

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 8 August 1979

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

PETITIONS: MARIJUANA

Petitions signed by 2 548 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation that provides for the legal sale, cultivation or distribution of marijuana were presented by Messrs. Dean Brown, Mathwin, and Russack.

Petitions received.

PETITION: BOTANIC PARK

A petition signed by 118 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation which would enable the Government to adopt the proposed North-East railway transit route through Botanic Park and along Victoria Drive was presented by Mrs. Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITION: LAND TAX

A petition signed by 65 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to revalue all properties assessed this year to ensure that property valuations should not exceed 90 per cent of current market values and abolish land tax on all residential properties immediately was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

A petition signed by 75 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. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME**STATE'S ECONOMY**

Mr. TONKIN: In the six months since the Premier announced that economic recovery was his No. 1 priority, what specific measures has he taken to restore business and consumer activity, to increase employment, and to achieve major new development for this State, and what success, if any, has he had?

Yesterday the Premier quoted from the latest A.N.Z. Bank Bulletin, which reported an apparent upturn in retail sales in the March quarter. The A.N.Z. Bulletin now acknowledges that the retail sales figure quoted by the Premier has since been revised downwards by the Bureau of Statistics; inquiries were made this morning. The recent upturn quoted by the Premier is no more than a reversal of a corresponding downturn in the preceding quarter. South Australia's share of national retail sales has not improved since September last year. Many other indicators also

show that South Australia's share of business activity is below that of other States. They appear in the Australian Bureau of Statistics publications, bank bulletins and many other publications. What indicators can the Premier point to which promise renewed business and consumer confidence in this State under his Government's policies and administration?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It seems as though the Leader of the Opposition is going to make this a weekly question. I think he asked an identical question last week.

Mr. Tonkin: No.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If it is not couched in identical terms, it is fairly close to it. One of the things I would like the Leader of the Opposition to do is from time to time join with me in expressing confidence in the future of this State, instead of doing what he attempted to do yesterday. This is a classic example of the tactics of the Leader of the Opposition.

I see in an editorial in the *News* today that he is now being considered as an appropriate alternative. When I have finished with him today I hope the people of South Australia will realise that he either has been blatantly dishonest or has not understood, but he certainly has manipulated figures. He said yesterday that State taxes in this State had risen by 500 per cent since 1971.

What the Leader did was take into account (this is the only way in which we can arrive at it) pay-roll tax that was passed to the States in 1971 by Prime Minister McMahon (I am not sure whether it was Gorton or McMahon, but McMahon will do) because it was considered to be a growth tax, on the basis that the States would get together, and any increase in the tax would be across the board; in other words, the States would agree on it. That money was available to the States in the form of Commonwealth grants prior to that tax being transferred.

If we look at the increase in these State taxes that the Leader should have taken into account, the increase amounts to 160 per cent over that period, not 500 per cent as the Leader cited. He has set out deliberately to doctor statistics. We used to have the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry as the chief doctor of statistics, whereas now the Leader has taken over from him. If the Leader is honest, he will say whether he included pay-roll tax. He will know that that is not a fair comparison.

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader knows what I am talking about. He is not a fool altogether. I would like him to be honest sometimes and to express confidence in this State's future.

Mr. Tonkin: If you'll change your policies.

The SPEAKER: Order! During Question Time yesterday the same thing happened concerning the Leader after he had asked his question. Today, I will call him to order and take appropriate action if he does not stop interjecting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have already indicated to the House this week the indicators I looked at when I said that I thought that the economy might be about to turn the corner in an upward trend. I will recite them again to the House for the Leader's benefit. I said that employment in industry in South Australia had increased by 700 over the same period last year, that there was a steady increase in the amount of overtime being worked, and that that was a forerunner, and I think that the Leader would agree that this leads to more employment. I repeat what I said about the increase in retail sales in this State. If the Leader says that this is only an upward trend from the downturn previously, surely that is a good sign.

The Leader does not seem to recognise anything that would give confidence to the people of this State not only

to spend but also to manufacture more so that people can purchase more. He asked what the Government has done since I have been in power to encourage industry to promote the economic well-being of this State. He knows that the prime responsibility for any upturn in the economy of this State, or of any other State, lies fairly and squarely with the Commonwealth Government. He knows that there is a limited amount that the State Government can do—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He must have a pain in his stomach.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is answering the question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader knows that there is a limited amount the State Government can do to affect the economy of this State. What I am interested in doing in this State is seeing that the business and industry we have here expand and are maintained, where possible, and we will do our best to attract new industries to this State. We have been pursuing that course. We have looked at incentives, those incentives are the best in Australia, and we are out to sell them wherever we can. There will be, and there are, things in the pipeline which, I hope, will give a further boost to confidence in this State.

They will be a direct result of the Government's efforts. It is convenient for members opposite to forget what has happened in the past, because that is achieved and there is nothing to it, but I do not forget it. The other thing we get is the irresponsible attitude—

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:—not only of the Leader but also of members of his Party in statements they make about taxation. Then, of course, the very next day, or in the next breath almost, they demand that the Government spend much more than it is spending in certain areas. Let me ask the Leader and challenge him to tell the people of this State where he is going with taxation. Members opposite are constantly saying we should rid this State of succession duties; the Leader is nodding his head. The Leader is constantly saying we should rid this State of land tax; he is nodding his head again.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Up and down, not sideways.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Let us look at State taxes: that would mean that \$40 000 000 annually would be taken from the State Budget. Even in the Leader's wildest dreams, and even with his waste watchdog flat out, nobody in his right mind could, for one moment, assume that we could cut services to that extent without sacking 3 000 to 4 000 people. Let us look at the average wage. Let us look at the effect it would have. The Opposition is not prepared to say where it would cut costs. The only alternative the Leader would have is another form of taxation. I want the Leader to stand up and say whether he believes what his Federal counterparts believe, and what the Prime Minister believes. Is he going to impose on the people of South Australia an income tax surcharge?

Mr. Tonkin: No, I am not.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader that he is not taking over the running of the House.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I challenge him to say whether he is going to impose a further form of sales tax on turnover: he will say "No" to that, too. So we have the situation where the Government is going to drop \$40 000 000 a year in income and is not going to charge

anybody any more in any other area, it is not going to raise any other taxation that I can see; it is just going to cut services.

Mr. Tonkin: We are not.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the Leader believes that, he is a joke, and knows he is a joke.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the mining debate?

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Deputy Leader just mentioned mining ventures. I point out to the Deputy Leader, because he must have forgotten, that Western Mining and B.P. Australia have just indicated that they are going to invest \$50 000 000 over three years in a feasibility study on Roxby Downs, and on further exploration.

Mr. Allison interjecting:

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Do not tell me that that is not an investment in the right direction. The Deputy Leader will say that the policies of this Government will prevent that area being exploited. He does not know any more than anyone else knows whether it will be a profitable venture to mine at Roxby Downs the huge deposits of copper, gold and rare earth that exist there, without having to tamper with uranium; he does not know that. That is a possibility that will be explored.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not want to go on with this. I simply say that I believe that the people of South Australia will benefit because of the attitude I have adopted. The Government's attitude is not anti-business and was never anti-business: the things that we will do as a Government will be balanced and fair not only to industry but also to those who have only their labour to sell. We have to take those people into account because, if one followed the philosophy, not necessarily of the Leader but of some of the people who sit on the other side of the House, we would have never got children out of the coal mines; they would still be there. Honourable members ought to look back to that period to see the trouble that that caused and the pressure that had to be brought to bear to bring that reform about. They may not be quite as bad as that—

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order. He is continually interjecting, and he is very lucky that I did not warn him.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They might not be quite as bad as that, but they look the same. I am satisfied that the people of South Australia know that the attitude of this Government and its Premier is such that all that can possibly be done to help them will be done, and I am certainly not going to join the knocking crusade that the Leader seems bent on pursuing, and he is followed not by all but by some of the members opposite. I hope he wakes up, turns over a new leaf, and sees that he can assist the Government, as he ought to do as a responsible Leader of the Opposition, to see that confidence in this State is renewed. The Leader has his part to play, and it is about time he started to play it.

HAPPY VALLEY SEWER SCHEME

Mr. DRURY: Will the Minister of Planning give me a progress report on the Reynella, Happy Valley and

Aberfoyle Park trunk sewer scheme and indicate a likely completion date? Constituents of mine in the Happy Valley area have asked me, on a number of occasions, when this scheme will be completed. Their concern is mainly for health reasons, but also because the temporary pumping stations situated along part of the route are aesthetically undesirable.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As the honourable member was kind enough to give me advance notice regarding the information he needs, I am pleased to be able to give him and the House details that I now have to hand. The \$6 700 000 Reynella, Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park trunk sewer scheme will cater for the present and future development of these rapidly growing areas. Currently, sewage flows from these areas are either treated at the temporary Happy Valley sewage treatment works or transferred by a series of pumping stations to the Christies Beach system.

When the new scheme is completed, the temporary treatment works and 11 temporary pumping stations will be eliminated. As the honourable member pointed out in his explanation, at least some of his constituents expressed views about the temporary pumping stations, so I am sure he will be glad to hear that the scheme as a whole will eliminate 11 of these necessary, but, in this case, temporary, pumping stations.

The bulk of the scheme involves the laying of 6 260 metres of sewers of various size in a generally easterly direction from the township of Reynella and 1 850 metres of sewers in a generally south-westerly direction from Fountain Valley Drive, Happy Valley. Flows from these areas will either gravitate or be pumped to a major new pumping station to be built at Corn Street, Reynella, and from there will be lifted to the upstream end of the Christie Creek trunk sewer. I can report that work on the gravity sewers has been under way since July last year and the entire scheme is expected to be completed late in 1982.

PORT STANVAC REFINERY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Deputy Premier say what negotiations the Minister has instituted with Mobil Oil Australia, and what steps the Government has taken to attract the Mobil Oil Company's planned refinery development to Port Stanvac in South Australia, rather than have it situated at the Altona Refinery in Victoria? According to a report in last week's *Financial Review*, quoting Mr. Jim Leslie, the Chairman of Mobil Oil Australia, a decision will be made by that company early next year on refinery modifications which will produce a higher yield of gasoline from available feedstock. The report states in part:

Mr. Leslie says current studies are evaluating various sizes and locations, either Stanvac or Altona . . . Officially, Mobil is not saying yet what the cost of the new investment will be, but the industry has been speaking in terms up to \$420 000 000.

Is the Government confident of attracting this new industrial development to South Australia, or does it expect to maintain its present abysmal record of industrial and mineral development?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As a preliminary in answer to the Deputy Leader, may I say that I am sorry to hear about his accident. I am glad that he has been returned to us in a healthy state even though his general fellow-feeling does not seem to be any better than it was before he had his accident. Although I am a little disappointed about

that aspect, it is good to see him smiling now.

In relation to the last rather superfluous remark made by the Deputy Leader, I will bring down details of the companies with which we are involved at present and which have been involved in some expansion in South Australia. Discussions have been taking place with Mobil. I do not propose to indicate in detail what they are but the matter is tied in fundamentally with the Redcliff project, because in the process of supplying ethane to Redcliff we pipe out the other liquids in the Cooper Basin and it is planned at this stage that those other liquids (condensate, oil, and l.p.g.) should go to Port Stanvac and that the partners in Petroleum Refineries of Australia (Mobil has a 60 per cent interest and Esso a 40 per cent interest in P.R.A.) would be involved fundamentally in the whole scheme. The timing of any investment project in relation to Port Stanvac must take into account the liquids that would be coming from the Cooper Basin and the time when they are likely to be available. At this stage, it seems that it is likely to be 1983 at the earliest and more probably early 1984.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If this is a proposal—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Perhaps the honourable member would allow me to answer the question in my own way. Obviously, if there has to be a substantial investment at Port Stanvac to cope with Cooper Basin liquids, that factor must be taken into account in Mobil's overall planning. The second factor that must be taken into account is that the Mobil refineries at Port Stanvac and Altona are two of the refineries that use, in the main, imported crude. The crude used at Port Stanvac is usually spiked with about 10 per cent of Bass Strait crude, but the configuration at Port Stanvac (and I think that much the same is true at Altona) is such that the percentage of Bass Strait crude cannot go up more than 20 per cent in terms of the present scale of operations. With any reduction in fuel oil coming to Australia, there is an overall problem for the Australian community, since there is an impact on the availability of fuel oil and distillate, because these come from the heavier end of the barrel, and the heavy Middle East crude is much more productive of these products than is the light Bass Strait crude.

Therefore, Mobil's plans for expansion must also take into account the requirements for fuel oil and distillate. The Port Stanvac refinery is a net exporter of those products, and several other places, including parts of Victoria and Tasmania, are very dependent on the export of fuel oil and distillate from Port Stanvac. Whether the investment to produce more gasoline is appropriate at Port Stanvac before the Cooper Basin liquids are coming down is a technical matter of considerable complexity. As I have indicated, there have been discussions with Mobil on the whole future development. There have been discussions between the Cooper Basin producers and Mobil in relation to any liquids scheme involving Cooper Basin liquids, and the closest relationship exists between the State Government and Mobil. I assure the honourable member that any proposals for a catalytic cracker at Port Stanvac that can be supported by the State Government will be supported and appropriate arrangements made.

It is not simply a straightforward matter. A certain amount depends on configurations of oil coming into this country, configurations of various refineries, likely future supplies of oil and condensate, and what happens in particular with regard to the liquids in the Cooper Basin. If I am able at any stage to give further information, I shall do so, but the honourable member and others can rest assured that the Government will not miss out on any development that could take place at Port Stanvac that

would offer us greater security in relation to petrol supplies, and offer also expansion and employment, both during the construction phase and permanently.

MALLEE ROOTS

Mr. CRAFTER: Is the Deputy Premier aware of the high demand in the community for mallee roots for household heating and the resultant harmful effects this demand may have on the environment of the Mallee region of the State? Can he inform the House of any action the Government may be considering to monitor this situation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think questions have been raised about the use of firewood for energy. First, the position in South Australia is such that no significant contribution to our energy supplies can come from the use of firewood. Secondly, as the honourable member has said, the unrestricted and unlimited use of mallee roots in particular can create serious problems in the Mallee country and in the extensive mallee areas of the State. We need to be careful that we do not involve ourselves in developments which only create further problems with our land in terms of erosion and problems of that nature. The Government is concerned about effective control of vegetation and limitations on the extent to which our land is further devegetated. I will be taking up this matter with the Minister of Lands and, if I can provide further information for the honourable member, I will do so.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr. GUNN: Does the Premier agree with the statements made by the Minister of Health on Saturday that it was unlikely that the uranium at Roxby Downs would ever be mined and that B.P. and the Western Mining Corporation were wasting their money carrying out surveys to provide the amount of minerals that are at that most important site? A report in Saturday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Mining unlikely to start—Duncan", states:

It was unlikely that uranium would ever be mined in South Australia, the Minister for Health, Mr. Duncan, said yesterday. He said this was his own personal view. He also believed the Western Mining Corporation was "wasting its money". He said the dangers associated with the nuclear fuel cycle were too great, and if Western Mining thought it could change A.L.P. policy by massive injections of funds into Roxby Downs it was wasting its money.

In view of the earlier statements by the Premier this afternoon in which he indicated that he as Premier and the Government want to do everything to encourage investment in South Australia, what action will he take against his Minister, who is doing everything he can to deny South Australia the money that it needs?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I expect he wants me to cut off the Minister's head to discipline him or stop him from talking.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You could do worse.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to allow, in Question Time, a repetition of the situation that developed earlier today. I will take the action necessary to prevent this from happening.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In explaining his question the honourable member pointed out that the Minister of Health expressed his personal opinion. I believe that, if

sufficient pressure is put on technocrats or on customer countries which will be relying on uranium to produce power or for use in peaceful purposes, it may well be that the policy of the Labor Party and of this Government can be satisfied. We know that technocrats may come up with technology that will in fact satisfy the safeguards we demand. We know that it is possible; it must be possible. We know how innovative technocrats can become when pressure is put on them. I think one has only to look at what happened during the Second World War when pressure was put on; the demand was there, the need was there, and they produced the goods. It is possible they can do this again.

That is the only chance of there being any change in the policy of this Government. It is fair and reasonable to demand that there be adequate safeguards before we become involved in the mining, treatment or sale of uranium to a customer country. I am very disappointed to think that the honourable member, along with all his colleagues, has deserted the stand which they took about two years ago and which is exactly the stand I have just cited. They ought to think of future generations when they are screaming about the almighty dollar and what it will and will not do, and when they think about this question overall.

The Minister of Health has given a personal opinion; that is his opinion. I think technology can come up eventually with answers that will satisfy the policy of this Government. We will be constantly reviewing the situation to see what is happening.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

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

MINISTERIAL TRAINING

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier urgently consider providing a sum in the Budget to provide for Ministerial training? Expenditure of State funds for the training of Ministers, no matter what their political persuasion, should not be necessary. However, on this occasion the appropriation of even a single dollar could be of tremendous value in teaching the Minister of Health that on politically sensitive subjects, such as uranium, no Minister can enjoy personal views.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the first person we ought to start training should be the honourable member himself. I do not think he could have thought up that question on his own. Here again, the Opposition is demanding that the Government spend more money. I have just explained in a reply to the member for Eyre the situation regarding this matter. I know that the member for Light is disappointed that we are flexible enough in this Party to allow members to speak out and say what they believe. We have seen recently what has happened to some members on the other side when they do the wrong thing. It is interesting indeed; they either resign or they are headed for the bush. The honourable member should not be upset about the incident; I do not think we will devote any money at all in the Budget to the training of Ministers, irrespective of their political point of view.

KNOCKERS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Does the Premier feel that members of the Opposition would fall into the same category as that 53 per cent of the Australian community that were classed as "knockers" in a recent survey conducted by the

Australian Manufacturers Council? In the *Australian* of 2 August, a report under the heading "Here's a \$1 000 000 swipe at all the knockers" stated:

A nation-wide survey has shown Australia as a country of "knockers" in which more than half the population view locally-made goods as second-rate.

The same group believes taxes are too high; that young people are headed for a grim future; and that foreigners see the country as backward.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, most emphatically, I believe that they do fall into that category.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS

Mr. GROOM: Can the Minister of Community Development say whether the Government is considering altering the system of grants to local government authorities? I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* that quotes Mr. J. M. Hullick, of the Local Government Association, as saying that the State Government should provide untied, rather than specific purpose grants, to local government.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: I noticed the report relating to Mr. Hullick to which the honourable member has drawn my attention. I must admit that I was a little surprised at Mr. Hullick's statement, although I certainly agree with the sentiments that any arm or level of government wants some certainty of funds, because that certainty assists forward planning. In that respect, local government in its relations with the State and Federal Governments is in no different situation from the State Government in its relations with the Federal Government. We have had ample evidence of the problems that have been caused by the Federal Government's undertaking a partnership effort with the State Government in some important area of social development and then withdrawing that support, with the consequent problems that creates.

Local government already has considerable access to untied funds, that is, they are free from any requirement that they be spent on specific purposes. Apart from its own fund raising through rate revenue and its loan-raising capacity, local government receives a share of the revenue raised by personal taxation that is distributed through the Grants Commission. Last financial year, it was about \$15 000 000. A major part of the distribution (almost one-third) is on a per capita basis, that is, it is distributed regardless of need. This year, the sum will increase to over \$19 000 000. Local government is the one arm of government in Australia that receives a real increase in funds at its disposal. That \$19 000 000 represents an increase of about 12 per cent to 13 per cent in real terms, depending on the rate of inflation, and that sum is untied. Local government will find that it will get tremendous benefits from the allocations of the Grants Commission.

Mr. Wilson: Will you compliment the Federal Government on—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If you say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister and the honourable member for Torrens are out of order, and I hope that they will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The honourable member's interjection led directly to the point I am going to make. The State Government contributes quite considerable sums to local government on a partnership basis and often on a matching basis, \$1 for \$1, or whatever, for special purpose programmes. If we look at those programmes, I do not think that Mr. Hullick's objections, as reported in

the press, really stand up. It is important to remember that the South Australian Government is responsible for the whole State. We have to ensure that development takes place equitably, area by area, and that resources and services are developed in the sort of priorities we see at the State level. That is why we raise our revenue.

For instance, if it were not for the library development programme, which provides assistance for capital costs, book stocks and the continuing administrative costs, and an emergency grant of \$1 000 000 in 1977, the western region of Adelaide would be completely deprived of library services. It was only by the State Government's recognising a priority in that area and making funds available, which local government in turn matched, that we were able to introduce the library services that are making such a tremendous difference in that area.

There are many other areas in which we provide these matching funds. Mr. Hullick is right in saying that there are many areas that local government can look to for funds, and it can sometimes get confusing. Our programmes are fairly clearly explained and information is made available to local government. Another example of the way in which matching funds can assist the development of the whole State can be seen in our regional arts facilities programme. Last week, I announced that we had made grants totalling \$114 000, which will be matched at the local government area. That may not seem a large sum, but it means that a total of 29 country institutes and halls will be substantially upgraded and renovated to ensure that major performing companies, community activities, and so on can take place in them. One can thus see the real benefit of the idea of tied grants and programmes where there is a partnership between State and local government, I am not convinced that many of these programmes and the benefits they bring to people in local government areas would take place if the grants were not tied in that specific way.

Certainly, if the Local Government Association, by its comments, is seeking a grants system which gives more flexibility, I shall be pleased to discuss that with it. However, I do not think that the State Government should abrogate its responsibilities to the people of South Australia as a whole and distribute its funds in such a way that that would lead to uneven or uncertain development in any of these areas of priority.

KINGSTON MAGISTRATES COURT

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Deputy Premier consult with the Minister of Environment and the Attorney-General and provide to the House details relating to certain cases heard in the Kingston Magistrates Court on Monday 9 July 1979? I will quote from the *South-East and Kingston Leader* of Wednesday 18 July 1979, which states:

In the Magistrates Court a Kingston man was convicted for driving under suspension on Tatunda Bay beach, which is part of the Coorong National Park. The court was told that the man was leaving the beach area after illegal duck shooting activities when he was confronted by a National Parks ranger who was hit by his vehicle.

The Kingston man left the scene in a four-wheel drive vehicle which was seized by National Parks Officers later in the night, early this year. He was fined \$120.

Several other driving offences against this defendant were withdrawn in court. Two other Kingston men were charged with illegal interference with a National Park and Wildlife vehicle shortly after the illegal duck shooting.

The court was told that both persons admitted pushing a four-wheel drive vehicle from a position within the park

where it blocked their access to the beach. They admitted lifting the bonnet and removing wires to prevent the Ranger from chasing them.

The magistrate told defendants that their actions were regarded in the most serious light and amounted to preventing a law enforcement body from carrying out their job. He sentenced both defendants to six weeks imprisonment and suspended the sentence on the defendants entering into a bond to be of good behaviour for two years.

I am anxious for this information to be brought before the House because of the effect that such cases are having on the morale and the work being done by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. We read in this newspaper article that the magistrate said that the actions of the people involved were regarded in the most serious light and amounted to preventing a law enforcement body from carrying out its job. The fact that the sentence of six weeks imprisonment was suspended on the defendants entering into bonds to be of good behaviour is felt to make the whole situation almost a farce.

People concerned about our national parks feel that the rangers and senior officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service have enough problems as it is in carrying out the work expected of them. The result of these cases could be that more people will have even less respect for the officers of the national parks and for the system generally, and make it even harder, as conservationists have suggested to me, for rangers to put up with the problems for very much longer.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Environment, but I think that I should say one or two things. I do not propose to comment, and I do not think that the Minister of Environment or the Government would be involved in circumstances in commenting on sentences imposed by the courts. After all, the courts are in full possession of the facts. No newspaper report gives an adequate account of what actually took place.

Mr. Wotton: I was asking for the details.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It would seem to me that if a first offender, for example, has a conviction recorded against him but a goal sentence is suspended on his entering into a bond, that would be a significant deterrent. It would be for me; I do not know whether it would be for the honourable member. Most people would be concerned to have any kind of conviction on their record relating to matters of that nature. I think that point should be made.

I know that it may be the feeling of the member for Murray that, if someone does something, he should go to gaol, regardless of the situation; it may be that others feel the same way. However, it may also be the case that a person who has a clean record and who gets any sort of conviction against him, even a suspended sentence, could become pretty upset, and that the action taken by the court has the requisite deterrent effect.

I think it is of fundamental importance to recognise that in a democratic community the impartiality of the courts is fundamental, and there cannot be a situation where the Government of the day can be alleged, in any way, to be interfering with the judicial process. I am sure that, if questioned, even the Liberal Party would support that point of view. I will raise the matter that has been brought to my attention by the honourable member with the Minister and ask him to provide a report. However, I am certain that in so doing he will not be willing to comment publicly in any way on what a court has done.

Mr. Wotton: I don't want him to comment; I want him to provide the details.

The SPEAKER: Order!

CHILDHOOD SERVICES CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the proposal to establish a childhood services centre at St. Agnes West, consideration of which involves other parties such as the Kindergarten Union and the Childhood Services Council?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I assume that this is a proposition which has come from the Kindergarten Union to the Childhood Services Council for funding but which in fact would be funded under the borrowing programme of the Kindergarten Union, that being the only capital money available for the pre-school area. I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Chairman of the Childhood Services Council to see what money will be available for this project.

PORT PIRIE LINE

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House whether any progress report is available on the standardisation of the Adelaide to Port Pirie railway? I know that this line is now an Australian National Railways line. However, as the Minister is in charge of transport matters in South Australia, I would think that perhaps he would have some information on what is going on. I therefore ask him whether he will inform the House of any progress at all.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would like to be able to tell the honourable member that the present Government is honouring the agreement that was signed, and later supported by legislation in this House and the Commonwealth Parliament, but unfortunately that is not the case: the Commonwealth Government is running away from it as if it is the plague. The Federal Minister, Mr. Nixon, as I think the honourable member would know, commissioned a review of the original arrangement that was contained in the legislation. That amended arrangement was submitted to the South Australian Government, seeking our agreement to a variation.

The South Australian Government told Mr. Nixon that it was prepared to vary the agreement, provided the Commonwealth Government was prepared to get on and do the job in accordance with the agreement ratified by legislation between the State and the Commonwealth. That achieved absolutely nothing. Since then, there has been a further review and it was stated that it could be done in a different way.

It is rather interesting to be able to say to members that the proposition that the A.N.R. now puts forward, supported by Mr. Nixon, is the very proposition that was put forward to the Commonwealth in 1971 by me and the then Railways Commissioner (Mr. Fitch), which was rejected out of hand by Mr. Sinclair, the then Minister for Transport. That proposition came to the South Australian Government a few months ago and our reaction was sought.

I wrote to the Federal Minister saying that we would be pleased to evaluate it and give him our views, but I asked, as considerable cost and time would be involved in analysing the new proposal, whether he could give us an assurance that we were not wasting time and money and that the Commonwealth would provide the funds to enable the standardisation proposal to proceed. The answer was in the negative: Mr. Nixon told us that there was no money.

Accordingly, until the Commonwealth Government is prepared to honour the agreement that was entered into between the State and the Commonwealth and endorsed

by legislation in both Parliaments, I am afraid that we have reached a stalemate position. The ball is in Mr. Nixon's court. We are waiting for him to honour the agreement that was entered into lawfully between the Commonwealth and the State.

SURREY DOWNS PRE-SCHOOL CENTRE

Mr. KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Education give an indication of the progress of planning for the Surrey Downs Pre-school Centre? Apparently, money has been made available for this project, and the only thing that is delaying commencement of contracting and construction is exact siting of the building.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot, but I will, following queries to the Education Department and the Childhood Services Council.

SOIL LEVY

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Deputy Premier say how the Government justifies the royalty that is payable to the Mines Department on soil moved from one section of Crown land to another? In many instances, it is necessary to fill or top-dress land to achieve effective utilisation of that land. However, leaseholders are required to pay this royalty, even though the soil concerned remains the property of the Crown. I ask the Minister whether it is ethical or honest of the Government to charge this royalty on land or soil that remains the property of the Crown, not of the lessee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not clear from the question whether the honourable member is speaking about royalty or about the levy paid to the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund. I will have the question examined to find out what sort of answer can be provided, but I point out that, if soil is extracted, we have a levy payment into the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund to provide for the rehabilitation of extractive areas generally. The activities of the fund have been significant since it was established in 1971, but we have not yet been able to do much in respect of some old disused quarries.

Mr. Arnold: I am referring to sand ridges that have been used for filling and top-dressing.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The whole position regarding the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund is that, if material is taken out, a levy is paid to the fund. I do not know whether it is that matter or whether there is some royalty provision. I will check for the member, but it is difficult, when we have this sort of payment, to make fish of one and fowl of another, depending on the use to which extracted material may be put. Such material from a quarry may be used to fill a hole. That will not prevent the quarry from being responsible for payment of a levy to the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund.

FILM CORPORATION

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the South Australian Film Corporation intends to produce the films *Felicity* and *Pacific Banana* and, if it does, will he say why those films are being produced and whether the corporation is using public money, through either grant funds or borrowing, to finance production of the films?

Felicity and *Pacific Banana* are described in the *Bulletin* of 31 July, under the heading "Soft porn, the answer to the

hard cash problem", as low-budget sex films. The *Bulletin* reports the producer, Mr. John Lamond, as saying that the South Australian Film Corporation investment amounts to 50 per cent of the combined budget of the two films. South Australians will want to know the Minister's view of the corporation's investing in low-budget sex films.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand the Film Corporation has determined to go ahead with the John Lamond production entitled "*Pacific Banana*". I am informed that it is aimed at making money and that it is a film of a style similar to *Alvin Purple*, but hopefully it is somewhat more witty and humorous than that film.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It would want to be.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I agree. The Film Corporation has its own charter and is required to make those decisions. It has made them. Certainly, if the film turns out in a way that is unsatisfactory, no doubt certain further conversations will take place.

I am not aware that there has been any agreement on a film called *Felicity*. Mr. Lamond, I think, produced a film called *Felicity I*, but the Film Corporation was not involved in that. Whether or not there is a sequel to that I am not aware at this stage. As far as I understand, there has not been a final decision on it.

Mrs. Adamson: Is public money being used?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Film Corporation has its sources of funds for these purposes. Any source of funds when front-end money has to be put up, I suppose, is public money, even if it has not been provided from this year's Budget. If it is earnings that have come from previous films, it can still be argued that it is public money unless it is borrowed. I could not distinguish that; I would still say that it is public activity.

NORTH-EAST LINE

Mr. WILSON: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government has decided definitely whether the north-east rail line will join with the present Glenelg tram line and, if it has, what is the estimated cost of upgrading the Glenelg tram line to accommodate the new rolling stock? It is my understanding that, if the north-east rail line is to join with the Glenelg tram line, a great deal of upgrading will have to take place, not the least being the over-pass system to carry the heavier rolling stock required for the north-east rail line. It is also my understanding that the electrification system would have to be different. I believe that the Glenelg tram line uses direct current, whereas the north-east rail line (the NEAPTR project) will use alternating current, and the rolling stock would be equipped with pantographs rather than trolleys, as is now the case with the Glenelg tram.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no doubt about the connection of the two systems. I was rather surprised to hear the honourable member ask that question. Indeed, that was part and parcel of the decision that was taken and announced a month ago, when the Government finally decided to build the underground through King William Street to connect with the Glenelg line.

Mr. Wilson: I didn't know whether you were completely definite on it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is definitely complete and completely definite. It is a goer, and that is it. When the system becomes operational, in about seven or eight years, I hope the honourable member will be able to board at North Adelaide, where he resides, go to Tea Tree Gully, stay on that l.r.t. and go down to Glenelg and then back to North Adelaide. I think the honourable member will have had a very pleasant trip out. For the information of the

honourable member, I point out that it will not be on the NEAPTR system. That term was from the initials of the North-East Area Public Transport Review. The review has now been completed.

Mr. Wilson: I called it the north-east rail line.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member might like to use the name that is now being used: the North-East Transit Project (the NET project). That is the name the honourable member will see from now, and I invite him to use it. There will be a continuation of the upgrading of the Glenelg line, which has already started. The over-pass at Goodwood was the first substantial upgrading but much had been done before that. There was then a delay in the upgrading of the line so that we could get a final determination about whether the two systems would become one system. That decision has now been taken, so the upgrading of the Glenelg line will proceed at a standard so that the condition of the track of what is now the Glenelg line will be equal to that prevailing for the North-East Transit Project.

Mr. Wilson: What about the extra cost that would be involved?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No extra cost is involved in relation to upgrading the Glenelg line, because it had to be upgraded. It is simply going on to the standard determined to be commensurate with that of the North-East Transit Project.

SALVATION JANE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Deputy Premier clarify the State Government's policy relating to the biological control of salvation jane, that widely proclaimed pest plant in South Australia? On 29 January the Minister of Agriculture announced at a meeting in Christchurch, New Zealand, that he intended to introduce into South Australia this type of flea and moth control. A few days later, on 1 February, a report appeared in the *Advertiser* under the heading "Bee men buzzing over weed control". I think the heading was self-explanatory, as was the lengthy article that followed it, because the bee-keepers in South Australia have lobbied heavily since then against the announcement of the Minister.

I think one of the bees must have stung the Minister, because shortly after that he changed his mind. As reported in the *Advertiser* on 6 February, the Director of Agriculture jumped to the defence of the Minister and wrote a Letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* in which he supported fully the biological control of salvation jane in this State. In the letter he said:

I would like to put the issue in its correct perspective. General agricultural production losses from salvation jane are considerable, particularly in the higher rainfall areas of the State. This weed competes with pasture and crop plants and can cause health problems in stock.

He went on to support generally the wide control, if not eradication, of this pest plant. Among other things in the letter he said:

Any continuing, no-cost biological control method would be welcome and undoubtedly of benefit to agriculture as a whole.

In the *Advertiser* on 3 August the Minister of Agriculture said that he would oppose the planned natural biological control of the controversial weed, salvation jane. He said:

While biological control would not eradicate salvation jane, it could adversely affect the quantity of natural fodder available to livestock in dry seasons.

Not much evidence has been put forward to indicate that the latter is so, but in the interim period certainly the bee-

keepers' heavy lobby has continued. Although that was only a matter of three or four days ago, we see in today's *Advertiser* that the Minister has changed his mind again. An article in the *Advertiser* today has the heading "Bugs get go-ahead to attack weed". I have only recently been appointed shadow Minister, but the many changes of opinion by this Minister reflected in the articles referred to—

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

Mr. CHAPMAN: —lead me to raise the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must cease commenting.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I therefore would welcome a clarification of the policy of the Government in respect of this weed, which is and has for a long time been a problem, and it is of great concern to the agricultural industry generally in South Australia.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to draw to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture the question and comments of the honourable member. The honourable member suggests that the Minister has been inconsistent. Of course, the honourable member falls into the trap of assuming that anything that appears in the press must necessarily be an accurate and full account of what a Minister has said at any time. I will also make sure that the Minister's attention is drawn to this question, and also to the remarks made yesterday by the member for Light, who concluded his comments by saying:

In the meantime, I believe that the action taken has been responsible and that some of the criticism that has been levelled has been irresponsible. I trust that all parties to this whole matter will view the matter positively, and that the end result will undoubtedly be to the benefit of this State's apiary industry.

I do not want to detract from the honourable member for Alexandra, but the member for Light would have made a good shadow Minister not just in agriculture but also in many other areas. In fact, I can think of any number of members of the shadow Ministry who could well be outperformed by the member for Light. The member for Alexandra will forgive me if, when asking for a reply, I draw to the Minister's attention the remarks on the same subject made by the member for Light.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Ajourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 7 August Page 421.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Recently, a well-known but little respected international traveller made one of his infrequent visits to Australia, and during that visit the Australian Broadcasting Commission gave him the opportunity to make an address to the nation. He started off this address with these memorable words: "This is another of my dry little talks." I thought if it was good enough for the Prime Minister to start one of his addresses to the nation with those words—

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I thought it was courtesy to the members of the House that a Minister be in charge of the House. I find that no such courtesy is being accorded to the Opposition or to any

other Party at the moment.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The Speaker has no control over that matter.

Mr. KENEALLY: I hope that my Address in Reply speech will not be taken up with points of order and questions by the Opposition, as has been the case in the past. I thought I might start my Address in Reply speech with the same humorous words.

However, if I did so, I suppose members would expect to hear another rendition of those lengthy, but dry, contributions by the Leader and the Deputy Leader to this debate. Initially, I want to refer to the comments of Opposition members, because I think that they raised some important questions which should not go unanswered. The member for Davenport made another one of his wellknown attacks on the unionists of this country. As is his wont, he said that all unionists were controlled by left-wing officials who had no regard for the welfare of Australia and who determined exactly what the unions could and would not do, without any influence from their members. He went on to say, as a result of my interjection, that I was a party to all this, because I had addressed a meeting at Port Pirie, and I will say more about that later. The member for Davenport said:

Unfortunately, strikes have been used as a political weapon by the extreme left wing unions. In doing so, the rank-and-file union members are being used and manipulated by militant union leaders.

By interjection, I asked him what left-wing unions and what militant unions he was referring to. He said that, if I were patient, he would name the unions and the officials. He spoke for another 10 minutes, and completely forgot to name the unions or the officials. This is a classic tactic used by the Opposition.

Mr. Dean Brown: I mentioned John Scott and the A.M.W.U.

Mr. KENEALLY: One leader and one union is hardly representative of the trade union movement in Australia. This is a classic example of what the honourable member's Party has been doing over the past six months. It assumes that, because there may be one or two militant trade unions, all unions are militant (I wish that, in many cases, they were more militant), that they are dominated by their officials and, as a result, all of them are against the national good. I say to the member for Davenport, before he decides to leave the Chamber, that I have attended two union stopwork meetings since I have been a member. I will describe to him what goes on at these meetings, because he obviously has absolutely no idea of what industrial relations are all about and how union members react to people outside the unions coming along to give them advice.

It was reported on the A.B.C. that I attended a meeting at Port Pirie and supported the strike. However, what I did was address the meeting of workers there. I started off by saying that I well knew that the last thing people on strike wanted was a well-paid person coming along and telling them about making sacrifices in what might, in their case, be a just cause. I also said that, if I were to do that, it would be totally unacceptable, and so it should be. I said that, once they had considered their decision about the issues involved, I would give them what assistance I could. The report said that the member for Stuart had gone along and supported the strike.

At that meeting, there were four paid officials of various unions, none of whom recommended to that meeting that the workers ought to stay on strike. One of the officials, as much as he was able to do, tried to persuade them to go back to work, but none of the officials was prepared to make any recommendations to the striking workmen.

There was a marvellous solidarity about the decision they took. They decided to stay on strike, against the advice of one of the trade unions and despite the advice that the other trade union officials gave them, namely, that they could not promise any success in their struggles.

That meeting was reported by various interested bodies as being an example of what trade union officialdom was all about, and that, had there been a secret ballot, there was no doubt in the world that the workers would have returned to work. That was just not on. The most powerful speech was made by a young worker from Port Pirie who, in an impassioned plea to his workmates, asked them to stay on strike, because the struggle and their case were valid. So they were. Do members know that a tradesman working for the Australian National Railways receives \$15 a week less than does a tradesman doing the same work in the New South Wales Railways? In Port Augusta, an A.N.R. tradesman receives between \$20 and \$25 a week less than he would get if he were working for the Electricity Trust. This is why the men in the railways went on strike: they wanted parity with other Government institutions.

Why did they not get it? Despite the advice given to me by some A.N.R. officials that they were sympathetic to the strike, these workers did not get parity because the Prime Minister told the railways that they were not to negotiate. It is no coincidence that the three major disputes we have faced in the State in the past two months have involved Telecom, the railways, and now the Commonwealth Public Service, all of which have the same employer, the Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser. The claims of workers are legitimate. No-one could dispute that a tradesman in Telecom who receives less than does a worker cleaning windows for the Victorian State Electricity Commission has a legitimate complaint. For shallow, cheap political purposes the Prime Minister is trying to stir up industrial trouble in his attempt to win votes. What distresses me in this country is that the average Australian has been so thoroughly brainwashed by this action by the conservative forces of the nation that I am not too sure that the Prime Minister will not succeed.

To suggest that workers in this country are dominated by trade union officials is ludicrous. I am prepared to admit that a trade union official worth his salt ought to be able to give leadership, and, if that leadership is given, expect that the workers might be prepared to accept directions that the union official gives. If the workers do not agree, they will not accept their officials' advice. If the officials continually give advice that the union members will not accept, they will change that official, and the Opposition should be in no doubt about that.

The other meeting which I have attended since I have been a member and at which I spoke was at Port Augusta some years ago when the dispute was on about the amalgamation of the metal trades unions. The Democratic Labor Party was using its numbers in the Senate to oppose the amalgamation. I addressed the meeting at which over 300 members of the metal trades unions were present. They decided at the meeting to move a motion condemning the D.L.P. and its interference in the Senate in what was a legitimate aim of the unions, namely, the amalgamation of the various metal trades unions. The vote was about 310 to one. That individual did not feel threatened. He raised his hand and voted against the motion, and he received the acclamation of members present. They did not agree with his stand, but they did not condemn him. No heavy pressure was put on him.

As a matter of fact, he won a great deal of credibility for himself, because he was prepared to vote against what was almost an absolute majority: 310 to one is, I guess, almost

an absolute majority. No-one likes strikes. The workers who participate in strikes do not like them, because they lose income; the public does not like them, because it is inconvenient; union officials do not like them for a couple of reasons—because, first, during industrial disputation they work harder, and, secondly (and this is particularly the case in smaller communities), if a person is a union official and his union is on strike, despite the fact that it might be the unanimous decision of the workers, the union official takes all the blame.

No member opposite has had to put up with the hate mail that union officials get when their unions are on strike. Their families do not have to put up with the ridicule that union officials' families get in small communities from housewives and other members of the community who have been disadvantaged and inconvenienced by the industrial dispute. Union officials do not have a great deal to gain. In some cases, union officials also lose income during the period of the strike.

What we have in South Australia, and federally, is the peculiar logic which is put forward mainly by the Deputy Leader and which goes something like this: Laurie Carmichael is a communist; Laurie Carmichael represents a trade union; Telecom has a trade union, so that trade union must be communist. The Deputy Leader is fond of saying that we have communist-dominated unions in Australia causing all the disturbances. How anybody in his right mind could suggest that the Public Service Associations in Australia are communist-dominated, I do not know.

I was a member of A.C.O.A., and a less militant organisation one could not find. It has to be an extreme circumstance indeed that will make A.C.O.A. take any action. The fact that it recently decided to strike for half a day and since then has had bans and limitation plans working against the Federal Government indicates that it considers the threat to its wellbeing a very serious threat indeed. Of course, the unions within Telecom are no more communist-dominated than is the Liberal Opposition in this Parliament.

It is an easy thing for members opposite to say. They never say what official, or what union; they just use that strange logic I mentioned, that some communists are union officials, so that means that all unions are dominated by communists.

What, in fact, the Liberal Party wants (and our Prime Minister wants) is to have tame-cat Uncle Tom type unions. It is fond of stating that it strongly supports the rights of trade unions, that they are an integral part of the scene in Australia, and that it demands the right for trade unions to take industrial action when their wellbeing is threatened. That is what it says, but when it happens it has the glib answer that a trade unionist would not go on strike unless he had his arm twisted by some communist standover man. What they want is tame-cat unions. It describes such unions as "responsible trade unions". Anybody who is prepared to stand up for his or her rights is "irresponsible" in the terminology of the Liberals.

It was strange to hear the terms used by the Deputy Leader. He described some of the trade union officials (I will just quote one sentence, which describes the completely anti-union and racist attitude of the Deputy Leader) as follows:

The communist union leaders and imports from other places are as slippery as they come.

I would like him to go to Whyalla or Port Augusta and use that sort of language when speaking to our migrant people and trade union officials.

Another furphy that the Deputy Leader and his colleagues want to put around is that high wages in

industry are destroying incentive and creating unemployment. We all know the catch phrase: "One man's pay rise is another man's job".

Mr. Venning: That's right.

Mr. KENEALLY: "That's right", a member of the Opposition says. Since 1975 there has been a 4 per cent redistribution of gross national product from wages and salaries into profits. During that time, unemployment has doubled. There seems to be some contradiction of that catch phrase in relation to what is happening within industry. I am not prepared to say that Malcolm Fraser is responsible for all unemployment, as I was never prepared to accept the Opposition's argument that the Whitlam Government invented unemployment. Malcolm Fraser is as unable to cope with the very difficult economic circumstances that prevail today as he said the previous Prime Minister was. One of the main reasons for unemployment in this country today was readily seen by those people who took the opportunity to see the film *The Chips are Down*, which was shown in one of the Parliamentary rooms last week. The silicon chip probably puts more people out of work than do the policies of the Federal Government. I will turn to that matter during the latter half of my speech.

I now comment briefly on what I thought to be a quite ludicrous situation, and something that highlighted the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party, particularly the Leader in this House. I refer to the speech made by the Leader in the other place last week when the new member of the Council was elected. The Leader there waxed strongly about the value of having female members of Parliament. We would not disagree about the sentiments expressed, but the sentiments he expressed and the actuality of events did not seem to agree in any great detail.

The Opposition in South Australia was anxious, some years ago, when Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Steele became members of Parliament, to have the first female member of Parliament in South Australia—it would be a feather in its cap, and it would be able to brag about it for a long time. It was similar to the time when the member for Hanson wore shorts into Parliament and got his photograph in the paper as the first person to wear shorts in this House. People probably laughed at his legs, because he has not taken the opportunity to wear shorts since. I think that is a fair comparison with the Liberal Party's attitude to women members of Parliament—the Liberals loudly praise the skills and capabilities of women, yet they do not have them in Parliament. When they do have them in Parliament (and they still have one left, but we do not know how long she will stay, because she says that she does not aspire to a long Parliamentary career, but that might well be because she is in a marginal seat), her abilities are not recognised in any shadow Ministry reorganisation (and I wondered about that, until last night, but now I am quite sure the Leader understood the honourable member's capabilities better than we do on this side of the House). We thought, from the wide publicity that she was getting, that she might well have been at least of the calibre of the member for Hanson, although in saying that I pay her no great praise at all. Enough of the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party and the Leader, because if I were to concentrate on that I would take up all of the time available to me, and the time available to all other members as well, I suspect.

Mr. Wotton: You haven't used it very well so far.

Mr. KENEALLY: I thought I was doing extremely well. The Leader and Deputy Leader spoke about uranium. Apart from the absolutely ridiculous claim made by the Deputy Leader, that because 25 years ago he did a science degree that somehow qualifies him as an expert in the very

complex subject of nuclear technology, and apart also from his ludicrous claim now that coal mining is likely to cause more injury to workers than nuclear energy, I would try to treat what he had to say seriously.

Mr. Mathwin: Coal mining "has caused", not "is likely to cause".

Mr. KENEALLY: I point out to the honourable member that we do not need people like him or his colleagues to tell us of the dangers of coal mining. The workers have been mining coal since coal was first mined. It is not the bosses or the owners, but the workers who go down into the mine and die there; it is not the people that the Opposition represents, but those whom the Government represents. That might well be the reason why we on this side have a greater concern than members opposite have for the well-being of workers when it comes to talking about the uranium industry. It might be because traditionally members opposite have represented the owners of industry; they are concerned only with the profit side of the nuclear energy industry. We on this side are concerned about the health of the people who work in the industry, and about those people whose health might be affected by the industry.

Mr. Venning: Where are the workers?

Mr. KENEALLY: I will talk about the workers later. It might surprise the honourable member that I include in the definition of "workers" people like farmers and small businessmen because they are not part of the free enterprise system that he bleats about. The Leader and the Deputy Leader, I believe, are quite intelligent people, despite their effective campaign to deny that fact or to disguise it. Because I believe that they are reasonably intelligent people, I also believe that they are quite sincere when they come into this Parliament and tell us that they believe that the total nuclear technology is safe. I do not deny them the right to say that, nor do I criticise their integrity. I am sure they know no more than do members on this side about what a nuclear catastrophe would mean in this world. They do not want to see hundreds of thousands or millions of people killed as a result of a nuclear disaster. They quite clearly do not believe that that will happen, however. That is very reassuring for them, and, because they believe that, they are unable to take any other attitude towards the mining, processing and selling of uranium.

I for one cannot accept their assurance that the total nuclear technology is safe. Whilst scientists disagree as to the safety of the technology, I think it is incumbent on lay people, and on everyone in this Parliament, to be somewhat cautious about the decisions made. If scientists agree that there are no dangers in the disposal of high-level wastes or in the total nuclear technology, and that there is not the possibility of nuclear war, I might be prepared to accept the same attitude as accepted by members opposite.

What disturbs me is that, because I do not agree with them, I must be part of some left-wing plot to deny the people of South Australia what is justly theirs. That is not the case. This is not a left-wing plot. Members opposite must surely know that the U.S.S.R. is one country which is in the market for uranium. To suggest that the member for Mitcham and all his supporters (few though they may be) are party to a left-wing plot is ridiculous.

The fact of life is that some people in the community (many more than members opposite would believe) are concerned about the possibility, even though it may be remote—and I do not concede that it is—that there could be a disaster in the uranium industry. If a disaster does occur, it would be catastrophic and would affect not only our generation but also generations to come. That is the

sort of decision that we are being called upon to be party to, and we cannot treat our responsibility lightly, in the same cavalier way as I believe some members opposite are treating it, although I am prepared to accept the integrity of those who have clearly convinced themselves that the process is safe and to believe that they give no regard to the financial benefits they see from it. One has to be somewhat cynical of the complete change in attitude of members opposite. Not long ago they all agreed to the proposition I put forward, and now for some reason they believe that—

Mr. Venning: What a lot of rubbish.

Mr. KENEALLY: There you are! Members opposite now believe that uranium mining is safe. The member for Rocky River said, "What a lot of rubbish". He voted on the matter two years ago. I ask the honourable member to tell the Parliament what he has learned in the past two years that would enable him to change his mind. I will tell him what he has learned; he has learned that there is possibly some political mileage to be made out of this issue because the press will pick up and report any outlandish statement and give it front-page coverage. The honourable member knows that he and his Leader can make some outrageous promises to the people at Port Pirie and almost guarantee them that, if there is a nuclear industry in South Australia, Port Pirie will get a nuclear enrichment plant. However, he also knows that he cannot promise such a thing. If there were to be enrichment plants in Australia, it would surprise me if the Liberal Leader in Canberra would do South Australia any favours (if a favour it would be) by siting an enrichment plant here. Of course, that would not be done at all.

I will comment now on something that worries me a great deal, as it should worry all members of this Parliament, and, in fact, all members of the community at large. At this moment in the history of the planet Earth, a complete and absolute collapse of the capitalist system is being faced—not that that worries me, but the effects do worry me. I do not believe the collapse will happen overnight; it will be a slow and inevitable process. The collapse will be resisted strenuously by the vested interests of this world—by the boardrooms, where the real financial interests lie. I believe there will be cases where the collapse will be resisted violently.

I know it can be argued that, since the days of the industrial revolution, the free enterprise system has contributed to the welfare of those people who have benefited from it, but there are thousands of millions who have not benefited by the free enterprise system. If, in speaking about that system one includes the small farmer and businessman, I would say that the system has something to contribute, because farmers and small business people are workers and, in many cases, they do not earn as much as do some well-paid salary earners in this country, although that does not mean that all small businessmen and farmers are in this category. Certainly, some are. They should be fighting with the rest of the workers for a fair share of the nation's wealth; they are certainly not getting it at the moment.

What I understand by the free enterprise system (and I am sure this is what everyone understands) is that it does not include a small business person, but means massive corporation interests, trans-national companies, greed, power, and the exploitation to go with these massive corporate interests. These things are the greatest threat to this country and to the well-being of the small business person, the workers, and everyone else. The threat is not being examined at all. Continuously, members opposite and their colleagues elsewhere say that the biggest threat to the welfare of Australia is the unions or big

Government. I can tell them that it is big private interests that are the threat, because they are putting people out of work. The big private interests are depriving the individual of a minimum income that enables him to live in some degree of security. What has happened in the past 100 years or so, and particularly what is happening now? The disparity between the haves and the have-nots has never been so great.

Mr. Venning: What are you talking about?

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Rocky River keeps interjecting as though he believes that he belongs to the free enterprise system. He and his colleagues are the shock troopers for those in the boardrooms. The Liberal politicians in Australia are out in the front row, supporting the free enterprise system as if they belong to it. If the truth is known, they are like we are over here. They are the victims of the free enterprise system, not part of it. In Australia, 10 per cent of the people own 92 per cent of the wealth of the country. Does any member opposite believe he is part of that system?

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us what you would do, comrade?

Mr. KENEALLY: Certainly, I will tell the honourable member. I do not have all the answers, but the debate has been stultified by this narrow political interest that members opposite would promote. They believe there is capital to be made by supporting the big interests. Free enterprise in Australia (and throughout the world) includes the press. It is part of the system, so it is prepared to pick up anything that is said to condemn the only pressures that can bring some rationale into the distribution of wealth in the world.

Members opposite do not seem to be concerned that the Henderson Report stated that 2 000 000 people in Australia have been declared to be living on or below the poverty line. Is this not a concern of members opposite? Does it not concern them that Australia, which is widely trumpeted as a classic example of the success of the free enterprise system, should have that disparity in wealth? If that happens in Australia, the shop window for the capitalist system and free enterprise, what is happening in other countries that are not as blessed as we are? Do members opposite consider it acceptable for Australia that we have 2 000 000 living on or below the poverty line, 10 per cent of the people owning 92 per cent of the wealth, and the Lang Hancocks of this world making \$1 000 000 a week profit?

The member for Coles is wont to speak here about what is pornographic in society. What is more pornographic in a real sense than the fact that individuals can make such a massive fortune while so many of their fellow countrymen are living in poverty? I do not know what it is in members opposite that leads them to encourage the amassing of such tremendous wealth, while their constituents and other people in Australia are battling. What does a person like Lang Hancock want with \$1 billion? He does not need the money: he wants the power to manipulate and control.

While we have the system that we have and the attitude of members opposite, the Lang Hancocks of this world can only become more and more powerful, because if they continue to reinvest in this country the massive wealth that they make at the expense of the rest of us, they will inevitably take it over. That is a threat that members opposite should be concerned about, but they are not: they fondly believe that they are part of the system and, regardless of what argument I put, they will not accept that they are not part of the system.

I repeat that, when a commercial decision is faced by a big monopoly on whether it needs to bring in more computerised technology or employ the people currently doing the work, it has no social responsibility to jobs and

the workers, so its decision will be made purely on a commercial basis. That means that people will be unemployed while machines do the work. Why cannot the unemployed people of this country participate in the obvious wealth of the country?

The member for Rocky River wants to leave the Chamber, because he has no answer to my questions. What distresses me is that there is no debate in this country on the matters that I am raising. I suspect that no comment will be made by members opposite, just as none has been made in this Address in Reply debate about the activities and economic policies of the Federal Government. I went through the Address in Reply debates of previous years, particularly in 1974-75, and looked at the private members' motions moved by members opposite in those years. Overwhelmingly their comments and motions were directed to the then Federal Government.

We have seen a deterioration in the economy of Australia, but members opposite are not concerned about that, because there is no political benefit in it for them. They are not concerned about people. They fondly believe that all this garbage they have mouthed about the free enterprise system describes their position and the position of small farmers and small business people in this country. I will go on repeating that the greatest threat to the well-being of Australians and the rest of the world is the system under which we now labour, the system with which we are now threatened, and, until we are prepared to forget all this politicking and get away from the political rhetoric that stultifies all debates on the economy, I cannot see the Australian economy improving, and I cannot see any future for the world but massive confrontation between the haves and the have-nots.

In case members opposite want to question some of my comments, I will quote some statistics. If they want to dispute these, I should like them to do so and give me the authority for their disagreement. It has been stated and undisputed that the wealthiest 1 per cent of the population of Australia owns 22 per cent of the total wealth, that the wealthiest 5 per cent of the population owns 46 per cent of the total wealth, and that the wealthiest 10 per cent owns 60 per cent of the total wealth.

Mr. Becker: Who wrote this for you? The shriek?

Mr. KENEALLY: That is a classic rejoinder. Members opposite do not wish to dispute the statistics that I am giving them. They will not come up with any disagreement based on facts. They just want to say that it is obviously communistic because they do not agree with it. In Australia, 50 per cent of the people own less than 8 per cent of the total wealth, and the richest 2 000 people own as much as the poorest 2 250 000 Australians. This is a result of more than 100 years of this much vaunted private enterprise system that members opposite believe is the salvation for the world.

The greed and exploitation embodied in the rampant uncontrolled private enterprise ethic are the cause of what I am now putting to the House. Members opposite may say that people, if they wish, can invest in the shares of private companies if they have any excess income, and I doubt that many workers have that. However, what is the position regarding income from interest, dividends and rents? It is that 1 per cent of adult Australians receive 45 per cent, 5 per cent receive 83 per cent, and 10 per cent receive 92 per cent. That means that 90 per cent of Australians receive 8 per cent of the wealth derived through interest, rent and dividends.

There is another statistic of which gentlemen opposite should be well aware. That is that 10 per cent of Australians own 52 per cent of the real estate and the wealthiest 300 000 have access to four and a half rooms

each, while the poorest 1 000 000 have access to two-thirds of a room each. I do not need to enlarge on these statements: what is happening in our society is self-evident. It is also self-evident that these are the results of the free enterprise of which members opposite are so fond.

I have mentioned the fallacy about one man's pay rise meaning another man's job and I repeat that, while there has been a redistribution of 4 per cent from salaries and income to profits, unemployment has doubled. If that does not refute that fallacy I do not know what does. We know that while 10 per cent of the people own 60 per cent of the wealth (and I refer members to the other statistics that I have given), it is the same 10 per cent who avoid paying taxes. One thing that distresses me is the dishonesty of the argument put forward by members opposite that we have to do away with wealth taxes such as succession duties.

Members opposite say, in justification of their argument that we must do away with succession duties, that this tax falls heavily on those people who are least able to pay the estate duties. There have been such cases. There could well be an argument to extend the exemptions for succession duties, and I would be prepared to support some changes in that law as it refers to siblings. What members are saying, however, is that if we abolish succession duties altogether we will have to do without the tax that we are able to get from the very wealthy sector of the community, and those people are avoiding tax every day of their lives. They do not pay tax. The member for Flinders shakes his head. I could show him many publications about tax avoidance showing how the wealthy can still get the pension; how to use superannuation to reduce tax (I have no objection to that); how to wipe out personal tax; how to avoid death duties. Do you think this advice is directed to the workers of the community, to the average wage and salary earner? Of course it is not.

It is directed to the people who have the wealth and they avoid paying taxes during their lifetime, and, if we were to do what members opposite want us to do, they would avoid tax when they are called upon to put back into the community some of the wealth they have derived during their lifetime. Even if that was the case, I would not mind so much, but the absolute majority of wealth, more than 60 per cent of the wealth in this country, is inherited wealth. It is not wealth that people have worked for through their skills and labour; it is inherited wealth. That is where the majority of wealth comes from, and I am saying that the community at large, the people of this country, are entitled to have some of that wealth go back into benefits for the community. I repeat that I think it is an absolute obscenity in a country in which we have millions of people who live on or below the poverty line to have the likes of Lang Hancock, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, Sir Charles Court and the millionaire from Wannon running around trumpeting their wealth and privileged position.

I want now to speak about something that has been causing me some concern within my electorate — the matter of fishing. For some reason or other that I am unable to comprehend some interests within the fishing fraternity believe that I, as a back-bencher in the Government, have some unhealthy and considerable influence on the decisions made by the Government dealing with fishing. I should establish my credentials. I have been fishing three or four times in my life, and I am not very fond of the practice at all. As the member for Henley Beach would say, fish such as snapper and whiting are apt to commit suicide when my line is in the water. Even when I do hook them they have more than an even chance of getting away. There have been a few suicidal fish. Those are my credentials.

However, in my electorate considerable tension has

built up because of the competing interest of the three sectors of the fishing industry, the A and B class licence holders and the amateurs. I was and still am involved in a continuing debate between scale fishermen as to the merits of the B-Class fishing licence in South Australia. Quite frankly, I support the continuation within the industry of those fishermen who have spent a lifetime fishing in a B-class capacity.

The argument is that B-class fishermen have a separate income and as such they are not entitled to fish. That is a very valid argument when we consider the position of scale fishermen who are not doing very well. A serious problem is posed for A-class fishermen who are not doing so well. On the other hand, there are considerable numbers of A-class scale fishermen in this State and other fishermen with commercial licences whose independent income from invested money is higher than is the independent salary of a B-class fisherman. If we now wipe the B-class licence out of the industry, we are saying that it is no good for the worker to be able to make a few quid on the side at fishing, while it is all right for the businessman to have his motels, farms, flats, or other interests in either his or his wife's name and for him to continue fishing. That is the logic that I have never been able to come to terms with.

If the fishing industry is able to clean up its own backyard and extract from within its members those people whose independent incomes are higher than the highest wage earned by a B-class fisherman, I will accept the argument, but I will not accept it until then. In my electorate there are B-class fishermen who have been fishing in that way for more than 40 years, and they do not catch a lot of fish, but if they lost their B-class licence they would seek to be granted an A-class licence. That would increase the fishing within the gulf and would be totally counter-productive. The A-class fishermen have not been prepared to consider that factor.

I want to say quite clearly that I do understand the problems of A-class fishermen who are not doing very well. I have a number within my electorate, and I see them continuously. In fact, an inordinate amount of my time is spent with the fishermen within the three sections of the industry. They do not seem to be able to agree on any of the recommendations they wish to make. They are all parochial and independent—I guess that is why they are fishermen. The part I play is to diligently represent those people who come to me. I am part of a subcommittee set up by the Government to assist the Minister where that assistance is sought on matters dealing with the fishing industry, and I am quite happy to do that. But for the fishing fraternity to ascribe to me powers and influence that I do not have, whilst it is flattering (and I would like to say it is true), is frankly not true.

What I would like to see in the fishing industry in the northern Spencer Gulf waters is greater policing of those people who are contravening the fishing regulations, and an overwhelming majority of successful fishermen in my area are doing that. This is quite well known. When I have spoken to fishermen in the three sectors of the industry, they have agreed that there should be no longer any netting of snapper in the northern Spencer Gulf waters, that they should be caught by line only, that there should be a complete and absolute ban on trawling in these waters, and that there should be compliance with the policy of owner-skippers on all fishing craft in South Australia, including the prawn fishing industry.

In the one or two minutes left to me I would like to say that I am concerned about what goes on in the prawn industry. It is a matter of great concern to me that a prawn licence without a boat attached to it can be sold in this State for \$250 000, a licence that in many cases is received

free from the Government. We are keeping the small fishermen out of prawn fishing and making it a reserve for the wealthy interests, and I am opposed to that. I understand that the total catch by some prawn fishermen this year will be about \$400 000, but that will not be their declared catch. The member for Flinders and the member for Eyre know as well as I do that the returns to the Agriculture and Fisheries Department do not indicate what are the catches of the fishermen. These fishermen are not so stupid as to try to suggest that that is the case. I believe that serious anomalies exist in the industry that ought to be rectified.

I do not have any inordinate influence on Government decisions regarding fisheries. If there are members within the industry, including the President of the Australian Fishing Industry Council, who I understand believes I do, I would like them to have a word with me so that I can put their minds at rest. I would have liked to have more time allotted to me. I think next year I will probably move that the Address in Reply speech of the member for Stuart ought to be of at least two hours duration.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): The greater part of the speech of the member for Stuart would have been more fitting in an address to the supreme soviet than to this House. I was not here when the Governor delivered his Speech but, on my return to this country, I did read with some interest the Government's programme for the ensuing legislative year. When I picked up this document I hoped that it would include some new initiatives and a new direction in relation to the way in which the Government was going to lead this State. In particular, I was hoping it would have realised that the programme and the policies of the past 10 years have been, to say the very least, disastrous for the welfare of the people of this State, but unfortunately it would appear as though we are to get more of the same bitter medicine. The Government has not learnt from its mistakes and, judging by the comments of the member for Stuart, I gather that we are in for an even worse period during the next few months. I was saddened by the Governor's Speech and the speech of the honourable member to see that the Government does not have any answers to solve the problems about which the honourable member was talking and about which he was so critical. The answers are not in making it more difficult for people with a bit of initiative and enterprise to get out and develop this great State so that everyone can benefit.

I think the honourable member ought to realise that a company without profit is a company that cannot offer jobs. He ought to know that the more Government controls that are put on industry or commerce, whether agricultural or the most technical, the less efficient it will become, the fewer people it will employ and the fewer goods that will be put on the market. The honourable member has been to the United Kingdom and around the world and I am pleased that he has been. He should have seen for himself what the policies he has been talking about did to the United Kingdom. They brought that great country to its knees. It will take a Government with great courage to reverse the dangerous policies that have been inflicted upon the people of the United Kingdom, people who led the world, who went out and developed some of the most isolated and difficult areas in the world. It will take a Conservative Government in that country to completely change its direction for the benefit of the English people.

If the honourable member had talked to the average person in the United Kingdom he would have realised that they were fed up to the teeth with the sort of nonsense peddled by Mr. Callaghan, Mr. Benn, and Mr. Healey

during the last election campaign—Government controls, more taxes, more restrictions. They broke the hearts of the English people. The only answer they had was more controls until the country was brought to about the equivalent of Czechoslovakia. That was their aim for the United Kingdom.

His Excellency referred to the deaths of Sir Baden Pattinson, Judge Travers, Mr. Harding and George Stanley Hawker. I did not know the first three gentlemen but I knew Mr. Hawker who represented for about nine years part of the district I now have the pleasure to represent. He was a wellknown member of the Merino Stud Sheep Breeders Association and gave a considerable service to the people of this State.

Paragraph 8 of the Speech states:

Mineral exploration has continued at an unprecedented level throughout a wide area of the State. This activity results from a recognition of the potential for discovery of a wide range of minerals including copper, coal and diamonds. Following the discovery of the Olympic Dam prospect at Roxby Downs, the Stuart Shelf has been a prime exploration target.

The Speech referred quite explicitly to the value these deposits could be to the people of this State. Unfortunately, apparently nothing will be done in relation to the early development of those mineral deposits.

I have just had the pleasure and privilege of travelling overseas on a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association study tour. I appreciate the honour that the House bestowed on me in giving me the opportunity to look at various matters in which I am interested. I think that much of the criticism directed at members of this House for accepting the opportunity to go overseas can be described only as ill-informed nonsense. It is essential that we, as members of the House of Assembly who have to once or twice a year make important decisions about how we are going to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, should, on a regular rotating basis, have the opportunity to look at the latest developments and trends overseas. If some people go overseas but do not get the value that others think they should get out of overseas trips, that is not the fault of the system; that is a matter that I am sure the respective Parties can deal with in their own way.

Mr. Arnold: It depends on how much work they are prepared to do.

Mr. GUNN: As the member for Chaffey has said, it is a matter of how much work a member is prepared to do. Anyone who reads the contribution the honourable member made following his return from an overseas trip will see that he gained a great deal from it. I believe the House should ignore completely the nonsense the member for Mitcham has been spouting in relation to this matter. He is not in the House today; as usual he is probably in court getting \$300 a day. He was in for lunch because it is the cheapest lunch in Adelaide.

I want to express my views in relation to this matter because I believe that, if the Government was to decide not to send any more members of Parliament overseas, the people of this State would be the losers. I believe we should continue this practice so that members can be in a similar position to that of members of the Public Service and members of private industry who travel overseas regularly. Any of us who has had that privilege will be aware of the number of people travelling around the world.

During my trip, I had the opportunity of visiting many countries. In particular, I looked briefly at agriculture in the United States of America and made a fairly close study of the nuclear industry around the world. First, I say that I

entirely disagreed with the member for Stuart, who was obviously advocating the socialisation of industry, particularly agriculture. He ought to know as well as anyone does that socialised agriculture has never been successful anywhere in the world. He ought to have a look at other parts of the world where this unfortunate experiment has been tried, because he would soon see for himself what is the situation.

I had a reasonably good look in the U.S.A., and I think that the first thing that strikes one when looking at agriculture there is that the potential for further development is unlimited: that country has the capacity almost to feed the world. The people have certainly shown a great deal of initiative in the way in which they have gone about developing their country. It is probably fortunate for mankind that the U.S.A. has a free enterprise economy enabling them to develop and produce these huge quantities of wheat and other grains that are essential to feed mankind. Having looked at agriculture in the U.S.A. and the type of machinery they use (I greatly appreciate the co-operation of the companies that showed me around, particularly the International Harvester Company, and the farmers who were kind enough to show me around their properties), I believe that we in South Australia can be proud of the agricultural machinery manufacturers we have here. I believe that the machinery produced in South Australia is equal to, if not better than, any elsewhere in the world. We should ensure that we do not do anything that will put these people out of business, particularly in relation to the tillage machinery produced here.

I was interested to have a look at grain storage and handling in the U.S.A., and I am pleased that the bulk handling system and facilities in South Australia are far better than those I saw in South Dakota or North Dakota, although I am not criticising those systems. I did not visit their terminal ports, but I did have the opportunity of seeing some storage facilities in agricultural areas, and they were not as good as the storage we have in South Australia. I believe that the rural community is fortunate, because only on rare occasions must they store large quantities of grain on their farms. The Australian wheat stabilisation scheme is something which the wheat and graingrowing community should strive to continue to accept, and we should ensure that nothing is done to undermine it. I am perturbed at the current attitude of the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture and the effects his attitude could have on sections of that arrangement.

I had the opportunity, whilst in the U.S.A., of visiting an Indian reservation. I looked at it in relation to the decisions the House will have to make in a few weeks time in relation to certain Pitjantjatjara lands. I do not think that much could be learnt from what I saw in the U.S.A., because we are dealing with completely different sets of circumstances.

The next matter to which I will refer has already been canvassed by the Leader, the Deputy Leader, the member for Stuart, and other members, namely, nuclear energy. Unfortunately, in my view, a great deal of ill-informed comment has been made regularly in relation to the nuclear industry. I am concerned that the Labor Party Government of this State and its Federal colleagues (the Opposition) appear to have done a complete back-flip. First, we must analyse why. It is my considered opinion that they have set out, led by the former Premier (Mr. Dunstan), to do everything they can to frustrate the Fraser Government, and they realise that this will be one effective way of doing it. I will refer to a few of the statements made by some prominent A.L.P. members. On 2 June 1975, Mr. Keating, who, I understand, is

considered to be one of the whiz kids of the Party, said:

Since we have taken over the administration of the policy in this area, particularly in respect of uranium, we have said that we intend to export as much of it as we can.

That other great enlightened character, who considers himself enlightened but who is one of the greatest prophets of doom I have ever run across, Mr. Hurford, said on 14 April 1972:

Uranium exports, in whatever form, could be highly profitable for this country. With the proper taxation policies there could be enormous economic benefits for everyone who lives here.

The then Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, said in February 1975:

In Brussels, London, the Hague, Paris, Rome and Bonn, as well as in Moscow, I have consistently asserted Australia's wish to develop her own enrichment capabilities so that as much uranium as possible should be exported in an enriched form.

I could go on at length, but let us come closer to home and look at the situation. A report in the *News* of 24 October 1974 quoted the then Premier as saying:

We will press for the establishment of the plant in South Australia if we have the conditions required. There is some concern about being able to supply enough water.

A report in the *News* of 4 November 1974 stated:

Talks between the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, and the Japanese Prime Minister are believed to have enhanced the State's chances of getting the project. State Mines Minister Mr. Hopgood said today he was more confident than ever South Australia would get the massive plant.

A report in the *News* of 13 May 1974 stated:

Mr. Connor announced a feasibility study in the possible establishment of a major uranium enrichment plant in the northern Spencer Gulf region of South Australia.

A report in the *News* of 27 September 1974 stated:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today he did not think the Federal Government's decision to establish a uranium smelting plant in the Northern Territory would rule out the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant being built in South Australia.

A report in the *Advertiser* of 5 November 1974 stated:

Mr. Hopgood, the Minister of Mines and Development, said, "Mr. Connor is awfully keen on letting us have Redcliff as well. He has made that pretty clear to most people I have talked to."

Therefore, we have seen the classic back-flip of the A.L.P. in this State. I believe that it was part of a programme of complete frustration of the Fraser Government. I will take my criticism of the A.L.P. and its left-wing friends a little further. It is clear, if one examines the areas of opposition to uranium mining and the nuclear industry, that it is coming from the same people who were involved in the anti-Vietnam marches, the same people who were waving placards and mouthing criticisms of our involvement in that conflict. They were successful: they handed that country over to the communists, and look at the results today!

We do not see any of those people marching today and protesting about what has happened to those poor unfortunate people. They are dead quiet, because the left wing and the communists have been successful. As it will not be as easy to create another Vietnam it will be more difficult for those people to defeat the Western economies and Western democracies. They realise that there will be a chronic shortage of energy throughout the Western world, and the world as a whole. Therefore, if they can take courses of action that will deny many parts of the world adequate supplies of energy, they will bring about in those countries economic down-turns and economic chaos the

like of which we have never heard or seen.

Anyone with any knowledge whatever realises that, for those economies to continue to develop, they have to have cheap and reliable energy. If that energy is denied to them by making it impossible for the uranium industry to continue, these people will have achieved their overall objectives very simply. I know members will say that I am pulling out the old bogey, but look around the world and see who the people are who are involved in the anti-uranium campaign. It is interesting to study the backgrounds of these people. The great fear that has been placed in the minds of people in the community by these people is not only irresponsible but is, in my view, quite hypocritical, because they have not only failed to assess the industry properly but they have failed to come out with the facts that are available.

Let us examine the energy situation today. We are aware that we will run out of oil. I put that quite simply to the opponents of the nuclear industry. How do they anticipate being able to meet the future demands for energy? What sources do they envisage will be able to take the place of oil, because it is quite obvious that in future we will be using coal for a number of other important energy requirements?

I believe that this State, this country and many other places in the world have failed miserably in not carrying out more research into the area of converting coal into oil. I had the opportunity to look at the Sasol I plant in South Africa. I believe that in future we will see throughout the world far more plants of that type constructed. I was concerned to hear that the people connected with that operation had been to Victoria and New South Wales, examined the coal deposits in those States and entered into discussions with the Government and officers from those two States. Those people have not been invited to visit South Australia and I believe that that is a course of action that ought to be taken soon.

Whether or not we like the politics of that country, if it has technology (which it does have) that will benefit us and make it possible for us to continue to be relatively free of fuel shortages, we should go there and examine those operations. If the Government of this State is not prepared to accept what the Leader, the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, other people in the community and I are saying in relation to the nuclear industry, if it is not prepared to accept that there are safeguards and arrangements that can be entered into to make the mining of uranium and the nuclear industry quite safe for mankind, I suggest to the Government that, as it has a resolution currently on the table of this House restricting it from going ahead with the mining and development of uranium, and is locked into an A.L.P. conference decision, it ought to make an investment on behalf of the people of this State (and it has wasted millions of dollars in other areas) by sending at least six members of the House of Assembly overseas to look at the nuclear industry in detail.

I do not suggest this to give a few members of Parliament a joyride around the world. There are facilities in the world that they ought to look at. They ought to go to France and look at the vitrification plant at Marcule. Premier Dunstan went there and the people at that establishment were amazed at his comments when I showed them a copy of his speech. We are all aware that in this State he was undermined by the then Attorney-General. It was one of the most disgraceful acts of disloyalty that any Minister could engage in while his Leader was overseas. Most of the community believed that he was overseas studying the industry so that he could come back and give the go-ahead so that this State would

get some benefit.

Mr. Tonkin: And come into line with the rest of the world.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, because South Australia is currently a laughing stock around the world. What happened? We know that the Premier was contacted in London and told to get back as quickly as he could because Duncan was playing hell in South Australia, organising his left-wing cronies.

We saw on the weekend another example of Cabinet disloyalty. We know that the Government is divided on this issue. The answers that the Deputy Premier has given over the past week or so show that he is not in favour of the policy. We know that the Government is divided on the Pitjantjatjara land issue, so they are two issues on which it is divided. If the Government of this State does not have the courage to do anything, it should send six fair-minded members, three from each side of the House, overseas to have a look for themselves. I am quite confident that, if any reasonable person had the opportunity to go to France, the United Kingdom, United States, Canada and Vienna, he would have to come back and say that not only are the safeguards adequate, but that they are designed in such a way as to protect mankind.

I will give members an example of this. Anyone who has been to a nuclear plant would have to be impressed with the stringent security that is imposed. The last nuclear powerhouse I looked at was in northern Taiwan. When I had had a good look around the establishment, the manager asked whether there was anything else I wanted to look at. I said that I would like to walk across the top of the reactor. He said that I was quite welcome to do that. We went through various security areas. When we got on top of the reactor he asked me whether I could see two closed circuit television cameras. When I said that I could, he said that they were placed there at the instance of the international energy agency in Vienna. He said that the only people who had access to the tapes in the cameras were the inspectors, because they were sealed. Every operation relating to that reactor, fuelling, the replacement of fuel rods and storage, is completely monitored. For people to say that nuclear reactors are unsafe and that the nuclear industry is conducted in a willy-nilly fashion is complete nonsense.

I hope that the Government is prepared to look closely at the suggestion I have made because I feel strongly about the issue. South Australia is a laughing stock around the world. The State badly needs the investment of large sums of money to get our economy moving. None of us wants to see South Australia continue to be the Cinderella State of Australia, no matter what are our political philosophies. I suggest to the Premier and his Ministers that harsh reality is about to catch up with them. If the Minister of Health and other members opposite think that little South Australia can live in isolation from the rest of the world, they are living in a fool's paradise (and it will not be a paradise for long). They are deluding themselves and have been the victims of their own propaganda, because the harsh realities of international politics will catch up with them.

Many people claim that we will expose the world to the risk of nuclear warfare. Let me make quite clear that we will be creating a situation in which Governments will be forced to take decisions which I do not think they really want to take. We will create instability in the world if we deny countries which are short of energy the opportunity of having adequate supplies of energy.

Mr. Whitten: We can't get rid of the uranium we are already producing.

Mr. GUNN: I suggest the honourable member read

carefully what Chancellor Schmidt had to say a few months ago about this matter. He carefully indicated wars could be fought over lack of energy, particularly uranium.

By 1985, France will be 60 per cent dependent on nuclear energy. What will countries like France do if the proponents of nuclear energy cut off the supply tomorrow and say, "You cannot have any". The lights will go out in many parts of the world—in Scotland, France and Germany—without nuclear energy. Chicago is 30 per cent dependent on nuclear energy. What about countries like Japan, Taiwan and South Korea, just to mention a few? I am surprised that members opposite have not realised, do not appreciate, or perhaps have shut their eyes to, the fact that if Australia is to help underdeveloped countries and the under-privileged persons in the world, whom members opposite claim they want to help, but have not done so in the past (I hope they do so in the future), energy must be supplied. If Australia denies these countries cheap sources of energy in the future, development will be held back. No-one can say that cheap sources of energy can be gained without nuclear power, because that is not possible.

Take, for example, one of the most highly industrialised countries in the world, West Germany, which has been rebuilt, is efficient, and is a lovely place to visit. It is a different matter when one goes over the border, but I will say more about that on another occasion. The member for Stuart, who cited the benefits of socialism, should travel on a train to East Berlin and see what the workers' paradise is like. A fence has had to be built to keep the people in. The trip would be a good education for him and all socialists; they could see the Alsatian dogs and the people with machine guns.

Mr. Mathwin: Is that to keep them in?

Mr. GUNN: Yes. One can go in, but the funny thing is that one has to pay in good capitalist money—West German marks—to get out. The East German authorities want people to bring in West German marks, not to use East German money.

Mr. Whitten: Did you spend much while you were there?

Mr. GUNN: I will not be sidetracked because I will probably not be able to talk about this subject again, after what I have said, although I am not worried about that; therefore, I will continue with what I was saying. People should understand that a great deal of information is available that can help dispel the fears of people. Much has been said about the Three Mile Island so-called disaster. I had the opportunity to spend a considerable time in countries that are members of the European Economic Community, which is keen to be involved in purchasing uranium from Australia. I think it is fair to say that all countries I visited are keen to buy Australia's uranium. For the member for Price to say that it will be difficult to sell our uranium shows that he does not understand the facts at all. The European Economic Community sent two officers to Harrisburg to look at the Three Mile Island power station. Their report stated, in part:

According to the survey results, doses received by members of the public as a consequence of the accident are low compared with the dose limits. The environmental contamination has also been minimal. Occupational exposure up to 4 April was still within the annual limits. Therefore from a health point of view the consequences of the accident can be considered as not significant.

The report is available for anyone to see. I was in Grand Forks, North Dakota, when an editorial appeared on 13 June 1979. It is worth quoting, because it gives a clear indication of the way in which certain people blew the

incident out of all proportion. The editorial stated:

Another view of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident is presented in the current issue of the *Minnkota Messenger* by Frank Rose, power supply manager of Minnkota Power Cooperative. Rose claims the news media built the accident into a panic situation "when nothing of the sort was warranted". He charges, "The credibility of the press must be questioned when they can make a nuclear accident, in which no-one was injured, into the disaster of the century."

Rose further claims that scientific facts developed since the accident are being given "short shrift" by news media. "Government scientists have gone over the Three Mile Island area with a fine-tooth comb and have concluded that radiation released at the nuclear site represents an insignificant addition to what would normally be received from living on earth," Rose says. "The average radiation dose received was very small." A standard X-ray exposes a person to between 20-30 millirems, Rose adds.

Rose continues, "Dr. Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb, reports that the maximum dose for any worker at the plant is 3 roentgens (rems) over a 90-day period. One of the plant workers received 3.4 rems and another received 3.1. No-one else in the plant received as much as 3 rems of radiation, while an astronaut is allowed to receive 35 rems.

Airline hostesses insisted a few years ago that they have the right to stay in service whether or not they are pregnant. Yet, they receive 50 millirems of radiation for every 50 hours aloft in a jet plane, Rose says. He adds it is doubtful that anyone living near the Three Mile Island plant site received as much as 50 millirems.

Rose says each of us receives each year 44 millirems from the sky, 40 from the earth, 5 from watching television, 60 from our homes due to building materials, plus additional amounts if we receive X-rays or go on airplane flights. He doubts there is any good in radiation but "we live with radiation exposure every day just by living on the earth".

Rose points out that one nuclear reactor replaces 40 000 barrels of oil per day. The 72 reactors in the U.S. can replace 3 000 000 barrels of oil per day and we are importing 9 000 000 barrels per day, Rose relates. While we feel the need for nuclear power is obvious, we feel that safety must be foremost in the programme and we certainly don't feel the press overplayed the first nuclear accident.

I disagree with the last paragraph. In my view, if people had considered what happened at Harrisburg and had analysed the situation properly, they would have come up with a rational answer. They will not continue to go around like the present Minister of Health who, like a parrot, continues to mouth deliberate nonsense and endeavours to place fear in the minds of the public.

If the Minister and his colleagues are successful, the only people who will miss out will be the people of South Australia—they will be affected by the current policy. The only people to be disadvantaged at this stage will be the people of South Australia. Let us make clear that it is all very well for those who live in South Australia and Australia, because Australia is one of the luckiest countries in the world (most of us do not realise how lucky we are), but everyone has his part to play in supplying resources to other parts of the world that are not so fortunate. If Australia is successful in stopping uranium export, the fast breeder programme will be accelerated. Britain has vast quantities of material that it can use for its fast breeder programme without importing one more tonne of uranium. Britain has a huge stockpile that can be used.

In recent times, the argument has normally revolved around Harrisburg and fission products. I suggest that those people who are concerned ought to look at the

vitrification process that has been developed so successfully in France and, I understand, also in Germany and Japan. Unfortunately, the American programme has been slowed down by the decision of President Carter, and many people have found his decision difficult to follow, but it is basically a safety programme about which the people are concerned.

It is interesting that, on the day on which I was having discussions in Germany, considerable debate was taking place in that country about whether the coal mines at Asp should be used as a repository for the vitrified material. The Chancellor of West Germany (Mr. Schmidt) favoured the project, but his colleagues in the State Parliament of Lower Saxony were trying to create political problems for the State Government, and the decision was made to defer it. As reported in the *Financial Times* of 17 May 1979, the Premier stated:

In a statement to the Lower Saxony State Assembly in Hannover yesterday, Herr Ernst Albrecht, the State Premier, a potential Christian Democratic candidate for Chancellor, said his Government had decided against letting the Gorleben project go ahead on political grounds. He said there was no technical objection, and no likelihood of danger to the public from the plan.

It is rather interesting to note that he made a purely political decision because of the actions of Chancellor Schmidt's colleagues. It was also interesting to learn while in Germany that the East Germans were across the border using the salt mines to bury nuclear waste. The reasons for this were quite simple. I have excellent publications that I recommend to you, Mr. Acting Speaker, for consideration. The area obviously had been free of moisture for a considerable time and was geologically stable, and, when the glass was vitrified into an inert mass, there was no danger of its being broken down and entering the atmosphere or the earth. By the time this happened, it would be down to radiation levels far lower than those that the earth emitted daily.

It was also interesting to make comparisons in relation to the amount of radiation that one receives. I had a graph that indicates the per capita radiation in the United Kingdom in 1978. It is of a statistical nature, and I will seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*. The report, which is headed "Nuclear power and the environment", states:

In a brick house in London the level of terrestrial radiation can be as low as 30 mr per annum, while in an Aberdeen house built of granite the terrestrial radiation level can be as high as 150 mr per annum.

I seek leave to have these documents inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Whitten): Is it statistical material?

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

Leave granted.

Per Caput Radiation: UK 1978

Source	mrem	per cent
Natural Background	96	74
Medical Irradiation	~30*	23
Fallout	2	1.5
Nuclear Wastes	0.2	0.2
Occupational	0.7	0.5
Luminous Watches	0.2	0.2
Air Travel	0.6	0.5

*UKAEA estimate.

Mr. GUNN: It was interesting that, while I was visiting the Dawnray fast breeder reactor, the manager, who explained the safety precautions to me in great detail, also stated that he had been invited by a religious group

concerned about the effects of radiation to go to Aberdeen. When he arrived at the church hall, he looked around the building and suggested that, if they were concerned about radiation, they had better go to his power station, because they would get less radiation there than they would from the granite hall in which the meeting was being held. Many people do not understand that we are subject to radiation every day: it is part of the normal environment. Nuclear power houses are not the only establishments that cause radiation. In most cases, if coal-burning power houses were subjected to the same safety criteria as are nuclear power houses, most of them would be closed down. The *New Scientist* of 12 May 1977 contains other information that I will seek to have incorporated in *Hansard*. It is headed "Risk equations: what risks should be run?" A paragraph headed "Can we measure safety?" states:

One such scale is the fatal accident frequency rate (FAFR), the number of fatal accidents in a group of 1 000 men in a working lifetime (100 million hours).

This table has been prepared, and I seek to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it, because it indicates clearly the risks that we run during our working lifetime, in comparison with those in the nuclear industry, and it indicates clearly that it is far more likely that we will have problems by normal activity.

Leave granted.

Fatal accident frequency rates (FAFR)

British industry	4
Clothing and footwear	0.15
Vehicles	1.3
Timber, furniture, and so on	3
Metal manufacture, shipbuilding	8
Agriculture	10
Coal mining	12
Railway shunters	45
Construction erectors	67
Staying at home (men 16-65)	1
Travelling by train	5
Travelling by car	57

Mr. GUNN: I now quote from a document I was given while in the United Kingdom. Some opposition has been generated by anti-nuclear groups in that country about the proposal to build a new nuclear power house at Torness, in southern Scotland. A publication issued about that project is headed "Your questions answered". It has been necessary for the nuclear industry in the U.K. and elsewhere to engage in public relations work. In the past, if one could be critical, I think the industry has failed to appreciate that it is essential to keep the public informed on what it is doing. It did not try to inform the public of its programme and the benefits to mankind, particularly regarding the safety programmes. The publication quotes questions and answers as follows:

Q. Could terrorists make a nuclear bomb with radioactive fuel from nuclear power stations?

A. No, it's just not possible. Plutonium is required to make a nuclear bomb and the fuel needs to be reprocessed in a multi-million pound highly specialised plant before the plutonium contained in the fuel can be separated. Such plant cannot easily be kept secret and without it terrorists would harm themselves rather than others by attempting to handle radioactive spent fuel.

Q. How can it be economical when Torness will cost £740 000 000?

A. The cost of building Torness is estimated at over £740 000 000; if it were a coal-fired station the cost would be about £500 000 000. But the important advantage of nuclear power is the running costs, which are about a third of those for coal or oil-fired stations.

Q. Finally, how can you reassure local people that you will not drastically alter their way of life?

A. From past experience we know that our major power stations have fitted in well with local communities. Local people at Hunterston do not object to our nuclear stations, which have been operating safely there for many years. They see that the nuclear stations are environmentally acceptable. They also see that farming and other activities can continue normally, right up to the perimeter fence of a nuclear power station. They know we have been good neighbours, and we will be the same at Torness.

I had the opportunity to visit Hunterston power stations, and it was one of the most efficient industrial organisations that I had visited. I recommend to members opposite that, if they visit Scotland, they look at the Hunterston A and Hunterston B stations. The manager of that organisation told me that, if that nuclear power house was turned off, they would have great difficulty in meeting the power needs of Scotland, so again we see the futility of the argument put forward by members opposite. And so we again see the futility of the argument that has been put forward by members opposite.

Recently there has been a great deal of discussion about the way we can produce alcohol for fuel, and run motor cars on it. That may be true in certain parts of the world, but one of the problems with which we will be faced is that we will be using up far too large a proportion of our food-producing areas. While I was overseas I was given a copy of a press cutting which states:

General Motors Corporation, which is second to Volkswagen as a producer of vehicles in Brazil, had its first studies into alcohol in 1931. "We know our cars down there are going to be involved in this," a spokesman said yesterday. "In 1978 we sold 880 000 vehicles, so a lot of them will probably be switched to alcohol, but we do not know how many. Using corn as a source for substitute alcohol for gasoline, for example, General Motors estimated that 1.45 billion acres would be needed. Assuming water is available. That represents 64 per cent of the total land area in the United States and three times the amount of crop land in use.

So, there was a real problem in relation to that suggestion. Earlier, I said that the lights would go out if there was no nuclear energy. Recently, a referendum was held in Switzerland in relation to what would happen, and the Swiss Government made quite clear that the country would face severe rationing if the referendum was successful. Fortunately for the people of that country, the referendum was not successful, and the proponents of nuclear power were not able to continue with their destructive policy.

I will now refer to one or two other matters in relation to safety. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to some of the statements made in a book put out by Mr. Robert Moss. I will not go into them in any detail, but I suggest to members opposite that they ought to read what the Deputy Leader had to say and study it carefully. An article headed "After Three Mile Island, Nuclear Power Bogey" states:

Britain may imagine that, with its coal reserves and its windfall of North Sea oil, it enjoys a privileged position and can afford to backpedal on the further development of nuclear power. This would be a foolish and dangerous illusion—and not only because the availability of coal is vulnerable to the whims of Left-wing demagogues like Arthur Scargill, who now figures significantly, as the leader of an anti-nuclear lobby called Energy 2000. In the long run, we will have to depend either on nuclear energy, or switch off the lights and shiver through the winter.

In fact, as a cynical American safety expert observed to

me: "Fewer people have died as a result of nuclear accidents in the United States than as a result of a single road accident in one celebrated Senator's car."

Stickers to that effect were being displayed around the United States. The article continues:

Health hazards. A leaked report from America's National Academy of Scientists suggests that the price of going ahead with nuclear power could be 2 000 deaths from cancer by the end of the century. The figure is suspect, but even if taken at face value, it is not alarming when compared with the greater health hazards of developing other forms of energy. Coal provides the most notorious example. A hushed-up report by the United States Energy Research & Development Administration in 1977 suggested that coal-burning power plants east of the Mississippi were responsible for 18 000 premature deaths from lung diseases and cancer every year.

Dr. Beckmann goes further: "Each year we delay in building a nuclear plant to replace 1 000 megawatts of coal-fired power. We condemn between 20 to 100 Americans to death." The most complete statement of Dr. Beckmann's view can be found in his book "The Health Hazards of not going nuclear". These are facts that it would be salutary to bring to Mr. Scargill's attention when he parades in front of the anti-nuclear demonstrators.

We are fully aware of the type of person like the union leader referred to in that article. He was a person who has said on occasions that he is quite happy to use industrial might to bring about the defeat of the democratically elected Governments.

I have enjoyed the opportunity of looking at this industry, and I hope that the Government will accept my recommendations and suggestions. It has been disappointing to listen to the contributions of members opposite to this debate. They set out in a cynical fashion to whine and whinge about the Federal Government. The member for Morphett has been acclaimed as one of the brighter—I say that reservedly—members of the Labor Party. He gave us a sneering example of just how slippery a character he is. He failed to accept that the decisions of the Government behind which he sits had any detrimental effects on the people in this State. Instead, he endeavoured to shoot home all the blame to the Federal Government. He went on at great length about various aspects of its policy. He was talking about fuel parity when his own Minister of Mines and Energy is on record as supporting that policy. That proves how hypocritical he is. Like the member for Stuart, he gave us an academic socialist lecture about the great benefits that would flow from his socialist theories. All he wanted to do was put South Australia into the same category as our socialist friends in Eastern Europe. I was amazed to think that they had no constructive propositions to put to this House about how we can solve the problems we are facing. All they want to do is spend more money. We have already seen examples of their spending. They did not attempt to justify the nonsense of Monarto or the shocking administration in the Hospitals Department, and one could go through a list of the programmes in which they have been involved. They gave us no undertakings that they would ensure that those decisions were not repeated in the future. They think that, if they continue to rave and rant about the Federal Government, they may be able to save their own political skins. It would be a disaster for the people of South Australia if they were successful in that campaign. I believe that they will not be successful, because at last not only have the media woken up to the facts in South Australia but also the people of South Australia are fully appreciative of what has been taking place for 10 years.

Mr. Groom: Are you going to have Mr. Fraser campaigning in your electorate?

Mr. GUNN: I would be quite happy to have the Prime Minister in my electorate.

Mr. Groom: Will you invite him?

Mr. GUNN: I would be quite happy to invite him; he has been in my electorate in the past. I make no apology for saying that I support the Prime Minister and his colleagues. I am not afraid to stand with the Prime Minister or his Federal colleagues, because what they are doing is one thing the Labor Party can never accept—that you have to be prepared to make tough decisions in Government.

The Labor Party believes there are always easy answers. It is always looking for the easy solution but it is not prepared to accept the reality of the situation, that tough decisions have to be made and that the Government must have a bit of courage and political guts to see the situation through so that in the long term the interests of the community will be improved. The interests of the people of this country are in having a Government which is prepared to make those tough economic decisions and not a Government prepared to live by short-term, day-to-day—

Mr. Groom: Do you think it's right that he should be putting people out of work?

Mr. GUNN: He has not deliberately set out to put people out of work. He is trying to lay the foundation for economic growth and recovery, and he will be successful. This Government has set out to do everything it can to destroy the economic base of this country. The Playford Government built South Australia and the Dunstan decade will go down in history as the term of office of a Government which drove industry away from this State and which turned South Australia from a prosperous State into the socialist quagmire we have today.

Mr. KLUNDER (Newland): I wish to speak for some time about the issue of law and order, an issue which causes a great deal of worry and concern to the South Australian public. From discussions with my electors and other people, I feel that the major concern is concentrated around a limited number of topics, including judicial leniency to adult offenders and especially to juveniles, and length of sentences and the related issue of minimum sentences. Also included is the belief that increasing the length of sentences will somehow reap the automatic benefit of reducing the crime rate.

I would like to deal with these matters in turn, briefly of course, because each in itself would be worthy of an Address in Reply speech. Then I want to move on to what I see as being the real answer to the problem of crime, and that is an unpopular answer because it neither promises a miracle cure nor promises to fix the problem cheaply, but it is an answer which I think is responsible and which ultimately is society's only real answer to the problem of crime.

I will start with the problems associated with sentencing. The criminal courts have a two-fold function which must be kept separately in mind. The first function is to determine the guilt or otherwise of the person accused, and the second is to determine his punishment if he should be found guilty. One hears relatively few complaints about the first function, and it appears that most people think that this is done as well as it can be. The second function, that of sentencing, is the one which normally draws a great deal of fire. I think that we need to look at the disagreement with the present system under two separate headings: first, that the maximum sentences as set by Parliament are too low, and, secondly, that the Judiciary does not sentence as heavily as it is permitted by law to do.

The first complaint, that the maximum sentences are

insufficiently high, is one that can be legitimately aimed at this Parliament. After all, we do set the maximum sentences. It is interesting that such complaints are usually not carefully considered. I have heard on a number of occasions from a number of people the claim that the penalty for robbery with violence is insufficiently high. The penalty for robbery with violence is life imprisonment. I do not think that the people who complain are looking for a return to the death penalty; they are just not aware that the penalty is as heavy as it is.

Earlier today I took the opportunity to look through the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to find out for how many offences there actually is a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. It came as something of a surprise to me, as I am sure it will be to other members, that at least 40 offences have the maximum penalty of life imprisonment. I will not read through the whole list but there are a number that I think we ought to pass over briefly at least, as follows: treason (section 7); homicide (section 11); conspiring to or soliciting to commit murder (section 12); manslaughter (section 13); attempted murder (section 18); rape; arson; injuries to property by rioters; robbery with violence; burglary, piracy; forging banknotes; rescuing murderers; and rioters remaining after the proclamation has been read.

As well as that (and all of those are in fact quite serious offences), there is a life imprisonment sentence for setting fire to crops of corn; for sending letters demanding money by menace; for sacrilege; and for impersonation in order to obtain property. These are only fewer than half of the total number of sentences of life imprisonment that are already set by this Parliament. I think then that in any case the Judiciary imposing the maximum sentence on all occasions, or even on a majority of occasions, can well be a retrograde step. United States research has indicated that juries are quite reluctant to convict when they consider that the maximum penalty is a Draconian one. In any case, if the life imprisonment penalty was set regularly for offences such as robbery with violence, there is absolutely nothing to stop such a criminal from going on and killing people, because the same penalty would apply.

Like other members of the community, in my private capacity I must admit that I have been sometimes rather mystified by the leniency of sentences handed out by individual judges. Before we take any action in that regard (and I will talk about possible ways of looking at this), I think we ought to have a study of offences and the length of sentences that are imposed. I would hate to intervene with a professional in his chosen field of expertise from a basis of newspaper reports which happen to sensationalise cases heard by individual judges rather than look at the overall situation of what is happening.

In the meantime I am prepared, albeit somewhat reluctantly, to abide with the decision made by the professional because, after all, he has been in attendance at a number of those cases and has all the evidence in front of him, whereas I do not have.

We often hear the catch-cry that a mandatory minimum sentence will help. I would like to take a look at a hypothetical case, say of imposing a one-year sentence for shoplifting. This, it is argued by proponents of a tougher sentencing policy, will severely reduce shop-lifting and since it is sufficiently Draconian it may well do so. I would like to look at a hypothetical case which I selected in order to disprove this theory and I make no apologies for its being a biased case.

Let us consider the possibility of a young wife, just deserted by her husband, with mortgage and hire purchase payments due and with people hammering on the door to get her to pay her husband's debts. She has two or three

small children to support, she is unable to get out of the house because of the lack of a car, she is down to her last few cents, and she is unaware that help is available in such desperate circumstances. She could very well steal food from a supermarket in order to feed the children. I do not think I would like to be on a jury which would have to find her guilty and give her a mandatory minimum one-year sentence. I do not think any member would relish that situation, either. There goes the case for minimum sentencing. The wide discretion of the Judiciary is designed specifically to reduce the chances of that kind of thing occurring.

Another area of concern is the judicial treatment of juveniles. The kind of criticism one hears is that the juvenile courts and the juvenile aid panels do little more than pat offenders on the head and release them to repeat the offence. Every member of this House has heard that said *ad nauseam*. I hope no-one is foolish enough to believe it because the reality, if one looks for it, is vastly different. First, in dealing with the effectiveness of juvenile aid panels, I refer to the seventh annual report of the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act by Judge Newman. On page 8, he says:

At present approximately 4 000 children appear before juvenile aid panels in South Australia each year. Taking the year ended 30 June 1977 as an example, 3 503 children appeared before panels, and in the same period 4 250 children appeared before juvenile courts for matters, minor traffic excluded.

The important part is as follows:

Statistics put before the Royal Commissioner show that 87 per cent of children appearing before a panel do not subsequently appear before a juvenile court. This in itself clearly indicates the effectiveness of the system.

I do not think we need go past those comments. This surely proves that the panel is doing a good job. At page 15 the report gives a further indication of the effectiveness of the treatment of juveniles through the court system. It gives the appearances and the number of offenders as a rate per thousand of the 10 to 18 years age group appearing before the juvenile courts. It is interesting to note that the number of offenders per thousand of the 10 to 18 years age group in 1975-76 was 33.1, or just over 3 per cent. In 1976-77, it was 31.9, and in 1977-78 it dropped to 30.5. There has been a decrease in the number of juveniles appearing before the juvenile court.

Mr. Mathwin: Because they go to the aid panels.

Mr. KLUNDER: All the same, is it not an excellent idea to keep the youngsters of this country away from the courts and without a record if it can be done?

Mr. Mathwin: I agree, but that's why there is such a drop.

Mr. KLUNDER: Let us look at the other side of the coin on the same occasion. The point I make is that that decrease has taken place at a time when there has been a huge increase in youth unemployment and all the problems associated therewith. This clearly indicates that the system is working, and that the system of juvenile treatment under this State's Acts is not a bad one. It certainly does not warrant the gloom and doom screams we hear from people. Once people know the truth, they will be prepared to change their tune.

A further common argument is that heavier penalties will bring about a reduction in crime; that was the view of the Judiciary in Great Britain, which helped to populate Australia with convicts. The basic flaw in that argument was mentioned by one of the great train robbers in Britain, not so long ago. I am prepared to quote even a criminal to see whether we can get somewhere. In a report in the *Advertiser* of 17 July 1978, Robin Edwards, said, "A

prison sentence is not a deterrent. What deters is the certainty of arrest. But no thief imagines that when he goes out on business he will be caught." When you look at it, that has a certain amount of common sense in it. There must be few criminals indeed who kiss their wives and children on the cheek at night and say, "I'll see you later: I'm just going out to get myself shopped for burglary," and of course, burglary carries a maximum sentence of life imprisonment.

Yet, the basis of the argument that an increase in penalties will decrease the amount of that particular crime hinges on exactly that sort of argument. It assumes that the person who is going to commit a crime will sit down before he commits it, preferably with an electronic calculator, and work out (a) the percentage chance of being caught; (b) the probable net gain after paying accomplices, etc; and (c) the length of sentence he will get if caught. He will then work out the cost effectiveness of committing that crime. When the sentence is increased, he will add that to his calculations and decide that that crime now falls below the critical limit at which he is prepared to commit the crime, and that, therefore, he will not commit it. As a corollary, it assumes that this person will thereupon be a law-abiding citizen rather than look around for another crime with a better cost effectiveness. I do not believe that criminals do that or that longer sentences deter the criminal, because he firmly believes, whether erroneously or not, that he will not be caught.

So far, I have merely indicated that I believe that a number of so-called solutions do not contain the miracle producing ingredients that are sometimes claimed for them. Unfortunately, the solution I propose is not cheap or easy and will not produce miraculous results. It is a commonsense solution which, I think, any sober and responsible Government would have to follow. It hinges on the idea that what deters the would-be criminal is the certainty of arrest. Obviously any Government must attempt to ensure that the probability of arrest is as high as possible. This means that it must equip, train and foster its Police Force. Before I look at the way in which this Government has discharged its duty in this respect since coming to office, I will consider first the problems with which the Police Force has had to grapple; secondly, the way in which this Government has assisted and fostered the Police Force and other Government agencies in this area; and, finally, at the way in which the Police Force has coped with the job it has been given.

A number of factors have an influence on the crime rate. I would be hard pushed to produce evidence of direct causal relationships, and I intend neither to attempt to show such relationships nor to try to isolate every factor which I think has some relevance. The first factor, however, is a reasonably commonsense one; it is a demographic factor. I believe that the rate of crime depends at least partly on the size and concentration of the population. I suggest that the correlation is greater than a direct ratio one, that is, an increase in population of 100 per cent produces a crime rate which more than doubles. This is due to the fact that, in larger groups, subcultures form and they are mutually self-supporting. There is an incredible range of sociological literature available on that point, and I do not intend to quote it here. This demographic factor also includes the age structure of the population. Most offences, it is known, are committed by people in the 15-24 years age group. If one takes a look at that growth of this age group in South Australia, one will see that it has risen from 193 750 in 1968 to 223 540 in 1976, an increase of 15.4 per cent in only eight years. If one applies the concentration factor I mentioned earlier to the 15.4 per cent, one would expect the rate of offences to

increase at a far higher rate than the mere 15.4 per cent.

I believe that another factor is the ease of mobility in communication. The fact that bank robberies in South Australia can be, and have been, carried out by Victorians is proof enough. I would be surprised if citizens band radio had not on occasion been used by would-be offenders. Another factor comes under the general heading of insecurity. This ranges from generalised and vague fears about the atomic warfare and the next Federal Budget to specific fears of unemployment, disillusionment, loneliness, and anonymity. Again, many of these specific fears apply most strongly within the 15 to 24 years age group.

A fourth factor is the way in which some offences have been redefined as a consequence of greater urbanisation and concentration of people with a resultant increase in anonymity. Once, juvenile shoplifting from the local grocery store could have been, and was, taken care of between the grocer and the parents of the youngster. It was possible, because they knew each other. Nowadays, the shoplifting that took place in a dozen grocery stores takes place in one supermarket. The manager of the supermarket, knowing neither the youngster nor the parents, and having a large number of offences on his property, has no option but to call the police.

Once, pinching apples from an orchard or riding the neighbour's horse was regarded as a high-spirited prank that got you a thick ear if you were caught, and no further action was taken. Nowadays, the equivalents of those two acts are stealing from a supermarket and pinching your neighbour's car for a joyride; neither is considered at all funny and you do not get a thick ear for them, you get a gaol sentence. It may be possible to claim in that instance, and in that area, that times rather than the youngsters have changed. Again, it is the 15 to 24 years age group which is most strongly affected.

Unemployment, I am quite sure, is undoubtedly a major factor, and it comes as no surprise to members, again, to hear that the 15 to 24 years age group is again the one that bears the brunt of society's ills; 40 per cent of South Australia's unemployed are under 21. I do not think that there is any doubt that feelings of anger, despair, hopelessness and worthlessness undermine the Protestant work ethic with which all of us have grown up and that these, and the enforced idleness, must certainly lead to temptations for young people who, in happier circumstances, would never have considered breaking the law. These are some of the factors that I think affect the number of offences committed. They have all been at work in the past few years and most of them affect most heavily that particular age group, the 15 to 24 years age group, which is most susceptible to committing offences in any case.

This leads us to the question of how the State Government has equipped the Police Force over the past few years to cope with the increased number of offences. I believe that the key is an increased certainty of arrests and consequently the quantity and quality of the Police Force are essential. It is possible to judge a Government's stance on law and order by its efforts to improve the Police Force. It is worthwhile looking at the South Australian Government's performance in this area in some detail.

Since pay and status are tightly interlinked in this community, it is worthwhile comparing pay rates of police officers over a period of time. In 1971, a first-year constable earned \$3 448. At that time, that was 77 per cent of average weekly earnings. In 1978 a first-year constable earned \$9 464, which was 93 per cent of average weekly earnings. That is an upward movement of 16 percentage points along the average weekly earnings scale. It is, therefore, a real rise and not one affected by inflation.

In 1971, a first-grade sergeant earned \$5 383, which was 120 per cent of average weekly earnings. In 1978, he earned \$14 745, or 145 per cent of average weekly earnings, an upward movement of 25 per cent. There is no doubt that the South Australian Government values its Police Force, as well it might, as it is one of the most honest and capable forces in Australia. It is in this particularly critical area that it has injected a massive boost to the status of police. To put it another way, the South Australian Government has recognised by its increases in real pay the value of work being done.

Another critical input that can be made by the Government is in terms of numbers of police. Again, this can be taken as a measure of the Government's sincerity in combating crime. A comparison between the years 1968 and 1978 is interesting. In 1968, police manpower consisted of 48 commissioned officers, 1 730 other ranks and 685 in active staff (that is made up of cadets, civilian staff, and so on). In 1978, the number of commissioned officers had risen from 48 to 105, other ranks from 1 730 to 2 768, and the inactive staff from 685 to 917. The total rose from 2 463 in 1968 to 3 790 in 1978. In that 10-year interval there was a 61.6 per cent increase in active staff, and the ratio of police manpower to population fell from 1 in 631 to 1 in 452.

That is not all. The State Government realised that increased mobility and communication had to be a part of an effective Police Force. Consequently, the number of vehicles was increased from 573 in 1968 to 831 in 1978, an increase of 45 per cent. Police reports indicate that radio tasking increased from 52 000 in 1968 to 170 000 in 1978, an increase of 227 per cent. Police budgets rose from \$9 000 000 in 1968 to \$54 000 000 in 1978.

Mr. Mathwin: Not a rapid increase when one looks at community welfare and sees how that has gone up.

Mr. KLUNDER: I might do that one of these days. During that time, the Police Department has extensively reorganised its organisation and its pre- and in-service training. I do not intend to deal with the organisational restructure in any depth as it is, as with most organisations, a complex entity which it is difficult to describe in words. I am already going fast enough to upset the *Hansard* staff now, and if I start throwing charts around I will drive them completely insane. Suffice to say that the list of units and sections that appears on the 1978 organisational chart but not in the 1970 organisational chart runs to 2½ pages.

Mr. Mathwin: We've had some good Commissioners, too, haven't we?

Mr. KLUNDER: I'll mention one in a moment. The Police Department has, in fact, geared itself structurally to deal with the greater complexity of modern living. Much of the credit for the restructuring must go to the present Police Commissioner, Mr. Draper, who, as Deputy Commissioner, was instrumental in the creation and implementation of the present organisation. He did an enormous amount of work on that in the early 1970's.

The bulk of recruitment into the Police Force has always been through the cadet system, despite sporadic induction of adults after 22-week courses. A review of basic training commenced in 1973. The present system consists of five phases, three at the academy and two postings, totalling 24 months. A system approach is used, and specific minimum performance objectives are set down for each component of the course. What strikes me, as an ex-professional educator, as particularly effective is the fact that the postings are of three and six months duration each. Having been closely involved with the training of student teachers, I have always felt that the amount of time spent by them in schools was both inadequate and too fragmented. I feel

that the colleges of advanced education could well take a leaf out of the Police Academy's book in this instance.

Police training, moreover, is followed up by three-week courses in each of the third and seventh years of a constable's duty. Of particular significance and interest is the part-time education assistance scheme, which allows members of the Police Force to acquire further qualifications as approved by the Public Service Board. The Police Studies Certificate is such a course and consists of five compulsory subjects, namely, communication I, resource structure of Australia, criminal law, law of evidence, and supervisory procedures. There are also four choice subjects that can be chosen from a range that varies from human relations to forensic photography.

It strikes me that it would not be a bad idea if some of the advanced courses to be offered to the police were, in fact, offered by colleges of advanced education. I can see two major reasons to favour such a proposal. First, it would confer a higher status on the course work offered to police. It seems to me that the status of police has been underrated in the past and that this would be a minor way of effecting an improvement. Secondly, colleges of advanced education are short of students in their normal, or traditional field (namely, that of providing teachers), and an expansion into the area I have suggested might well offset their presently declining enrolments.

What I have said so far has given an indication of how the South Australian Police Force has been assisted in its fight against crime by the actions of successive Labor Governments. It is now worth while to turn our attention to the fact that other agencies deal with the problem of crime after the offender has been convicted. We should also look at the way in which both parole officers and prison staff have been assisted in their operations.

The annual report of the Director of Correctional Services has given an accurate analysis of the numbers and duties of the Probation and Parole Branch staff only since 1974-75, but the figures since then do present an interesting picture. In 1974-75, there was an Assistant Director, Probation and Parole; one Senior Probation and Parole Officer, Grade II; four Senior Probation and Parole Officers, Grade I; and 30 Probation and Parole Officers—that is, a total of 36 officers. The average case load was 85.

In 1975-76, the total number of officers rose from 36 to 60; 2 284 clients were supervised, with an average case load of 50. In 1976-77, the relevant figures were 65 officers and the average case load was 49.1. In 1977-78, the officer complement rose to 68 and the average case load rose to 59.9. This figure is acknowledged in the Director's report as possibly being inflated due to some terminations perhaps not having been noted and also due to the fact that the number of estreatments processed had fallen behind the number of requests made.

However, as the Chief Secretary has indicated, this reversal was due to temporary causes, and the 1978-79 figure dropped to 55 case loads per person. This, as the Chief Secretary pointed out earlier this week, is the figure suggested as appropriate by the United Nations. This State intends to lower the figure to below 55, a move which I expect will be enthusiastically supported by all sides in politics and for which the Government, especially in these times of economic stringency, deserves full support. In the meantime, it should not be forgotten that the figure of 55 is the lowest for any State in which such figures are kept and that it compares well with the National-Liberal Party coalition Queensland Government figure of 78 and the Liberal Western Australian Government figure of 90. Only the Northern Territory, where the scheme is still at an early stage, has a better ratio than South Australia. Six

additional officers are expected to be appointed to the Probation and Parole Board branch staff this year, and this will, of course, assist the situation enormously.

The Correctional Services Department should also be mentioned in connection with its prison staff. The status and support services of prison staff have also been upgraded by the South Australian Government. In 1969-70, the average daily number of prisoners was 929, and the number of staff was 366. In 1977-78, the average daily number of prisoners dropped from 929 to 749, but the staff number rose from 366 to 530. The cost of running the Prisons Department in 1969-70 was \$2 368 000. In 1977-78 the corresponding cost was \$9 100 000. In both this area and that of the parole service, much can still be done although in neither area could it be claimed that the Government has been procrastinating.

I now turn to the way in which the police have coped with their job. The Police Commissioner's reports divide offences into five separate categories: offences against the person; offences against property; offences against morality; offences against good order; and the carry-all category of "other offences". The total number of offences between 1968 and 1978 rose from 128 000 to 186 000, a rise of 48 per cent. What is interesting in terms of police performance is the way in which the Police Force has been able to maintain its clear-up rates despite the overall increase in the number of offences. The clear-up rate in offences against the person has remained in the range of 50 per cent to 63 per cent during those 10 years. In other words, the chances of the police catching up with offenders are better than even. In the category of offences against property, the clear-up rate ranges from 28 per cent to 35 per cent. In offences against morality, the range is from 47 per cent to 63 per cent. In offences against good order, the range is from 88 per cent to 93 per cent, and in the category of "other offences", the clear-up rate is always about 99 per cent.

There is little doubt that, in the face of mounting difficulties and increased crime, the South Australian Police Force has maintained a proud record in its actions against offenders against the laws. As I have stated, the action of improving and increasing the Police Force is not a miracle cure for crime, but a complex, slow and expensive exercise. It is also a responsible exercise that keeps producing results and is protecting the community. What I have outlined is an expensive and careful way of dealing with the problem of crime in this State. I do not believe that there are any quick and cheap miracle cures. Instead, I believe that the Government's deliberate upgrading of its police and correctional services is the responsible and proper way to tackle the problems of crime in South Australia, and I congratulate the Government on its foresight in dealing with this important aspect of protection for the citizens of this State.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I would like to pay my respects and extend condolences to the relatives of four distinguished members of Parliament who have passed away in the period since the last session. Particularly, I note the proud community record of Sir Baden Pattinson, the former member for Glenelg and Minister of Education. Sir Baden, at one time, was Mayor of Glenelg and served that district in an excellent manner. He introduced into the community many worthwhile benefits, one of which is the Sir Baden Pattinson Kindergarten. He was a wonderful benefactor to the community, a great statesman, and a great worker for his people. I also had the pleasure of knowing Mr. (later Justice) Travers, the former member for Torrens. His advice and help to me as an ordinary back-bencher on legal matters was always

appreciated.

In preparing my speech this afternoon, I thought to myself, "What a pathetic debate has developed regarding the contribution of Government members." However, I cannot say that after listening to the speech of the previous speaker. At least he contributed something worthwhile and gave us the benefit of his research and knowledge into his subject, which will not be wasted.

Dr. Eastick: That might be the kiss of death.

Mr. BECKER: I would not do it that way, but it is pleasing to note that someone on the Government side can make a worthwhile contribution to this debate.

Mr. Keneally: He raised the most critical problem that this country is facing and it was completely ignored.

Mr. BECKER: The member for Newland raised some interesting points of view; he knows that I want increased and tougher penalties for armed hold-ups, and other crimes of violence. It was interesting to note in the English press that a prominent member of the bench said that he was concerned about the increased incidence of armed hold-ups. Whilst the maximum penalty of life imprisonment applies, one questions the suggestion of minimum sentencing in that respect. In many cases, armed hold-ups are premeditated crimes, and I believe that it is time—

Mr. Keneally: What would you suggest as a minimum sentence?

Mr. BECKER: At least five years, with no parole: no messing around. Some people, because of their occupations, are required to look after and supervise the assets of their employers, and so risk their lives. Bank officers called for a minimum term of five years, with no parole.

I now want to clarify some points made by Government members, with particular reference to the member for Morphett, who read parts of an article that appeared in the *Australian* of 7-8 July. Whenever that member is in difficulty, he jumps on the airport issue for headline hunting in the local area. He did not read the part of the article that states:

Night curfews on aircraft at Sydney, Brisbane and Adelaide airports have been relaxed by the Department of Transport.

I may say, for the benefit of the journalist who wrote the article, John Spiers, that it is a pity he did not do his homework and write in a far more responsible way, because the headline is misleading. The report continues:

Smaller jets will be allowed to land and take off at the three airports during the previously forbidden hours.

No suggestion has been made that large international jets will be landing at Adelaide Airport. That is a fact. Some time ago the Federal Minister for Transport agreed to allow Delhi-Santos to bring its Lear jet into Adelaide after curfew hours. Approval was given on a six-months trial basis, it being recognised that it would not be used on many occasions and that the Lear jet, in the same way as the Cessna Citation, the Falcons, and the Westwinds, is considerably quieter than the Fokker Friendships that are permitted to come in at about 4 o'clock each morning. The Fokker Friendship is known as the freighter plane and each airline operates one. Doubtless, these will be replaced by Lear jets or similar aircraft.

Dr. Eastick: Is it a Fokker or an Electra?

Mr. BECKER: I do not know, but it comes in at 4 a.m. and sometimes wakes me up. Approval has been given to organisations such as Delhi-Santos, because in case of emergency the aircraft would have to get to Adelaide Airport. This is one problem with oil and gas drilling companies. Unfortunately, we have no extensive helicopter services such as Victoria has, where B.H.P. and Esso have a helicopter on standby for the 24 hours of the day. The member for Morphett has nothing to fear regarding

abuse of the curfew at Adelaide Airport. It was also stated that the Prime Minister had abused the system of overseas air travel. For the benefit of the House, I should have recorded in *Hansard* exactly what happened, as follows:

In his 1975 policy speech, Mr. Malcolm Fraser said, "There will be no international safaris by members of Parliament. Australia does not need a tourist as a Prime Minister." The Fraser Government has adhered to that commitment. In fact, the Prime Minister has halved the amount spent on overseas travel by the previous Labor Prime Minister.

A comparison between the three Labor years and the first three years of the Fraser Government clearly shows that sanity has returned. Between 1973 and 1975, \$1 505 020 was spent by the Labor Prime Minister on overseas trips. Between 1976 and 1978, \$735 488 has been spent by Prime Minister Fraser.

Using present-day prices, the comparison is even more dramatic. Mr. Whitlam's trips cost almost \$2 458 492 in today's prices. Mr. Fraser's trips would cost \$846 881 in today's prices. That is more than \$1.6 million less.

Mr. Whitlam made 11 overseas trips. Mr. Fraser has made nine. Mr. Whitlam was accompanied by 258 people. Mr. Fraser was accompanied by 170 people.

Ministerial Travel: In the Labor years from 1973 to 1975, Ministers made 130 overseas trips. In the first three years of the Fraser Government, Ministers made 109 trips. Labor Ministers spent 2 109 days outside Australia in three years compared with 1 578 days for Fraser Government Ministers in the first three years.

The actual cost of Labor Ministers' trips was \$2 694 619, while the cost of Fraser Government Ministers' trips has been \$1 910 582. In today's prices, Labor Ministers would have spent \$5 132 122, while the present Government's Ministers' trips would have cost \$2 140 490.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He has got his own plane.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, but he bought it from Qantas, which is a Government airline anyway, and it was only a paper transfer. The Liberal and National Country Party Government has spent 58.2 per cent less on overseas trips for Ministers than the previous gallivanting by Gough and company cost.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You've got to be joking!

Mr. BECKER: I have just read the figures for the honourable member. If he did not listen then, I hope he will listen to this: In *West Side* on 20 June 1979, the member for Henley Beach, under the heading "Water rates not tied to revaluation", said:

"Fears of large increases in E. & W.S. rates as a result of recent property valuations were groundless," Henley Beach M.P. Mr. Glen Broomhill said today.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Dead right, too, wasn't it?

Mr. BECKER: No. It goes on:

"Some property owners had feared that very large increases in property valuations would lead to equally large increases in rates. This is not so," he assured residents. Mr. Broomhill explained that properties throughout the State were revalued every five years, but in times of high inflation very substantial increases on the value of properties were to be expected over such a period. "At one time this did have the effect of causing rates to rise very sharply in the areas covered by a particular revaluation. Recognising that this was undesirable, the Government introduced a rate equalisation scheme in June 1975 under which rate increases resulting from increases in property values were spread as evenly as possible over the whole five-year cycle," Mr. Broomhill stated. "So while annual rate increases are to be expected in periods of high inflation, they will not be nearly as high as the increases in property valuations which occur every five years. In fact, it is quite possible that the rates could fall in some cases, or a particular property whose valuation increase is

below the average. Water rates for the coming financial year have not yet been declared, but this will be done shortly, and residents will find that the true picture is much better than they have been led to believe. The rating system is complex, not generally understood, but the truth is that the rating system under this Government is much more equitable than it ever was previously."

I have read the whole of that.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I appreciate that very much.

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member must have been in good form when he prepared that press release. The South Australian *Government Gazette* of 5 July 1979, a week after the honourable member made that statement, contains this notice:

Notice is hereby given that the base water rates for the financial year 1979-1980 applicable to the land situated in the corporations or district councils within the undermentioned water districts calculated on the basis of the annual value of the land are fixed as hereunder:

For the councils of Glenelg, Henley and Grange, etc., the percentage of the annual rate is 4.5 and the minimum annual rate is \$36. The water and sewerage rates for Henley and Grange, and Glenelg, have been set at 4.5 per cent of annual value. In Henley and Grange, valuations have increased for residential properties by more than 100 per cent to about 400 per cent. I have not taken into account commercial property. I think it would be unfair to use the commercial properties around Henley Square. Those hardest hit are those along the seafront. I would not be surprised if the member for Henley Beach came into this one, either.

North of Military Road, it seems that the land value (or unimproved value) has jumped from \$18 000 to \$50 000, and that has been based on the fact that the Coast Protection Board and the Henley council bought some land at Henley South for car parking purposes. That also forced up the annual values. Although we would have expected only a slight increase in water and sewerage rates, most of the residents have experienced a 30 to 40 per cent increase this year, and in some areas it could be even more. Until we get our water rate accounts, it is hard for anybody to calculate, and people will not complain until they receive their next quarterly rate notices.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It's due to inflation, really.

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member is saying that it is not tied to revaluation; that is not correct, because water and sewerage rates are based on annual values. The member for Henley Beach says that water rates are not tied to revaluation: they are. I will speak about my own case. We also know that in the Henley and Grange Council area the equalisation factor was 90 per cent, so, if the valuation was spot on, and if the adjustment of the water and sewerage rate and also the land tax was spot on, the residents would not expect an unduly large increase.

In the Glenelg council area the equalisation factor was 64 per cent. I do not know why there is a differential of 26 per cent between the two councils, but the figure for the Glenelg area was lower. In Glenelg, in relation to water and sewerage rates and also land tax, the residents, particularly those in Glenelg North, have been over-taxed for the past two years because the property revaluations (the unimproved and also the annual values) have increased only between 35 and 40 per cent. That proves that property valuation is nothing more than an educated guess. The whole system is a joke, and it is no wonder that the taxpayers believe they are being ripped off. Under a water and sewerage table scale of charges, which is the same as that for the Henley and Grange Council, the increase in water and sewerage rates in my case will be about \$1 a quarter, but the fact that the price of water has

been increased another 2c means that the water allocation will be reduced quite considerably. That is where the whole trick lies in the situation. There may be small increases in water and sewerage rates. In some instances it will be 40 per cent or more, but at the other end of the scale the water allocation will be reduced considerably, so that the Government has a system of double taxation. It increases its income at one end according to the valuation, and then, because of that increased water and sewerage rate, the water allocation is reduced, because over the past three years the price of water has increased 50 per cent.

We know that the Government prefers to receive the bulk of its income through excess water charges. To say that it is not tied to revaluations is not correct. Everybody's water and sewerage rating is based on revaluations on property. It is based on the annual values, and the explanation is given in the *Government Gazette* of 5 July.

There is no doubt that the public meeting held in the Henley Town Hall has caused problems for the Labor Party in this State, particularly the Government, and it has been interesting to note during the past few weeks the constant attacks that are being made on the Opposition, and particularly on me for having that meeting and for explaining to the people what is the true situation. The public in South Australia and property owners do object to land tax.

The member for Morphett said that people would not object to \$20 or \$30 land tax, yet four years ago the land tax on my house in Glenelg North was \$72. Under the equalisation factor, it dropped back to about \$40, and it has gradually climbed to \$55. Because of the equalisation factor that was allowed for Glenelg and because the revaluation has not come up to the 64 per cent, my land tax will drop by \$11. I and my neighbours and the several thousand people living in that area have been over-taxed for the last two years.

The principle involved in having been over-taxed, not being able to obtain compensation for that, and the fact that the local government bases its council rates on the property valuations as well, is most annoying. It is annoying to find that councils like Glenelg intend to increase their council rates by 20-22 per cent and the biggest insult to property owners is that the equalisation factor was far greater than the valuations. The whole system falls down when authorities use as a basis of obtaining taxes a straight tax levy or a poor man's wealth tax such as land tax is—\$40 to \$60 to the average landowner, the person who is represented by the member for Henley Beach and me. People who purchased homes 20 or 30 years ago are now starting to realise that they are paying the penalty for having selected an area. They are paying a tax to the Government that has not used responsible management in handling the taxes, and that is the real crux of the issue.

People will pay taxes for what they want, but they will not pay taxes if they can see Governments wasting that money. That is the thin end of the wedge as far as the present Government is concerned. There is no doubt that this had led to the problems shown by the exposure by the Public Accounts Committee, which indicated that we could save \$14 000 000 to \$20 000 000 a year by the prudent management of our Hospitals Department and health services, without reducing patient care and without reducing services at all. It is amazing to think that anybody could allow such wastage in meat alone; the standard wastage is accepted at 6 per cent, yet in one hospital it was as high as 50 per cent. It is poor management and supervision.

Is it any wonder that the people of Henley Beach have

latched on to the system of what is called Proposition 13. Proposition 13 in California proved in 12 months that taxes could be reduced significantly, and indeed in that State they were reduced by 57 per cent, creating 550 000 jobs. It was a matter of doing that or going broke, and the person who promoted that system (a 75-year-old gentleman, Mr. Laffler), said that Governments must be limited. Excessive taxation leads to either bankruptcy or dictatorship, and that is a problem we have in South Australia.

Whilst our taxes may not be as high as they were in California at this stage, the problem that one must bear in mind is that the platform of the State Labor Party is that public expenditure policies of the State Labor Government will provide that Governments will regulate their financial positions by raising tax rates rather than by cutting public expenditure programmes. I do not know who was responsible for the drafting of that but, whoever it was, those who have supported it should really look at that again. That would be one of the most irresponsible statements ever to come from any political Party in this country—that the Government will raise taxes rather than cut public expenditure programmes. The Premier is on record as having made the following statement to the Australian Institute of Management:

I personally won't tolerate waste and inefficiency, and when I need advice from the private sector, as I did when I appointed Sir Norman Young, to help us on hospital management, I won't hesitate to seek that advice.

There it is: the Premier saying that he will not tolerate wastage and inefficiency, yet the platform of his own political organisation is such that taxes will be raised.

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

Mr. BECKER: With a Government wanting continually to increase taxes, the people of South Australia are now calling for restraint. Is it any wonder when we consider the growth in tax revenue since 1970? In this State the estimated receipts for 1978-79, the actual amounts collected in revenue, as stated in the last Budget, show that the growth tax in revenue since Labor came to office in 1970 has been as follows: land tax, 210 per cent; stamp duties, 284 per cent; succession duties, 94 per cent; pay-roll tax, which was introduced in the financial year 1971-72, 548 per cent; liquor tax, 272 per cent; racing tax, 1 062 per cent; motor vehicle licence and registration fees, 224 per cent; and other taxes, 713 per cent.

The total tax revenue overall has increased by 504 per cent. In the same period from June 1970 to June 1979, the average weekly earnings in South Australia have risen by 203 per cent and the rate of inflation, prior to the June quarter, in this State has risen by 145 per cent. In other words, the State Government has been increasing its own income from State taxes and revenue at a rate 2½ times faster than the increase in personal income, and 3½ times faster than the rate of inflation.

This afternoon, the Leader asked the Premier what his Government had done to assist business in South Australia and to improve the economy and employment opportunities. The Premier could not answer the question. Despite his diatribe, he was unable to come up with any satisfactory answer. The Premier made great play about the pay-roll tax, which was handed to the States by the McMahon Government. I well recall in 1971 when the legislation was introduced in the House. I followed the then Leader (Mr. Steele Hall) in the debate and pointed out that the estimated revenue of about \$20 000 000 would be a growth tax and would be inflationary. That was when the then member for Ross Smith (Mr. Jennings) made his

famous speech: it was the shortest speech ever delivered in the House. He said he concurred.

It is interesting to note that, in 1971-72, the receipts in South Australia for pay-roll tax were \$23 400 000, and that was obtained at a rate of 2½ per cent. In 1978-79, the pay-roll tax rate is now 5 per cent, and has yielded to the Treasury \$152 000 000. As we have said, that is a 548 per cent increase. No matter what the Premier said this afternoon, he cannot deny that pay-roll tax has severely hit employers, whether small or large, in this State, and has reduced employment opportunities.

When we look at the tremendous sum the Government has received over the past 10 years, bearing in mind that there has been an increase in Government revenue through indirect taxes of about 504 per cent, is it any wonder that the people are now saying that they have had enough of the continual taxing efforts by the Government to fund its expensive programme? They have had enough of the Government's forcing its will on to the people.

In this regard, we find that the Minister of Public Works has now instituted an inquiry into the Public Buildings Department. Whether we will ever find out what he discovers in that inquiry will be interesting. I think he ought to consider that the people want to know where the money is being spent. Open government is the most informative method today of keeping the people abreast of what Governments are doing with their taxes.

It has been pointed out to me that, in the Public Buildings Department, we ought to look at one particular area. I understand that this follows a recent advertisement relating to district officers. Three clerks were needed. The application to the Public Service Board was refused because of the nil growth factor. If three clerks are wanted for district offices there is a way of getting around it, and this is what has been happening. Works branches have the right to employ weekly-paid staff without board approval. The tradesmen have Leaving or equivalent qualifications. Therefore, a tradesman is taken off the tools, made a clerk, and the board is not told. He is paid as a tradesman, plus a tool allowance, industry allowance, travelling allowance, and leading rate, none of which apply when in an office. The records are falsified. The take-home pay is more than that of a junior clerk by about \$50 per week. Then another tradesman is taken on to replace the person off the works programme. The total misuse of Government funds amounts to about \$200 per week in each district. The net result is that you get a clerk, plus \$50, contrary to the Public Service growth policy. The method used is by falsifying records. The net result is a scandalous waste. The person who forwarded me this information recommends an inquiry into wage records of all district officers over the past four to five years.

I hope that, if the Minister of Public Works is going to do something in the area for which he is responsible, he will take note of those remarks and incorporate in his inquiry the wage records of his various district officers, particularly over the past four or five years, if this is how the department has been able to manipulate the system. It is frustrating on behalf of the taxpayers when we hear allegations of the waste that goes on.

I know that anyone can pinpoint particular areas. One can point to the tendering system and the method being used. It is annoying when we find that two men were employed for eight months at a cost of \$44 000 to paint a clinic, exterior and interior of 13 rooms, and, after eight months, the job had not been completed. It is annoying to taxpayers to know that one department purchased a cottage that had to be refurbished. There was salt damp on one outside wall, and the bathroom and laundry needed upgrading. Floor coverings were required in five rooms,

and painting throughout. The first quote given verbally by an officer of the Public Buildings Department was \$93 000. After meeting with architects concerned at the site, the officer was told that it would be over \$30 000. When the person asked for a detailed itemised job quote, the price was \$18 000. It is those sorts of allegation that make us wonder what is going on.

Another allegation is of a room of about 25 ft. x 17 ft. that was to be refurbished and set up as a video-screen room. A contractor was employed and, after spending \$30 000 on the job, it was found that it was not up to the standard required. The contractor was sacked, and the department expected that it would cost another \$38 000 to bring this small room up to the required condition—\$68 000 to rebuild that small room.

In another area, the department was given a job to air-condition a main building of 13 rooms. The final quote was \$50 000, although the original estimate was about \$25 000. The person who arranged the job forgot to crawl into the ceiling and take into account the low level of the roof in conjunction with the ceiling and the dividing walls. These are only small amounts, but when they are multiplied in some large contracts and in the tendering going on internally in Government departments, we wonder what is the tremendous amount of money that is being wasted.

There are reports before the Government at the moment. In March this year I called on the Premier to release a report which had been prepared and which was commenced in June 1978. It involved an independent inquiry into the acquisition of computer equipment and associated software at the Flinders Medical Centre. I believe that a Mr. Molloy headed the committee and reported to the Premier this year. In March, the Premier informed me (via the *Advertiser*) that the report had been received and that Cabinet would decide on a course of action. On 25 June, I wrote to the Premier asking what had happened to the report, whether he would release it, and what action Cabinet had decided on. Until now, there has been no reply to my letter, nor has there been any announcement by the Government about what has happened about this inquiry. I believe that the Government does not want to release that report of this inquiry into the Flinders Medical Centre computer system and its associated problems. The Government does not want to tell us what action it took following receipt of that report. I would have thought that by now the Government would have done something about it. We must come back to the stated intention of the Premier that he will not tolerate waste or mismanagement and that he will act quickly to do something about it. Therefore, if we are to have, as the Premier says, open government, and if the taxpayer is to be informed about what is happening to his money, I think that it is essential that the Premier advise us exactly what is going on in that area.

Other reports have been promised to this Parliament. One was the Corbett committee inquiry into the issue of pharmaceutical, medical and surgical supplies. That report was received by the Premier earlier this year and we have heard nothing about it. We have no idea what is happening in that area, although we know that expenditure, according to the Auditor-General, is about \$11 000 000 for the financial year ended 30 June 1978.

The previous Premier promised that he would bring down a report to this Parliament early in the year concerning the Frozen Food Factory. Again, we have had nothing. We have not heard, or been told, what the Government has done, or intends to do about the Frozen Food Factory. All we know is that it cost about \$10 000 000 to build and establish, and that the estimated losses for the first year were about \$700 000. We do not

know what has happened since. I believe that accumulated losses at the Frozen Food Factory could be about \$1 500 000. There has been a tremendous number of problems with that project. It was a classic scheme where somebody dreamt up an idea, the idea was floated, and before anyone knew what had happened the project got out of hand. We do not know how many hospitals are receiving frozen food from the factory, or at what price. It all comes back to management of the taxpayers' money, and sound business management so far as the State is concerned.

Regarding the future of South Australia, I would like to refer to an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on 30 April 1978, as follows:

South Australia is in the direst plight of any State in Australia. Put together, unemployment, motor vehicle depression, high living costs, a stagnating building industry, the bankruptcy of small business, a grotesquely overweight bureaucracy, the flight of population to eastern cities for better opportunity, a rural industry savaged and rendered uncompetitive by trade union intermediary costs, and you haven't got a sluggish economy, a recession, you've got an old-fashioned proper depression—the Great Depression repeated 50 years to the day later.

An honest Government would let the people know the worst, rally our energies and resources and somehow with our backs to the wall it would bring out the best in all of us.

But what happens? If David Tonkin tells the truth, that small businesses are packing up all over the place, Des Corcoran claims that Tonkin is guilty of the unpardonable sin of "knocking South Australia". We're used to the egomaniac brainwash that South Australia is the greatest, we lead the world in this, we're the best in Australia at that. We have a Government that breaks its arm patting itself on the back. But can you fool most of the people all of the time that we're all right Jack? A bit of the ruthless truth would cool down trade union intransigence, challenge business to get going, and get the bureaucracy out of its inert complacency.

That article written by Max Harris last year is true today, when we still find this tragic situation so far as South Australia is concerned. It is a tragic situation when there are departments replying to constituents and organisations about open tendering and Government letting of contracts outside the free enterprise system. I am pleased that the appropriate Minister is present at the moment because the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors wrote to the Minister of Transport on 28 February in relation to the construction of a new wharf at the Morgan dockyard, as follows:

Your decision to employ the Marine and Harbors Department is noted with extreme concern by our members. Within our industry there is extensive idle plant and manpower resources well able to carry out this work. Actions such as you have advised continue to undermine our industry to the extent that members are unable to remain viable in this State. We again draw your attention to the undertaking which our Premier, Hon. J. D. Corcoran, gave to our federation on 21 July 1978, viz., that your Government will endeavour to ensure that contractors will continue to participate in Government works programmes at a level which will maintain their viability.

You are aware, of course, that our industry relies heavily on Government spending for their work opportunities, and we have frequently requested the opportunity to publicly tender for such works in order to ensure that the Government obtains maximum construction from the limited funds available to it. In view of the critical situation currently prevailing, we respectfully ask that you reconsider this decision.

The Minister of Transport replied on 2 May, as follows:

Thank you for your letter of 28 February 1979 concerning construction of the new wharf at the Morgan Dockyard. I have obtained a report on this matter and have been advised that the Highways Department, in the knowledge that the Marine and Harbors Department, have available the necessary plant, labour and expertise to undertake the rebuilding of the wharf at the Morgan dockyard, invited the Marine and Harbors Department to submit an estimate for the work.

The Marine and Harbors Department is faced with a responsibility to maintain employment for its relatively small construction work force and, in view of the Government's stated intention not to retrench employees, undertook the opportunity to submit a quotation which was accepted by the Highways Department. It is pointed out that the work is being undertaken at cost. There is no profit margin, which would not be the case in the event of the work being carried out by private contractors.

There is damning evidence that the Minister was not prepared to put the construction of the Morgan dockyard wharf to public tender because he believed that the work would not be undertaken at cost because private enterprise would seek to make a profit if it did the work.

This is where the Minister has been misled, because many times in the Auditor-General's Report statements have appeared regarding a Government department doing work for another department, with the cost being stated at a certain figure. However, when the project has been completed, the cost has escalated two or three times. If the job had been given to private enterprise, the contract would have been fixed and the Government would have known where it stood. Time and again in the Auditor-General's Report the full cost of projects has exceeded even the estimates put to the Public Works Committee, sometimes by millions of dollars. In one year, the excess was about \$18 000 000. That additional money was not approved by the Public Works Committee. This, of course, is the tragedy of the present system.

However, the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors was not prepared to let the matter lie there. On 5 June, the federation again wrote to the Minister on another matter, as follows:

I am writing on behalf of the members of the federation to express our concern at the possibility that the construction of the Regency Park overpass and associated earthworks will be done by the Marine & Harbors Department. It appears that the private construction industry in this State has again been denied the opportunity to tender for such work, when it, too, has the necessary plant, labour and expertise available, and a responsibility to maintain security of employment for its workers.

The depressed state of the private construction industry in South Australia represents a tragic loss of skilled work teams and technical investment. The practice of one Government department doing construction work for another without competitive tenders has resulted in severe unemployment in the private sector which has affected the quality of life of thousands of South Australians.

We point out that construction by public tender ensures keen competition, thus lower cost to the taxpayer, and also provides a substantial contribution to State revenue in the form of pay-roll and other taxes, and Government charges levied on the private sector. The Government and the private construction industry, by working in harmonious co-operation, can only improve the economy and reduce unemployment in this State. We therefore request that you seriously consider offering the construction and earthworks for the Regency Park overpass to public tender.

The following reply was received on 25 June from the Minister (it seems that the Minister replies more quickly to

people in private enterprise than he does to members of Parliament):

I refer to your letter dated 5 June 1979 and advise that I am not prepared to change the decision to use available Marine and Harbors Department resources to construct the bridgeworks associated with the Regency Road railway overpass at Islington. The Government has a responsibility to the public in ensuring that the most effective use is made of its total resources. The arrangement whereby the Highways Department engages Marine and Harbors Department personnel, whose skills can not be effectively utilised by their own department at present, is to be commended.

The cost of previous work performed by the Marine and Harbors Department has compared favourably with Highways Department estimates, the standard of the finished work has been high, no problems involving additional costs or industrial disputes have arisen and planned time schedules have been achieved or bettered. The Commissioner of Highways is completely happy with bridgeworks carried out to date under this arrangement and can see no advantage in the Regency Road overpass works being let out to contract. Roadworks associated with the structure will be carried out by the Highways Department.

That was one occasion on which no public tender was called for; there was no opportunity for private enterprise to tender for that multi-million job. The unemployment situation has been aggravated. The waste of skills can be laid at the Government's feet. The Minister of Transport has stated that in no circumstances is the Government prepared to consider a private tender. It should be mandatory that all Government work go to public tender and at least three firms be requested to tender for any one job. That is the only way to find out whether true advantages and benefits are flowing from the private sector.

I was very disappointed to learn during the past 24 hours of the problems associated with the Modbury Hospital. Allegations have been made by some patients who have recently spent time in the hospital. It has been claimed that the nursing-patient ratio is not as high as we have been led to believe. Some wards have been closed, and the psychiatric unit, which was built at a cost of \$1 700 000 and which was completed some time ago, will not be opened until 1 January next year. One wonders what is really going on in the Health Commission when this type of situation occurs.

In March 1978, a report was brought down about the nursing ratio at the Modbury Hospital. It was stated that the situation at that hospital was as good as anywhere else in Australia and that the nurse-patient ratio was at an acceptable level. One wonders what is happening for the situation to deteriorate so rapidly. Why have wards been closed at the Modbury Hospital and why has the psychiatric unit not been opened? It is no good the Minister blaming the Federal Government for cutbacks. It is par for the course. This seems to be the general tactic—one blames anyone but himself. The Government should be prepared to take the responsibility of setting the priorities with the taxes received in the State.

A few days ago the Doctors Reform Society called for an inquiry into hospitals on an on-going basis. I believe that this should happen. Following the Public Accounts Committee inquiry into hospital management costs and staffing, to ensure that health costs and patient care remain at a reasonable level, that health costs can be contained so that those who seek hospital and medical insurance will not be forced to pay high rates, and that patient care is maintained at an excellent standard (and this can be done), the Auditor-General should head an inquiry and deal each year in his report with the costs and

efficiency of hospitals in South Australia. This on-going inquiry would ensure that at least some action was being taken and that sound and efficient management was being maintained. It would be a tragedy to see a situation in which the Government closed down wards and reduced patient care, and blamed either the Public Accounts Committee or some other authority.

Mr. Chapman: Are you saying that the Public Accounts Committee is gagged and unable to perform its proper function?

Mr. BECKER: No, not at this stage. I believe that the tremendous benefit that has come from the report cannot be left there. The work of the Public Accounts Committee should be followed up annually by an independent authority. The Auditor-General would be the best person to do that job because he is answerable to Parliament alone, he has the qualified staff, and the opportunity to go into departments. I believe he would be carrying out the true function that is really necessary to ensure that the taxpayers receive benefit.

Mr. Chapman: In those circumstances, what then would be the function of the Public Accounts Committee—if the Auditor-General took over that role?

Mr. BECKER: The Public Accounts Committee would continue to investigate and assess departments, working on what the Auditor-General reports from time to time. When one considers an inquiry such as was held into hospitals, one can see that the report was lengthy and detailed and took about three years to prepare. The report is being accepted throughout Australia.

It is being accepted around Australia as a guideline for sound management of hospitals. The Federal Government has also taken the lead by announcing an inquiry into hospitals nationally, and that Government will be able to advise the various States what is necessary in setting the standards that the people expect, and at the same time contain costs.

Many areas in the Health Department have been allowed to lapse in the past few months, and I do not think the new Minister has grasped what it is all about. He seems to have embarked on other campaigns, whether regarding uranium or dividing his Party. The Mental Health Act, which was passed by this House some months ago, is still to be enacted, and the Chiropractors Act is yet to be proclaimed. The Minister is sitting on probably a couple of reports that are vital to health.

Another point that alarms me is that the South Australian Branch of the Australasian Institute of Radiography has written to me, saying that it has made representations to the Government, which has offered to establish a committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. W. McCoy, to set up a Registration Board of the Australian Institute of Radiography. I understand that this meeting took place about five weeks ago, but nothing has been done. I believe that the public should be protected from the excessive use of X-rays, particularly from the risk of being subjected to massive doses of radiation. By setting up a board, which would be in line with my Party's policy, we could ensure that the people would be protected in this area of concern.

I believe that people receiving full registration should have completed recognised training in radiographic-radiological techniques and protection, and should hold a suitable qualification; for example, radiologists-radiographers. Those requiring limited use should also be so licensed upon the establishment of need and competence; for example, general medical practitioners with limited equipment; those in remote areas without trained personnel; and associated health fields such as dentists, veterinary surgeons and chiropractors (the member for

Light will be delighted to hear that).

At present, Tasmania and the Northern Territory have registration boards for this purpose. Therefore, legislation is necessary in South Australia. The whole point is to reduce the opportunity for excessive radiation. We must have a registration board for radiographers, because it is in the interests of the nation's public health to minimise exposure of consumer-patients to potential radiation hazards. The individuals performing such radiological procedures should be fully qualified by reason of education and experience in the operation of equipment or in the performance of procedures so as to avoid unnecessary consumer-patient and operator exposure to unnecessary radiation and to assure efficacious consumer-patient services. It is in the interests of public health and safety to ensure that persons administering potentially dangerous radiation to consumer-patients are properly qualified.

Therefore, the Minister of Health has another issue on which he must move, and he has a case to answer as to why he has not acted in the past five or six weeks. He has been preoccupied with the counting in the numbers game. We saw the tragic situation earlier this year when the then Premier resigned. Then the numbers game started. Following that, we had the resignation, or sacking, as we call it, of the Minister of Health (Mr. Banfield), and hard on the heels of that was the resignation of Mr. Tom Casey, who was also sacked.

We knew in November last year that these two gentlemen had been given their marching orders months before it happened and that the Government kept that under wraps. Now Mr. Morley is complaining that his organisation is not getting satisfaction through the Labor Party preselection system. We have two survivors in the Government, namely, the Minister of Transport and the Chief Secretary. Is it any wonder that the numbers game is continuing? Reports written by Peter Ward in the press last week explain the whole situation regarding the numbers game in the Government.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): First, I join with my colleagues in congratulating the new member for Norwood on his election and on his speech in this debate.

Mr. Chapman: He just sneaked in, though, didn't he?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. I may come under attack for what I will say now, but sometimes I question the value of this debate.

Mr. Chapman: I depends on how you perform in it.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I suppose that that is true but, on the other hand, it gives members of this House an opportunity to voice their concern, desires, or support for certain aspects regarding their lives and the lives of the people they represent. I want to deal with only three or four matters, and I have chosen them because, although they may have been discussed previously, I consider that they are extremely important, and they concern me very much.

Mr. Chapman: Don't be hypocritical, criticising—

Mr. MAX BROWN: My criticism of the member for Alexandra will come soon. First, I voice grave concern about the announced policies of the Liberal and Country Parties, particularly in Queensland and Western Australia, on law and order.

Mr. Wotton: Tell us about the Police Force in Whyalla.

Mr. MAX BROWN: We have a very good Police Force in Whyalla, and I will come to that matter soon. Members opposite, like their colleagues in other States, have continuously bombarded this Government on the question that we must have law and order. I will deal with the legislation in Queensland and Western Australia. I do not know whether all members have read it.

Mr. Chapman: Are you sure you aren't out of your depth?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not know whether the honourable member understands it, but I do. In the Queensland Act, section 124 provides:

A procession (whether comprised of pedestrians or persons driving vehicles or animals or both pedestrians and such persons) for other than funeral purposes—

I am pleased that they had the goodwill to exempt funerals—

shall not parade or pass along any road unless and until a permit to hold such procession has been obtained from the District Superintendent.

If he happens to be away, I suppose they do not get a permit anyway. The provision continues:

A person desirous of holding a procession for other than funeral purposes upon any road shall at least fourteen days prior to the date fixed for such procession apply to the District Superintendent for a permit to hold such procession.

If we look at this Act and the Western Australian Act, we find that what has happened in those two States is that two Acts of Parliament have been enacted that deny decent, honest and good people the right to demonstrate peacefully against something about which they are not happy. The penalty is \$500 on each person or six months gaol, or both. This is the difference between those States (Queensland and Western Australia) and this State.

I was pleased to take part recently in Whyalla in a procession or demonstration by which mothers of children who go to kindergarten demonstrated against the cutting back of finances to kindergartens by the Fraser Government. It was a peaceful demonstration; in fact, the Whyalla police escorted it. If that happened in Queensland or Western Australia, I wonder whether the police would take out the batons to the children. After seeing the television news from Queensland, I question whether or not we are getting to a stage of unruly rioting. In the television news service 48 hours ago of events in Queensland, I did not see the police taking part. All they did was sit in their cars and allow this to happen.

I point out to members opposite that if we or any other Government legislate to deprive decent people of the right to demonstrate, we ought to be looking at ourselves as legislators. I believe quite seriously that as responsible legislators—and I hope we are responsible—we should do all in our power to have these types of laws thrown out and never considered as law again. I believe that, if legislators set out to deprive people of the right to demonstrate peacefully against what they consider is wrong within our society, those legislators must face up to the responsibility of what happens in consequence of that legislation, and that is exactly what is happening.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has nearly made a speech for the member for Whyalla. He will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is not good enough for us or any other legislators in this country to say, "This is the law; you should obey the law", knowing full well that we have passed a law that is not acceptable and is unfair to people we represent. I turn to the question that has been bandied about for so long I have lost count—uranium, that marvellous substance that we have here that overnight, as far as the members opposite are concerned will bring back great amounts of wealth to this country.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Let us have a look at the A.L.P.

policy. Members opposite know what the A.L.P. policy is. We have had this ballyhoo about uranium even as late as this week, and I point out to members opposite (I do not know whether or not they know) that public opinion, according to the latest Gallup Poll, is very strongly going anti-uranium, I think some 56 per cent of people were against.

I refer now to an article on nuclear power that we have all had, although nobody seems to have mentioned it. It appeared in the *Australian* in July of this year, and it was headed "Nuclear power dream starts to dissolve". We have heard members opposite who have come back and told us that this is an absolute bonanza. Let us look at the American position. The article, written by Neil Mercer, in New York, states:

Buffeted by a seemingly endless number of political and economic problems, the U.S. nuclear power industry is struggling to stay afloat.

Later the article states:

What is clear is that, in the year 2000 nuclear power in the U.S. will be nowhere near as important as was forecast at the start of the decade.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should resume his seat. Last night I had to protect the honourable member for Victoria when I could not hear him above Government interjections, and I hope Opposition members will permit me to listen to the member for Whyalla.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am thankful for your support, Sir. The article continues:

Although 72 nuclear plants now provide 13 per cent of America's electric power, statistics supplied to *The Australian* by the forum reveal the depth of the industry's depression. In the five years 1970-74, orders for 140 nuclear power plants were placed with the four makers, Westinghouse, General Electric, Babcock and Wilcox and Combustion Engineering. In the past four years only 13 orders have been received. In the same period, companies, fearful of the enormous building costs and fickle demand for electricity, have cancelled plans for 34 reactors. In addition, last year at least 40 reactors were deferred indefinitely or delayed.

Despite this, members opposite talk about a bonanza. The article continues:

Everyone agrees that that level of activity would see the industry caving in, starting with the smaller ancillary companies in the early 1980s. A recent General Electric survey found that 45 per cent of people believed nuclear plants would make their communities more dangerous places to live as against only 29 per cent who felt that way five years ago. "We've lost the initiative," admits GE's Vanderslice. "And it's going to be hard to regain it."

We are on the threshold in relation to nuclear energy, and until we can be assured that nuclear power can be used safely, it should be abandoned. Recently, when there was an incident at a plant in America recently, it was brought home directly to the American public that, no matter how safe we believe nuclear energy may be, it is not completely safe.

Mr. Allison: What about the Appin disaster in New South Wales recently, when coal miners were killed? There is always a danger.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not deny that.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! This is not supposed to be a discussion at a tea party.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Regarding nuclear power, I believe that we are on the threshold, and we should have a good look at where we believe we are going. I have just been handed a document on nuclear power which is interesting.

It states:

3 January 1961. Idaho Falls, U.S.A. Three men were killed instantly in an explosion, the cause of which is still unknown today. The bodies of the men were so severely irradiated that their exposed hands and heads had to be severed and buried in a dump for nuclear waste.

In 1964, Mrs. Mary H. Weik, secretary of the American committee on radiological dangers, compiled a list from the official statistics of mortalities in the U.S.A. for 1962 (published 1964). She established a disquietening correlation between living in the area of a nuclear installation and the increase, sometimes quite large, in deaths by various causes:

Leukemia—

Garfield, Montana—600 per cent

Scaix, North Dakota—290 per cent

Mohave, Arizona—270 per cent

It covers miscarriages and malformed babies, yet people say that there are no dangers in it and that we ought to go on with it.

I turn now to a matter which concerns me, and I take strong exception to what has been said as a result of the Royal Commission's report on drugs. I raise this question on the basis that the Opposition (and I refer specifically to the member for Coles) seems to have some idea that, because we are in the Labour Party and in Government, we are not concerned with drugs.

Mr. Allison: You aren't, are you?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Numerous times, both to the Whyalla police and to my constituents, I have made it clear where I stand on this question. I do not believe that we ought to legalise drugs such as cannabis. I go even further and say that, at one time, a so-called businessman in Whyalla sold accessories to be used in drug taking.

Mr. Chapman: Is that your view or that of the Party?

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is both. This man was suspected of selling drugs, but it could not be proved. I made my position clear to him, as I have done this evening. I took strong exception when the member for Coles organised her petition in an effort to suggest that Labour Party members were pro drugs. In common with many other people in public life, I am a family man, and I believe that we have enough problems in our society at present without that of drug addiction.

Mr. Chapman: What about gambling, abortion, and matters of that nature—would you like to express an opinion on those?

Mr. DRURY: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker, is it or is it not Question Time?

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order; it is, in effect, discussion time. The attitude of Mr. Speaker has been that there should be a reasonable latitude on matters such as this, but I hope that honourable members will observe Standing Orders.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I have strong views on the use of cannabis, which I have expressed this evening, and I believe that we have problems, as the member for Alexandra has pointed out. I do not want to go into the pros and cons of social problems. Suffice to say that we have enough of them to combat in this day and age without going into the unknown quantity as regards the social aspects of drug addiction. I put that seriously and strongly.

I know that the Opposition would be disappointed if I did not deal with another matter which, I believe, is of grave concern to the general public of Australia. Over many months, members of the Opposition have had the uncanny knack of producing a copy of the *Herald*, the constitution of the Labor Party, or some rule that they say we are supposed to abide by. Tonight, I will produce a document of theirs, namely, the policy speech that the

present Prime Minister made in 1977.

Mr. Hemmings: I thought they had destroyed it.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I think that they want to destroy it. The Prime Minister said:

Our nation is on the move. We are ready to stride into a new era of prosperity and development. We have broken through in the fight against inflation.

It intrigues me even to think that we have broken through the wall of inflation, because I point out that, after the last mini-Budget, the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Howard), in an interview on *Nationwide*, admitted under questioning that the Government, despite its mini-Budget and high unemployment, could not promise that inflation would take a downward trend. What a terrible situation! This document, which I suppose is valuable to some people, continues:

We all know what the real answer to unemployment is. This gentleman has the answer to unemployment! The document continues:

It is a generating growth and development; it's industry providing new jobs, its training people to fill new jobs—and keep them.

There was a time in my area when this fabulous new training method supposedly came about. Unfortunately, it was difficult to find out what we were trying to train them to be, because there were no jobs to train them for; that is the situation, whether we like it or not. The Liberals say they have saved tens of thousands of Australian jobs because they gave Australian industry the protection they promised it. Tens of thousands of Australian jobs! I would like to know where these tens of thousands of jobs are. We talk about the economy of this country, but I wonder, and have wondered for a long time, what it costs the general taxpayer of this country to pay the dole for some 400 000 unemployed people, who produce nothing, and, in fact, have had taken away from them the dignity that they had when they were employed, and their will to work at all. I think that that is an absolute disgrace, to say the least. Even if we have to subsidise jobs to some degree, let us create them. In the past the word "subsidy" has been a dirty word, yet we know that in many fields throughout the world many industries are subsidised, in some cases heavily subsidised.

Mr. Chapman: How much did it cost to keep each man in the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla?

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is costing a lot more at the moment to keep them unemployed.

Mr. Chapman: Is it?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. Let me say this, and I have said it before; so far as shipbuilding is concerned, we will rue the day, as a nation, that we closed the shipbuilding industry. At the present moment this nation is at the mercy of international shipowners. They can demand any price they like for a ship.

Mr. Chapman: It happens to be a lot less than what it costs us to produce them here.

Mr. MAX BROWN: All I can say to that interjection is that the honourable member has a narrow mind. He is not looking at the repercussions of this matter, or at what the future may hold.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a very narrow view.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Very narrow, to say the least. I also point out that what has happened in this particular unemployment situation is that the demand for skilled labour has gone. The only demand, if there is any, is for semi-skilled or unskilled labour. That is causing another degrading situations in which an unemployed person who is trained has to accept, for the sake of a reasonable living—

Mr. Chapman: That will be the position when you

retire; you'll be both unemployed and untrained.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That may be, but what I am saying is that those people have to accept a lower standard of employment simply because they have to live—that is what it amounts to, and it is a very degrading step, to say the least. It ill-behoves members opposite to support that situation in any way. I can remember when Senator Cotton was going to come to Whyalla, wave some magic wand over the situation and say it was all right. The next thing I knew he was in America—he never came to Whyalla at all. The document continues:

We have been the first Government to pass laws protecting individual unionists and giving responsible rank and file unionists the chance to make their voices heard.

I suggest that there is more industrial unrest in this country today than ever before.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: Let me say to the member for Mitcham that the trend of industrial disputes in the past tended to involve wharfies, seamen, metal workers, and those types of people. Disputes now involve Telecom technicians.

Mr. Slater: White collar workers.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is right. And we are looking at pilots, ground staff at airports, and the last dispute involves barmen. I do not think that I can remember many disputes in the liquor trade union before. At this time what we should be doing is not provoking people but making an honest endeavour to work out what the causes of these disputes are. I suggest to members, seriously, that the continual interference by the Federal Government in the Industrial Court is doing no good in relation to finding a possible solution to industrial unrest. The long-standing failure of the Industrial Commission to grant a full flow-on of cost of living adjustments is a reason why there is this trouble. Mr. Fraser is a classic example of a person who is—

Mr. Chapman: Are you saying—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member for Alexandra has made so many interjections he has made a small speech. I ask honourable members to observe Standing Orders and to cease interjecting.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I point out that the theory of a base rate for a married man with two children is unfortunately no longer with us. The failure of the system to recognise the real need and at least attempt to provide equitable margins to employees is one of the major causes of all disputes. Let me remind this House that the railways dispute in Port Augusta is a classic example in which employees of the national railways at Port Augusta are being paid less for doing the same job than their counterparts are paid in New South Wales. A car or lorry driver employed by Telecom is earning more than a telecommunications operator or a technician. I am saying that somewhere, somehow, the Industrial Court has got to sit down and have a serious look at these anomalies within the award system.

Mr. Chapman: The drivers might put in twice as many hours as the technicians.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The honourable member can interject as much as he likes, but those are the cold facts of the matter; that is what causes the number of industrial disputes that we have at the present time. I also believe that, contrary to what other people think, the real need is for Governments, whatever their colour (and I am not saying that the Labor Party federally was not involved in this sort of situation), to look at the methods of taxation. Where an indirect tax becomes another tax so far as the Federal Government is concerned, it becomes, invariably, an indirect financial burden on the wage earners of this

country—there is no question about that.

The Adelaide News of 25 May contained a report stating that, in the opinion of the Australian Taxpayers Association, the Fraser Government's mini-Budget deprived the ordinary worker of at least \$7 a week in take-home pay. I point out that that in itself is not a figure, unfortunately, that the Industrial Court had to examine regarding the cost of living, but it should have. On top of that, the health rate at that time also jumped \$3 a week. Indirect taxation is not the answer for Australia.

I raised the question of the barmen's dispute because I think it is necessary at this time to look at what has happened in that industry. I have found, through my involvement with the industry, and with great respect to the Licensing Court and others involved, that there seems to have been, somewhere along the line, an agreement worked out between the Hotels Association and the liquor trade unions, which was ratified by the court. This agreement deprives full-time members of the liquor trade union, employed in the liquor industry, of penalty rates, and has brought about the question of casual labour. Casual labour now dominates this industry. I can understand the present attitude of certain members of the union in the demands that have been placed on the Hotels Association for an increase in wages because the cold, hard facts are—

Mr. Chapman: This is a South Australian dispute. You blamed Fraser for that a moment ago.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I did not say that at all. I am trying to bring to the attention of this House the anomalies that exist and why workers at this stage are hitting the street in retaliation against certain conditions.

Mr. Chapman: They should be able to demonstrate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I hope honourable members will enable the member for Whyalla to express his own views.

Mr. MAX BROWN: As an extra incentive in this matter, the Hotels Association wants Sunday trading. I put to this House that Sunday trading at the present time would be governed by casual labour. There is no other situation that could develop. First, the industry would be governed by casual labour and secondly, this would increase the overhead of the hotels. The Hotels Association Secretary on television last night said that, if bars were opened on Sundays, extra money might be charged for, say, a butcher or a schooner of beer. I do not support the opening of bars on Sundays; I believe that there is plenty of scope for anyone, anywhere, to get a drink on a Sunday. I am sure of that. One can get into a hotel if needs be; one has only to walk into the lounge of a hotel and one can be served. I believe that the Hotels Association is completely on the wrong tram, and Sunday trading would increase substantially the operating costs of a hotel. In some areas, of course, hotels would not bother to open because they could not afford to do so.

I am sure we all remember the taxation reform, as expressed in Mr. Fraser's policy speech. The Government was to bring about a situation whereby if an employee received, say, \$5 a week increase, that increase would be in take-home pay and the Taxation Department would not slug a person extra tax in regard to that \$5. I can remember a television advertisement in which Mr. Tony Street walked down the aisle of a factory. He was asked, "What does all this mean?" He replied, "It means that the worker gets a \$5 a week increase and he will not be slugged." I would like Mr. Street and Mr. Fraser to approach the average wage earner today and explain the situation to him. I think it would be found that the average wage earner would reject that idea out of hand.

Mr. Chapman: What are you actually saying?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am saying that Mr. Fraser, in his policy speech, promised that if the average worker of this country was to get a wage increase by legitimate means, that is, through the arbitration system, taxation would not increase as a consequence.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think you can trust Fraser?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I cannot, but maybe I am biased. The last remark made by Mr. Fraser, of all the things he said, was the most cruel statement of them all. He said, regarding social security and health:

Our social reforms, have helped families and individuals and widened freedom of choice. Our family allowance is the most important innovation in welfare for decades. The Medibank reforms give Australians choice in health insurance. The old harsh means test has been replaced by a simple income test. We have taken politics out of pension increases by linking them automatically with the consumer price index.

I wonder how he would talk to the aged pensioners today. He said further:

We have brought in a pension for all sole parents—another major reform. Now, so that more homes and centres for the aged and handicapped can be built, we will extend the present three year funding programme for a further year. We will provide larger grants to homes for the aged in remote areas, and subsidise the added costs people in remote areas must pay to obtain specialist medical treatment.

We will encourage families to care for their sick and aged by increasing and expanding the domiciliary nursing care benefit. We have given the handicapped a new deal and we will maintain our expanded child-care programme.

In all sincerity, I believe that that is the most blatant broken promise of them all. I think I should end here. When the Prime Minister said that life was not meant to be easy, I can only assume that he really meant it. The unfortunate thing is that this statement gives me the impression that he really meant what he said in regard to the poor people of this country, such as aged pensioners.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think that is right. He had a pretty hard upbringing himself.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I can only say that I wish my life had been as hard as his.

Mr. Millhouse: He had plenty of money but—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There has been more interjection than speech.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The aged pensioners and ordinary people, the unmarried mothers and under-privileged people, have been hit more by this broken promise than by any other. On that note, I support the motion.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I take this opportunity to convey my respects to the families of the late Sir Baden Pattinson, Stanley Hawker, Leslie Harding, and Leo Travers. Only recently I have read some of the speeches made in this House by the late Sir Baden Pattinson. That man, with the others I have mentioned, contributed much to this House and the Parliament.

Also, I should like to be charitable and congratulate the member for Norwood, as the only new member in the House, on the way he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. As I and others members on this side have said previously, while I do not agree with all the points made, I commend him on the way he presented his address. Probably, more charity should be shown in this House in these matters.

I have much to say about many areas. First, I want to continue where I left off in the grievance debate yesterday, when I was referring to some of the many grave problems about the economy of the State. I referred yesterday to

succession duties, and I will say more on that and on the problems of land tax and capital taxation generally. It is time the State Government recognised its responsibility, because it is responsible for putting South Australia so far behind the other States.

We on this side are fed up with the garish talk by the Government about the present Federal Government. It refuses to accept any responsibilities for the problems in the State. It is prepared, on behalf of the people, to bury its head in the sand and hope that the problem goes away. However, it will not go away. Despite what the State Government says, the present Corcoran Labor Government has held back the recovery in South Australia.

I am referring not only to mining (we have said a lot in this debate about mining) but also to manufacturing investment. Also, I am extremely concerned about the unemployment situation here. Again, the State Government has refused to accept responsibility and we have the highest unemployment of any State in Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think your Party could do any better?

Mr. Slater: What do you suggest?

Mr. WOTTON: I am particularly concerned, because in Murray Bridge, in my district, we have an extreme—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have mentioned previously that this is not a tea party and members should not be having a discussion across the floor.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, we would just like you—

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

Mr. WOTTON: Before I was rudely interrupted by other members, I was saying that I am particularly concerned that in Murray Bridge, the largest town in my district, the unemployment figure is extremely high. It concerns me that many of those unemployed are young people who are trying genuinely to find work. We know that many people are not doing what they should be doing regarding finding work and that they are abusing the present system. However, many others are genuine in trying to find work.

Yesterday I referred to the problems associated with succession duties. I will refer again now, as I did last year in the Address in Reply debate, to some problems associated with the Government's pigheaded attitude on succession and estate duties. Last year I referred to a particular constituent who had been forced to pay a minimum of \$30 000 and who was advised that additional duty by way of late payment penalty was accruing at 10 per cent per annum on the balance outstanding and on the amount that the person was unable to pay. I refer now to a letter I have received from that person. She heard the advertisement regarding the Federal Budget, when the former Premier was saying time and time again, "Write to your Liberal M.P.: tell him you are angry." This advertisement sparked off a number of letters to me and other members. Her letter, addressed to Mr. Dunstan, states:

Seeing you on T.V. in 1976, in an interview, when asked about succession duties, you commented;

"People must expect to pay tax on what is after all, a windfall." How can you define an inheritance as a windfall, when the inheritance received by the family is the direct result of the work contributed to it by the family?

We realise that the present Premier is just as pigheaded about the situation as was the former Premier. The letter to Mr. Dunstan continues:

"*Death and Those Duties*," By Helen Caterer. "Helen, you're wrong"—Dunstan.

I would like to refresh your memory on a few paragraphs, you mentioned:

(a) "If Miss Caterer had bothered to check with the Government before writing her article, and not just spoken to Mr. DeGaris of the Liberal Party, she would have been told of this, and she would also have been told that many of the examples she used were wrong."

(b) "The article at no stage points out that the Commissioner of Succession Duties has the power to extend the time for payment of duties and that this power has often been exercised in cases where hardship would occur."

(c) "Miss Caterer also claims that succession duties are causing a tremendous burden to be placed on ordinary people because of inflation. This just patently is not true."

Mr. Dunstan, this just patently is absolutely true in our case, where my husband died just prior to the abolition of duty between spouses—July, 1976. I trust that you will remind the Commissioner of Succession Duties of the power he has regarding the \$30 000 plus 10 per cent per annum. Mr. Dunstan, what would you do if you were in my situation? Being discriminated against, with all women in the power structure, when no recognition is given, allowances made for wife and family sharing 30 years of work with your life partner, contributing equally to wages, improvements on a property purchased for £45 or \$90 per acre, bring it up to over \$1 600 per acre, hobby-farmer valuation, while the property at all times remained in my late husband's name.

To be confronted with a tax on what tax has already been paid, all one hears is, this is legal, or this is law, what is justice? Death or Succession Duties!! In our case it can only be described as legalised criminal extortion.

In answer to that letter, the former Premier wrote:

Succession duty forms an integral part of the State's taxation system by means of which the Government raises moneys to provide education, health, community welfare and other public services at the standard the community requires. Taxation measures of all kinds are kept under continual review and, when the Government finds itself able to grant remissions, it tries to ensure that those areas causing the greatest hardship are given the highest priority. In recent years, the Government has granted a complete exemption from succession duty to spouses and, in addition, it has increased succession duty rebates substantially. However, no matter what date is selected to implement a concession from a tax or what guidelines are framed for eligibility, there are always some people who fail to qualify by a small margin. Unfortunately, this situation applies in the case of your late husband's estate.

The person whose letter I have just quoted and her family are finding it difficult to retain a property that has been in the family name for many years. They have built up that property out of virtually nothing to one of the finest properties in the Adelaide Hills. At this stage, that property is very likely to be put on the market as a result of the Government's pigheadedness in regard to succession duties. As I said yesterday, South Australia can now be recognised as the disincentive State of Australia because of the Government's pigheadedness in refusing to repeal succession duties.

I have repeatedly called for more positive action by the South Australian Government in regard to decentralisation. Not long ago the Deputy Premier visited Murray Bridge, in my electorate, and during his address said a great deal about the need not only to attract new industries to places such as Murray Bridge but also to look after and provide incentives to the ones that are now there. The trouble is that words do very little to overcome the problems that we have in that town and in so many other towns throughout the State at present. I can assure members that we have had nothing but words. The Government denies that business and industries are

closing down in South Australia and that people are moving away. They deny or dissociate themselves from statistics that prove that that has been happening. I suggest that the Government have a look at what is happening in country towns, large and small, and see the number of businesses closing down in those areas and the unemployment that arises from those shut-downs.

The most common complaint that I have received from so many areas relates to the Government's control over so many facets of industry and business: if not control, it is certainly interference. As an example, recently we have seen a very large firm of earthworks contractors close down at Murray Bridge. We have seen a number of tradespeople, small business people, close down and I believe that they would have been able to continue the work that they were doing if they had been given some incentive and if there had not been so much Government interference in what they were trying to do, the Government carrying out work that could so well be done by those people.

I want to speak briefly about matters relating to the Environment Department. I do not intend to say very much, because many times in this House I have referred to some of the concerns that I have had with that department. The department has a new Director-General, Dr. Peter Ellyard. I have not yet met him, but I hope that he will bring many much needed improvements to that department. I also hope that we will get back to seeing a little bit of open government, because I have been concerned for some time about the secrecy that has surrounded the Environment Department and about the fact that, as shadow Minister for the Environment, it has been almost impossible for me to find out anything that has been happening in that department. Because of the many problems associated with the department, a number of people within that department have, because of their concern for conservation and the environment generally, come to me with specific problems, but it has been very much a closed door in relation to my use of officers of that department. I believe that the Opposition should have the right to use the Public Service. Provided that we are not asking questions on matters relating to policy, I believe that the Opposition should be able to take advantage of an effective Public Service as much as the Government can do. Dr. Peter Ellyard possesses very great academic qualifications, and I sincerely hope that he will bring much success to that department.

As I have said previously, I am concerned about certain areas. I am concerned about the lack of environmental impact legislation. We have been hearing about it for many years now. In fact, the member for Henley Beach would reflect that, when he was Minister, he was genuinely talking about the need for environmental protection legislation in this State. There is still a need, and it is greater now than ever before.

In his Speech in opening Parliament, the Governor said:

My Government is continuing to promote a vigorous programme to protect the environmental and cultural heritage of the State.

Reference is made to the new Aboriginal Heritage Act, and His Excellency goes on to say:

A new Bill providing for the preparation and assessment of environmental impact statements in relation to major projects will be introduced during the current session of Parliament.

If we went back through many Governor's Speeches at the opening of Parliament we would find a sentence almost identical to the one I have just quoted, because the Government for so long has been saying that there is a need for such legislation, but it has refused to do anything

about it.

I have mentioned on a number of occasions my concern relating to the low morale within the Environment Department, and I was rather interested to receive the answers to a few questions that I received last week. If this is the type of answer we are to receive to genuine questions from the new Minister of Environment, he needs to pull up his socks if he is to make any positive contribution towards conservation matters in this State. I asked the Minister what steps had been taken over the past 12 months to solve the problems within the Environment Department, and the reply was as follows:

The management of the Environment Department has been continually concentrating its efforts on steps towards overcoming whatever problems may exist.

In other words, the Minister is not prepared to say what those problems are and what the remedies are in regard to those problems. I also asked:

Have the steps been successful and, if not, why not?

The answer I received was "Yes". I guess we could say that was fairly shrewd answering by the Minister. It tells absolutely nothing, and I believe that the public of South Australia needs to know more about what is happening in that department. The other question I asked was:

What are the reasons for the "very poor" morale of 57 staff members found by the Public Service Association in their survey?

The answer was as follows:

Lack of clear policies and objectives which previously existed would appear to have resulted in problems within the department.

I remember the present Premier and the former Minister of Environment telling us that in the House. It does not say a great deal for the capability of Ministers for Environment prior to Mr. Corcoran's taking over. It suggests that lack of clear policies and objectives was the major problem. Another question I asked was as follows:

What action has been taken within the Environment Department since the beginning of April 1979 to improve morale among staff members?

The answer was as follows:

It is evident that measures introduced over the past 17 months have significantly improved the situation.

Once again, the Minister was not prepared to say what action had been taken within the department. I suggest that there is little action for which the Minister can take credit. The final question was:

Is there a need for staff members of the Environment Department to be—

(a) given greater say in issues which affect them in their work; and

(b) given greater access to information with the department and, if so, what steps will be taken by the Government to ensure that this happens?

The answer was as follows:

These matters are to be considered by the recently appointed Director of the Environment Department.

I suggest that one of the major problems in regard to the lack of morale in the department is that the officers are not being given a fair go, nor is the information they bring forward considered by the Government. I believe that they should be given greater access to information that can affect and help them in their department.

I now say something about the present police investigation into the inspection service of the department's National Parks and Wildlife Division. The investigation was ordered by the Government during the past few weeks. I hope, if nothing else happens as a result of the investigation, that the true facts about the internal traumas of the department, particularly of the division,

may at last see the light of day. I suggest that far too many innocent people have been under a cloud of suspicion for far too long in that division. We are aware that rumours of illegal trafficking in birds and reptiles have been rife for many years, particularly since 1977. In March 1978, a scheme was discussed whereby the Government might legally enter the overseas market in protected birds. A former Minister for the Environment (Mr. Simmons) recommended at that time the following:

That Federal export and customs regulations be relaxed to handle the export of South Australian parrots by the South Australian Government to try to cope with bird smuggling problems and to make some money for the State.

There was evidence that wide-ranging discussions were held overseas to explore the possibilities of these schemes. However, the plan received a poor reception from all ornithological experts and, for that and probably other reasons, it was dropped, because we have not heard any more about it since then.

At that time, allegations about bird smuggling were also being made by Mr. J. B. Cox, who in March 1978, made disclosures about illegal trafficking in reptiles. Discussions about illegal trafficking in reptiles were made public by a Mr. Levi. He alleged that he had been invited by a National Parks and Wildlife Service officer to help prevent illegal trafficking in reptiles in return for an import permit. An investigation of the bird-smuggling affair was made at that time by the Crown Law Department, culminating in five wildlife officers being severely reprimanded. I believe that there the matter rested.

I believe that there has been a great deal of uneasiness since then, and I believe that it has been felt by many people that the slate was anything but clean following that inquiry. The then Minister for the Environment, now the Premier (Mr. Corcoran), became hot under the collar about certain issues raised in the House and threatened that any national parks officers who spoke on departmental matters without his permission could lose their job. I believe that the Ministerial statement made by the present Premier at that time will be remembered by public servants, particularly those in the department, for a long time.

We now have a new Minister, and we have recently heard that Mr. Field, an invalid pensioner, has been accused of trapping protected birds. We heard that the charges had been dropped and that a police investigation had been ordered. Overall, it has been an extraordinary situation. There appears to have been a mammoth bungle by some person or persons in the investigation service of the division and, before the affair is finished, it is certain that heads will roll. It appears that a bird-smuggling racket, whether for well-meaning or nefarious reasons, has continued, despite the earlier Crown Law investigation.

The public of South Australia has a right to know what is going on in the department, and I hope that there will be no interference by the Government in the police inquiry. It is to be hoped that the inquiry will reveal the true culprits and completely clear the air so that the service's officers can get on with their proper job, namely, the responsible management of South Australia's large areas of badly neglected national parks.

I will now say something about the Government's handling of the environmental side of NEAPTR, particularly relating to the Torrens River, because I believe that the Government has very effectively stripped the Torrens of its heritage status following the announcement by the Minister of Environment that the Government would move to object to the river's being listed on the Register of the National Estate. The Minister has said that the Government objected to the listing

because "certain developments of parts of the river may be necessary in the future."

Mr. Slater: That's right.

Mr. WOTTON: That is what it is all about. The Government's decision to object to the listing indicates that it will be deliberately selective about which parts of the river have heritage value. This is an incredible situation. The South Australian community, and conservationists in particular, believe that the total river has heritage value and should be protected. The Federal environmental legislation, as we know, prohibits the allocation of Federal funds for development that will affect areas or buildings listed on the national heritage register. This Government knows that it will receive no Federal subsidies for NEAPTR if the Torrens is on the Register of the National Estate.

We now see the incredible situation that the State Government is appealing against a proposal by the River Torrens Committee, which is an instrumentality of this same State Government and which was set up by the former Minister of Works (the now Premier), Mr. Corcoran. In September 1974 he announced plans to develop the Torrens River as a major recreational area. Work was to begin in 1975. This plan was to extend from the seafront to the foothills and was to include walking trails through natural river surroundings. The then Minister for Conservation (the member for Henley Beach) said that this plan would provide "Places close to home where people can easily get away from the pressures of city life". Since that day nearly five years ago, the controversial and costly NETS plan has been prepared by the Government. This plan will effectively eliminate the natural character of the river. It is my opinion that this Government is prepared to seal our heritage for the price of a tram line.

Mr. Wilson: That is felt by a lot of other people, too.

Mr. WOTTON: That is felt by a lot of people in South Australia. We see another example of the Government's being only too ready to bend the rules to suit itself. It is a perfect example of Government hypocrisy. It is hypocritical to dodge conditions in Federal environment legislation when the State has its own, so we are told, environmental protection policy with which the people of South Australia are expected to comply. The Government has various worthwhile pieces of environmental legislation with which the people of South Australia are expected to comply. We know why the Government has taken this action. The South Australian Government knows that it will receive no subsidy from the Federal Government for the NETS scheme if the Torrens is on the Register of the National Estate because Federal environmental legislation prohibits the allocation of funds for development which affects areas or buildings classified in the register.

I quote from a release in the *Advertiser* attributed to Mayor Price and Mayor Otto, of the Walkerville and St. Peters Councils respectively, which states:

The Government should make up its mind whether the whole river was worth preserving for future generations to enjoy, or whether it should be destroyed in the name of progress.

I will take this matter further, because I believe that there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of the Government to soft pedal the NETS issue in the hope that what the people do not know they will not worry about. In February this year, in answer to a question relating to the release of public comments, the then Minister for the Environment (now Premier) promised this House that public submissions on the NEAPTR scheme would be available to the public. In all fairness, we cannot grizzle about that, because the report was released sometime in

June. However, I suggest that there are not too many people who know about that report. In fact, I suggest that the Government has been strangely secretive about the whole report; it has done nothing to promote or sell the report to the public of South Australia.

Most people who submitted their comments on the draft environmental statement have not been notified of its existence. I will refer later to some of the submissions in that report. Even representative bodies such as the Conservation Council of South Australia were not informed that the document was available. It is not difficult to realise why that happened. The answer is that, if we look at this report, we find that, of the 66 submissions received, 40 expressed active rejection of the NEAPTR scheme, while commenting on the draft environmental impact statement. About 12 people gave what I guess we can refer to as qualified approval, and the other 12 people preferred an extension of the Northfield heavy rail line.

We are looking at spending some \$125 000 000, or more, on what we are told is a transport need. That is a conservative estimate of the amount involved. I do not intend taking this matter any further, because I want to refer particularly to the environmental problems associated with the NETS issue, and particularly those related to the position about the Torrens River.

I turn now to matters relating generally to environment and planning. The opening statement in the Liberal Party environment policy states:

Our conservation policy will maintain a balance between the natural desires of people for improved living standards and employment and recreation, and will be compatible with continuing progress and general productivity.

The importance of retaining a proper balance in our outlook has always been an important and creditable characteristic, no matter what subject is being dealt with. Two areas in which I believe we particularly need to use a sense of balance are conservation and planning. Our planners today have more challenges than they have ever had in the past. I was interested to see the comments attributed to the new South Australian President of the Royal Australian Institute of Planning recently under the heading "Planners tackle new challenges", as follows:

Unemployment and the energy crisis mean critical new planning challenges. We must make sure homes have ready access to work to cut fuel costs and, in planning new developments or industries, we must take into greater account whether they are close to people who want jobs . . . Planners who plan a new road system, for example, need to consider more than has traditionally been the case—questions such as jobs and energy consumption must be considered. In the past, planners mainly considered environmental factors, such as street-scaping and shopping amenities. While these are important, there is a change of emphasis towards economising and the environmental needs of our society.

There is no doubt in my mind that future city expansion, for example, must be considered on the basis of resources, services, transport, schools, etc., available to a site. Those factors will have to be sensibly weighed against the costs of the community's conservation wants and needs.

Planning, and in particular planning for land use, is fundamental to any consideration of the environment in which people live. In fact, I suggest that the planning portfolio interacts closely with the environment portfolio. For those reasons, and for many other reasons, I am pleased to be able to share these two fields of community interest and to have the opportunity to monitor Government initiatives in these fields closely. Increasingly, land use conflicts and decisions must be faced by all levels of Government nowadays.

The situation must be avoided at all costs where decisions of community concern are made on the basis of expediency, tradition, short-term economic considerations and other factors that frequently are unrelated or contradictory to sound land use. Until quite recently, land was regarded not as a national resource of limited extent, but as a commodity for private exploitation. It must be recognised that there is a great need to conserve land for specific uses because such land may otherwise be in short supply, for example, for fresh fruit and vegetable production, attractive areas for recreation and conservation that still retain some examples of indigenous native vegetation, for specific areas for the extraction of building and road-making stone, and for natural creek and river bank localities. I suggest that this can only occur when policies have been formulated to balance the uses of land and national resources with economic, social and environmental values.

Decisions about the use of land can properly be made only when there is an accurate record of basic data about the land and its ecological characteristics. This information is imperative in order to assess the characteristics of the land and to evaluate its potential for various uses. The quality of administration is a significant factor in allowing sound land use decisions to be made. It is easy for an uncoordinated pattern, which will be damaging to the environment, to emerge, if there is insufficient inter-agency co-operation. It must always be remembered therefore, that most specific land-use decisions have an impact beyond the immediate areas, and that fact should never be forgotten.

We on this side of the House believe that all Government departments should contain some properly trained officers who will be able to gauge environmental consequences of decisions taken in planning projects and in carrying out the necessary work to implement these decisions. Conflicts in the community over the use to which land will be put are likely to be resolved only if there are publicly accepted land-use policies, which have attempted to balance wide community interests. Procedures must exist for appropriate community participation, and that is extremely important. People are continually affected, both physically and mentally, by the environment in which they live; therefore, land-use planning must always be carried out with the strongest possible regard for environmental principles. I do not think that we could do better than follow the axioms set down in 1971 by Dr. Downes, who is highly respected in the planning and conservation field in Victoria; he is a former Soil Conservation authority Chairman and director of the Ministry of Conservation. He stated:

Decisions about the future use of land should take into account the following rules:

- (1) Decisions should not be made without adequate information and knowledge about the land, its capability for all possible uses and its relative suitability for each of these different uses.
- (2) Decisions on the use of public land should not be made unless they are necessary; a reserve of uncommitted public land is a most flexible and valuable form of land use.
- (3) Decisions on the development and use of resources of a district should be considered in relation to the whole resources of the State, and for many resources, those of the whole Commonwealth.
- (4) Decisions should be made on the basis that all purposes for which land can be used for the welfare of the community are inherently equal, but needs and priorities may vary from time to time and from place to place.

- (5) Decisions should be based on an understanding that different kinds of land have different potentialities for various uses, the most valuable land being that eminently suitable for a number of uses.
- (6) Decisions should be made to provide for multiple use to the greatest possible extent.
- (7) Decisions to use the land for particular purposes should be made in the knowledge that a suitable system of use and management, to ensure that the land will continue to serve its chosen purpose, is available.

I believe that these axioms would allow flexibility in planning and some margin for change and appropriate management technique to ensure care and balanced use of land.

The importance of interaction between Federal and State Governments should be stressed. While the responsibility for land-use planning lies with the State and local government, many land-use decisions in fact have consequences beyond their immediate impact. The resolution of this problem is possible within a federal system of government. Federal and State Government should be concerned with strategic or policy planning of land use and land resources. The responsibility for creating a healthy and happy living environment lies with many fields of planning, including transport trends, both public and private, water supply, health needs, education, fresh food production, waste disposal, etc.

Proper regard must be taken of diminishing fossil fuel reserves, especially liquid fuels for transport. A planning trend towards shorter job and home/shopping distances must be established. There is a real need to conserve energy to enable alternative sources to be developed within a time scale which will not cause too much disruption to our way of life and standard of living. The inevitable depletion of finite resources, and the need to diminish energy use in manufacture, must accelerate planning for the recycling and reuse of much domestic and industrial waste. Even the production of energy from, and the purification and reuse of, sewage wastes, must be considered as being a high priority in future planning. This is happening in other countries and it is high time that we started looking seriously at these matters in Australia and in South Australia.

Methane generated in this way can be used for household cooking and heating in adjacent housing developments, and purified effluent can be used to irrigate crops and trees. These methods are being used successfully in other countries. These potential uses may as yet be far in the future, but the initial planning for suitable land should be looked at now.

Some important principles have been established in a comprehensive report on balanced land-use policy prepared by the Commonwealth Scientific and Research Organisation Land Resources Laboratories in 1976:

First, there is a need to maintain a balance between the native vegetation and the arable, pastoral, forestry or urban uses of land if Australia's unique fauna and flora are to be preserved in their natural state;

secondly, land should be used in a conservative sense, i.e. whether it is used for forestry, pastoral or agricultural activities, and the practices adopted should be such that they will maintain or improve the productive capacity of the land;

thirdly, the major factors militating against conservative use are economic pressures, resulting from inadequate farm size, droughts and excessive fluctuations in market price, which lead to over-cropping, over-grazing and other unsound management practices that cause soil erosion. We have seen quite a deal of over-cropping this in South Australia recently;

it has been a concern of State Government departments for some time. . .

Finally, in this State, where it is possible to exercise a deliberate decision as to where our new growth centres will be, it is necessary to also remember our limited water supplies, as well as the need to avoid polluting our inland and coastal waters. By siting such growth centres correctly, waste water arising from sewage and domestic effluents can be used over again either for the growth of crops or for industrial purposes. As a result, the amenities of the beaches and waterways around the city would be preserved.

There are many areas that I could continue to speak about in regard to planning but, because of the limitation of time, I want to refer to a few problems that I have encountered. I have only just received my challenge relating to the responsibility of the planning portfolio on our side of the House and, whilst I am tempted to go into several issues about which I am interested and concerned regarding planning generally, I will mention only a few. One is regarding land use, where several specific areas have concerned me for some time.

We have quite a ridiculous situation of which members would be aware when subdivisions are being opposed by the Director of Planning and approved by the Planning Appeal Board, and then often another authority refuses to allow development to take place in any case. Of course, the reverse situation applies also. I suggest that probably several problems in this and other areas relate to a breakdown in interdepartmental liaison as much as anything else. There is, however, a need for Government policies to be examined in this area, and I am aware of the intended legislation on development control that we have been told we will see in this place soon.

Another area of concern that has been brought to my notice lately relates to council bonding. I do not have time to go into this in detail, but problems are being experienced by councils and developers because of lack of standard engineering design practices, and I believe that there is a need for a collective review in this area. Recently, I have been intended to learn of the procedure followed by New South Wales in an attempt to achieve a settlement of the differences between the parties without recourse to formal hearings. Conciliation conferences, as they are called in New South Wales, may not be the complete answer. I am not suggesting that they are, but they could certainly help.

As I understand the conference system there, it has been settling a large number of appeals without the need for a formal hearing. I am also told that the success rate of conferences depends largely on the relatively minor disputes, and that the more substantial disputes are less frequently settled by the conference system. The system depends on all parties being prepared to compromise.

I also want to refer briefly to the need for planning, particularly urban renewal, in South Australia, mainly in relation to the city of Adelaide. South Australian planning laws are greatly in need of re-structuring, and it is to be hoped that the foreshadowed legislation will assist in bringing this about. At present we have a situation in which better planning laws are needed, and not necessarily fewer planning controls. The present system appears to place unnecessary restrictions on reasonable development, while doing little to inhibit further degradation of the environment. The unsightly and unnecessary ribbon development along the South Road through the Reynella and Morphett Vale area, which appears to be rapidly spreading father south, must be halted. Our present transport system cannot cope with this sort of suburban sprawl. A major re-think must take place to allow further development to be carried out in a far more practical and

aesthetically pleasing manner.

Liquid fuels for transport will inevitably become a limiting factor soon, and planning must come to terms with this problem. Far-reaching decisions need to be made between urban consolidation at the heart of radial fixed public transport systems, and urban consolidation in subregional areas. Inner-city renewal has a high priority in enabling people to live near their jobs and so reduce worker-job travel distances. However, for the same reason, consideration must also be given to redevelopment with medium and high density housing around subregional centres. Concurrently with this concept, there is a pressing need to retain as much as possible of pleasant open-space areas in the metropolitan and outlying areas to improve the living environment and quality of life of a maximum number of people.

For the past decade there appears to have been relentless migration of people from the country to the city, and this trend is continuing. In fact Australia is one of the most urbanised countries on earth, as we should know, and South Australia is heavily centralised. Therefore, it should be recognised that transport and energy problems of the future could be, and will be, greatly reduced by a renewal of central city areas and the more efficient use of land, because sprawling cities are profligate users of energy and other resources. It may be that redevelopment costs will be higher initially in the inner city. However, over the longer term it has been shown that it is cheaper to live in the inner city.

A concept that should be closely examined involves redevelopment of residential accommodation in city centres, with job opportunities in subregional areas. It has been worked out that the cost of public transport in the peak hour in the main direction was two or three times the cost for the rest of the day. Therefore, it may be sensible to have inner city consolidation of residences to make better use of existing public works networks. This would encourage some reverse travel on the lightly utilised direction of peak-hour public transport. Then people could get on to an empty train or bus every morning, with a choice of a whole carriage full of seats, to make the journey to work more pleasant. This would probably help to overcome many of the pressures of modern living experienced nowadays.

The recycling of old buildings, both residential and commercial, should be encouraged, since the services are already there. I refer to water, sewerage, shops, transport, etc. It would seem to be good plain economic sense to pursue a policy of inner-city renewal. Future population trends must be closely examined in the South Australian context. It may be that more job opportunities, when, and if, they occur (and we hope they will) will be available in outer areas, and a policy of subregional urban consolidation should be encouraged, as well as redevelopment of inner city areas. There is no doubt that decisions such as these must be made now, so that proper planning policies can be formulated that will curb energy needs and still provide a reasonable and pleasant lifestyle for the citizens of Adelaide and surrounding areas. A proper concern and awareness must be shown by the Government so that decisions can be made with full regard for their possible urban consequences and long-term economic and social costs.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Health): I move:

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

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Norwood and seconded by the member for Napier. I congratulate the member for Norwood on his maiden speech, a well prepared, thoughtful and considered address emphasising some of the very important aspects of the problems of society at present. I congratulate him not only on the matter contained in his address but also on the manner in which it was presented. It vindicates the choice of the electors of Norwood at a recent by-election in electing him to represent them and I feel sure that he will do so both in the House and within the electorate of Norwood.

Those of us who have been in the House for some considerable time have listened to quite a number of addresses by the Governor in opening Parliament. We all know it is a prepared document setting out the proposed legislative programme for the Government for the forthcoming session. The speech on this occasion given by His Excellency Mr. Keith Seaman impressed me in as much as he spoke precisely and clearly to members of both Houses in a way that gave immense dignity to the office of Governor. I believe he has given great dignity to that position. On the occasions I have had the pleasure to be associated with him, he has shown a presence and understanding which benefits the office of Governor in this State.

I turn now to some of the speeches that have been made in this debate. The major part of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was the usual denigration of South Australia, and one wonders whether he really believes what he said if he is a true South Australian. He continually knocks everybody and everything associated with the State. He not only knocks South Australia but also his own colleagues. We had the spectacle recently of what was called a reorganisation or reshuffle of the shadow Cabinet. Other members on this side of the House have referred to this matter. I sympathise with the Leader a little because he did not really have much to pick from. However, the shadow Cabinet did contain quite a few surprises, not only to members on this side of the House but to members on the other side as well. We are often told by members opposite that Labor Party members sign a pledge and are disciplined in a way that they are not, that they are free to be guided by their own conscience. The selection of the shadow Cabinet gives the lie to this contention, as we see that the Hon. Mr. Geddes, in particular, got the axe for not toeing the line, and the member for Fisher and the member for Goyder were also relegated to the back bench. The member for Alexandra was pushed sideways.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Stan is the campaign manager of the member for Light, isn't he?

Mr. SLATER: I am not quite sure of that, as that information has not come to me as yet, but it may be of some significance. We saw in the press following the reshuffle of the shadow Cabinet an article headed "This team will win—Tonkin" and it gives a resume of the persons elected in the new line-up. There are 14 shadow Cabinet members; if they had extended the line-up to 24 they would all have got a start, and there would not have been the difficulties that existed in relation to those that are disappointed. On the same page, under the subheading "I am hurt, says sacked Liberal", the following report appeared:

A Liberal MP who has been sacked from the Opposition's shadow Cabinet said yesterday he was "disappointed and hurt." He is the Member for Fisher, Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans and the member for Goyder, Mr. Russack, with Mr. Geddes, MLC, were sacked from the shadow Cabinet by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tonkin.

In addition, a comment on the same page says that the reshuffle may backfire and that the Leader may have created more problems than he solved in his Cabinet reshuffle. Only time will tell whether that will be the case, but nevertheless one of the best commentaries that I have seen on this matter appeared in the *Nation Review*, written by an old friend of the member for Eyre, Mr. Bruce Muirden.

Mr. Allison: That's a communist paper.

Mr. SLATER: I was certainly unaware of that and it might also be news to a lot of other people. Anyway, the article, which was headed "Telling it like it isn't", I would like to quote sections of the article:

David Tonkin might just have edged Billy Snedden off his pedestal as the begetter of the most memorable verbal infelicity in recent politics. Remember Billy's plaintive cry after his defeat in 1974: "We were not defeated. We just didn't win enough seats to form a government. Well, David's in the same stakes now. His twisting and turning to explain why he had sacked one of his most dedicated lieutenants and shifted others around, led him right to the top of the grade in double-speak.

Tonkin had made big changes on his return from an overseas trip; his front bench plainly needed revitalising. Stan Evans, the Liberal whip, who served with diligence a term as "shadow" to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, was removed entirely. Evans was rightly peeved, and everyone else was amazed, including government MPs. He had been doing a very good job. The only reason one can suggest for his demotion has been that suggested by Greg Kelton, political writer on *The Advertiser*, to the effect that Evans, as Whip, apparently felt it necessary to warn his Leader last year that he had better lift his game or the Libs would lose more seats. Tonkin may not have taken kindly to such honesty. He certainly has not appreciated the (very mild) commentary on his performance provided by *The Advertiser*. In the latest *Australian Liberal* he complains of the anti-Liberal attitude of some unnamed *Advertiser* journalists.

I do not want to quote the entire article but, as there are other sections of interest to the House, I want to include them in the record, as follows:

Another groining inflicted by Tonkin was his continued resistance to bringing former leader Bruce Eastick—still an impressive performer—back into the team. Others, including moral crusader Jennifer Adamson, have apparently let it be known that they don't want to be part of the Tonkin fourteen—yes, fourteen, one more than the Labor Ministry, which makes mockery of all the Liberal rhetoric about running a tight ship, cutting down overheads, too many public servants, too much government patronage, etc., etc.

Mr. Allison: He forgets we're not paid and your are.

Mr. SLATER: It is true that shadow Ministers are not paid; shadows have no substance, as has been proven by some of the speeches by members opposite in this debate. The article concludes by also indicating that the then shadow Minister of Transport, Mr. Chapman, had been pushed sideways, and moved to agriculture "which is not a very important portfolio". I think that is the best commentary on the so-called reshuffle of the Shadow Cabinet. I think it indicates the problems existing in the Opposition.

Most Opposition members join with the Leader in their chorus of denigrating South Australia and everything associated with the Public Service. One such member is the Deputy Leader, who previously has criticised the activities of Government departments, particularly the Public Buildings and the Engineering and Water Supply Departments. He claimed that the former department was now taking work away from the private sector. I recall on

two occasions about four or five years ago in my district when private contractors had tendered to construct school buildings. One was the Payneham Primary School, then in my district, and the other was the Klemzig Primary School, which still has the good fortune still to be in my district. Both buildings were tendered for and under construction by private contractors, both of whom went into liquidation while the buildings were being constructed. As a consequence, the Public Buildings Department had to complete the buildings.

I believe that that was one of the circumstances in which the department entered into the construction section of its activities. The Construction Branch grew out of that sort of situation because private entrepreneurs and private enterprise could not fulfil their obligations. The Deputy Leader said that the Liberal Party would reverse this situation by allowing the department to construct in the public sector by reducing its day labour force without retrenchments. I should like to know how one reduces day labour without any retrenchments. If he, or anyone else, can tell me how that would be achieved, I should like to know. Most important, the people who would like to know are those employed in the two departments.

I turn now to another matter, which I raised by way of question in the House yesterday, namely, the campaign by the Australian Hotels Association for the extension of trading hours on Sunday. I understand that a submission has been made to the Government for amendments to the Licensing Act to allow flexible hours on Sunday. The association's spokesman, Mr. Connelly, said that the association was seeking the Sunday opening of bars and lounges to be an optional measure. It would appear to me that if one hotel were to open, it is reasonable to assume that, because of the competitive nature of the hotel business, it would not be long before all hotels were open on Sunday. It is also claimed by the A.H.A. that there is a strong public demand for Sunday trading. Mr. Connelly said that the 900 licensed or permit clubs that open on Sunday are an example of public demand for Sunday trading. What he does not appreciate or what he forgot to mention was that the clubs provide a much different type of atmosphere from that in a hotel. The members of sporting and social clubs bring people together with a common interest. They prefer to assemble in a club atmosphere rather than in a hotel. The clubs look on their funds raised from sales of liquor and from other sources to be devoted to the mutual benefit of club members, rather than for private pecuniary gain.

In addition, clubs with a licence or a club permit, with only a few exceptions, must purchase their liquor, under the terms of the Licensing Act, from a hotel. So, the hotel industry still receives trade from clubs and, in most instances, gives a 10 per cent discount. This still leaves a substantial profit for the hotel for just receiving the liquor from the supplier and retailing it to the clubs.

I believe that Sunday opening would not assist the hotel industry; it certainly would be a retrograde step to employees in the trade and those associated with the trade. I do not believe that all hotel keepers and hotel managers really want Sunday trading. I believe that the A.H.A. executive is misleading its members somewhat by pursuing this aspect of Sunday trading. The Licensing Act, when amended two or three years ago, extensively expanded the trading hours of hotels. I believe that the present position is sufficient and that there is no great public demand as has been submitted by the A.H.A.

During an adjournment debate, I spoke about the proposed national sports lottery. Time then did not allow me to pursue certain avenues I wanted to pursue, so I take this opportunity to comment further on the matter. One of

the points I was making was the effect that any national sports lottery would have on local sporting clubs in their fund-raising activities at local level.

One must also consider the effects that a lottery would have on the activities of the South Australian Lotteries Commission and on the commission's operations. I believe that the commission has been an extremely successful operation. It has been innovative and, despite the criticisms of certain Opposition members, it has conducted its operations successfully to the great benefit of the State. I believe that the commission and its staff are to be congratulated on the smooth, efficient and effective manner in which it conducts the various forms of lottery that operate in the State. I think that, when the commission's annual report is issued this year, we will see the success it has had, both financially and otherwise, in some of the innovations it has introduced over the past 12 months.

I believe that any intrusion by a national sports lottery would have a deleterious effect on the commission's efforts; that is one of the important aspects which needs to be considered if ever the so-called feasibility study proposed about that rather unusual meeting in Melbourne, sponsored by Mr. Ellicott (Minister of Home Affairs), with regard to promoting a national sports lottery ever sees the light of day.

While on the subject of lotteries and fund raising, I will make a number of references to regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act, and point out what I consider to be a need to amend certain aspects of these regulations. There have been amendments to the regulations in respect of annual licences, and I believe beer ticket machines. However, I wish to refer particularly to the regulations covering the game of housie, more popularly called bingo in this State. The regulations in respect of bingo came into operation in 1971. To my knowledge, they have not been amended in any way since. I believe that the regulations were framed cautiously at that time because it was felt that certain restrictions would need to be imposed because we had no previous experience of the operation of this game in this State. However, it would appear in the light of experience (and it is my view) that certain amendments would assist the promoters of bingo, in particular the smaller schools, as they are described, in the game for fund-raising.

It appears from my observations, and remarks that have been made to me, that a number of larger operations do exceptionally well, but a number of the small ones cannot compete. They come and go, because if they do not get enough people present they do not provide substantial prizes and they fade out. I am not making any specific proposals at this stage, because I do not think I have given the matter sufficient investigation or thought; I have certain thoughts in mind, and I will endeavour to promote them to the Minister of Recreation and Sport so that he may be able to give everybody an equal opportunity to take part in the game of bingo, and perhaps consider some amendments to the regulations.

I want to comment on what has been described as a campaign (and there have been numerous letters to the press, and members have raised the matter in the House from time to time) of law and order. I believe that the campaign has been promoted, and to some degree run, by the press. It has covered aspects of law and order such as sentencing persons, parole and other aspects of law and order. There have been many and varied comments about the matter by many so-called authorities on the subject.

One has to look to the cause rather than the effect of this problem. The press seems to blame the Government. The Government makes the laws, of course, but the

courts, based on the facts of the particular cases, impose the penalties. What we ought to be looking for, so far as crime and punishment are concerned, is not the effect but the basic cause. We ought to be looking for the reasons why people become anti-social, why they break the law and why crimes of violence occur. Moralising will not solve this basic problem.

One has only to look on any day in any newspaper from anywhere in Australia, not only South Australia, to see that there are usually sensational headlines portraying hold-ups or some crime of violence that has been committed, not only in South Australia or Australia but elsewhere in the world. Newspapers believe, in some particular way, that crime is news. One has only to pick up the daily paper and see what films are being shown to see that they are usually films of violence. The same applies to television, on which the programmes portray violent crimes.

As a consequence of these factors, the community has gradually accepted violence as some sort of norm. The media has a responsibility to the community to ensure that sensationalism involving crime is not given pre-eminence. If they are to campaign about aspects of law and order, they need to set an example. The community is entitled to facts, not sensationalism that gives a false impression of the facts. We live in a rather curious society where, gradually, these sorts of things come to be accepted as normal behaviour.

It is a rather curious aspect of society that it accepts rather complacently the astronomical financial rewards of newspaper proprietors, pop stars, sports heroes and other folk heroes, yet the moment Parliamentarians have their pay adjusted there is a chorus of popular hatred and abuse that is difficult to explain. Clearly, there is a widespread belief that politicians are an unworthy, lazy, power-hungry lot.

Mr. Gunn: Overpaid and underworked.

Mr. SLATER: The honourable member is supporting my argument. I say that it is the general consensus of opinion in the community that politicians are a bunch of lazy so-and-so's, who are incompetent and should be recompensed by paying them as little as possible. The public recognises that politicians are necessary in some way, but when they cannot accomplish miracles the public blames them for not producing those miracles. Politicians are supposed to have a wide general knowledge and certain qualifications. They should have certain ideals. They should be married, I suppose, and their wives should be handy for social occasions. I am sure that the member for Todd agrees with the remarks I am making at the moment that politicians should be married.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will make up her own mind.

Mr. SLATER: The public thinks that members should be married and that their wives should be available on all occasions to answer the phone day and night and to answer the needs or whims of constituents. During that process, they are supposed to be prepared to accept insults from constituents, as well. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments and suggested amendments:

Amendments:

No. 1. Page 1—In the Title—After "South Australia" insert "; to amend the Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973-

1974;".

No. 2. Page 7, line 13 (clause 13)—Leave out "not exceeding" and insert "of".

No. 3. Page 7 (clause 13)—After line 20 insert subclause as follows:

(3a) A person appointed under subsection (1) or (3) of this section must be a judge, magistrate or legal practitioner.

No. 4. Page 7, line 36 (clause 16)—After "may" insert "for the purposes of this Act".

No. 5. Page 10, lines 14 and 15 (clause 18)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "being an amount per litre not exceeding 25 cents per litre".

No. 6. Page 10, lines 20 and 21 (clause 18)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "being an amount per litre not exceeding 24.1 cents per litre".

No. 7. Page 10, lines 22 to 47 (clause 18)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 8. Page 14, line 12 (clause 27)—Leave out all words in this line.

No. 9. Page 15—After line 9 insert new clause 29a as follows:

29a. (1) Subject to this section, an appeal to the Supreme Court against any decision or order of the tribunal may be instituted by any person who was a party to the proceedings in which the decision or order was made.

(2) An appeal under this section must be instituted within one month of the making of the decision or order appealed against, but the Supreme Court may, if it is satisfied that it is just and reasonable in the circumstances to do so, dispense with the requirement that the appeal should be so instituted.

(3) The Supreme Court may, on the hearing of an appeal under this section, do one or more of the following, according to the nature of the case—

- (a) affirm the decision or order appealed against;
- (b) quash the decision or order appealed against and substitute any decision or order that could have been made by the tribunal;
- (c) make any further or other order as to any other matter as the case requires.

No. 10. Page 17, lines 1 to 8 (clause 33)—Leave out the clause.

No. 11. Page 18, line 14 (clause 38)—Leave out "or other person concerned in the management" and insert "and the manager".

No. 12. Page 18—After line 29 insert new clause 41 as follows:

41. (1) The Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973-1974, is amended—

(a) by striking out paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of section 17a and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:—

(b) any failure to make application in accordance with this Act, for renewal of the licence in respect of the premises;

(b) by inserting in section 31 after the passage "application for" the passage "the grant or renewal of";

(c) by striking out paragraph (c) of section 31;

(d) by striking out paragraph (c) of subsection (1) of section 34 and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:—

(c) the licence expires and is not renewed;

(e) by striking out section 35 and inserting in lieu thereof the following section:

35. (1) A licence shall, subject to this Act, expire on the day being the anniversary of the appointed day next occurring after the

grant of the licence or the last renewal of the licence, as the case may be.

- (2) The board shall grant a renewal of a licence upon application made in accordance with this Act before the expiry of the licence.
- (3) The board may grant a renewal of a licence notwithstanding that application for the renewal is made out of time.
- (f) by striking out from subsection (3) of section 36 the passage "and be accompanied by the prescribed fee";
- (g) by striking out paragraph (c) of section 41;
- (h) by striking out from subsection (3) of section 45 the passage "and be accompanied by the prescribed fee";

and

- (i) by striking out paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of section 64.

(2) The Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973-1974, as amended by subsection (1) of this section, may be cited as the "Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973-1979".

Suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 16, line 7 (clause 30)—Leave out "an amount" and insert "the sum of the total amount paid by the Commissioner pursuant to section 30a of this Act during that month and the amount".

No. 2. Page 16, line 8 (clause 30)—After "this Act" insert "together with the cost of the administration of the Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973-1979,".

No. 3. After line 8 insert new clause 30a as follows:

30a. (1) A person may, during any quarter commencing on or after the first day of January, 1980, lodge with the Commissioner a claim in the prescribed form and verified by statutory declaration for payment of an amount determined in accordance with this section in respect of the quantity of motor spirit purchased within the State by that person during the last preceding quarter and used otherwise than for propelling road vehicles on roads.

(2) Where application is made by any person under subsection (1) of this section, the Commissioner shall pay to that person an amount arrived at by multiplying the prescribed amount by the number of litres of motor spirit that the Commissioner determines were purchased within the State by that person during the last preceding quarter and used otherwise than for propelling road vehicles on roads.

(3) The Commissioner may, for the purposes of making a determination under subsection (2) of this section, require the applicant to furnish him with such further information as he requires verified by statutory declaration if he so requires.

(4) Any amount that the Commissioner is required to pay to any person pursuant to this section shall be paid out of the General Revenue which is hereby to the necessary extent appropriated accordingly.

(5) The Commissioner may recover in any court of competent jurisdiction, as a debt due to the Crown, any amount paid upon an application under this section which he was not required by this section to pay to the applicant.

(6) In this section—

"quarter" means the period of three months commencing on the first day of the month of January, April, July or October in any year;

and

"prescribed amount" means 4.5 per centum of the amount determined by the Minister under section 18 of this Act as being the value of motor spirit.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This is simply an amendment to the title of the Bill, brought about by a subsequent amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

This amendment alters the term of office of the Appeal Tribunal from a period not exceeding five years to a term of five years. In many instances, there would be no objection to this, and in most cases I would anticipate that the appointment would be for a period of five years, but there are many instances in which it would be undesirable to have a mandatory requirement for a five-year period. Indeed, it may be desirable to have an extension for 12 months or two years. This mandatory requirement is not necessary; it could result in someone not being reappointed for a lesser period. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. WILSON: I support the amendment, which gives the tribunal some degree of independence. By appointing the tribunal for a period of up to five years, that is, for some period decided by the Minister, the degree of independence of the tribunal is removed. If the tribunal knows that a five-year term is involved, it will be aware that it has some security of tenure and will be in a much better position to judge impartially. I am not reflecting on people who may be appointed to the position. I believe that the reasons for the amendment are clear, and I oppose the motion.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

This matter was previously canvassed when the Bill was before us. I said then, and I repeat now, that I am not opposed to the concept that a person who will be appointed as the Appeal Tribunal should be a legal practitioner; he might be a judge, a magistrate, a doctor, a dentist, a farmer or a candlestick maker. I did not accept this view previously, and I still do not agree that a restriction should be placed on the appointment. The person who is appointed should be, in the opinion of the Government, the Minister and the Governor, who would make the appointment, the person best suited for that appointment, without there being the restriction that the amendment would place upon such a selection. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. WILSON: I support the amendment, as does the Opposition. In the previous Committee stage, the Minister made much play of the fact that by restricting appointment to a legal practitioner, we were pre-empting, the position to a judge or magistrate. That point was made strongly by the Minister. He also said that we would be making business for the legal profession. Now, those objections are answered by this amendment. By the addition of "judge" or "magistrate", the impartiality that the Minister wants is achieved, and the objections that he has answered. I support the amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

I am sure that the Opposition is pleased to hear that the

Government accepts this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6 and 7:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 5, 6 and 7 be disagreed to.

The purpose of the amendments is to determine that the amount that the Minister may declare under clause 18(4) for the purpose of this Bill shall be predetermined by legislation. This will mean, as I indicated when the Bill was previously before this House, that the chances of a successful challenge before the High Court of Australia in regard to the contravention of the Constitution of Australia would be strengthened considerably.

Mr. Venning: What about Western Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think that the member for Rocky River even knows where Western Australia is. If he had read the Western Australian legislation, he would not have made an interjection of that nature. This matter is marginally constitutional, and nothing should be done that will jeopardise the legality of the legislation. If the line suggested by the Legislative Council is followed, we will simply be playing with fire and increasing the risk that the legislation will be declared invalid. Frankly, the Government is not prepared to take that risk. For those reasons, and a number of others, the Government is not prepared under any conditions to accept the amendments.

Mr. WILSON: The Opposition opposes the motion completely and as strongly as it can, with every means at its disposal. These amendments go to the very nub of the whole debate about this measure. The amendments would restrict the amount of revenue that the Government could obtain from this measure to a little more than it would normally have received under the road maintenance tax provisions that previously applied. That is what the public of South Australia is concerned about.

The Minister knows that the people have been misled, because the Government will rip off them millions of dollars more than it would have received under the road maintenance tax provisions. We moved amendments in a simple form, on the finite basis of cents per litre. However, we have since considered the constitutional provisions. My advice is that to amend the Bill in this way would not subject it to constitutional challenge more than it would have been subjected by any other means. If people challenge the Bill on a constitutional basis, this amendment will not make any difference to whether they are successful.

Mr. VENNING: We support the amendment. Sir Charles Court would not be silly enough to introduce legislation that would be open to challenge. The Minister is trying to get a rip off in State income, and we will not have a bar of it.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crafter, Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hudson and Simmons. Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy and Nankivell.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 8 and 9 be

disagreed to.

Amendment No. 8 deletes the provision that, regarding objections and appeals, any order or decision of the tribunal shall be final and without appeal. The amendment inserts a provision for appeal to the Supreme Court against a decision of the tribunal. The Government does not desire that this legislation should be a feast for the lawyers. We believe that the tribunal should be able to make decisions rationally and not be subjected to protracted legal proceedings. Accordingly, we reject the two amendments.

Mr. WILSON: The Opposition supports the amendments. It believes strongly in the right of appeal. These amendments substantially alter those that the Opposition moved previously, and tidy them up.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 10:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 10 be disagreed to.

The Legislative Council's proposal is to delete the provision that no liability will attach to the Commissioner, the tribunal, or any inspector during the carrying out of his normal duties.

Mr. Mathwin: You aren't going to agree to any of them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You are right, because people up there are trying to sabotage the legislation. Hopefully, tomorrow morning we will determine the future of this legislation.

Mr. Chapman: It will be down or out.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You had better get your bloody election material ready early, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked other members to withdraw "bloody", and I ask the honourable Minister to withdraw it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Is it unparliamentary?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member had better get his ruddy election material ready early.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister will have to withdraw "bloody".

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I withdrew "bloody" and said "ruddy". That is not unparliamentary is it?

The CHAIRMAN: No, that is entirely Parliamentary.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is ridiculous to have liability attached to people carrying out their normal task. It is a normal case in legislation and must apply in this case.

Mr. WILSON: The Opposition supports the amendment. We cannot see why the private citizen should be responsible for negligence and yet the Government should not be.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 11:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

The the Legislative Council's amendment No. 11 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 12:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 12 be agreed to.

Amendment No. 12 is an amendment to which we are now prepared to agree. I think the Committee ought to be made aware of the circumstances relating to this amendment, as it is fairly important. The policy of this Government is that money matters do not reside within the province of the Legislative Council, and that its powers ought to be restricted considerably from what they presently are. Since the Bill was initially introduced I have had further talks with people concerned with this measure

and have readily accepted the fact that the duplication of licence fees ought to be relieved if possible. We have found a way which is acceptable to the Labor and Industry Department and which satisfies the constitutional requirements of this Bill.

Accordingly, the amendments were prepared on the basis that they would be submitted to the Legislative Council to avoid the hassles that occurred in this place, and the Legislative Council was advised that those amendments would not be moved in the Legislative Council because that was contrary to what is the generally accepted view of the majority of people, that the Upper House should not be a Chamber determining financial matters, and that when Parliament resumed next Tuesday week that, subject to this legislation being enacted, I would introduce into this Parliament then an amending Bill. As this is the Chamber that ought to be responsible for the financial measures of the Parliament, the matter would be handled in that way.

However, the Leader of the Opposition, in the Upper House (Mr. DeGaris) saw fit to take the business out of the hands of the Government, as he and his colleagues have done on so many occasions, and has moved the amendment, which is amendment No. 12 and in part the schedule of amendments suggested by the Legislative Council, because the two are tied together. The amendment No. 12 constitutionally is in order because it simply paves the way. It is the suggested amendments which the Legislative Council does not have constitutional authority actually to move, but only to suggest, hence they are in that fashion.

The Government rejects the concept that the Legislative Council ought to have financial authority over the Government of the State, and for the reasons I have stated did not intend to proceed. However, the facts now are that the Legislative Council has transgressed and the amendment is now before this place. Obviously it would be a rather bloody-minded attitude to do other than simply accept it, but in doing so I lodge the protest that I have.

Mr. WILSON: I congratulate the Minister on taking up the suggestion that the Opposition made during debate in this House. It was our suggestion that the B class licensees would be disadvantaged. The B class licensees are the small business men who come under the ambit of this measure—the service station proprietors. We made the point that these people would be completely disadvantaged by the measure, and in fact would be required to take out yet another licence. The Minister has accepted the amendment and for that the Opposition is grateful. Regarding the constitutional powers of the Legislative Council, the Minister knows that this type of amendment has come down from the Legislative Council many times before, and certainly I have not heard the Minister put on the act he has put on tonight.

Motion carried.

Suggested amendment No. 1:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

This is really tied back to the question of the variation of the amount that is payable, a matter already rejected. I will deal now with suggested amendments Nos. 1 and 3, both of which we oppose.

Suggested amendment No. 1 refers to section 30a and amendment No. 3 spells out that section, which deals with the question of exemption on motor spirit used on non-road vehicles. I support the concept of the proposition but, because there is no machinery to give effect to it at this stage, it is no good introducing it. What has to happen is that the question of exemption for non-road vehicles needs

to go to the Australian Transport Advisory Council so that we can determine a common policy to provide the exemption that is necessary. I accept that there ought to be an exemption, but the machinery is not there yet, and it is useless carrying motions that really cannot be given effect to.

Mr. WILSON: I oppose the motion. The Minister is not correct when he says there is no machinery. I am glad that he accepts the principle which was so strongly put forward by us that this use of motor spirit should be exempted. Obviously, many sections of the community will be disadvantaged if the amendment is not agreed to. The machinery is in the amendment. When we debated the Bill earlier, we moved an amendment that would have allowed the oil companies to ascertain the quantity of motor spirit used for non-road use as far as a bulk delivery system was concerned. The Minister made great play about the constitutional position in that regard. He said that the oil companies would probably not co-operate in ascertaining this quantity.

What has happened now is that the Legislative Council has tried to amend the Bill, by using a different system, by using declarations, which would involve not the oil companies, but the Government and the customer alone. The customer would make declarations every three months, I think. It purely revolves on the Government as to how the exemptions would be administered. It has nothing to do with the oil companies; therefore, the Minister's objection is overruled by the way in which the amendment is worded. The Opposition opposes the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I support the views expressed by the member for Torrens. The Minister has again admitted to the Committee that he agrees with the principle of exemptions applying to off-road vehicles. I had some doubts about the mechanics of applying the principle put forward by the Opposition at the time, and the only method that I thought that such an exemption would apply mechanically was on a common principle with that applying through the Customs and Excise Department with respect to diesel fuel sales and or duty fees applicable to that product. It seemed to me at the time that that was a reasonable basis on which to differentiate fuel used for off-road vehicles as against on-road vehicles.

At the time, the Minister objected to that suggestion, and now we have the amendment from another place which not only supports the principle we put forward here but also the principle at least now agreed to by the Minister, and it provides the details of the machinery with which to carry out that agreed principle. It does not automatically apply exemption for off-road petrol use. It applies only if a person is prepared to sign an agreement and, even then, only if he seeks to enjoy the exemption. The amendment provides plenty of time in the interim for details of a regulatory nature to be tidied up by the department, if the Minister is serious about supporting the exemption for off-road petrol use.

The framework is there, the detailed machinery is provided by another place, and the homework has been done. All it requires is agreement by the Government to the principle which the Minister says he agrees with. A deep principle is involved. We are adamant about it, and will fight for it till the end, because it is an entitlement to those who were not involved in road maintenance charges to the State and who, accordingly, should not attract any tax within the ambit of the Bill. The principle is one that all members should support in the interests of those who deserve to be covered under the amendment.

I hope that the Minister will relax from the rather arrogant attitude he has demonstrated in relation to this

clause and that he and the Government will support the Opposition in exempting off-road vehicle users from the taxation that not only replaces road maintenance tax but contributes money to the State for use for purposes other than those agreed to by members of both sides of the House over the past several years.

Mr. VENNING: I am amazed at the Minister. He said that the machinery is not here, but why did he introduce a Bill when he has not done his homework. Fancy admitting that the matter is not complete. One wonders, on hearing the Minister's comments, whether the Government was ever interested in the machinery being introduced to correct this iniquitous situation. The Minister told us during the debate that the oil companies would not agree to collect the money. Who is running the country—the Government or the oil companies? I received a letter from my son in the United States, where there has been complaints about the price of petrol rising. The Government said that the oil companies would be nationalised, and the price immediately came down. I would have thought that the Minister would grab the amendments with open hands, because they are what he is looking for—the necessary machinery to make it possible for the motor spirit used in off-road vehicles to be exempt from this legislation. The Minister is not dinkum about this legislation; he is just pulling the wool over the eyes of the people of this State.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crafter, Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopper, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hudson and Simmons. Noes—Messrs. Gunn and Nankivell.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Suggested Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

This amendment has already been discussed in substance in conjunction with amendment No. 1.

Motion carried.

The following agreement for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments would adversely affect the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the Legislative Council's suggested amendments and amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference, to be held in the House of Assembly conference room at 9 a.m. on Thursday 9 August, at which it would be represented by Messrs. Becker, Hemmings, Virgo, Wilson, and Wotton.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the

conference with the Legislative Council to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.
Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 513.)

Later:

Mr. SLATER: Prior to seeking leave to continue my remarks, I was speaking about the public attitude regarding the receipt of large financial rewards by pop stars, television personalities, newspapers, and so on, but as soon as Parliamentary salaries are increased, there is an outcry in the press and by some members of the public over Parliamentary salaries. One of our members, the member for Mitcham, joins in the chorus in the hope of gaining some political capital, and joins in the chorus with the press and some members of the public regarding Parliamentary salaries. The public recognises that politicians are necessary, but when they cannot come up with a miracle they are blamed for all sorts of things and, because they do not produce the miracles, they are not worthwhile in the eyes of the public. If politicians have a study tour or an overseas trip, as many of our fellow countrymen do every year, they must be junketing at the taxpayers' expense.

Every three years Parliamentarians must run the risk of being unemployed. If by chance they survive a period up to retirement, when they receive superannuation, for which they have contributed 11½ per cent of their salary while in Parliament, the public still thinks they are getting a hand-out on retirement. Happily, there are still many of us of each political persuasion who idealistically accept some of the old-fashioned ideas relating to service to the public and are willing to do their best in the community interest, despite the criticism, contempt, cynicism and abuse heaped upon many of them. If it is true in a democracy that people get the representation that they deserve, there are times when all of us, as members of Parliament, could be forgiven if we wonder why we ever bother.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. In doing so, I express my sympathy to the families of those who have served the Parliament of South Australia. I add my congratulations for the outstanding service of these men—Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Leo Travers, Mr. Leslie James Harding, and Mr. George Stanley Hawkins. I know more about Sir Baden Pattinson; I used to look upon him as a friend and, at times, as an adviser. He was a previous member for Glenelg and served in many capacities in government and in local government. He was the Mayor of Glenelg at one stage. He provided outstanding service to many community services and was involved in many community efforts. He was President of the Royal Lifesaving Society for many years. He was probably the best Minister of Education this State has ever had, and was responsible for the highly successful learn-to-swim campaign for schools, that has gone from strength to strength since its inception.

I refer to the statement of the Government that it will once again need to exercise a tight control over all expenditure if it is to avoid a substantial deficit. That is no real change from what has happened in the past and it will be interesting to see what kind of control the Government intends to exercise. High up on the list of Government intentions is a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation

and Arbitration Act, to give a greater security in employment to workers consistent with the economic well-being of this State. It is presumed that the Government will seek to make the trade unions safe against the action of tort, making them a selected part of the community. They would not be able to be sued for any damages that occur through their actions.

Tourism is higher on the list than in previous years. The past Premier demoted tourism, but the new Premier has brought tourism to sixth place on his priority list. If ever there was an area in which the Government has failed completely over the past few years, it is certainly tourism, which leaves a lot to be desired. The Government has little to be proud of regarding that matter. On a number of occasions I have brought to the attention of the Government the fact that it will not allow an independent tourist bus to operate from Glenelg to the Barossa Valley. I have stated on a number of occasions the situation in which tourists find themselves if they stay at Glenelg or Brighton. That is natural because that area is probably one of the best tourist areas in the city and has more facilities for tourism than any other area of the State.

Tourists have problems in getting to the Barossa Valley; they either have to take the tram, which has been running for, I think, the past 50 years, and by now almost has square wheels, or they can take a bus or taxi into the city before they are able to get to the Barossa Valley. The same procedure occurs when tourists return from the city; another mode of transport must be found to convey them to their destination. Also on the list is the hardy annual, which has appeared for a number of years—the Government is to provide for the preparation and assessment of an environmental impact statement. Major projects relative to this are to be introduced during this session of Parliament. Four Ministers of Environment have been going to do that. The member for Henley Beach, the first Minister of Environment, promised to bring that about. The next Minister of Environment thought he would do it. I then tried to bring in a private member's Bill to hurry up the situation because of the fiasco regarding the Morphettville Bus Depot. The next Minister, and also the present Minister of Environment, have promised that they would bring in this Bill. So we see this hardy annual.

We will see what happens to this matter in the end. The Governor refers to the transit project, and the Government will also complete the Lonsdale Road and construction of part of the Main North Road will be continued into the next financial year. I have mentioned the concern of a number of my constituents about the problems that the opening of the Lonsdale Road will create. There will not only be problems in my district but also in the district of the member for Morphett. Colossal problems will result because of the traffic and extra vehicles that will travel on Brighton Road. Eventually, many vehicles will end up in the territory of the member for Morphett and he, too, will be faced with the problem of knowing where, and how, they will go from there. Considerable problems will be created for the people in those two areas.

I have been concerned about a number of matters over the past few years and particularly the question of juvenile institutions in South Australia. The Government has made the situation, particularly in McNally Training Centre, into a colossal problem. Even if the Government started to clean up the matter this week, because so many reliable staff have been lost, there would be problems. If tactics were changed completely, the available staff would not be able to cope with a new system and many months, or years, would elapse before the establishment of discipline

in this institution.

McNally has been renamed the South Australian Youth Training Centre. The names are changed often, such as the names of the assessment units and the Sturt unit. The main point that I wish to raise is the shocking situation revealed by the new Minister of Community Welfare in reply to questions, some of which I asked last year when I put Questions on Notice, and other I asked early this year. At last, a few weeks ago, I received replies. The former Minister has ducked the issue time and time again, with excellent footwork. He could have given me some replies in the short sitting that we had to deal with the Santos legislation.

The replies reveal that there have been 19 assaults on staff between January and May this year. One residential care worker has been off for 58 days with problems, and one has been off for 28 days. In this time of high unemployment, there have been 11 resignations between January and May. I have not the figures for the period since May, but I will quickly ask a Question on Notice about that. The Minister was brave in replying to the question, much braver than his predecessor, but I want to know whether he condones the situation at McNally whereby convicted homosexual rapists are encouraged to sleep in the dormitory-type units with, in some cases, first offenders.

We should not forget that some of these boys, if not first offenders, are in an institution for the first time. Many of them are on remand and are innocent, yet the Minister or the department condones the situation that allows these convicted homosexual rapists to sleep in dormitory-type accommodation. I wonder what action the Minister is taking to rectify the situation. The person to whom I was referring in the Question on Notice has only recently returned, after having walked out of McNally a few weeks ago. He has recently been captured and was returned yesterday or the day before. Now the department has decided that he will be accommodated in a cabin unit, after all he has done and after all these months. If we look at the questions that I put on the Notice Paper, we will see how long that situation was allowed to exist. The question that I asked was:

Has there been at any time since 10 February 1979 a convicted homosexual rapist mixing with other inmates and/or sleeping in a dormitory unit . . .

The reply was "Yes", and he was allowed to sleep in assessment 2, assessment 3, and Sturt. Assessment 2 is for first offenders and boys on remand, boys who are innocent because they have not been proved guilty, yet this boy has been allowed to sleep in those situations. The reply to my question about whether it was the policy of the Government to allow this boy to mix with other inmates in dormitory-type accommodation was "Yes, where there is night officer supervision." There is one officer on duty at night from 11 p.m., and I suggest that no officer would dare go alone into dormitory-type accommodation with these boys. In the event of trouble, he would have to ask an officer in charge or another unit to go with him.

It is obvious to me that the department condoned the situation. It is also obvious that at 9 a.m. on the day after I put this question on the Notice Paper, the boy about whom I was inquiring was removed from McNally and put into the court. He was released on bail, with no opposition from the Community Welfare Department, although the department had full knowledge of his medical history, knew that he was a convicted homosexual rapist, and also knew that he had been on a charge of two further rapes.

The boy was released into the community and, within four or five days, he was charged with raping another 15-year-old girl. That charge has not come up yet but it will

come up soon. What a way to prove a point, and what a situation to be in! What a shocking situation, yet, because I put these Questions on Notice, I submit, that boy was allowed out of McNally and put into court. There was no information for the court about the medical history. What I have said refers to Question on Notice No. 32, and No. 33 is similar.

Before I deal with the latter question, I ask what has happened to the two former Ministers (Mr. Justice King as he is now and Mr. Payne) who expressed concern about mixing these boys with the first offenders. These boys are in institutions for the first time, under remand and presumed to be innocent. What would be the concern of parents of this type of child, parents whose child is in an institution for the first time or on a first offence, or in there alone? They would know that boys in a dormitory situation are open to these sorts of things that go on.

It is well known these things have gone on, as was proved in the evidence given to the Royal Commission. At the inquiries into the Juvenile Courts by Justice Mohr it was mentioned on a number of occasions right throughout that evidence. This has been allowed to go on, and the department has condoned the situation to its shame. A report in the *News* on Wednesday 14 March in relation to this matter requested me to explain to the media just what the situation was. I then said that I was concerned about the matter and the safety of the community, which has been disregarded completely by the Community Welfare Department and the Minister in particular.

The head of the department said that criminal charges were the responsibility of the police and that it was up to them to oppose bail, suggesting that the police did not oppose bail, and that was a complete out-and-out lie. The police did oppose bail in this matter. Mr. Cox suggested in the matter-of-fact way in which he made his report to the paper that it was up to the police to oppose bail, and he said that it was not the responsibility of the department. The boy was under the care and control of the Minister and the department, and yet the department wants to opt out and say it is not its area or concern.

This boy had slept in three of the units, and three of the five units are for assessment of remand boys and those who are awaiting trial, or those that are waiting for decisions about treatment. The period in that situation averages from three to six weeks for those boys. So we know just which boys they were mixing with. In the *Advertiser* of 25 November 1976 it was stated that first offenders and rapists had been mixed. That was an occasion on which I had told the Assembly about the situation in the maximum security block at McNally. I then said that this allowed first offenders and repeated offenders to mix together.

The Minister at that time, Mr. Payne, said that my claims were the greatest mishmash and hotch potch he had had the misfortune to listen to for some time. I take it then that the past Minister condoned the situation, because it has occurred again and again right throughout the system since at least 1974, and perhaps before that. Do not forget that this Government was responsible in 1971 for taking the power out of the courts and putting it into the hands of the Community Welfare Department. Now there is new legislation, and that is not working too well. Under the new legislation, boys do not go to the courts unless they are involved in very serious crimes, such as homicide. All the rest of the business goes to the panel. The first boy to be released under the new system was back again within six hours on a further two serious charges.

In 1976 again the situation was mentioned in the local press about the convicted criminals, including rapists, being housed together with the first offenders at the

McNally Training Centre. The answer that the Minister gave recently was that it was the policy of the Government in such situations to allow this to happen if there was a night officer in attendance.

On 5 April 1977 a report of proceedings before the Royal Commission into the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act stated:

Night staff at the McNally Centre "are scared stiff to go anywhere near the dormitories," a Royal Commission was told yesterday. Mr. A. V. Russell, counsel assisting Mr. Commissioner Mohr, said certain information had been received about this. Mr. Russell asked the centre's supervisor (Mr. D. M. Meldrum): Is there any foundation in that, that they are told if they go in they will be beaten up? It would take a very brave man to front up to those dormitories at night.

Mr. Meldrum: It takes a certain amount of skill and courage to deal with clients we have at any time, and the dormitory situation is a fairly difficult one. I am very much against dormitories, which is why we are moving to conversion to rooms.

Mr. Meldrum told the commission yesterday there was a lot of bullying behaviour and verbal threats among the boys at McNally. Judge Mohr said that in one incident a member of the staff had been "pushed and shoved", and he asked Mr. Meldrum how often that type of thing happened. "About once a month," Mr. Meldrum replied.

Mr. Meldrum agreed it was the type of sexual conduct that should be "nipped in the bud." Judge Mohr: What happened? Mr. Bruff (the Acting Director of the Department for Community Welfare) tells us that departmental philosophy and policy is that the conduct should have been stopped the first time it was seen.

Yet this Government, its Minister and its department, condoned over weeks the situation of mixing this type of offender with first offenders and boys that were on remand.

An *Advertiser* report of 8 July 1978 stated:

Sexual offences were likely to be "fostered or promoted" by isolating young men overnight in locked dormitories at the McNally Training Centre, a Supreme Court judge said yesterday. Mr. Justice Wells directed the Crown to bring to the attention of the Minister of Community Welfare evidence of the dormitory lock-up practice which had been given at a rape trial before him. He suggested having one or two officers remain on duty inside the dormitories at night to prevent any criminal acts. "I do not suggest that is the only remedy, but it may well be worth considering," he said.

Another report on the same page states:

A spokesman for the Public Service Association, the union which covers McNally workers, said yesterday that staff at the centre were aware some inmates were being drawn into homosexual activities. The spokesman said one method of avoiding the problem was to isolate youths with known homosexual tendencies . . . It was union policy that two members should be on duty together while in a particular unit.

When I asked some time ago what was the department's philosophy regarding young offenders, I was told that it was to prevent reoffending and to assist in the personal development of these young people. Is this how the Government assists in the personal development of these boys? I asked again whether there were sex offenders or convicted homosexual rapists housed in dormitory units at McNally. The answer was that 29 youths convicted of sexual offences were held in the centre, five of whom were convicted of homosexual rape, and they were housed in assessments Nos. 1, 2, 3, Sturt and Grenfell. In other words, they were housed in every unit at McNally. The department shared them out. This is a Government that is

supposed to protect people, yet it condoned the situation of allowing convicted rapist and hard-core criminals to sleep in dormitories with first offenders and those on remand.

Mr. Groom: Would you put them all together?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: We would put them in separate accommodation. I know that the honourable member is out of order for interjecting out of his place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already told the honourable member that he is out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: I appreciate your protection, Mr. Speaker. Let us have a look at a press release of January 1979 of the previous Minister (Hon. R. G. Payne). It states:

A special unit began operating today at the McNally Training Centre to accommodate longer-term residents and youths who prove difficult to manage in the centre's other units. The unit is named the Sturt Training Unit.

The unit has had about five names, such as assessment No. 2, old Sturt, "The block", and New Sturt, so you do not know where it is; that is the system under which the department works. The release also states:

The new unit is situated in the centre's old security section. In other words, "the block". The release continues:

Mr. Payne said the Planning Committee believed the new unit should embody the "highest state of the art" of residential care.

What beautifully chosen words! It continues:

It will have clearly stated aims, methods and rules for staff and residents. Each youth placed in Sturt unit will be clearly informed of the standards of behaviour and involvement expected from him and of the limits and consequences which will apply. The unit will provide a firmly structured environment for youths who are unsuitable, unwilling to cope with the programmes which operate in the centre's other units. There will be no change in the basic philosophy of helping residents learn more appropriate behaviour, but the expectations will be straightforward and obvious and aimed at encouraging self-achievement.

That was in January, but what happened? Within three weeks, the place was bombed and wrecked. We had the first riot on 25 January, which put it out of action completely. Within a couple of weeks they got it back after much hard work. Then another riot occurred on 10 March, and it has not been open since. I went there some months ago, and I could not describe how bad it was. It was as though a bomb had hit the place. I understand that, at one stage, the Public Buildings Department refused to work there. Outside workers were brought in who refused to work there because of the conditions. I asked the Minister a question, which because of the sittings was answered months later, about the cost of repairs and the cost of the carpet. The Minister said that the carpet had been washed and relaid; however, from information I have gleaned, there is new carpet throughout the place. Only last week, the Minister said that new carpet had not been laid but that the old carpet had been relaid with an extra strip placed down the side. The Minister said that the inmates would be allowed to keep chickens and fowls, and that it would be a great place. As a result of the Minister's press release, a tour was arranged by the *Advertiser*, which later published a glowing report on the block. The report contained some marvellous pictures, but where they were taken, I do not know. They must have been taken a long time ago, because the place was all shiny and clean. It was a real confidence job.

It is certainly far from the state of the place as I have seen it. Perhaps the difference is that the press told them they were going there a week before they went, and the

people at McNally were able to polish it up to make it look good. This article is reputed to be the inside story about McNally. The reporting, so far as I am concerned, leaves a lot to be desired, because it is far from the situation as I have seen it. Mr. Leahy, the former supervisor of McNally, had asked to be removed from the job because he could not stick it any longer. He said he was being let down by the staff. He blamed the residential care workers for the let down; he said that he was always apologising for them because they were inactive. It was not the system used; it was the poor old residential care workers—they were the people who were making it bad.

Mr. Groom: Who gives you this information.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will get some information from me if he interjects out of his seat again.

Mr. MATHWIN: The article states that the riot was the worst in McNally's 12 year history, cost \$30 000, and involved nine inmates. The first riot involved three inmates who, incidentally, either last week or the week before were released out into the community. Two of those people were out and back again within two days—good stuff. It shows how successful the system is. Yet, on so many occasions the previous Minister has stood up in this House and denied that the situation existed as it was, denied claims about conditions and that the floor staff had colossal problems. He said that I did not know what I was talking about, yet the Minister, after 12 months of pushing, went to McNally, met the staff and saw for himself that things were bad. The *Advertiser* articles states:

Despite a clearance from the department's director-general, Mr. I. S. Cox, allowing staff to talk to me, all residential care workers who favored increased discipline asked not be identified.

So here we have the whole thing in a nutshell. If a person does not agree with the system, he is in trouble; he is either out, in serious trouble, put on a bad shift, put into the block to work, or made dormitory night watchmen. The report continues:

Bob Leahy has been appointed by the department to investigate its recruiting process in an attempt to find out where it is failing to attract suitable people to residential care.

I understand that Bob Leahy has just been given a promotion and is now secretary, either to the departmental head or to the Minister. He has been given a good situation. He certainly was not successful at being a Superintendent at McNally; there is no doubt about that. The article continues;

Barry Kennedy, the recently appointed deputy supervisor, says the basic qualification for residential care workers is that they are "people who have made good use of their life experience".

I have a letter from a person explaining what the situation is for people working at McNally now. They have no control and are in fear of their lives most of the time that they are in there. No wonder they are getting burnt out quick and lively. The article continues;

"Qualifications sometimes help but they are not always necessary," he says. "We should be looking more towards older, more stable people who have simply learnt from life experience."

How true that is. How true it is that the department has got rid of most of the people with experience who used to work there, either by burning them out, or in one way or another. There are few originals left, very few people who are able to control these boys. Control, so far as the Government is concerned, is far from desirable. A number of members on the Government benches believe that it is quite wrong to lock these boys up. A report in the

Advertiser on 22 April 1977 gave the evidence of Dr. E. C. Scanlon, a former consultant psychiatrist at the centre, as follows:

Dr. E. C. Scanlon said some of the boys would have done better if placed in a "hard core unit" and locked up with no specific remedy but time.

Mr. Commissioner Mohr: Lock them up, give them a certain amount of discipline and give them something useful and productive to do during the day as best they could?

Dr. Scanlon: Yes. I saw a great need for one group of boys to be in some degree of long-term institution where they could be meaningfully employed in that institution.

It is ironic that if you go to McNally and see somebody working in the garden, or mowing the lawn, it is being done by an outside contractor; they will not allow the boys to do the work around the place. What a deplorable situation!

The other points I will raise are similar. Before I pass on—

Mr. Groom: Don't leave them.

Mr. MATHWIN: This is valuable information that, no doubt, members of the Government do not know about. It is interesting to see that the boy to whom I was referring in most of my questions, the homosexual rapist who was

allowed out on bail and within days committed a further rape, was, I understand, placed back in McNally. He was so bad that it was decided, and a recommendation was made, that he should be removed from McNally under section 70 of the old Act. This was done two days before the new Act came into operation. That recommendation was on the Minister's table for two days and, when the time came for the department to decide whether it would remove this boy from McNally under section 70 of the old Act, it was too late, as the new Act had come into operation and they could not remove him. Therefore, we have a situation in which the boy remained at McNally. He decided that he had better get out, so he removed a key to the fire door from the box, unlocked the door and put the key back. About an hour later, he decided he had had enough so he opened the door and walked out of McNally. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 9 August at 2 p.m.