mushrooms, the Adelaide Magistrates Court was told yesterday. Darryl Bruce Hill, 21, garbage collector, of Cadell Street, Windsor Gardens, was charged with having consumed psilocine and psilocybin drugs at Kurralta Park on May 30. Assistant Police Prosecutor, Mr. L. Hayes, said police had gone to a flat at Kurralta Park and had found Hill in a "dreamy" condition on an ambulance stretcher. Hill had admitted going to the Adelaide Hills to pick "magic" mushrooms.

Several books are available at various shops in Adelaide which I will not name advising people how to go about manufacturing extracts from these mushrooms, one book being called *A Field Guide to Psilocybin Mushroom*, by F. C. Ghouled. Will the Minister accede to my request?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes.

MENINGIE AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Education tell me the construction programme for the Meningie Area

School which, I understand, is part of this year's works programme? It is to be a Demac school, which may be constructed not in one piece but piecemeal and occupied as sections are completed. What is the intended timing of this project? According to the original plans, it was expected that the assembly hall would be completed before Christmas, but at this stage, as far as I know, no action has been taken to commence work.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will ascertain from my department why the work has not commenced. It was timed to commence about now and the construction phase is 12 months. As I understand it, the buildings would be occupied as they were completed. Why building has not commenced, I am not sure. I have not recently checked on the matter with my department, but I will do so now, since the honourable member has raised it. I would not anticipate that if there was a delay of a month in starting the project that would seriously affect its completion date, which I think is about this time next year. I will get the information sought.

TOURISM

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport to give a breakdown of the money provided by the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau for advertising and promotion in various regions of South Australia, including the Riverland, and will he say how this compares with the situation obtaining in other States on a per capita basis? Although initiatives have been taken by a Riverland firm to promote package tours, the level of Government support in other States seems to be far greater, thus placing the South Australian tourist industry at a distinct disadvantage. I should be pleased if the Chief Secretary could confer with his colleague and provide me with that information.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education say what is the position regarding the responsibility of Education Department staff employed in State schools who are concerned about the increasing number of children who are arriving at school early in the mornings and staying later in the schoolyard after school? The Minister would be well aware that a problem exists regarding these children, who, for many reasons, arrive early and stay late after school finishes. Also, some staff arrive at school early to prepare for the day's work and stay later to catch up on work that they have not finished, or to prepare for the next day. I am concerned, as are many teachers who have approached me, about the responsibility involved when accidents involving school-children occur in the school-yard while these teachers happen to be working on the premises.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I recall that this matter was the subject of legal proceedings in New South Wales last year and that, as a result of that and the widespread comment that ensued, my officers, when I last checked with them, were seeking a Crown Law opinion on the matter. I will find out what specific information I can give on the technical legal position of teachers.

The Director-General of Education, earlier this year, circularised all schools, suggesting that they should take up the matter with parents to try to dissuade them from

sending children to school before 8.30 a.m. I am not sure what success that circular has had. Certainly, however, the department has taken action to try to ensure that children are not at school at unacceptably early times. The problem does not seem to persist so much at the end of the day: early arrivals are the major problem. As I have said, the technical legal problem is subject to Crown law opinion. I will obtain what additional information I can.

DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why did the Premier omit to answer last Tuesday my Questions on Notice concerning the sittings of the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs and the payments made to Mr. Dennis Muirhead? It has, of course, become the Government's practice in the past couple of years not to answer every Question on Notice on the following Tuesday. Last Tuesday, although I was disappointed that I did not get answers to my questions, Nos. 695 to 698, concerning the Royal Commission's formal sittings, whether there was a junior to Mr. Muirhead, and concerning details of the breakdown of legal fees paid to Johnston, Layton, Withers, and company, I was not surprised.

However, I have today received a letter from the Chairman of the commission, Professor Sackville, which one of my assistants who opened it for me described as a bitter serve for the things I had said about the Royal Commission in debate in the House.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How many assistants have you got? I have only one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The difference is that I cannot afford to pay mine, but I will bet the Government pays yours.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable Minister does not upset the honourable member for Mitcham. I hope the honourable member asks his question, because other members want to ask questions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In fact, four points are made by Professor Sackville.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What has this explanation got to do with the matter of why I did not answer, last Tuesday, the questions that were on notice?

Mr. Millhouse: Because all the information is in this letter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already called the honourable member for Mitcham to order. If he continues, I will have to warn the honourable member. I was of the opinion that the honourable member was going to quote from a letter. If he continues in that vein, I will have to take action. I do not want him commenting in any way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The four matters discussed in the letter to me from Professor Sackville include the question of formal sittings; in fact, in the letter, he set out all the information that I had sought in my question. As the letter is dated 17 October, it is perfectly obvious that, had the Government wished to answer my questions—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the honourable member for commenting. If he continues, I will take away his leave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that was a comment. The second matter concerns my agreeing with an interjection by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The third is my suggestion that the report will be in the same terms, or the recommendations will be in the same terms, as every other report has been. The fourth concerns

the research programme of the Commission. Any member can look at that letter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise again on a point of order. The honourable member has referred to some matters that quite plainly have nothing to do with his question about why I was not able to give him, last Tuesday, the answer to the question. The matters to which he has now referred have nothing to do with that question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The first one certainly did.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member. I uphold the point of order, and I think the honourable member has already asked his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am just coming to the end.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is still giving an opinion. I have already warned him, and I now take his leave away. The honourable Premier:

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member does not interject. I have not gone as far as I should have gone. If he continues, I will take the necessary action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is that, when Cabinet met on Monday, the information was not to hand.

Mr. Millhouse: Deliberately.

At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1493.)

First Schedule.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$18 535 000.

The CHAIRMAN: As the Leader of the Opposition has informed the Committee that he intends to move for the reduction of this vote by \$100 000, other members who wish to speak on this line should do so before the motion is moved.

Dr. EASTICK: What is the present situation in relation to the delivery of buses for the Bus and Tram Division? How many buses have been delivered? Are they, in the opinion of the Government, operating satisfactorily? Has the Minister of Transport any other information regarding the upgrading programme of the bus fleet?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): The delivery of buses is proceeding to the revised schedule. The difficulties experienced earlier have been overcome, and the buses are now being delivered in accordance with the revised schedule. Generally speaking, their performance is very good. Some mechanical modifications are being carried out by the supplier, the Volvo organisation. A problem in relation to tyre wear has not been resolved, and the Volvo company, to give first-class service, has sent one of the buses back to Sweden for testing by the manufacturers. All in all, the programme is quite up to standard.

Mr. WILSON: Can the Minister say how the NEAPTR project is to be financed, or what part of the allocation is to be used for that programme? The only information we have had has been a statement by the Minister for Planning, whilst the Minister of Transport was overseas, that the project would be financed out of Loan funds.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the honourable member would know that the final decision on the NEAPTR project has not been taken. The e.i.s. is open for public comment. I think three of the six weeks during which it

must be available for public comment have passed. At the conclusion of that period, the comments will be evaluated and a final e.i.s. will be produced. When this is in the hands of the Government, it will decide whether to proceed with the planned light rapid transit system to Tea Tree Gully. In taking that decision, the Government will have to consider the matter of finance, and the procedure will be determined at that stage. We cannot make provision for the finance before deciding that something is to be done.

Mr. WILSON: I take issue with the Minister on this. I understand that he said a few weeks ago that that work was likely to be undertaken this year. If that is so, provision must have been made in this allocation for such a contingency.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said that I hoped work would commence immediately the decision had been taken by the Government. The work to which I referred was the planning and design work. Some of the preliminary planning and design work, and also the acquisition of property, has been going on for some time and will continue. That work will be done in the normal course of operations and does not involve Loan funds.

Dr. EASTICK: An amount of \$9 514 000 has been allocated for depot buildings and plant for the Bus and Tram Division.

Can the Minister say what buildings are to be erected, what plant is to be installed, and what the Government's policy is in this area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government's policy is to provide adequate and suitable accommodation for workshops, depots, and the like. A new workshop is being built at Regency Park. The new depot at Lonsdale is on the drawing board, and a decision to proceed there has not been made. The upgrading of other depots is being considered in order to provide S.T.A. with adequate facilities to service its fleet.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the workshops and the services provided therein include work that has hitherto been contracted out, or is this a natural extension of the present policy?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The S.T.A. now has about twice as many buses as it previously had, hence more workshop facilities are needed. Secondly, the Government intends to vacate the Hackney premises in about 12 months and the first step is to relocate the workshop. Depot facilities only will be left at Hackney. Future activities in the workshop will be similar to past activities, because almost all S.T.A. work is done very efficiently by its own staff.

Mr. WILSON: Does the provision of \$107 000 for the Christies Beach Hospital refer to the Government's contribution to the maternity wing of that hospital? Also, has a consortium agreement been reached with private enterprise relating to this hospital and, if so, what is the projected time of completion?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): This provision is the Government's contribution to the new maternity suite at Christies Beach Hospital. I believe that arrangements have now been achieved for the consortium; the matter was before the Industries Development Committee. I understand from the Chairman of that committee that there has been a report, but I have not seen the recommendations for the guarantee.

Mr. Wilson: You can't say when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I cannot give a date.

Mr. MATHWIN: In replacing rolling stock, has any new design been considered because of the possible electrification of services in future?

After all, the Government has promised electrification

of the Christies line. If that is to be done soon, as I expect it might be, and if we are to build new rolling stock, that matter surely would be considered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The electrification proposals have not been discarded: they have simply been put in the pigeon hole, because of the withdrawal of Federal finance. The rolling stock we are now building can be adapted to an electrified service with reasonable ease, and certainly we have taken that into account. For the S.T.A., we are referring to an estimated \$3 000 000 from Loan funds and not \$31 500 000, because \$28 500 000 is provided from other sources, and not from the Loan programme.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): For what specific purpose is the \$100 000 loan to Monarto Development Commission being allocated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There will be a deficit of \$1 100 000 by the commission this year. The commission will borrow \$1 000 000, and \$100 000 is funding towards the deficit.

Mr. TONKIN: How many people are still employed by the commission, particularly on site at Monarto?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have that information with me, but I will ask the Minister.

Mr. TONKIN: As the commission will apparently make a loss of \$1 100 000 this year, has the Government further considered the possible realisation of some of the assets, not necessarily selling off the entire estate, but selling any part of it, or in any way trying to develop some of the assets and realise some of the capital tied up in that development?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member had better be specific. Obviously, we cannot start getting rid of the assets of Monarto without folding up the whole project. In addition, the major assets are the land acquisitions we have made. If we were to sell the land at purely rural values (although the Opposition has talked about compensation for the acquisition of Monarto), we would make a substantial loss, which would have to be funded immediately, because the money would have to be repaid to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What value does the Government put on its land holdings? Did I understand the Premier to say that the commission will be in the red to the extent of \$1 100 000 this year?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For a body that is doing nothing, that is a pretty whacking loss. Leaving aside altogether the question of fairness and justice done to dispossessed landowners who were tipped off their land for no purpose, I should like to know what the valuation of that asset may be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have a specific figure here about that matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you get it for me?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: I will probably soon be able to enlighten the member for Mitcham on this matter.

Mr. EVANS: On October 10, I asked the Minister for Planning a question about Monarto, as follows:

What will be the total cost of Monarto when all debts incurred on that project have been settled and in what year will the payment for the debt be completed?

The Minister answered as follows:

The cost of Monarto to 30 June 1978 is . . .
\$25 184 000. Present debts will have all fallen due for payment by 2006.

The Minister failed to indicate what the final debt will be at the end of that period. I estimate that it will be more than \$40 000 000. If the Premier or the Minister cannot give me an exact amount for that debt, I would appreciate

an approximation of what the Government believes the debt will be, if Monarto is not used for other purposes during that period. In other words, what will be the accumulated debt for Monarto by the year 2006?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I believe that this question is part of a Question on Notice that the member has set down for next Tuesday. If a question is asked about any particular subject, that automatically excludes debate on that question until such time as the question is answered.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold that point. On the other hand, the Minister has the right to give what information he wishes when answering a question.

Mr. Tonkin: It would be much more honest for him to say he doesn't know.

Mr. CHAPMAN: If the value of the assets in Monarto were such that the Government could recover all money spent, would it sell the area now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I do not believe that the Government should dispose of an important asset that it believes will be important for the maintenance of Adelaide as the kind of place that it now is. There is, inevitably, pressure for additional housing development. We have applications by people seeking to develop, for instance, in Littlehampton. If those applications were to run into trouble because of Government proposals to keep that area a rural one, that could result in additional housing in Adelaide. On present indications it will be necessary for the Government to have Monarto in future if Adelaide is not to become a difficult city to move in, as Melbourne and Sydney already are. In those circumstances, the State has a considerable asset. I do not believe that it is sensible or economic for the future of this State for the Government to dispose of Monarto.

Mr. Chapman: So the arguments put forward so far, that the Government would lose a considerable amount of money, are really irrelevant and the Government has made up its mind, and will keep it, anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We believe it should be kept. For the Opposition to say that we should save money for the State by making a considerable loss at the moment is nonsense.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier give me a breakdown on rolling stock replacement and additions? Is the \$107 000 provided the full commitment by this Government to the Christies Beach Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the full commitment in capital sum as far as I am aware. That does not mean we do not have to support it, because the maternity provisions will have to be given support and back-up from the Flinders Hospital, and that will run us into some cash.

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

That the vote "Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$18 535 000" be reduced by \$100 000.

The whole question of Monarto, and in particular the Monarto Development Commission, has been a tragedy from its inception. On the surface it appeared to be a fine idea, and it looked as though another major satellite city, following the success of the establishment of Elizabeth (north of Adelaide), was exactly what was required for the future development of the Adelaide metropolitan area. When members considered the Murray new town legislation they felt that there was a positive need for it.

Since then the population projections on which the need for Monarto were based have proved to be sadly wrong. More to the point, an enormous policy of waste and neglect by the Government has been revealed. The tragedy of Monarto is that it was never necessary, not only from the point of view of population projections, but also as regards planning needs for Adelaide itself. A great deal

has been said about this subject in this House and publicly, in the past, and I do not intend to go into all the details, because it is not necessary. The absolutely disgraceful failure of Monarto is a sad and sorry story that is well known to the people of South Australia. Indeed, one need only say the word "Monarto" and everyone in South Australia knows what a bungling mess the present Government has made of that entire project.

If the Government had done its planning properly and considered the position of the city of Adelaide and the inner suburban areas, and if it had embarked on a programme of inner urban renewal at the proper time, it would have been patently clear to anyone that there was no need at all to consider the establishment of Monarto. Because the Government neglected the inner urban areas, it led to the suburban sprawl and the spreading out north and south of Adelaide, and this was stated by the Minister as one of the main reasons for the establishment of Monarto.

Indeed, we heard that reason referred to again today when the Premier said that he would not consider getting rid of Monarto, because we need it to make sure that Adelaide is the sort of place that we want to live in in future. We have almost reached zero population growth in Adelaide. I do not know what the most recent figures are but our population increase certainly does not match the population projections in any way.

What concerns me, the Opposition, and people in the community generally are the increasing amounts of money that are still being poured into what is virtually a white elephant. Monarto is a scandal, as I said in June last year, when we heard that the Government was paying \$1 300 000 a year interest on State and Federal loans. I described that as a scandalous situation, and it was. At that time the total debt was about \$19 000 000, which had been borrowed for the Monarto project. Now we find that the bill for the new city, as it was put in the press, is about \$25 000 000. The annual interest bill when the debt was \$19 000 000 was about \$1 180 000, but now that we have a debt of \$25 000 000 the interest bill is \$1 860 000, or \$35 750 a week, being met from taxpayers' funds simply because this debt, with its interest payments, is accruing year by year.

We basically saw the death knell of Monarto when the Whitlam Government, in its last year of reign in Canberra, refused to give the full allocation of funds requested by the State Government. The death knell for Monarto, having been sounded, Federal funds have not been forthcoming subsequently.

What concerns South Australian taxpayers is the magnitude of what the debt is likely to become, and it is interesting that the Minister was unwilling to answer a question on that matter in this place today. We are told, now that Monarto has been placed on a care basis for the next five years, that the South Australian Government has confined work on Monarto. We are told that the commission will make a loss of \$1 100 000.

Mr. Millhouse: A loss for doing nothing.

Mr. TONKIN: Whether it is doing anything or not, it is certainly not doing anything to achieve the original objectives that were set out for the city of Monarto, and that is the fundamental factor. I do not know whether it is doing any consultancy work but the Premier said that it will make a loss of \$1 100 000 this year.

What will be the loss next year if the commission remains in existence? To be honest, that is something I had not taken into my calculations of how much the State will be up for. We have made the responsible suggestion, based on sound business principles, that when you make losses, you cut them as fast as you can, especially when it is

taxpayers' money and you can see no long-term need for this project anyway.

When one decides to cut one's losses, it should be done as quickly as possible. I suggested last year that we should sell off Monarto, but the idea was rejected at that stage and it has been rejected at this stage. It is not a new suggestion. It simply means that we should cut our losses, because losses they will be.

We have done some calculations on a valuation of the property, and this is easy, if one refers to the Auditor-General's Report in regard to land and improvements. At June 1978 a total of 14 990 hectares was held within the designated site. In the area adjoining the site, 4 281 hectares of land was held at the same date, the total land under the control of the commission being 19 271 hectares. The cost of this land was about \$7 500 000.

The valuation of that land on a broad-acre basis at present is some \$400 a hectare. If we take the overall cost of 19 000 ha at \$400 that comes to about \$7 600 000, or about \$8 000 000 in round figures, on a broad-acre basis. That cost does not cover severances, compensation, and all the other expenditures that make up a large portion of total debt. We are unlikely at present to get more than \$10 000 000 back from the sale of that land, on a broad-acre basis.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We'd be lucky to get \$7 500 000.

Mr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the Minister is being so definite, when a little while ago he was being so vague. Another proposition has been put forward that the land adjacent to Murray Bridge could well be subdivided and used (this was said by the Premier in press reports) for the further expansion of the Murray Bridge township. If it happens that sale of that land is not on a broad-acre basis but on an allotment basis, it is possible that we could get \$10 000 000 back for it. It is an academic argument. What matters is that last year, if the land had been sold off and prices had not varied, as we have seen, from the time when it was first purchased, we would have had to find some \$9 000 000 extra to make up the deficit, supposing we got \$10 000 000 for it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You wouldn't get \$10 000 000 for it. Stop plucking figures out of the air. Your name is not Hans Christian Andersen, or even Grimm.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections must cease.

Mr. TONKIN: By his interjections, the Minister is making his own case very much worse. Let us say \$10 000 000 because, if we get less than that, the loss made up will be even more. Last year, on a \$10 000 000 basis, we would have had to find an extra \$9 000 000; this year we will have to find an extra \$15 000 000. Next year, I have calculated that we will have to find another \$19 000 000 and, in 1980, probably another \$23 000 000 or \$24 000 000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have not even done your arithmetic properly. That's rubbish.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister will have a chance to reply.

Mr. TONKIN: All we have to do is to compound the principal and interest, because we are accruing the interest, and add on the deficits.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister is completely out of order by continually interjecting.

Mr. TONKIN: In five years time, when this project is to be put into mothballs, the accumulated accrued interest and capital will be in excess of \$35 000 000, probably \$37 000 000 or \$38 000 000. The value of the land will not increase to anywhere near that same proportion.

As I said previously, we will have to find \$24 000 000 or

\$25 000 000 that will have to be paid back. I can see no prospect, by hanging on to this land, of our ever making a profit on it or of doing anything but losing more money. I cannot see, on present population projections and the present trend towards inner-urban renewal, that we will ever need this property for the purposes for which it was originally intended. The Government should face reality and the fact that the whole project has been a miserable failure, and it should cut its losses while it can. It may think that, by deferring this whole matter and shoving it aside for five years, it will eventually be some other Government's problem to find this excess money.

Mr. Millhouse: Maybe the Hudson Government.

Mr. TONKIN: Heaven help us if it is. However, there is not much likelihood of that. By doing nothing about this project now, the Government is foreclosing options for future Governments that could well use the money that they would otherwise have to apply to pay off the accumulated debt on Monarto. After five years, there may be projects of vital importance to South Australia with which the then Government will not be able to proceed because it will have an increasing debt hanging over its head, a debt that should never have been allowed to reach that level. I speak in the strongest possible terms of my opposition to allowing this project to continue. The Government seems to have washed its hands of the whole matter and wants to forget all about it. I have never seen such an example of poor planning and total disregard for the long-term consequences to the people of South Australia of the continued commitment of taxpayers' funds.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We have had the usual song and dance from the Leader of the Opposition on this matter. Detailed consideration must be given to answer all the various questions about Monarto. I refer, first, to page 379 of the Auditor-General's Report which shows that at 30 June 1977 outstanding loans totalled \$18 939 000 and at 30 June 1978, \$18 841 000. So, there was a slight reduction in the sum outstanding.

The relevant consideration, if one is to examine the loss that can be avoided, is to compare the costs that will be incurred as against the revenue that will be received this financial year. The Monarto Development Commission will receive about \$300 000 this year, whereas its cost in relation to administration and land management will amount to \$600 000. So, in relation to avoidable commitments this year, \$600 000 is being paid and \$300 000 received. The land management expenses need to continue because to some extent, when the Monarto commission took it over, the land needed considerable rehabilitation. An extensive rehabilitation programme, involving much tree planting, has been conducted at Monarto, and this is now starting to come to fruition.

The land at Monarto has never looked better. The tree-planting programme and the rehabilitation that has been carried out have produced considerable improvement, and I would support the continuation of that work. What the Government has chosen to do, rather than make a revenue allocation to Monarto, has been to use the borrowing power of Monarto as an overall contribution to the total amount of borrowing that we are able to do under Government and semi-government borrowings, because the Monarto Development Commission can borrow \$1 000 000 this financial year without any impact on our Loan programme.

Mr. Tonkin: Does that make it any the less—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the Leader listened for a moment, he might appreciate the point.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out there is a limited

time available to the Committee to discuss the matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The interest payments of the commission this year are estimated to be \$890 000. If that \$1 000 000 were not borrowed, there would have to be a subvention from the Revenue Account to the Monarto commission to pay for that \$890 000, and we would have \$890 000 less to finance current expenditure. We could have done it in that way, but the Government chose—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is very difficult to deal with a pack of so-called adults with an intellectual age of about eight or nine years.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order. I do not believe the Minister should refer to his colleagues on the Government benches in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold that point of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When I was looking at the member for Chaffey I said eight or nine years but, now that I have seen the Leader, I realise that I should say seven years. It is a reasonable choice for the Government to make. If the Government borrowed \$1 000 000 on Loan Account and used it to build, say, a school, the interest costs of that are a permanent charge on the Budget. The \$1 000 000 borrowed by the Monarto commission is a permanent charge effectively not on the Monarto commission but ultimately on the State Budget. It is exactly the same as borrowing under the overall Loan programme. The only consequence—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. I will maintain order. I should warn the Committee that, if there are any more interruptions, I will have to take the necessary action.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The only consequence of the attitude that has been taken by members opposite would be to say that the Government should not even borrow at all, even under the Loan programme. Every additional piece of borrowing that is done year by year under the overall Loan programme that we are dealing with now means an increase in interest commitments that has to be met out of the recurrent Budget. If the State had had a better Loan allocation from the Commonwealth—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader can be stupid if he wants to. If he keeps on displaying his ignorance, that is all right, but I would appreciate it if he did it somewhere else. We are absolutely sick of the ignorance and abysmal lack of knowledge of the man.

Mr. Mathwin: You're a pompous theorist.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the honourable member for Glenelg to order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Commonwealth Government this year did not increase the Loan allocation for South Australia by one cent. As a consequence of that, the real capital development programme of this State was reduced. To some extent, the State Government has been able to offset that by means of borrowing through various statutory corporations wherein there lies a borrowing power of up to \$1 000 000 a year, without being subject to the Loan Council agreement or to Loan Council approval, or without affecting any of our other borrowings.

The borrowing of \$2 000 000 by the Monarto commission would reduce our semi-government programme in total by \$2 000 000, but if the Monarto commission borrows only \$1 000 000 there is no impact anywhere else. Rather than make a subvention to the Monarto commission to pay the debt charges that exist there, we have chosen to borrow through the Monarto commission an extra \$1 000 000. In circumstances where the Commonwealth has restricted the State's overall

programme, I would fully justify that position.

Furthermore, the State Government has said to the Commonwealth, by way of letter from Premier to Prime Minister, that whilst the Monarto project is deferred the Commonwealth Government borrowings of \$9 147 000 should be converted to grants over the period of the deferment. After all, the rate at which we proceeded with the project was governed by the provision of funds from the Commonwealth. The Loan provisions and the grants provisions made by the Commonwealth enabled us to go ahead and purchase the site, and that purchase has been finalised. The borrowings of \$9 147 000 represent the major part of the total borrowings undertaken. Our application to the Commonwealth, which has been only recently submitted to the Prime Minister, is that, as the Commonwealth has refused to continue with the expected level of assistance, it should be willing to convert those loans to a "grant" during the period of the deferment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: For the benefit of the Parliament of this State, the sooner someone deposes the Leader of the Opposition, the better. He is forever degrading this Parliament and the overall standard of debate. He will not listen to a point. It is impossible to get it through his thick head. His performances are F-minus all the time.

Mr. Becker: You'd be a nice old biased teacher.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If I had him in my class, and if I were teaching, he would have been out showing his backside to the principal months ago.

Mr. Gunn: I thought you didn't believe in physical violence.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the honourable member for Eyre to order, first, for interjecting, and, secondly, for interjecting when being out of his seat.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would be prepared to make an exception to my views on corporal punishment in the case of the gentleman I have just mentioned.

The Leader has said we should sell the Monarto site for \$10 000 000, which is grossly excessive, because, on broad acre value, the best one would obtain in terms of income-producing value for agricultural purposes would be about \$6 500 000.

Mr. Allison: You must have been thinking about it. Did you pay too much for it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I obtained an approximate valuation in order to demonstrate the economics of the proposition. The sale of the land for \$6 500 000 would reduce the indebtedness of the Monarto Commission from \$18 800 000 to about \$12 300 000, and we have the debt charges on that.

Mr. Millhouse: We would be bankrupt.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not a question of being bankrupt. Every time South Australia undertakes Loan work, it is borrowing money, and, unless that Loan work is an income-producer (and many of them are not), a debt charge is added to the Treasurer's miscellaneous line in the following year. This has happened year after year; members opposite have voted for those Loan works and for the extra debt charges. I suppose members opposite will now say that South Australia is bankrupt. That is a load of nineteenth century hogwash.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You should get—

The CHAIRMAN: I call the honourable Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The sale of the land for \$6 500 000 would be merely a reduction in our debt commitment. There would still be a debt commitment of more than \$12 000 000 and also debt charges that would

produce \$20 000 000 or more by the year 2006.

Mr. Gunn: Did you—

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the Government had a reasonable Loan programme, I would have advocated that the existing debt charges of the commission be met by expenditure from the Revenue Budgets each year, with no further borrowing being undertaken by the Monarto commission. However, that is not the position. There has not been a reasonable Loan programme, and consequently it is necessary to use the Monarto Development Commission in borrowing the \$1 000 000 that can be borrowed without affecting the overall programme. That saves \$1 000 000 basically out of the Revenue Budget. It is reasonable to tell the Commonwealth that loans that have been made to the State for the purposes of the Monarto Development Commission should be interest-free because the deferment has been, to a significant extent, the consequence of the refusal of the Commonwealth to make the additional necessary funds available.

Regarding the so-called remarks by the Leader of the Opposition about population projection, the demand for additional houses and the extent to which Adelaide expands geographically depend not on the immediate rate of population increase or the birth rate, but on the rate of household formation. This is a function of the rate of population increase 15 and 20 years ago.

The rate of household formation in Adelaide is still relatively high. It is affected by the birth rate of the late 1950's and early 1960's. The rate of household formation in Adelaide will stay at a significant level for at least another 10 to 15 years. As a consequence, the area of Adelaide will expand. The Leader says that this is all because the Government has not done anything about inner suburban renewal.

Mr. Tonkin: "Neglect" was the word I used.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He said that, because of this Government's neglect of inner suburban renewal, Adelaide has an urban sprawl. The urban sprawl of Adelaide has been going on since the Second World War, in case the Leader has not heard the good news. The new suburbs developed at their most frequent rate during the 1950's and 1960's, during the greater part of which this Government was not in power.

The Leader has completely failed to tell anyone what he would do about inner suburban renewal. I suspect that all the Leader and the Liberal Party would do would be say, "We'll have to rezone R.1 areas, make people take flats, and increase the density in our R.1 areas as a consequence." Is that what the Leader would do to get greater population in the inner suburbs? He will have to tell the people what is his policy. How will he get greater densities in the inner suburbs? Would he rezone all R.1 areas and R.2 areas where flats can be provided only by consent?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I take a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is all very well for the Minister to filibuster and play out time, but he should not try to provoke the Liberal Party by talking directly to members of the Opposition as he is. He should at least address the Chair, I suggest.

The CHAIRMAN: Although I will not uphold the point of order, I will take note of it. I ask the honourable Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall take your correction, Mr. Chairman, and address my remarks to the Chair. I ask, through you, whether the Leader is prepared to give

us details about what he proposes with respect to inner suburban renewal. Where will he get higher densities? What will he do?

Mr. Goldsworthy: What has this to do with the discussion?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader raised the subject.

Mr. Tonkin: I didn't say a word about it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He did not say a word about how inner suburban renewal was going to be brought about.

Mr. Tonkin: You're filibustering.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am replying to all interjections, for the benefit of the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Tonkin: You're out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Interjections are out of order, but my replies are not. The Leader's charge with regard to inner suburban renewal is not true. The Government, through the Housing Trust, has purchased and upgraded, in the past six years, more than 1 000 inner suburban houses, under a programme that commenced under this Government. That programme, at the rate of about 150 houses a year, means that less Housing Trust money is available to build new houses on the fringes, but it leads to the upgrading and retention of run-down inner suburban houses.

We have gone in for extensive development within the city, in co-operation with the Adelaide City Council, but by and large it does not have much impact on population, because, while we are getting more dwelling units in the inner city areas, families are moving out, and people without families are moving in. It is difficult to devise ways and means whereby people with young children are willing to take an inner city address.

If the Leader and his Party want to carry on about inner suburban renewal in the way in which they are carrying on, I suggest that they must give specific policies. They have not done that, and there is no foundation for the charge made by the Leader that it is Government neglect that has led to urban sprawl. Urban sprawl has gone on for years as a consequence of the degree of population expansion within the community.

I now refer to the question of the possible subdivision of parts of Monarto as an extension of Murray Bridge. At present, the Government is considering a proposition put forward by the Monarto commission for the development of a rural living subdivision near that part of Monarto adjacent to Murray Bridge and to the proposed Murray Bridge exit from the freeway. We have had an assessment made of the demand for land in Murray Bridge, both for ordinary suburban allotments and for rural living type allotments.

Mr. Tonkin: It would have been better to concentrate on Murray Bridge in the first place, wouldn't it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Environmental conditions are such that the extra population Murray Bridge can take is limited. If the Leader had done his homework, he might know something about that. The land adjacent to Brinkley Road could be developed into an effective rural living subdivision, and a significant gain made for the Monarto commission as a consequence. An attractive development would be provided, as well.

Mr. Millhouse: You have only two more minutes to go.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If honourable members keep on interjecting, I am happy to consider any submissions they make with respect to their interjections. If they cannot contain themselves, I suggest that it is their own silly fault. The problem we have confronting us in Adelaide is that there is already enough subdivision in the Adelaide Hills to provide accommodation for another

120 000 people. The environmental consequences of that sort of expansion of population in the Hills areas would be disastrous for Adelaide. We have heard previous arguments about good agricultural land being taken over and used for hobby farms or rural living, and it has certainly been suggested to us that areas of less than prime quality land should be set aside for this purpose.

Whatever one says about Monarto land, it is valuable land for many purposes, but it cannot be described as prime agricultural land. The land that lies around Brinkley Road and between the freeway alignment and the present Murray Bridge road would be suitable land for this purpose. I should have thought that honourable members opposite, who are interested in preserving prime agricultural land in this State and in ensuring that Hills areas are not despoiled by excessive development, would support not just a limited amount of development of hobby farms and rural living at Monarto but extensive development for that purpose.

After all, one of the things that we have been able to demonstrate is that, by providing allotments varying from, say, 4 acres to 12 acres, a septic tank system can be provided to deal with sewerage without having any overall sewerage scheme. That would represent a considerable saving in Government investment. At no stage, until about two years ago, did the Leader or the Liberal Party say anything about urban sprawl or inner suburban renewal: that is a new slogan that the Leader has started to gas on about.

Of course, having said previously that there is no case for Monarto, the Leader has also gone on record and said that there is no case for any further extensive development in Adelaide in any other direction.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The time allotted for the Committee stages of the Bills has expired, and I now put the necessary questions.

Mr. Millhouse: Congratulations.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is: "That the vote 'Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$18 535 000' be reduced by \$100 000."

The Committee divided on the question:

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

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Rodda. No—Mr. Payne.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The question now is: "That the remainder of the schedule and the second schedule be agreed to."

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$18 535 000; Miscellaneous, \$15 150 000—passed.

Second schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 11 and title passed.

Bill and Loan Estimates reported without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

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

That these Bills be now read a third time.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to remark on the Budget and Loan Estimates generally and on the form in which they have been introduced. Before I do that, I should like to protest against the fact that we have had a limited time—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Under Standing Orders any speech on the third reading must be confined to the Bill as it has come out of Committee and cannot deal with other matters.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I think that the honourable Leader knows the position.

Mr. TONKIN: I will not deal with that subject any further but I am sure that all members in this House understand—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN:—your position, Sir, in having to rule under Standing Orders. The form of presenting the Loan Estimates and the Budget together is an improvement. For that reason I should like to reiterate what I said in the second reading debate, that there should be, I believe, far more integration of the total financial documents of the State when they are presented to Parliament.

I draw the attention of members again to the matters raised a short time ago about the way in which the Budget is drawn up. I would like to see further reforms, and I am pleased indeed that there is a Government committee in the Treasury looking at this entire matter now. I hope it will consider the suggestions that have been made by the Opposition about how Parliament's examination of the financial documents, especially of the Government's expenditure, whether it be on capital works or recurrent expenditure, can be improved. I look forward to the further report of that committee, although I emphasise that I believe it is more and more important that we look at programme and performance budgeting rather than at the present form of line budgeting that we now have. That factor has been accepted by most Treasury officials, and I hope that it will not be long (and that depends entirely on how rapidly we can institute that programme) before we are considering in this House programme and performance budgeting rather than the present form of looking at lines.

I refer to the remarks made in the Committee stages about general subjects in the Bills which we have considered and which are now at the third reading stage. I was amazed to hear the Minister of Mines and Energy say that, if the State had had a reasonable Loan allocation, we could continue to suffer various losses.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I didn't say that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has spoken.

Mr. TONKIN: In relation to Monarto, the Minister said several times that, if we had had a reasonable Loan allocation from the Commonwealth, we could have continued allocating funds from General Revenue, and not accrued interest. He is really saying that we could afford to go on borrowing.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You didn't even listen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: He seems to believe that, if we borrow through the Monarto commission, or through any one of the more than 60 statutory authorities which have the power to borrow up to \$1 000 000 each year, without gaining the approval of the Loan Council, in some way that money is different. The Minister intimated that it did not have to be paid back, and that it was not a debt which would be standing against the State and which would have to be repaid by the tax payers. That was the clear implication of what he said.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on!

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister said that if it were borrowed in that way it would have no impact anywhere else. I quote his words.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They were not my words.

Mr. TONKIN: I suggest that, if the Minister cares to check *Hansard*, he will find that that is exactly the message he gave.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You might have heard, but you didn't listen.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader has only a short amount of time to speak, and the honourable Minister will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. TONKIN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out to the Minister, as he pointed out to Opposition members when there was a time limit earlier, that it is extremely difficult to conclude your speech within the time available if you have to be worried about interjections all the time.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader does not have to answer interjections, and they are out of order.

Mr. TONKIN: True, this reveals a most disturbing attitude on the Minister's part, and, presumably, on the part of the Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why do you keep on lying?

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable Minister will cease interjecting. As has been said before, "lying" is unparliamentary language, and I hope the Minister will withdraw the remark.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I withdraw the word "lying". Why does the Leader keep on indulging in untruths?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

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

Mr. TONKIN: I accept the honourable Minister's apology. He seems to think the money does not have to be paid back and therefore, with 60 State authorities, the State can afford to borrow \$60 000 000 each year without having to worry about the Loan Council, and because we do not have that worry, for some reason it is all right. That is not a principle which I like to see adopted and applied, as the Minister suggests it is, by the Government of South Australia. Of course the money has to be paid back, and the pity of it is that it must be paid back by Governments of the future. It shows a totally irresponsible attitude by the present Government in putting this State into debt.

Monarto is bankrupt, to quote the member for Mitcham. The way we are going, the State will be committed up to the hilt and we will be in hock as deeply as we can go before this Government is finished with us. Obviously, it has been living in the hope that the Federal Government will in some way bail it out. That is what the Minister said about Monarto. The Government will convert loans to grants, or there will be money interest-free.

Mr. Millhouse: They've got Buckley's hope.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already spoken to the honourable member for Mitcham. If he continues I will name him.

Mr. TONKIN: The honourable member for Mitcham is quite right. If the State Government continues that irresponsible attitude towards the taxpayer it will get little sympathy from the Federal Government. The State Government seems determined to continue borrowing principal to pay interest, and at the same time increasing our indebtedness so that we have to pay more interest and borrow more money to keep on paying ever-increasing amounts of interest. As a financial stratagem, and financial and economic policy, it will not do. It will catch

up with this Government very quickly.

The South Australian public has no reason to have confidence in its State Government, because of the economic policies that it has so clearly voiced this afternoon through the Minister of Mines and Energy. I am at least pleased that he came clean.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time allotted for the remaining stages of these Bills has expired. I now put the question: "That these Bills be now read a third time."

Bills read a third time and passed.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 August. Page 730.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this Bill, as it is in principle in keeping with its own policy for the expansion of the State's library system. One or two measures included in the Bill are simply commonsense provisions. The provision for driving and parking vehicles on the library property on North Terrace is simply another step following the legislation enacted for the Art Gallery premises. This is now being repeated and will ultimately provide uniform powers regulating, restricting or prohibiting the driving and parking of motor vehicles on land in the large North Terrace area, which is difficult to define because there are no boundary fences between the various Government institutions sited there.

The major provision that is worthy of comment is the Government's intention to give the Libraries Board power to borrow money further to establish and improve library services in this State, with the proviso that borrowings will be subject to the Treasurer's consent and may be guaranteed by the Government to be repaid from appropriations against the General Revenue Account.

Following remarks that were made earlier at various times during the Budget debate, the Opposition states that this is yet one more statutory authority that will have power to borrow probably a considerable sum of money, and that these statutory authorities are being increased steadily, particularly over the past few years, rather than being decreased.

Mr. Tonkin: Apparently the Government thinks that doesn't in any way affect the economy of the State.

Mr. ALLISON: Obviously, it is aiding and abetting the old Keynesian principle of deficit funding, which is under considerable criticism by latter-day economists.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: But not by you.

Mr. ALLISON: I criticised it only two or three weeks ago.

Mr. Millhouse: There aren't a lot of economists who still support it.

Mr. ALLISON: That is so, and many of them are dead, too.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a typically arrogant statement.

Mr. ALLISON: It is typically true, also.

Mr. Millhouse: They support it now.

Mr. ALLISON: The honourable member said something like that last evening.

The SPEAKER: Order! I can hear a little chatter from both sides. However, I should like to hear the member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. ALLISON: Thank you, Sir. I am trying to make the point that, when a Government borrows increasingly a larger and larger proportion of the State's annual revenue (and I am speaking about the percentage of borrowings as

against total revenue, not simply in straight-out figures), the greater will be the debt that must be repaid, not by this Government or by Governments in the immediate future, but by Governments that will be our children's responsibility. I suppose our children are likely soon to be landed with a double indemnity of paying our superannuation and debts. That really is the nub of the question.

I therefore hope that the Libraries Board's borrowing power does not have to be exercised to any great extent, but that the Government will continue to make available considerable money through normal budgetary procedures, and that the Libraries Board's borrowing power will not have to be a great addition to the sum of money that is normally made available.

When the Premier released the Crawford Report on libraries only last week he said that about \$30 900 000 is reportedly recommended for the development of the South Australian public libraries with a specific sum, I think, of about \$8 800 000 over eight years being required for capital expenditure. That means an additional amount of \$1 100 000 over and above the amount that would have normally been made available through the State Budget had this year's pattern of expenditure continued over the next eight years. The Premier stated that the execution of these improvements would be dependent upon the Government's consenting to the Libraries Board's borrowing money. Therefore, one has to question just how soon the improvements are going to take place, how much money the Libraries Board will be permitted to borrow, and how much money the Government will contribute in addition to the Libraries Board borrowing. These questions were not answered in the release of the Crawford Report.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you read the report?

Mr. ALLISON: I read it quickly last night. There is a copy in the library, but Opposition members were not privileged to have the release. It has not been tabled.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

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

Mr. ALLISON: The Opposition supports the legislation in the hope that it will lead to a swift improvement in the state of South Australian libraries. If we are not going to have the Libraries Board empowered to borrow very much money and if the State is going to reduce the amount of money that it would normally spend on libraries, I draw attention to the need for the immediate provision of shop front libraries, which were referred to in the Labor Party's policy speech in September 1977.

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: Did you coin the term?

Mr. ALLISON: I got it from the United Kingdom in 1975. The sum to be expended, \$30 900 000, may be considerably more than would be needed to provide an instant service to those areas. In the United Kingdom and elsewhere in Europe, I saw cheap and efficient library services operating literally from a 14ft. by 10ft. site, with shelves all around. An itinerant librarian was in attendance several times a week. These libraries were on the pavement in normal shopping areas; they were not the large, well equipped libraries that we hope will be constructed in the future, with the co-operation of councils. What I have been describing are emergency steps that can be taken pretty well immediately, not with books catalogued and classified but with basic books provided almost as consumables, so that people could start developing the reading habit if they did not already have it. Perhaps we might introduce an ethnic library at Thebarton immediately. This could be done at other

appropriate sites, too. My suggestion would not involve the expenditure of large sums on library complexes, and we must bear in mind that it appears that the Federal Government and the State Government are short of money. So, in the hope that the Libraries Board is given teeth to do the job that the recent report has dealt with effectively, the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): It is a pity that this Bill is being debated so soon after the release of the Crawford Report, the report of the Library Services Planning Committee. It is obvious that the member for Mount Gambier has not had a chance to digest it, and I have not had much opportunity to get to grips with it. It arrived in the library only yesterday, and I immediately got a copy. It is quite a technical document. I have had a chance to talk to professional librarians (not those in the Parliamentary Library, in case they think I am taking their names in vain) about the report and the proposals in it. This Bill probably provides the only occasion we will have to debate that report during this session of Parliament, or perhaps ever.

I refer, first, to the Horton Report, which is entitled *Public Libraries in Australia*, which was commissioned by the Whitlam Government, and which was made in February 1976. On page 141, the report deals with the position in South Australia. I want to quote several passages from it and the first is as follows:

Geographic features and population distribution (generally close and major urban settlement) have shaped the largely centralised public library system of South Australia. Thus the State Library provides the service of centralised selection, acquisition, cataloguing, processing and exchange of library materials to municipal libraries, in proportion to the amounts contributed to the Libraries Board of South Australia by local government authorities for these purposes. Initiative for establishment of service rests with local government authorities, which bear capital and staff costs, though they do receive subsidies. Continuation of this prerogative of initiation is favoured by the Libraries Board. This is despite the fact that in rural areas, particularly, the existence of the (subscription) Institute Libraries, of which there are still 160, has tended to inhibit public library development. The Libraries Board does, however, foresee that larger establishment and operation subsidies will be necessary to stimulate further the favoured form of free public library service.

Later, the report states:

In common with its sister States' Library Authorities, the Libraries Board regrets the insufficient funds available for library materials and for staff, and the unavailability of qualified staff.

I ask members to note those two points, because they are the nub of our problem. This is a good report on the whole, but there are two obstinate problems no report can solve. The first is whether we have sufficient qualified staff to do all the things recommended, and the second is whether we have the money to do them. I know that the Bill, in part, is meant to provide some of the money, but only, as I understand it, a flea-bite of the money we will need. The report continues:

It faces particular problems, it asserts, because of its responsibility for the half million individuals for whom no library service is otherwise provided. (85 per cent of the State's area is not administered by local government.) And despite the State's relatively lower population, its needs for quality in reference and information service do not, it is pressed, diminish on account of size. Insufficient staff has resulted in the build-up of unprocessed and inaccessible materials: insufficient expansion of existing services; and most importantly, inhibition in introducing new services—as

for example, promotional work with business, industry, State and local government organisations; the establishment of "information posts"; oral history collecting, etc.

That is about all I need to quote from the Horton Report. Whilst I have taken a couple of paragraphs from the section on South Australia, I hope I have not quoted them out of context. That points to some of our problems.

The Premier made this report public last week, and the member for Mount Gambier was correct when he quoted the sum of \$30 000 000. On page 203 of the report a table shows the projected cost to the State Public Library development over eight years, 1978-79 to 1985-86. It is under two headings: the first is "establishment costs", which consist of establishment capital, initial book grant, expansion and upgrading grant. The second heading is "ongoing costs", which consist of administration, subsequent capital and books. The total of the establishment costs is \$8 772 838. It is estimated that \$1 352 530 will be spent this financial year. Ongoing costs total \$22 202 472, of which it is anticipated \$1 805 342 will be spent this year. I have not checked the allocation in the Budget, but those are the projected costs of the committee. The total for this year is \$3 157 872. I think the Bill gives authority to borrow up to \$1 000 000.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's not in the Bill; that's the present arrangement with the Commonwealth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the sum to be found by loan or from revenue for the ongoing element this financial year and over the next eight years. It is a very hefty sum for a State which, although it manages to find money for the arts and so on, is on its uppers in many other respects. I wonder whether we will have enough money to do this. A librarian has told me that the State Library is at present drastically under-staffed; as people leave they are not replaced. It is doubtful whether it will be possible to staff the library if the proposals set out in the Crawford Report are implemented. It is useless having plans if there is insufficient staff to carry them out.

In the State election campaign last year the Government made some sweeping promises about improving library services in the western suburbs. The State Librarian (Mr. Olding) has had to try to comply with the promises, which were probably made without, or against, his advice. To do this, old books have been dug out and sent to the western suburbs.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Oh, no!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister can tell me I am wrong; I hope I am, as I often hope I am. However, I have been told that that is what is happening. These books are not the kind those people want to read. The member for Albert Park and other members from that area might do well to look into this matter. If what I have said is right, the library—

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I would like some protection. These interjections are not even directed at me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was also doing a similar thing not so long ago. I call honourable members to order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If what I have said is correct, library services that have apparently been provided for the western suburbs—

Mr. Harrison: They're worthwhile and well accepted.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Albert Park to order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the member for Albert Park is satisfied, but I think that he may be rather easily satisfied. For the past five minutes I have been trying to get a phrase out of my mouth, but I have not been

able to do so; luckily, I have retained it in my head. This is more of a confidence trick than anything else. There has been a nominal fulfilment of the promise, but nothing more than nominal. To that extent, it is no more than a confidence trick. I have referred to the money that will be needed (and wonder whether we have got it) and the question of staffing. Another aspect that emerges from this report, particularly now that the Minister of Mines and Energy, the pretender to the Deputy Premiership (and he has worked jolly hard on it, and I congratulate him for it)—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will return to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I propose to speak on this Bill, and I rose to speak at the appropriate time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's your right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I congratulate the Minister on the virtuosity of his performance this week, and I am sure that it will improve his chances in his own Party for the Deputy Premiership.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will get back to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not for a moment, in what I am saying about the report, reflect on Mr. Crawford, who was Chairman of the committee. He has been since childhood a friend of mine and a person for whom I have some affection and considerable respect; nor does what I am saying reflect on any members of the committee.

Mr. Mathwin: He's done a jolly good job with libraries.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member says that he has done a jolly good job with libraries, but the reaction that I have had to the report is that the administration will be top heavy. We have the Minister at the top and, under him, as I understand the report, is to be an advisory committee, and responsible to that committee is the Libraries Board, which will become a paid body. There will also be a Ministerial advisory committee. A proliferation of committees is proposed, all of which will have to be manned by people and which will make the administration of the project topheavy indeed. The report contains a chart. I am surprised that the member for Mount Gambier, who was, I presume, leading for his Party, did not go into this matter, because it seems to me that it is an important aspect of the Bill.

On page 208 there is a suggested organisation incorporating the committee's proposals for structural change. As always with something like this, there is a good deal of empire building. The permanent head of the department becomes the "Director-General", and a number of divisions are to be established: an archives division and a State Library division, which really, when one looks at the various units in it, will not amount to very much. No doubt Mr. Olding, the present State Librarian, will be left in charge of that, but he will have sheared off him most of the significant services, which will go into the public libraries division. It has been suggested to me that this is one way in which the Government can sidestep Mr. Olding, because there is not the rapport between the Government and him that one would wish.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: How do you sustain that sort of comment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That has been suggested to me by a person who is a librarian and whose opinion I support. If it is wrong (and I again invite the Minister to say if it is wrong), I shall be pleased. I suggest that if this organisation is adopted it is certain that Mr. Olding will be left with the State Library Division and nothing else. Am I not right?

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That is not my decision: I am

no longer the Minister. You will get your answer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister says that it is not his decision, I do not think he can really complain about what I have said.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Yes, I can, because you are talking about the relationship between Mr. Olding and myself during the period that I was Minister, and it was excellent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is fine. My point still stands, because that is no answer to what I have said.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it in order for the Minister to interrupt me in that way when I am speaking?

The SPEAKER: It is quite in order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In that case I will simply go on.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Very logical.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: My relationship with Mr. Olding was very good over a five-year period, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Be that as it may, I have said what I have said, and I do not retract it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But you stand corrected.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not stand corrected. I believe that what I have said is right.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is only prolonging the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We had a good example of that this afternoon when you were out of the Chamber and did not know what went on.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is an opportunity for members to hear from outside the Chamber what is going on in the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But you being the Speaker are not to know what is going on. The State Library Division will consist of the following: Local History Research Unit; Technical Services Reference Research Library, which is itself in three parts; Information and Co-ordination Unit, which is in four parts; Planning and Development Unit; Administration and Finance Division; the Public Library Division, which will have in it all the lending services, the adult services and the young people services; Community Services; and Consultancy, Planning and Technical Services. Undoubtedly, what is being done is to split the lending services from the State Library proper. Whether this is wise, or whether it is simply to by-pass Mr. Olding, has not been determined, but that will be the result of what is proposed in the Crawford Report.

That report puts a far greater emphasis on lending services, and the bulk of the money recommended under the report will go into the lending services. How much money will be available, and will the staff be there to do what is necessary? It has been put to me that the recommendations in the report are a very strong example of over-management. Despite all that has been said in lauding the recommendations of the committee, those recommendations will probably fall down on these two points—money and staffing. Associated with them is the question of the very top-heavy nature of the organisation that is proposed.

I make no apology for taking the time of the House on this matter because it is important and the question of library services is seldom debated in this House. I am surprised that the Liberal Party is apparently not taking the opportunity, in view of the release of this report, to have a full-scale debate on library services. We will not get another chance to do so for a long time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will get back to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The Bill allows for semi-government borrowing of funds for library purposes, but I venture to say that we will not be able to find, even with the aid of this Bill, sufficient money to do all that is recommended in the Crawford Report.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I would like to reply briefly to one or two things that have been said in the second reading debate. As I indicated to the honourable member for Mitcham by way of interjection, I am no longer effectively the Minister in charge of libraries. I am handling this Bill because I introduced it in the Chamber before the reshuffle of Ministerial portfolios and because the Minister of Community Development is not present in the Chamber at this time.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that deliberate?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, it is not. Why should it be?

Mr. Millhouse: I don't know.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is continually interjecting, and I have been very lenient with him this afternoon. I assure the honourable member that I will not be so lenient in the future. The next time the honourable member interjects I will name him.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is also amazing how some people put the worst possible construction on any sequence of events. Both speakers have raised the matter of funding for the initiatives which are set out in the report that has recently been released. Having commissioned the report and having committed itself at the last State election to a significantly improved effort in relation to library services, Cabinet will ensure that funds are available for this project to proceed. It will be for the new Minister to determine exactly how the various recommendations in the report will be implemented. As the person who has recently moved out of the chair, I can only say that the new Minister will have my full support in ensuring that the programme proceeds properly.

I am also grateful to the member for Mitcham for having raised the matter of the Horton Report because, if there is one thing that will assist us in ensuring that the programme is carried out, it would be that the Commonwealth Government should face up to its responsibility in this matter. The Horton Report sets out a very modest programme where the Commonwealth is concerned, but it would enable this State to obtain \$2 000 000 a year for the next 10 years in furtherance of the programme. For example, the honourable member quoted from a section of the report which pointed out that the vast majority of this State, though it be sparsely inhabited, nonetheless has no local government authority. Given that, traditionally, the mechanism for the development of library services has been contingent on the agreement of local government, that of course has been one of our problems.

In addition, the report points out that Queensland and South Australia have similar problems in both having subscription library systems, which in some ways have inhibited the development of municipal library services, simply because they were there. The report earmarks initial considerable subventions that should go to Queensland and South Australia for the purpose of the translation of these subscription libraries to free public library services. That is an innovation encouraged by the Crawford Report.

We have had massive inaction from the Commonwealth Government on the matter. To make matters worse, the only Commonwealth Minister who knows much about this

report (because it was committed to him) was Senator Withers, and I do not know whether anyone in Canberra presently has the carriage of this matter. We have had evasion and equivocation from the Commonwealth on this matter. No doubt all of the States would like to see some small initiative from the Commonwealth, given that it was a Commonwealth report that was brought down, given that on no occasion has the present Government specifically repudiated that report, and given that it is not an open-ended commitment; it is one that sets out a programme for a 10-year period, and then it would cease so far as the Commonwealth is concerned. It would be up to the States to continue that matter.

The member for Mount Gambier mentioned shop-front libraries, the sort of thing that occurs from time to time in the United Kingdom. He described the sort of thing that we have done successfully in this State with the use of mobile libraries. He referred to itinerant librarians; in fact, the library itself has been itinerant, but we do not see that as any more than an interim measure.

The member for Mitcham raised the matter of further debate on this subject. I imagine that my successor will certainly introduce further legislation in the future, because I imagine that the two Bills under which provision of libraries occurs in this State will require further amendment and, perhaps, a complete redraft. I cannot guarantee that, because I am no longer in the chair, but I imagine that will occur and will enable further debate to proceed on this important topic.

The final matter that I refer to concerns the books available in the recently opened libraries in the western and north-western suburbs. Although I was not present at the opening of the Woodville library, which was opened by the Premier, I was present at West Lakes and Semaphore. I took much interest in the books on the shelves there, because I am a bit of a bookworm myself (I am probably somewhat of a frustrated librarian). I can assure the honourable member that much care has been taken to ensure that appropriate reading material is available in those libraries. In fact, there were some exciting pieces of reading available for people in all sorts of areas—music, sport, vocational areas, and all that sort of thing. I can assure members that there has been no con job in relation to this matter.

It is not a matter of recycling unwanted books that have been in the bowels of the State Library for some time. Of course, a certain degree of recycling occurs throughout the library system. If a book sits on a library shelf and does not move for three or four months, the local librarian sends it back to the State Library. That does not mean that it is shredded or that it stays there: usually it is sent to another area to see whether it moves there. Doubtless there would be some books in those libraries that have been in other libraries, but to suggest that the people in these areas are being fobbed off with a con job flies in the face of the facts as I personally know them.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 14 September. Page 919.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The State Lotteries Commission seeks to restrict the use of the words "Lotto", "Cross

"Lotto", or "X Lotto", assuming total control of those words. I will support the second reading. One of my colleagues has already indicated his view that the word "Lotto" should not be the sole province of the Lotteries Commission. I will leave him to argue that point. I think "Lotto", "X Lotto" and other similar forms of lottery have existed throughout the world for about a century.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If we pass the Bill, bingo, it's gone!

Mr. EVANS: I will have a game of "housie" with the member later, if he supplies the funds for both of us to play. I am concerned that we should be telling a State institution, "You have the sole province in this area."

Recently, a provincial paper requested that it be able to run some form of "Lotto". The Lotteries Commission was at its wits end to know how to answer this, so it sought a legal opinion, which was that the Lotteries Commission had no say over who used the words "Lotto", "X Lotto", or similar terms. The paper concerned agreed to operate its "X Lotto" in accordance with the provisions laid down by the Lotteries Commission. The commission then became aware that other people might run "Lotto" competitions. I do not necessarily object to the Lotteries Commission's retaining the right to the use the term "X Lotto": it has advertised and commercialised that name in this State, and spent much money in so doing, although it has also recouped much money in that regard.

It is worth looking at the commission's sales. One sees from the Auditor-General's Report that in 1975-76 the Lotteries Commission received 48.3 per cent of its income, or \$7 660 000, from lottery tickets, whereas "X Lotto" brought in 51.7 per cent of the commission's income, which amounted to \$8 187 529. In 1976-77, lottery tickets brought in \$10 280 000, or 51.1 per cent of the commission's revenue, whereas "X Lotto" in that year brought in \$8 389 821, or 44.9 per cent of its income. If one examines the situation obtaining that year, one sees that there was a substantial increase in lottery ticket sales, whereas there was only a light increase in "X Lotto" sales compared to sales in 1975-76. There was also a drop in the percentage of "X Lotto" revenue compared to lottery ticket revenue.

One sees from page 367 of the Auditor-General's Report that in 1977-78 \$12 200 000 was received from lottery ticket sales, whereas \$12 755 391 was received from "X Lotto" sales. So one sees that again "X Lotto" has sneaked back to be slightly in front of lottery ticket sales and to comprise slightly more than half of total sales. South Australians are now spending \$25 000 000 a year on "X Lotto" and "Lotto".

When the Lotteries Commission was first established, we were told that the surplus from lottery operations was to be paid into the Hospitals Fund and that it would be something extra for hospitals. However, one finds that the surplus from operations available from transfer to the Hospitals Fund was \$7 860 514 in 1978, compared to \$5 660 998 in 1977. One can see, therefore, that more money is going into the fund. The trouble is that this money is being used in lieu of general revenue.

No-one can prove that hospitals are any better off now. This is another form of taxation. True, it is a voluntary tax, if one likes to use that term, because people contribute, hoping that they have a chance to win something. Of course, that is their decision. As long as they do not put themselves in a position in which the rest of society must support these people because they have overspent, no harm is done.

It is interesting to note that nowhere in the world has a worthwhile survey been conducted into the social consequences of gambling. The matter was examined by a

church group in England which decided that impulse action gambling was a bad form of gambling. If we allow the Lotteries Commission to continue with its sweet way of asking for a privileged area in which to operate, it will not be long before it asks Parliament to preserve the words "instant lottery". Indeed, this will be brought into operation in December, and there is no reason for one to assume that the commission will not make that request. We are trying to give our Lotteries Commission (a legalised gambling commission) an opportunity to preserve certain functions within its own province.

In every country that I have visited, gambling is regarded as bad, even in this country. It is considered to be so bad that we make laws in an attempt to control it. If it was not so regarded, we would not make such laws, and anybody could set out on any course he chose and run any sort of gambling operation. More important is the distinction between a bet and a gamble. When we refer to the Lotteries Commission, the interpretation in European countries would be that that is a gamble, particularly "X Lotto", because the chances of winning are millions to one. The interpretation of a bet is that a person uses some skill; for example, where two people in England sit and play poker or some other card game. Even though there is some risk or some chance, there is also some skill involved. It is therefore considered to be a bet. Wagering on horse racing, dog racing, trotting races, and pigeon racing is regarded as a bet in the European countries but, where there is a roulette wheel or dice, that is regarded as straight-out gambling. It is a game of chance. As in "X Lotto", no skill is applied.

Instant lotteries are exactly the same, in principle, as poker machines; that is, instead of people elsewhere walking into a club to operate a poker machine, in Adelaide people will be able to walk into a Lotteries Commission agency. One puts a dollar note over the counter and receives a ticket, rubs the back off, and then sees a number. One will not have to wait; one will know whether one has won \$10 000 or a smaller sum. If one wins a prize, one puts the ticket into another heap, with a chance of winning \$50 000. The Premier has said that he will not accept poker machines. I believe the concept is exactly the same. There are poker tickets out with prize money of \$100 sold in football clubs, but that is nowhere near the money we are talking about. Soon the Lotteries Commission will be saying it wants to preserve this bigger field, this instant form of prize money.

The Lotteries Commission is a powerful organisation, and is blatantly advertising gambling in our newspapers to try to get some sense of credibility and community acceptance. I am not sure that we are achieving much by allowing such advertising campaigns for "X Lotto" or for lotteries. In England, it is illegal to advertise gambling; if one wants to gamble, one must seek out a place to do it. I think that, if we were to adopt the practice of not allowing the Lotteries Commission to advertise in the press, or on radio or television, that would be more acceptable to those people who are opposed to the massive newspaper advertising campaigns. I am not speaking from a moral viewpoint, because I buy tickets. Parliamentarians have them pushed under their noses by sporting and charitable groups.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you speaking for your Party, or as an individual?

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member will find that I am speaking as an individual. The Bill is a conscience issue, not a Party issue. One of my colleagues will be moving for the deletion of the word "Lotto".

The volunteer groups in our communities work hard, raising money from small lotteries and small gambling

activities. It is a humbug, perhaps, when we are continually asked to participate, but I believe that we should be telling the Lotteries Commission that it must stay within the bounds of community acceptance and should not, to the detriment of volunteer and service groups, encourage people to buy tickets in the hope that they might be helping the hospitals, because they are not doing so. I support the second reading.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Like my colleague the member for Fisher, I support the second reading; certain other action will be taken in Committee. I am concerned that the Government is taking the opportunity virtually to register the word "Lotto", as well as the words "Cross Lotto" and/or "X Lotto". The Bill makes the Government's intention clear. New section 19(10a) states:

(10a) A person shall not, without the written authority of the commission, distribute, display or publish, or cause to be distributed, displayed or published, by any means, any notice or advertisement in which the word or words "Lotto", "Cross Lotto" or X Lotto" (whether with or without the addition of any other words, symbols or characters) are used as a title or description of a lottery other than a lottery conducted, or to be conducted, by the commission.

That is a wide and sweeping clause, capitalising on the word "Lotto" and the "Lotto" type of lottery. The member for Fisher explained that, comparing the financial years 1977-78 and 1976-77, the income from "X Lotto" has increased by about 50 per cent, and is significant to the profit of the Lotteries Commission. "X Lotto" sales now make up about 51 per cent of the overall income.

The word "Lotto" worries me. Murray's English Dictionary (better known as the big *Oxford English Dictionary*), Volume VI, 1908, page 457, contains definitions of "Lotto", as follows:

A game played with cards divided into numbered and blank squares and numbered discs to be drawn on the principle of a lottery. Each player has one or more cards before him; one of the discs is drawn from a bag, and its number called; a counter is placed on the square that has the same number, the player who first gets one row covered being the winner.

To me that is bingo; it is a clear description of what we call bingo. Continuing:

1899 R. Whiteing *No. 5 John St. 77*. The toiling infants under age are found at the game of loto.

The definition continues:

2. A lottery (of the Italian kind).

1787 P. Maty tr. *Riesbeck's Trav. Germ. Ill. lxx. 248* The *lotto* of Genoa, which, though decorated with a smooth and splendid name, is in fact no more than a Pharaoh table.

1827 Hone *Every-day Bk. II. 1535* To the honour of the Hanoverian government, no *Lotto* was ever introduced into it, though many foreigners offered large sums for permission to cheat the people in this manner. 1884 *Sat. Rev.* 14 June 774/2 The love of gambling is a national characteristic; and . . . *Lotto*—that is, the official weekly lottery—is the most dangerous of the forms it takes.

In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th edition, 1975, volume II, p. 24 is an item on bingo, incorporating mention of *lotto* as an old children's game. It states:

Bingo has had many names and variations. The earliest name, *lotto* (or *loto*) a children's game, was first recorded in 1778. The original American form, called *keno*, *kino*, or *pokeno*, dates from the early 19th century. The only form of gambling permitted in the British armed services, the game is called in the Royal Navy *tombola* (1880) and in the Army house (1900) or *housy-housy*.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is a fascinating and erudite speech, but as

the Bill deals only with the use of the word "Lotto" or "X Lotto", or combinations of those words, I suggest that reference to cambino or other things that are not part of this Bill is out of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Whitten): I uphold the point of order, and ask the member for Hanson to continue.

Mr. BECKER: I accept that, Sir, but I am trying to inform the House about the origin of the word "Lotto" and about how it has led to the use of other words such as "Bingo".

It is not an original word or something that has just come into being. The word has been around since 1778. The *Australian Encyclopaedia*, third edition, 1977, Vol. 4, pages 55 and 56, in an item on "Lotteries", incorporates the mention of Tatts Lotto (Victoria) and "Cross Lotto" and "X-Lotto" (S.A.). There are other dictionary definitions of "Lotto". The *Penguin English Dictionary*, by G. N. Garmonsway, 1965, page 428, states, "Game of chance in which numbers are drawn at random, bingo." The *Encyclopaedic World Dictionary*, P. Hanks, Edition 1971 (Paul Hamlyn), page 939 states:

A game played by drawing discs from a bag or the like and covering corresponding numbers on cards; Bingo. There is a close definition of the word "Lotto" and "bingo" as far as those authorities can be used. The *Australian Encyclopaedia* refers to the history of lotteries in Tasmania and Victoria, advising that there is a Tatts Lotto in Victoria.

I am concerned that the Government is introducing legislative powers to use exclusively for its own gambling and promotion purposes of the word "Lotto". If the Government wants to promote "Lotto", or as we have come to know it in this State normally as "Cross Lotto" or "X Lotto", I do not object, but I object to the use of the word "Lotto". The Bill is extremely wide. It means that, although a person may play "Lotto" for fun and games, he can still do it but, if a person wants to use the word "Lotto" to raise money, he is prohibited from doing so. This strict use of terminology is cutting into fund-raising by various sporting and charitable organisations. It is for that reason that I do not think that the Government has the right to take a word dating back to 1778 and use it for its own promotional purposes within the State Lotteries Commission. I am concerned that we are getting legislation that plays on words. The Government is controlling the use of words. We have sufficient regulations and controls over our lifestyle but, when we start playing around with the English language, where will it end?

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading with great reluctance. The member for Hanson has already made the point that there has been in the past few years an intrusion by the Government to an extraordinary degree into the everyday lives of people in this State. This is something we have had to contend with and to which we have become accustomed. If we go on passing rules and regulations as we have been doing, we will soon have to get a permit to do almost everything. I see no reason why the Government should have a monopoly on the word "Lotto": I am not even sure about "Cross Lotto", whether spelt in full or with a capital X. It seems to me that we are getting to a stage that is verging on the ridiculous. Are we to have legislation to reserve to the Government the use of the words "lottery" or "raffle"?

Mr. Becker: Or "Bingo".

Mr. TONKIN: Or "Bingo". All that we are doing,

although it is only in a small way, is legislating for yet another Government monopoly. That is a principle I do not care for one little bit. Other businesses can, by registering a business name, reserve the right to use a particular term or business name, and that is fair enough. Perhaps that is what the Lotteries Commission ought to be doing with the terms "Cross Lotto" and "X-Lotto". There are some words in common usage that we know perfectly well cannot be reserved in that way. The Companies Office tells applicants that that is the case.

As the member for Hanson has said, the word "Lotto" has been in common use since at least 1778. It refers to a game which is commonly played by children. What worries me is that if we pass this legislation, including "Lotto", when will we introduce legislation to cover ludo and snakes and ladders? It is ridiculous and I do not care for it one bit. I am certainly prepared to consider, with some reservations, the reservation of "X Lotto" to the Government. I believe we are creating a monopoly. I will not in any way support taking over "Lotto" as something exclusively the Government's. If we get to that stage of absurdity, Lord help us.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I think the basic reason for this Bill can be seen from the Auditor-General's Report. The revenue to the Hospitals Fund from the Lotteries Commission for 1977-78 will be about \$8 000 000. To the extent that the Lotteries Commission is competed against by small lotteries, we are in for a serious situation because the revenue to the State obtained from small lotteries is 2 per cent to 4 per cent. That is why this Bill is necessary. "X Lotto" has been successful and it is simply not possible to tolerate a scheme that will compete effectively.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to the conducting of instant lotteries. I believe that instant lotteries relate closely to poker machines. The new clause is as follows:

18a. The Commission shall not conduct any lottery in which an entrant in the lottery may, before the expiration of two hours after the time at which he entered the lottery, determine whether or not he is entitled to a prize in the lottery.

I am attempting to insert an amendment to prevent the Lotteries Commission from conducting instant lotteries. Instant lotteries operate in the same way as poker machines. A \$10 000 maximum prize is possible, and other smaller prizes. Most members object to operations of the poker machine type. The Premier and the Government object to poker machines, yet they are now prepared to introduce, by way of the human operation instead of mechanical operation, a form of instant impulse gambling.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): The Government is not able to agree to the proposed instruction to the Committee. We do not believe the fear that the honourable member has stated is based soundly. Certainly, the Government would not contemplate anything like poker machines, but we do not think that anything comparable to that situation would arise.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood,

Hudson (teller), Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright. **Energy):** I ask that progress be reported.
Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Rodda. No—Mr. Payne.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

ADJOURNMENT

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short titles."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and

At 5.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 24
October at 2 p.m.