

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 February 1979

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 989, 990, 991, 1005, 1007, 1009, 1011, 1029, 1030, 1033, 1034, 1037, 1054, 1057, 1058, 1061, 1065, 1070, to 1073, 1077, 1080, 1089, 1091 to 1093, 1105.

TEROWIE ROAD

989. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is it the intention of the Highways Department to provide funds to the District Council of Hallett, or to undertake the work itself, to complete the sealing of the small section of road that leads off the Terowie-Peterborough Road?

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: It is presumed that the question refers to the road west of the railway line and connecting Terowie to the Peterborough-Terowie Road. The Highways Department does not intend to undertake this work. Consideration would be given to assisting the District Council of Hallett, subject to funds being available and to council giving the project high priority in applying for grants.

PETERBOROUGH VISIT

990. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): When the Minister recently visited Peterborough, who issued the invitations to meet him and why were the representatives of the District Council of Peterborough not invited?

The **Hon. J. C. BANNON**: As I pointed out to the honourable member in my reply to Question on Notice 888, the visit to Peterborough was arranged at short notice and its primary purpose was to present a grant of \$12 500 to the town of Peterborough for upgrading of the hall. However, a number of organisations were contacted and advised of my visit. Through an oversight the district council of Peterborough was omitted. Subsequently, I wrote to the district council on 22 January explaining the situation. On any further visits to the area I shall ensure that I make contact with the district council.

PERPETUAL LEASES

991. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Has the Government changed its policy relating to the transfer of perpetual leasehold land and, if so:

- (a) what is the present policy of the Government;
- (b) when was it changed; and
- (c) why was it changed?

2. Will the Government now review the increased rentals charged on transfer of perpetual leases in the last three years and, if not, why not?

3. Will the Government compensate people forced to pay extraordinary sums to freehold their land in order to effect a sale?

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

1. There has been no change in policy relating to transfer of perpetual leases, but the manner of policy application has recently been clarified to ensure consistent

application of the policy where change in land use is proposed following transfer.

- (a) not applicable.
- (b) not applicable.
- (c) not applicable.

2. All transfers where new leases involving a change in land use with increased rentals are currently being re-examined.

3. The policy relating to the assessment of the Crown's interest for the freeholding of leasehold land has not been changed.

MINISTER'S POWERS

1005. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Will the Minister enumerate the functions and powers he has taken over from the Minister of Community Welfare or any other Minister stating the nature of those functions and powers and the councils, committees and authorities involved in that take-over?

The **Hon. J. C. BANNON**: The replies are as follows:
1.1 Functions and powers transferred from the Minister of Community Welfare: The Minister of Community Welfare delegated the administration of sections 25-31 of the Community Welfare Act to me.

1.2 Youth Bureau: Formed by the Government prior to the creation of the Ministry, this bureau now is responsible to me.

2. Museum Division: Transferred by proclamation from the Education Department.

3. Botanic Garden Division: Transferred by proclamation from the Education Department.

4. Arts Development Division: Transferred by proclamation from Premier's Department.

5. Community Centres: The administration of the community centres at Angle Park and Thebarton has been transferred from the Minister of Education.

6. Libraries Department: The administration of the Libraries and Institutes Act and Libraries (Subsidies) Act has been transferred from the Minister of Education.

7. Art Gallery Department: The administration of the Art Gallery Act has been transferred from the Premier.

The following Authorities are now under my jurisdiction:

Authority	Previous Minister
Libraries Board	Education
Museum Board	Education
Board of the Botanic Gardens	Education
Constitutional Museum Trust	Premier
Art Gallery Board	Premier
State Opera	Premier
S.A. Theatre Company	Premier
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	Premier
Regional Cultural Centre Trusts	Premier

The following committees are now under my jurisdiction:

Arts Grants Advisory Committee	Premier
Arts Finance Advisory Committee	Premier
Opera Theatre Management Committee	Premier
Regional Arts Facilities Committee	Premier

TRUCK OPERATORS

1007. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Does the Highways Department forward letters to truck operators requiring information relative to alleged trips which have not been documented in operator returns for road maintenance tax and, if so, on what evidence is

the operator so approached?

2. What is the wording of a typical letter of this type?
3. What number of such letters has been forwarded in each financial year from 1973-74 to date?
4. What number of such allegations have been successfully refuted?
5. What explanation can be given for the dispatch of such allegations where the allegation has been successfully refuted?

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

1. Yes. The evidence used is that the vehicle has been observed travelling along a public road.
2. Pro-forma letter is attached.
3. No statistics have been kept but the number could be very considerable.
4. No statistics have been kept—the number would be minimal.
5. Incorrect vehicle registration number recorded, owner as per Highways Department records is incorrect, etc.

Registered owner of vehicle

Dear Sir,

*Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act,
1963-1975*

It would appear that some journeys have been omitted from Records of Journeys submitted by you, as indicated by the information set out below.

You are now asked to complete the enclosed supplementary Records of Journeys form for any journeys omitted from previous returns, and forward this, together with the charges payable thereon, to this Office within fourteen (14) days.

Date Reg. No. Location

Yours faithfully,

Enc. COLLECTOR OF ROAD CHARGES

LIBRARIES

1009. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice): Has the Minister received a reply from the Federal Minister of Home Affairs to his letter requesting a meeting to discuss the provision of library services in South Australia and, if so, has the meeting taken place and with what result?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: Yes. The Federal Minister replied to my letter of 21 December 1978 on 22 January 1979 in effect rejecting my request. He did, however, state that he should be in a position to convene a meeting of cultural affairs ministers sometime during 1979 and would include consideration of the Horton Report at such a conference. To date no meeting has been arranged and I will be writing again to the Minister.

COMMUNITY CENTRES

1011. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. What was the extent of Government assistance, both financial and otherwise, for the new Modbury Community Resource Centre?
2. What other community centres in South Australia are:
 - (a) being constructed;
 - (b) in the planning stage; and
 - (c) proposed?
3. What are the estimated costs of the above, including Government assistance?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Modbury Community Resource Centre is an initiative of the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully.

It provides accommodation for four clients, namely:

- Meals on Wheels,
- Royal District Nursing Society,
- Mothers and Babies Health Association,
- Department of Community Welfare (Family Day Care and Toy Library).

The capital cost consisted of (1) State Government \$78 818 (Department of Labour and Industry SURS \$68 118, Childhood Services Council \$10 700), (2) \$1 500 each for the four users and (3) \$5 800 from the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully. In addition the Childhood Services Council is providing \$7 304 as salary for a half-time librarian.

2. (a) (b) and (c) The term "community centre" is loosely used to cover a wide range of activities in various parts of the State. The Department of Community Development is currently formulating a definition of "community centres" and undertaking a survey of initiatives which may conform to that definition. The two major "community centre" initiatives of the Government are:

- (1) The Parks Community Centre
- (2) The Thebarton Community Centre
- (3) (a) The Parks Community Centre \$14 700 000 consisting of \$3 196 000 Commonwealth Government, \$400 000 local government and the balance from State funds.

(b) The Thebarton Centre \$4 529 000 is being funded entirely from State funds.

TOBACCO LICENCES

1029. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What number of tobacco retail licences are current and, if categorised, what are those categories and the number in each?
2. Have any licences been revoked for improper practice and, if so, what number and for what reasons?
3. Has any concern been expressed by *bona fide* retail outlets as to the number of licences held by social clubs associated with work groups, sporting clubs, and the like, and, if so, what are the details and what, if any, action is proposed to overcome the difficulties?
4. Have any distributors been apprehended for selling tobacco products outside of the licensing procedures, and, if so, what are the details and what action has been taken against the offenders?

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

1. 4 854. These licences are not grouped into categories.
2. No.
3. Yes, by one association. However, no evidence was produced to support that complaint and no special action is proposed.

4. Many inspections are conducted by officers of the State Taxation Office to detect breaches of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act and all complaints made to the State Taxation Office concerning sales by unlicensed persons are investigated. Numerous instances have been detected where retailers have not held current licences but in all cases the appropriate licence fees have been paid and no further action has been taken.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

1030. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What plans, if any, does the Government have to observe the commemoration of the United Nations International Day

for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, on 21 March?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The United Nations Association, which receives Government funding, is the principal body involved in organising activities connected with the celebration of special days such as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. The Education Department plans to remind schools of the U.N. International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination through the *Education Gazette*. In addition, displays to celebrate the day will be set up in the State Library and the Department of Further Education Language Centre Library in Currie Street, as both libraries have special facilities for ethnic readers. In addition, organisations wishing to celebrate the day by arranging conferences or other community education activities may apply for financial assistance from the Ethnic Grants Advisory Committee of the Premier's Department.

DENTAL TREATMENT

1033. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):

1. What is the Government's policy in relation to dental treatment in high schools by Government employed dental technicians?

2. To what age is it intended to give free dental treatment to students in South Australian schools?

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

1. It is not the intention of the Government to employ dental technicians in school dental clinics.

2. Fifteen years.

SCHOOL UNIFORMS

1034. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):

1. Does the headmaster of a high school in South Australia, with the concurrence of his staff, have the authority to enforce the wearing of school uniform at the school?

2. What is the Government's policy in relation to the wearing of school uniform?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Government does not discourage the development of school policies which involve the adoption of a uniform or an attempt by the school to induce all students to wear it. However, there is no power in the Education Act that would enable the Minister of Education or any of his servants to enforce compliance with such school policies.

BLANCHETOWN LAND

1037. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):

1. Is the Lands Department making available blocks of land at Blanchetown for housing, without roads, services, etc., being provided?

2. What land is the department making available at Blanchetown?

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

1. In view of the prohibitive costs associated with the provision of water supplies for Blanchetown, no further residential sites will be made available in the foreseeable future.

2. Nil—see 1. above.

ONKAPARINGA ESTUARY

1054. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):

1. When is it proposed to start work on the Onkaparinga estuary near Port Noarlunga to convert this into a State park, recreation area, and conservation study area?

2. What funds is it proposed to spend on this project in the next five years?

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

1. A draft report has been prepared by a Steering Committee with representation from the Noarlunga City Council and appropriate Government departments. Arrangements are well advanced for this report to be placed on public exhibition for a three-month period, and release is expected within a few days. A decision on when work should commence on the scheme has yet to be made. It will depend on the outcome of public exhibition and what the final report proposes. This being a joint enterprise with the Noarlunga council, it will also depend upon prior negotiations with that body.

2. The literature to be made available during public exhibition urges caution in the present economic climate and asks people not to raise their expectations unduly. The concept plan, when accepted by the council and the Government, will form the basis of steady development over a lengthy period rather than short-term intensive capital works. The extent of funds expended over the next five years will depend upon:

(a) what the final report proposes;

(b) negotiations on funding with the council;

(c) the possible attraction of private capital (subject to adequate safeguards);

(d) the availability of Government funds.

OTTOWAY WORKSHOPS

1057. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): Has the Minister details of the expenditure of \$450 000 at the Ottoway workshops as promised by the Minister for Planning during Question Time in the House of Assembly on 13 September 1978?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question was answered in the House of Assembly on 11 October 1978.

SWIMMING POOLS

1058. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): What changes are envisaged in the laws governing safety of swimming pools in South Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A committee has been appointed to review the Swimming Pools (Safety) Act, 1972, in regard to its effectiveness, practicability and operation, and in the course of that review to take notice of the standards established by the Australian Standards Association and practices in other States. When that committee has submitted its report, the Government will give consideration to any changes that may be required in the laws governing the safety of swimming pools in South Australia.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

1061. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): What are the titles and the individual salaries of staff currently employed by the Monarto Development Commission?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There are at present 10 staff members employed by the Monarto Development Commission, as follows:

Chairman, Mr. A. W. Richardson, Salary \$39 151* (Is also chairman of JFWI and has other duties not associated with MDC); Secretary to Chairman, Miss M. J. Vaughan \$12 055* (This position will shortly be vacated and abolished); Accounting Officer, Mr. J. S. Zabrowarny \$12 055; Account/Ledger Clerk, Miss N. Vreugdenburg \$10 105; Estate Manager, Mr. G. Woodroffe \$17 030; Property Clerk, Mr. K. J. Scott \$11 079; Office Assistant, Miss J. F. Nitschke \$7 486; General Inspector, Mr. L. Kelsall \$11 293; Ranger, Mr. G. H. Oortlepp \$10 728; Fire Control Ranger, Mr. J. W. Fullwood \$11 293.

Other people are employed from time to time on a temporary or part-time basis on work involved in tree planting, property maintenance, local government, weed and vermin control, community facilities caretaking, and special works projects funded by the Commonwealth Government. As at February 1979, there are 16 such persons, including seven Aboriginal workers and four engaged through Woods and Forest Department.

TEACHERS

1065. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): What steps is the Government taking to reduce the number of teachers in training institutions in South Australia so that there will be employment for trained teachers at the completion of their course in the future?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Government in 1978 instituted a series of meetings with representatives from the Education Department, universities, Board of Advanced Education and colleges of advanced education. At those meetings the question of intakes for 1979 into courses of teacher training at the pre-service level was considered and by and large the recommendation from those discussions was that the analysis provided in the Anderson Committee's Report should be accepted as the basis for reducing in 1979 the intakes into pre-service teacher education courses to a level 20 per cent below those applying in 1977.

The consequent reductions have been effected in the colleges of advanced education, and I understand the universities have also adjusted their intake quotas into the relevant courses to accommodate that reduction. The Board of Advanced Education is currently examining the scope for further reductions in 1980 and 1981 in pre-service teacher education courses, and I will shortly be seeking to call together a meeting of representatives of the colleges and of the universities, and the Education Department to perform a similar task in relation to the 1980 and 1981 intakes.

INSTITUTE PAYMENTS

1070. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What are the estimated payments for the financial year ending 30 June 1979 for non-recognised hospitals, institutions and other bodies for:

- (a) capital purposes;
- (b) special maintenance and other payments; and
- (c) current maintenance?

2. How do these amounts compare with similar payments for last financial year?

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

1.	Estimated 1978-79 \$	Actual 1977-78 \$
Payments to non-recognised hospitals, institutions and other bodies for:		
(a) Capital purposes ..	875 000	939 230
(b) Special maintenance and other purposes	905 000	1 848 182
(c) Current maintenance.....	16 557 000	14 182 805
	18 337 000	16 970 217
2. Refer above.		

CONTRACT TEACHERS

1071. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. How many overseas contract teachers are employed this year?

2. How does this figure compare with each of the last three years?

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

1. Nil.
2. 1976, 96; 1977, 6; and 1978, nil.

WEEDS

1072. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Why are the weeds not cleared totally from both sides of Tapley Hill Road, West Beach?

2. Would not this maintenance create extra jobs?

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

1. The Highways Department is only responsible for maintenance of the pavement and the shoulders of Tapley Hill Road, West Beach. The road reserve is vested in, and is the responsibility of, the Corporation of West Torrens.
2. Not known.

BITUMEN

1073. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What were the reasons for bitumen coating:

- (a) Burbridge Road, West Beach;
- (b) Henley Beach Road, Lockleys;
- (c) Henley Beach Road, Fulham; and
- (d) Tapley Hill Road, Fulham?

2. What was the cost for each job?

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

1. (a) Final stage of reconstruction—application of wearing course.
- (b) Maintenance resurfacing.
- (c) Maintenance resurfacing.
- (d) Maintenance resurfacing.
2. (a) \$85 000.
- (b) and (c) \$42 000.
- (d) \$26 000.

INSTANT MONEY GAME

1077. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered an investigation into the social implications of the Lotteries Commission's Instant Money Game and, if not, why not?

2. Will such an inquiry be established forthwith?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Limited investigations have

already been made into the social implications of the Lotteries Commission's Instant Money Game. During the first few weeks, there was a very high demand for the Instant Money Game but this was offset by a 35 per cent to 40 per cent reduction in sales of conventional lottery tickets. The demand for Instant Money Game tickets has now reduced to about half of that of the first few weeks. Looking at these trends, it would seem that many people would have invested their money in another form of lottery had the new game not been introduced. During the initial period of this lottery, many small prize winners reinvested their winnings. Indications are that there is now a growing tendency for these prizes to be collected. It would appear that the novelty of the game is waning. A study of similar lotteries introduced in the United Kingdom in recent years indicated that a similar pattern occurred there in the early stages. There is no evidence of adverse social effects in relation to the United Kingdom lotteries.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY

1080. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What are the total loan borrowings for each local government authority?
2. What is the percentage of interest and repayments to income for each local government authority?

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

1. As returns from local government for 1977-78 have not as yet all been received, the information sought cannot be provided at this stage.
2. The information sought is not readily available.

TOW-TRUCKS

1089. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Government propose to introduce further legislation this session concerning tow-trucks and their operation and, if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) why; and
- (c) is it the intention of the Government that such legislation be considered by both Houses during this session?

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

- (a) Shortly.
- (b) To provide for the licensing and control of motor body repairers and painters, tow-truck operators and drivers, and motor vehicle loss assessors.
- (c) Yes.

BUILDING INDEMNITY FUND

1091. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. How much is there in the Building Indemnity Fund?
2. What levies have been imposed pursuant to s. 19n of the Builders Licensing Act in each financial year since its establishment, and why?
3. How much has been paid out of this fund pursuant to s. 19o of the Act in each financial year since its establishment?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:
1, 2 and 3. Nil.

The Part of the Builders Licensing Act which provides for the establishment and operation of a Building Indemnity Fund has not been brought into operation.

FURNITURE

1092. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. How much was spent on furniture for the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research?
2. When was it spent?
3. What is going to happen to it now?
4. Is the council to be disbanded and, if so, when?
5. Is new furniture to be provided for the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia and, if so, why and at what expense?

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

1. \$35 300.
2. 1974-75—\$27 720
1975-76—\$ 2 870
1976-77—\$ 4 330
1977-78—\$ 380 } \$35 300
3. See 4. below.
4. The future of SACEPR is currently under review, and I will be making public announcements at an appropriate time.
5. No decisions have been taken.

TEACHERS

1093. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. How many teachers employed on contract in 1978 have been employed again for this school year?
2. How many teachers employed for the first time in 1979 are university graduates?
3. What is to be the intake of students in each college of advanced education this year compared with each of the last three years?

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

1. Out of 640 applicants appointed to permanent teaching positions in 1979, 129 were employed on contract in 1978. Out of 215 applicants appointed to contract teaching positions in 1979, 72 were employed on contract in 1978.
2. Fifty-four teachers employed for the first time in 1979 completed a course at a South Australian university in 1978. Of these 53 were employed on a permanent basis and one as a contract teacher. It should be noted that further contracts will be written during 1979, to cover vacancies arising due to resignation and leave of various forms.
3. Whilst noting that the colleges of advanced education have intakes into a wide range of courses it has been assumed by the tenor of the question that only intakes into teacher education courses are required and further, that these should be restricted to pre-service intakes. Based on this assumption, approved intake numbers to pre-service teacher education courses for 1979 and actual intakes for 1976, 1977 and 1978 are as follows:

	Actual			Approved intake
	1976	1977	1978	level
				1979
Adelaide College of the Arts and Education ...	608	516	449	390
Hartley C.A.E.	583	509	487	405
Salisbury C.A.E.	348	315	300	280
Sturt C.A.E.	232	228	274	200
Total.....	1 771	1 568	1 510	1 275

PRIMARY TEACHERS

1105. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Did the Government promise increased non-contact time for primary school teachers and, if so, when and has that promise yet been fulfilled and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Although the Government foreshadowed 10 per cent non-contact time for primary school teachers in 1979 in its policy, financial considerations have not enabled this to be met completely. While all schools have been staffed to provide 8 per cent non-contact time a number do have sufficient staff to provide 10 per cent non-contact time.

PETITION: VIOLENT OFFENCES

A petition signed by 10 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. Dunstan.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

A petition signed by 31 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that blood relations sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relations was presented by Mr. Harrison.

Petition received.

PETITION: ABATTOIRS AREA

A petition signed by 417 residents of South Australia praying that the House would define, in the Abattoirs and Pet Food Works Bill, the central abattoirs area, and that the Barossa Valley area be excluded from that area or, alternatively, allow the Barossa Valley to be served by local slaughterhouses was presented by Mr. Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

A petition signed by 216 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. Tonkin.

Petition received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

A petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community was presented by Mr. Tonkin.

Petition received.

PETITION: DOGS

A petition signed by 87 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Dogs Act to prevent the restraining of dogs on premises by the use of a chain, rope, or any other material was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not pass legislation seeking to legalise marijuana was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME**GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY**

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will undertake an urgent review of all areas where its departments or instrumentalities are competing with private enterprise, and immediately arrange for the return to private enterprise of those activities? It is generally acknowledged that the State Government has failed dismally in attracting new industry to South Australia, or even in keeping existing industry here.

One of the major factors quoted by many interstate and local companies is the continued intrusion of the State Government into activities normally adequately covered by private enterprise, such as in the clothing factory, and Public Buildings Department activity in the building and construction industry.

The Government has already indicated by legislation that it intends entering into more activities now covered by the private sector and the result has been a further disincentive to investment in South Australia. Will the Government now recognise the folly of its policy, and help private enterprise take its proper role in maintaining and developing the prosperity of this State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take issue with the Leader's remarks about the following of the policy this Government has followed since it has been the Government, namely, since 1970 and indeed, before that, in 1965-68. The Government believes in a mixed economy, and I think that that is apparent, even to him. Indeed, he cites as one of the areas of intrusion by the Government the Public Buildings Department's intrusion into the building industry. I have explained to the House many times that the total effort across the board on the part of the Public Buildings Department's being physically involved with day labour amounts to 8 per cent of the total work carried out by the department.

The main reason for that 8 per cent is that, in 1973, the Government decided to set up a Construction Division within that department, because of the way in which we were being ripped off by private enterprise during what was a good period for private enterprise. If private enterprise is upset about that, it can blame itself. The Government saw the necessity to protect itself from the activities that went on at that time when inflated prices were being put forward and when private enterprise was not anxious to do the work (and there was plenty of work around). The Government has maintained a balanced approach.

There is a need, because of the down-turn in this area, for day labour forces to be reduced, and that is being done. However, the Government does not intend to abort the policy that led to the formation of that division. The Leader has made a general statement that the Government has failed to attract industry to South Australia: that is not true, and he knows it. He said that the Government has failed to encourage existing industry within the State to expand, and he knows that also is not true. Figures will be supplied soon based on fact and accurate surveys that will show, and will give the lie to, the

sorts of things that the Opposition has been saying for too long regarding business activities, employment, and costs. I will not recite the figures today, but they will be made public soon.

The Government does not intend to change its present policy. The Leader commented about the clothing industry. The people of Whyalla would have been grateful for the establishment of that industry. This was an effort on the part of this Government to decentralise industry into country areas. Because of actions of the Federal Liberal Government, the people of Whyalla have suffered heavily. This Government hoped partly to overcome the problem created by the Federal Government in closing down the largest shipyard in Australia, situated at Whyalla. The Government constantly reviews these matters, but it does not intend to change the general thrust or direction that it has followed so successfully for so long.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy had any recent discussions with senior officials of the Dow Chemical Company and, if he has, can he say what are the results of those discussions?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Today, I have had discussions with the Managing Director of Dow Chemical, Australia (Mr. Stoker), and I can tell the House and the public that the Dow Chemical Company will be proceeding with its feasibility studies of the Redcliff proposal. This will involve an expenditure by Dow of about \$1 000 000 for the remainder of this year. I can also say that comments made by Mr. Leigh Dupuy, from Hong Kong, and reported in the *Advertiser* last Saturday were correctly reported. He was reported as saying (and he did not say that the I.C.I. people were liars) that any company that acted on the basis of public announcements only would never do anything. He said that the situation was more complicated than it seemed and that the further studies would be undertaken. That comment has been confirmed today. This project is vital to South Australia. I have previously gone on record as saying that it is a project that has some national significance, because Redcliff, in comparison with any alternative, involves a better use of our scarce energy resources.

In its proposals, I.C.I. must import some feedstock. In circumstances where Australian production of crude oil is declining and imported crude oil is rising in price, for I.C.I. to plan a project that involves increased use of imports is not only risky but also not in the national interests if there is an alternative indigenous source available. The Redcliff proposals, on the other hand, make use of the liquids from the Cooper Basin. Any alternative project for the use of liquids and ethane from the Cooper Basin on all of the studies that we have carried out along with the Cooper Basin producer and with Dow is not viable and cannot be financed.

In other words, if Redcliff were not to go ahead an alternative project to leave ethane in the town gas and ship the liquids to the coast (and ICI said it will take the liquids) simply is not a viable project and could only be made viable if the Commonwealth Government were willing to pay a substantial bounty of some millions of dollars each year to the Cooper Basin producers in order to get out the liquids. Can you imagine the Fraser Government doing that? I cannot.

If the ICI projects went ahead and Redcliff was scrapped, the likelihood is that the Cooper Basin liquids would be flared. They cannot effectively or economically be stored. They are produced as a consequence of

producing natural gas for Sydney and Adelaide and when the producers get into the wet wells the liquids come out automatically and, if there is not a project to use them at that time, they will be flared and burnt off. Does anyone think (does anyone in the Federal Government think) that Cooper Basin liquids will be able to be flared in the mid-1980's when the oil importation problem for Australia will be much greater than it is now? How many more Irans will we have before the penny drops with the Federal Government on that point?

Moreover, and largely again because Redcliff uses an indigenous resource, the net effect of Redcliff on the balance of payments is estimated at \$220 000 000 per annum. On our estimates of the ICI proposals the net impact is between \$85 000 000 and \$120 000 000 per annum, at least \$100 000 000 less per annum than Redcliff. With Australia's balance of payments in deficit, and because the oil importation problem is likely to continue to be in deficit, how can anyone say it is in Australia's national interest to allow ICI to import more oil or feedstock into the country for Botany Bay, for example, and prevent Redcliff from going ahead?

In addition, the impact on employment is significantly greater from Redcliff than it is from any alternative ICI project. On all of those grounds there is, therefore, a national interest, not just a State interest, involved in favour of Redcliff as against the ICI project. The Dow Chemical Company, I repeat, has, in every dealing that I have had with it since I have been the Minister responsible, dealt with the South Australian Government in an honest, open and frank manner. I have absolutely no criticism of it. It has now affirmed that it will be continuing with its feasibility studies. It has affirmed, therefore, publicly that it does not accept the ICI announcements as meaning that the ICI projects will definitely go ahead. In particular, it is highly doubtful (as is anybody else who knows anything about it) about the so-called announcements in respect of Point Wilson in Victoria. Without having to quote anyone else, I also am impressed by the timing of the Point Wilson announcement occurring the day after a certain announcement was made about a certain election.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will oppose any moves to increase succession duties in South Australia, as outlined by the Labor Party policy group for consideration by the Labor Party at its conference this month? In outline of an A.L.P. proposed policy published this week, there was talk of further restrictions on business, with plans to control professional people in South Australia and to change the State taxing system where by there would be an increase in succession duties. This policy would spell disaster for South Australia at a time when business is struggling and when all other States are abolishing succession duties, with the notable exception of this State. Any proposal to increase succession duties further on any section of the community will further deter investment in the State and will cause people to leave us. Will the Government then oppose this lunacy advocated by a section of the Labor Party in this State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question is hypothetical. The Deputy Leader was honest enough to say it was purely a proposal. I have the proposal before me, and it refers to succession duties levied such that larger inheritances bear a higher rate of duty, with maintenance of existing exemptions for the family home.

Thus, the proposal is aimed at the very large inheritances. This matter is yet to be debated in the councils of the Party, and no doubt it will be. However, at this stage I will not pre-empt any discussions that may take place on this matter in the councils of the Party. Therefore, I ask the Deputy Leader to be a little patient and let us see what happens at the convention being held, I think this weekend. If and when this proposal does become part of the policy we will then answer these questions.

DRUGS

Mr. GROOM: Will the Chief Secretary request the Commissioner of Police to have conducted a full police investigation into the allegations made by Mr. Oswald of drug trafficking in schools in seaside electorates? Yesterday's *Advertiser* contained a report from Mr. Oswald, an Adelaide pharmacist, of hard and soft drugs being trafficked in schools in the Glenelg, Brighton and Seacombe Gardens area. The allegations are evidently based on an alleged survey conducted by the pharmacist. No schools, headmasters or school councils in my electorate were contacted by Mr. Oswald as part of his survey. There has been a suggestion that the allegations were politically motivated. If the so-called survey is politically motivated it is a cruel joke by the Liberal Party on parents of schoolchildren living in the area. The allegations are serious and have caused grave concern in the minds of parents in the area. My reason for requesting a full police investigation is that parents need to be fully and factually informed officially as to the existence of any drug problem in South Australian schools.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The banner headlines that we got in the newspaper yesterday caused me a great deal of concern. There is no doubt that they did also to parents of children in that area. I therefore asked the Acting Commissioner of Police to make sure, first, whether any approach had been made by Mr. Oswald to put the benefit of his survey before the police, and to make sure that in fact they did check to see whether there was any truth whatsoever in the allegations.

I had a report before I came to the House today to the effect that Mr. Oswald contacted the Drug Squad on 30 June last year, gave them the results of his so-called survey into the matter in the area, and expressed a great deal of concern for the children, which I am sure we will all share. The extent of the information that he was able to give to the police as a result of this survey, which he has only just made public, for certain reasons, is that he gave the names of two juveniles he said were mixed up in the drugs business. He also said that two or three had been pushing drugs around the Marion Shopping Centre.

The police investigated the matter and found that one of the juveniles concerned had had a minor conviction relating to the possession of Indian hemp, but that the other had no record. The drug squad attended the Marion Shopping Centre on several occasions and found no evidence whatever to support Mr. Oswald's allegations. When they called on him yesterday to find out whether any new matter had prompted the release of this survey last weekend, they found that he had no further information to add. It is obvious that this is a deliberate political beat-up by the endorsed Liberal candidate for Morphett.

A report in today's *Advertiser* states:

The Brighton High School principal, Mr. R. M. Farrow, said that, to his knowledge, staff had never suspected drug use or abuse at the school. "We have been alert to the situation and have found no evidence of it," he said.

The Dover High School principal, Mrs. S. M. Roberts, said that, except for one student who had caused concern and who had now left, she was unaware of any drug abuse at the school.

The Mawson High School principal, Mr. D. R. Geytenbeek, said the school council was drafting a set of policies on drugs for discussion by parents and staff. Although staff were asked to watch for signs of drug abuse, nothing had been reported to him.

The Seacombe High School principal, Mr. L. D. Beare, said no cases of drug abuse had been brought to the attention of staff. He would be interested to know where and how Mr. Oswald had contacted the people he used in his survey.

The Mitchell Park High School principal, Mr. A. C. Williams, said: "I feel reasonably confident that we haven't got that kind of problem here. Some of the senior students might have had some experimentation at weekends. If it is going on, it is very cunningly concealed."

I do not think there is any doubt on all the evidence that the allegations made by Mr. Oswald have been made purely for political reasons. It seems that the electors of Morphett will be subjected to a constant stream of misrepresentation in the next two years. It seems certain, however, that it will not pay off, because you cannot fool people with such allegations all the time.

As allegations of drug pushing in schools are most serious, I have asked the Commissioner to make sure that any such allegations are thoroughly investigated. In due course I will give another report to the House. In the meantime, I warn the electors of Morphett to watch out for the sort of material that, even in the past few days, I think, has been distributed by Mr. Oswald and put in their letter boxes, based on the sort of evidence to which I have just referred.

HELICOPTER

Mr. BECKER: Can the Chief Secretary say when the Government intends to acquire a helicopter for the joint use of the Police Department and the South Australian Health Commission, and what type of machine is being purchased? During the 1977 State election campaign, the Premier promised the people of South Australia that the Government would purchase a helicopter to be used for traffic surveillance and rescue work. It was hoped that the machine would be operating in the 1977-78 summer season. The 1978-79 summer season is now almost over.

I understand considerable discussion has taken place between the Police Department and the South Australian Health Commission on the type of machine to acquire. On 5 July, the Deputy Premier, in answer to my Question on Notice No. 429, said that investigations were still being conducted and that the Chief Secretary would be continuing inquiries, on his then current overseas tour, into the use of helicopters and the types, as well as the cost of such machines. The Minister informed me on 10 October 1978 of the outcome of his overseas tour and his findings, and I am still amazed that he has yet to fulfil the Government's election promise and acquire this helicopter.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is true that the Government has promised to acquire a helicopter for this purpose. It is true, too, that the Government will honour that promise.

Mr. Becker: When?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The promise to acquire the helicopter was made before the last election and it will be honoured during the term of this Parliament. That is quick action compared to the phony promise made by the

Opposition at the last election to build a new hospital in the area, and it will cost the State considerably less. A wide range of methods to give effect to the commitment is being considered. To maintain a helicopter is expensive. We want to be sure, if the object is to deal with emergency circumstances, that a helicopter is always available for emergency purposes, and that is not easy to ensure. I was informed by the Tokyo Fire Brigade that it has five helicopters and expects to have at least two serviceable at any one time. For that reason it is not just a question of owning or hiring a helicopter; it is a question of ensuring that a back-up facility is available for that machine.

The cost of a helicopter varies considerably. In Chicago I went aloft in a police helicopter which the department was then buying for \$US70 000. On the other hand, to buy an aerial ambulance is about \$A700 000. We will have to examine a wide range of options before we make a decision. Those examinations are still proceeding in relation to purchasing and hiring and another possible way of solving the problem. It would be easier if, in fact, helicopter firms were operating in South Australia on a large scale. The disaster organisation in Tasmania has a helicopter, and last year it was working on the basis of a 45-minute availability, and 45 minutes is barely enough for the purpose for which we need this helicopter in the southern suburbs. The cost of hiring the helicopter in Tasmania was \$60 000 standby time plus the flying time. An advantage there is that the firm has several helicopters available in Tasmania and is able to guarantee a continuous service in daylight hours. This year it is desired to increase the availability to 15 minutes, and it was estimated that that would cost \$100 000 standby apart from the flying time. The Government does not wish to rush into this matter without investigating the position thoroughly so as to find the most economical and effective way to give effect to the promise which was made and which will be honoured.

HOUSEHOLD BUDGETING

Mr. KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare take urgent steps to publicise the fact that officers are available in his department who are capable of giving advice to the public regarding matters of budgeting, debt consolidation and the advisability of considering bankruptcy? For some time I have been concerned at the number of people who have come to see me about enormous budgeting problems, usually owing to the fact that an income has been cut off by unemployment and that mortgage repayments have become too large in proportion to the new level of income. In some cases, no amount of counselling would enable those people to maintain payments and so stay in their homes. Often they lose their home and still have a debt to repay. In some cases, however, help might have enabled them to survive the crisis if they had sought assistance earlier, that is, before accumulated debts rose to unmanageable proportions. It is these people who would benefit from knowing that help was available. Some of them are losing their homes, not because they cannot meet their debts, but because they do not seek advice early enough regarding how to go about meeting those debts. These people will be assisted by the widest possible dissemination of the knowledge that the Community Welfare Department has the expertise to advise them. I urge the Minister to utilise every possible occasion to publicise this fact.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will certainly examine the possibility of publicising this matter further. I think most members would realise that the honourable member was referring to the department's Budget Advisory Service, a

service available at 24 centres throughout the State, 12 in the metropolitan area and 12 in country areas, located at district offices, in most cases, and, in some cases, branch offices, as at Naracoorte (as the member for Mount Gambier would know), and so on. People who have availed themselves of the service have much praise for it. The honourable member asks whether the service can be made more widely known, because, if more people have access to it at an early stage, they stand to benefit considerably. I would not disagree with the point he has made. I point out, however, that there has been considerable publicity on this matter. A short time ago (late in 1978, I think) an excellent article by David Lewis, which appeared in the *News*, gave a clear and concise explanation of what service was available under the head of Budget Advisory Service. He also pointed out that it was as simple to obtain, in the main, as contacting the local district office of the Community Welfare Department.

At those 24 centres I have mentioned, the services of 60 trained advisers are available. That, in itself, is worth commenting on further, because the 60 advisers have been obtained by the department and are not on salary, so that the Budget Advisory Service operates with a modicum of economy, the sort of thing recommended to the clients who approach it. The service is operated on the basis of a fee for the time involved, and no other overhead is involved. I think that members would agree that this is a good way in which to approach the matter. To obtain the service, an appointment can be made with an officer at the district office or other location. However, in cases where it is inconvenient for the client, as often happens because of the number of young children who must be cared for and other family difficulties, the service can be taken directly into the home, appointments being made on this basis.

The trend that has occurred in the service is interesting to note. I have recent figures with me that will, I hope, be of interest to the House and to the honourable member. In December last, 83 new cases for assistance were handled. In the half year ending in December, 556 persons received assistance under the scheme. One way of detecting what the effects of the Federal Liberal Government's economic policies are is to look at the increase in requests for assistance in this area. For the previous half financial year, 355 requests for assistance were handled. In fairness, I should say that, during the second half of the year, the service had been expanding to some degree, because it was available at more offices. So, some of the escalation from 355 to 556 requests would be due to the fact that more advisers were available to give this service. However, that trend still exists.

Regarding publicising the service, in addition to the report in the *News* to which I have referred, the department has a leaflet, which is an important way of making knowledge of the service available throughout the State. Copies of the leaflet are supplied to all social welfare agencies throughout South Australia, whether voluntary or Government. In the figures for December 1978, a useful breakdown shows that, of the 83 new persons seeking assistance, 46 were referred to the service by social workers. Obviously the dissemination of the information through making the leaflet available to social work agencies throughout the State has proved to be of some benefit.

The Budget Advisory Service, through the department, has now embarked on a "speaking to groups" campaign within the schools, and is speaking to other community groups. I am certain that the member for Newland would agree, because that was the import of his question, that early intervention in these matters can be of assistance to families in financial strife. Lecturing in schools on the

topic of managing money, which could well appeal to young people even because of the title itself, is being introduced in schools, thanks to the Minister of Education and the various schools concerned.

Because of the co-operation of the Attorney-General, people who have been summoned regarding debts are given a notice at the time of the service of any summons, pointing out that the advisory service is available to them and giving the locations. The scheme is available at Campbelltown, Modbury and Enfield. If the honourable member referred clients to the Modbury office, where I am sure he is known, or to any office, excellent service would be obtained.

POPULATION GROWTH

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is the Deputy Premier aware of the latest population statistics for South Australia, and will he say whether the comparatively slow growth rate reflects the drift of people away from this State to the other States, where more development projects are in progress? South Australia has the slowest growth rate of any State in Australia. The latest Bureau of Statistics figures of population growth rates shows that the rate in New South Wales was 1.23 per cent; Victoria, 0.98 per cent; Queensland, 1.31 per cent; South Australia, 0.70 per cent; Western Australia, 2.0 per cent; Tasmania, 0.73 per cent; and for the whole of Australia, 1.23 per cent. People are obviously leaving South Australia to go to other States. Even the famous South Australian, Max Harris, is about to desert South Australia for more prosperous lands on the eastern seaboard.

The low growth rate in South Australia has been persisting for a number of years. If it continues for another four years, South Australia will have a smaller population than even Western Australia. The growth rate in South Australia is less than that of Tasmania. South Australia has a net reproduction rate below an eventual zero population growth rate, and it is about half the growth rate predicted by the Premier recently.

Mr. Keneally: What are you doing about it?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My potential still lies before me. Will the Deputy Premier examine these figures, which I believe reflect a very serious trend for the future of South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no knowledge of current figures. I assume that the honourable member is referring to the latest figures available.

Mr. Dean Brown: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In recent times I have seen figures that reveal that in each year over the past few years South Australia has had a net overall gain in population. I am suspicious about the way in which the honourable member uses figures, and I will check them later. Having to lean on the likes of Max Harris to support his case shows that his proposition must be weak. I am wondering whether the honourable member will take the same decision as was taken by Max Harris. If he did, I think that would bring about a vast improvement to the State. I agree with the honourable member for Stuart that the honourable member could play a more active part in rectifying the situation, if it is as he has described, than he is currently doing.

TICKET SALES

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Community Development say whether the collapse of Computicket Australia Pty. Ltd. have any effect on the sale of tickets

through BASS outlets and whether computerised ticketing has been accepted by the public in South Australia? I refer the Minister to reports in this morning's newspapers concerning the collapse of Mr. Harry M. Miller's company. In particular, I draw the Minister's attention to Mr. Miller's comment that the concept of computerised ticketing was taking too long to be accepted to justify any further investment at this stage.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The collapse of this company has received considerable publicity throughout Australia, as the honourable member has mentioned. If, in fact, Mr. Miller's assertion is correct, namely, that the public is being slow to accept, or is not accepting, computerised ticketing, that will have some fairly severe repercussions for us in this State. As members will be aware, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, which owns the South Australian franchise of the BASS system of computerised ticketing, has for some time been handling all its bookings, which cover a wide range of events, not just those at the Festival Centre itself, under computerised ticketing.

Fortunately, Mr. Miller's statement is not correct in its general sense at all. In fact, the public's ready acceptance of computerised ticketing can be seen just by looking at what happened at the Festival Centre last month. During the month of January this year, box office sales recorded by the trust were a record for January since the inception and the commencement of the centre in 1973. A record number of tickets was sold, for a record value. That is an impressive result, particularly when past results encompass three festivals. The BASS ticketing concept operated here in South Australia is different indeed from that of Mr. Miller's Computicket. Mr. Miller has been treading the country for the past 12 months or so attempting to sell his ticketing system and has brought considerable pressure to bear at all levels of the entertainment industry and at Governmental and political levels, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria. The collapse of his system indicates the difficulty he has had selling his concept.

The BASS concept was the one which the trust adopted after extensive and exhaustive examination, including an examination by the trust's General Manager of computerised ticket facilities throughout the world. He was convinced, and the trust in turn adopted his recommendation that we take the franchise for BASS. That has proved to be an extremely successful decision, not only in terms of convenience but in commercial terms as well.

The BASS system is, in fact, owned independently in each State in which it operates. In other words, the Festival Centre Trust in South Australia owns the franchise, in Victoria the Victorian Art Centre has taken it over, and in New South Wales a company comprising Grace Brothers and Mitchells operates it. Miller's system, on the other hand, involved a centralised system. He owned the whole system and his company ran the computerised centres from a central location, employed all the staff itself and took all the booking fees at the outlets at which they operated.

BASS, on the other hand, has lower overheads, is decentralised, and the booking fee is shared with an operator such as John Martins, Myers, or whoever has the outlet. The system is more flexible, more soundly based financially and more efficient in terms of the software used. I think we are fortunate that the Festival Centre Trust carried out that investigation and chose that system, despite the pressure brought to bear by Miller and his operators or entrepreneurs throughout Australia. Computerised ticketing is used widely apart from its use for theatre bookings. It is used for sports events, major rock concerts and so on throughout Australia. Discussions are taking place with cinema chains to try to extend the

computerised ticketing network to them.

Contrary to what Mr. Miller says, as a system and concept, it is extremely useful and successful. Bass has outlets in Adelaide at numerous locations, including John Martin's, Myers, Allans, the Festival Centre itself, West Lakes, Tea Tree Plaza, Enfield and Apollo Stadium, and new outlets are planned, so it is a very successfully decentralised system. The hard reality is that it is not a failure of the public to accept computerised ticketing; rather, it is a failure to accept an inferior system which was being promoted by Mr. Miller for his own purposes, because he seemed to think that this sort of system could gain acceptance if hard pressure selling tactics were used. That system has proved not to be acceptable. There is probably room for only one system of this sort in Australia; and we in South Australia saw early that the most efficient and effective system was the Bass system, which is now operating here to the benefit of the buying public and our entrepreneurial activity in the arts.

PRAWN FISHING

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Fisheries in another place, say whether the South Australian Government will reassess the interim fee structure for prawn authorities on the grounds that the official production figures for the 1977-78 year recently released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show a decline in catch of 27.4 per cent over the previous year? During the prawn dispute last year, an interim agreement was reached between the prawn fishermen and the South Australian Government that the authority fee should be equivalent to 1 per cent of the gross catch. As the only available figures at that time were for the 1976-77 year, the interim fee was set at \$1 830 per vessel. The figures for 1977-78 are now available, and they indicate that there was a drop in the value of production of over 27.4 per cent, from \$9 727 000 to \$7 062 000. With the figures now substantiated, will the Government now reduce the prawn authority fees by a like amount, that is, 27.4 per cent?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly refer the detail of the question to my colleague and ask him for a report, which I will bring down for the honourable member as soon as possible.

LEAFLET DISTRIBUTION

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Attorney-General consider investigating a business called Mal J. Beesley Business Boosting Promotions, located at 4 Goyder Place, Brompton, and say whether it is possible to recover payment for persons who contracted to distribute leaflets for this business but who have never been paid? I have received complaints from a constituent who is unemployed and who answered the following advertisement in the positions vacant column of the *Advertiser* on 23 November 1978:

Leaflet distributors required, casual basis, all areas, particularly southern, \$12.50 per 1 000. Start today Green Street, Brompton, 10 a.m. to 7 p.m.

The firm's address at the time of advertising was given as Green Street, Brompton, but it has since moved to 4 Goyder Place, Brompton. My constituent distributed 6 000 leaflets in a specific area and, although he has called upon the company on numerous occasions for the \$75 owing him, he has still not received any payment. A

number of other people, some of whom are unemployed, have also not been paid. One woman took on this job to boost her supporting mother's pension and to buy Christmas presents for her children. The leaflets carried advertisements for a form of industrial-domestic rubbish bin called "Baggit-bins". I have approached the company on numerous occasions, but without success. I have a copy of the leaflets, together with other information, and I should be pleased if the Attorney would look into this matter, especially in relation to the non-payment of money owing to those people who fulfilled their part of the contract as advertised.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member was kind enough to provide me with a copy of the advertisement which appeared in the press in relation to this matter. It seems that the firm of Mal J. Beesley Business Boosting Promotions and "Baggit-bins" has been used as a particularly nasty method of obtaining services from unemployed people. It is quite despicable that people, particularly the unemployed, should be induced to work in this way and subsequently not be paid for the services they have provided. I would be pleased to have the Consumer Affairs Branch investigate the operations of this firm.

More than that, if the honourable member can provide me with a list of the names and addresses of people who have been cheated to date, I shall refer the matter to the Legal Services Commission, to have the commission look at the possibility of acting for them as a group to try to recover the money owing. Taking one action for the payment of an amount of \$75 or less would in normal circumstances be rather an unprofitable venture when one considers legal fees, court fees, and so on. However, if all the amounts were lumped together and the Legal Services Commission were to act for each of the individuals, I imagine it would be possible to take an action for recovery and to get most of the money owing, without having to pay out exorbitant amounts in legal fees. If the honourable member will supply me with any names and addresses he has, I shall refer the matter to the Legal Services Commission.

ARSONIST ON BAIL

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Deputy Premier say whether, as a matter of Government policy, the Government has considered an alteration to the law which would prevent the set of circumstances which allowed an arsonist to be released on bail after having been apprehended for some 49 arson actions? The matter relates to a number of bush fires and grass fires which were started recently in the Elizabeth area. A person was apprehended. When appearing before the court in the first instance, that person, against police evidence and against the police case, was allowed out on bail. This matter has caused much concern to many people in the community, especially those with homes in rural or semi-rural areas. Whilst I do not want a specific answer on this case, which I suspect would be *sub judice*, the matter highlights to the Government and to the people a problem of great concern while there remains a period of high fire risk.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know of no review of policy involving this matter. Although I shall be happy to confer with the Attorney-General about it, my understanding is that the matter is purely a decision of the court, normally taken after argument by prosecuting counsel and counsel for the defendant. I take it that normally whoever presides in the court in which a case is being heard would make a decision on that basis. Off the cuff, I think it would be extremely difficult to devise a policy or to alter

legislation to provide that such cases as the honourable member has mentioned should be taken into account. However, I shall discuss the matter with the Attorney-General to see whether there is some area in which we can move to overcome the problem raised.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare provide information on how much use is being made of the Government's travel concession scheme for unemployed persons?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes. The honourable member indicated to me his interest in this matter, so I obtained the latest available figures, which are to the end of January. Those figures show that since the introduction of the scheme at the beginning of November, 4 243 travel concession cards have been issued to unemployed people. As honourable members would know, the card entitles the holder and the spouse of the holder to the same transport concessions as the State provides to many pensioners. A break-down of the figures shows that the Adelaide Community Welfare Centre has issued more than 1 400 cards and the Elizabeth centre has issued more than 1 000 cards. Significant numbers have also been issued by the Port Adelaide, Glenelg and Salisbury offices of the department. These cards have also been available in many major country centres since 8 January, when the Government announced the extension of the scheme. It is a little early at this stage to judge the response to the scheme, because the cards have been available for only a short time. The most recent report, from Whyalla, shows that 90 cards have been issued for use in Whyalla.

NEAPTR

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the Minister of Transport propose to announce the Government's intention to proceed with preliminary design work on the NEAPTR route along the Modbury corridor, along the Torrens River route and along King William Street before his department's environmental impact study is released for public scrutiny? A few days ago in this place the shadow Minister for the Environment asked the Minister for the Environment whether the environmental impact study commissioned by the Transport Department was coming under the scrutiny of the Environment Department, and, if so, whether their final assessment paper would be made public. In his reply the Minister assured the House that the assessment of that study would be made public. Does the Minister intend to make public any aspect of the Government's intention in relation to this work before the public release of that report?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I presume that the honourable member is referring to the Environment Department's assessment of the draft environmental impact statement.

Mr. Chapman: The one done by your department.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member could get his thinking exactly straight I could answer him. I think he is confused at the moment. The draft environmental impact statement was released to the public last December. I do not know whether the honourable member has taken the trouble to read it or not.

Mr. Chapman: I have a copy and I have read it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased.

Mr. Chapman: You know that the final report, which was referred to in this House last week, is the one I am referring to.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what the honourable member is referring to, because he is mixed up, and I am trying to get it straight. The Environment Department is required to assess the draft e.i.s. and submit its assessments to the Minister of Transport, and that it has done. The matter has been considered by Cabinet and, if the honourable member can contain himself for a short time, he will get all the information he needs.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Education say whether his department can take action to force children of school age to attend school when parents of doubtful quality are denying their children that privilege? For some months I have been involved in a case in which the father of a family of two children, both of school age, has at least on one occasion, and I believe several times, taken his children from school. That man's fitness as a father is currently being investigated by the Community Welfare Department. That department is having some difficulty in taking action against the father because he is at present moving from one place to another to avoid, among other things, his obligation to give his family a proper education. I can supply information in relation to the case, and I ask whether the Minister can take action.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Certain aspects are raised by the honourable member. The regulations are clear as to the responsibilities of parents under the Act to their children who are between the ages laid down in the legislation. We have not a large structure but an efficient structure set up within the department to ensure that the Act is complied with to the fullest extent possible. The problem arises from time to time in cases of marital break up where it is often not clear to the principal of a school or to the teacher exactly which parent has the *de facto*, if not *de jure*, custody of the child.

From time to time embarrassed principals have to sit across the desk from an individual who demands that the children be released from the school into his or her care, and the principal is by no means certain that this individual's right to the care of the children is properly secured. In that situation the school plays it as safe as it possibly can, and its clear responsibility is for the welfare of the child. It is only in situations of marital breakdown that that sort of thing occurs. Certain aspects of the case referred to by the honourable member have been referred to me, but if the honourable member would like to give me the full facts as he understands them, I shall be pleased to investigate them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MARIJUANA

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GROOM: Yesterday, the Liberal Party circulated in my district a pamphlet relating to alleged drug trafficking. After the initial misrepresentation in the pamphlet, it went on to say:

The South Australian Labor Government is preparing the electorate for the relaxation in the laws relating to the non-medical use of drugs.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask whether the member for Morphett is giving a personal explanation. I do not think it has anything to do with him as a person.

The SPEAKER: I have spoken to the member of Morphett concerning the matter, and I and the Clerk have read the letter. The honourable member is quite in order.

Mr. GROOM: The pamphlet went on to say:

The local Labor M.P. for Morphett remains silent on the issue. Where does he stand in relation to the Dunstan Government on drugs?

As far as I am concerned, these allegations and any inference that I would support legalising marijuana are a misrepresentation and grossly untrue. In view of the Chief Secretary's explanation this afternoon, it is clear that the pamphlet was part of a cynical, orchestrated political exercise.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is out of order. The Chair will make the decision.

Mr. GROOM: It is a misrepresentation, because many people in my district have sought my views on marijuana since I have been a member. The author of the pamphlet has never sought my views, and I want to put on public record that I do not support and have never supported legalising marijuana or removing penalties, and I would vote against any move in this Chamber which sought to do so.

At 3.9 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LEVI PARK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the Hon. D. A. Dunstan be discharged from attending the Select Committee on the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill and that the Hon. R. G. Payne be appointed to the committee in his place.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1979

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 6. Page 2382.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. Although this is a formality, a number of important and far-reaching matters of vital importance to the State are raised by the legislation that should be canvassed in this debate. I see, from the second reading explanation, that the Government is aiming at a balanced Budget on 1978-79 expectations of operations of combined accounts. I am pleased that the community's concern for control of Government expenditure has finally got through to the Government and has penetrated the Government's conscience. Budgeting for a balance on this financial year may sound an admirable result that will please everyone, but only if it is taken at face value: it all depends on the way in which the facts are presented.

In this instance, the facts and figures as presented do nothing to reassure those people who are so desperately

concerned about the financial situation in which this State currently finds itself. The overall result, despite the balanced Budget for which we are aiming, will still mean a \$6 500 000 deficit, that is, an accumulated deficit at the end of this financial year. The document has made clear that that sum may vary by several million dollars one way or the other. I predict that, if the amount is to vary, it will probably vary on the debit side, and that the deficit is likely to increase.

I remind members that the Government's budgetary performance last year was disastrous: there was a record \$25 000 000 operating deficit, at a time when every other mainland State had budgeted for a balance and achieved that balance. It was only by the final exhaustion of our total reserves that the deficit was reduced to \$6 500 000. Obviously, as far as this Government is concerned, that is where the deficit will stay and it suits it well to promote a balanced Budget. No steps are being taken to do anything about the accumulated deficit of \$6 500 000—certainly no action appears in this document.

To all intents and purposes, the additional funds made available to the State as a result of the country railways transfer to the Commonwealth have been dissipated, and there is little indeed to show for these funds. I find it amazing that South Australia should have had a \$25 000 000 operating deficit last financial year at a time when it had received additional funds as a result of the railways transfer agreement. The Government's attitude generally of not particularly caring is expressed and epitomised by the present financial position of the disastrous Monarto fiasco. In that case, interest is being accrued, and the total debt in connection with Monarto is increasing by leaps and bounds almost every week. The present Government does not seem to be concerned. It is prepared to leave that project going for another five years.

Mr. Mathwin: It probably doesn't have the figures.

Mr. TONKIN: I am certain that the Government has the figures, but that it is unable to comprehend the effect that this accumulating debt will have on the future of South Australia. In five years, the debt will have grown to well over \$35 000 000, and the taxpayers of the future will have to foot the bill, not the taxpayers of today. That does not concern this Government, which continues to build up even more and more such debts.

The necessity for settling in the future the outstanding accounts for debts run up now by the present Government is something that we can in no way escape. The people of South Australia must be warned that projects which may be desirable, urgent or indispensable in the future may not be possible because of the present Government's irresponsibility in building up massive debts now. In other words, the money that could have been available to conduct those projects in the future may already be committed today in debt repayment. Over-spending and over-commitment at present will certainly close off a future Government's options, because so much of our income will be required to service and repay the debts being incurred.

The present Government is mortgaging the State's future, and it is the taxpayers who will have to foot the bill. So much for any chance of reducing State taxation while the present Government remains in office! If one thing is clearly apparent, it is that there will be no change in the level of State taxation at this stage. The Deputy Leader today asked about the Labor Party's policy on capital taxation. It seems that it may well increase the level of succession duties to be paid.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's not policy.

Mr. TONKIN: It may or may not be policy at present (it is not officially Labor Party policy), but it is certainly

something to be considered by the Labor Party conference. I take it, from what the Deputy Premier has said, that he intends to oppose such a move when it is raised at the Labor Party conference.

Mr. Dean Brown: He wouldn't commit himself.

Mr. TONKIN: He would not say so, when he answered the Deputy Leader's question. The general position is made more interesting and significant by the revelation that South Australia will receive about \$5 000 000 more than was expected from the Commonwealth-State personal income tax-sharing arrangements. It amazes me how quickly the State Government's criticism of the Federal Government's Budget and its taxation measures has been silenced, in the knowledge that an extra \$5 000 000 is coming to the State's revenue as a result. I see no sign of the Premier's rejecting such a sum, despite the anti-Budget rallies that were so assiduously organised by the Labor Party.

The figures now show that it is just as well that that money is available because, without it, the proposed balance (actually the continued accumulated deficit of \$6 500 000) would have become a deficit of \$5 000 000 on top of that. In other words, because of the Federal Government's policies, the South Australian Treasurer has been saved from presenting what could have been a much less favourable situation had it not be for the Federal Treasurer. Speaking, therefore, of a total short-fall of \$2 000 000 in receipts being offset by an under-expenditure of \$2 000 000 is far too simple a way of looking at the State's finances. What is more significant is the \$5 000 000 that would have been outstanding had it not been for the increased share of the Federal Government's taxation.

Summing up, the position is as follows: pay-roll tax is down by \$3 000 000, and the pipelines authority short-fall in debt recovery is down by \$5 000 000. That is a deficit of \$8 000 000, which is offset by the increased share of Federal income tax of \$5 000 000 and the general net increase in State taxation of \$1 000 000. I suppose it was inevitable in this State that there would always be some increase in taxation receipts.

Of passing significance in the overall picture is the absence of any increase in mineral royalties, which could significantly improve the State's financial prospects. The difference is currently between about \$2 000 000 in South Australia and about \$40 000 000 or over in Western Australia and Queensland. It is possible that such sums could be received in South Australian revenue if we were to go ahead with mining and mineral development.

While the present Government remains in office, South Australia is committed to a ban on uranium, and such income to the State's revenue is not likely. Of greater significance is the short-fall of about \$3 000 000 in expected pay-roll tax. This is a further serious confirmation of the State's general economic, industrial and employment situation. Commonwealth Employment Service figures for South Australia show a marked deterioration. Still at 7.9 per cent, they are considerably higher than the Australian national average of 7.1 per cent. Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for South Australia show a rate of 8.4 per cent compared with a national average of 6.8 per cent. The latter figures show that South Australia has the highest unemployment figure of any Australian State. If we use the C.E.S. figures, we see that it has the second highest unemployment figure of any State in Australia, Tasmania being the only State with a higher figure. This trend is continuing. I seek to have a table, which sets out comparative unemployment figures, inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES FOR DECEMBER 1978

State	Commonwealth Employment Service per cent	Australian Bureau of Statistics (full-time work) per cent
New South Wales	7.0	6.2
Victoria	6.5	6.3
Queensland	7.4	7.6
South Australia	7.9	8.4
Western Australia	7.4	7.5
Tasmania	8.2	7.4
AUSTRALIA	7.1	6.8

Mr. TONKIN: The short-fall of \$3 000 000 expected in pay-roll tax reflects this critical situation for South Australia, and the events of the past few weeks have provided no consolation or comfort or any sign of relief for the people of this State. While major projects and developments totalling many hundreds of millions of dollars (for example, \$1 100 000 000 in relation to petrochemical projects and \$200 000 000 for G.M.H. expansion) and promising many thousands of jobs are going to other States, the prospect for South Australia remains grim.

While the economy of Australia is being generally recognised, even by Federal Opposition Leader Mr. Hayden, as steadily improving, South Australia's economic situation is stagnating. This is clearly shown by the document we are now debating. How any Government can persist with a policy on uranium which achieves absolutely nothing, either for the world or for South Australia, in the face of South Australia's critical need for industrial regeneration and jobs, is something which will never be adequately explained. Safeguards are vital and have been approved, so what is the point of the ban? The Government will not be forgiven by the people of South Australia who so desperately need those jobs and the security they represent.

The short-fall in expected pay-roll tax receipts continues the trend which was so significant a part of the last State Budget. The Liberal Party has constantly advocated measures to assist private enterprise to create employment for South Australians, and those proposals have been rejected just as regularly by the South Australian Government. Apart from an increase in base exemption in line with other States, to allow for inflation, this Government has offered no major inducements by way of pay-roll tax exemptions to encourage industrial expansion and development and thus create more jobs.

I would far rather, as Treasurer, receive less than expected in pay-roll tax receipts because of remissions or exemptions which I knew were creating new jobs, and therefore security, than is now the position because jobs are being destroyed. The very nature of pay-roll tax is a paradox at any time, since it is basically a tax on employment. At times of high unemployment, it must be modified significantly so that it can be used to encourage employment. But it has become increasingly apparent that the present Labor Government is totally inflexible and unresponsive to the effects of its policies on the people of South Australia.

At this critical time for our State, I call upon the Government to set aside its narrow commitment to Party dogma, and to respond to the cries for employment and security which are growing louder every day. During Question Time, by way of interjection when the Deputy Premier had finished his answer about whether the Government would consider handing Government enterprises back to private industry, I asked him whether the Government had considered handing the clothing factory

over to private enterprise. He said, "No, why should we?" That sums up the attitude of the Government. It is totally unresponsive to the plight of South Australia and unconcerned that in creating jobs in a Government factory it is likely to destroy jobs in the private sector. All it is achieving is Government ownership of enterprise; it is not achieving more jobs.

Mr. Mathwin: How is the glove factory going? Is it doing any good?

Mr. TONKIN: That matter can be covered later. As well as by a programme of realistic pay-roll tax concessions, private enterprise must be encouraged and enabled to provide more jobs by the removal of the obstacles to development presently caused by the policies of the present Government. The South Australian Labor Government will never be able to escape the direct blame for unemployment in this State while it persists in holding to its attitudes towards uranium, workers compensation, trade union control disguised as industrial democracy, compulsory unionism, and succession and gift duties, and also towards the business community generally. The Government cannot put the blame for unemployment on to any other body or Government; it must shoulder the blame itself.

The latest A.L.P. proposal for a commission to watch the operations of private companies, in the interests of the public and of society, is the last straw. The Premier, early last year, put forward (almost, it seemed, as a consolation for industrial inactivity) the suggestion that tertiary industry (that is, the administration of industry) could provide the basis for South Australia's future. Honourable members will remember that this suggestion was greeted by the business community with great hilarity, contempt and resentment.

Ridiculous as this proposition was in suggesting that South Australia could do without the jobs provided by the manufacturing part of industry, such a policy as that most recently proposed in relation to the continuing supervision of the activities of private companies would effectively hit any prospect of tertiary industry firmly on the head, too. As a recent editorial in the *News* put it: "Will they never learn?". Unfortunately for South Australia, the answer is obvious; they will not learn. Just as obvious is that the State's situation has little hope of improving while the present Government remains in office.

South Australia's economy is at an all-time low, and, even more distressing and unfortunate, future prospects are even lower. Business confidence virtually does not exist and hope has been destroyed. What South Australia needs is a new confidence in the future, industrial expansion, jobs and job security.

Mr. Keneally: And a new Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN: I could not agree more. What this State needs is the Labor Party in Opposition. South Australia needs viable projects actually achieved, not those trumpeted from the roof tops before an election (as we have seen all too often in the past) and then allowed to fail through sheer impracticability or total incompetence on the Government's part. What South Australia needs more than anything else is a Government which is more concerned about the welfare of the people and less about its own policies. The Liberal Party has enunciated its 10-point plan for industrial development in, and future promotion for, South Australia.

It proposes an immediate pay-roll tax incentive scheme similar to that proposed before; a raising further of the basic level of exemption from pay-roll tax; an exemption from pay-roll tax in respect of additional employees; a rebate of pay-roll tax for all apprentices; and a review of further pay-roll tax-based incentives. Also, it proposes an

immediate overhaul of the workers compensation legislation to reduce the cost to industry while still adequately protecting the worker. It proposes an immediate review of areas where Government is intruding into private and individual enterprise, and an immediate review of unduly restrictive legislation, which increases costs and inhibits development without commensurate advantages (for example, building regulations and some of the consumer legislation).

It also proposes the introduction of sunset legislation to require that statutory bodies be reviewed periodically to justify their continued operation; the provision of transport subsidies to enable South Australian firms to compete more effectively on interstate markets; and the introduction of capital tax incentives to enable South Australia to fall in line with the Commonwealth and other States on succession, death and gift duties, so that investment will remain in and be attracted to South Australia again. We have all seen recent press reports about the enormous boom in real estate that has occurred in Queensland, a considerable proportion of which is coming from people who are purchasing properties in Queensland, having left South Australia in disgust.

We put forward a campaign to retain, attract and develop industrial and mineral development with establishment loans available at low rates of interest to approved industries, and a stable economic and political climate, which is necessary for their efficient development. We propose the adoption of a policy of industrial democracy which involves voluntary participation and not trade union control; a positive programme to reassure private enterprise on this score; and the immediate investigation of schemes for the restructuring of industry and the retraining of workers. Those are the policies which will point the way to a new future, a rejuvenated future, for South Australia. They are the positive policies which will bring private enterprise back into full partnership with the Government of this State and which will help private enterprise to play its proper part in the further advancement of South Australia.

Private enterprise made this State what it is today. Private enterprise has been totally ignored and, indeed, totally inhibited in its activities during almost the past 10 years—what has been called the Dunstan decade. There is little doubt now that the Dunstan decade will be remembered, but it will be remembered for the continual run of failed projects and for the conversion of this State's economy from an expanding, productive and prosperous one into a stagnant, failing and rapidly destructive one.

Mr. Mathwin: The "Dunstan decay" is more like it.

Mr. TONKIN: The honourable member has taken the words out of my mouth. It is indeed the "Dunstan decay" that we are now seeing in South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Supplementary Estimates indicate some trends in South Australia are a cause for concern. The Leader said that the Premier early in explaining this Bill acknowledged that pay-roll tax receipts would be down this year by \$3 000 000. This comes on top of the down-turn in pay-roll tax last year, when receipts were down about \$6 500 000. There is a compounding effect again this year, and that should be a cause for considerable concern by the Government, because it indicates a decline in business activity.

Government members get up blithely in the House and assert that all is well in South Australia, that business is healthy, that members of the Opposition are knockers, and that the Leader in particular likes to spell doom and disaster in South Australia. The Government, by its own evidence, indicates that all is not well with business activity

in South Australia. The down-turn in pay-roll tax would be in receipts from the private sector; there has been no diminution in the activities of the public sector. The Government has sought to overcome its economic problems in recent years by putting more and more people on the public pay-roll, but in the long-term that simply exacerbates the problem. There is no down-turn in pay-roll tax from the public sector; the down-turn has come wholly in the private sector. The down-turn, on top of the \$6 500 000 down-turn last year, indicates that all is far from healthy in South Australia.

The unemployment figures recently published confirm what is patently obvious from the down-turn in pay-roll tax. Those figures indicate that the situation in South Australia is quite alarming. We compare most unfavourably with the other States. Members know that those figures come from two sources—The Commonwealth Employment Service and the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The Bureau of Statistics figures are compiled by a sampling method, and many claim that those figures are more accurate. The C.E.S. figures for unemployment are: NSW, 7 per cent; Victoria, 6.5 per cent; Queensland, 7.4 per cent; South Australia, 7.9 per cent; Western Australia, 7.4 per cent; and Tasmania, 8.2 per cent. The Bureau of Statistics figures are: New South Wales, 6.2 per cent; Victoria, 6.3 per cent; Queensland, 7.6 per cent; South Australia, 8.4 per cent; Western Australia, 7.5 per cent; and Tasmania, 7.4 per cent. On the Australian Bureau of Statistics figure, South Australia has almost a 2 per cent higher unemployment level than the national average.

We know what a song and dance the Labor Party made about an increase in unemployment of 1 per cent, yet we recall that unemployment leapt from about 2 per cent during the term of the former Liberal Administration to about 4½ per cent under the Whitlam Administration. It then increased by about 1 per cent the following year, and there was a tremendous song and dance from the Labor Party, yet we have a situation where the unemployment figure in South Australia is creeping up towards 10 per cent, 2 per cent higher than the national average. That is a cause, I would have thought, for great concern in the South Australian community, particularly for the Labor Party, which says it is so concerned about unemployment. How is it that in two Labor States, Tasmania and South Australia, there are by far the worst unemployment figures in the Commonwealth?

The Leader of the Federal Opposition acknowledges the Fraser policies are working, and what a turn around that was. During the past week Mr. Bill Hayden said that there were signs of economic recovery, but unfortunately these signs are not reflected in South Australia. The down-turn in receipts from pay-roll tax, which comes from the private sector, and the tremendous increase in unemployment in this State, to the extent that this State's figures are the worst in the Commonwealth, indicates that all is not well. For members of the Government to try to shrug this off by saying that members of the Opposition are knockers is not good enough. Until it faces the economic facts of life and gets its head out of cloud nine and its feet on *terra firma*, we will continue on this sorry path.

Proposals which were promulgated only last week and which were referred to today during Question Time by the Leader, and subsequently by me, were made by the policy committee of the Labor Party. I noticed with great interest that it was the Attorney-General who poked those policies under the nose of the Deputy Premier to help him answer the questions. The Attorney-General was well involved in those policies; he had them before him. These policies intend to put further strictures and restrictions on private enterprise in South Australia.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We all have a set of those policies.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney-General had them to hand. On reading that account, I thought that it smelled of the Attorney-General. This business about extra consumer protection groups spread throughout the whole of the community, the setting up of those groups to keep an eye on professional people, and the increasing of succession duty on the so-called wealthy in the community (everywhere else in Australia the duty is being reduced or abolished to attract capital) will spell disaster for South Australia. To show the lunacy of the Labor Party, I point out that it intends to consider those policies, in the present economic climate, this month. How lunatic can a political Party get when it promotes policies such as this at a time when we have a down-turn in business activity as indicated by the Bill now before us? It cannot be described as other than lunatic.

The Premier, when he is with us, has described some Federal Government policies as the idiot policies of the Fraser Government. It is those so-called idiot policies that little old Mr. Hayden is now saying are working. The only word to describe the proposed policies of the A.L.P. in South Australia is "lunatic"; they are worse than idiot. Any political Party which has on its platform, for discussion at this time, further controls on business, controls over professional people, more snoots in the community, more groups set up to protect consumers, and an increase in succession duties, has to be lunatic; there is no other word to describe it. This comes at a time when pay-roll tax, which was down \$6 500 000 last year, will be down an estimated \$3 000 000 more this year.

I now turn to the transfer of \$5 000 000 from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account. That is very poor economics. Along with several other members, I had a discussion with Sir Thomas Playford, when he was here for lunch one day, on this matter. As is his wont and his habit, he was quite interested to talk about what was happening. Nobody, not even the Playford knockers, can deny that he was a very prudent Treasurer. Some people might not have liked some aspects of his Administration, and these knockers have tried to make light of some of his achievements, but he was a prudent Treasurer, and he described the transfer as very poor economic policy. For one thing, the interest paid on that \$5 000 000 will be about 15 per cent. Also, it will have another very adverse effect on the future of South Australia, in that our Loan allocation in the future could be reduced. In fact, I think it has been reduced. It took Liberal Governments many years to build up over and above our normal entitlement to Loan funds, and much of the development work in South Australia was carried out from funds we had managed to negotiate over and above our normal allocation. The Dunstan Administration, far from seeking to increase our Loan funds for developmental projects, on what are truly Loan projects, and capital development, is by transferring these funds, contracting the provision of Loan funds to this State in the future; that is a very poor economic policy.

A very large increase has been made to the allocation to the Education Department. We know perfectly well that all is not well in the operations of that department. It is a tragedy (and I cannot use a word less strong than that) that we have thousands of highly qualified young people who cannot get jobs as teachers. As I have mentioned previously in this House, I have met one or two of these excellent young highly trained people, who have had four or five years higher education and who hold degrees and diplomas. They cannot obtain jobs, and they are not likely to get jobs even with this additional allocation, as it will be

used for pay increases for teachers already in employment. The Education Department says it normally expects a high resignation rate and that the people who resign are replaced by more lowly paid people within the department. There is a groundswell of opinion among teachers themselves, to their very great credit, that it is time to call a halt to some of the handouts the Government is giving in the public sector and, indeed, to teachers themselves. As mentioned previously, some teachers have publicly stated that they would prefer not to receive a holiday leave loading of 17½ per cent so that more people could be employed as teachers. They acknowledge that the leave loading was meant to compensate people for not receiving overtime payments during holidays. The teachers have said that, if that leave loading were not paid to them, more young people could be employed.

The Labor Party is living in a fool's paradise. It believes it can create a Utopian society here where we can spend more money than we productively earn. The end result is that, if one has a job, one is privileged. If one does not have a job, one has very little prospect of getting a job. In South Australia we are rapidly approaching a situation where one in 10 of the population cannot get a job, and in that situation things have gone much too far. This situation is far worse than that in other States; it is 2 per cent worse, in fact. An unemployment figure of 2 per cent was previously considered undesirable, but we now have 2 per cent more unemployed people than has any other State in Australia. The education bill continues to rise very markedly, with \$9 600 000 extra having been voted to that department. The only additional employment that will be provided will be for 75 persons out of the thousands now out of work.

I now turn to the proposal to transfer the Museum and Botanic Gardens Division to the Community Development Department. This division was created when Dr. Inglis was summarily promoted sideways. It was a demotion actually, because he went from being a Director to being an Assistant Director. When the Deputy Premier took over as Minister for the Environment, one of the first things done was to unload Dr. Inglis. This was done by paying him the same salary and giving him the newly created title of Deputy Director-General of Education (Museums and Botanic Gardens), or something like that.

Mr. Russack: Will he get the same salary as the Director-General?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think he got the same salary as he got as Director of the Environment. He was shifted sideways. The Deputy Premier did not want him, so they created a new position. The teachers complained that the money for the new position would come out of the education vote. Although it was claimed that the money was to come out of the environment vote, that is not how it appears from the statement before us. The extra money is in the education vote. It is obvious that the deposed and demoted Dr. Inglis is now to move to another host, in this case the Community Development Department. It seems some trouble is being experienced in deciding where the Museum Division and the Botanic Gardens Division should reside.

Community welfare and community development have been big deals with this Labor Government, which has set up regional offices of community welfare around the State. Much of its social legislation has exacerbated community problems. The Minister shakes his head, but I claim that much of the free-wheeling legislation of this Government seems to have exacerbated some of our community problems. When that happens, the Government sets up a department to look after the rejects and derelicts. The Government has decided now to do something about

tightening up on pornography.

We have seen the growth of a department that was initiated by the then Minister, now Mr. Chief Justice King. We saw an escalation of the Community Welfare Department and now we have the Community Development Department. If, in our legislative measures, we were careful to look after those influences in the community which tend to give cohesion and stability, perhaps the community would develop satisfactorily, as it has in the past. However, if we pass legislation which takes a knock at the family unit and which tends to give the idea that anything goes, and that we can all do our own thing, it is not surprising that it is necessary to set up a department to look after society's casualties.

It is interesting to see how much money has had to go to this department. When it was set up, there were complaints in the House about what it would cost, and the Premier said that it would not cost more than \$60 000, because people were to be transferred from other departments. An advertisement appearing in the *Advertiser* on 3 February last called for applications for the position of Deputy Director of the Community Development Department at a salary of \$30 100, more than half the money that was to have been spent on the department. Goodness knows what the Director gets. With two highly paid officers, the Director and the Deputy Director, the \$60 000 has gone.

Then we have a fairly long explanation in the statement about the \$2 780 000 for the department. It is suggested that that sum is not really involved, because there will be some juggling of the books, but at least an extra \$190 000 is acknowledged. The document states:

While the funds sought for this department will be largely offset by those transfers, the Supplementary Estimates include provision for an increase in expenditure of \$190 000. The Premier was a bit off the mark with his confident expectation of \$60 000. Even if we ignore the \$2 780 000 and come back to \$190 000, it is still far from the estimate of \$60 000. Certainly, the Deputy Director will take a fair slice out of that. I believe that this department will grow, like Topsy, like all other Government departments, especially those set up by Labor Governments.

Mr. Mathwin: Who'll pay in the end?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know who will pay. We have taxes in South Australia that the other States have managed to knock out. This statement does not surprise me. It is what one would expect from a Labor Government—a downturn in business activity and an increase in expenditure in the public sector. When will this Government learn? When will it come to grips with the economic facts of life and see that we live within our means, that we do not increase unnecessarily the size of the Government sector, and that we do our utmost to stimulate the real source of wealth in this country, the productive section of the economy?

An additional \$133 000 is to be provided for women's shelters; in reality, the State Government is providing \$41 000, and it will get back from the Commonwealth \$92 000. I have not been involved with women's shelters, particularly the Naomi women's shelter, for a year or two now, nor have I been involved in argument in this House in connection with Naomi. It is the responsibility of the State Government to see that this money is accounted for. When I was involved, on the complaint of people from the shelter, the evidence was overwhelming that money had been misappropriated; as a result, the Minister set down some guidelines to tighten up the situation.

Since then, there have been one or two disturbing reports about women's shelters. A week or two ago, people from a shelter went to the Adelaide Children's

Hospital and demanded that a child, who was still infectious, should be taken from the hospital. I did not involve myself in that matter, but it seems to me that the control at the shelter leaves something to be desired. From my observations previously, it seemed that the Minister could not control the situation. He would send down one of his women's advisers, she would have talks, and then go back to the Minister. Knowing the personality of the person involved, I am not surprised at that situation.

The State Government is charged by the Commonwealth with the responsibility to see that this extra \$92 000 is accounted for. It is all very well to say that shelters should be given autonomy. The complaints I have had are in connection with only one shelter. The Government is side-stepping its responsibility if it is not controlling satisfactorily the expenditure of that money. A report in the press a week or so ago disturbed me when I saw that that same shelter was involved in what appeared to be an unfortunate incident.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Did you make inquiries about it to see whether the press report was accurate?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not involve myself in the controversy but I am saying that my past involvement with that shelter indicated the fact that there was a misappropriation of funds and that all certainly was not well. It seemed to me, from further contacts, that the Minister was having great difficulty in controlling the situation, and the women's adviser he sent to talk to them did not seem to be able to come up with an answer. I will leave it at that.

The only other point in the explanation which deserves comment is the fact that the Government has to contribute \$1 200 000 to the Superannuation Fund in connection with the Health Commission. We have referred to the Superannuation Fund which is growing like Topsy in this State; no-one seems to know what will be the end result for the taxpayers of South Australia of the generosity of the State Government towards its employees. It had to put in more than \$20 000 000 last year, and even for a State like South Australia that is a considerable sum. As one could almost predict under a Labor Administration, this document provides for more and more expenditure in the public sector while the private sector contracts, and this is a recipe for long-term disaster. I think the Labor Party had a bad week last week in South Australia. Traditionally we support this Bill; the Government is voted in to administer the affairs of the State. However, all in all it indicates that all is far from well in the State of South Australia and no-one in their right mind could accuse us of being "knockers" for making that point.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I will not go over the ground canvassed by the Leader and the Deputy Leader concerning the assessment of the preamble to this document, except to say that I am still concerned that the Premier has decided that the 1978-79 Budget will remain a balanced document on the combined accounts and it is planned to hold the accumulated deficit from the previous year at \$6 500 000.

I do not like the way the Government continues to combine the Loan Account and the Revenue Account. In the past we dealt with the Revenue Account and the Loan Account separately. The Government should not combine the two figures in relation to an overall result. Money has been taken from the Revenue Account in the past and put into the Loan Account, and now we are finding that money from the Loan Account is being put back into the Revenue Account. Any organisation that takes money from the Loan Account and puts it in the Revenue Account to keep things afloat will end up in serious

financial difficulty because interest must be paid, and we are paying interest on our Loan Account for 53 years. I am not at all happy with the way in which the Budget documents are being handled in this State. There should be Parliamentary estimate committees in this State as there are in the Federal Senate. If we had estimate committees, we would be able to go away during the sittings of the House and investigate in detail the various items of the Budget. A brief report would be made in this House, saving a considerable amount of time in this Chamber.

The Government has decided that it will hold the accumulated deficit at \$6 500 000, and this means that for the financial year ending 30 June 1979 we will be paying \$520 000 in interest. It is all very well to say that we will hold an accumulated deficit, but someone has to pay the interest, and it is either lost income to the State if we use trust account money or, if we have to borrow it from the Reserve Bank at the bond rate of 8 per cent, it is \$520 000. At the end of June 1979 that accumulated deficit will be worth \$7 000 000. If no effort is made to repay that deficit, the total will escalate, and the taxpayers of South Australia will be looking for relief and will not be able to obtain it from the State Treasury. That is a tragic situation when we consider the high proportion of tax already imposed on the people of this State.

Of course, the saving grace for the Government was the \$5 000 000 the State received unexpectedly from the Commonwealth-State personal income tax-sharing arrangements. I can remember the scream on the other side of the House when the Federal Budget was brought down imposing further taxation in an effort to ease the Commonwealth Budget deficit. Tremendous criticism was expressed by members of the Government about this extra income tax being imposed on the people of Australia, but the Premier was grateful to receive that \$5 000 000 because the tax-sharing arrangement was such that the Federal Government could not keep that money; it had to give it back to the State. Had we not received that money, I believe we would have been in trouble.

Previous statements from the Premier in releasing the monthly figures of the Revenue Account and the Loan Account have been cautious. He has been cautious when predicting the outcome as at 30 June 1979. I notice he takes a plunge here and makes a more definite statement that the Budget will be balanced, but I find that difficult to accept when in his monthly reviews he has not been prepared to make that statement. I wonder what was the real motive behind this document when it was originally planned. When we are dealing with Supplementary Estimates we get suspicious about the reallocation of funds. This document could be likened to robbing Peter to pay Paul, because that is what it does. With a slight variation, the overall amount will remain the same. It will have no impact on the Budget we originally approved except that, as revealed in the explanation dealing with Government departments, when money is required for various reasons we find that that money is being taken from another department. That is where the clarity of the document leaves a lot to be desired. We do not know which departments have cut down their expenditure, and in what areas, to make up the funds that are required for other areas.

I have always believed that, in relation to the Federal and the State Budgets, both Governments should be forced by legislation to give a half-yearly review to taxpayers. This would be the time to do that review, and a far more detailed document should be presented to Parliament. Similarly, it would not hurt if we had a half-yearly review from the Auditor-General, because he is

continually going about his investigation of Government departments and we have to wait until September to get his report. In some instances, his investigations are about 12 or 15 months earlier than the report. Therefore, he could make a half-yearly review, which would reduce the amount of reporting we receive annually. We must sharpen up our handling of the finances of this State and improve the working of this House by having an estimates committee and a half-yearly review of the State Budget and a half-yearly report by the Auditor-General.

Some of the explanations relating to various departments are disturbing. Regarding the Police Department, the document states:

An additional \$700 000 is required for this department. Of this amount, \$300 000 is required to cover increased salary costs. . . . and \$400 000 to cover additional contingency charges.

That sum of \$300 000 was provided in the Budget. A lump sum is provided in the Revenue Account to cover wage and salary increases during the whole of the year. I am surprised at the following statement:

The payment of a bonus to police officers, together with a lower level of staff separations than was anticipated originally, offset partly by delays in filling some vacancies, accounts for the additional salary requirements.

Every year since I have been a member, the police in South Australia have received a bonus at Christmas. Surely to goodness that allocation was made when the Budget was introduced in September. If it was not, the Minister owes the House an explanation. I cannot accept the statement that the payment of the bonus is part of the reason for additional moneys, unless someone has made a mistake. There is no excuse for this kind of error cropping up in the Supplementary Estimates. No-one denies the police officers their annual bonus at Christmas, but it must be ratified. It has been given to them for many years, and I hope that the practice will continue. Surely the provision should have been made when the original Budget was introduced.

The explanation also states:

The effect of increased fuel prices on vehicle operating costs and increased workmen's compensation premiums has resulted in additional contingency costs.

I am concerned at increased workmen's compensation premiums. Fuel prices would have had some impact on the Police Department's operations that was not foreseen, but the increased workmen's compensation premiums worry me greatly. Are members of the Police Force being put at greater risk? Are they incurring a greater number of injuries, thus forcing them to go on to workmen's compensation? If so, it is time the Minister examined the matter and found out what is happening to the police in upholding law and order in the State and in carrying out their duties. If increased workmen's compensation is to have such an impact on the police budget, certainly we are gravely concerned, especially for the safety of police officers. I would not want to reduce premiums but I would want to examine the problem. It is time the Government did something about it.

Regarding correctional services, the document states:

This financial year, there has been an increase in the number of offenders held in custody and, as a result, it has been necessary to increase the number of callbacks to ensure prisons are manned adequately.

This increase will cost \$250 000 this financial year and, here again, it is cause for concern in relation to the economic situation within the State and to the number of offenders being held in custody. We know the manning and costing of our correctional services, but we are not told in the document which correctional institutions are

involved—whether male or female, or whether in the juvenile area. I would like a greater breakdown of the requirements in that area.

The Law Department is to receive another \$250 000 for reimbursement of jurors and witnesses; that is surprising. The document, under "Treasurer, Miscellaneous", states:

An additional appropriation of \$800 000 is required to provide for the State's contribution to the Electricity Trust of South Australia for subsidies in country areas (\$530 000).

I have no argument with that. For many years, the member for Eyre and other country members have been making representations for improved services in areas such as Ceduna, Hawker, Streaky Bay and Wudinna. I am concerned that the Treasury has to meet a bill for interest on the trust's funds and other moneys amounting to \$270 000. In a glib manner, it is explained as follows:

The additional amount needed to cover interest on trust funds and other moneys is associated with special arrangements between the State Bank and the Electricity Trust of South Australia to provide additional funds for welfare housing purposes.

It is a pity that the Government could not be honest and tell the House exactly what it is doing with the funds from the trust. I can only assume (and I hope that it is correct) that the trust is being required to invest its surplus moneys with the State Bank, and the Government is using the State Bank to borrow that money back for welfare housing purposes. The document states:

Treasury has acted as a financial intermediary in these arrangements and will be paying interest to the trust and receiving interest from the bank to offset the payments.

I assume that, if the trust lodges money on fixed deposit with the State Bank, and receives the ruling rate of about 4 per cent, the State Bank lends the money out for welfare housing at 8 per cent or 9 per cent. The difference is that the trust is missing out on the opportunity to obtain the maximum interest, which it normally would receive in the market place for its surplus money. The Treasury uses the additional moneys with the State Bank to offset payments to the trust. What a roundabout way of doing the whole deal! The tragic situation is that the trust has to go to the people of this State to obtain this funding, together with its loan funding.

The trust is now being instructed to lodge any surplus funds with the State Bank, at probably half the rate it is paying the public for this money in the first place. The Government then uses that money, through the State Bank, to fund welfare housing, and turns around and subsidises the interest. So, the Treasury of this State, because of a short-fall, is having to pay out \$270 000 to subsidise the trust for the loss of interest. This is socialism at its best! No doubt, the Minister of Mines and Energy would have dreamt this up; it is typical of his skulduggery. It is a pity that the investors in the trust are not informed of this arrangement. It would be beyond the media to comprehend this type of economic mismanagement and to be able to relay it to the people. Somewhere, somehow, someone has to spell out to the people of South Australia, particularly the investors in the trust's debentures and to the taxpayers of South Australia that, through some chicanery by the Treasury, we are now having to subsidise the trust to the extent of \$270 000, because the Government is using the trust's surplus moneys for what it calls welfare housing purposes. That is also hard to accept. I do not deny that we need welfare housing, but the price we are paying for it here needs examining.

Education has been dealt with by the member for Kavel. I am surprised to read, under "Transport", the following:

\$200 000 is required to cover additional costs faced by the Motor Registration Division of the Department of

Transport. These funds are to finance the operation of the Crash Repair Industry Steering Committee. . . .

No estimate is given. It is about time the Minister gave us a breakdown of the estimate, something that could have been included in the document. The document continues:

to replace some existing cash registers and to improve security measures.

The Minister does not say where or how, or how many cash registers are involved. I wonder whether this has something to do with the decentralisation of the department throughout the State. If it has, he should tell us. A few bland lines is not good enough; the taxpayers are entitled to know what is happening to revenue.

Regarding "Minister of Transport, Miscellaneous", the document states that recent increases of fuel prices have been very costly to the State Transport Authority. A sum of \$40 255 000 was allocated to the State Transport Authority towards the anticipated deficit for this financial year. That is an absolute scandal. South Australia does not own country railways, and there is a reduced metropolitan transport system. Bus fares have been increased in some areas by about 50 per cent, and more. South Australia has probably the most incompetent system of transport in Australia, and it has to be subsidised by over \$40 000 000. An amount of \$1 000 000 is now sought because of higher interest rates on borrowed funds. The Federal Government has just increased its interest rates by .2 per cent. How can the Government find problems in meeting its interest bills?

The Minister of Transport was allocated \$20 000 000 some years ago to buy new buses. Advertisements called for tenders to provide public transport vehicles for the State Transport Authority, and for tenders to lease buses. Many buses are now leased. Have leasing arrangements proved more expensive than previously thought, and if so, why does not the Minister say? If some bungle has been committed, or if the original sum is not enough, the Minister should say now. This should have been fully explained in the preamble to the Appropriation Bill. The Government hopes that all these things will be passed over; the Bill is a dishonest document from that angle.

Regarding the Community Welfare Department, it will be necessary to provide an additional \$500 000 for payments of a portion of water and sewerage rates for pensioners and other needy persons. In the original Budget, the allocation was \$4 000 000. Why was a mistake of \$500 000 made? This sum was considered in the Budget at the correct time, and now, suddenly, a request is made for another \$500 000. Are there more pensioners, or is there an increase in the sum people have to pay? The explanation states:

Second, in order to qualify for the maximum Commonwealth Government support, we must provide an additional \$133 000 for women's shelters. Since this expenditure will attract Commonwealth funds totalling \$92 000, the net additional cost to the State will be \$41 000.

I am concerned about the statement "in order to qualify for the maximum Commonwealth Government support, we must provide an additional \$33 000". A sum of \$361 000 was allocated for women's shelters in South Australia, and I am not convinced that the shelters are fully justified. As the member for Kavel said, there is some doubt about the financial management of these organisations. I will do the best I can to get the Public Accounts Committee to inquire into women's shelters, and if that is not possible I will ask the Federal Government to examine the situation. The management of women's shelters should also be examined. I have a Question on Notice relating to these organisations, which states:

1. What is the policy of the Government in funding women's shelters?

2. Do all women's shelters accept persons with epilepsy and, if not, why not?

3. How many persons have been refused accommodation because they have stated they suffer from epilepsy?

It might be unfair to pick out one known complaint, but I have been told that people are not being accepted into shelters if they have epilepsy. These people are entitled to help. One woman who needed emergency shelter was refused because she suffered from epilepsy. Another woman did not inform the shelter that she had epilepsy. She stayed overnight and was absolutely disgusted at the behaviour she encountered in the shelter. At 6 o'clock she was informed that no tea or coffee was available, and that someone would go to the local hotel to get booze for the night. She said she could not drink alcohol and was informed that she would have to wait until the morning for tea and coffee. We judge these organisations by the complaints we receive.

What irks me is that the Federal Government will pick up the tab. In order to qualify for the maximum Commonwealth grant, you can bet your socks that money is being spent as though it is going out of fashion, because administrators do not care where it goes. This sort of thing has happened in Government departments in recent years, and it is about time the chicken came home to roost. The Federal Government should examine financial arrangements with all States and discover how it is being ripped off in some areas. The area of women's shelters would probably be the most gigantic rip-off of all time. The shelters should accept people, whether they suffer from epilepsy, diabetes or anything else. If the shelters do not accept such people, funds should be stopped. The present situation is an absolute joke.

Regarding the South Australian Medibank agreement, the explanation states that the Commonwealth advanced funds to non-Government recognised hospitals to provide a working cash balance pending reimbursements of actual expenditure. The Commonwealth Government has advised that it will not be able to advance money after the end of this financial year, and that we will need to repay them before 30 June. The amount involved will be reimbursed by the Commonwealth early next year, and \$800 000 is sought for this purpose.

There has been no provision in the Supplementary Estimates of the amount of money that the Government has suddenly received through the Instant Money Game, which was dreamed up by the Lotteries Commission. At least 22 series in the Instant Money Game have been sold. The sum turned over is about \$11 000 000. The profit to the Lotteries Commission would have to be in excess of \$3 500 000, but I cannot obtain an exact figure. The cost would be similar to that of a lottery, about 8 per cent.

This money is transferred from the Lotteries Commission to the so-called (and this is the greatest misnomer of all time) Hospitals Fund, and is immediately drawn out and put into Treasury. All the way through, the Treasury receives interest on the money. The public of South Australia thought that when lotteries were introduced into South Australia there would be no need for badge days or appeals, and that charities would be looked after. Don't you believe it! The Treasury grabs the money. If it wants to twist the reason around, it says that the money is going to non-Government hospitals and institutions. We are given an explanation for the request for \$800 000. So far as I am concerned, \$3 500 000 is available to cover that purpose. It is also there to cover, through the Hospitals Fund, the non-Government hospitals.

When one looks at the allocation last financial year to

non-Government hospitals, one sees that it was pretty meagre. The figures were revealed today when I asked for the estimates for payments in 1978 and 1979 to non-recognised hospitals, institutions and other bodies and was told, "Capital purposes, \$875 000; special maintenance and other purposes, \$905 000; and current maintenance, \$16 500 000" (rounding off that figure). Yet, in 1977-78 the amount for capital purposes was \$939 000, and for special maintenance and other purposes it was \$1 800 000. The amount for current maintenance was \$14 100 000, the total being \$16 900 000. An amount of \$15 000 000 was taken from the Hospitals Fund to offset that amount, yet the Hospitals Fund retained a balance of \$4 000 000, so the whole of that allocation could have come from the Hospitals Fund, but it did not.

This financial year it is proposed to spend \$18 300 000. There is no doubt in my mind that all of that money could come from the Hospitals Fund, the profits from the Lotteries Commission and the off-course deductions from the T.A.B., unclaimed dividends, fractions, etc., and motor vehicles stamp duty on insurance.

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

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I will refer to four matters, the first of which relates to money to be made available in the education field. At least some of that money is to be used to employ a further 75 teachers. In my district is a large number of young people who were encouraged by this Government to take up training as teachers so that, when qualified, they would have an opportunity to obtain employment. They now have those qualifications but do not have an employment opportunity. The State Government has rattled the bucket over the years and has said that it is the Federal Government's fault and that that Government should be doing something about the matter.

In the early part of this fiscal year the State Government attacked the Federal Government over the way it allocated moneys, saying that not enough money was allocated to the State. The Premier now admits that the Government has received a considerable sum more from the distribution of personal income tax under the sharing arrangements, the extra amount being \$5 000 000. I have heard no comment from the Government, or from the Premier, that it is a good thing that the Government ended up with more than it expected. It continues to attack the Federal Government saying that it is failing to give enough money to the States. The State Government knows that it is in trouble with money; it cannot make ends meet. It knows that that is the situation in Australia—that we have set up some bureaucracies that we cannot maintain.

That is no solution for this group of young teachers, however. The present Government could, if it wished, do more than it is doing by providing job opportunities for 75 teachers. If it asked some of the teachers due for long service leave to step down (and the Minister has that opportunity) it would be able to create some contract positions for teachers without a significant increase in cost to the taxpayer or the State. I have spoken to a significant number of teachers in my electorate, and many of them have made the point that they do not like a system whereby people are allowed to accrue long service leave so that other trained people cannot be employed. Out of the 1 000 waiting to be employed, only 75 are being catered for, and that is not satisfactory.

The Government is making money available so that unemployed people may have free bus travel. That sounds commendable, and maybe these people need some help. The sum of \$100 000 has been made available for that purpose. Another section has been forgotten about. Some

young people have been lucky and have gained employment as apprentices. The cost of travel on State Transport Authority buses is high today, and apprentices have to pay other costs. Many young apprentices are struggling to survive because of the high cost of public transport, the cost of lessons, buying text books and so on. They are struggling to pay these on the salaries they get, which in the first year are not much more than unemployment benefits paid to those who do not have jobs. We are tending to neglect one section of the community while giving a benefit to another section. Apprentices should be considered if we are talking about giving free travel on an already expensive operation like the State Transport Authority, which loses more than \$40 000 000 a year.

In his explanation of the Bill the Premier said:

Following the support generated for intra-district bus services, the Government is introducing Community Bus Services in the Campbelltown, Tea Tree Gully and Thebarton districts. These services are independent of the State Transport Authority and cater for children and youth groups, senior citizen clubs and organisations and other community groups in need of welfare transport services. An amount of \$100 000 is sought for these services.

On an average, that is \$33 000 for each district council or city council area mentioned.

Mr. Arnold: What reply did I get from the Minister last year on that subject?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Chaffey got a flat "No" on that, I think, from the Minister. I will leave that for the country member to argue. I will argue for the other sections of the metropolitan area and give examples of the hypocrisy of this policy. In areas such as Mitcham Hills, Aberfoyle Park or Happy Valley (part of which the member for Mawson represents)—

Mr. Slater: And well, too.

Mr. EVANS: I will find out when he stands and says that those areas ought to get a similar bus service. If those areas cannot get that service implemented, or get part of the service that is provided for other areas, surely an amount of \$33 000 should be made available to each of those municipal areas so that the council can decide for what purpose the money will be used within the area. In the Mitcham Hills area how does an aged or slightly incapacitated person get from the Cherry Gardens and Coromandel Valley area into Blackwood, or, more importantly, into the inner metropolitan area just to do some shopping? There is an inadequate bus service from Blackwood, Belair and Hawthorndene, and none from parts of Coromandel Valley or Cherry Gardens. That is all part of the metropolitan area.

It is hilly country. In winter it has the worst weather of any part of the State, and it is impossible for the people living there to walk, so they are left out there totally isolated while other small areas such as Thebarton, which have better climatic conditions on average and which are fairly close to community services, are given an allocation from State funds. One could ask why those three districts are to get this assistance. The Stirling, Crafers, Bridgewater and Aldgate area could justify having a community bus service. In that area there are poor, aged and housebound persons who rely on Meals on Wheels. There is no chance of these people getting public transport to community facilities. One or two trains a day pass just outside the centre of this area at odd times, but the people are still some distance from shopping centres, doctors, hospitals, and community welfare services.

This area is equally as wet as in the Mitcham Hills area. For three months during the winter it is cold and it is impossible to go out and walk (if they are capable of

walking) with any certainty that they will not be drenched by heavy rain and faced with cold, wintry conditions. These people are not considered to be citizens worthy of the same consideration as is to be given the citizens of Thebarton, Tea Tree Gully, or Campbelltown. The same can also be said of the portion of the member for Mawson's area where he and I share a common boundary. What happens to young couples in the Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park area? What sort of bus service and community facilities have they got? The land commission sold large tracts of land but did not offer any sort of community facilities. No provision was made for a small delicatessen, and the brand new shopping centre is up to two miles away. These people do not even have a bus service to enable them to acquire normal community services. No consideration is given to those people. The Government selected three well-favoured and chosen areas, and one might ask whether it did so for political purposes. If it was not done for political purposes, why was \$100 000 given to three small selected parts of the metropolitan area to provide a community bus service for those who may need it? I do not deny that some in those areas may need it, but why not give it to others who live in districts with far worse communication or public facilities? The Hills are part of the metropolitan area, and the people who live there pay their taxes. They contributed to the \$40 000 000 loss that the State Transport Authority built up. Why are they not entitled to the same consideration as is given to others? There is silence from members on the other side, because they cannot justify this. They know they are politically manipulating the system for their own ends as a political organisation.

It is also interesting to see that we are considering the Health Commission superannuation scheme and that the Government is trying to set up a separate organisation to administer the scheme. I hope that the Government takes note of the strong feeling within the community that public servants, whether in the Health Commission or any other section of the Public Service, should not be allowed to go on accruing long service leave. At the end of their career these people will bleed the State, after some massive length of service, for pay at the highest salary that they have achieved at any time in their working life span. We as a Parliament as well as the Government (while it is there temporarily) should be telling these people to take their long service leave when it falls due. If this is not done, the end result will be very expensive to the State. This Government is putting off paying this bill and leaving it for some other Government to pay in the future. The Health Commission superannuation scheme is included in this because it appears in the Appropriation Bill. The Minister for Mines and Energy is cagey enough and knows enough about finance to know that is what is happening.

I am sure that Cabinet has discussed this and has decided not to force public servants to take their long service leave when it is due, when they should have a rest so that they can have a spell from their tedious duties and come back reinvigorated and with new enthusiasm. This Government does not want to do that because it will have to foot the bill today. The Government cannot afford to foot the bill today, so it will leave it for a future administration, and the people of that era, to foot the bill. This will not be possible without more severe taxes than we have at the moment. The Government knows what it is doing in this field, and I believe it has deliberately planned to put off this debt. They should be paying it today by encouraging these people to take their long service leave and having more people move in to fill in the gaps while others are on long service leave. The Government knows that it cannot afford to pay this bill, but it also knows that

future generations will not be able to pay the bill as well as we could pay it today if we attempted to do so. In other words, the Government is not prepared to make cuts in the right places, and it hopes it will not be around in the future to cover the gaps.

There will be a drop of \$3 000 000 in pay-roll tax receipts. What reason has the Premier given in the second reading speech for this drop? Have his reasons anything to do with the article in today's *News*, that stated that South Australia's population rate had dropped behind that of the rest of Australia? It was also stated that our percentage increase was so small that it was practically identical to Tasmania's. It was further stated that within four years Western Australia would have a greater population than that in South Australia, and that Queensland would have almost double our population within 10 years. Yet the State A.L.P. likes to rubbish Queensland and say it is a bad area to which to go. The article states that the Bureau of Statistics had said that the difference in the increase in population was due largely to the down-turn in South Australian industry in recent years. In other words, it is quite plain that this Government has destroyed opportunities for industry in this State. It has frightened industry away to such an extent that we are now getting a decrease in the amount of pay-roll tax that we are collecting. This means that, if we are going to keep up the sort of services we have in this State, we will have to start taxing some other area until more industry leaves. I finish on this note—

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Hear, hear!

Mr. EVANS: The Minister says, "Hear, hear", and I know it hurts. He feels a sense of guilt because he knows he is leaving the Ministry before very long. He will go out on superannuation and will not have to worry about this State, because he is retiring as Chief Secretary and is leaving the Parliamentary scene. His twinge of conscience will not be for long. However, if he is a genuine South Australian it will go on for some time after he leaves the Parliament.

Some people think that this moving away of people from the State involves those with a great deal of money who are taking industry with them, and that the decrease in pay-roll tax is insignificant in the overall scene. The next group of people to be affected will be those owning an average home and having a job. I believe they are already being affected. When the job goes, when there is no other job opportunity, and when they try to sell their home on the market in South Australia, with its depressed economy, they will not be able to recoup sufficient money to enable them to move to another State where the opportunities exist to establish themselves again in a home, and to start a new lifestyle in a new State.

That stage is being reached. Until now, only industry has been affected, but we must take heed of the warning that is evident. The rank and file workers, who are buying their own homes, are the people who will not be able to recoup enough to re-establish themselves in another State. One sees evidence of that in every suburb, where established homes are for sale. However, people cannot get a price that will give them an opportunity to start elsewhere. When the position starts to snowball, the life's savings of many people will be in jeopardy.

Some Government members think that will not happen, but it is quite evident at the moment that it is happening. The first indication is the slow increase in population in South Australia as compared with that in other States; it is significantly lower. There has also been a decrease in the amount of tax the Government expected to collect from pay-roll tax. The Bureau of Statistics figures show that the reason for the decrease is the loss of industry to this State.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: They don't show that at all.

Mr. EVANS: That is the position.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: It is dishonest to impute that to the bureau. Read the paper.

Mr. EVANS: It is not dishonest. We are in that position. We are destroying the opportunities that have existed in the past. That is the result of this Government's socialist attack on private enterprise and free enterprise, attempting to destroy it at every opportunity.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Bill.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): The subject of Redcliff has been in the news a great deal in recent days. The news we have heard with the announcement by I.C.I. of major developments and the announcement by Altona of further major developments is heartbreaking for South Australia. The Opposition fully supports the Redcliff proposal. We wish to see it go ahead. It is even more vital to the State's economy than it is to the State Government's political hide, and, believe me, it is worth a considerable amount to the State Government's political hide. Putting politics aside, it is a vital industry to South Australia. If there is any way in which it can be achieved for this State, we will do what we can to assist the Government in achieving it.

In the past week, the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy have made a number of allegations that absolutely demand refuting, because their sole purpose has been to fool the public of South Australia into believing that the State Government is not responsible for the present uncertainty about the Redcliff petro-chemical project. That is something which cannot be allowed. Following the announcement last Wednesday that I.C.I. was to establish its petro-chemical plants at Port Wilson and at Botany, in New South Wales, the Minister of Mines and Energy has said that he will soon embark on a publicity campaign to convince the other States that Redcliff is of national importance and should therefore go ahead. We wish him success, for South Australia's sake, and it is reassuring to hear that Dow is to continue with its feasibility study.

However, I am amazed at the sheer audacity of this Government in trying to shift away from its own Party the blame for Redcliff's not being further advanced than it is. The Government knows that it was the A.L.P. policy which drove Dow out in the first place and which later saw the end of the I.C.I.-Alcoa-Mitsubishi consortium. To say that the Prime Minister deliberately held up Loan Council proceedings last year is absolute nonsense. When approval for overseas borrowing was granted on 6 November last year, the Minister of Mines and Energy did not complain about the delay. He was quoted as having said that it might well be a case that approvals for additional borrowing for infrastructure purposes became a continuing Commonwealth strategy in influencing the direction of major energy developments throughout Australia. He was totally in support of the examination which had been given to the project, because he knew that South Australia's submission could, would, and did stand up. He did not sound too upset then.

But now, unpalatable as it may be to the Minister and Government members generally, I intend to recount the sordid history of Redcliff, in which the A.L.P. plays the central part, aided and abetted by the State Labor Government. The full story goes back to the discovery of hydrocarbons at Gidgealpa No. 2. It was a milestone in

South Australia's history, and it occurred on 31 December 1963. Following that development, natural gas contracts to supply Adelaide were concluded. These were concluded until January 1988, and contracts were concluded to supply the Sydney market until 2006. That is a considerable commitment to the producers.

In the Cooper Basin, the nature of the hydrocarbons varies considerably. There are some areas where there is a great deal of dry gas, and this will be used first. There is a relatively high CO₂ content, and this requires additional treatment at Moomba. I pay a tribute to the operators of the entire Moomba field for the work they have done and for the way in which they have managed to supply gas to the Adelaide and Sydney metropolitan areas. The proportion of crude and liquids in some holes is relatively high, as far as liquids are concerned. Obviously, there is a need to find a use for the liquids, in the interests of energy conservation, and a market for the economics, and to fulfil gas commitments economically. A market must be found for those liquids if we are able to use the gas to supply the Sydney and Adelaide markets and fulfil our contracts.

The initial involvement of Dow Chemical was a relatively well kept secret from the people of South Australia. When the Premier announced the proposed petro-chemical plant at Redcliff, as he did in the 1973 election campaign, Dow had already been investigating the prospect in this State for more than 18 months—in other words, since about August 1971. The Government's officers and departments had been assisting.

It was unfortunate for Dow Chemical that its arrival on the scene coincided with the era of the new "It's Time" Federal Whitlam Government. It was unfortunate, too, that the State Labor Party Government was so totally subservient to its centralist federalist colleagues that it was prepared to let them totally dictate its policies, regardless of the effects they might have on the people of South Australia. Although there had been some election points scoring made by one of my predecessors about a letter of intent, Dow Chemical was ready to sign an agreement with the producers in May 1973. If it had done so, we could have had a world scale petro-chemical plant coming on stream at about this time last year—in other words, in 1978.

We could have been producing petro-chemicals and there would have been none of this doubt and indecision. South Australia would have had the benefit of those jobs and of that investment. That was the expectation, but sadly it is not the reality. Up to 4 500 jobs were expected in the construction stage and when completed Redcliff was expected to employ almost 1 500 people, and with the associated jobs concerning the producers, who work on a two-to-one ratio, we could have expected a total work force of more than 4 000 when the project got underway.

The total investment was estimated at \$600 000 000 with another \$50 000 000 spent on infrastructure, which included 450 kilometres of pipeline, a power station, harbour facilities and housing. Of course, those figures are the figures at the time and they have escalated vastly since then. In total, about \$850 000 000 and \$900 000 000 in investment and between 3 000 and 4 000 jobs during construction and at least 1 500 after construction, not to mention the associated jobs which would be supported by the project, would have been created now, if Dow Chemical had gone ahead and signed that contract in May 1973. But the proposed contract was not signed in May 1973, and the first of the blows against South Australia was struck by the Federal Labor Government. The South Australian Government was powerless to prevent it; indeed, I suspect it did not even try.

The Federal Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr.

Connor) introduced legislation which required that the propane and butane fractions be alkalated to produce motor spirit. This situation, which was ridiculous from the economic point of view, produced an imbalance to the overall financial situation which made it impossible for the Dow Chemical Company to go ahead with the proposal as planned. Conversion to motor spirit of propane and butane is uneconomical and inefficient, but this is what the Federal Labor Government wanted and insisted on, and the signing of the contract was deferred. Federal Labor members and the State Minister condemned the decision publicly in March 1973 but no further action was taken by the State Government to challenge that decision of the Federal Labor Government. No action was taken by the Federal A.L.P. members, either. Faced with the decision of the Federal A.L.P. and the Caucus decision, they gave in, and the Redcliff petro-chemical project was lost for the first time when the Federal A.L.P. again imposed yet another aspect of its total minerals and energy policy on the State Labor Government. On 8 November 1973, in this House, the Premier said that the Federal Minister had announced a requirement of 51 per cent Australian equity in the development of the Redcliff project. Dow, an American-based company, which had spent \$2 000 000 in investigations, feasibility studies and environmental studies, was virtually dismissed from the project, which was effectively put back by more than 18 months.

It is interesting to read through the press reports of the time, and I give a brief summary now. A report of 3 October 1973 stated that the Premier said in the Assembly that the Federal Government's entry into the oil and gas industry would not endanger Redcliff. A report of 11 October 1973 stated that the Premier said a petro-chemical plant proposed for Dampier in Western Australia would not threaten Redcliff. A report of 12 October 1973 stated that conflict between the South Australian Government and Connor had been taken to Whitlam. Connor had imposed an export embargo on l.p.g. from the Cooper Basin fields with the requirement that these liquids should be converted into motor spirit. This, coupled with the refusal to specify what was the level of Australian ownership in the project, placed over it a cloud of uncertainty.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Connor killed it.

Mr. TONKIN: Connor indeed killed it with the aid of his Labor Party colleagues. A report of 12 October 1973 was that the Premier was concerned about the future of Redcliff. He said he was concerned about the future of Redcliff. The two consortiums involved both demanded to know the situation regarding equity. The Premier said the situation was crucial; time was the essence. Interestingly, the day before, the then State Mines and Energy Minister, Dr. Hopgood, reported a fruitful meeting with Connor.

On 13 October 1973 a report said that Connor backed the Australian companies Ampol and C.S.R. in the hope of squeezing out the two consortiums, Dow and ICI, Alcoa and Mitsubishi. The Premier said the project was in grave danger of collapse. At this stage Connor still was not saying what level of Australian equity he expected. He said on the same day that S.A.'s gas reserves were doubtful and would not cover demand for more than 12 to 14 years because of the commitment to supply gas to Sydney. Was there any length to which the Federal Labor Minister would not go to sabotage this project for South Australia? On 13 October there was a feature article in the press by Bruce Guerin, who is now an officer in the Premier's Department. He said that the most remarkable feature about the Premier's outburst at the time was the fact that it had been so long delayed. On 15 October 1973 we saw an announcement that Ampol and C.S.R. would

not be continuing with the project.

On 16 October both Parties in this House passed a motion of concern about the Federal Minister's attitude. On 18 October it was announced that the State Government had a binding agreement with the Federal Government for the support of Redcliff. It was not until 22 October that Connor finally said he would like 51 per cent Australian equity, and so it went on. On 24 October the Premier told the Assembly that work on Redcliff was to start in April 1974. It was a further six months later, in February 1974, that work was able to get started because of a disagreement between the South Australian Government and the consortium, because the consortium wanted to work out the degree of Australian equity later. The Premier of this State insisted on a firm agreement being negotiated before any all-clear would be given. These delays have all added up and they are the result primarily of the actions of the Federal Labor Minister, Mr. Connor and, secondly, of the State Labor Government.

The programme went on slowly. When I.C.I., Alcoa and Mitsubishi took over it was at least 18 months behind in investigation and further behind still in negotiations with the State Government. 1974 was a year of the Federal Labor Government, anxious to push on with its programme of State ownership and control at breakneck speed. This culminated in the disgraceful loans affair. It appeared determined to put every possible obstacle in the way of private enterprise and development, and this was in preparation for its own planned *coup de grace*, financed by massive, and highly dubious, overseas borrowings. These were the hurdles placed in the way by the Federal Government: the 51 per cent Australian equity requirement; removal of the 50 per cent subsidy for exploration expenditure; removal of shareholder allowances for exploration; removal of the depreciation provisions for taxation; a loan calculated to increase the cost of feedstock by 25 per cent; and an amendment of the Income Tax Assessment Act to force earlier payment of taxes.

As a result, the producers were forced to increase the price of gas. Again, there were no exploration wells for two years and a definition of reserves was therefore delayed. This action put the project back. The disastrous effect of the requirement that propane and butane be alkalated to motor spirit has already been dealt with.

The last straw was the requirement that the petro-chemical plant must be sited at Redcliff. This was supported by both the Federal and State Labor Governments, because of the unemployment problems that were likely to exist in the Iron Triangle. This was clearly documented in the Redcliff Petro-chemical Development Project Report (No. 2), at pages 15-19. A suggestion that infrastructure costs could be significantly reduced by locating the plant north of Adelaide, for instance at Port Gawler, was rejected out of hand by Federal and State Governments. The raging inflation of 14-15 per cent at that time had also taken its toll of the project, and the escalation of estimated construction costs from \$600 000 000 to \$1 000 000 000 finally closed the door on the project for the second time.

The complete dominance of the Federal Labor Party over the State Labor Government during this period makes an absolute mockery of the later A.L.P. election slogan, "When Dunstan fights, he wins for S.A." Dunstan has won nothing for South Australia as far as the petro-chemical plant and many other projects are concerned. Had the State Government really fought its Federal colleagues and stood up to them, the petro-chemical plant could have been expected to come on stream some time this year, and the effect on South Australia's employment and development cannot be over-estimated.

Again, it was not to be, and the policy of the A.L.P. (Federal and State) lost South Australia its petro-chemical plant and the investment and jobs associated with it for the second time in less than two years. Had it not been for the policy of the A.L.P., South Australia could have had constant employment of between 3 000 and 4 000 jobs and investment of about \$1 000 000 000 already with the plant about to come on stream. How welcome that project would have been to the community of South Australia, beleaguered as it is now, and desperate for jobs and investment. This is the cost to South Australia of blind adherence to an A.L.P. policy, regardless of the effects on the people of South Australia.

It seems inconceivable to me that the State Government should now be allowing another major A.L.P. policy, this time on uranium, to stifle yet more major projects for South Australia. The parallel is amazingly close. Certainly, although it is now making every possible effort to persuade Dow to continue with the original Redcliff project and to try to blame someone else, for example, the Federal Government, I.C.I., or the Victorian Government (I notice, though, apparently not the New South Wales Government), the South Australian Government cannot escape the clear responsibility it has as the State arm of the A.L.P. for losing the certainty of the petro-chemical project for South Australia, not once, but twice already—in 1973 and 1974.

Mr. Gunn: That's a good effort.

Mr. TONKIN: It is a remarkable record, which the people of South Australia would do well to examine carefully. The Government has claimed that delays in Loan Council enabled I.C.I. to get in first, but this is not a reasonable argument. The A.L.P. policy, as I have shown, was responsible for far greater delays. The Government does not want anyone to know about this; the information is surprisingly sparse. It is not given the same backing of the Government publicity machine, as have been many of the other projects of which we have heard, all of which were to the Government's favour.

The I.C.I.-Alcoa-Mitsubishi consortium finally pulled out on 16 July 1975, and there was a joint statement from the local Minister (Hon. Hugh Hudson), the Minister of State for Redcliff, and Mr. Bridgland, representing the Redcliff petro-chemical consortium. It was a restrained announcement. It said nothing of the Government's part in allowing this project to lapse, and that is hardly surprising. The present Minister of Mines and Energy, with the support of the Deputy Prime Minister, invited Dow back to reassess the project, on 4 March 1976 (that is, after eight months further delay). During that eight months, the producers had done everything humanly possible to persuade Dow to come back to the project. Dow had a great deal at stake, but so did the producers. The producers had to find some way of exploiting the liquid fraction of their discovery. Dow would consider coming back only if it had an official joint invitation from the State Government and from the Federal Government. It took eight months of hard work by the producers to persuade Dow to listen to such an invitation.

Dow was still so affected by the previous treatment it had received at the hands of the Labor Party, both State and Federal, that it was not prepared to trust a Labor Government in the negotiations. It had spent \$2 000 000 on the project and, for a time, it was prepared to see that \$2 000 000 written off. It was not until it was invited back by the joint letter that it somewhat reluctantly came back to South Australia on 4 March 1976. It was not until June 1977 that it announced a further study, to take another \$3 000 000. If delays are to blame, this delay of about 15 months more, directly caused by the treatment Dow had

received previously at the hands of the A.L.P., must be a major factor in the project's present uncertainty. The whole history of the project's negotiations has been one of delays, difficulties, and disasters, initiated by the A.L.P.

The present claims that the delays in granting Loan Council approval for all of the States' 12 proposals for the infra-structure borrowing, simply to jeopardise South Australia's Redcliff project, are clearly not reasonable: they are ridiculous. Claims that the Prime Minister, the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales, and I.C.I. have been engaging in some form of political conspiracy directed against South Australia cannot be anything other than hysterical over-reaction. Claims, which the Liberal Party wholeheartedly supports, that the Redcliff project would be a better proposition for the nation as well as for the State, are realistic but they are of little value if the announced expansions of the major petro-chemical giants (I.C.I. and Altona) make it uneconomic for Dow to continue. This is the fundamental fact of business life that the A.L.P. seems totally unable to grasp: no matter how attractive and good a project may be, it must be developed, and it will be developed only if a company finds it an economic proposition.

It is the Government's task to do everything possible to make it an economic proposition for a developer, in this case, Dow Chemical. The Government should already have made submissions to the company, offering realistic and attractive concessions. It must swallow its pride and recognise that it lost most of its bargaining power when it lost the project for South Australia, not once, but twice before. In view of the Government's past record, South Australians will want to know what are these concessions that are being offered. Concessions in areas such as land tax, power and water rates, pipeline operating charges, pay-roll tax, and wharf and harbour dues can be offered. This is what the Minister should be doing now, as a matter of urgency, rather than proposing to travel around Australia extolling the virtues of the project. It is only the practical, business-like approach to this project that has any chance of success. I am desperately afraid that a practical, business-like approach is something that this Government does not possess.

What is the State Government prepared to do to try to make amends for its Party's gross mismanagement in 1973-75? It must do something, because we desperately need this project. If we are able to persuade Dow that it can proceed (and the Liberal Party will do whatever it can to help achieve this end), South Australia will be fortunate, but the administration of the Labor Government will always remain under a cloud as unrealistic, unbusiness-like, and totally unmindful and uncaring of the best interests and welfare of the people. The Labor Government is unable to understand the needs of the business community. In view of the policies it has adopted and the disincentives it allows to continue in the community, it seems that it does not wish to understand the needs of the community. I believe that it wishes to see private enterprise out of South Australia.

Unfortunately, we cannot do without this project, and the Government recognises that fact. If Dow finds it impossible to proceed, it can only be the Labor Party that is to blame because it cost South Australia its advantage in 1973. South Australia will be in a worse position by at least \$1 000 000 000, and 3 000 to 4 000 jobs, not to mention the continuing income to the State that would have been expected from the project. All the Government's attempts to blame someone else will not mean a thing to those South Australians who desperately needed one of those jobs and who could have shared the income and the security that those jobs represent. I hope South Australia

gets the Redcliff project, although everyone knows that the chances do not look good. Whatever the outcome may be, the Australian Labor Party stands indicted for all time for putting Party politics before the good of the people. The people of South Australia will not forget.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Regarding the development of uranium resources at Roxby Downs, in 1976 the Premier said that South Australia was well ahead of other States in attracting a uranium enrichment plant to this State. The Minister of Mines and Energy was at that time overseas. Mr. Hudson claimed that he was misreported, that the gloss given to the story of his trip was incorrect. I find that very hard to believe. In 1976 an editorial in the *Australian*, in the same issue as that in which details of the Minister's trip were given, headed "Dunstan trying to enrich his State", stated:

Mr. Dunstan is a very enterprising Premier. His move to send his Mines and Energy Minister overseas to seek finance for a proposed \$1 400 000 000 uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff, near Port Augusta, reflects the panache with which the South Australian leader approaches the job of helping his State get on in the world.

It also highlights a truism that many people in Australia—including those in Mr. Dunstan's own Party—are prone to forget: that the view from one part of the country is often quite different from that in another. The view from Mary Kathleen in Queensland, for example, is very different from that in Mr. Tom Uren's office in Canberra, or the trades halls of Sydney and Melbourne. The people in Mary Kathleen want uranium mining in Australia to go ahead, and they could not give two figs for Mr. Uren's doctrinaire "leave the uranium in the ground" theories and the obscurantism of the city-orientated militants.

Mr. Dunstan's view from Adelaide is also rather different. Far from seeking to keep the uranium in the ground, he wants not only to get it out, but also to have it transported to his State and there processed to make it more profitable for Australia when exported. Nor is Mr. Dunstan fencing around this plan with needless ifs and buts, although, like the Federal Government, he says that he will pay due regard to the Ranger uranium inquiry report when it is presented.

He sees no environmental danger to South Australia from the enrichment process ("less danger than from a normal chemical plant", he says) and has no qualms about the morality of using uranium as a world energy fuel (he told a recent A.L.P. conference that with coal running out and solar energy not a proposition nuclear power was the world's only hope as a future energy source).

Mr. Dunstan has also pointed out that the mining and enrichment of uranium in Australia does not contravene A.L.P. policy, which gives the lie to the squeals of protest from Mr. Uren and his radical friends. In fact, A.L.P. policy encourages the processing of uranium in Australia.

The reason why Mr. Dunstan's view on uranium is so different is that, like the people in Mary Kathleen, he is much closer to the wishes and needs of his community than the city Trades Hall activists. South Australia has a large population, and to provide jobs and wealth for these people Mr. Dunstan realises that he must attract industry to his State. At the moment South Australia relies heavily on the car and component industries, on the white-goods industry, and on shipbuilding. Some of these industries are suffering from the drop in consumer demand, and others are in serious jeopardy for other reasons. Shipbuilding, for instance, could virtually cease in South Australia, threatening the jobs of many in the Spencer Gulf area. South Australia is in urgent need of an injection of new industrial activity, and a uranium enrichment plant promises to be just what the doctor ordered.

If it comes off, such a plant would be the biggest single industrial complex in Australia, easily outpacing the Newcastle B.H.P. works and the Victorian motor plants. It would be more than full compensation to South Australia for the collapse of plans to build a chemicals complex at Redcliff. This is back in 1973, members will recall, when Mr. Connor, the then Federal Minister, effectively killed Redcliff when he sought to promote a plan for the north-west shelf; that was where Mr. Connor wanted the petrochemical plant. Through his discouragement of Dow and through the pipelines legislation that he put through Federal Parliament which put a complete prohibition on the sale of liquids, he killed Redcliff. That is what this reference deals with. The editorial continues:

It would provide several thousand jobs and attract associated and infrastructure industries to the area.

And so it goes on. I want to compare that situation with the current stance. Mr. Uren and his henchmen have had a win in the meantime. Far from the Premier's taking the stance adopted in July 1976, the wheel has turned full circle. Since then we have had a Federal A.L.P. conference in Perth (I am speaking from memory) and we know perfectly well that the left wing had a victory. So, in 1976 the Premier was all in favour of this enrichment plant. The Minister of Mines and Energy was overseas and he is reported to have had discussions with a view to attracting capital here for the enrichment plant. He denied that vigorously, as he often does; he says that he was misquoted in the press. Mr. Uren and his henchmen have had a victory. This is what Mr. Uren said in connection with the latest moves to block any possibility of the Labor Party's changing its mind in South Australia. The Premier went overseas with high hopes of getting evidence to change the Labor Party's mind here. An article, headed "One man cannot change U-policy: Uren", states:

A.L.P. policy on uranium mining could not be changed by one man or his personal charisma, the Federal Opposition's spokesman on urban and regional affairs, Mr. Uren, said last night. Mr. Uren was speaking about a uranium fact-finding mission overseas by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan.

He said he was confident A.L.P. uranium policy would not be altered. Mr. Uren last night met "people concerned" about the South Australian situation on the proposed mining at Roxby Downs near Lake Torrens.

He would not say whom he planned to meet, but it is known he saw at least one State A.L.P. member opposed to mining—the Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan.

The Premier came back and, before his unfortunate indisposition, he asserted vehemently that there was no split in the Labor Party on this issue and that it was unanimous, but we also know that the forces were gathering against any change in policy, even while he was overseas.

The difference in stance between the statements he made overseas (one day he said that hopefully the problem was solved, and a day or two later he said that the problem was not solved) reflected the phone conversations he had with the people who were keeping him briefed about the machinations of his colleagues back in Adelaide led by the Attorney-General and the Chief Secretary, who attended the meeting called by the committee to oppose any change in the A.L.P. uranium policy. No split in the Labor Party! What a lovely situation! There is the poor fellow overseas doing his darndest to get evidence to change the policy back to the 1976 situation, and here they are shooting him down from the other side of the world. What a happy little band! No split in the Party! We know perfectly well who is in command. We know that back in 1976 we were way out in front to get this uranium enrichment plant. We know that Uren and company in the meantime had a victory,

and they are well and truly on top. What a pity that South Australia had to lose those three years. Not only have we lost those three years but we are way behind.

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

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): Last October the Leader called for a conference between trade union leaders, industrialists and the Government to try to find a means to get the South Australian economy going again. I know that that conference has not been called. For it to be held would require a degree of Government initiative. I believe that, if that conference was held it could and should as its first agenda item consider a method to convince South Australian people to buy goods and products manufactured and produced in this State. Over the years we have heard the catchcry about buying South Australian goods, and various appeals have been made to the South Australian public by Government and business leaders to try to stimulate the South Australian consumer to buy our products and thereby improve the economy.

Latterly, the issue has been raised again, and I believe that this time it should be given serious consideration, especially when one considers the degree of unemployment in this State. I believe that it is a suggestion of considerable merit and that, if organised properly, a successful campaign could be implemented. The first step in any such promotion would be the appointment of a South Australian promotions committee or, if we wanted a catchier name, a "Buy South Australian Committee". This would consist of experts from the Economic Development Department, business and trade union leaders, and community representatives. Such a scheme would have to have the services of a leading public relations firm. There would need to be no half measures in such a scheme, and it should be granted an initial budget of \$1 000 000 at least.

Its terms of reference should include as its first priority the promotion of South Australian products to the home consumer. A massive public relations campaign would have to be implemented to convince South Australian people that by buying locally manufactured goods they would be helping to provide work for the unemployed. It is obvious that if the South Australian economy can be stimulated in this way and that if consumers buy more South Australian products, South Australian firms and the country people who produce our agricultural products will become (and I do not hesitate to use the words) more profitable. If they become more profitable, they can then employ more people.

If such a scheme were instituted it would be necessary to identify the goods and products on sale. The State Government owns the copyright for the State emblem, the piping shrike. Legislation was passed through this Parliament a few months ago whereby the State Government gained control of that emblem. Upon application from manufacturers, the Government could allow goods for sale to be identified with that emblem. This could be either printed on the container or fixed to the products by the means of a self-adhesive label. Consumers could then readily identify locally-produced goods and, provided the price was comparable, purchase those products instead of those produced overseas. It would be a distinct possibility and, provided the campaign was carried out correctly by this committee and the public relations firm hired, significant benefits would follow.

The housewife, when she went to do her shopping, would be able to identify the product that had been produced or manufactured in this State. Provided the price was comparable, the housewife could be induced by the

public relations campaign to purchase the local products at the expense of those manufactured interstate or overseas. The list of possible products is endless. It would include white goods such as refrigerators, washing machines, furniture, agricultural machinery, motor vehicles, clothing, dairy products and groceries.

Almost every family has a member affected by unemployment. Consumers purchasing South Australian goods would know that they were making a contribution to the future of a husband, wife, daughter, son or other relatives or friends, let alone the work force as a whole. I have spoken to many South Australian businessmen about this proposal. I have also spoken to many community leaders about it. Those who manufacture goods entirely for the South Australian market are, of course, keen about the scheme. They believe that it would increase their profitability and enable them to employ more people in this State.

Many South Australian manufacturers sell most of their goods interstate. One firm to which I spoke this morning sells 80 per cent of its products in the Eastern States. Even taking into consideration that they sell so much of their production interstate, the firm told me that the increase in the home market that would result from a scheme such as I have outlined would make a significant difference to sales, once again enabling it to achieve great profitability and so employ more people.

It is true that, generally, the South Australian market represents only 10 per cent of the national total, but nevertheless that 10 per cent can be significant in real terms. In these times of political and industrial confrontation, a programme of this nature would provide a unique opportunity for co-operation between all sections of the community. The Opposition and the business community would combine with the Government and trade unions and by doing so would all be working for the betterment of this State. Some critics will no doubt say that such a proposal is all very well in theory but may not work in practice. Some people may say, in fact, that it is naive. I believe, however, that if the proposal were approached realistically and with enthusiasm it would work. I believe that there is no doubt that it would work.

As I mentioned before, the promotion would have to show no half measures, and I mentioned an initial figure of \$1 000 000. There would have to be saturation on television, radio and the press so the people would become aware, and a consciousness would arise in the community, of the importance of purchasing our own products to the exclusion of products from interstate or overseas where the price was comparable.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Members will no doubt be aware that for the last three years I have been pressing for improvement to the treatment of effluent from Mount Gambier, where hundreds of thousands of gallons go out to the sea daily at Finger Point, adjacent to Port MacDonnell, where it pollutes the ocean. As recently as last week I presented to the House a petition with almost 1 000 signatures. I have another sheet of the petition that I am unable to present because of an error in presentation made by members of the electorate. Nevertheless, it increases the number of signatories by some 50 or 60 names, which is quite a substantial representation from the people of the South-East.

I am particularly concerned that \$186 000 was allocated in the last Budget towards the duplication of the pipeline. That is an essential part of the system, but it is certainly no substitution for filtration and proper treatment. At present raw effluent is discharged into the sea. Over the last three years considerable complaints have been received not only

from the residents of Port MacDonnell, who stand a good chance of getting their own back when they swim in the sea, but also from a wide variety of other people. These people include members of the South Australian Surfing Association, who maintain that the beach there is one of the finest surfing beaches in South Australia. Complaints have also been received from tourists who regard it as one of the finest and most pleasantly secluded beaches on the southern coast. Professional fishermen are also very concerned, and in a few moments I will read extracts from a letter from the Australian Fishing Industry Council. There have also been complaints from amateur fishermen and rock lobster fishermen, who find that the water adjacent to Finger Point is being increasingly polluted with nitrogenous materials, and is therefore highly unsuitable for marine life.

Complaints have also been received from abalone fishermen, who extract about 30 per cent of the total South-East abalone catch from the immediate vicinity of Finger Point. That is significant, because the abalone catch, at the present price, would be worth about \$1 000 000 over 10 years. One fisherman in one day could pull out 12 100-pound baskets, giving a 1 200-pound catch, which indicates the amount of abalone that could be caught in that area. This is significant because the nitrogenous content of the water leads to eutrophication, or stagnation of the water. This leads to green algae growth, which gradually poisons off the potential for marine life to live there.

More recently, members of the community have become fearful that there might even be heavy metals located in the water. I believe the Engineering and Water Supply Department has conducted some tests there, but it remains to be seen whether the tests were adequate to determine whether heavy metals were present in the sewage and in the water. Perhaps I will put a question to the Minister of Works on this matter tomorrow. The possibility of heavy metals being present in the water, in addition to the nitrogenous material and all the effluent and excreta going down the drain, could lead to the possibility of food poisoning from shell fish caught in the vicinity of Finger Point and around Port MacDonnell. The whole fishing industry is concerned because this is a very important export branch of the fishing industry and any food poisoning found in any of the fish exported from South Australia, for example to the United States, would no doubt close a very lucrative market for the professional fishing industry.

The Australian Fishing Industry Council recently approached the Premier, contacted me independently as the member for the district, and also contacted the Shadow Minister for Fisheries, expressing their great regret that nothing had been done to provide an adequate filtration system. The council found it quite incredible that the Government might be in a position to negotiate a loan of \$186 000 000 for Redcliff, but at the same time it was unable to find the necessary funds to protect not only the marine environment but also an important industry in the South-East. The council also reminds the Government that the lobster industry is already under pressure and the interests of the public generally should also include the interests of the fishermen and their families. It points out further that they would have liked the extent of the contamination of the area to be permanently established already by the Government, along with the effects on the industry, and they find that the only real samplings taken were taken from the beach.

It is interesting to note that when a television crew went to this area several months ago to examine the pollution on the beach, they had been beaten to the draw by the

Engineering and Water Supply Department, which had cleaned up the whole area and had tipped the refuse over the sandhills just out of view so that the cameramen went away disappointed. I understand that very recently another camera crew, on behalf of a television station, went along and did a more comprehensive survey. I do not know the extent of the pollution they found there, but no doubt they would have found more than the last crew did. It is important that, with 30 per cent of the abalone catch coming from that region and making its way to the Melbourne and export markets, this region is cleaned up in the not too distant future.

Another aspect which may not please the Deputy Premier too much is that, although the Corcoran Breakwater, named after the present Deputy Premier's father, is quite a magnificent construction, unfortunately there is so much pollution in that area and the breakwater has impounded water adjacent to Port MacDonnell and made it very still and calm so that this water is also under threat of becoming stagnant as the onshore drift of nitrogenous water gradually finds its way into that embayment to stand there and ache under the sun. Probably with disrespect, I suggested that the Corcoran Breakwater might be harbouring what in future may be known as Des's Dyke, because it really is aching. I suggest that the Deputy Premier inspect it with a view to changing the Government's mind and having a substantial donation made to provide a filtration plant.

I asked the Premier, when he was in the South-East recently releasing the Green Triangle Report, what were the Government's intentions. The Premier and the Deputy Premier made it quite clear at that time that the purchase of land to close off the beach and provide a raw effluent discharge outlet was only a temporary measure. However, they did not give any specific date for the provision of filtration, and this could be any number of years away. I have received letters from the Premier and the Deputy Premier setting out the rationale, this being that the State is near bankruptcy and finance is at a premium. That may be so, but I have conducted some private research through an industrial company in South Australia, seeking information on whether we could not have a cheaper system as efficient as, if not more efficient than, the one proposed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I am not decrying the work of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, because it is extremely capable and does as good a job as anyone on the Australian mainland in cleaning up effluent, but there is every possibility that an overseas system, possibly one from Holland, could be implemented here. This system is used in literally dozens of countries and might be more efficient, cheaper to install and, more importantly, cheaper to operate. The system presently proposed costs about \$1 000 000 a year to operate. Even if the alternative system is as costly to install, and that is unlikely, but is found to be substantially cheaper to run per annum, it would literally wipe out the capital costs in a matter of years. I was under the impression that it would be about 12 years before the one system caught up with itself and actually paid for its initial capital cost and that the overseas system was the cheaper of the two.

I serve notice on the Government that I am still investigating and that when I have completed my investigation I shall be putting forward a fairly complex alternative scheme. I hope that the Premier will look at it not only from the capital cost point of view but also from the on-going cost point of view.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): More and more people in South Australia and in other States are asking, "What is

the problem in South Australia? What is happening to South Australia? Why is it coming to a standstill?" The simple answer is that the State is no longer being run as a business undertaking. If people in private business ran their affairs in the manner in which South Australia is being run by the present Government, they would be out of business and bankrupt in no time.

We have only to look at some of the undertakings of this Government to see what has happened in recent years. Take, for example, the State Transport Authority and the costs of public transport to South Australia under the present Government. The *Advertiser* of 8 February contained an article headed, "Commuter figures drop by 1 000 000." We know that the subsidy for public transport in the metropolitan area is more than \$20 000 000, and now, in this Bill, the Government is asking for a further \$1 000 000. The commuter figures from the 1976-77 financial year to the current financial year show a dramatic drop, even though the subsidy on transport is increasing daily. The report states:

The report shows that the State Government subsidises the average passenger fare on buses and trams of 23 cents by 32 cents.

No-one could run a business on that basis and survive. The average train fare of 27.5 cents was subsidised by the Government by \$1.21 a passenger. That sort of activity is absurd, and that is why South Australia is grinding to a halt. There is no way on earth in which we can continue in this way and still have a viable State.

Under the heading "Minister of Transport—Miscellaneous", the Premier has referred to a matter I raised in this House last week. The member for Fisher has also raised the matter in relation to his own district. I refer to the provision of \$100 000 for intra-district bus services in the Campbelltown, Tea Tree Gully, and Thebarton districts. This is superimposing a further public transport system on that provided by the State Transport Authority.

Dr. Eastick: It's also buying votes.

Mr. ARNOLD: Precisely; that is the only reason why it is being done. The transport services already provided by the Government are subsidised to the tune of \$25 a head. On October 18 last I put to the Minister of Transport that a subsidy of \$1 or \$1.50 a head in rural areas would be a sufficient subsidy to enable a private bus operator to operate a mini dial-a-bus service within country towns, to enable the elderly, the disadvantaged, and young people with schoolchildren to travel from their homes to shopping centres.

Last year, we had in the Riverland a seminar of which the Minister of Community Welfare would be well aware, because it was organised by his department. It was a most successful seminar, highlighting the problem of isolation in the community. It made me aware of a problem that exists in every part of South Australia. Many people, particularly those on low incomes and in disadvantaged circumstances, tend to be isolated in their homes, dependent on friends to take them from their homes to the shopping centre and back for shopping, for medical treatment, or for other purposes. Without any public transport, those people, especially the elderly, are completely isolated in their home environment. The seminar clearly indicated the magnitude of this problem, which must be overcome.

When I put it to the Minister of Transport that the Government should provide a subsidy of \$1.50 a head to enable the service to be put into effect, he claimed that it was being ridiculous, yet \$25 a head is provided in the metropolitan area. Obviously, in making such a claim, the Minister regards people living in rural areas as second-class citizens. There is no other answer. The provision of

\$100 000 for further bus services to districts within the metropolitan area merely highlights the total disregard of the Government for people in country areas.

Its priorities are completely out of tune with those of normal business management. It seems that it is determined to continue in this direction, as indicated by the answers given this afternoon by the Deputy Premier to a question from the Leader; it would appear that the Government has no intention of changing its tack. It is locked into its philosophy, and there it will stay until the people of South Australia dismiss it from office.

We have only to look at an article in the *Sunday Mail* on 11 February 1979 for further evidence. The Deputy Premier this afternoon denied that people and funds were leaving South Australia and going to other States. This comment from the article is attributed to Sir Bruce Small, who said:

South Australian aid to Queensland—millions for land: investors from South Australia have helped Queensland's Gold Coast to its best year on record, with real estate sales alone totalling \$365 000 000.

That is a further indication that funds are being taken out of South Australia. The Premier has not been willing to acknowledge that the people leaving South Australia are those with capital, while those coming to South Australia tend to be people looking for a welfare State. Whilst the Premier can probably claim statistically that there is not a net loss in population, South Australia's capital is flowing out at a steady rate, much of it going to New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. This will continue as long as the present policy of the Government remains.

Because of its tie to the trade union movement and Trades Hall, which determines its philosophy and its policy, there is no alternative. This situation will continue while the present Government remains in office. Until we get back to a free enterprise philosophy there is little hope that South Australia will come out of the present recession, which is far greater here than that in other parts of Australia. That point was illustrated in Question Time this afternoon, particularly in relation to the question asked of the Deputy Premier by the member for Davenport.

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Last July, I drew to the attention of the House the grave position that had befallen members of the apiary industry as a result of decisions of Agricultural Council to allow the introduction of biological control of salvation jane. As a result of that concern, which was reported to the House on 19 July 1978, the next Agricultural Council meeting decided to delay action so that the position relating to the apiary industry could be reassessed.

Consultation occurred with various members of the apiary industry and with persons associated with farming, agriculture and agricultural seed production, as well as with members of the Agriculture Department. Finally, at the council's most recent meeting in Christchurch, New Zealand, it was decided that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation could proceed with the biological control of salvation jane. That decision was taken without any positive knowledge of the effect that the move would have on the socio-economic problems being experienced by apiarists in this State.

The industry that is directly related to honey from salvation jane is worth more than \$300 000 a year to this State and, apart from the money received from salvation jane honey, there is a clear understanding that the pollen picked up by bees when feeding on salvation jane plays an

important part in the health and well-being of the bees. Earlier this afternoon, I took to the Minister of Agriculture a deputation of persons from the Commercial Apiarists Association and the Apiary Association of South Australia, and representatives of this State's packing industry. We were able to tell the Minister that a major problem still existed in relation to the decision taken and its effect on South Australia's apiary industry. The Minister has undertaken to make available some background material to members of the apiary industry, and I am aware, from the discussions that ensued, that members of the industry in this State and indeed across the whole of Australia are taking legal advice at the highest level to safeguard their industry.

One must place on record the real difficulty that will be experienced by members of the industry in South Australia. If biological control becomes a complete control (that may not seem likely, although the evidence available from C.S.I.R.O. and other sources is not that it will not be a complete control), the South Australian industry could be completely destroyed. There is an insufficient supply of honey or nectar from the other natural flowers associated with the South Australian environment. In some years, eucalypts do not flower and the honey return is negative.

The intrusion of aphid in relation to lucerne production has had a deleterious effect on honey production from that species of flora, and salvation jane, being a stable background to the whole apiary industry, requires serious consideration by the Government. I say "serious" in the sense that, if no long-term provision is made to assist members of the industry who lose their right to continue in the vocation that they have held for many years, it must become a Government responsibility to relocate and retrain these people, or in some way to look to the socio-economic requirements of these people and their families.

It is evident that, until now, no such consideration has been given to the likely effects on the apiary industry. It is hoped that the industry will be able to survive and that, in surviving, it will not require Government assistance. However, it is a hit-and-miss situation, and certainly it did the Government no good to go to the agricultural decision-making body and give its support to biological control without knowing the full consequences of that action.

I was interested in the discussion earlier today of the economic problems that face South Australia. This difficulty has become more and more apparent as time has passed. It is refreshing to note that a number of industries and indeed some Cabinet Ministers in this State have been willing recently to highlight one of the major blights on recovery in South Australia. I refer to the high cost of providing penalty rates for many of the service industries in the State. I was heartened to see the following report on page 18 of the August 1978 *South Australian Hotel Gazette*:

Ever-increasing penalty rates were this month likened to a "cancerous growth" by a Full Bench of the South Australian Industrial Commission. Dealing with a claim for cumulative shift allowances and penalty rates by a group of employees (not associated with the hotel industry), the Full Bench said:

"We must say that as a matter of basic concept we regard contemporary trends towards seeking ever-escalating penalty rates and premiums with considerable concern. It may well be argued that they are akin to a cancerous growth which in the long term could be counter-productive to the employment and economic well-being of employees generally—particularly as common sense suggests that they are likely steadily to render Australian industry less and less competitive."

The bench said if the claimed provision applied to the

present employees who already enjoyed extremely generous leave privileges, the result would be totally unjustifiable and incongruous.

This does not relate directly to the hotel industry, although it could apply equally to it. The fact is that it was picked up by that organisation's journal and highlighted, and that it has subsequently been the reason for the preparation of a Federal paper by the Australian Hotels Association is most interesting and pertinent. A document entitled "Penalty rates in the hotel industry", which is a position paper, is available from the Federal and State bodies. It refers to the real difficulties that exist in industry today, more specifically, in its industry. It refers to the problem to which the Premier and other Ministers have been alluding recently, namely, that, if we are to make a recovery, we must provide to the community a service for which it is able to pay.

I was even more interested to see volume 15, No. 5, of the Railways of Australia publication *Network*, the June 1978 issue of which asked the question, "Who's the boss?"

Many people have a misconception of who is the boss. There is only one boss and no matter what your particular skill, trade or profession is the boss remains the same—the customer. He is the person who buys your product, he is the person who keeps you in business and consequently he is the person who pays your salary or wage, buys your home and/or car, educates your family and, amongst numerous other things—

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

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): The matter I want to raise is the scandalous way in which the Fraser Liberal Government's policies have affected South Australia since that Government came into office in December 1975. I know this is painful for honourable members opposite, because they are the lackeys of the Fraser Liberal Government and during the past 3½ years have done very little, practically nothing, to assist South Australia. Take the Whyalla shipyards as an example. We all know what the Fraser Government did to Whyalla.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. GROOM: In December 1976 it was reported in the *Advertiser* that the Premier warned that Whyalla's future was grim without the shipyards. He told a press conference that he had been unable to get any response from the Federal Government to South Australia's proposals for support for the shipbuilding industry. He said that unlike other countries such as Sweden, whose Government was heavily subsidising its shipyards to continue building ships, the Federal Government appeared to have no proposals to sustain the industry in Australia. The Premier warned in the *News* of October 1976, that 10 000 people would be forced to leave Whyalla upon the closure of the Whyalla shipyards. He put that in a submission to the Federal Government, but we all know how sympathetic the Federal Liberal Government was to Whyalla and the shipyards, because their subsequent actions resulted in a closure of the shipyards, to the detriment of South Australia, including the people of Whyalla.

Take the Redcliff proposal as another example. On 13 June 1978 it was reported in a newspaper that the prospect of the massive project going ahead hinged largely on a meeting of the Loan Council the following week and that the Redcliff proposal was reported to have strong support from the Commonwealth Minister for National Development (Mr. Newman). Evidently, at the Loan Council

meeting the project had the support of the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Anthony), and also of Mr. Lynch. The report in the *News* went on to outline the very attractive investment prospects in Australia as a result of the Redcliff petro-chemical complex. Dow Chemical told the then Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Anthony) that its major hurdle was the approval of infrastructure for the Government of South Australia.

This was put to the Federal Government. These matters had been prepared early in 1978, and that Government had had ample time to study them. The Redcliff proposal would result in a gain in Australia's balance of payments of about \$200 000 000 a year, and that \$90 000 000 each year would flow in taxes and royalties to the Federal and State Governments. In Whyalla it was reported that the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr. Lynch), had indicated clearly to the people of that city that he would support the proposals.

The State Minister of Mines and Energy said in October 1978 that it would be a scandalous waste of the nation's resources if Redcliff was not proceeded with. In a press release dated 14 June 1978, the Prime Minister (and this was before the Loan Council meeting) evidently backed the Redcliff project. At the Loan Council meeting he acted contrary to the advice of the Deputy Prime Minister and Mr. Lynch, and on his own initiative.

He deferred the approval, and we know now the deferral was precisely to enable the Hamer Government to try to catch up with its petro-chemical proposals in Victoria, because very soon after that Loan Council meeting, after paving the way, after lulling the people of South Australia into a false sense of security that he supported the Redcliff petro-chemical complex, in October 1978, a report in the *News* stated that the Federal Government's support was firming behind alternative plans for Victoria. That is how the Fraser Liberal Government looks after the national interests of this country. Mr. Fraser's only motivation to try to pull South Australia backwards is that the Hamer Liberal Government is facing an election and seems likely to be defeated. The Prime Minister is prepared to sacrifice the national interest in the hope of some cheap politicking for Mr. Hamer during his election campaign. On the Whyalla shipyards, Mr. Fraser has directly hit South Australia, and in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical complex he has done his best to subvert the proposal in South Australia, with an announcement about a plant in Victoria that has not even been costed.

That is not all he has done. Take an industry that is vital to South Australia, like the wine industry. What has he done to that? We produce 60 per cent of Australia's wine and 90 per cent of Australia's brandy, and what did he do in the recent Federal Budget in relation to the brandy excise? I know the honourable member for Chaffey is in trouble in his district, because he is a lackey of the Fraser Government. He is trying to soft-peddle it all but the Fraser Government directly hit South Australia with that 85 per cent brandy excise. The excise was designed to hit no State but our own. When approaches were to be made to the Prime Minister about the brandy excise and its effect on South Australia, members opposite said they would boycott the talks. That is the sort of thing that honourable members opposite do for South Australia.

They later joined in as a result of pressure from the press, but their initial reaction was to damn South Australia and to want to boycott the talks. All the predictions about the brandy excise have come true, because brandy consumption in South Australia has dropped about 40 per cent and the grapegrowers allege that they have been deceived by the Minister for Primary

Industry (Mr. Sinclair). That Minister was booed out of Renmark. Leaders of the industry, private enterprise people, were extremely critical of the utterances of Mr. Sinclair. They said he did not know his facts because he gave them figures to show that the brandy consumption had dropped only .7 per cent. The brandy industry produced figures that showed that that was not accurate.

There had been a 44 per cent drop in November 1977 compared to November 1978, and these are the sorts of actions and policies of a 19th century Federal Government. It does not seem to realise that Australia has one national economy, that the States are integrated, and that they all depend on one another. Yet, the Prime Minister has singled out South Australia, with the support of the State Opposition. He has deliberately hit South Australia and members opposite think it is a joke.

Regarding the State unemployment relief scheme, the State Government allocated State money to that scheme. As a result, the Commonwealth Government collected about \$7 000 000 in income tax revenue, not to mention the social security money it saved as a result of about 1 100 people a month not being on the social security. We appealed for some reimbursement from the \$7 000 000 that he would not otherwise have got. Of course, he rejected it, because there was no way this 19th century conservative politician was going to help a Labor Government. The problem is that he is faced with three successful Labor Governments in Australia, namely, those in South Australia, New South Wales and Tasmania. Possibly a fourth one is coming up in Victoria. Mr. Fraser is prepared to try to sacrifice South Australia by sabotaging industry that is rightly ours and acting in a very deceptive way with the support of State colleagues. With the announcement by the State Minister of Mines and Energy today that the chemical complex is going ahead in relation to the feasibility study. These are only some of the things I have selected in relation to how the Federal Liberal Party has hit South Australia. It is a nineteenth century conservative Government that is to be condemned for its actions, especially those in relation to South Australia since 1975.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I want to talk about the mess that the Labor Government is getting South Australia into as a result of its attitude to drugs, and to condemn it for failing to evolve a proper policy on drugs in schools. It is a disgrace that this Government has not evolved a policy on drugs in schools and has simply lumbered schools, parents and teachers with the job that it, as a Government, should be performing.

The problems have been highlighted by extraordinary statements in this House this afternoon by the member for Morphett and the Chief Secretary in response to a responsible action undertaken by the Liberal candidate for Morphett (Mr. John Oswald), when he produced a report—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was all phoney stuff.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. ADAMSON: Let us see whether it is all phoney stuff. First, I refer to the claims of the member for Morphett and the Chief Secretary, both of whom must be feeling rattled indeed. This afternoon the Chief Secretary stated that Mr. Oswald's allegations were made for purely political reasons. That is an interesting technique of the Chief Secretary to try to discredit his opponents. The member for Morphett said that there were misrepresentations in the pamphlet. I refer to the pamphlet and the situation in which the report was first devised. When the report was compiled, the present Liberal candidate for

Morphett was not a candidate for any political Party. He had been an excellent candidate for the Federal Liberal Party in the electorate of Grey, and had come close to winning the seat for the Party. However, at the time that the survey was made last year there was no likelihood of his being the candidate for Morphett. Dr. Peter Heysen was the candidate for Morphett, but unfortunately he has had to retire for family reasons.

Mr. Oswald is a pharmacist who, as a concerned parent and citizen, could see that things were wrong. He tried to investigate facts in order that they might be set right. The material that he is circulating in Morphett is accurate: its accuracy has been borne out. This afternoon the Chief Secretary quoted from the *Advertiser* and referred to school and departmental authorities, saying that there was not much to be concerned about, that they did not think there was much happening in the way of drug peddling in schools. Perhaps it might be instructive to listen to what the students themselves have to say, statements that validate completely the claims by Mr. Oswald. I should like the House to hear what the students have to say. Their comments were reported in the *News* (12 February 1979) and—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you believe everything you read?

Mrs. ADAMSON: It seems that the Chief Secretary believed what he read in the *Advertiser*, but presumably the Minister of Mines and Energy is not going to believe what is printed in the *News* simply because it does not suit his line of argument. One student's comment is reported, as follows:

One student said a classmate had admitted being a user of morphine. One girl in the class of 32 students, aged 15 and 16, claimed she had seen "a deal" of marijuana take place in her class at the school late last year. Another girl said she knew of drug tablets being placed in students' school bags so students could have a free "trip" and possibly try to buy more tablets.

Members interjecting:

Mrs. ADAMSON: The response of the member for Napier indicates that he has mock concern, and obviously "mock" is the operative word, and he has little concern. The report in the *News* continues:

They also said it was hard to determine the extent of illegal drug use. They indicated that at least seven of the 32 students knew of friends who smoked marijuana.

So much for the allegations of the Chief Secretary and the member for Morphett that the Liberal candidate for Morphett was not dealing with the facts. It is clear that he was dealing with facts and, at the time he collected the facts, he was not politically motivated but was performing community service as a pharmacist.

Mr. Keneally: Why didn't he release the information until he became the candidate?

Mrs. ADAMSON: I am glad that the honourable member asked that question. The report was released in response to the present community concern and debate that has been generated by the South Australian Government's appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate these matters. It is appropriate that they should be debated, and the Liberal candidate for Morphett, who will be the next member for Morphett, was performing a useful community service.

Mr. Groom: Why didn't he go to the Commission?

Mrs. ADAMSON: The member for Morphett asks why the Liberal candidate did not go to the Royal Commission. I think that, like so many people in this State, he is completely cynical about the operation of the Commission and the findings it will bring down. I am glad that the member for Morphett is asking such questions, because it

gives me the opportunity to say exactly what I think about the way the Royal Commission is operating in South Australia.

We must not forget that the member for Morphett stated this afternoon that he was totally opposed to the legalisation of marijuana. I congratulate Mr. Oswald on flushing out the member for Morphett, causing him to come out in the open and say what he thinks, which is certainly at variance with what many members of his Party think, notably the Attorney-General, the Hon. Anne Levy, the Hon. Frank Blevins, the Hon. Chris Sumner and many others.

The reason why the Labor Party does not have a policy on drugs that it can implement in schools is that it is hopelessly divided on this issue. One has only to go back in history to see why. It is as much divided about drugs as it is about uranium. On the front page of the *Advertiser* on 15 June 1976, under the heading "A.L.P. calls for inquiry into legalising 'pot'", the following statement appears:

The State A.L.P. convention yesterday called for an inquiry into whether the use of marijuana should be legalised in South Australia. But the debate indicated that prominent A.L.P. politicians are deeply divided on the issue.

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) supporting the call for an inquiry, clashed with the anti-"pot" views expressed by two former Federal Ministers, Mr. Cameron, M.H.R. (Science)—

exhibiting a bit of sense for a change—

and Senator Cavanagh (Police and Customs).

Since then, the Commission has been established and certain A.L.P. politicians have gone to great lengths to be present and make their views known when the Commission has organised its so-called "luncheon discussions" and other seminars.

Mr. Oswald, who is an outstanding candidate with considerable ability and whose integrity is unquestioned, has gone out and investigated the facts and made them known. I emphasise that it is a disgrace that the Labor Government has not implemented a policy on drugs in schools. Simply because it is divided on the issue it has passed the buck to the schools, and lumbered the schools and parents with problems it does not want to face. I refer to *Schools and Drugs, Some Guidelines*, released by the Education Department of South Australia, which states:

Each school is encouraged to develop its own drug policy in consultation with staff, students and parents, and to communicate its resolutions to the whole school community. It is absolutely disgraceful that the Labor Government should just pass the buck like that. It is wrong that a child—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's complete misrepresentation of—

Mrs. ADAMSON: There is no misrepresentation. I am quoting directly from the booklet and saying that it is wrong that a child at Christies Beach should be treated any differently from a child at Morialta or Gilles Plains. The Government is responsible to see that all children are treated the same. It is wrong that children should be treated differently in relation to drugs according to where they live in South Australia.

It is criminal that the Government has allowed this to happen. At the back of the booklet are guidelines, and this statement is made:

These guidelines are not included for direct adoption.

In other words, you can do what you like: "We're not going to tell you what to do, mainly because we cannot tell you what to do".

Dr. Eastick: They're too scared.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Exactly. The booklet states:

Each instance of drug possession or abuse will be

considered individually and independently according to the given set of circumstances at the time.

The booklet does not even say that the parents or the police must be advised if a student is found in possession of illegal drugs.

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

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): First, I want to say that we are all somewhat stunned on this side of the House by an announcement made this afternoon. With a Government such as we have in this State, we are stunned most of the time. The Deputy Premier has said that the Government is to go ahead with Mr. Virgo's pet little project, NEAPTR. This is an incredible situation, because in the House only last Thursday, I asked the Deputy Premier, as Minister for the Environment, the following question:

Will the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government will release to the public the assessment on the NEAPTR scheme prepared by the projects and assessment division of the Environment Department? If it will, when, and if it will not, why not?

In replying, the Minister said:

The answer is "Yes", it will be released when it is completed. The situation is that the position in relation to the final e.i.s. and assessment will be no different from that in the case of the Morphettville bus depot. It will be released by the Minister of Transport. I do not know when that will be, but it will certainly be released.

Today, we heard on the television news that the Minister had decided to go ahead with the project. I challenge the Minister for the Environment to release the assessment immediately. I believe that the public of South Australia deserves to know just what effect, if any (and I believe that it will have a great deal of effect), NEAPTR will have on the City of Adelaide, on the park lands particularly, and on the Torrens River. As this is an important matter, I believe that the people of South Australia should know exactly what is happening.

In addition, I also challenge the Minister to release the Hassell and Partners Report. This is an interesting situation, because this report was produced at the request of the Minister for the Environment. It was prepared by Hassell and Partners, and the draft report was sent to the Environment Department to be considered as part of its final assessment. I challenge the Minister to make that report public, too, bearing in mind that a committee was set up by the Minister to consider the possible effects that a scheme such as NEAPTR might have on the Torrens River and on the city area itself. I challenge the Minister to release both reports immediately. I will have more to say about that matter later, and I know that my colleague, the shadow Minister of Transport, will also touch on that subject.

Another matter I refer to, having referred to it previously (although it has done me no good), is my concern, which, I believe, is shared by many of my colleagues, about replies we are being given to our questions and, indeed, to correspondence generally by this Government. As I have said many times, this Government boasts of being an open Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WOTTON: It is rubbish. If the Government practised what it preached, the people of South Australia would know what was going on in this State, instead of being hoodwinked. I make special reference to this matter, which relates not only to questions asked in the House, but also to correspondence. I do not know about other members, but in my own case I have waited up to three or four months for replies from Ministers to

questions relating to electoral matters and other matters affecting the State generally. It is not good enough. The Government is very cunning, because it hopes that any challenge brought up by way of question or correspondence to a Minister might disappear during the time it takes him to organise a reply through his department. He holds on to it as long as he wishes, hoping that everything will be all right. However, that is not the result.

My concern relates particularly to the Environment Department and matters pertaining to it. The Government's attention to important matters that may degrade the environment in South Australia in years to come appears to be minimal. That is obvious, considering the replies we are receiving from the Minister for the Environment. Last week, in answer to 30 Questions on Notice, I think I can honestly say that only about five of the 30 replies supplied constructive information, which is exactly what I was trying to seek from the Minister. Let him dispute that and say that I am being politically minded in asking these questions and seeking information on behalf of South Australians. This Government promotes the concept of open Government, but let us have a look at some of the replies I received to some of my questions. The first question related to national parks, and I asked:

Will management plans for specific parks be drawn up by the National Parks and Wildlife Division, and approved for those parks, before any more trusts are proclaimed to manage such parks and, if not, why not?

The answer I received was "No". The preparation of management plans for South Australia's system of 197 conservation parks, national parks and reserves is being shockingly neglected at present. The National Parks and Wildlife Act was passed in 1972, and one of its prime objectives was to formulate management plans for conservation and recreational parks and game reserves. So far, only four plans have been prepared, and only two of these have been approved—two out of 197. Not one member would fail to recognise the importance of proper supervision and management of this State's national parks. Another matter to which I refer (and I have referred to it several times) is that of feral goats and the need for the Government to look positively at the problems these animals are causing, particularly in the northern parts of the State. The population explosion of feral goats in that area is receiving scant attention, if any at all, by the Environment Department. The Government is procrastinating, and it is completely irresponsible in the way in which it is looking at this subject. I could go on to deal with matters concerning gulf pollution, and Aboriginal and historic relics. When I raised the matter of my concern and that of many other people in the State in regard to Adelaide's water supply, I was told that there were no problems. All I received from the Minister was personal abuse. A Question on Notice I asked was as follows:

Have ways and means of limiting the formation of chloro-organics been discovered?

The reply I received was "No", yet the Minister has the audacity to tell the people of South Australia that they do not have anything to worry about so far as Adelaide's water supply is concerned, that it is all under control. Then he comes out and says that there is no solution to this problem whatever. I could go on and on.

This week I received one answer out of 30 questions placed on notice. Of those 30 questions, 28 related to environment matters, and two to community welfare. I received one answer relating to a community welfare matter, but not one question out of 28 was answered about matters relating to the environment in this State. That shows how much concern the Minister has for the environment in this State.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to speak in the debate at this stage. I was under the impression it was going to be about two hours before I had this opportunity. I will take up, first, the subject touched on by the shadow Minister for the Environment. I can appreciate his concern about the NEAPTR announcement made this afternoon. I think the Minister demonstrated again today just how arrogant he is towards the public he professes to serve.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Is the Liberal Party opposed to it, supporting it, or having two bob each way?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Liberal Party has made its position quite clear. For the benefit of the Minister, who seeks to know our attitude, it just so happens that I have on my desk this evening a paper which outlines the official Liberal Party attitude towards this project. It gives me great pleasure to refer to that paper. We believe that the provision of a rapid transit service to the north-eastern suburbs is indeed acceptable and should provide the type of service that those people require. We believe (in fact we said on 1 June 1978) that this matter ought to be treated as a matter of urgency.

We went on to say following lengthy discussions on this subject, that while the actual route of the transit corridor at that time was the sole responsibility of the State Government an early decision was necessary in order to stop the confusion that was occurring in the community. We believe that unnecessary divisions were caused in the community as a result of the Government's procrastination about the guidelines for that project.

During the so-called six-week public participation period, considerable bitterness existed. Indeed, the Premier, whether taking leave of his senses, or just leave of his role as Leader of the Party (or whether it was just as a result of his political ambitions within the District of Norwood), sought to make a release of his own. We made it patently clear that, if the Government could find the money (and we doubted that it could) and decided to proceed with that scheme, we were deeply concerned about the impact that it would have on the city of Adelaide and its environs.

As the shadow Minister has already told the House tonight, we were deeply concerned about the impact that this project would have on our park lands. Furthermore, we were bitterly opposed, and still are, to the introduction of tram tracks in King William Street. Indeed, to this time we have not been furnished with sufficient evidence to demonstrate that there is a need to connect the commuters from the north-eastern suburbs with a tram link to Glenelg. There has been no evidence put forward to indicate that the people from that outer north-eastern area are at all interested in being connected to a service link through to Glenelg. Unless there is a need that can be clearly demonstrated, then indeed we do not hold that it is valid to proceed in that direction, quite apart from the environmental impact on the city centre and quite apart from the destruction of King William Street in particular.

At no time has evidence been brought to our attention indicating any justification for extending a north-eastern suburban link through the city centre and connecting it with Glenelg. We are failing miserably to make full use of our existing railway station premises. Indeed, we are ignoring that grand establishment adjacent to the city centre and failing to utilise it to its full extent, and we are proposing, with the Minister's announcement today, to go right past that facility and up the centre of King William

Street, harassing the existing population and traffic in that thoroughfare.

Those remarks are made directly in reply to the challenge thrown out by the Minister of Mines and Energy, although not too many mines nowadays because he does not support the only useful mining enterprise in the country. Let me pursue that line for a moment: here we have a Government that is motherless broke and floundering to know where its next dollar is coming from. In fact, the whole debate today revolves around the Government's effort to seek approval from this Parliament for more funds in order to keep going, at this relatively early stage in the financial year. Quite apart from its Budget for the full financial year, the Government is crying out for more funds in February.

There are several areas from which a Government can get money in order to continue services. It can borrow (and we know how good this Government is at borrowing); it can cut services in order to allay the need for funds; it can increase taxes to a level where it gains sufficient revenue to cover those services; it can sell off a paddock, as it did a year or two ago when it sold the railways to the Federal Government; or it can call on its own natural resources. Surely, in today's economic climate, it is sensible to pursue the latter and dig up some of those resources which it owns and to which it has immediate access.

I know the Government has a problem, facing an element within its Party that is trying to muster the numbers to dominate and control that Party. I refer to the Attorney-General in particular and his left-wing supporters. I know it has a problem, and that has been clearly demonstrated in recent weeks. In the meantime, the Government chooses to lay aside the opportunity to capitalise on that natural resource, and it continues to tax, introduce licensing systems and set patterns for the purpose of extracting more and more money from the public and exhausting the community. In fact, as was said earlier this afternoon in Question Time, the Government is driving from our community to other States some of our long-term and well-established industries, and failing to come forward with any attractive policies in order to retain industries, let alone bring back those that have gone. It has failed to make any effort to retain those people who are hanging on here, many of whom are wondering whether they can exist any longer.

Returning to NEAPTR scheme, I was disturbed to find that yet again the Minister chose this venue to announce that it is a goer as far as the Government is concerned. This afternoon the Minister of Transport completely ignored the undertaking given last week by his colleague the Minister for the Environment, who said, in answer to my colleague, that he would publicly release the assessment produced by his Assessment and Project Division. Neither the Opposition in this place nor any member of the public was given the courtesy of observing, let alone commenting on, that statement. I understand that it was intended to release that statement simultaneously with the report.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): At the outset of this grievance debate I want to support the comments of my colleague the member for Mount Gambier about raw sewage. It is a great pity, after we have heard so much this week about protecting the environment and looking after all those things dear to us, that this blatant ruination is occurring in Mount Gambier. The Government has been able to find

money at the drop of a hat to fund certain things, yet we are seeing the environment interfered with and polluted at Mount Gambier. I support the member for Mount Gambier in his plea this afternoon for some action to be taken to preserve that part of the State which is now suffering.

Speaking about the South-East, I remind the Minister of the move in the area to join another State. If the gentleman concerned (I think his name is Potts) gets his way, then Mr. Allison and I could well be serving in our last Parliament. Some people in the South East do not quarrel very much with what Mr. Potts has to say. Indeed, I myself remember saying some time ago that we would be better off in Victoria.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I think it is extraordinary the way you go from sewage to Potts.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister's genius never fails to amaze me. Certain people in the South-East look upon the scheme to break away from this State as a means of getting themselves off the hook with regard to succession duties. The Government cannot be insensitive to the ramifications and ravages of capital taxation. The South Australian Government is the only Government in the Commonwealth that is out of step on this question. People are leaving the State for this very reason, and this is evident in my district, as well as in those of the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Mallee. It is with great regret that these people are leaving South Australia.

Referring now to the Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill recently assented to, I cite two cases that have been brought to my attention (and I know there are others) where, because of the high capital value involved, purchasers have not been able to buy quite sizeable properties as a whole, so these properties have been subdivided. One of the two properties I am talking about was sold in the middle of last year and the other one in about August. One property was freehold, and the other was one where the right-of-purchase option has been effected. One of the vendors has bought a property on the New South Wales border and the other a property in Northern Queensland at a place called Moura. The dates for settlement had been set at, I think, 1 March and 9 March respectively. Because of the guidelines set down (and we have no appropriate regulations under the Planning and Development Act) relating to the subdivision of land in excess of 50 hectares (and this matter involved an amendment in another place), approval is vested in the authority of local government.

Once local government has received the application, it is obliged to send, within two calendar months, the papers of transfer to the Director of Planning, who can discuss the matter with his officers, and at the end of the two months the council can accept the opinions of the planner or agree to the subdivision. Both the vendors concerned have had to obtain bridging finance, which is costing them \$5 000 each, in order to meet the obligations on the properties they have purchased in New South Wales and Queensland. I am sure that when this amendment was agreed to it was not foreseen that this sort of expenditure would have been foisted upon such people when they sold their land. I hope the Government will pay due regard to the anomaly facing these people, especially as the \$5 000 that these people have to find is no small amount. They have paid quite sizeable deposits on their new properties; having made a firm offer to purchase, they have had to honour those offers.

It is no fault of theirs that this anomaly has crept into the Planning and Development Act. With the final decision resting with the local government authority, I wonder what decisions it will make or what it will do in the two-

month period, because it does not matter very much what examinations are carried out. It appears to be an extreme waste of time for the planning authorities and others to whom matters involving these broad acres are referred.

People are leaving this State because of this Government and its lack of ability to recognise the iniquities attached to capital taxation. In the two cases I have mentioned, \$5 000 is being paid for the privilege. The Government is not getting any benefit out of that. That benefit is gained by the usurers, the people who provide the bridging finance.

I am sure the Minister of Education would not be unmindful of what these people are putting up with, and I hope that he will discuss this aspect of the matter. I do not expect that he would have foreseen it, nor would any other member of the Government or the people in another place. The matter arose as a result of a conference. The amendment looked to be a good one. In practice, however, it is costing these people valuable funds that would be of great benefit to them in setting up in their new State.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): We have listened tonight to the member for Morphett firing the first shot in his campaign to become one of the new Ministers when the elderly gentlemen are pushed aside. If, as a Minister, he gets as confused as he did tonight, he will not last long.

Mr. Rodda: They are not pushing them aside.

Mr. GUNN: I understand the Ministers were given their marching orders this week. I suggest that the member for Morphett should go to the Parliamentary Library and read a speech made by Mr. Nixon a couple of years ago, clearly indicating how many shipyards the member's colleague Charlie Jones had closed—one at Port Adelaide and two in Queensland—and the policy that he put into effect that brought about the closure of the Whyalla shipyard. Nothing the honourable member can say can justify the nonsense he has gone on with. He has been a victim of the nonsense peddled by Mr. Wallis. The member for Whyalla, of course, has been in his usual slumber and has said nothing. The member for Morphett should look at what the Labor Government Treasurer did to the wine industry. He seems to have forgotten that. It suits him to have a short memory, but if he goes to the Parliamentary Library and checks the facts he will not make such a fool of himself.

I am sorry that the member for Whyalla is not in the Chamber tonight, and also that the member for Stuart is not here. Aided by the Hon. Mr. Blevins and by Mr. Wallis, those members have deserted their constituents in the northern part of South Australia. By their strict adherence to Labor Party doctrinaire philosophy they have deserted the people who have shown great interest in the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in that part of South Australia. The people want to see the Roxby Downs development take place and the associated facilities built in the iron triangle.

Obviously, the members I have mentioned have taken the side of the Attorney-General. Mr. Blevins was one of those who organised a meeting, stabbing the Premier in the back while he was overseas trying to sell one of the largest potential mining developments in the history of this country. The member for Whyalla, of course, would know nothing about it, but the member for Stuart would not have been far away. He is a prominent member of the left wing of the Party.

The Deputy Leader indicated how the Minister of Mines and Energy went overseas a few years ago endeavouring to sell the project of a uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff. The Premier had a report prepared in the Trade and

Development Division of his department. He released in September 1976 a report headed "South Australian uranium enrichment—Premier's Department", and the report went to great lengths setting out the advantages of having such a plant in the iron triangle or at Redcliff. The Minister hawked this all around the world, trying to get someone interested. Even at that time, the potential of Roxby Downs was obvious.

It is an indictment of all the members representing the area that they have failed to support the wishes of their constituents and to support publicly the Western Mining Company and the other groups that would have to be called in to develop the huge Roxby Downs deposit. It is obvious from their silence that they are feeling guilty; otherwise, they would have been making some clear statements. We have heard nothing from the member for Stuart, who is always asking Dorothy Dix questions. The member for Whyalla is not noted for saying a great deal. Mr. Wallis is always blaming someone else, especially the Federal Government, but on this issue he has been silent. In the interests of the people they represent and of South Australia, it is about time they supported their constituents. The Mayor of Whyalla—

Mr. Groom: What have you done?

Mr. GUNN: The project has my complete support. I would develop the Roxby Downs project, and I believe that, in the interests of this State, we should have a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. We mined uranium at Radium Hill for about 20 years. We processed it, it did no harm, and no-one worried. The left-wingers want to deny the Western world this energy resource, and so we have had all this nonsense. It is all right for their leftist friends in other parts of the world to develop these processes, but they do not want it in the Western world.

In the last few weeks, no logical concrete proposal has been put forward to justify the ban, except that it is Labor doctrinaire policy. They did a tremendous back-flip to try to make things difficult for the Fraser Government, because they could not accept that the people of Australia, on two occasions, had completely rejected them. The people would have nothing to do with the nonsense put into effect by the Federal Labor Government between 1972 and 1975. They have set out on this campaign of obstruction against the Fraser Government. There is no doubt that Whitlam and Connor were going to sell uranium. The Minister of Education announced that he was going to have a feasibility study carried out for a uranium plant at Port Pirie. I commend him for supporting the Roxby Downs project, as he did the other day.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Come on!

Mr. GUNN: I have not seen it corrected anywhere.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: The Minister of Mines and Energy corrected it.

Mr. GUNN: He says so much that no-one believes him. Until this evening, the Minister of Education has not corrected that headline. If he wants to hold South Australia back, he is welcome to do it. If this Government does not have the courage to do what is right for South Australia, it will be rejected by the South Australian people.

No Government can say to the people of South Australia, particularly when it has the highest rate of unemployment, that we can do without our mineral resources. After all, we have virtually only our rural industries to support us, and, although we have had droughts, the Government has not been nice to South Australia's farmers. The Government cannot continue saying what it has said about a project that will cost \$1 000 000 000 to develop. It cannot say, because of left-wing ideology, that minerals in one of the greatest areas of

mineralisation will have to stay in the ground. That is just not on!

If this Government does not give Western Mining Corporation the go-ahead so that it can attract outside capital to build this tremendous structure, it will have to fall. The sooner that happens the better it will be, because South Australia cannot afford to let this project go or to hear the sort of nonsense that is being put forward regarding this matter. The member for Morphett, instead of peddling a lot of nonsense, should examine the long-term effects that this sort of policy is having on employment opportunities and on the welfare of every citizen in this State. We cannot afford not to have over \$1 000 000 000 injected into this State's economy. Of course, the mineral royalties that would flow to this State would help us to get on the right track. One has merely to look to Western Australia and Queensland to see—

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

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I should like to read to the House a letter that the Premier sent to the Chairmen of Community Councils for Social Development throughout the State, as follows:

I am writing to advise you of decisions taken recently by the South Australian Government regarding community development. These follow the consideration of the report of the Committee on Community Development and Assistance and the subsequent public submissions on the recommendations of that report.

I attach for your information a statement in which the main aspects of the new arrangements are set out. These include the transfer of Ministerial responsibility for existing Community Councils for Social Development, the decision to establish community development councils over the next two years, the creation of a grants fund on community development, and the setting up of a forum on community development.

The Minister of Community Development will be contacting you at an early date regarding the establishment of community development councils and new arrangements at the State level in the community development area. The Government views these changes as a process of evolution which will build upon the significant achievements of community councils for social development.

The decisions have been reached after a lengthy process which has allowed all interested parties to contribute their views. They reflect the importance with which the Government views the whole area of community development. They also demonstrate the desire of the Government to encourage local government to participate fully in the deliberations of community development councils and to contribute their perspectives and detailed local knowledge. Most importantly, it underscores the appreciation of the Government for the enthusiasm and effectiveness of existing community councils and its determination that their contribution should be strengthened.

The Premier referred therein to a report of the Committee on Community Development and Assistance. I support the work done by community councils, provided that they do not ride roughshod over local government. During 1972-75, the Whitlam Government wished to formulate certain policies for Australia, and the State Government is now trying to implement some of those policies. I should like to read the following from the report, entitled "Committee on Community Development and Assistance", to which the Premier referred:

At the national level, the Whitlam Government, 1972-75, recognised that, with post-war expansion of State and Federal Government functions, the relative importance of

local government had been allowed to decline. It instituted policies to revitalise local government and encouraged it to reappraise its role in Australian society. Funds were provided through the Federal Grants Commission and, in addition, there was a range of new specific purpose grants. These developments added to the status and confidence of local government and directed it into new areas.

Mr. Hemmings: Don't you agree that that's true?

Mr. RUSSACK: I will give credit to that Government, because today we get funds direct from the Federal Government that are administered and processed differently. The report also states:

Local government is electorally responsible to its community. Local government authorities were established by legislation in this State as organisations to identify local needs and tax local residents in order to provide services to meet these needs. Throughout its history local government has provided, or made possible, services which could be characterised as community development. Like other governments, local government has become increasingly concerned with the social needs of the community.

So, one sees from that report that the Government has taken a new initiative and is trying to revitalise community services through the new Community Development Department. The report refers on page 29 to regionalisation of bodies, as follows:

As a result of the Whitlam Government's policies, local government authorities throughout Australia were encouraged to organise themselves into regional groupings and to work and plan together on a regional basis. Under the 1972 Federal Grants Commission Act, local authorities were required to group together as Regional Organisations of Councils for the purpose of receiving Federal finance.

However, we know that the ultimate aim was that those regions would become administrative regions and that democratic representation of those areas would disappear. They would be administered by a central Government.

Mr. Hemmings: Come off it. The constitution of the regions prevented that.

Mr. RUSSACK: No. However, I challenge the Government regarding this matter. A move could be afoot to downgrade the status of local government in South Australia to the advantage of the new Community Councils for Social Development. I say that because the immediate past Director of Local Government has, as the Minister of Local Government said last week, been transferred and is now Director of the Community Development Department.

Earlier, during last year's part of this session, a private member's Bill was introduced in this place. Had that Bill passed, local government would have been recognised in South Australia's Constitution. The Government did not vote against the Bill, but said, "Let us wait until next session and see what we will do about it." I venture to suggest that it is possible that that acknowledgement will not be forthcoming, because of certain changes that are now occurring.

Also, in last year's part of the session, the Minister of Local Government took advantage of a private member's Bill to include measures that he knew might not be acceptable to the Opposition. The Minister could well have introduced a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, which amending Bill could have been independent of the private member's Bill, to give regions more ability to have joint undertakings. I am not opposed to joint undertakings, as provided for in Part XIX of the Local Government Act. Indeed, even now it may be all right. However, I warn local government that, as the Premier said, the evolution of the present system must be carefully watched.

Time prevents me from developing this point as I would like. However, last Thursday, when I asked the Minister a question in this regard, he became abusive and did not give me an answer. I had intimated that a major move could be imminent in South Australia in local government.

Mr. Hemmings: You are not going to read from the *News*, are you?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am, because there could be an element of truth in the report, which states:

In a minor associated reshuffle the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, is expected to give the Recreation portfolio to the Community Development Minister, Mr. Bannon.

The handing of recreation and local government to Community Development Minister, Mr. Bannon, is seen as a natural move with all three portfolios connected with one another.

The report mentions that there should be a committee of Ministers and the Ministers mentioned are the Minister of Local Government, the Minister of Community Welfare, and the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Parts of the portfolio of the Minister of Community Welfare have been transferred to the Minister of Community Development. The only other one would be the Minister of Health.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I get very annoyed on occasions such as this when the super-hypocrite of public spending is not in the Chamber. I refer to the member for Mitcham. He came in this afternoon at 2 o'clock. We have not seen him after he received his answers to Questions on Notice, and he is not in the Chamber this evening.

Mr. Venning: He has got marked off.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. I call him the super-hypocrite of public spending because I get annoyed when people take the opportunity to abuse their Parliamentary colleagues as this member has. Before I read a letter that I received from him today, I inform members that this person who claims that he is the protector of public spending has always taken the opportunity to use the advantages provided by the Government through the privilege of being a member.

The South Australian Housing Trust recently held a seminar for electorate secretaries and most members allowed their secretaries to attend. For some unknown reason, the member for Mitcham was able to have not only his secretary attend but also one other person. Two people were representing the member for Mitcham, taking advantage of the generosity of the South Australian Housing Trust.

Prior to that, the Social Securities Department also organised a seminar for the electorate secretaries. Again, most members' secretaries went along, but the member for Mitcham was represented by three people, again taking advantage of the generosity that was extended to members of Parliament. How this person can write this sort of letter to me and make the attack that he has made on members of Parliament in the past few months indicates that he is a super-hypocrite, because I believe he still has to answer a question to this House. The question is:

Is it honest for members of Parliament to absent themselves from sittings of the House to earn a private income?

I was annoyed when I received his letter dated 12 February. It starts "Dear Heini". Normally, he begins "My dear Heinrich", so I must be in favour with him at the moment. The letter states:

I was pleased to have your support, and that of most of your Party, for Peter Blacker and me on Wednesday and our motion to have repealed the Parliamentary Superannuation

Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1978. I must admit though that at the time I thought it was given rather grudgingly. However, I am prepared to take the support at face value, to accept that it was quite genuine and that you have had a change of heart since you supported so strongly the increases last November.

Indeed, I am encouraged by the support we had to ask you, as a mark of your sincerity, to reconsider your refusal, so far, to renounce the benefit of the Act. I propose to raise the matter again and I think it would show others that those 15 of us who now want the matter reviewed are genuine in our desire that the increases given under the amendment should not stand. Are you therefore now prepared to renounce? I have written similarly to all members of the Liberal Party who supported us.

Yours sincerely,

ROBIN MILLHOUSE,
State Parliamentary Leader
of the Australian Democrats.

That will have to go down in my memoirs as one of the greatest letters I have ever received from the member for Mitcham.

Dr. Eastick: The answer is "No", is it?

Mr. BECKER: There is no way that I will renounce it. I am prepared to let him debate the issue and I would support any members' rights to raise the matter if they wish. As one who has been a white-collar worker and represented the members of the organisation through their union, I believe everybody is entitled to superannuation benefits. They contribute to those benefits and therefore they are entitled to them. It is all very well for the member for Mitcham to want to—

The SPEAKER: I am pleased that the honourable member has linked up his remarks.

Mr. BECKER: It is all very well for the member for Mitcham to want to renounce the superannuation benefits now that he has served the maximum term. There is a system in operation in other States where, after a member has served his maximum term, his contribution to the superannuation fund is reduced by half. He wants a review, because he can see a saving for himself of about another \$1 000 a year.

However, there are far more important matters concerning the people of South Australia, and the one I am greatly concerned about is the effect of the Instant Money Game. I asked the question of the Premier as follows:

Has the Government considered an investigation into the social complications of the Lotteries Commission Instant Money Game and, if not, why not? Will such inquiry be established forthwith?

In reply today, the Premier said:

Limited investigations have already been made into the social implications of the Lotteries Commission's Instant Money Game. During the first few weeks, there was a very high demand for the Instant Money Game but this was offset by a 35 per cent to 40 per cent reduction in sales of conventional lottery tickets. The demand for Instant Money Game tickets has now reduced to about half of that of the first few weeks. Looking at these trends, it would seem that many people would have invested their money in another form of lottery had the new game not been introduced.

During the initial period of this lottery, many small prize winners reinvested their winnings. Indications are that there is now a growing tendency for these prizes to be collected. It would appear that the novelty of the game is waning. A study of similar lotteries introduced in the United Kingdom in recent years indicated that a similar pattern occurred there in the early stages. There is no evidence of adverse social effects in relation to the United Kingdom lotteries.

On 21 December I wrote to the Premier, suggesting that portion of the proceeds from the Lotteries Commission Instant Money Game be made available to voluntary health and welfare organisations. I was a little disappointed to receive the reply from the Acting Premier and Treasurer in which he stated:

The State Lotteries Act provides that not less than 60 per cent of the value of all lottery tickets sold by the Commission must be offered as prizes. After allowing for the Commission's administration costs, the remaining revenue is transferred to the Hospitals Fund for the purposes of developing, maintaining and improving the State's public hospitals. In 1977-78, almost \$7 000 000 was transferred to the Fund by the Commission and, since commencing operations in 1967, it has contributed over \$34 000 000.

This contribution from the Lotteries Commission has lessened the call on general revenue and has made it possible to provide more funds from general revenue for other areas of expenditure within the Minister of Health's portfolio. In 1977-78, for instance, a total of \$13 600 000 was paid to voluntary health and welfare organisations by the Hospitals Department.

The Government believes that, in current circumstances, the overall allocation of funds to the various functions associated with the delivery of health services is appropriate.

I do not agree with that. Many small health and welfare organisations are seeking assistance from time to time from the Health Commission and at present they are not receiving that support. I would have thought that, with the success of the Instant Money Game (some 23 series have been sold) with a turnover of between \$11 000 000 and \$11 500 000, which would give the Lotteries Commission about \$3 500 000 profit, that money I believe would be transferred directly to the Hospitals Fund. As we all know, the Hospital Fund is an account which receives surplus moneys from the T.A.B. on-course statutory deductions, unclaimed dividends, and the transfer of fractions.

Racing clubs put in their own unclaimed dividends. Then we get the profits from the Lotteries Commission, unclaimed prizes, and the stamp duty on insurance policies relating to motor vehicles. That money is then paid directly into general revenue. It does not go directly to hospitals or to health and welfare organisations. On 10 November the Minister of Health explained to me the four main categories concerning grants to smaller organisations, non-recognised hospitals, and the like. I was perturbed about what he said in his letter to me of 10 November, which states:

Grants made to the smaller voluntary organisations are generally aimed to allowing the organisation to overcome any immediate financial problems or to re-establish itself on a financially viable basis. It is not commission policy to recommend the payment of regular annual grants to this class of organisation.

This is the area on which the public depends for much help and guidance for various organisations. The Asthma Foundation received no assistance, and the Diabetic Association received \$1 000 last year and the same amount this year. The Multiple Sclerosis Association did not receive any benefit. Other organisations outlined in the Auditor-General's Report received some small amounts of funds. However, that is not good enough, and the Government is now in a financial position to fund all the health and welfare organisations as a means of preparing and helping the community to overcome the problems and encourage preventive medicine.

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

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): In taking part in this debate,

I desire to express my views about uranium. That matter was raised last week, and I believe it is an issue that provided some hope for development and future expansion of South Australia's industrial standing. I am concerned, because I do not think there has ever been a period in South Australia's history when the industrial sector has been so depressed.

True, if depression were a mark of stature or an indicator of a State's position, then South Australia would be tops. We are now in a position where no-one has any confidence. The industrial sector had that one ray of hope on its horizon. Roxby Downs was the project that provided the opportunity for jobs and expansion, and in general this State would have benefited tremendously.

However, the Government in its wisdom has decided not to proceed. The uranium debate has been emotional. Regardless of what happens, no one person amongst us is technically qualified to provide an answer to all the questions. I have approached this problem with the view that we are in a technical age. Already more than 180 nuclear reactors operate throughout the world and about 430 new nuclear reactors are in various stages of planning or construction.

Mr. Groom: Would you sell uranium to Iran?

Mr. BLACKER: I will qualify this as I go. Because we are in a nuclear age and because we are facing a world energy crisis, no-one can do anything to prevent the use of nuclear reactors. At this stage, we just do not have an alternative. I hope that solar development and other means of harnessing natural forces can come into being. We know that that will have to come in future generations and that even the resources of uranium and plutonium are limited and something has to take their place, but there is no present alternative to nuclear reactors.

Such reactors are in use and no-one can do anything about that. However, the problem arises about how we are to prevent the development of the fast breeder reactor. Government members have been concerned about plutonium, and I, too, am concerned about it. It can be used in a destructive way, it can be used to the disadvantage of the community, and it can be used for blackmail and similar reasons.

However, plutonium, as dangerous as it may be, fades into relative insignificance when compared to the waste from fast breeder reactors. I refer to the chain of events where, in order to obtain the power, we have a nuclear reactor, and the waste from that reactor is plutonium. Some countries can already see that they are unable to obtain ready supplies of uranium and are developing the fast breeder reactor, which takes plutonium waste and further refines it in the generation of power. The waste from that product is the most dangerous substance known to man.

We then have a highly volatile substance that is much more volatile than plutonium could ever be. For this reason I believe that, if we farm out our uranium over as long a period as possible, thereby keeping the nuclear reactors operating for as long as possible, we will restrict the development of the fast breeder reactor.

In reply to the question I asked of him last week, about his concern about development of the fast breeder reactor now being developed in France and the technology that Germany has sold to Brazil, the Premier expressed much concern about the fast breeder reactor. We all share that concern. The Premier said that, because of the action of France and because the transaction with Brazil had already transpired, there was nothing that we could do to influence it.

Perhaps we could not influence that, but at least we could influence the development of other fast breeder

reactors. If our uranium were in stream and could be sold to customer countries, and if we applied whatever provisos were physically possible—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What would they be?

Mr. BLACKER: I said whatever was "physically possible".

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are they?

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't you read instead of asking stupid and inane questions across the Chamber?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have heard many stupid comments across the Chamber. The honourable member for Flinders has the floor.

Mr. BLACKER: Honourable members fail to realise that, by leaving the uranium in the ground, South Australia will hasten the development of the fast breeder reactor. That is the situation I am trying to avoid. It is the situation that every Australian should be trying to avoid.

Mr. Groom: To which countries will you sell the uranium?

Mr. BLACKER: I am not a member of the Uranium Forum or whatever it is called. I hope that our leaders have enough foresight to analyse that. By keeping our uranium in the ground we have already allowed for (and the South Australian Government can take the blame) these fast breeder reactors being developed.

Mr. Groom: To whom would you sell it?

Mr. BLACKER: I am not going to buy into international discussions. Common sense must prevail. If it does not, we are going to have fast breeder reactors and then, whatever the Government says, or whatever any other Government says, will not make a skerrick of difference. This situation is with us. The disposal of plutonium waste (that is, waste from nuclear reactors) is with us.

It has been proven that the waste from nuclear reactors can be held. It has not been proven for how long it can be stored, but it can be stored as an interim measure. The Premier has stated that we are fast approaching the situation where it can be safely stored for all time. That is technological advancement and is something that is taking place. There is nothing that any of us can do about it.

No-one can deny the present situation. If we had developed Roxby Downs, we would have had uranium on stream and we would be helping to avoid the development of the fast breeder reactor, or at least delay it. That is what we are trying to do, and I believe that that should be the responsibility of every citizen. Consequently, it will be not only a benefit to South Australia in terms of jobs, money, or development of South Australia industrially, but it also can play a valuable part in the retarding of fast breeder reactors.

The fast breeder is my concern. Other people have said that we would have problems with a nuclear reactor. Perhaps we would have, but it has been proved over a number of years that those problems can be solved, whereas we have not proved that there is any chance, at this stage, of solving the problems of a fast breeder reactor.

I will make one or two other points, particularly on industrial development in this State. There have been a couple of severe blows in the past week about the future of Redcliff. I hope that Redcliff goes ahead because, if South Australia ever needed development, it needs it now and it needs it quickly. I have always expressed concern for the environment, particularly pollution of the gulf. I have asked questions of the Minister many times about the berthing and dredging that will take place in the gulf. He has assured me that there will be a 51ft. berth in the gulf and that there will be no dredging (and that is mentioned in *Hansard* on two occasions). It is physically impossible to

put a 51ft. berth at Redcliff, because the 51ft. would be in a hole. If one looks at a marine map, one will see why. The deepest water to get into that hole is 30ft.; so, there would need to be 20ft. of dredging to service a 51ft. berth at Redcliff. It is an elementary situation. We have a 51ft. boat sitting in a hole, and we cannot get it out.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I think that the solution to the former problem is to tie hot-air balloons to it and hope that the ship will float out.

I refer to the workmen's compensation premiums paid at the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service. I was drawn to the problem that might exist as a result of reading the Auditor-General's Report for the 1977-78 year. Page 244 of that report indicates that during the period from 1976-77 to 1977-78 there was a 51 per cent increase in the premiums paid. Having gone back through the Auditor-General's Reports, I am convinced of the urgent need for a full investigation of workmen's compensation claims at the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service. The claims have risen by more than 43 times—in other words, a 4 300 per cent increase over the past six years. As a result of investigation, I found out that some workers have been on compensation for periods of several years. In addition, last year a number of employees were overseas, but were still claiming workmen's compensation. I was surprised to hear that, since they were still on the full benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

I have taken the cost of premiums over recent years from the Auditor-General's Report, and I seek leave, Mr. Speaker, to have inserted in *Hansard* a table indicating the year, the cost of the premiums, the percentage increase in those premiums for each year, and the number of employees.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member guarantee that it is purely statistical information?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes.

Leave granted.

COSTS OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Year	Cost of W.C. premiums \$	Per cent increase in premiums	Number of employees
1972-73	8 900	—	310
1973-74	15 000	69	335
1974-75	44 000	193	375
1975-76	126 000	186	450
1976-77	186 000	48	472
1977-78	281 000	51	458
1978-79 (est.)	393 000	41	—

Source: Auditor-General's Reports.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That table shows that, in 1972-73, the cost of premiums was \$8 900. By 1978-79 (the estimate for the current year that has been paid in advance), the premium rate had risen to \$393 000. An increase from \$9 000 to \$393 000 is an incredible increase over only six years. It is interesting to read through the comparable annual increases for each year, taking the 1972-73 year as the base. The increase in 1973-74 was 69 per cent; in 1974-75, it was 193 per cent; in 1975-76, it was 186 per cent; in 1976-77, it was 48 per cent; in 1977-78, it was 51 per cent; and for the current financial year, it is 41 per cent. They are the percentage increases in any one year, and I will return to them shortly.

The obvious argument that will be thrown up by people wanting to try to break down those figures will be that there was a substantial increase in the number of employees. I have taken out those figures as well. The

number of employees in 1972-73 was 310, whereas it has increased in the 1977-78 financial year to 458. There has not been an increase in employees to anywhere near the same extent as we have had in the actual premium rate. Last year alone the premium increased by 51 per cent, or \$95 000, which was noted by the Auditor-General (and I refer specifically to page 244 of his report). Those huge increases are substantially greater than the general increase in workmen's compensation premiums which the Government has claimed is a rip-off by private insurance companies. Here, we are dealing with a Government agency which is paying the premiums and which administers the scheme; it has nothing to do with a private insurance company. We now see that the Government's premiums have been far greater premium increases than have been those by the private insurance companies. The Government had had the hide to call the increase in premiums by private companies, an increase of about 200 per cent to 300 per cent over a four-year period, a rip-off; yet here we see a 4 300 per cent increase over a six-year period by the Government. That highlights the point that, first, the Government's claims against the private sector are unfounded and, secondly, the Government is incapable of administering the scheme. The Premier said that increases in fuel prices on vehicle operating costs and increased workmen's compensation premiums have resulted in additional contingency costs. This is one such area.

It appears that the huge increase in workmen's compensation costs has been caused by, first, poor legislation under the Act and, secondly, inadequate supervision of claims by the Government laundry. The Minister of Labour and Industry has claimed that safety in private industry is inadequate. However, when the cost of workmen's compensation reaches a figure of \$858 a worker each year in a Government factory, safety standards appear to need urgent attention. I ask the Government to investigate this problem immediately. It highlights, first, inadequacies in and failures caused by the Act; and, secondly, a particular problem existing at the Government laundry. No well-run organisation with a relatively static work force could ever justify that kind of increase in premiums, unless there was no supervision of safety or of the claims being made. The evidence I have received of people making claims on workmen's compensation whilst holidaying in Europe and of people being on workmen's compensation for two or three years certainly indicates that there needs to be far greater supervision than there has been hitherto.

Before the Government, particularly the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Premier, throw rocks at private industry as regards workmen's compensation costs, I suggest that they look at their own organisation. I request that the Premier or the Deputy Premier supply to the House a detailed report on why these costs have increased at the Government laundry, saying what action the Government will take to reduce those costs.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): This afternoon, and this evening in my office, I listened with a sinking heart to the comments of my colleagues highlighting the situation in South Australia and what is happening under this Government. It brought back to me that South Australia, during the period it has been under Labor domination, has slipped from being the first State of the Commonwealth to the Cinderella State. That decline can only be laid at the feet of the people sitting opposite. It is a shame, because I believe that some members opposite may have enough common sense to know when things are going all right and when they are not. Unfortunately, those members are

under pressure from trade unions.

Mr. Keneally: The left-wing trade unions.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, the left-wing trade unions, and worse, the Communist inspired trade unions. That is where they get their instructions. It is a shame to think that South Australia is heading in that direction, simply because the Party that was elected to power by the people is not governing; it is the power behind the Government which is dictating its policies today. It is a shame to think that the people of this State have to tolerate that situation any longer.

Much has been said in this debate about the Premier's going overseas recently. I believe that he went away with the idea of coming back with the right message for South Australia. It was interesting to note the remarks of some of the more level-headed members opposite. I refer to the Minister of Education's remarks, reported in an article that appeared in the *News* on 22 January headed "Let's go Roxby—Hopgood".

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I didn't say that: the *News* did.

Mr. VENNING: Well, the article states:

The potential of uranium at Roxby Downs was hailed today by a South Australian Government Minister as a "major, rich mine by any world standards". The discovery at Roxby Downs could provide a much needed revival in the State's mineral industry, the Education Minister and former Mines Minister, Dr. Hopgood, said.

Mr. Wotton: Don't you think the Minister said that?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, I do, and I think he was on the right track. The article continues:

Speaking at the opening of an Australian Drilling Association symposium at Adelaide University, Dr. Hopgood said SA's mineral industry declined after an exploration boom from 1967 to 1973. "However, recent events have altered this gloomy situation at a time when the State again would benefit from a growth industry to combat economic difficulties," he said.

I go along with all that; I reckon it's jolly good stuff. I also read in the paper (I know you cannot believe everything you read in the paper, but I think the article expressed the sentiments of those to whom the article is attributed) an article headed "Dunstan upset by Party's new talks." That article states:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, has told Labor politicians he was disappointed that they attended special uranium meetings while he was overseas.

I believe that is the problem with the Premier today; he is absolutely heart-broken at what happened. He was endeavouring to do the right thing; he had got the message about where the State was drifting; he thought it was the last chance, so he went to Europe with the sole purpose of coming back with the answer that was to be good for South Australia. When he was away he got the message about what was happening back in South Australia and he did a complete U-turn. I said to some of my colleagues when we were talking about this matter one day, "Will you keep me informed about which way he is facing at the present time?", because I had a job keeping up with the U-turns being made by the Premier.

An interesting report, which appeared in the *News* on 25 January headed, "We won't stop it—A.W.U.," states:

The Australian Workers Union believes there is no way of stopping the mining and export of uranium despite opposition from other unions and environmental groups. The union's national secretary, Mr. Frank Mitchell, said this today.

The AWU, with 140 000 members, is Australia's second biggest union. The union, at its annual convention yesterday, reaffirmed its policy of supplying labor for the mining and milling of uranium. Mr. Mitchell said uranium mining

companies were already letting contracts for construction work on uranium mining sites in Australia.

Uranium mining in Australia should get under way in about two years time, he added. The union opposed the export of uranium to countries which had not ratified the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

This morning, the SA secretary, Mr. Allan Begg, said his branch would ignore the Federal attitude until the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, returned from his fact-finding mission.

Members can see that there is a difference of opinion within the union, and it is a shame to think we have such a problem.

Mr. Groom: To whom are we going to sell uranium?

Mr. VENNING: Are you a fast-breeder? We heard the honourable member ask my colleague, the member for Flinders, where he would sell the uranium. I am satisfied from the honourable member's interest that he is, for sure, a fast breeder and I compliment him for that.

I refer now to the situation as I see it in the Iron Triangle. Today I heard my Federal Leader being condemned because of the shipping works closing down at Whyalla. Mention was made about the clothing factory that had taken its place. It was said that here was a golden opportunity for members in those areas to put pressure on the Government to assist it in deciding to assist in the establishment of the works at Redcliff. Those members have not been successful in bringing pressure on their Government colleagues to encourage the establishment of a works there. What organisation, whether national or multi-national, will come to South Australia with all the impositions that are placed on development here. They will go anywhere but to this State.

For a change to take place there must be a change to a Government that has a different philosophy from the present Government. I cannot see anything else for South Australia but disaster in the present situation. The opportunity was presented for both the member for Stuart and the member for Whyalla (ably assisted by the member for Rocky River) to bring about some activity in that area. So much has been said for so long that a lot of people have gone into the area and got mixed up in real estate believing that something would happen in that area.

The member for Flinders said how he had had the wool pulled over his eyes about the depth of water in the gulf. One hears from time to time what the Government plans to do at Port Pirie with new industries across the bridge to nowhere. It goes on and on, this heap of poppycock about what the Government is doing. In reality, it is doing nothing, and if it were not for the primary producers of this State, who are carrying the State's economy, God help South Australia. With the record wheat crop that has been harvested in South Australia—

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glennelg): This State is fast becoming, and indeed is recognised throughout the Commonwealth, as the Cinderella State of Australia. People are leaving this State in great numbers, although the Premier does not and will not admit it. He should admit this fact, because it is true. Businessmen are leaving this State and are establishing in other States. Irrespective of what the Premier says about the Premier of Queensland he has seen fit to buy his own bit of property in Queensland. I was going to Queensland, but that has put me off; I thought if it was good for the Premier of South Australia to go there, then it was no real place for me to settle down in.

This State has the highest unemployment in the Commonwealth of Australia, yet prior to the last election the Government, at great cost, inserted advertisements in

the *Advertiser* stating that in the past two years South Australia had had the lowest level of unemployment in Australia because the Dunstan Government believed in the right to work (that is, provided they join a trade union, because we have compulsory unionism here). The advertisement in question concluded, "We are showing Australia how". Indeed, the South Australian Labor Party is certainly showing Australia how at present!

The Government and the Premier take every opportunity to blame the Federal Government for all these problems. Indeed, they will blame anyone but themselves. However, the blame must lie directly with the socialist Government of this State and its various policies, including its policy on worker participation, which is a warning to businesses of what is to come. If we look at one of the earlier statements on worker participation appearing in the *Advertiser* in 1975, we see:

"The Labor plan for three-tier industrial management could put South Australia in the lead for world industrial development", the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said. "The proposals call for a high level of worker participation and job security in industry. Consideration of the 12-page report occupied the whole of the convention at a morning session, but the recommendations were adopted by 250 delegates with a minimum of debate. Mr. Dunstan went on to say, "All we are doing is adopting here a set of principles. We will experiment in the next three-year programme to see to it that those principles are carried into effect. Then from that situation we will be in a position to propose legislation".

The three years predicted in 1975 is up and we now see the situation going from bad to worse. We now have compulsory unionism: it has been put under the hat of preference to unionists, but there is no difference at all between them. We have seen the Minister of Labour and Industry interfere with the proceedings of the Industrial Court in the recent case involving Minda Home when he gave the court directions on worker participation at Minda Home.

That is what we can expect in future from this Government and that is what business is afraid of in this State. A number of statements have been made by the front runners or heavies of the Labor Party and in particular by the heir-apparent, the Attorney-General. In the *Advertiser* of June 1978 under the headline "Redistribute wealth, says Duncan" the following appears:

The A.L.P. must develop a national plan to extend public ownership where it was vital to eliminate "exploitation and other anti-social features," the Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan, said last night. He said any overall national economic strategy should include policies to redistribute wealth from the upper-middle class to the majority of Australians through progressive taxation.

We have seen the Attorney-General's attitude to taxation and the distribution of wealth. An article in the *Advertiser* last week, discussing proposed business control by the A.L.P. to be considered at the next convention shortly, states:

A proposal that the State Labor Government should form a commission to monitor business activities in South Australia will be considered by the A.L.P. The proposal is contained in the report of the A.L.P.'s platform committee to be presented to a special State A.L.P. convention in Adelaide on February 17 and 18. The proposal is that the body would be known as the Corporate Affairs Commission and would be responsible for the monitoring and regulation of all levels of business activity "in the interests of society as a whole."

The committee recommends that succession duties be levied so that larger inheritances bear a higher rate of duty.

With the existing exemption for the family home being maintained.

I previously stated that socialism meant higher taxation. The closer we get to a welfare situation, from the cradle to the grave, the more it costs the taxpayers. Therefore, socialism actually means higher taxation; your dollar in the Government's pocket. One wonders why the Government should want to legislate for compulsory unionism. It boils down to the fact that the Government receives a high income from trade unions in the form of sustenance fees and political levies.

With compulsory unionism, everybody who wants work is forced to join a union and will be forced to contribute to the Labor Party irrespective of whether or not he is a socialist or belongs to another Party. Many trade unionists are members of our Party, but with compulsory unionism they will be obliged to contribute to the Labor Party, aligning themselves with and even being considered to be members of a Party that they do not support at all. There is no doubt that finance for Labor Party is the basis of compulsory unionism, because it will help that Party socialise the whole of South Australia. It also helps the Labor Party finance ridiculous advertisements such as those seen in the newspapers prior to the last State election.

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): We have heard some criticism in this State of the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon, in his negotiations to arrange cheaper air fares to and from Australia, especially for end-to-end flights. I think Mr. Nixon is to be congratulated. He is the only Federal Minister who has ever tackled this problem, a problem which no other Federal Minister of any political persuasion has been willing to tackle. So far, Mr. Nixon has been successful in achieving at least some of the aims we want to see achieved in relation to tourism.

Some of the Asian countries are unhappy because Mr. Nixon has arranged fares at the cheaper rate only between Australia and parts of the United States and Europe. Many Australians, realising the benefits, have made bookings to travel out of the country. Many people have booked fares to come here, enjoying the cheaper way of getting here to look at Australia. If we make these tourists welcome—and that is up to the industry—and if we become a tourist conscious country, the visitors will tell their friends at home of the benefits of visiting Australia, and we will have an increased tourist trade.

For every 25 000 tourists coming to the country on a regular basis, more than 1 000 jobs can be created. We must produce job opportunities, and the tourist industry is labour intensive. Mr. Nixon has made it possible for people to travel to Europe or to America for about \$500. Some people argue that no arrangement has been made regarding stop-overs within the Asian countries, such as Singapore and Hong Kong, with their cheap shopping. That has been one of the main purposes of visiting those places. Travellers bring goods into the country free of customs duty, often to the detriment of their own colleagues and their job opportunities. In this way, we have automatically destroyed the jobs of some of our fellow Australians.

If that is the purpose of the stop-over, I believe it should be allowed, but it cannot be argued that a stop-over should

be available on the cheapest possible fare. The cheapest rate must be reserved for end-to-end fares, so that the operating company can be guaranteed a full payload. Without that, the cheap fares cannot continue to operate. That is the idea behind Apex fares and charter fares, where travellers book as a group, and where there is no stop-over.

One daily paper reported recently that we were to have cheaper domestic flights within Australia to carry passengers to the gateway airports for international flights. The statement was premature. I was with the Leader and the Minister only a few hours after the delegation had left. When the details of the statement of the delegation were made available to the Minister, he was disgusted to think that someone had related what was nothing more than half-truth and supposition. We know that is so, because the final details of the arrangements have not yet been reached.

The Federal Minister is keen to get a reduction in the cost of domestic flights from Adelaide, or any other city without an international airport, or where an international flight is not operating out of the local airport. It is hoped that the people concerned will be able to travel overseas at a price comparable with the price paid by Sydney or Melbourne people. What was the point of making a statement that was unfair and inaccurate?

I do not blame people for saying that they had had some success or for the campaign conducted, because perhaps it was necessary, but let us look at the opportunity domestic airlines have for reducing fares without the taxpayer having to subsidise them. T.A.A. and Ansett cannot operate at a loss on a continuing basis. We live in a vast continent with hundreds of airports, large and small. The Federal Government, I believe, should consider classing some of our smaller airports as projects that should be considered for national development. They should not be considered as part of the overall communication or transport system for the purpose of airport charges. If we attempt to make airlines pay the total cost of maintaining our airports and airport services, we must charge high airport fees. Those high airport fees are one of the things killing the domestic airlines.

It is the policy of the Federal Government to attempt to recoup all the costs of operating the airports. There is a way in which the costs of operating the major airports and the major regional centres could be carried by the airlines, because that is where the major passenger turnover takes place. We should say, however, that the smaller airports are mainly concerned with national development, serving rural, mining, or Aboriginal communities. They should come within the area of national development, the taxpayer paying through some form of Federal Government grant for the maintenance of those airports and the operation of the staff. The airlines should not be hit for carrying commuters between the major centres. In that way, we could reduce airport charges.

In this country, domestic airlines have to pay an average of 70c a gallon for fuel. An aspiring A.L.P. candidate, whose name I have deliberately forgotten, advocates that the fares in Australia should be the same as those in America or England. He did not say, however, that the cost of fuel in those countries is 40c a gallon. He did not say that the domestic airlines in Australia are lucky to get 80 per cent loading, or that it is more likely to be 65 per cent loading, whereas in the countries he mentioned the airlines have heavier loading and a bigger payload.

He did not say that the airport charges in those countries are lower because of the vast population and the greater number of travellers. If, through Mr. Nixon's efforts, we get many more people coming into the country and many

more going out of it, and if they have to travel from smaller airports to the main gateways, that will mean a greater payload for the domestic airlines, perhaps giving them the opportunity of reducing domestic airline rates.

That person was unfair in attacking the domestic airlines, not using all the facts that adversely affected them, and saying that he was concerned that they could not operate successfully on fares much lower than those that obtain at present.

The Federal Government will have to examine airport charges, and the taxation concessions that it gives for equipment and the ability to write off equipment and buildings, before it will be able to get domestic airlines to reduce their fares. Qantas stepped into the fight, stating that it would like to carry people around Australia on domestic lines at a reduced rate. It can do so because it handles its passengers about once only for every nine times that domestic airlines must handle their passengers in terms of miles travelled. I hope that the State Government takes up this challenge, as the New South Wales Government has done, and reduces its taxes.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Police, \$700 000.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Chief Secretary, as the Minister responsible for the Police Department, say whether, in relation to the administration of pistol licences, there has been a tightening up?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, there is nothing in this vote relating to pistol licensing.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order, as nothing in this vote relates to pistol licensing.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order. The issuing of pistol licences is very much a function of the Police Department. It therefore comes within the duties of police officers and, therefore, within the line for administration. I therefore suggest that it is totally in order for the member for Eyre to inquire regarding that matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order, and my previous ruling obtains. I have ruled that the matter of pistol licences cannot be discussed under this vote.

Mr. BECKER: I was surprised that the Premier said in the second reading explanation that an additional \$700 000 was required for this department, \$300 000 of which was required to meet increased salary costs and \$400 000 of which was required for additional contingency charges, and that he referred also to the bonus paid to police officers. We all know that police officers receive a bonus each Christmas, so why was the allocation not included in the Budget that was considered last September?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): It was not included because the bonus is not an automatic addition to police officers' salaries. It involves a conscious decision by Cabinet to provide a bonus in recognition of the special efforts of the police during a certain year. This bonus was introduced some years ago, when the level of leave generally and payments for police were lower than they now are. Cabinet has decided again this year that it will be appropriate to pay the bonus to the police, and it therefore seeks the extra allocation now.

Mr. BECKER: I acknowledge that payment of the bonus was introduced many years ago, but it is always granted each year. As we know that the bonus will be paid in 1979-80, why cannot provision be made in the Budget for payment of this bonus?

Mr. MATHWIN: In the second reading explanation it was stated that part of the further \$400 000 now required for administration expenses, etc., involved increased fuel

prices and increased workers compensation premiums. Are those premiums paid through the State Government Insurance Commission, and by what percentage have workers compensation premiums increased?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: The administration relating to the issuing of pistol licences is currently the responsibility of senior police officers. When the new regulations under the Firearms Act come into force, will this still be the responsibility of the Police Department, or will some other department fund the administration of the advisory committee that is set up for this purpose?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, the contingency sum of \$400 000 deals with the administration, and refers to increased fuel prices and workers compensation; it has nothing to do with pistol licences.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order that pistol licences should not be discussed under this vote. However, if the Chief Secretary had intended to answer, that would have been a matter for him.

Vote passed.

Correctional Services, \$250 000; Law, \$250 000—passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$800 000.

Mr. BECKER: I seek information from the Minister regarding what is, if my interpretation of the Premier's explanation is correct, an unusual set of circumstances. The Premier said that the additional amount needed to cover interest on Electricity Trust funds and other moneys was associated with special arrangements made between the State Bank and the trust, and to provide additional funds for welfare housing purposes. He also said that the Treasury had acted as a financial intermediary in these arrangements and would be paying interest to the trust and receiving interest from the bank to offset the payments made.

Am I to understand that ETSA is investing surplus funds with the State Bank at a low interest rate, which will probably be the fixed deposit rate, and that the State Bank then lends that money for welfare housing and the Treasury is recouped by the State Bank? To obtain these funds, the trust must go to the public and offer about .5 per cent more than the normal bond rate, yet we are asking ETSA to invest its funds with the State Bank at almost half the rate that it could normally get on the short-term money market. Will the Minister give more details regarding the position?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): First, because of the building of the northern power station and the large expenditure that will be required in certain years during that construction period, there has had to be a build-up of liquid funds inside ETSA. Secondly, the rate that it is getting from the State Bank is somewhat better than that relating to the short-term money market, although I would have to check that for the honourable member. Thirdly, a proportion of the liquid funds held by ETSA must be held in a form that is fairly readily recoverable. Judgment must be made by ETSA in relation to what its expenditure commitments will be for the northern power station.

It is inevitable, with an expenditure in excess of \$50 000 000 over a period of years, that if we had not started on the process of building up funds within the trust in the past few years we would never have been able to finance the overall project. I will check out any discrepancy that exists with the trust in investments that occur at a rate below the rate borrowed and bring some further information on that point to the honourable member, but I do not think the margin is significant.

Mr. MATHWIN: I ask the Minister on which system the trust works. About 6 per cent is taken from the trust and put into Government revenue each year, yet when half the year has gone by the Government is asking for another \$800 000. Surely, if the Government was to conduct the business correctly, it would take out less in tax and square the books a bit better than by taking the tax from the users of electricity, and then asking for another \$800 000 about six months after that was done.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member should appreciate that moneys cannot be paid without an appropriation by Parliament or unless the Governor's appropriation fund is used. The Governor's appropriation fund has only a limited capacity for use and, where additional expenditures are required, Parliament has to be approached again for a further appropriation, no matter what the revenue position is. For example, with the Treasury acting as intermediary between the Electricity Trust and the State Bank there is no change in the position. The Treasury receives interest from the State Bank and pays interest to the Electricity Trust. While that position means a net impact of zero on the Budget, our Westminster system requires that that payment of interest to the Electricity Trust be appropriated. It has to be subject to an appropriation by Parliament or it cannot be paid, so once the arrangement is made for the Treasury to act as a financial intermediary a further appropriation has to be obtained.

Similarly, with the increased subsidies required under the country subsidy arrangement, if these sums are to be paid in relation to Coober Pedy, Ceduna, Hawker, Streaky Bay and Wudinna, we have no authority to pay without Parliamentary approval. If our revenue goes up, that does not require Parliamentary approval, but, if we are going to pay out more than we have already had approved by Parliament, we simply have to get further approval by Parliament. That relates traditionally to the control and rises in our Budget system because Parliament has insisted on having control originally over the expenditure of the king. Now we are substituted for that.

Vote passed.

Education, \$7 250 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek information on the money which is being appropriated for the Curriculum Directorate. Another \$250 000 is being provided, the original vote being nearly \$7 000 000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: Money has been made available because the Premier said at the time that there had been an increase in the cost of fixed charges, particularly in respect of fuel and power, and one of the excuses given by the Premier was the high increase in costs in this area. Is the Minister aware that in the new Demac seven-teacher units it is impossible, because of the design of the buildings, for staff and students to operate unless the lights are on all day. The windows are very small and at the top of the walls, and air-conditioning is very difficult. I have been told by an air-conditioning expert that power is actually wasted because of the design of the buildings. In the colder months of the year the hot air that really needs to be retained is lost through the windows, and in a seven-teacher unit in my area 164 fluorescent lights must be on all day, no matter how hot or how bright the day is. Is the Minister aware of this, and is his department taking any action to solve this problem so that we are not wasting power on a continuing basis, as we are doing at the moment?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I will take up the matter with the Public Buildings

Department.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister any response to my query about the expenditure of almost \$9 000 000 on the Curriculum Directorate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister say why the Teacher Housing Authority has not been carrying out adequate maintenance on a number of residences in—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is a statutory authority; it is not provided for under the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I was looking through the lines and the second reading speech, and I accept the point of order. The Teacher Housing Authority is not a matter under discussion.

Mr. EVANS: We are allowing for the employment of 75 additional teachers. The Premier said that there had been an increase in the need to employ temporary relieving assistants and hourly-paid instructors, and that is another reason for the money being allocated. Does the Minister ask those people who are entitled to long service leave to take it when it is due, as he has the power to do, so that more people can be employed in the field of education, particularly on the contract system than the 75 allowed for in this provision.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In this matter there is general Government policy, and we do not treat teachers any differently from public servants.

Mr. EVANS: What is the general Government policy in relation to long service leave and when people take it?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No compulsion is operating at present.

Mr. EVANS: I am not asking the Minister whether there is any compulsion under the Superannuation Act or the Education Act. The Ministers have the opportunity to suggest when employees should take their long service leave to fit in with the overall programme of the department, and I am not asking for compulsion. I am asking whether the Minister takes any action to request people to take their long service leave somewhere near the time when it is due.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There are obvious advantages in that course of action taking place, and we place no impediment in the way of teachers if they wish to do so.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. How many times may an honourable member seek information?

The CHAIRMAN: On matters such as we are dealing with now he has unlimited opportunity to question the Minister, and I cannot accept the point of order.

Mr. EVANS: I am not asking the Minister whether the Government stops people from taking their long service leave: I am asking whether the Government's policy is to encourage people to take their long service leave when they have qualified for it so more people can be employed in particular education fields on a contract basis.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have nothing to add to what I have already told the Committee.

Mr. EVANS: This is not a filibuster: it is an important issue.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the honourable member that he cannot continually ask the same question of the Minister. If the questions are similar in substance, it is doubtful that he will be able to carry on. If the questions are different, he has the right to carry on.

Mr. TONKIN: It is obvious to members on this side and to the Minister's colleagues that the Minister is deliberately ducking the point of the question asked by the

member for Fisher. The Act provides that it is open to the Administration and to the Education Department to state when long service leave shall be taken. This matter is of grave concern to many heads and principals. It is of even more importance to unemployed teachers who wish to know what their future will be. The Minister might do this Committee, if not those teachers and the population generally, the courtesy of saying what his policy is now and whether there is likely to be any change in it. If the provisions of the Act are followed by the department, people looking for work can be given work, because people due for long service leave will be required to take it.

It will also save this State much money in the long term. This issue is important enough for the Minister to treat it seriously. He has not, and I challenge him once more to tell the Committee whether he intends, so as to aid forward planning, to help provide jobs for unemployed teachers, and save this State money in the long term, and to say whether he is willing to implement the provisions of the Act.

Vote passed.

Further Education, \$850 000; Libraries, \$170 000; Transport, \$200 000; Highways, \$300 000—passed.

Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, \$1 100 000.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister said that recent increases in fuel prices have been costly and that he was late in introducing the recent fare increases in public transport—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I didn't. God, you bloody—

Mr. BECKER: I rise on a point of order. The statement of the member for Alexandra has been challenged by the Minister, but in the Treasury document the Minister states:

The revised fee structure for bus and rail services is being introduced somewhat later than was planned.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order, but I was about to ask the Minister to refrain from using words such as "bloody".

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister is seeking more than \$1 000 000 in additional funds for several reasons, including a delay in the introduction of the new schedule of fee increases. Why was he late? Did he have some fears about public repercussions that might result? Was he waiting for the overall zoning programme to be completed so that he could smother these increases in the plan? Why was he running so late as to cause his department such additional expenditure?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): The principal reason why additional funds are required is that the Commonwealth Government increased the cost of fuel tax to the State Government. That tax is on fuel that we use to run rail transport and buses. I have appealed to the Federal Minister, asking that the public transport system be exempted from paying Federal taxes in exactly the same way as we exempt Federal vehicles operating in South Australia from paying State taxes.

Unfortunately, the honourable member's Federal colleague (perhaps I should refer to the Country Party colleague of the member for Flinders, in case the member for Alexandra does not wish to be associated with a Country Party Minister) and the Fraser Government have inflicted upon the State Government additional costs. That is the principal reason for the additional operating costs.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister has explained his attitude towards the Federal Government, and I remember his last similar message. He said that the S.T.A. was affected by taxes and charges inflicted upon it by my Federal colleague, but what Federal charges and taxes are

now inflicted upon the S.T.A. that did not apply under the previous Labor Minister?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The additional fuel taxes that were imposed in the last Federal Budget.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Although that factor is set out in the explanation seeking to justify this amount, why was the Minister late in introducing the new fare structure?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The amount involved was insignificant. The principal reason for the increase was inflicted on us by the Fraser Government and the admitted colleagues of the member for Alexandra.

Mr. BECKER: The document also states:

... and higher interest costs on borrowed funds than was originally forecast.

How did this come about? Why were his advisers unable to forecast that the S.T.A. would have to meet higher interest costs? The bond rate has only just been increased, and I cannot understand how the State Government, the Minister, or his advisers would have known about that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This document does not reflect the interest rate that the Treasurer (Mr. Howard) announced over the week-end concerning the 0.2 per cent increase. I will seek further information. What I think the S.T.A. did (and now it seems rather foolish) was accept in good faith the prediction of the Prime Minister that there was going to be a reduction of 2 per cent in the interest rate. That did not eventuate, so we are paying higher rates.

Mr. BECKER: I would be grateful if the Minister could get the information.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I don't think you should take Fraser's or Howard's statement at face value.

Mr. BECKER: Any borrowing from the authority would be on the long term.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We won't do it again.

Mr. BECKER: How did the authority borrow money this financial year? The capital requirements would have been covered by the Loan Account. The fund would have been well organised, and the money would have been borrowed long before the State Budget was introduced.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're wrong there.

Mr. BECKER: There seems to be a trick there, and I would appreciate a full explanation about when the Loan moneys were taken up.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said that I would obtain that for the honourable member.

Mr. TONKIN: What proportion of the increased costs of fuel can be attributed to the air-conditioning, or cooling, units on the new buses? There is, as I think everyone who has used an air-conditioner in a car knows, a considerable increase in fuel consumption associated with the operation of any air-conditioning unit. I understand that the Minister's latest advice to Adelaide travellers is to keep the windows open, because the air-conditioning does not seem to be doing much good.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not right.

Mr. TONKIN: That is basically what he means, even though he does not say it. Exactly how much of the additional money that is being spent on capital expenditure is increasing the fuel expenditure and, therefore, increasing the costs to the transport authority?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am surprised to hear the Leader carry on in this way, because he is one of the fortunate people. He and his Deputy join with the Ministers, who have the luxury, at the taxpayers' expense, of sitting in a vehicle and being driven from home to the destination, be it Parliament House, a Liberal Party meeting in the country, or wherever else, in refrigerated air-conditioned comfort. The Deputy Leader ought not to have that smirk on his face, because the overtime earned

by the drivers is regularly gazetted, and we know the kind of use, for political Party purposes, to which the cars allocated to the Leader, the Deputy Leader, and the Leader in the Legislative Council are put. They are right on the top of the list. If the member for Heysen had a car, he would probably exceed it, but he does not have a car. I make claim to all Opposition members who love to deliberately distort the facts of life that there are no refrigerated air-conditioning units in S.T.A. buses. I have never said that they are air-conditioned, and it is only people who want to twist the score who say that. The buses contain a water-cooled, air-cooling system that must have a circulation of air; there must be ventilation.

Mr. Gunn: It's evaporative.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is an evaporative system, and I am grateful to the member for Eyre, because obviously he is one of the few Opposition members who understands the system. If the Leader would like an evaporative system installed in his car instead of the refrigerated one that he has, I may ask the garage to accommodate him.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He'll have to keep the windows open then.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, and people could hear his bleating as he went along the road. The costs of these units were about one-fifth of that of a refrigerated unit when we first considered them. They were about less than \$2 000 in capital cost, whereas a refrigerated unit was about \$10 000. Secondly, as my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy reminds me (and he is conscious of this matter, and it is just as well that someone is), the amount of fuel used to drive an evaporative unit is infinitesimal compared to that used by a refrigerated unit. To suggest, as the Leader has done, that any of this amount is due to the refrigerated units is ridiculous and it shows his utter lack of appreciation of what the buses are all about.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Is there any provision for assisting the private bus operators in the Adelaide Hills and nearby metropolitan area who have been affected by the recent adjustments to the fare schedule?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the Minister intend to take any steps to assist those private operators who have been dramatically affected by the recent fare schedule?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The last question asked by the honourable member is out of order. It is not a matter that ought to be discussed by the Committee.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The explanation sheet refers to the State Transport Authority's intention to assist certain community groups.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They're community buses.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not know that the people I am seeking to represent in this instance care a damn whether they are community buses.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman must be concerned about whether they are private buses or community buses. Otherwise, how can I rule whether the question is relevant or otherwise?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I take the point. Is the Minister prepared to consider, within the ambit of this community-type service, extending those services to the areas that have been affected as a result of his recent announcement on fare charges?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The community buses provided for in this area are provided by the community, and the buses to which the honourable member has referred are run by private enterprise. The two are as different as chalk and cheese.

Mr. CHAPMAN: As a result of the announcement the Minister made and the impact caused by the new schedule of fares, the private operators are already being driven out

of business, or are subject to being driven out.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Private bus operators are running services from the Hills to the city, whereas the community bus services traipse around within the local community.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is referring to private bus operators. They have nothing to do with community buses, and he is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order. If the honourable member's query related to private bus operators, it is not a matter for discussion.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It did not really relate to private buses. It related to an area that has been well served by private enterprise and that is being destroyed by the Minister's recent announcement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is further away from the matter under discussion than he was when the point of order was taken. He cannot continue in that vein.

Mr. GUNN: During the course of the Minister's reply to the Leader he entered into a discussion about the use of Government cars.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not going to allow the honourable member for Eyre to continue and I will point out why. I appreciate that the honourable Minister discussed the use of Government cars, and that that is not a matter dealt with under this vote. It is traditional for Ministers to have more latitude in the answering of questions than is given to the members asking questions. This may irritate members of the Opposition and I am sure it does. Nevertheless, it is traditional for Ministers to be given greater latitude in answering questions.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Particularly when they're half full.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Well, when they're totally full.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to completely withdraw both those statements.

Mr. Goldsworthy: About being half-full or full-full?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Very well, I withdraw them.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Under what Standing Order do you permit the Minister of Transport to refer to the alleged private use of Government cars and then not allow Opposition members to put the record straight? I wanted to refer to the use of Government cars, which I have observed and had drawn to my attention, by members of the Government, the Chairman and the Minister of Community Development, about which one could ask a serious question. Under what Standing Order do you give the Minister the opportunity to be critical of the Leader and Deputy Leader, and not give members on this side the chance to make the record correct?

The CHAIRMAN: I have already stated that in answering questions it is traditional to allow Ministers greater latitude. Committee discussion may not be reduced to a debate about matters not relevant to the lines, irrespective of who raises them in the first instance. I insist that we maintain that line.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: a moment ago you asked the member for Kavel to withdraw certain statements. I was wondering whether those statements can be stricken from *Hansard*. Can any ruling be made that they not be recorded in *Hansard* at all, both the original statement and the withdrawal?

The CHAIRMAN: It is the responsibility of *Hansard* to record the proceedings of Parliament, and that would include the statements made by honourable members.

There is no power for the Chairman or the Speaker to request *Hansard* to strike those statements from the record of the proceedings.

Mr. BECKER: On a further point of order, Mr. Chairman. Would it be within the power of the Committee to move a motion that they be withdrawn?

The CHAIRMAN: No, it would not be. What would happen is that that would be recorded. The original statement would be recorded as well as the motion to strike it out. It cannot be done.

Vote passed.

Community Welfare, \$300 000.

Mr. WOTTON: What is the Government policy regarding those who choose, as an alternative lifestyle, to support a child or children as a sole supporting parent? I notice that, already, \$8 243 000 is set aside for financial assistance to sole supporting parents and now we are looking at a further provision of \$300 000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Vote passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, \$733 000.

Mr. WOTTON: Is the sum of \$133 000 provided as support for new shelters, or for existing shelters?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it is for existing shelters and to ensure that we qualify for the maximum degree of Commonwealth Government support. The appropriation made in the Budget last year would not have permitted the maximum amount of Commonwealth support for women's shelters. If we provide the additional \$133 000 we will get a sum, I think, of about \$92 000 back from the Commonwealth, so the net additional cost to the State of that extra provision is \$41 000. The overall impact is that existing women's shelters will be able to do a more satisfactory job as a result of this further appropriation. The Government is determined that the net cost to the State of \$41 000 is worth while spending in order to get the additional Commonwealth assistance.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister obtain information about the funding for women's shelters? I would take it, on this latest allocation, that the State provides one-third and the Commonwealth Government two-thirds of the money.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is a bit more than that. I think it is 70/30.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. Is this the funding arrangement overall for the whole amount allocated to women's shelters or will this be the funding basis in the future?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I will check that.

Mr. BECKER: Could figures be supplied of the number of persons assisted by the shelters in South Australia and the number of shelters we now have?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Vote passed.

South Australian Health Commission, \$2 600 000—passed.

Community Development, \$2 780 000.

Mr. WILSON: During the debate on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, when the power for the appointment of the thirteenth Minister was granted by the Parliament, much play was made of the fact that staff for the new department would be seconded from other areas of the Public Service. How many of the staff paid under these lines have come from outside the Public Service and how many of the staff were originally employed elsewhere? I do not refer to the Botanic Gardens, Arts Development, or Community Division, divisions the Minister received from other departments. I refer to the

staff for his own department. How many were brought in from outside and how many were appointed from other departments so that there was no net increase in the Public Service because of the staffing of his department?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development): By "his own department", does the member mean the administration and clerical staff line under "Office of the Minister"?

Mr. Wilson: Yes.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: That line refers to salaries and wages for a press secretary, an executive assistant, a research assistant and a steno-secretary. The press secretary was already employed by the Government on other duties as a research writer for the Constitutional Museum Trust and was simply transferred on to my staff. The Museum Trust came under the new department and for a time the press secretary continued his duties there.

He is not being replaced by the Museum Trust which has employed some part-time research assistants to do the sort of work he was carrying out. In terms of extra cost and net payment there has been no change. In the case of the research assistant and the steno-secretary, both of those positions are being occupied, although only one appointment has been finally made and that was from within the Public Service. An executive assistant's appointment is to be made and at the moment that person is likely to come from within the Public Service. In terms of the Minister's personal staff under that line, those people are presently employed by the Public Service.

Whether they are replaced in the positions they vacate will be a matter for the departments concerned. The overall principle is that there shall be no increment under the staff ceiling and staff freeze position, so that positions will be wasted to compensate for them. Whether that happens immediately or in the future has not been determined and depends on when vacancies arise. In terms of net cost, certain figures were bandied around in the previous debates, and \$150 000 was mentioned. The figures show that those staff costs (and I do not include the press secretary because that position has been transferred and is not an extra cost to the Government) amount to about \$50 000. In fact, the figure is \$49 638 in a full year and that is considerably less than the sum of \$150 000 that was being mentioned before for Ministerial staff, and so on.

Mr. WILSON: Do the Minister's remarks also apply to the staff for the Director's office, because the Director's office would also be involved in setting up the department? Has there been a net increase in the Public Service as a result of the setting up of this office?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: No, there will be no net increase in the Public Service because the position created under this line, Management Services Division, will be compensated for in other positions that are not filled elsewhere. The position of Director, for instance, is a new position for the Community Development Department, and that is an extra position, but in the overall manpower level of the Public Service, a position will be wasted to ensure that the balance is kept. There will be a total of no more than 15 positions which includes, I think, staff for the Youth Bureau, the appointment of which was determined before the Community Development Department came into existence. Appointments such as the Director, and the proposed Deputy Director, for which an advertisement has already been placed and applications are being received, and one or two project officers, who represent an increment to staff because they are new positions in community development, will be compensated for by the wastage of positions in other areas of the Public Service in the terms of the board's overall policy.

Mr. WOTTON: What does the Community Division line cover at this time and what will it cover in the foreseeable future?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: Since the Supplementary Estimates were prepared, we have renamed this the Community Resources Division as a more accurate description of its function. At present it comprises what we call the Community Branch, which is staff transferred from the Community Welfare Department. They were a small unit that serviced the Community Councils of Social Development. As sections 25 to 31 of the Community Welfare Act have been delegated to me as Minister for Community Development, the unit that serviced that function under the Act has also been transferred. The Youth Bureau was established prior to the creation of this department and at that stage was attached to the Community Welfare Department and also forms a component of the Community Resources Division.

The function of the community centres, that is, the Parks Community Centre and the Thebarton Community Centre, which were previously under the Minister of Education, has been transferred to the Community Development Department. A Ministerial Advisory Committee also forms part of the Community Resources Division. The two or three staff involved are on secondment from the Education Department; they were doing that job with that department and have been seconded across to the new department. We have also set up a working party on information services and when we have a report and some idea of where we are going on information services, that component will also probably come within the Community Resources Division, so in the end there will be four components. It can be seen from that outline that there are no new staff and, in the case of the three existing functions, there are no new functions which have been added to the department since its inception.

Vote passed.

Minister of Community Development, Miscellaneous, \$6 578 000.

Mr. WILSON: The net increase on this line is about \$400 000. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said:

The Supplementary Estimates provide \$6 578 000 for this purpose. Of that amount, \$6 180 000 results from the transfer of existing functions from other areas to improve the delivery of these services. Offsetting savings will occur under Premier, Miscellaneous; Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous; and Minister of Education, Miscellaneous.

If that is so, when they are taken out, it will leave a \$400 000 increase, which is alarming in view of the present stringencies required in the administration of this State, and in view of the Premier's statement that these cost savings would be included. What is the exact extent of the \$400 000 increase?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The increases are explained later in the explanation of the Supplementary Estimates, and it is in three parts. A further \$350 000 was added to the original Budget estimate for the operation of the Parks and Thebarton Community Centres. In fact, the Parks Community Centre in particular is now coming into commission, as the buildings are progressively finished and handed over. Staffing requirements have meant that the original Budget, as approved last year, will not be sufficient to provide for that staffing and maintenance of the centres as they come on stream. This is particularly so in the case of the Parks Community Centre, for which a sum of \$350 000 is provided. A further \$11 450 is provided under line 1090 relating to the working party on

information services. That is the working party on which the member for Torrens questioned me the other day, and that is what we think the exercise will cost. There is a third supplementary amount of \$37 250 to the Progressive Music Broadcasting Association. At the time that organisation applied for an FM licence, the Government said that, if it was successful in obtaining a licence, some assistance would be given to it in the same way as assistance was given to Ethnic Broadcasters Limited.

Since the first budgetary estimates were formulated, P.M.B.A. has obtained its licence. It is a Community Broadcasting Association, and it hopes to be on the air in the middle of this year. The Government has made a grant available, supplementing a smaller amount obtained through the Arts Development Division from the Arts Grants Committee, which in fact was prior to their getting their application. It is a supplementary amount for capital costs and establishment costs.

Mr. WILSON: The Parks Community Centre has cost the taxpayer \$14 700 000 and, although I can think of no more worthy place to have such a centre, I wonder whether we can afford to provide palaces of this kind when money is required to provide community centres in other suburbs and in the country. It is worrying to see that an extra \$350 000 is required to cover extra development, particularly at the Parks Community Centre. For how many years in the future will this supplementary assistance be required from the Government? How self-supporting will the Parks Community Centre be in its operation?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: Under the roofs of the Parks buildings are many functions which normally are performed by Government departments, including a school, a further education centre and a library, which is being funded in part by the local government body. Local government is also providing funds to assist with the building of the sports and recreation area, particularly the swimming pool. The Federal Government provided \$3 000 000.

In considering the cost of \$14 700 000, one must remember that there have been some contributory payments from Federal and local government sources, but the bulk of it has come from the State Government. There is a community welfare office and a health service, and these functions require servicing. Staff is provided at the Parks Community Centre for cleaning, general maintenance and various other functions relating to its role as a centre. If it were not being done by the centre and shown as a line here, it probably would be split up in numerous small lines among various users of the centre. It is far more economical and efficient to have one allocation out of which to pay this.

One of the reasons why we require more money at present is that, while the various areas are coming on stream, they are not going to start generating revenue for some time. It is hoped that substantial revenue will be generated from the recreational area and from the dining and cafeteria facilities. Various user departments, including the Education Department, will be making some contributions. There will be revenue, and a number of activities carried out at the centre will be funded, although not in the next six months. We need this money in the immediate short term.

Such a centre will never become fully self-supporting, and we would not expect that of, say, a school health service or community welfare office. If he has not done so, I invite the honourable member to visit the centre. It is probably now in a state where an extremely good view of the services and facilities offering can be obtained. Most visitors are enthusiastic about the success of the concept. It needs finishing in some areas, but it is a remarkable facility

which will justify every cent spent in what was an underprivileged section of Adelaide.

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister say how much of the \$2 358 400 required for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust will go into administration costs and wages? I was concerned, when I received the report of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, to see how many people were employed. Whilst everyone realises the trust's contribution to the arts, and whilst we are proud of the centre, I was concerned and amazed at the number employed.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: This was previously provided under the Premier's Department. It is a straight transfer, and it was before the House when the Estimates were discussed previously. I should have thought that that was the occasion when the honourable member would raise his question. I think the most ready reference would be the trust's last annual report, although there may have been some changes since the date of the report, which was tabled recently in the House. The honourable member should be able to get a fairly ready assessment of the numbers of staff from that. However, I shall endeavour to obtain the information he seeks.

Mr. BECKER: What is the breakdown of the amounts involved in the increase of \$350 000 for the Parks and Thebarton community centres? The Minister has referred to recreation facilities at the Parks Community Centre, which is nearing completion. I understand that lavish equipment has been purchased for the centre, particularly for the sporting and recreation areas. I believe it includes a considerable amount of rock-climbing equipment, snorkels, flippers, goggles, everything needed for a swimming pool and swimming training, diving equipment, underwater gear, half a dozen 35-mm cameras, and other equipment. Some of the equipment has been purchased by the Public Buildings Department and is held in a store at Seaton under very tight security. It is arriving in considerable quantities. How much has been allocated to the Parks, and will this include the purchase of and payment for this equipment? What is the breakdown of the amount of equipment purchased to go into the new sections soon to come into operation? I would like to be assured that the equipment purchased and the price paid can be justified.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member. I do not know what the honourable member would call lavish equipment. However, this is a new centre that has the most modern facilities. It is obvious that much money has been spent on setting up the centre and the structure, and it would be a pity if the equipment was not adequate to ensure that these facilities were completely used.

The honourable member referred to rock climbing. One of the important new features of the gymnasium provided in the Parks Community Centre is a rock-climbing wall, which is unique in Australia. It is interesting to see, and will provide teaching of skills in rock climbing. It will be a useful recreational and athletic activity. So, presumably equipment is needed. I assure the honourable member that the appropriate equipment is being bought in the normal way in which the Government's supply and tender system operates. I will obtain the details for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: I suggest that the Minister see an itemised statement so that he knows what is happening.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the further provision of \$1 760 000 now required for grants and provisions for the arts. Will the Minister give more information regarding this item, which was not referred to in the second reading explanation?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: This is a straight transfer

from the Estimates passed by this House previously and provided under the Premier's miscellaneous vote. Matters concerning it should have been canvassed adequately previously. If the honourable member requires specific information, I will try to obtain it for him.

Mr. MATHWIN: The sum of \$1 760 000 appears under the heading "Further provision now required". If the Minister does not have the information I seek, I should be pleased if he would make it available later. Will he also couple it with the allocations for the South Australian Theatre Company and the State Opera of South Australia?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is not extra money; it is a reappropriation of funds.

Mr. MATHWIN: We are entitled to this information, and I ask that it be provided.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: That is unnecessary. The heading "Further provision now required" is a little misleading, because these are not extra allocations. If one looks at the column headed "Amount provided by Appropriation Act (No. 2), 1978" one will see that, wherever an asterisk appears, the sum referred to in the second column was provided by an Appropriation Bill, the debate and questions on which have already ensued. I do not think there is any necessity to provide further information. The items alongside which there is no asterisk are new items on which questions have been asked. The only thing one can see in this respect is the working party on information services, which I have already covered in reply to the member of Torrens, and the Progressive Music Broadcasting Association, which I have also covered. So, it is not an extra provision of \$6 578 000 but a transfer, less the two sums to which I have referred, from one Appropriation Bill to another, and I think that no further information is required.

Vote passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 February. Page 2379.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill provides for the appropriation of \$220 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on in the early part of the next financial year and, although the title of the Bill refers to the year 1980, it is needed to take us over until the end of August, by which time it is expected that the Budget will be introduced in the coming session of Parliament.

I wish to refer to matters that concern this State's Public Service, particularly to the Public Service report. That report, tabled in this House recently, shows a most alarming trend, which has been noticeable for many years and which has not changed in any way.

It is most important that, when we consider these matters, we look carefully indeed at the growth of the Public Service. From 1969 to 1978 South Australia's population increased by 11.2 per cent, its work force by 14.6 per cent and its Public Service by 82.1 per cent. That is an amazing increase in the size of the Public Service in the past 10 years. It is even more amazing when one considers the figures that have already been referred to today on population growths, a growth rate in South Australia of .7 per cent, as opposed to an Australian

average of 1.23 per cent. The population growth rate in South Australia is far lower than that of our Public Service, and this simply means that there has been an enormous shift over the past 10 years from the private sector (the general work force) to the Public Service of this State, and that shift is continuing.

This is even more significant when examined in conjunction with this State's unemployment figures. Those figures have been tabled in the House and are already the subject of record. However, it is appropriate to remind members that the unemployment figures in South Australia are, depending on which set of figures is used, either the highest or second highest in Australia. That is nothing of which South Australia can be proud. I wonder what the unemployment figures would be in this State if it were not for the remarkably high proportion of public servants. This is yet another reflection of the enormous emphasis that the Government places on the public sector at the expense of the private sector. It shows clearly what little regard the Government has for the private sector. Some departments deserve recognition in this race to see who can increase its Public Service entitlement more.

The Premier's Department, in the period 1971 to 1979, has increased its staff from 85 to 195; in the Community Welfare Department the increase has been from 609 to 1 156; in the Lands Department, from 476 to 926; and in the Treasury, from 23 to 126. The Government is in fact slowly converting the private sector to a public sector with its ever-growing intrusion into private industries, administration and business.

It is traditional to support the Supply Bill but in doing so I would once again warn the people of South Australia that in destroying private enterprise the Government is destroying development, job opportunities and, basically, South Australia's future. That will continue to happen if this Government remains in office and continues to expand the public sector at the extreme expense of not only the private sector but the community as a whole. I support the Bill, but with considerable reservations on that score.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Bill.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to speak about matters which are of particular importance to the people of South Australia. The Australian Labor Party has, in the last two weeks, made it quite clear that it still holds to its present attitude on uranium, and the results for South Australia of such insistence on that policy have become quite clear and are becoming increasingly clear to everyone in the community. The cost to South Australia, if this continues—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. I cannot hear the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN: The cost to South Australia is absolutely enormous in terms of those very important things: investment, development and especially jobs. Most people in the community believe that the Labor Party's policy is one of a complete ban on uranium, but I and many of my colleagues are not absolutely certain as to exactly what the policy is following the Premier's recent remarks. He says one thing on one occasion and says quite the reverse on another. The policy as enunciated by the Premier on Tuesday clearly involves leaving uranium in the ground as far as most people in the community are concerned. His attitudes and remarks indicate that he is either not clear on his thinking or does not really believe what he is

advocating and would really like to be saying something else.

There is no question in many people's minds that he went away on his recent overseas tour to prepare the ground for a change of mind, to condition the people of South Australia to this wonderful revelation, this state of mind where he would be able to come back as the only person in South Australia who can make a decision on uranium and reassure the people of South Australia that it was safe after all, that it would be possible to mine and treat uranium, and that he could go ahead and do what was right and proper. If he had done that he might have won the support and respect of the majority of South Australians, because he would have been doing what was best for them. He did not choose to do that, and it was quite clear from the statements that he made from overseas that he was subjected to enormous pressures even while he was away from his State. He was forced to keep his options wide open, and on his return he finally stated to this House his continued commitment to the ban on uranium.

I do not believe it was a coincidence that meetings were organised while he was away by certain sections of the Parliamentary Labor Party, and I certainly do not in any way believe that it is a coincidence that the Ministers, including the Minister at the table now, who were, while he was away, supporting him on the subject of opening up Roxby Downs and getting on with the job of mining uranium, have not been heard from since, except in the most vague and fence-sitting way. On Tuesday 6 February the Premier reiterated his Party's adherence to the total ban on uranium. The reports in the media of that debate gave a very strong impression in the minds of some people that the Liberal Party was concerned only with the enormous loss of investment in jobs to the State that would result from the ban. Certainly we are concerned about that matter, but the Premier indeed tried to go further and implied that that was all that the Liberal Party was concerned about. He said on Wednesday 7 February in this House:

I pointed out yesterday that the honourable member was at variance with his Federal Leader, who has said quite clearly in the Federal policy of the Liberal Government that safeguards requirements must come first.

That statement was totally untrue. The State Liberal Party has made it quite clear that it believes safeguards requirements are of vital importance and that it not only supports those laid down by the Federal Government but would insist on its own local safeguards as well. The Federal Government safeguards were announced by the Prime Minister on 24 May 1977, and it is significant that in the Federal Parliament on 24 August 1978 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Peacock, announced agreements with Finland and the Philippines which incorporated the full safeguards. I would like to put on record for this House exactly what was said at that time. Mr. Peacock said:

The agreements which I have tabled represent important steps in the establishment of a network of bilateral agreements between Australia and countries wishing to import Australian uranium. The purpose of these agreements is to ensure that when Australia supplies uranium for peaceful purposes it will not be diverted to non-peaceful or explosive uses. To this end the agreements incorporate stringent safeguards and controls on the use of uranium we supply to other countries for peaceful purposes.

The Agreement with Finland incorporates all the Government's safeguards requirements as announced by the Prime Minister on 24 May last year. These are:

- (1) an undertaking that nuclear material supplied by

Australia will not be diverted to military or explosive purposes;

- (2) the application of International Atomic Energy Agency (I.A.E.A.) safeguards, which provide an international check against diversion of nuclear material;
- (3) fallback arrangements to ensure continued safeguarding of this nuclear material should I.A.E.A. safeguards for any reason cease to apply;
- (4) a requirement for Australia's prior consent to any retransfers, to ensure that uranium supplied by Australia cannot be re-exported unless we are satisfied that the ultimate destination is acceptable and that adequate controls would apply to the transferred material;
- (5) a requirement for Australia's prior consent for high enrichment or reprocessing of nuclear material supplied by Australia. This ensures that these operations can only take place if Australia is fully satisfied about the arrangements and conditions. This effectively reserves Australia's position on reprocessing, as the Government has said it would, pending the outcome of current international studies including the International Fuel Cycle Evaluation Study (I.N.F.C.E.);
- (6) provisions ensuring that adequate physical security will be maintained, to guard against theft or other illegal use of nuclear material by groups or individuals; and
- (7) provisions for consultations to ensure the effective implementation of the agreement;
- (8) all of these safeguards and controls are to cover nuclear material derived from Australian uranium so long as it remains in a form relevant from the point of view of safeguards; that is, until it has been consumed or diluted to the point where there is no practical possibility of it being useful for the purpose of making a nuclear weapon.

Further to that series of safeguards, the Foreign Minister went on to set down other provisions, as follows:

A right for Australia to have access to relevant conclusions of the I.A.E.A. on its inspections in Finland.

An article on sanctions which will apply if a recipient breaches the agreement or does not comply with I.A.E.A. safeguards.

An article providing for arbitral procedures to resolve any disputes over implementation of the agreement.

I have put those matters on record because far too much rubbish has been talked in this House, especially tonight by the member for Morphett by way of interjection about safeguards and the Liberal Party action to them. I now answer the interjections that came so inanely across the Chamber so often. We would not have to worry about Iran. It would not have been supplied with uranium under the safeguards arrangement, because there was not such an agreement. If anyone will supply Iran with uranium from now on, it is likely to be Soviet Russia, with no questions asked.

The Liberal Party in South Australia accepts and supports those safeguards as responsible and proper safeguards and as being most necessary. It is appropriate that this be put on record in the context of general public concern. Therefore, the Premier was totally inaccurate when he accused me and my Party of being at variance with the Federal Party. We are just as concerned as anyone that uranium is not supplied without proper safeguards.

As has already been pointed out tonight, many people in the community believe that failure to supply uranium under proper safeguards and controls could lead to greater

danger. The proliferation of fast breeder reactors has been referred to by the member for Flinders, and I share his concern that plutonium might be produced by the fast breeder reactor process. That is a real danger compared to the use of ordinary nuclear fuel.

There is also a real danger of a massive future environmental problem resulting from the continued consumption of hydrocarbons. A catastrophe of monumental scale could arise with climatic changes melting the polar icecaps. A few years ago we would have said that it was science fiction, but now it is very much a possibility, and a possibility that could be a reality in the first half of the next century. We cannot disregard that possibility.

There is then the need for the third world countries to derive enough energy to develop in the way that they should develop. There is no reason why they should be disadvantaged, either. The Liberal Party says that the uranium ban in South Australia has not changed the world uranium situation: it is not influencing the development of safeguards or disposal techniques in any positive way. All it is doing is costing the State thousands of potential jobs at a time when these jobs are sorely needed.

Deciding that the uranium ban in South Australia is not achieving anything is not in any way, as has been suggested by one or two people, throwing away moral and ethical principles. To the contrary, the deep concern for those people presently unable to find jobs, and suffering because of it, indicates a highly developed moral and social conscience. That is the Liberal Party's attitude.

The Premier and his Party have continued to hold to the total ban. However, as I have stated, there is some doubt as to where the Premier really stands. On Wednesday last, after his comments about the safeguards, when talking about the setting of those safeguards, he stated:

That will make it clear to the uranium industry what has to be met, and in the circumstances the uranium industry will know what its course ahead is—

this is the important part—

now, if the honourable member thinks that that means leaving uranium in the ground, all I can say is that that is not what the industry believes.

What exactly did the Premier mean by that? Clearly, he implies that the total ban on uranium, which he has espoused to the public, should not be and is not being interpreted by the industry in that way. It was well known, even during the Federal Labor Party campaign (that Party's disastrous campaign), that exploration was continuing and discussion on uranium technology and uranium enrichment was continuing in this State. That action was described as keeping up with technology at the same time as the Premier was on television saying how terrible uranium was and that he would not touch it with a 40ft. pole.

Mr. Gunn: What about exploration on Plumbago Station?

Mr. TONKIN: True, there was exploration on Plumbago Station, the visit from URENCO, the visit to Roxby Downs and the visit to Redcliff. Everyone in South Australia would be forgiven for thinking that the Labor Government's attitude and policy was one of continued development of uranium. Now the Premier has indirectly told the mining industry, "Although we are promoting an absolute ban on uranium, you should not take that to mean that uranium will be left in the ground. At some time in the future, and soon enough for you not to delay your best efforts now, I have decided that uranium mining will occur."

That is basically what he said. There is no gainsaying that. Where does our Premier really stand? No wonder his statements have been so equivocal in recent weeks. He

wants uranium and he wants to develop it, but he cannot say so because of pressures within his own Party and the risk of creating and bringing out into the open the enormous split that lies just beneath the surface. The Premier is reduced to telegraphing his real attitude in this way, hoping that the general public will not notice.

If the public did notice, there would be an outcry about what would be clearly a most hypocritical attitude on his part. While he equivocates and dithers publicly, South Australia is losing investment and jobs. We are not well off for jobs or investment. That has been made clear. There have been one or two half-hearted attempts to deny that from the benches opposite, but most realistic and practical people even in the Labor Party accept that South Australia is in a pretty poor condition.

The whole record of the past nine years has been summed up well as the Dunstan decade being really the decade of decay. It seems that there has been nothing but a succession of dismal failures and proposed projects that have not come to fruition. The A.L.P. is good at blaming someone else. It has blamed the Prime Minister so often for so many different things in the past three or four years that it has now become almost a laughing stock. It is almost a conditioned reflex, and people tend to laugh as they did when the Premier only last week blamed the Prime Minister again for the loss of the petro-chemical plant, totally forgetting that it was his own Party, both Federal and State, which lost that plant for South Australia twice previously, in 1973 and then in 1974. We could have had that plant on stream now if we had not had the delays and mismanagement of the Federal and State Labor Party.

Mr. Venning: Only a foolish person makes the same mistake twice.

Mr. TONKIN: They have done it twice, and I hope they have not done it a third time. The Government has been steadily eroding the basis for South Australian prosperity. It has been done carefully. I do not think that the architects of this scheme have really appreciated what they were going to achieve. I think they believed they would gradually replace private enterprise with widespread Government ownership and control. I pay the architects of that scheme the courtesy of believing that they were unthinking when they devised these policies. I do not think they realised what damage they would do to South Australia, but damage they have done. They have adopted a policy of introducing a Bill for a specific innocuous or reasonable purpose involving some aspects of business. There are several examples of this technique now before us.

They involve certain members of the community in that section of the business community in advising them. They put the legislation through. Once it is on the Statute Book, it is there, ready to be reactivated at any time. A perfect example is the door to door sales legislation, which is now being amended, having been introduced in one form in previous sessions, amended heavily by the Attorney-General of the time after the outcry from the community, and finally put on the Statute Book in an amended form. The amendments currently before us in a further Bill now bring the legislation right back into that original objectionable form. That is par for the course. That is the technique which is being followed. Most of the recent examples have been introduced in a somewhat more stringent and open form.

It is a source of continued amazement to me that some members of the business community, people who live by private or free enterprise, are still not able or willing to see that the Government intends the eventual destruction of private enterprise. Some of these people perhaps have

been flattered by being consulted by the Government; others may have been attracted to the thought that a position may be available in a new authority to be created; but whatever the reasons or the authority, the Government has certainly managed to achieve a great deal of intrusion into the private sector, and private enterprise has suffered sorely. Some sections of it have actually helped to dig the grave of their industry, and the Government is simply waiting to push them in, with a little more modification of its legislation, a little more toughening up and control.

Then, that section of private enterprise will go over to public ownership, with all the resultant evils. Industrial development is at a standstill in this State. There will always be exceptions to prove the rule, and I have no doubt that we will know when the exceptions come along, because they will be trumpeted from the rooftops by the Premier and the Deputy Premier, and the Minister knows that. I imagine that the Government is desperate to have any developments to trumpet about and to offset the potential loss of a uranium enrichment plant.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The I.r.t. increased from \$70 000 000 to \$100 000 000 over Christmas.

Mr. TONKIN: That is another project. There are exceptions that prove every rule, but it does not gainsay the general situation. The Government is now intruding or attempting to intrude into many sections of private enterprise, and even into the lives of private individuals. The clothing factory is threatening to close down private firms. That is not just fancy; it is happening all the time. The State Government Insurance Commission is taking business away from other companies by what they would call dubious methods. Private bus operators are being put out of operation by the State Transport Authority in a most arbitrary way.

The Public Buildings Department is taking contracts away from the building and construction industry, no matter what the Deputy Premier may say. The Incorporated Associations Bill would effectively extend Government supervision and control into many spheres of public and community life—from schools to church organisations to charitable organisations, almost everywhere that the Government could extend its influence.

Other Bills, namely, those dealing with the Overseas Trading Corporation, the Timber Trading Corporation, and the Companies Act Amendment Bill show clearly that the Government is aiming at controlling private companies, and, where possible, by forcing them out of business, taking them over. It is obvious that the present Government will do nothing to help private enterprise, even though it is private enterprise on which we should be depending to create jobs now. We cannot do without private enterprise.

That fact was recognised by, I think, Mr. Hayden, when Federal Treasurer, in introducing a Federal Budget. He said, "We must now stimulate the private sector to help create the jobs we need in Australia." Unfortunately, he did not do anything to stimulate the private sector. It seems to me that what is going on at present is exactly that sort of thing in South Australia. Much lip service is paid by the Government to private enterprise. There is much consultation with private enterprise, but that is achieving nothing but the destruction of private enterprise. That, basically, is the root cause of South Australia's problems.

This afternoon, the Deputy Premier talked about a mixed economy and said that there was a place for the private sector and the public sector in such an economy and that both should be working side by side, or words to that effect. There is no question of this Government working side by side with private enterprise in any way,

shape or form.

Mr. Mathwin: No hope at all.

Mr. TONKIN: There is no hope for private enterprise while this Government holds its particular policies and puts into action the disincentives that are destroying private enterprise in this State and keeping development from coming here. The whole situation is showing itself in the lack of job opportunities. This is the key factor to the entire situation in South Australia: our employment situation is worse than other States, particularly for the young, yet here a Labor Party, which supposedly is dedicated to looking after the working man, is actively destroying jobs by the policies it adopts, espouses, and puts into operation. One of the best things I have heard for many years was something that happened yesterday. A meeting of tourist industry representatives was held to complain about the Hotels Commission Bill, and properly they should have complained about that Bill. There were no two ways. The Bill would mean an intrusion into almost every aspect of the tourist and catering industry.

For a time, the Government, by using its usual methods, persuaded certain people in the catering and tourist industry that there was nothing to fear but, fortunately, that meeting, having had the facts put to it, has now come out totally against any Government intrusion into the tourist industry. Not only has it done that in the most forthright way, but the 200 people present at the meeting have now determined that they will spearhead a "Save private enterprise campaign". The people of South Australia in the private sector have had more than enough, and all the other groups to which I have referred (from insurance to clothing manufacturers, to people in the transport industry, and to the tourist industry) who earn their living and who believe in the private enterprise system and in individual initiatives and the right for people to work for themselves are banding together, using this as a spearhead. They will mount such a campaign, which the Liberal Party will totally support, as has never been seen before in this State, and there is little that the Government will be able to do to stop it. People can stand just so much Government intrusion and pushing around by Government.

Mr. Venning: No more.

Mr. TONKIN: That is right. The people have come to a point when they will accept no more, as my colleague has said. South Australians have come to breaking point. They are sick and tired of Government controls, Government intrusion, and the destruction of private initiatives, private enterprise, prosperity, and jobs, because that is what the policies of this Government is bringing.

It is possible that a leopard may change its spots, but it is highly unlikely. I believe that the present Government has painted itself totally and absolutely into a disastrous corner for the State. I could possibly ask responsible members of the A.L.P. to use their good offices and votes in Caucus and their influence at the coming conference of the Labor Party to reverse these disastrous policies that are costing South Australia and its people so much.

However, I am certain that I would be wasting my breath if I did that. It is a great shame. I do accept (and I say that I believe) that many people in the Labor Party now, both inside and outside Parliament, and in the trade union movement, are having serious doubts about the course of action being followed by this Government.

I have received, in the past two or three weeks, letters the like of which I have never received before. Quite often, as honourable members know, we receive letters addressed to us by members ostensibly of our own Party saying "I have always been a Liberal Party supporter but," and the Labor Party receive letters saying, "I have always

been a Labor Party supporter, but," but at the present moment I am getting letters that say "I have always been a Labor Party supporter, but I am never going to vote for them again because of what they have done to me, my family or the State."

That is a total departure from the usual but it prefaces a most exciting time for South Australia, a hard time, a tough time, but a time when we can finally work to dislodge the Labor Government and get this State back on its feet again as it used to be in the days of Sir Thomas Playford and the other Ministers who worked so hard during that time. I do hope that this State can get back to that prosperity. That chance will come at the next election, whenever that may be, because then the Labor Party members will have to stand up and be counted.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I would like to carry on from the points I was making during the earlier grievance debate, when I referred to the fact that in 1976 the Premier was lauded for his foresight and tenacity in seeking a uranium enrichment plant for South Australia. This was at the time the Minister of Mines and Energy was overseas actively seeking support and finance for such a scheme. An editorial that appeared in the *Australian* of 2 July 1976 states:

South Australia already has uranium reserves at places like Radium Hill and elsewhere, and it would not be difficult to transport the yellow cake—the raw uranium product—from the Northern Territory and Queensland to Redcliff. And South Australia with its gasfields and plentiful resources of coal could easily provide the cheap power required in the enrichment process.

Western Australia and Queensland are the other two States in the running for an enrichment plant, and Mr. Dunstan is well aware of this. So his move in going out and trying to get overseas finance for a South Australian plant has put his State ahead of its rivals in the race. Full marks to Mr. Dunstan.

As I said, the wheel has turned full circle. We now have the Premier, in 1979, not only three years behind but probably 10 years behind. There are two points he has made: one is that it is not satisfactory to supply uranium to a customer country if it is not a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty. That can certainly be negotiated, Canada has proved that. I will quote the safeguards policy that has been adopted over the years by the Canadian Government, which is profitably mining and exporting uranium at the present time as well as fuelling its own four reactors. This article appeared in *Image Canada Today—Safeguards Policy*. The article states:

Safeguards policy: Since 1958, Canada has required that exports of Canadian nuclear materials, equipment and technology be used only for peaceful purposes. In May of 1974 India exploded a nuclear device using plutonium obtained from a Canadian-supplied CIRUS research reactor. As a consequence, in December 1974, Canada's nuclear safeguards policy was revised to become even more stringent, so as to ensure that no Canadian material, technology, or equipment would be used again in development or manufacture of a nuclear explosive device of any kind.

The new policy moved Canada ahead of other nations in its nuclear safeguards demands. Deliveries under existing uranium sales contracts were allowed to proceed, however, while new Government-to-Government agreements were being negotiated. In December 1976, additional safeguards conditions were announced by the Minister of External Affairs. Under these even more stringent terms, all new contracts for the supply of Canadian nuclear materials, technology, and equipment will only be approved by the Government if the recipient country has ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) or if it is willing to allow

inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency of all its nuclear facilities.

In January 1977, the Canadian Government embargoed the export of Canadian nuclear materials and technology to all countries which had not completed negotiating these revised nuclear safeguards agreements with Canada. Shipments of uranium to a number of countries were affected: principally Japan, countries of the European Economic Community, Switzerland and the United States. As of early 1978, agreements had been reached with all customer countries with the exception of Switzerland, and shipments have been resumed.

For the Premier to stand here and claim it is not possible to negotiate agreements in relation to non-proliferation with countries that have ratified the non-proliferation treaty is absolute nonsense, the Canadians have done it. The other point the Premier has made is that in fact Sweden—

Mrs. Byrne: What has the Australian Government done?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On the contrary, the Australian Government has a similar policy. The other point made by the Premier was that there was no satisfactory solution to the long-term burial of atomic waste. He conceded that Sweden was well on the way and that the end was well within sight, by the end of the year, I think. They classified the waste material. They have large granite deposits which had remained static for millions of years, so they could bore a hole, pad this stuff up with other material (and I cannot remember the name of the material they use) then it could be deposited in the bowels of the earth in this large granitic rock.

The Premier made the claim, falsely, that very few countries were similarly disposed for the final disposition of this atomic waste. It was interesting to read what the Professor of Economic Geology said the day after the Premier's television interview with Mr. Alan Reid. I thought the Premier conducted the interview well; Mr. Reid seemed to be incidental to the whole performance. Nevertheless, I do not believe, despite the Premier's domination of that interview, that he managed to get his message across to the public of South Australia very well. He certainly didn't to Professor Ypma. The article is headed "Dunstan spoke 'uranium nonsense'", and states:

Claims by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, on television last night about uranium safe disposal problems were "sheer nonsense", uranium expert, Professor Peter Ypma, said today.

And Mr. Dunstan's reluctance to mine uranium was only promoting the spread of plutonium, he warned.

Professor Ypma, Professor of Economic Geology of Adelaide University, was commenting on a Channel 9 interview with Mr. Dunstan.

Professor Ypma said: "His statement that the Swedish (safe disposal) process is inapplicable to large parts of the world is sheer nonsense".

The Swedish method involved depositing nuclear waste in glass form in granite rock—but Mr. Dunstan claimed this could be done only in a few countries, Professor Ypma said.

"Seventy-five per cent of the earth consists of stable crystalline rock," he said.

The Hon. J. C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He happens to be the professor of Economic Geology. It would be as well if the Minister of Community Development went and talked to someone who knows. The Minister does not know who this man is, he is the Professor of Economic Geology at Adelaide University. How ignorant can the newly fledged Minister be, and the Government claims it has consulted the experts! I suggest that the Premier and his Minister do a quick course in geology. For the Premier to stand and say

he has come back with this hard-line policy, that we will not touch the stuff, and that Sweden is blessed with this great slab of granite rock (nobody else has it), that the French have got it stored under the floor (and the Premier stood on it and should glow at night), and that nobody else has got the solution, is sheer nonsense.

As any geologist who has investigated this question would know, 75 per cent of the earth's crust is stable crystalline material, and certainly this professor in South Australia has pointed that out. The professor also explained that the Labor Party policy was achieving precisely what it claimed it did not want to achieve. It states that it does not want the amount of plutonium in the world to increase and does not want to add anything to the nuclear cycle. In fact, if the Premier had taken any notice of what the Americans have been saying recently, he would realise that by withholding the supply of uranium, he is encouraging countries to reprocess. Of course, in reprocessing, plutonium is the product sought for use in a fast breeder reactor.

I have heard the Minister of Mines and Energy saying in this House previously that we must be frightened of the plutonium economy. It would be far worse overseas if we got into the fast breeder reactors and far more dangerous. Yet the Government's policy is deliberately encouraging this. If we examine the two grounds on which the Premier took his stance, we can observe that it was a pretty shaky stance. The stance had no foundation in fact at all, and on both scores he has misled the public. These safeguards can be negotiated with countries who signed the non-proliferation treaty, as demonstrated by Canada. To state that Sweden is the only place where this material can be stored is palpably false.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Over the past few months I have received a vast amount of mail, both before and since the publication of the South Australian Institute of Teachers Special Bulletin entitled "What the Cuts in Education Spending Mean to You". It is quite significant that by far and away the majority of school principals, staffs and parents and friends organisations that have contacted me have been critical of the State Education Department for its cuts in education spending. This happened in spite of obvious attempts by the Minister and members of the Government to foist the blame quite firmly on the Federal Government for cuts in spending.

I advised most of the people who wrote to me, and also the Minister of Education, of the background to education cuts in South Australia. I have put some of these statistics in *Hansard* before, but I believe they are worth repeating in view of the spate of activity that has taken place since December of last year. Over the past few years the Federal Government has made considerable sums of money available to the South Australian Government. The total funds available are as follows: 1975-76, \$975 000 000; 1976-77, \$1 033 000 000; 1977-78, \$1 179 000 000; and 1978-79, \$1 219 000 000. It is significant that included in these sums are large untied grants, which means that the South Australian Government has been able to spend considerable sums of money as it saw fit; that is, the untied money could be allocated to Government spending, including education, according to Government-established priorities. The Federal Government did not tie the State Government hand and foot when it granted that money. Therefore, the State Government has had a total Federal allocation to education of \$2 500 000 000 for 1978-79, from which its own allocation was made. That is a vast sum of money.

The State Government has been making a great play about cuts in education. In fact, the Federal Government

made another major concession when it agreed to index upwards the salaries component across the entire educational spectrum, with the single exception of pre-school, which was one area over which the State Minister made a great fuss when in fact it was an extremely minor part of education spending. What that really meant was that 85 per cent of the total expenditure for education from the Federal Government was guaranteed against inflation, and the remaining 15 per cent for capital works has also been protected over the past few months in regard to contracts for building, which have tended to be pegged with little inflation factor built into them. That has generally helped to peg back inflation. It is also significant that the Institute of Teachers also lodged an ambit claim last year for a 20 per cent increase in teachers' salaries. That alone would have added approximately \$50 000 000 to the Education Department's salaries bill. That, too, was a far greater amount than the small sums the State Minister has been trying to prune from the education budget. I refer in particular to the \$500 000 cut in the first half of this current year's equipment grants, a very minor amount, really.

The complaints made by many of the schools to me regarding the Minister's having reneged on his promise to give non-contact time to primary school teachers are also worth some comment. My personal opinion is that if the Minister did not intend to give non-contact time he should not have promised it. And promise it he most certainly did in A.L.P. policy, for example, which was published towards the middle of last year. I recall that because I was asked to make some comment on behalf of the Liberal Party. My reply to the Institute of Teachers at that time was that I felt it would be better to reduce the staff-student ratios in primary schools by the appointment, not of an ancillary staff to help non-contact time, but of specialist staff.

For example, the number of librarians in primary schools is far lower than it should be. The number of specialist physical education staff is not adequate, and there is a vast deficiency in speech and hearing therapist services throughout South Australia. There are so many required in the metropolitan and country areas that this is obviously a great deficiency that has to be attended to by training more staff, rather than importing them from interstate sources.

Another factor which has militated against schools in South Australia getting equipment grants and other grants is that recently the Minister has seen fit to push through Bills that have brought the education and further education teaching professions into line with the Public Service in respect of the granting of additional long service leave, and I refer to the 15 days instead of nine days after 15 years service. A much higher ceiling has been awarded to principals of schools for annual leaving loading, for example. Principals of schools have rung me and complained about the way in which they have been given additional benefits when they would have preferred to have junior members of staff taken on to help reduce the staff-student ratio. Teachers are generally very conscientious in this regard.

[Midnight]

The Federal Government has reduced inflation considerably, from 17 per cent to 18 per cent in 1975 to less than 8 per cent now, and that has increased the amount of money available for education spending, simply by adding to the value of each dollar spent rather than diminishing the value, as was done in 1975. Anyone closely involved in education would realise that there are plenty of areas

where economies could be achieved without affecting the quality of education.

Many parents would much prefer an improved methodology and an improved curriculum to spending more money on rather ephemeral aspects of education. I have a massive submission from the people responsible for developing primary and secondary school curricula, saying that far too little money is being spent in that direction, since it was 1974 when the Review of Primary School Curriculum booklet was published and there are still insufficient curriculum writers in mathematics and English, for example, right through primary and secondary school, from entrance into primary school through to year 12 in secondary school.

These are areas in which positive action can be taken by the Minister and the Government to improve the quality of education, and areas in which the Federal Government is in no way involved. It would not cost so much money when one considers that only this evening we have added several million dollars to the education bill without adding any extra staff at all to improve the teacher-student ratio.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.2 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 14 February at 2 p.m.