

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 February 1980

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

NEW MEMBER FOR NORWOOD

Mr. Gregory John Crafter, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his place in the House as member for the District of Norwood, in place of Mr. Frank Raymond Webster, whose election had been declared void.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 550 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by the Hon. P. B. Arnold and Messrs. Slater, Whitten, Lewis, and Oswald.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SALVATION JANE

A petition signed by 198 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce biological control of salvation jane was presented by the Hon. W. E. Chapman.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUNDAY TRADING

A petition signed by 25 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays was presented by Mr. Oswald.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The **SPEAKER:** In the last few years the volume of Questions on Notice has increased quite markedly. The numbers replied to last Tuesday, for instance, delayed *Hansard's* type-setting operations quite considerably, and the complete set of pulls was not available until approximately 2 p.m. on Wednesday.

While I make no comment on the wisdom or otherwise of either the number of questions or the answers they receive, their existence has led to major problems in the printing of the weekly volume of *Hansard*.

I am concerned to have pulls of speeches as soon as possible after the adjournment of the House and also to cause the minimum disruption to the work of the Government Printer and the *Hansard* team. I have, therefore, after consultation with the Leader of *Hansard*, directed him to have answers to Questions on Notice placed at the end of the weekly volume. Members will, of course, already have the copies of answers supplied by the Minister, and tabled copies will remain available until the weekly volume is distributed. Answers to questions previously asked will continue to be printed in their normal position.

I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 474, 528, 536, 556, 559, 564, 565, 571, 575, 579, 582, 604, 605, 607, 608, 620, 623, 644, 645, and 662.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton):
Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Botanic Gardens Act—Regulations—Revocation.
- II. District Council of Eudunda—By-law No. 25—Keeping of Poultry.

By the Minister of Planning (The Hon. D. C. Wotton):
Pursuant to Statute—

- I. City of Adelaide Development Control Act—Amendments.
- II. Planning and Development Act—Interim Development Control—Corporation of Whyalla.

By the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman):
Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Agricultural Chemicals Act—Fees.

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison):
Pursuant to Statute—

- I. South Australian Teacher Housing Authority—Report, 1979.

By the Minister of Health (The Hon. J. L. Adamson):
Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Building Societies Act—Regulations—Prescribed Banks.
- II. Credit Union Stabilization Board—Report, 1978-79.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OVERSEAS VISIT

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Last week I indicated that I had received an informal approach to assess whether I would accept an invitation to visit Japan during the first half of this year. I now wish to advise the House that yesterday I received an official invitation from the Japanese Government for the head of my department and me to visit Tokyo for a period of one week in April. That invitation will cover the cost of accommodation and in addition that of head of Premier's Department. I will be accompanied by the Director of State Development and a press secretary, whose expenses, of course, will be met by the South Australian Government.

The purpose of the visit will be to discuss with the Japanese Government the extension of trade relationships and investment between Japan and South Australia. I will also hold discussions with them on the desirability of opening a representative office in Tokyo. Invitations have also been received from companies in Japan which already have links with South Australian industry for talks on their future activities in this State. The Mitsubishi company and the Bank of Tokyo are two corporations with which I shall be having discussions. Other trading corporations have also indicated an interest in holding discussions with me during the one-week visit to Japan.

I am also taking the opportunity while out of Australia of holding discussions with the Agent-General in London. I have previously announced my intention to place greater emphasis on the trade and investment operations of the Agent-General's Office, and a significant reorganisation of that office is proposed after I have discussed my

objectives with the Agent-General. I have received invitations from the Chambers of Commerce in London and Birmingham to address them on initiatives that my Government is taking which are making trade and investment a much more attractive proposition in this State. On the return journey from Japan I will be making brief stopover calls to Seoul, in Korea, and Hong Kong for discussions with the Australian Trade Commissioners and Chambers of Commerce to assess first-hand expanded trade potential between those areas and South Australia. At this stage, firm costing estimates of the overseas visit have not been completed nor has a firm itinerary been determined, but I shall make further announcements on these two aspects at an appropriate stage.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SCHOOL-TO-WORK TRANSITION PROGRAMME

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: For the information of all members, and especially in view of recent press comments, I wish to explain the details of the School-to-Work Transition Programme that has been agreed between the Commonwealth and State Governments. Following an approach by the former Commonwealth Minister for Education, Senator Carrick, on 5 October 1979, State and Commonwealth officers discussed possible methods of increased assistance for school leavers and for those whose departure from school was imminent.

Later, at the meeting of the Australian Education Council in Perth on 25 and 26 October 1979, all Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers of Education, together with the Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, endorsed the need for a comprehensive policy on transition from school to work. As a result of this decision, the Prime Minister notified the State Government of the Commonwealth's acceptance of that resolution and its decision to fund a school to work programme for a five-year period.

The Commonwealth's policy objective as stated by the Prime Minister is "that ultimately all young people in the 15 to 19 age group would be provided with options in education, training and employment, or any combination of these, either part time or full time, so that unemployment becomes the least acceptable alternative". The Prime Minister indicated that progress towards this objective was seen as involving several developments, including improved techniques for identifying schoolchildren at work who are at risk of later difficulties in the transition from education to work, improved vocational education and counselling services, and provision of alternative courses for "at risk" students. The extension of work experience programmes, "link" courses combining elements of secondary and further education, teacher education programmes, and further pre-apprenticeship schemes were also recommended to the States as avenues for likely development.

The financial terms of the Commonwealth's offer were that \$25 000 000 (not \$250 000 000, as reported in yesterday's press) would be made available to the States in 1980 subject to Commonwealth approval of State spending programmes. Of this total amount \$2 200 000 is to be allocated as South Australia's share, and the State Government is not required to supplement this grant in 1980. It was also proposed by the Commonwealth Government that over the next four years a total of \$225 000 000 would be allocated to the programme by

both the Commonwealth and the States—not on a \$1 for \$1 basis, as reported in yesterday's press, but in the ratio of 5:4 with the Commonwealth making the major contribution. From 1985 onward the Commonwealth suggested that the special programmes would be absorbed within normal funding arrangements.

In response to this invitation, officers of the Departments of Education, Further Education, Labor and Industry, and Employment and Youth Affairs, together with representatives of employer organisations, prepared detailed submissions of programmes that fell within the Commonwealth's guidelines. Indeed, South Australia's proposals were drafted, costed and the subject of informal discussion between Commonwealth and State officers before the end of 1979 and before those of several other States. Unlike other States, however, South Australia delayed official presentation of its proposals until three matters had been clarified by the Commonwealth Government.

The first of these relates to uncertainties in the payment of allowances to young people who join the transition programme. This Government is of the view that, if programmes for school leavers are to succeed, then the financial incentive for participation should reflect the Commonwealth's stated objective that unemployment should be the least attractive option. The second is the concern of this Government that State revenue priorities should not be determined by Commonwealth Government tied grants, which would be the effect of the Commonwealth's proposal in the four years 1981-84. Thirdly, this Government is anxious to ensure that adequate monitoring and evaluation methods are established to assess the effectiveness of the programme in the years ahead.

The Premier sought clarification of these matters in a letter to the Prime Minister dated 11 February 1980, adding that the South Australian Government was unable to agree to the Commonwealth's proposals in their original form. The Premier explained that South Australia would be willing to accept the Commonwealth's offer for 1980 but with no commitment at this stage to appropriate State revenues beyond 1980.

It was while these issues of principle were being considered by the Federal Government that other States' specific submissions were being examined and approved in part by Commonwealth authorities. That is why South Australia was not among those States which were mentioned in the Commonwealth Government's recent announcement of approved spending programmes. At that time, however, the Prime Minister informed the Premier that the Commonwealth Government prepared to proceed with the 1980 programme, providing full funding for this year, without prior acceptance by the States of the proposed funding arrangements beyond 1980. The Prime Minister has offered to renegotiate the funding of the scheme in these years.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister has acknowledged the importance of benefits and incentives for young people engaged in the programme and has offered to seek detailed State views on this matter. As to the wider ramifications of the transition programme upon Commonwealth-States financial relations, the Prime Minister has offered to include this subject for examination in the review of tax sharing arrangements. In other words, each reservation expressed by the South Australian Government has received a positive and encouraging response from the Commonwealth Government, and this has cleared the way for official submission of South Australia's specific proposals for 1980.

State Cabinet has already endorsed these proposals but,

because they have not yet been approved by Canberra, I am unable at this stage to describe them in detail. That will follow shortly. I can say, however, that the three objectives implicit in our recommendation are: first, to improve the skills and abilities of young people in accordance with present and anticipated labour market requirements; secondly, to accelerate the development of curricula that better meet the needs of school leavers; and, thirdly, to assist the training of teachers to help them assess the needs of the work force and provide more effective help for students who face the transition from school to work.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTHERN VALES CO-OPERATIVE

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The current position of the Southern Vales Co-operative Society is that the company is in an untenable financial position as reported and, following recent applications by the co-operative to the State Bank and subsequently the South Australian Development Corporation, it is evident that any assistance that may be considered for the co-operative should be accompanied by stringent conditions of servicing, if not management and field vineyard restructure.

Yesterday, State Cabinet considered the position of the Southern Vales Co-operative Society, and in particular the southern region impact that would occur on immediate winding up of that society. The Government is responsibly sensitive to the needs of the community, and in this case decided to request the State Bank to extend a seasonal loan to the society to enable the society's 1980 vintage to be processed at that co-operative. The request, not direction, as reported in the *Advertiser* this morning, was made on the basis that the State Bank make a fresh assessment of the position. The State Bank is currently studying the position, and both the co-operative and the Government are awaiting its report.

Seasonal loans in this context are ordinarily specific loans for the purpose of paying growers in the form of a first advance at 30 June and a second advance at 30 November in the season of delivery. These loans are ordinarily repayable within 12 months of the first payment being made.

I should like to place on record precisely what was given in a press release to the *Advertiser* last night regarding the Government's decision of yesterday, and in particular that part that referred to the request to the State Bank. It was stated:

The Minister of Agriculture, Ted Chapman, said last night that the State Bank would be requested to approve a seasonal loan to the society for the 1980 vintage.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: MOORE'S BUILDING

The SPEAKER: I have received from the honourable Leader of the Opposition the following letter:

I wish to give notice that when the House meets today, Tuesday 26 February 1980, I shall move a motion without notice that the House at its rising adjourn to 2 p.m. on Thursday 28 February for the purpose of debating the following matter of urgency:

1. The failure of the Government to satisfactorily explain the reasons for its purchase of the Charles Moore building for law courts;

2. its intervention to prevent the building's continued use as a retail outlet, despite its announced decision not to purchase the building and its knowledge of an offer for the building from the private sector; and

3. the misleading information given to this House by the Premier concerning this matter on Wednesday last.

I call on those honourable members who approve of the motion to rise in their places.

Members having risen:

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn to 2 p.m. on Thursday 28 February, for the purpose of debating the following matter of urgency:

1. The failure of the Government to satisfactorily explain the reasons for its purchase of the Charles Moore building for law courts;

2. its intervention to prevent the building's continued use as a retail outlet, despite its announced decision not to purchase the building and its knowledge of an offer for the building from the private sector; and

3. the misleading information given to this House by the Premier concerning this matter on Wednesday last.

This morning's newspaper contains a public announcement, under large letters, namely, "Disposal—Complete clearance of shop fittings, office furniture, and sundry items at Charles Moore's Victoria Square store". The clearance is to begin tomorrow and go until Friday. I imagine that, if he happened to see the item, the Premier and members of his Party would have been thinking, "Well, thank goodness for that. They are finally selling up the shop fittings and so on. The embarrassment that has been haunting us in relation to the Moore's building and the fiasco caused by our initial lack of decision and by the bad decision which we subsequently made and which we are stuck with will be over."

Regrettably, this issue will continue to haunt the Premier for a good many years hence. The indecision and incompetence that surround the handling of this issue by the Government have been a backdrop to its performance since mid-December last. The Premier's answer to the question asked by the member for Hanson last Wednesday has now moved this issue to centre stage and requires it to be debated in the House as a matter of some urgency. I remind members that the member for Hanson asked whether the Premier was aware of allegations to the effect that the Government had stepped in and prevented a sale of Moore's building to an Adelaide businessman. That refers to Mr. Jack Weinert, a well-known Adelaide developer, who was largely responsible for the development of the Central Market complex.

The Premier was asked whether there was any basis in fact for these claims. The Premier said, "No, there is no basis in fact for these claims. The Government did not step in." He said that Moore's was on the market, and the Superannuation Trust decided to buy it. He said, "It is not true that the Government stepped in to overcome the free market situation in any way." Well he might say that, as it is consistent with the rhetoric of his Party before and subsequent to the election. However, this was an astonishing answer, given what has already been made public about the state of negotiations at the time the Superannuation Trust made its offer.

We should not be diverted by the Premier's careful use of the name of the trust—the Superannuation Trust. As I will show, the Premier told Mr. Weinert that the Government was buying the building. Leaving that aside, does anyone believe that the Superannuation Trust would speculate on the building of law courts and embark on such a purchase without assured knowledge that the

Government indeed had a use in mind for the building that would enable a proper and sufficient return. On the contrary, all the evidence points to the fact that the trust was either instructed, or it was suggested to it, that the purchase of the building was appropriate and that the Government would provide tenants for it. The Government changed its well publicised decision not to use the building, and used the financial device of the trust to acquire it. Last Wednesday, following that remarkable reply from the Premier, I contacted a number of the principals in the group who have been trying to make the Government see reason on this issue.

I read what the Premier had said, and their response was immediate and unequivocal. Indeed, I shall quote the exact words of one of them, and the member for Hanson might like to note this, considering the Premier's reply. This person said, "There is no question that he [the Premier] is lying through his back teeth." They are not my words, but they demonstrate the depth of feeling on this issue, and they illustrate the frustrations of people who have been so adversely affected by the Government's action. Evidence for this is contained in correspondence which has been provided to me by principals in this matter following the Premier's misleading reply in this matter, and which has been given with the full authority of those principals to use in the course of this debate.

Let us put this in its historical context. By 18 December last negotiations for the sale of the Moore's building to Mr. Weinert were well advanced. Mr. Weinert had first expressed interest in the building late in September, and formally began negotiating with Mr. Baker, the agent for Charles Moore Ltd., on 10 October. The Charles Moore company had already accepted an offer for the building made by the former Labor Government. That has been made clear, and has been restated a number of times since (we have never attempted to hide the fact). That offer, which was much lower than that made by this Government, was conveyed in writing on 17 August and accepted by Moore's, again in writing, on 27 August.

One of the first decisions of the new Government was to reverse that decision. Mr. Baker was advised in writing on 26 September, just seven days after the Government was sworn into office, that the new Government did not desire to continue with the arrangement to purchase—quite clear and unequivocal. He was thus free to deal with a private buyer; he had it in writing that the Government was not going to step in and acquire the building, so he could proceed to work in the private sector.

This was confirmed by the Premier's public statements made when Moore's announced that it was closing its store. In the *Advertiser* of 11 December, the Premier is reported as saying that the building was unlikely to be used by Government departments. There was little he could do, he said, as the decision was one for the company. In the *Sunday Mail* of 16 December he is quoted (even more unequivocally) as saying, "The State Government does not have any plans for buying the building." Note the date: Sunday 16 December. This was the context in which Mr. Weinert was conducting his negotiations, one of written and public statements by the Government saying it was not interested in buying Moore's. That was confirmed personally by the Premier to Mr. Weinert at a public function they both attended on the night of Tuesday the 11th.

Mr. Baker met with Mr. Weinert on the morning of the 18th, that is the Tuesday after the *Sunday Mail* article had contained that unequivocal statement by the Premier. I will read a passage of a letter from Mr. Weinert to Mr. Baker in which he sets out the sequence of events on that day, as follows:

On the morning of 18 December, in my office, and in the presence of my secretary, you outlined Moore's revised requirements on the sale briefly, such as they were prepared to leave the carpets, and also pay out Claude Neon, and I agreed with all other commitments. This you will remember, as you read the minute from the board meeting of Moore's, and it also explained the method of transferring the property, which was agreed by Moore's board. I accepted.

At that moment we received a telephone call for you, which was taken in my office. After finishing the call, you said, "I have never been put in this position before, but I have been told that the Government will be purchasing Charles Moore's unconditionally": For some half an hour or more we [Mr. Weinert and Mr. Baker] discussed this generally, because I had accepted, and I telephoned, in your presence, the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, as neither of us could believe that something like this could happen at a minute's notice, when only two to three days before the Government had stated that they were not interested. Mr. Tonkin, when I asked, stated, "Yes, the Government had changed its mind, and was purchasing Moore's building." I repeated to him, "Do you mean to say the Government is purchasing Moore's?" He said, "Yes." I stated that I could hardly believe it, and out of courtesy he could have at least telephoned me, knowing that I had had discussions with him only three days before, and told him I would be purchasing and had agreed to Moore's price of \$2 300 000.

Clearly, from that, Mr. Weinert was left high and dry at the final stage of his negotiations. Mr. Baker then left, but as the next passage of Mr. Weinert's letter makes clear, it was not until mid-afternoon that he discovered that his purchaser was the trust. Mr. Weinert's letter states:

You subsequently left our office at approximately 11.20 a.m. and told us that you would report back immediately you had something definite. It was not until 7 p.m. that you telephoned me at home to advise that you had sold the building, but at 2 p.m. you found the purchaser to be the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

The sudden intervention by the Government is confirmed by Mr. Baker's reply to that letter, dated 16 January 1980. Members should bear in mind that these letters trace a disagreement between these two men which revolves around whether Baker had acted improperly in his dealings with Weinert. But there is no disagreement over the impact which the telephone call made on the negotiations, and that is the crucial point when we examine the Premier's reply last week to the member for Hanson. I will read the account of the agent, Mr. Baker:

Until the telephone call at your office I had no idea that the Superannuation Board would be interested and, even when I was requested to attend a meeting that afternoon with them, I had no idea what their role would be bearing in mind that the contact with the Valuer-General's Office indicated that the Government had changed their minds and would after all be the purchasers.

The Premier may wish to argue that this does not constitute an intervention.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Are you going to read the whole of that?

Mr. BANNON: I will indeed. In his reply to the member for Hanson the Premier referred to the free market situation. But when he spoke to Mr. Weinert on the morning of the 18th he said, "Yes, the Government had changed its mind." In astonishment Weinert asked the Premier again, "Do you mean to say that the Government is purchasing Moore's?" The Premier's reply was "Yes". This he says is no intervention; this was simply the trust entering the market as one of the free market bidders for the building. Would he have us believe that the trust acted under its own volition?

Will the Premier deny that the Government had decided to put courts in the Moore's building (for reasons best known to itself), and then used the trust as a financial device to carry through its intervention? As Mr. Barker, the Moore's agent, says in his letter:

Even when I was requested to attend a meeting that afternoon with them [the Superannuation Board] I had no idea what their role would be bearing in mind that the contact indicated that the Government had changed their minds and would after all be the purchasers.

The crucial issue is why Baker did not return to Weinert and give him the chance to raise his offer. Why, given that he had been engaged in hard bargaining for over a month with Weinert, did he immediately take the Government's offer, which, after all, was only \$100 000 up on what Weinert was offering? Make no mistake, there had been hard bargaining; the two parties had started quite away apart before coming to the figure of about \$2 300 000. In his letter of 14 January 1980 to Mr. Baker, Mr. Weinert says:

You know within 10 days you had brought me from my first offer of \$2 000 000 to \$2 300 000 so certainly another \$100 000 or \$200 000 would not have stopped me, but you did not give me the opportunity.

The answer is in Mr. Baker's letter of 16 January, in which he writes:

It seems to me quite obvious that, if a Government makes up its mind that it wants something, then one could visualise a long-winded process possibly ending up in resumption.

Resumption is a word he used to indicate compulsory acquisition. The letter continues:

In my view it would have been wrong and against my client's interest to hold a Dutch auction. I doubt if there was any realistic possibility of you making any kind of offer with the threat of possible resumption hanging over the property. If it had come to resumption, my clients and myself would have been embarrassed in any compensation claim by the obvious fact that we had an earlier contract with the outgoing Government at a lower price and on less advantageous conditions relating to licensees in particular.

That is an interesting extra fact which indicates just how bad was the deal that was finally entered into by the current Government in relation to the purchase of the building.

Mr. Baker is clearly an experienced property agent and, to give him his due, he obtained a price close to what Moore's originally wanted, and certainly in excess of what he had been prepared to accept from the Corcoran Government.

In other words, even if he did give Weinert the chance to bid again, the finish was already fixed. "It seems to me quite obvious," he said, "that if a Government makes up its mind that it wants something, then one could visualise a long-winded process possibly ending in resumption." Mr. Weinert has the final word to say on this when he points out:

You accepted the Superannuation Fund without coming back to me because you were under the impression that, if you had not agreed to sell to the Superannuation Fund, the Government would have acquired the building under its power.

There is no doubt in their minds that the Government had intervened. There is no doubt that a free market situation no longer existed. There is no doubt that the Premier was not speaking the truth last Wednesday in reply to the member for Hanson. Why does this issue persist? It persists because it was a bad decision which the Government refuses to re-examine or modify.

There are so many things wrong with the Moore's decision, and I will briefly summarise some of them. The

building is not suitable for law courts. Its structure will require extensive modification. Its location will mean there is a security problem. The use of the building for law courts destroys the vital retail outlet on the square. Moore's is a shop window, a front window, to the businesses in the Central Market and in Gouger and Grote Streets. They have spent around \$250 000 a year in promoting the area. Already, business is down quite markedly as a result of Moore's closure.

Employment opportunities are being lost in the retail industry. Despite the best efforts of the Moore's company, only 25 of the 150 people who were working there have found work. Development of Moore's will be incompatible with the future development of an international hotel in the area. Again, there are problems of security and the need for cell blocks in close proximity. Renovations will be far more costly than figures so far put forward by the Government suggest, particularly if it finds it needs to overcome the security problems, to construct an underground subway entrance for prisoners.

It will place a financial burden on S.G.I.C., which planned on its building having a number of courts leased from it by the Government. It is unjust and unfair to the traders who operate from within Moore's—Arturo Taverna, for instance, who is losing so much money at the moment. He is unable to find out with whom he should negotiate with regard to compensation for the lease he still holds. Interestingly enough, the Superannuation Trust has sent him to the Attorney-General. Many alternatives are open to the Government; there are many ways it can get out of it. The working party the Premier has established should look, as a matter of first urgency, to retention of that retail area for lease-back by the Superannuation Fund, if necessary, to make quite sure that all the bad things that have flowed from this do not remain. I return to the basic point—the Premier clearly misled us in relation to the free market forces.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I am absolutely amazed at the Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You always are.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have not had much of an opportunity to be amazed at the Opposition, other than for its lack of activity since the session resumed. I have no reason to become excited right now, but I am still amazed. It has taken more than a week for some sort of activity to be generated from the other side of the House. It has perhaps been stimulated by the revelation that was made in this House last week that the previous Government had an option on the property which, if it had been exercised, would have led to the Charles Moore's site being used for an international hotel, and to the demolition of the building.

The hypocrisy of the concern which is now being shown by these shining knights in white armour (or something) over this whole matter is quite absurd. They, in fact, were members of a Government that had an option to buy the building for its demolition. This motion is therefore absolutely amazing. It may not have been the revelation made in the House last week which has stimulated this motion. Perhaps it was just that the Opposition was ashamed of its performance last week.

Mr. Bannon: There was a natural disaster.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, the Opposition is certainly a natural disaster; I totally agree with the Leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It has been said that this matter has been brought back to centre stage by the member for Hanson. The Leader qualified all that he said

this afternoon by saying "given what has been made public". The Leader seems to intimate that this was a sudden decision taken by the Government. He, as a member of the previous Government, would have known full well that the Superannuation Trust had been looking at the whole question of using Moore's for law courts in the term of his Government. The situation had been inquired into most thoroughly. The proposition had been considered by the Government, although I am not sure whether it had gone to Cabinet; it probably had not.

The point was that the previous Government had this information available to it and would have been making a decision on it, but for one thing—its tremendous anxiety to finally get something moving on the international hotel scheme. Because of that anxiety, an option to purchase Moore's to make it available for an international hotel consortium took precedence over that other scheme.

It just does not add up. The things that the Leader has said as a member of the previous Government shows either that he has an enormous gap in his memory or that it suits him not to remember.

This was not a sudden decision by my Government. The matter had been considered by the previous Government and had been wiped out by, I suspect, an over-riding authority to obtain it for the international hotel. As I said the other day, that was the first docket that came across my desk, but it was the docket that was turned down, and the option was not followed through. We were given an opinion by the Crown Law Department, which said that we were perfectly able to withdraw from that deal, which, in my view, would have been totally wrong and improper. The building would have been demolished, the facade would have been lost, and the marble staircase would also have been lost for all time. So it was not a sudden decision. The Leader states that someone is saying that the Premier is lying through his teeth. It is surprising that he is not prepared to state who that person is. I challenge him to say who it is.

Mr. Bannon: He'll tell you himself.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If he does, I hope he does so in front of witnesses, because I will have a great deal of pleasure in taking the necessary action.

Nobody other than Mr. Weinert has been identified by the Leader. I understand that other people were involved in that consortium, but as Mr. Weinert was the negotiating principal I would have thought that he should figure. The Government had certainly decided that it would not buy the site to proceed with an international hotel; it decided that it would not, and it said that it would not. But it was only at the stage that the discussions and plans, which had been gone into very thoroughly before, came to the attention of the Government again, and the alternative proposition, which had been considered by the previous Government (the information was available to it) on the transition of Moore's into law courts, was once again presented to Cabinet as a most desirable matter. All that work had been done during the time of the previous Government.

It has been said that Mr. Weinert said that he had discussions with the Premier and that I had confirmed publicly that the Government did not intend to buy the building. I certainly did say that the Government did not intend to buy the building, because that was its intention at that time. The Government had certainly decided that it would not purchase the building for an international hotel. I repeat: if, indeed, Mr. Weinert, who spoke to me on two occasions, believes that anything I said to him was an indication of the Government intention, he is mistaken, because I would not at any time give anyone in the community, most improperly, any inside information on

the Government's intentions. These matters properly belong in Cabinet. I would not tell him anything which may give him any reason whatever to have any information that he should not properly have. What interpretation he chose to put on what I said is entirely his affair, and not mine.

I place on record also that the other conversation that I had with Mr. Weinert concerned Moore's to the extent of how soon the Government would be prepared to grant a casino licence for the building. To do the Leader justice, I think he may have been conned a little, but nevertheless that is the issue. Cabinet decided to make an offer for the scheme to convert Moore's into law courts. That offer was made. The crucial issue which the Leader says exists is the question why the agent did not come back to Mr. Weinert and have further negotiations with him. The fact was that the agent had had long and protracted negotiations with Mr. Weinert.

I find it fascinating that the Leader should read from a letter from the agent. He read the pieces that have been underlined, I presume by Mr. Weinert, and he stopped short of reading the rest. Mr. Weinert gave us a copy of the letter. I think I should read the next paragraph, because it states:

I maintain that my statement that you had adequate opportunity to buy the property is true in every respect. Between the receipt of my letter of 10 October and my discussions with you during December, you could have formed a view of what the property was worth to you and closed the deal.

That is exactly the case.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Two months!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Mr. Weinert had two months to negotiate, to make an acceptable offer or, indeed, to pay the asking price if he had wanted to, but he did not choose to do so. The Leader talks about resumption and about visualising a long-winded process. That is absolutely ridiculous. No mention was made of resumption or of any Government activity. The Government considered the matter that was put to it by the Superannuation Board, and the board then made an offer, which the agent was pleased to accept, because he was not getting anywhere with Mr. Weinert. The Government did not interfere. The point is that Mr. Weinert was trying to drive a very hard bargain indeed.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That is called free enterprise!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed; I thank the member for Mitchell; it is free enterprise. The Superannuation Board came into the operation with another open offer, which was accepted—and that is free enterprise, too. Mr. Weinert, I repeat, was trying to drive a very hard bargain. He was trying to use inside information, and what construction he puts on it is his own business. He missed out on the deal, after all that time of negotiation, and he is sore. The fact that he is sore has been causing him to create as he has been doing ever since. He has the Opposition in an enormously difficult position. Having known about the plans for the law courts beforehand and having known that the building was to be bought by the Government for an international hotel and therefore demolished, the Opposition, nevertheless, has found itself in this extremely interesting position of having to attack the Government for what is a responsible decision.

There is no doubt that there is a pressingly urgent need for additional accommodation for courts in the city of Adelaide. Security arrangements are far from satisfactory in a number of those courts. There is an extreme shortage of civil court accommodation. The Supreme Court and Local Court accommodation is fragmented into seven buildings. The Moore's proposal means that all the courts

in Adelaide will be on the southern and south-western end of Victoria Square. The proposal put together by the previous Government to build on the site west of the Supreme Court would have cost at least \$30 000 000, and our information now is that the cost would have been closer to \$50 000 000.

There are a number of other reasons why the purchase of the Moore's building and its conversion to courts is the best proposition for the people of South Australia. It will save the Government money, it will certainly be a good investment for the Superannuation Board, it will avoid the spending of up to \$50 000 000 to provide similar accommodation in a new building, it will relieve the enormous scarcity of courtroom space, it will cut down on the waiting time for litigation, and there are many other reasons, but those I have given will do for a start. I am not quite sure what was the misleading information given to this House on Wednesday, because the information that was given to this House on Wednesday was entirely and absolutely accurate. The Opposition may be embarrassed when it is made public that it was also considering a plan to convert Moore's into law courts.

It was probably also embarrassing to it to hear that the option to buy the Moore's site for use as an international hotel would have involved the demolition of the building. There is absolutely no foundation in the remarks that the Leader of the Opposition has made today. I think that, for the second successive week, I should give him a little advice. I suggest that he watch carefully the information he is given and that he check it through. I further suggest that he read all of the letters given him for quoting, not only selected parts of them that are pointed out to him. I also suggest that he come clean regarding the activities and the intentions of the Government of which he was formerly a member, particularly as they relate to the matter in hand. I still maintain (and the Minister of Public Works will confirm it) that the Moore's site is, without doubt, the cheapest option open to the Government. It will save a considerable sum of the taxpayer's dollar, and I remind the Leader that it was on that basis that this Government was elected to power so convincingly last September.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): I am surprised at the jaunty approach the Premier has taken to this serious charge made by my Leader. I think that the Premier realises that it is a serious charge and that my Leader had a duty to draw the attention of the House to a number of facts which he has recited to the House. I am concerned even more personally, as the former Premier, about some of the statements the Premier made this afternoon regarding the intention of the Government which I led in connection with the future of the Moore's site.

I will recite the facts to the Premier from memory, because I believe that it would do the House a great service if he were prepared (and I think that he ought to be prepared) to table all the documents relating to the previous transactions entered into by the previous Government with Moore's, or its principals in Melbourne, so that there can be no doubt in the minds of members or the public of South Australia regarding what transpired up until 15 September.

I think that it was in late June that a confidential letter was received from Moore's (and I think that any member could understand the reason for its confidentiality), making an offer to the Government for the purchase of the Moore's property in Victoria Square. I base what I am saying on memory only, because I have not had the advantage of going through the documents which have

been referred to and which I ask the Premier to table. I made a verbal submission to Cabinet, not a written submission, because there was some urgency about the matter, requesting that Cabinet give me authority to ask officers to proceed with the negotiations for the purchase of Moore's. Whether or not I formalised that with a written submission later, I am not certain, but I can say that the original approach to Cabinet and the action taken were based on a verbal submission to Cabinet.

I instructed the Director-General of the Premier's Department to make the necessary arrangements for negotiations to begin. He, naturally, contacted the Land Board; its officers carried out a valuation, and negotiations proceeded. This was only to do with the purchase of the building, and I will give the reasons, so that the Premier may hear them, that I put before Cabinet verbally as to why we ought to purchase Moore's. I believed (and I still hold this view) that, wherever the Government could be involved in the development or character of Victoria Square, it ought to be; that Moore's site was an integral part of the square; and the Government ought to be involved in anything dealing with its future. There was no discussion regarding what we would do with it. I thought that that was the most adequate reason I could give why, in general terms, Cabinet ought to approve of the purchase of the building.

Those negotiations proceeded. Whilst the Premier talks about two months being a long time for Mr. Weinert to negotiate, I think the final report I received from the Director-General was received on either the Friday before the election (14 September) or the Monday after the election, when I asked the Director-General what the situation was concerning the purchase of the Moore's building. He told me that negotiations had been completed, that the price was, I think, \$2 300 000 (I thought originally that it was \$2 100 000), and that a contract would have been drawn up but he had decided, of his own volition and without consulting me, not to proceed with that contract in the light of the election. The price was \$2 300 000. Had there not been an election we would have proceeded to finalise that contract and that would have been the purchase price.

We see, later on, the Superannuation Board purchasing that building for \$2 400 000, so the indecision and incompetence of the Government cost a cool \$100 000.

Mr. Millhouse: And it will cost them a lot more.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Let us proceed with that, because that is also important. There is the first \$100 000 down the drain. So far as any discussion in Cabinet is concerned (and I speak from memory only, and that is why I would like to see the documents involved), there was no formal discussion about what Moore's building would be utilised for after its purchase. Our options were absolutely open. Indeed, I saw a number of things that could have been done with the building. The Premier mentioned one alternative: the building could have been demolished and the site become part of the international hotel. The building could have been retained. I must say that I had no personal knowledge, until I heard the Government's announcement, of any discussion that went on in Government (and that may not be unusual) about its utilisation of the building as law courts. I say frankly that I had no knowledge of that at all. I would expect that, if those discussions as to its use as law courts had reached an advanced stage, I certainly would have known. That was not an option that I had considered.

I had considered the retention of the building and, indeed, leaving the ground floor for shopping, and utilising the top part as a casino with a connection to the international hotel. If people do not believe that, I point

out that I mentioned to the consortium investigating the development of the hotel that there was a possibility that there would be an approach for a casino licence to be granted in South Australia, and that that was one of the things I was interested in. I do not want to go through all the details that would have been necessary to accomplish that because the policy of the Party was well known. It was this: if a private member's resolution was carried in this House that a casino should be established in South Australia then the Government would facilitate legislation to see that that casino was established and would leave the granting of the licence to the court.

I saw that as a distinct possibility, because I hold the view that we would have no problem with the establishment of an international hotel if we could establish a casino in proximity to it. Look what that would have done to generate activity in that part of Victoria Square. That never came to pass, but I am demonstrating to the House and to the Premier, if he will listen, that the Government had not discussed at any stage any detailed plans for the future of that building—contrary to what the Premier has said. That is why it is so important, from my point of view, that the documents that he has talked about that passed his desk (some of the first documents he saw) should be tabled in this House to clear up that point. There is no doubt in my mind that the Government, as it is wont in so many things, hesitated about this matter and then made a hasty decision which it later found it should not have made.

That is not unusual, because it has done that in other areas as well. It decided not to buy. The problem of law courts had been faced by the previous Government for many years. Schemes had been looked at and rejected, but I had not heard of the development of law courts in Moore's building until it was announced by the present Government. I can say that quite honestly. If the Premier can find in these documents anything, anywhere, indicating that detailed discussions took place on the future of this building, which we had not finally purchased, I ask him to table it in this House. In that case, I will stand corrected, but I know that he cannot do so because my memory has never failed me to that extent.

We see the Government in a predicament over the law courts. It got the idea, from wherever it originated, that the site would be suitable for law courts; whether or not that is so I am not going to argue in detail this afternoon. The Government then decided that it could not go back on what it had said about not purchasing the building, because that would look too bad, and the next best thing would be to convince the Superannuation Board that this would be a goer. No doubt it did that. I do not think the Premier actually said so, but there must have been negotiations between the Government and the board before a decision was made for the board to purchase the building for \$2 400 000.

It is evident that the Government was prepared to spend, not on its building but on the Superannuation Board's building, some \$16 000 000, or whatever it will cost to develop the courts, and some arrangement would be made, no doubt about rental or something else, for the board to be taken care of. It seems that the cleanest operation would have been to do what we did with the new office building in Victoria Square which is owned by the Superannuation Board: to let the board build it in its entirety, with the assurance that we would utilise it, as we have done in Victoria Square.

That evidently has not been done but that is apart from the question, too. The question really boils down to this: did the Premier mislead this House last Wednesday or Thursday in a reply to the member for Hanson? It is my

belief that he did. For the Premier to denigrate Mr. Weinert or to be prompted by the Minister of Public Works that Mr. Weinert had had two months in which to finalise these things is not good enough. I wonder how long it would take the Premier, as a private business man, to finalise negotiations involving more than \$2 000 000.

Of course, Mr. Weinert was not aware that he would have pressure at that time. He was not aware until a late stage of the proceedings that anyone else was interested in it. The statement from the Government gave him complete confidence that he could proceed to take his time, which is vital in any negotiations of this magnitude, and complete the negotiations at his leisure. That is an advantage that he received and he deserved it. Yet, right at the last moment those hopes and aspirations were shattered because the Government had a change of mind. It was the Government and not the Superannuation Board, because I know full well that the Superannuation Board would not have entered into something like this unless it had certain concrete assurances from the Government. And, as the Premier said to Mr. Weinert, according to the Leader of the Opposition, it was not indeed the Superannuation Board that was purchasing the property. He said the Government was purchasing the property. That is the truth of the matter.

Private enterprise was not given a fair go in this matter. The Premier often speaks in this House about the great benefits of private enterprise. I notice that a sticker, on the back of a car this morning, stated:

Who would want Tonkin stimulating your private sector?
I do not want to bring any fun into this, because I think it is a serious matter. I think the Premier has a lot more to answer for. He has tried a jaunty and irresponsible way to evade the real question this afternoon; and that question was whether private enterprise was given a fair go, not only about the purchase of the building, which is the critical thing, but also with this so-called working party that is to be set up—another working party! I think the Government is being absolutely consistent in this. Whenever it finds difficulty with any decision it has an inquiry, a working party, or a Royal Commission.

Mr. Millhouse: You did about the same thing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I thought it was about time the member for Mitcham had a say. The Government of which I was the Leader and that of which Mr. Dunstan was Leader made more decisions without inquiries and without working parties than this Government has done so far. The member for Mitcham would have to support that if he is truthful at all. Members of this House should seriously consider the matter raised this afternoon. The Premier's credibility, and the credibility of his Government, is at stake, because he has not satisfied this House with his reply that indeed he did not deceive—and that is the word to be used.

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

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): This afternoon the Opposition has put forward an urgency motion in which it has raised three points. The first was, I presume, a chance to try to attack the Government for failing to justify its reasons for purchasing Moore's building. It was interesting to note that nowhere did the Opposition refer to the many statements the Government has made in justifying that, especially on the cost angle. So, it has almost conceded defeat on the first point of the motion before it has started.

I find the second point now extremely amusing. The motion criticises the Government for failing to allow the Moore's building to be used for retail purposes, and yet

the member for Hartley, in his speech, openly admitted that his Government was considering using the building as a casino—not for retail business, but as a casino. The member for Hartley apparently is not supporting all of this motion. He could be trying to support the third part, but he is not supporting the second part, by his own admission this afternoon. I think it is pertinent at this stage to remember that Mr. Weinert himself was considering the property for use as a casino, and so certainly were some of the city councillors who have been so vocal against the Government. One of those city councillors admitted to me that he thought the Moore's building should be used not for retail development but as a casino. That person now has the hide to try to claim publicly that Moore's should be retained for retailing.

The third point the Opposition has levelled at the Government this afternoon is that the Premier misled the House last Wednesday. I presume that members opposite have been trying to argue that it was a compulsory acquisition which was quite unfair to the private sector. I think the Premier has more than answered that.

Once again I bring to the attention of the House and the public what I think is the real assessment, and that is the assessment of the person who is dealing with the transaction. I refer to Mr. Baker, who is the agent acting on behalf of Moore's. Who else, as an independent person, should we go to rather than someone who was in the midst of all negotiations, and not just on one side, like Mr. Weinert? I would suggest we could not pick a fairer, more independent person than the agent.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who was he agent for?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Moore's.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How could he be independent?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: He was conducting the purchase. It was the agent himself—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The debate so far has been commendable. There has been some interjecting, which is natural. I ask the House not to allow the debate to deteriorate at this late stage.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It was the agent himself who admitted that the building was on the market for the highest bidder, whether it be the Government or any other private purchaser. It was very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition, in reading out the letter from Mr. Baker to Mr. Weinert, stopped just before the critical paragraph in which Mr. Baker admitted that. Why did the Leader of the Opposition deliberately leave it out, even though I challenged him to read the entire letter, as he said earlier he would? He left it out deliberately, because it completely destroyed the very point he was trying to make, and that Mr. Weinert has made.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That part of the letter has been read to the House by the Premier. Also, I have a letter from Mr. Baker of 18 January in which Mr. Baker makes exactly the same point, as follows:

My client sold the property for a price they felt was fair. The property was offered to other prospective buyers at a price of \$2 500 000 with an indication that offers would be considered. No better offer than that accepted was ever made or appeared in prospect at that time, and parties who complained that they never had a fair opportunity are incorrect. The property was readily available from mid-October 1979.

That is from Mr. Baker himself.

In the short time I have left, I return to the first point,

which is really the crux of the entire argument—why did the Government go ahead and purchase the property? Three alternatives were available to the Government for development of the courts: the first was the decentralisation proposal, which included a number of sites, particularly the Sturt Street site, the S.G.I.C. building site, and the three-storey building behind the existing Supreme Court. That proposal, especially the Sturt Street part of it, was rejected by the City of Adelaide Planning Commission on 3 October last year. That is why the Government therefore assessed alternative sites, because the proposal that the previous Government was planning to proceed with was rejected by the City of Adelaide Planning Commission as being against the principles of the development of Adelaide.

The second proposal was the western courts proposal, which had been put forward over a number of years and which was rejected by the then Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth, in 1977 in a letter to the judge in which he admitted (and there are subsequent dockets to prove this) that the western courts proposal was being stopped because it was too expensive. Our present estimates, based on an independent assessment by professional architects, show that the western courts building would cost at least \$30 000 000. Based on a similar assessment of estimated costs by the same architects, it would appear that the South Australian Government will save between \$7 000 000 and \$10 000 000 by developing the Moore's site instead.

The former Premier criticised the Government because it cost an extra \$100 000 to buy the Moore's building compared with the option the previous Government had. I point out we are now saving the South Australian public between \$7 000 000 and \$10 000 000.

The next proposal put forward by the Leader of the Opposition related to the Torrens building. He wrote a letter to the editor asking why the Government did not develop the Torrens building. If he had asked an architect first he would have found out that all the internal walls are load-bearing, and it is not possible to develop that building for courts. We have looked at other ways of developing a cheaper alternative to the western courts proposal. We have found that we cannot put up any building whatsoever that comes near the cost of the Moore's proposal.

I conclude by referring to a statement made to me by one of the members of the consortium that, with Mr. Weinert, was trying to buy the Moore's building. He said, after the purchase, "The Government has got an absolute bargain. You have bought it fairly on the open market. I do not blame you for going in and buying the building at that price. It is cheap, whether it is used for courts, retail development or office accommodation." That is why the South Australian Government went in and purchased it.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Who said that?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Members of the consortium. The Government bought that building because it was saving substantial sums of money for the South Australian Government. After all, that is the ground on which we asked to be elected and it is the ground on which we were elected.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung, the motion was withdrawn.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The principal object of this Bill is to introduce a probationary licence system similar to that which exists in the majority of other States of Australia. Victoria and Western Australia introduced a probationary licence system in 1964, Tasmania in 1965, New South Wales in 1966, Queensland in 1970 and the Northern Territory in 1974. Consideration was first given to introducing the system in South Australia in 1967 but was deferred in favour of the points demerit scheme which had regard to erring drivers of all ages and not only to new drivers. The purpose of the probationary system is primarily educational, in that it creates a greater awareness in a new driver of his responsibilities, not only in his own behaviour but in his behaviour towards others. The probationary driver will be required to observe road traffic rules including all speed limits and for the period that he is a probationary driver to drive at a speed no greater than 80 kilometres per hour. One of the major factors in the cause of accidents is the speed at which vehicles are driven, and under this scheme the new driver will be restricted to driving at a speed which relates to his experience as a driver. He will be required to display "P" plates to distinguish him from other drivers.

The scheme anticipates that the good driving habits created during this probationary period will continue after the driver is granted a full unrestricted licence. In common with most States the basic principles are the issue of a probationary licence to any person who has not previously held a licence or has not held a licence for three years, and cancellation of that licence upon conviction for any one of a number of traffic offences, or conviction for a breach of the conditions of the licence. The probationary licence will be issued for a period of one year. If the licence is cancelled, a waiting period of three months must be served before again being eligible to apply for another probationary licence. A right of appeal against cancellation is provided. The same provisions are to apply to holders of learners permits, as it would be an anomalous situation if learner drivers were to be subject to less stringent conditions than probationary drivers.

The Bill also seeks to broaden the powers of the consultative committee appointed pursuant to section 139b of the Act. Drivers who have been convicted of an offence or a series of offences involving the use of a motor vehicle or who otherwise behave in a manner suggesting they may be unfit to hold a licence are interviewed by the consultative committee. The committee already has the power to recommend the cancellation of a licence or to recommend that the Registrar refuse to issue or renew a licence. Their powers are to be extended to allow them to recommend suspension of a licence or the issue of a probationary licence to persons who come to their attention. As a corollary to the probationary licence system, the Bill also provides for the creation of an offence under the regulations where a person who is not a learner driver or a probationary driver drives a vehicle to which "L" plates or "P" plates are affixed. I believe that the probationary licence system is most worth while and will play a significant part in the preparation of new drivers for today's traffic conditions, and in reducing the risk of accidents involving young inexperienced drivers.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to

come into operation on a day to be proclaimed. It is envisaged at this point that the Act will be proclaimed three months after it is passed. Clause 3 provides that section 98b of the principal Act, which is the demerit points provision, applies in relation to the holder of a learner's permit. Clause 4 inserts two new sections in the principal Act. New section 81a provides that a person who has not held a driver's licence at some time during the previous three years (either in this State or in another State or country) must be given a so-called "probationary licence" for the first twelve months of driving on a full licence. The section also applies to a person who comes from interstate with a current probationary licence issued in that other State, the intention being that such a person will only be issued with a probationary licence for the requisite number of months to make up a total "offence free" probation period of twelve months.

The section thirdly applies to any person who has had his licence cancelled under these new provisions. The two conditions to which a probationary driver will be subject (in addition of course to any other conditions that may be imposed under any other section of the Act) are, first, that he will not exceed the speed of 80 kilometres per hour on any road in any part of the State and, secondly, that his vehicle must bear "P" plates. It will be an offence for any person to contravene these conditions, the penalty being a maximum of two hundred dollars. It should be made clear that this section refers only to the holder of a driver's licence. Similar conditions will be imposed upon all learners' permits pursuant to section 75a of the Act and so specific amendment is not needed in this area. It is not intended to endorse probationary conditions upon learners' permits issued for the purpose of enabling a non-probationary driver to gain a further classification on his licence.

New section 81b provides for the cancellation of a learner's permit or driver's licence endorsed with probationary conditions where the holder breaches either of the probationary conditions, or where he incurs three or more demerit points (whether for one offence or as an aggregate in respect of a number of offences committed on different occasions). The Registrar is obliged to cancel a permit or licence in those circumstances, whether or not the driver is by then the holder of a full (i.e., non-probationary) licence. The Registrar will specify in the notice of cancellation the day upon which the cancellation is to take effect. A person who has had his permit or licence cancelled under this section is not permitted to apply for a fresh permit or licence until the expiration of three months. If he is currently disqualified or has had his licence suspended, he of course cannot apply for a new permit or licence until that disqualification or suspension has expired.

It should be pointed out that the effect of cancellation is that the person no longer holds a permit or licence, and so, if he drives a motor vehicle on a road, he will be guilty of the offence of driving without a licence contrary to the provisions of section 74 of the Act, which carries a maximum penalty of two hundred dollars. It is intended that before a person can get a fresh licence he will be required under section 80 of the Act to undergo a practical driving test. Where the holder of a learner's permit has his permit cancelled under this section, it is up to the Registrar in his discretion to decide whether that person should undergo a written test again before he is issued with a fresh permit. A right of appeal is given against cancellation of a driver's licence under this section, on the ground of undue hardship, but it should be noted that this right is not afforded to a person who is still on a learner's permit at the time of cancellation. Where an appeal

succeeds, the probationary period is to be extended, or a fresh probationary period imposed, for the period of one year from the time when liability for cancellation arose (i.e., conviction of the offence that gave rise to cancellation). A person who has had an appeal allowed is not permitted to appeal against any subsequent cancellation for a period of one year from the determination of that successful appeal.

Clause 5 empowers the consultative committee to direct the Registrar to suspend a licence or learner's permit, or to impose a period of probation, where a driver has committed offences or otherwise behaved in a manner that shows him to be unfit to hold a permit or licence. Clause 6 obliges the court to notify the Registrar of any conviction of the offence of contravening a condition of a permit or licence, thus enabling the Registrar effectively to carry out his duty to cancel permits or licences under new section 81b. Clause 7 empowers the Governor to make regulations relating to prohibiting persons from driving vehicles bearing "L" plates or "P" plates unless they are the holders of a learner's permit or a probationary licence.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 21 February. Page 1161.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I take the opportunity of congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on being elected to the highest office that the Parliament can bestow on one of its members. I congratulate all the members and new Ministers who have taken their places since the election. It is pleasing to see the way in which they are going about their duties. I am sure that the people of South Australia are very pleased to have representing them people who are so concerned with their welfare. I was grateful again to receive the confidence of the people of Eyre in returning me with an increased majority, unlike the situation of the member for Elizabeth, who is smiling. I understand that he and his other left-wing colleagues had their majorities considerably reduced. It was pleasing to see the people in his area and other parts of the State recognise the dangers that they present to the people of South Australia.

An honourable member: It was cut by 13 per cent.

Mr. GUNN: That is a significant swing against the honourable member. I am pleased that the Government has already commenced to act on a number of its election undertakings, namely, succession duties and other areas of taxation. I will have a little more to say about that later. It has been interesting to gauge the reaction of the Opposition, and particularly to listen to the comments of some of the older members, as well as some of the new members on the opposite side. On Thursday we had a lengthy speech from the member for Elizabeth. It was interesting to listen to what he had to say. He was criticising this debate, saying that it was of little value. I find that rather interesting because, if the honourable member does not know how to use this debate on behalf of his constituents or for the benefit of the people of this State, I am rather surprised. I would have thought that someone who has been a Minister for a number of years and who has now been rejected would have a number of things to put to this House that would at least be constructive.

It was interesting to note during the honourable member's comments that he was at sixes and sevens with his Leader. I understand that the Leader was going to

support this motion, but the member for Elizabeth is opposed to it. We are aware that he is the contender (the crown prince) for the Leader's position, and that he is just waiting for the opportune time to depose him.

An honourable member: With or without orange flower water.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, with or without it. However, I suggest to the honourable member that he give his very close attention to the measures that the Government will be putting into operation in the near future. I am looking forward to his support when the Government sets up committees to examine the Budget and Loan Estimates, which committees will allow members of this House some involvement in what Government departments are doing. I agree that the manner in which Opposition members conducted themselves during the Budget debate and the Loan Estimates debate clearly proves that they were not only negative but that they had very little to talk about. The type of questions asked by former Ministers, people who had been out of office for only a few weeks, clearly indicated either that they had very short memories or that they did not know what was going on in their own departments. I think that it was probably a bit of both. I suggest to the member for Elizabeth and other members that they ought to go back through *Hansard* and read some of the comments they made. Some of the questions they asked were, in my view, quite childish, and had little relationship to the proper management of the affairs of this State.

A matter that has received great prominence over the past few weeks is the issue of land rights for the Pitjantjatjara people in the North of this State. It is rather interesting to look at the attitude expressed by the new Opposition. If there has ever been a confidence trick played, it has been played by the current Opposition. The attitude of members opposite on this matter and the manner in which they have conducted themselves in Opposition made it clear to me that not only were they divided in Government but they set out to hoodwink the Aboriginal people.

The original legislation was introduced in Parliament on 22 November 1978. It was referred to a Select Committee and considered, and then reported upon by the Select Committee. The Bill lapsed and was again placed on the Notice Paper for 24 May. Between 24 May and the time when Parliament was prorogued for the election, we had nine full sitting days, and during that time the Labor Party took no action whatsoever to bring that matter to a vote. The Labor Party had the numbers in this House; the only thing that stopped it was that it had no intention of bringing that matter to a debate, because it was concerned about the implications and there were Ministers in the previous Government who were not prepared to see the matter finalised. They wanted to tie up some agreements before that legislation went through, because they believed that, if the legislation went through as presented to this House, it would be detrimental to the future development of this State.

Mr. Keneally: But you support that report?

Mr. GUNN: I did not sign a report of the Select Committee. Go and check your facts. The Government made no attempt to put the matter to a vote in this House. All the crocodile tears which are being shed around the country are really an attempt to cover up the Labor Party's inactivity. If the Party was so sincere about this measure, why did it not reserve some of the Parliamentary time during that period, and why did it not put the matter to a vote?

The member for Elizabeth and other members have got up and bleated in this House, but they have given no

reason why this matter was not put to a vote, and it is on their conscience.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Because there was other legislation to be dealt with, as you know.

Mr. Keneally: And we thought we would be back in Government after September, didn't we?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: This is a very serious matter, and I am sorry that members opposite are not treating it seriously. They are endeavouring to engage in political point scoring. During the election campaign, when I was visiting various parts of my electorate, I had it put to me in one area in the North-West by a prominent spokesman of the Aborigines that he was concerned at the undue delay. I said that I knew of no reason why the matter had been delayed.

Mr. Keneally: Did you tell him that you supported the report?

Mr. GUNN: I told him there and then (and I made it quite clear to that person) that the Liberal Party supported an inalienable freehold title to the land currently held by the Aborigines. After the meeting I made it clear to the adviser, so that there could be no misunderstanding of what we had to say. To make sure that there was no misunderstanding, I contacted my secretary and asked her to inform the Leader of the Opposition exactly what my comments were on that occasion. I was accompanied by a colleague so that there would be no misunderstanding, as the last thing that I and my colleagues wanted to do was raise the expectations of the Aboriginal community unduly. Unfortunately, their expectations were raised previously, and they were the victims of a confidence trick by the Labor Party. The Labor Party set out to promise them the world, and then deliberately failed to honour its undertakings.

Following the Labor Party's failure to carry on with the legislation, it was interesting to make some inquiries about just what had been promised and what the effects of this legislation were going to be. It was brought to my attention that the Labor Party intended to give away the unnamed conservation park in the North-West of South Australia—a considerable area. I understand that a Minister in the previous Government received a certificate in relation to its value as a conservation area. I understand that that area was to be transferred to the Aboriginal community. I do not know whether the communities were told, but before that course of action could be put into effect the approval of both Houses of Parliament would have been necessary.

What members of the Labor Party have not told the community generally in this State is that over the last few months of their Government (and I believe over the last 12 to 18 months) mining exploration has been taking place in that unnamed conservation park. We have heard no bleatings from ex-Premier Dunstan and his colleagues about the mining exploration that took place in that park, and also in other areas out from Maralinga where considerable exploration activity has taken place. An announcement was made by the Deputy Premier in relation to granting exploration licences for an area in the North of South Australia, and one would have thought from the reaction that the Government had decided to allow massive strip mining operations throughout the whole of the North-West Reserve. The type of activity which was stirred up by certain A.L.P. organisations, and other organisations that traditionally support the A.L.P., was not only misleading but in my view was quite dishonest. The Government has never supported operations of a willy-nilly type. We believe that the Aboriginal community should be consulted.

Mr. Dunstan is now going around the country telling

people about the terrible things this Government will do, yet the Government of which he was the Leader allowed mineral exploration in very large tracts of the North.

Mr. Keneally: What do you mean by consultation? Do you mean that you will talk to them and tell them what will happen?

Mr. GUNN: I understand that that is how Mr. Hudson and the Labor Party carried on, but this Government certainly has not carried on in that way. To this stage, there have been lengthy discussions with the Pitjantjatjara people, with which I have been involved.

Mr. Hemmings: They aren't very happy.

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member will be patient for just a few minutes, I will comment about that matter. The Aborigines and the Premier have put certain points of view in the discussions in which I have been involved, but after the discussions certain spokesmen have been shooting off their mouths, making all sorts of statements.

Mr. Keneally: Are you referring to Mr. Thompson as one of those spokesmen?

Mr. GUNN: Certain statements have been made and I was surprised, to say the very least, at the tenor of those statements. I am fully aware that many people are endeavouring to get in on the act.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member has had an opportunity to speak, and I am taking my opportunity now. I was at Victoria Park racecourse when a European gentleman became quite agitated with me and cast aspersions on the point of view I held on certain matters. When I inquired whether he had been to the area or whether he had any knowledge of it, I found that he had absolutely no knowledge of the area whatever. It was apparent that he and others were trying to get in on the act. They had to have a cause of some sort; it did not matter what it was, whether they knew anything about it, or whether they were helping the Pitjantjatjara people. As long as they got in on the act they were happy. I made an interesting assessment in looking around on that occasion at Victoria Park to see who was there—how many Aborigines and how many Europeans.

Mr. Randall: The member for Napier was not there.

Mr. GUNN: No, he was not. It was interesting to see who were the spokesmen. People stood up on that occasion and said that they wanted a Bill introduced that was identical to the one introduced by the previous Government. One of the people who spoke on an earlier occasion told me about problems relating to the payment of royalties, and wanted amendments moved to the Bill. I agreed entirely with the suggestions he made then, and I will explain my reasons later. I believe that the people who have been advising the Aborigines about many matters have, unfortunately, not been giving the correct information. They have been giving information that is not in the long-term interests of the Aboriginal community or in the interests of the people of this State in general. Any Government has to consider the welfare of minority groups as well as the welfare of the total South Australian community.

I do not believe that, had the Labor Party been completely united or happy about the legislation, the then Minister of Mines and Energy would have allowed the Director-General to give the evidence that he gave to the Select Committee. I do not believe that any senior public servant would give to a Select Committee information of this nature unless he had the approval of his Minister. Every member should read carefully what Mr. Webb, a senior, respected and responsible public servant, had to say. Mr. Webb gave very strong evidence in relation to this matter. I do not believe that he would have been prepared

to go on public record, making the statements he did, unless he had the support of his Minister, because otherwise he would have been sticking his neck out. As a responsible public servant, I do not think he would have been prepared to do that.

Mr. Keneally: Not under a Liberal Government; there was more flexibility under the previous Government, of course.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is living in cloud cuckoo land.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Stuart to refrain from interjecting as consistently as he is doing. It is recognised that, in the Address in Reply debate, there will be some interjection, but interjections from the honourable member have been excessive and I do not wish to hear from him again.

Mr. GUNN: On page 145 of the evidence of the Select Committee, the Chairman and I asked the witness a series of questions. I asked Mr. Webb a question about his refusing to allow a group of people to go to the area, and he answered:

In view of the importance of mineral exploration and development to the State, the increasing constraints arising out of environmental requirements and proposed land rights legislation are continuing causes for concern. There is a need for a proper balance to be effected in the determination of these issues if overall public interests are to be achieved.

He also stated:

I support the view of the A.M.I.C.

That statement referred to a submission made by the mining interests relating to the effect of this legislation. Mr. Webb was concerned about the large area of South Australia that was to be tied up because the Department of Mines and Energy had not had the opportunity to carry out much work in the area. I asked him:

You referred to third parties; what do you mean by that?

He answered:

When we were in the area and dealing with the people themselves, we were able to make arrangements and employ them to do all the normal things. We have had some difficulties recently with the Department for Community Welfare.

I am not surprised that he had problems with the Department for Community Welfare. I would not be surprised if there had been trouble with environmentalists. I make clear that I am concerned about environmentalists. I believe that irresponsible environmentalists are an impediment to the proper development of this State. Some people who are charging around all sections of South Australia with little practical knowledge about the mining, agricultural and pastoral industries are a real impediment. It is time the Government clipped these people's wings, otherwise this State will not develop in a way that will be in the best interests of everyone in South Australia.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting to note that Opposition members are so interested in this debate and in the problems associated with the Pitjantjatjara people that there have been only two of them present in the Chamber. Now, only one is present, namely, the new member for Norwood, who, I am sure, is enjoying his brief return to the House, as it will be only short-lived. I am sure that, at the next opportunity, the electors of Norwood will realise how well they were served by Mr. Webster. My colleagues and I look forward to having him back after the next election as a supporter of the Government.

I have been referring to some of the evidence. During the evidence given by the Pitjantjatjara council,

particularly by its legal adviser, I asked a question of Mr. Toyne, as follows:

Do you believe that no national interest could be considered, so as to allow mining for a particular period, that could not take place in any circumstances?

He said:

No. The Pitjantjatjara council is not likely to sympathetically view that proposal. Their best interest is served by their having absolute discretion on whether mining takes place.

I thought that that, in itself, was an interesting comment to make, because it clearly indicates that they believe that the Minister of the day should have no overriding authority. As I understand the land rights legislation in the Northern Territory, the Minister has some overriding power in the national interest. I believe that it would be improper for any Government to pass legislation which denied, in the interests of the people of this State or of the nation as a whole, the Minister of Mines and Energy the right of taking certain action to allow mining for a prescribed period.

I believe that the Labor Party deliberately misled the Aboriginal community when it put before the House and the people of this State legislation that would have created a situation which that Party itself would not have been prepared to accept. It is interesting to examine a few other documents, which I fortunately have in my possession, because for a long time I have been aware that it has been the desire of the Aborigines at Yalata to obtain a title or control over certain sections of land at Maralinga. They have made it clear to me for a long time that they do not want the land to be transferred to the Pitjantjatjara council or Mr. Toyne to be involved in it.

Unfortunately, the previous Government appears to have allowed a situation to be created whereby the Pitjantjatjara council would have had the right to claim all that land even though considerable sections of the Aboriginal community in this State, including the Pitjantjatjaras themselves, did not want that action to take place. The Labor Party, in my view, was acting in a manner contrary to the best interests of the Aboriginal community. On 10 July, the Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust wrote to the Minister of Community Welfare, as follows:

I wish to advise that I have today been informed by the Yalata people that they are concerned that during their meeting with the Minister of Community Welfare at Yalata last week the Minister informed them that it was the intention of the Government to consult with Mr. Philip Toyne to ascertain if he was agreeable to the Government's proposal to transfer the Maralinga lands to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. This statement by the Minister has caused much concern to the Yalata people who want to know what has the Maralinga land question to do with Mr. Philip Toyne.

As was agreed at my meeting with the Ministers of Planning and of Community Welfare on 29 June 1979 I have made no public statement on the outcome of the meeting or of the Minister's undertaking to seek Cabinet approval for confirmation of the earlier Cabinet decision of 1972 to transfer to the trust the whole of the Maralinga lands. However, in view of the concern now expressed by the Yalata people and the doubts which have been raised in their minds, I would now seek your earliest advice of Cabinet's confirmation of the 1972 decision.

I understand that they received no advice from the previous Government in relation to this matter. That clearly indicates that there are sections of the Pitjantjatjara people who do not want their land to be handed over to the Pitjantjatjara Council.

Mr. Hemmings: No-one has denied that there would be a few people—

Mr. GUNN: I do not think that the honourable member's knowledge of these matters is great; I suggest that he listen for a while. I know that it is difficult for him to understand anything. I realise that the genuine welfare of the people concerned and of the people of the State generally matters little to the honourable member. I am trying to draw one or two matters to his attention. I hope that, with all the time he has at his disposal, he will try to weigh up what I have had to say and consider it closely, because of the implications the original legislation would have had on the people of this State.

I will refer now to what took place when the legislation was made available to the community, and cite some of the reactions to it. It clearly polarised groups in the community, and caused grave concern to many constituents in my district. It is very foolish of any Government to create a situation which unduly raises the expectations of minority groups in any part of the State. The legislation, as drafted, allowed the Pitjantjatjara Council to lay claim to huge tracts of South Australia. It allowed them to lay claim to existing opal areas, thus causing a great deal of concern to the communities in that part of South Australia. I believe that it was foolish of the Government of the day even to allow that situation to arise.

I bring to members' attention some of the feelings of the communities in those areas. I refer to a report that appeared at Coober Pedy in a publication known as *Opal Chips*. The report was by the Chairman (Mr. Coker) of the Mining Subcommittee of the Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association. Mr. Coker in the report, headed "Apartheid: Lands Bill", said:

If this Bill is passed by Parliament, 16.3 per cent of South Australia would be in the absolute control of the Pitjantjatjara people.

Mr. Coker goes on to explain his views on the matter. It is most unfortunate, to say the least, when such a situation is created. I refer now to a public meeting held in Coober Pedy to discuss this matter. The section from which I will quote was part of the President's report to the 1978-79 annual general meeting of the Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association. He said:

The attendance of 520 people at a public meeting on 5 May to discuss the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill was a record. It is hoped that the concern expressed at this meeting may cause the Government to either abandon the Bill or revoke the most objectionable clauses.

That was the feeling of a large section of the community in that area. I understand that all present at the meeting (except, I think, two) appeared to support the action to which the Chairman referred.

Mr. Hemmings: Why don't you read out what the Roman Catholic Church has to say?

Mr. GUNN: I will come to that. The honourable member is somewhat impatient. I suggest to him that, if he wants to further his knowledge in this area, he should listen for a few minutes. We had the ridiculous situation last week when he was commenting on this matter. Obviously, he knew little or nothing about it, because of the sort of comments he was making. He was insulting the intelligence of his own electors and the people of the State generally by making the stupid sort of half-witted remarks he was making.

The honourable member was implying that the attitude of this Government in relation to this matter was similar to the course of action taken by the Government of Germany against the Jews. Any person who accepts the responsibility of being a member of Parliament and comes into this Chamber and makes that sort of remark is absolutely unworthy to be a member. This Government

has acted with propriety during the whole of its negotiations with the Pitjantjatjara people. The only people who have misled the Pitjantjatjara people are previous Government Ministers and other members who have been involved in this matter.

If the honourable gentleman doubts what I have had to say, I suggest he examine the type of agreement and arrangement that the previous Government was endeavouring to enter into with the Pitjantjatjara people. It was setting out to enter into an agreement with the Aboriginal community which would have completely voided all the provisions of the legislation it had before Parliament. My concern in this matter is to see that the Pitjantjatjara people in South Australia are given a fair go and are well treated. This Government also has a responsibility to the community in South Australia. I believe it is the responsibility of every member of this House to ensure that not only minorities are given a fair go but that the overriding interests of the total community are considered carefully.

I think we should look at some of the problems that the legislation, had it been passed, would have created. I referred earlier to royalties. As the Bill was originally drafted, all royalties would have been paid to the executive of the Pitjantjatjara group, which was going to be set up by that legislation. There was no requirement whatever to have any royalties which the Aboriginal community in the north received, paid to local communities. I think that that was a grave anomaly. Provision should have been made in the Bill to ensure that, if royalties were to be paid, they should be apportioned to the local community, and that some of the funds should go to the general Aboriginal community in this State.

Another serious flaw in the legislation (and these are only minor matters) was that the executive committee was going to consist of a chairman, vice chairman and two other members—a very small group. That, in my view, would have been quite improper. Each of the local communities should have been represented on that executive committee. Several other areas in the legislation need serious consideration. I believe the Government should look at them carefully during the next few weeks and enter into discussions with the Aboriginal community about them. The Labor Party has a great deal to answer for because of its handling of this situation. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that, instead of reading the newspaper, he read the evidence given to the Select Committee by Mr. Webb, because I think it might enlighten him slightly. If he reads that evidence, he will agree that Mr. Webb would not have given evidence of that kind without the approval of his Ministers.

I want to mention briefly one or two other matters in concluding my remarks. Several matters in my electorate are causing me concern. During the past few weeks, as I normally do, I have travelled the whole of my electorate, discussing various problems with my constituents. Concern has been expressed about the previous Government's reducing the amount of money available to country councils for road and highways construction. The present Government will have to consider that matter carefully. This matter was also raised yesterday at an Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association meeting.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There was a 3 per cent cut there.

Mr. GUNN: That was a decision of the honourable member's Government; I am referring to last year's grants. This problem has been drawn to my attention in various parts of the State, so I hope the Government will be able to provide funds to local councils to carry out the sealing of roads in their areas. I believe this is essential.

One or two matters that concern me are legacies of the Dunstan Government. I appreciate the grave problems the present Government has inherited. It has a massive Public Service and armies of inspectors of various kinds going around the country making life miserable, not only for the public but also for people who are trying to make a living and to get on with the job of developing South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: They have strong powers, too.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. I believe the Government has a responsibility, as a matter of urgency, to do something about the powers of inspectors. The Government should look closely at the considerable amount of legislation passed by the previous Government that gave those inspectors their authority. It should also consider certain pieces of legislation where the onus of proof was reversed, because that legislation should be amended. That is a quite unnecessary provision in nearly any piece of legislation.

A few months ago a constituent drew to my attention the fact, that, in running a small service station and a small supermarket, he had to have more than 20 permits or licences to operate those businesses. Because his supermarket sold milk and his service station down the road sold milk he had to have two milk vendor's licences. He had to have two business names registered, and he had to have three permits to sell petrol. I have told the House of the difficulties of a constituent of mine in the north of South Australia in dealing with the motor fuel distribution people. I understand that a very grumpy judge heads that organisation. He appears to be more interested in his own survival in that organisation than in doing anything constructive to help people who are trying to develop the State. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Industrial Affairs will soon act to do something about that organisation, because my constituent in the north of the State, who set out to build a roadhouse and wanted to have petrol pumps, had to wait more than 21 months to get permission to put in petrol pumps. There was no opposition to his putting these pumps in, but this judge refused to accept Lands Department maps (I understand he cost the fuel company over \$4 000). My constituent was amazed that any person could be so childish and small-minded as was this judge. I call on the Minister to get rid of him as Chairman as soon as possible, because by doing so he will be acting in the interests of the people of this State. I suggest to him he obtain the file relating to the granting of a fuel licence at Marla Bore roadhouse.

I turn now to another constituent who has been having trouble with all these licences and permits. I think it is high time that the Government, as a matter of urgency, had someone review all existing licensing requirements and look at all the statutory boards to see how many can be abolished, amalgamated, or restructured. There are far too many of them. Far too many people in business or commerce are caught up in red tape and nonsense. It is not only annoying but time-consuming, expensive, and, in most cases, completely unnecessary.

One area of concern in my district could be the problem of conservation. The District of Eyre contains some areas of great significance to the people of this State, areas that should be protected and well managed, but I believe that there ought to be a balance and that common sense should prevail. I do not think it is necessary to continue to expand our national parks or areas set aside, because it is my considered opinion that, in the past (and I know the new Minister is concerned and is doing his utmost to rectify the problems of the past), they have not been properly managed or looked after. This is something to which the Minister and his department will have to pay close attention.

It is a pleasure to be sitting on this side of the House. It has been interesting to observe the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition settling into their new positions. The Leader and the Deputy Leader look very comfortable in their new seats, especially the Deputy Leader, who is taking up a considerable area of the front bench. From the manner in which they have settled in, they seem to be enjoying it. I hope they are, because it would appear that they will be there for a long time. They will have many years in which to enjoy that position.

Unlike the member for Elizabeth, I do support the motion. I am pleased to be again the member for Eyre. I appreciate the confidence the people have placed in me and I am sure the people of this State will be well served by the new Government.

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I thank you, Sir, for the courtesy extended to me, and I rise to support this motion. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the high office of Speaker in this Parliament, a position to which I am sure you will make a substantial contribution in the conduct of the business of the House. My only regret is that you will be missed from the debates which occur in this Chamber. I remember well, as a visitor to this House two or three years ago, a lively interchange you had with the former member for Brighton, when you referred to him as the honourable member for bumph and turgid prose. Not to be outdone, as was his wont, he had some difficulty in distinguishing your membership, whether it was as member for air or Light. That repartee has been sadly lacking in this place in recent years, and your inability to contribute to debates is a loss to the conduct of the House.

I take this opportunity to thank the people of Norwood once again for their support of my candidature at the recent election and for returning me as their member in this House. The members for Norwood have, at every valid election in the last 27 years, returned a Labor representative to this House, and they did so convincingly once again at the most recent election. In fact, the electors of Norwood have returned an Opposition member more often than they have returned a Government member. My predecessor, the former Premier (Mr. Dunstan), was an Opposition member of this Parliament for more years than he was a member of the Government, and that is a role to which the people of Norwood are well accustomed. They expect to have a member who will fight in Parliament for their interests; they do not want someone who will toe the Government line, and they did not find that with the former Premier. It is well known to the community that his stands often were not popular with the majority of people in the community but, given the fullness of time, they were borne out to be decisions and stands which were of immense benefit to the community in the long run. I hope to be able to continue the work I was doing when I was last elected to this Parliament, to maintain a lively representation for the Norwood electors, and to take up issues, albeit unpopular issues, from time to time.

During the Norwood election campaign, the community expressed some alarm and pointed out to me the harm done by many of the decisions already taken in the brief time the Tonkin Government has been in power; indeed, the overwhelming support for the Labor Party in that election I think is some indication of that concern in the community at large. As they told me, their concern is for the decision-making process that the Government has adopted. Many people say that the Government is not listening to their needs, to what they have to say, and that they, their families, and their businesses are being affected

by that lack of consultation and that lack of understanding of their problems.

Interestingly enough, it was often the Government's own supporters who told me of this during the election campaign. I cite just a few examples of this lack of consultation in the decision-making process. The decision to light the West Lakes stadium is, I think, a decision which did not please anyone in the area. I know it was a difficult decision, but the people most directly affected, the people who live in that area, are the ones who are saying that their views were not heard and were not taken heed of. We heard earlier in the debate today about the Moore's decision, where small business people particularly are saying that their views on this issue were not even canvassed. They are saying that the Government made a decision regardless of their welfare and the welfare of the people of that community and that part of the city.

Whatever the member for Eyre said about the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation, those people to whom I have spoken in the Pitjantjatjara clan and those people who are supporting them say that the thing that disappointed them most was that a decision was made without consultation. They feel that they were let down, that a promise given was broken, and that a decision was taken without discussion with them. To me, that is the thing that has upset those people more than anything else: that, once again, was a decision made without adequate, proper and just consultation?

Whilst on the subject of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill, I think it is interesting that the member for Eyre, in his remarks, did not refer to the representations that have been made undoubtedly to the Government and the well documented submissions made to the Government by the bodies representative of mining interests. I am not sure whether it is the Mining Industry Council or the Chamber of Miners in Australia, but I understand that a well documented submission has been put before the Government, and that that is the blueprint for the Government's stand, which is substantially different from that taken by the former Government. In fairness to the debate, and in fairness to the people who will be affected by this decision, that submission should be placed before this House and it should be subjected to scrutiny and public comment.

I refer now to a matter in relation to my own district. Prior to the September general election last year, the Liberal Opposition proposed that there be an O'Bahn bus service, and a lot of television advertisements and newspaper publicity was given to this proposal as an alternative to the l.r.t. system. Strangely enough, the advertisements did not show any precise route from Lower Portrush Road into the city, and that question was evaded when answers were sought during the election campaign.

Now we have had a period of some months of Government and that proposal is sinking slowly into oblivion. Meanwhile, the people who live in the suburbs that will be affected by one or other of the proposals that have been put up, bearing in mind that there have been proposals to develop the Torrens Valley since 1952 and the various MATS plans that have been brought forward since then, have lived for almost two generations in fear of one proposal or another.

The most irresponsible and the most ill-thought out must be the O'Bahn proposal. So, once again, we have a decision taken on the spur of the moment by the Party that is now in Government, to put that proposal to the people before it was even discussed in full council by either of the councils affected on either side of the Torrens—Walker-ville council or the St. Peters council. No, it was put forward as a solid proposal, a panacea for the transport

problem of the northern suburbs, yet dropped quickly afterwards.

Mr. Mathwin: Your people wouldn't even get interested in the other scheme. You never even went over to see it.

Mr. CRAFTER: There is no O'Bahn scheme in existence in the world. That is one of the great concerns about it. If the public were consulted—

Mr. Mathwin: That is not correct, and you know it.

Mr. CRAFTER: The l.r.t. proposal was one of the most thorough consultation processes that this State has ever experienced. It went on for several years. There was a very thorough consultation process with the community.

Mr. Randall: Tell us how much it cost.

Mr. CRAFTER: Whatever it cost, it was worth it, because the community was involved in the decision-making process. They are the ones who will be affected by it. To make decisions without consultation is disastrous. We are now seeing the results of that. Ask the Victoria Square traders or the Pitjantjatjara people, and all those people in the community who support them.

The people who live at West Lakes will say that the few thousands dollars spent on the consultation process is worth it, because the decisions made are lasting. There was a Royal Commission into West Lakes. I suggest that a judicial inquiry was the proper course, whereas the decision was made on *ad hoc* judgments in disregard of a proper judicial inquiry, where the only way the parties in that case could have been brought together was under the compulsion of law, because they would not sit around the table.

A further decision was made by Government at the end of December to opt out of any planning development controls for retailers in the community. Section 36 of the Planning and Development Act has now lapsed. As recently as two weeks ago the Minister of Planning, speaking at a public meeting at Norwood, said that this was now the responsibility of local government, which does not want it.

Mr. Randall: Which local government does not want responsibility?

Mr. CRAFTER: The Local Government Association, for a start, is one of the bodies that has been very critical of the power that has been thrust on local government, but every councillor that I have spoken to is totally frustrated by its lack of power to bring about some controls for retail development in the community. In fact, if a council tries to bring down a moratorium, as the Minister suggested they should, they will find that they have no power to restrict retail development. If they try to, the developer goes straight to the Planning Appeal Board and it costs the council a substantial sum of money to lose the case. In fact, the Minister said at a public meeting that councils did have power to bring down moratoriums. He further said that he would prepare a paper pointing out those powers. I would very much like to see it, as would, I am sure, retailers right throughout the community, because it would be the greatest piece of fiction that one has read for a long time. Local government does not have this authority. Even if it did, it would certainly not be the correct approach in the community interest if every council, particularly inner suburban councils that cover very small areas, had the power to decide overall development controls.

In my electorate there are three large shopping centres on the Parade. There is some discussion about a further one being built on the Freeman Motors site in one corner of the electorate. There is a proposal to build another shopping centre in another corner of the district at Tusmore, and there is an existing shopping centre in the

other corner, on Magill Road. A proposal is being mooted to build a shopping centre at a site adjacent to the Hartley College of Advanced Education. Of course, a major shopping centre is being built at St. Peters.

The small business people who have for years and years contributed to the community and been part of community life in Norwood are now under threat. At the moment, six shops are ready to close, and 18 jobs are in jeopardy. This was put to the Minister who said, "It is not my problem; it is local government's problem." I believe that that answer was totally irresponsible, and it was rejected by the majority of people at that meeting. It is to burden local government with something it is just not capable of responding to. That decision to opt out of planning development controls on retail development was taken, once again, without consultation with the various groups in the community that were going to be affected.

A further example of this is the State Government decision to refer community development boards to local government. In fact, I understand that the Government is saying, "We do not want to hear about the problems of the local community, or the problems people are facing in living a fuller and more humane life with some dignity in the suburbs. Tell local government about it."

I understand that the grants provided to community groups to foster some community participation and newer programmes in the community to meet rising needs will be abandoned shortly. Once again, that decision was taken without proper consultation as an *ad hoc* decision which can and will bring about great harm to the very fabric of our community.

Apart from those sorts of decision, there are almost 900 teachers in the Norwood electorate, a substantial number of people who are or were active in that profession. Almost to a person, they are appalled at this Government's approach to education, to its simplistic, arrogant and unresponsive approach to one of the most fundamental criteria for good government, the approach to education.

People such as the General Secretary of the South Australian Institute of Teachers must be rueing the day that they added some support to the policy of the present Government, a policy which has turned into a gross piece of fiction. Look at some of the promises made to teachers, parents and students. What has happened to them? The present Government promised that there would be kindergartens for 3½-year-olds. There has been some limited expansion of pre-school programmes, but no extra funds. There is insufficient money to cater now for 4-year-olds, we find.

The Government said class sizes would be reduced. The fact is that only by waiting for student enrolments to decline will class sizes reduce. There have been no extra funds nor additional teachers. There was to have been extra non-contact time for primary teachers, but there has been negligible improvement and there is now record teacher unemployment. Appointment of specialist teachers—nothing has been done about that. Appointment of remedial teachers—nothing has been done about that. Upgrading of health screening—nothing has been done. Provision of properly staffed resource centres—still nothing has been done about that. Special staff and equipment for schools with special needs—no action has been taken. Increasing student job experience—here the new State Government did not even attend a Canberra meeting to make use of additional funds being offered by the Federal Government, which is an action worse than nothing. Extra support for disadvantaged secondary schools—that is a promise about which nothing has been done. Development of special student community

courses—in fact there has been a squeeze on the curriculum directorate.

Increased school economies—in fact, there has been a reduction in funds to pay for more unavoidable costs. It was promised that an increased proportion of funds would be directed to school councils—once again, set aside. Reduction of teacher rentals—in fact, rents have been increased. Additional assistance for special schools—nothing significant has been done there. Provision of libraries, language, science, craft and physical education resources where the need has been demonstrated—still waiting for a decision on that. Increased technical education resources—no action. More flexible classroom space—as the South Australian Institute of Teachers says, "Bring your own." Optimum use of natural lighting and ventilation—marginal to no improvement.

The Childhood Services Council was promised that it would obtain greater control in assessing needs and arranging facilities for pre-school facilities. There has been no change, and we have been told that there is not enough money. The school dental programme to be maintained—it will not be increased. New trends in further education were announced—in fact, the Department of Further Education is to have a reduced budget, and there do not appear to be any new trends emanating. Retraining for victims of redundancy—nothing yet done. Bridging literacy and numeracy courses for migrants—no changes yet evident. Adequate numbers of teachers to be trained, especially further education teachers—they have been told that there are just no jobs to be created.

Incentives for remedial teacher training—a vital area for the care of those who are disadvantaged in our schools—in fact, there have been reduced time scholarships in that area. It was promised that there would be emphasis on the training of specialist subject teachers in secondary schools—nothing has been done there. In just that one area of education, we can see the disappointment of many of those in the community who do have a professional and dedicated approach to education.

The consultation processes that were established by the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments in this State are now being appreciated by the electorate at large. Gone are the days when decisions of Government are taken alone within the Cabinet room. They must be based on thorough, proper and just consultation with those people in the community who are affected by them, and the consequences are to be assessed before the decisions are taken, not afterwards.

I believe the Norwood by-election is proof of the disillusionment that is rising in the community about the decision-making processes of this Government. In fact, the vote that the Labor Party received last Saturday week was in excess of that received in the by-election last year. Interestingly enough, the most substantial increases in the voting in that election came from the strong Liberal booths. In the booth of Hackney, the vote increased by over 7 per cent. At Kensington Park, it increased by almost 5 per cent. I think the Government must accept that there are some people who have in the past supported it but who are no longer prepared to support it, because of the decisions it is taking.

The member for Eyre raised the myth that in fact the Norwood electorate has been represented by a Liberal Party member since the last election. He has fallen into the trap into which many of his colleagues and some of the newspapers have fallen into by not accepting the decision of the Court of Disputed Returns that no-one was returned to this Parliament legally at the last election. The *News* has not yet admitted that the decision was that no person was legally elected at the 15 September election for

the seat of Norwood. Very little discussion has occurred in the community about the reason why that election was declared void. We have heard discussion on some breaches of the Electoral Act, but there has been little discussion about the defamatory publication which was authorised by the Liberal Party and which was held by the court to be a substantial reason for declaring that result void.

I refer to the decision of the judge that an advertisement, which was published by the Liberal Party and which was authorised by the Director of the Liberal Party and signed by the candidate at that election, was calculated to influence the vote of electors. The judge found that the publishers of the newspaper in which the advertisement appeared and another person were guilty of undue influence within the meaning of the Act. She found that neither of those had the appropriate intention to defame the petitioner, but nevertheless a defamation had occurred under the auspices of the Liberal Party and, because of the damage that that had done, on that ground alone the election should be declared void. I find it disconcerting that the newspapers and other opponents saw fit to bury that aspect of the decision. No doubt, they are not pleased with that finding, but no-one in the community can be pleased with that finding. However, an error in judgment was made, and it should be admitted.

The second ground of the petition, which referred to a defamatory article, was shown not to be defamatory of me personally. However, the judge saw fit to make some comments about that advertisement. Once again, the newspapers did not see fit to discuss the consequences of that sort of advertising. I refer to the actual words which appeared and which were complained of in the petition. The words were:

A Liberal Government will make the streets safe for your daughters to walk on without being molested by those hooligans who have been acting as if they owned the place for the last 10 years.

The judge said that the use of the words in that advertisement was to be deplored. That is the sort of brinkmanship, the sort of political advertising, that really brings politicians and the political process into disrepute in the eyes of the reasonable man in the community.

The Director of the Liberal Party, when giving evidence at the court, explained that he did not speak Italian and that he was unable to check the translation although he authorised it, but he said that he had called for an advertisement which was in support of family life. That certainly is a noble aspiration from any political Party, but, when one attempts to support family life by placing in a newspaper an advertisement in the Italian language which warns people and their daughters to be cautious of all those hooligans, thugs or criminal elements (as it was referred to in some translations) who molest people in the streets, and as people who have been acting as if they owned the place for the last 10 years, the connection in those words is just too close to a meaning that it was the Government which had been in power for the last 10 years that had caused those acts of violence in the streets to be let pass. I think that any right-minded person in my position would have had a very serious responsibility to bring an advertisement of that nature to the court.

Mr. Mathwin: Your policies are a bit weak on it, though, aren't they?

Mr. CRAFTER: I was going on to say that obviously there is need for law reform, whether in the Constitution Act or in the Electoral Act, to bring down a code of ethics whereby political Parties are accountable for and bound by the sorts of in-house ethics that exist in the advertising industry at large. In fact, there are no real controls on what is put in political advertisements, apart from taking a

matter to a Court of Disputed Returns. The circumstances in which a petition can be lodged to that court are rare indeed. The community is being harmed, and it will be harmed in the future unless a proper code of ethics is brought down. A close reading of the judgment of the Court of Disputed Returns will show clearly the need for that legislation.

Some interesting comments have appeared in the press since the court decision was brought down about the need for reforms in other areas of the Electoral Act, but little has been said about advertising, the content of advertising, and the public accountability of the advertisers with respect to political campaigns. I find it particularly interesting that Max Harris, in the *Sunday Mail*, referred only to the electoral offences in his column after the election was called and chose not to refer to the proven defamation. I would have thought that defamation would have been one of the few things that Max Harris, as a publisher and writer, would be qualified to comment on but he saw fit to ignore it.

I noticed that the member for Fisher, in his column in the *Sunday Mail* (and I have some regard for him as a columnist), also chose to ignore it. That lets down the community. Political Parties must be bigger than they appear to be in admitting that errors were made. We must work to bring about new standards in advertising. The harm that has been done, especially to ethnic minority groups within my own district, by that type of advertising, is immense. People have felt that they have been manipulated or used in some way for political gain. The fact that people are disadvantaged by their inability to participate fully in community life, and are misled in some way by a political advertisement published in their native language is a clear case for law reform.

There was some comment prior to and after the election about the stacking of rolls in Norwood, and there was a call for an inquiry. I am not quite sure what form the inquiry was to take; at one stage it was suggested that a Royal Commission should be held, but the next day the Premier stated that there should be an internal Liberal Party inquiry. No matter what form the inquiry takes, something should be said about this matter. I noticed during the election campaign that every old issues of some political capital for our opponents was raised. I think only the Chowilla dam and the Petrov affair were not raised; everything else had a fair and proper hearing.

The relaunching of the book that attacks the former Premier was a classic piece of political capital-seeking during the campaign. I deplore the actions of those people who opposed me in that campaign who doorknocked with the book in their hand, and who read it out to people on their doorsteps. That sort of campaigning is the lowest of all campaigning. Fortunately, there were sections in the book that exposed other aspects of political life and were, no doubt, to our advantage. However, in general, I think that the result of the election clearly indicates people's approach to that sort of campaigning.

During the campaign, we saw not only the inquiry into the stacking of the roll but also an inquiry into the preparation of some blocks for the printing of bus tickets. A lowly public servant was accused of taking this decision on his own initiative, without Ministerial approval. The day after the election, an announcement was made that bus fares would be increased.

We find that there will be another inquiry into the dismissal of the former Police Commissioner, Mr. Salisbury. What is the basis for that inquiry? Is it some comments made by Mr. Ceruto at a press conference, when he was released on bail on that day to re-release the book? His credibility has been questioned by the Royal

Commission. Mr. Salisbury says that his call for a further inquiry is based on evidence that is in the possession of Bazz and Pilko, two radio commentators. So, we find that the Government is launching another inquiry, which received enormous publicity during the by-election campaign period, based on comments made by Mr. Ceruto at his press conference and comments made by Bazz and Pilko.

Regarding the stacking of the rolls, the Premier is reported to have said that he received an anonymous letter 12 months ago stating that the rolls were being altered illegally in the Norwood district (or that is my reading of what the Premier said). I point out to the House that, in that 12-month period, there have been three elections in the District of Norwood and a Court of Disputed Returns. During the court hearing, the roll was the subject of some comment and examination, and evidence was given by the Commonwealth electoral officers. Yet, the Premier saw fit not to produce this letter, this piece of evidence on which he is basing the inquiry, until the time when the election was almost over. Surely, that fact must cast grave doubts on the Government's motives in calling for this inquiry.

I would like to put on record my confidence in the officers of the Commonwealth Electoral Office who maintain the rolls as agent for the State Electoral Office. They have checks and balances that are made to vet each application for enrolment. The declaration made when one is seeking to get on the roll is a personal declaration of the bona fides of the application. To suggest that an individual or a political Party (I am not sure about whom the Premier was speaking when he said he believed the rolls were stacked) could convince some 700, 800 or 900 people that they should break the law and vote when they are not entitled to vote, is attributing an enormous amount of illegality and ill-purpose to that group or individual, which is beyond the realms of practical possibility.

Those wild accusations were being made because the Premier or the Government decided that the roll should be closed quickly after the election date was announced. I know that it has been said that the time allowed for the closing of the rolls was the same as that at the previous general election. However, in the meantime, the Court of Disputed Returns commented on the inability of many people to enrol. To my mind, that would have been sufficient notice for the Government to have allowed a longer time for people to enrol. Indeed, I believe that many more people would have enrolled if they had had time.

However, the Premier makes no reference to the 2 600 people whose names were removed from the roll in the five-month period from March to September last year. In the inner suburban areas there is an enormous fluctuation in population, predominantly because of the large flat-dwelling population of the district. There was clear evidence before the Court of Disputed Returns since that time that this pattern is continuing. Whatever the Premier said happened on that occasion, it is not in any way against the law for people who are legally entitled to enrol to do so.

I believe that his own Party put many people on the roll. If the Premier is now saying that the inquiry should lead to law reform, given what has occurred in the meantime, I would be most concerned at any laws that came out of an inquiry based on an anonymous letter received 12 months ago making allegations about roll-stacking.

In addition, I believe that the approach to the Government was made by his own Party. No other Party or individuals were invited to make submissions to or give evidence at the inquiry. That, clearly, must be contrary to natural justice, and any results or conclusions drawn from

it must be suspect because it is not really a true inquiry. Before legislation is brought before the House to amend the Electoral Act (and I agree that it must be amended in many ways, as I have already outlined), we need to know that proper inquiries have been conducted, or I do not believe there will be the support of the electorate for any such proposals. I believe that the actions of the Premier and of other spokesmen for his Party in raising this matter of poll-stacking is a smokescreen. It is an allegation without substance—one that was opportune to bring at a time of substantial defeat for the Government at a poll, conducted a short time after the Government came to office.

I have briefly outlined some of the reasons why I think the people are turning away from the approach the Government is taking to its responsibilities in Government. Unless the Government changes its approach and talks to people, and becomes a democratic institution itself, unless it supports the institutions of democracy (the Court of Disputed Returns has shown that the Liberal Party was prepared to flout the provisions of the Electoral Act in order to gain office), and unless there is some reform (in the House and in the community) in its consultation with affected groups, not just in legislation before the House but in the day-to-day business of running the State, I believe that it will surely be heading for these Opposition benches again.

The example created by the previous Administration needs to be extended and built on. Consultation with the community with respect to light rapid transit is an example of that. Although this leads to some conflict in the community, to the formation of interest groups to protest and act against what may be the wishes of most members in the Government, it also leads to a healthy community and to a proper decision-making process. When we lose that ability to consult and to have the proper decision-making processes carried out, democracy itself is suspect, and we fall into the dangers we see so evident in the world today.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I support the motion. I regret that the newly elected Speaker is not in the Chair so that I might congratulate him on election to that high position. Mr. Acting Speaker, I congratulate you on the position that you eventually obtained. As a result of the close contact I have had with you, I am sure that you will do a good job in that position. The Speaker is fair and unbiased and, as our Leader says, he has the confidence of the Opposition. I also congratulate the member for Norwood because, as he has already said, the person who formerly sat in his place as the member for Norwood was not really the member for Norwood. He was illegally elected and never properly returned. I am sure that justice has been obtained. The ex-member for Norwood did not speak in this debate, whereas many other new members have spoken. I am sure that justice has been done in his not speaking, as he would have spoken illegally had he done so.

Before dealing further with the Norwood by-election, I congratulate those new Australian Labor Party members of Parliament, namely, the members for Albert Park, Ascot Park, Florey, Peake, and Salisbury. I also place on record my regret at the loss of previous members, namely, the members for Todd, Newland, Morphett, and Brighton. I am sure that the House will miss some of the recently retired members. I believe that some new members will be what are known as "oncercs". I will refer to one or two of them. Perhaps I could feel sorry for the member for Henley Beach, because he has burnt his bridges. He will find it difficult to get back into another

job. I believe that will be one of the thousands of unemployed after three years, because I cannot see members such as the member for Henley Beach and Semaphore being returned at the next election. Whilst the member for Semaphore sits on the Opposition benches, as has been said previously he is not a member of the A.L.P. I believe that the Semaphore seat will return to the A.L.P. at the next election.

I refer now to the Governor's Speech, delivered on 11 October 1979, and express regret that this is the first time that the motion for adoption has not been adopted before there has been an adjournment of the House. It is something of an affront to the Governor that the Address in Reply was not delivered to him before the adjournment of the House. I will refer to one or two things the Governor had to say in his Speech, which, as is well known, is written by the Government of the day. In paragraph 2, he said:

My Government has already initiated moves to stimulate industrial expansion, and will continue to promote industrial development.

I suppose that is why the Premier went to Colonnades a few days after being elected Premier and said, "What a good job my Government has done. This is an instance of how good my Government is." The project had been completed before the election, yet the Premier wanted to take credit for it. He went to the Riverland cannery, another project initiated by the previous Government, and said, "This is another good thing we have done. We have helped the people in the Riverland by building them a cannery."

The Minister of Transport visited the greatest Government workshop which I have ever seen and which was initiated by Geoff Virgo and the previous Government. I refer to the State Transport Authority's depot at Regency Park. It is a great place for people to work. All the initiatives to have that workshop built were taken by the previous Government, but no reference at all was made to the work the previous Government had done. It would appear to the casual visitor to South Australia that it was a case of "How good I am" by the Premier and Minister of Transport.

Mr. O'Neill: Now, he's going to give it away to private enterprise.

Mr. WHITTEN: He would love to but, although he can be crook in some ways, he is not quite that game. Let us look at what happened to another project, something which the Premier did not know was under way until it was half built. He asked the previous Minister of Transport when his department was going to get on with work in connection with the Cavan bridge. That bridge was a project wholly implemented by the previous Labor Government, but when the official opening took place was there any invitation sent to the member for the district, or to the previous Minister? Of course there was not! One would not expect it from such a Government.

The Minister of Environment went down to Port Adelaide, into my electorate, and I complimented him for the great job he did, because he gave credit to the previous Labor Government, and said, "My Government intends to continue this great work initiated by the previous Government." What happened then? He was conned by the Mayor of Port Adelaide and went on television and said that the Queenstown site would be developed by Myers. I felt sorry for the Minister that night, because he did not know how he was conned; he thought Queenstown was part of the site on Commercial Road. Still, he will learn, I hope.

Mr. Randall: You don't want that site developed?

Mr. WHITTEN: I like that type of development, and I

want it to continue. I hope it continues, because it is going to be great for the whole of Port Adelaide. I hope that some of the members who sit on the other side and giggle a bit will wake up to what was done by the former Labor Government, in co-operation with the traders and council of Port Adelaide, to redevelop Port Adelaide. Port Adelaide will come alive because of the initiatives of the former Labor Government. I felt sorry for the Minister of Environment, who was conned after endeavouring to be dinkum when he spoke at the opening of the first stage of the development, the new store of Coles at Port Adelaide. That also shows confidence in the State because Coles spent \$1 500 000 at Port Adelaide redeveloping that site. It has built it in such a way that the building tones in with the old style of Port Adelaide. It is the first store of its type to be built in Australia and it really conforms with the way Port Adelaide should be redeveloped.

The Minister of Education went down to the official opening of the Parks Community Centre, a \$15 000 000 project initiated by the Australian Labor Government in Canberra (Whitlam put \$15 000 000 into it). The Minister said what a great job his Government was doing in South Australia for education. We have heard a little bit from the member for Norwood this afternoon about what the Minister of Education is doing for education in South Australia. Have a talk to some of the teachers about what he is doing for them!

Mr. Max Brown: What he's not doing for them!

Mr. WHITTEN: Quite right. With this projected 3 per cent cut in all departments, he will do a lot more for education—returning things to the way they were in the Liberal era of the 1950's and 1960's.

Paragraph 3 of the Governor's Speech states:

... my Government's plans to restore confidence among South Australians in this State and to provide incentives leading to more jobs, particularly for young people presently unemployed.

I wish that the person who wrote that speech for the Governor (and I do not know whether it was the Premier or the Minister of Industrial Affairs) would come to Port Adelaide and see what he has done to young people, because what has happened there is certainly a disgrace. I will come back to the matter of jobs in Port Adelaide in a moment. The Premier promised more jobs. Chrysler sacked 300 people just after Christmas—300 people on the bread-line, on the dole, with no hope of getting a job.

Mr. Max Brown: New Year's gift.

Mr. WHITTEN: It certainly was! Chrysler did not tell them before Christmas, but when they came back in the new year after their holidays it was, "You, you and you are out on the dole; there is no job for you." A person over 45 is condemned to a life as an unemployed person, because he will never get a job; he is too old, particularly when we have a Government such as that in Canberra led by Fraser.

In an adjoining electorate Oldfields Bakery sacked 60 people. I do not know how many people have become redundant because of the merger of the A.N.Z. Bank and the Bank of Adelaide, but the member for Hanson would have some idea because he expressed concern that many people from the Bank of Adelaide would lose their jobs because of that merger. I have been unable to find out how many people lost their jobs. In last night's *News* that venerable gentlemen, the red carpet man, Mr. John McLeay, was reported as follows:

In the four years the Fraser Government has been in office Australia has slowly but surely been put back on the economic rails. This has been due almost entirely to the policies and encouragement of the Federal Government . . . The State Government's policies are in harmony with those

of the Federal Government.

I am pleased to see him go on record as saying that, because it had been said that, under the Fraser Government, there would be jobs for all those who wanted to work. I received the latest C.E.S. figures on the 8th of this month. Since the advent of the Fraser Government, the figures are as follows: at the end of its first year, in December 1976, a total of 327 524 people were unemployed; during the next year that number increased to 404 000; and, in December 1978, the figure was 451 000. There has been a slight improvement this year, with 440 000 unemployed as at December 1979. If one analyses those figures and compares the job vacancies, there are 444 754 unemployed and 18 312 jobs available—a ratio of 24 to one.

Mr. O'Neill: And they don't want to work?

Mr. WHITTEN: It has been said that they are dole bludgers and that they do not want to work. I would assess that number as being a half of 1 per cent. I do not know of any person who is unemployed who does not want to work. People want some dignity; they do not want to be on the dole. I have heard a proposal recently that some of these people could find useful employment; it is called a system of civil conscription whereby people can be sent to do jobs, which would help the nation and the State. There is no intention of creating paid jobs; they would do those jobs for their dole money. It is not surprising that the people who have suggested that are people who are too old to be involved in that plan themselves. It is the same with the people who advocate conscription to the armed forces. One finds that those people are not eligible themselves, and that is how hypocritical they are. I do not want to sidetrack myself from the unemployment situation, so let us look at the South Australian figures. In December 1976 there were 25 070 unemployed; and at the end of December 1979 the figure was nearly double that at 46 976. Job vacancies total 1 127, so that 41 persons are chasing every job available.

At Port Adelaide the position is even worse. At 28 December 1979, 2 894 people were registered at the C.E.S., and there were only 44 job vacancies, so that 65 people are chasing every job available in the Port Adelaide area. There were 553 young females registered as unemployed and only four jobs available to them, a ratio of 138 young females chasing every job.

Mr. O'Neill: They think it is funny over there.

Mr. WHITTEN: I notice the member for Henley Beach laughing and joking with the Minister of Health, who seems to think that it is a joke that people are out of work. I do not think it is a joke; it is a disgrace. It is not much good the member for Henley Beach shaking his head because while I was speaking about these young females who are out of work—

Mr. RANDALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): What is the point of order?

Mr. RANDALL: An article in a newspaper was presented to me to consult with the Minister of Health.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Will the honourable member state his point of order?

Mr. RANDALL: The point of order was that I was not listening to what the member was saying; I was consulting—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is an appropriate procedure under Standing Orders by which the honourable member can explain his position if he believes that he has been misrepresented.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker; I believe you should hear the member for Henley

Beach, who was endeavouring to explain that he was not laughing at the remark made by the member for Price. That is the point he wanted to get through. The member who was addressing the Chair said that the member for Henley Beach and the Minister of Health were laughing and did not care about the unemployment situation. The member for Henley Beach wanted to point out to you and to the House that he was not laughing at the comments being made.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I have explained to the honourable member for Henley Beach what are his rights should he wish to pursue the matter.

Mr. WHITTEN: With due deference to the member for Henley Beach, I say that it appeared to me that he was laughing at the comments I was making about the unemployed.

Mr. Becker: He wasn't.

Mr. WHITTEN: It appeared to me that they were joking and laughing whilst I was referring to the unemployed people in Port Adelaide. The true figures of the unemployed are not shown in the C.E.S. reports because many people do not care to register or are not eligible to register. They still want to work but they do not register, because many of them take the attitude that there is no point in their registering because there is no possibility of their getting a job. They will not go through the formality of putting down their names. If this Government had not discontinued the SURS scheme, many people would have been able to work with dignity and get paid for the work they were doing, instead of being forced to chase from factory to factory to look for jobs that do not exist. There has been no continuation of the SURS scheme, and the Federal Government does not have a plan for job creation. It therefore appears to me that many young people will not work for many years, and people over the age of 45 who have been sacked will perhaps be condemned for the rest of their lives not to work.

Another matter which concerns me greatly is the imprimatur given by the Government to the Metal Industries Association to go overseas to try to attract tradesmen to South Australia and Australia. The claim is that there is a grave shortage of tradesmen. If there is a shortage of tradesmen, it has been brought about by the policies of employers and now of the Government. They have not taken the opportunity to train apprentices as they should have, and they have not trained sufficient apprentices. No opportunity has been taken by the Government or employers to upgrade the training of tradesmen. Tradesmen who have been in industry for many years have perhaps not caught up with new technology, but no incentive is given to tradesmen to take time off, with pay, to try to catch up on new technology so they can take their place in the work force to do the job the employer wishes them to do in the way he wishes them to do it.

To relieve unemployment in this country, I believe there must be a reduction in working hours. I believe two proposals could assist in providing work for more people. One is a 35-hour week, but I believe that a nine-day fortnight would be more beneficial to workers than would a 35-hour week. I say that since it will not only assist workers but it will also provide a level of production at the rate applying with a 40-hour week. If nine days of eight hours a day are worked, it would work out at 36 hours a week, which is one more hour than the goal of 35 hours a week. Considering the long distances workers have to travel, and bearing in mind that a worker's day lasts from the time he starts out of a morning to the time he gets back at night, if he can cut out one trip a fortnight, he has

actually cut two hours off his working time. The employer gains because he has to start his machinery on only nine days in a fortnight rather than 10 days.

The worker will also gain financially because he will be travelling one day less a fortnight. With the policy of the Fraser Government to increase petrol prices as it is doing, it is now costing people more to travel to and from work. Many people are travelling 40 miles a day to work. If they use two gallons of petrol a day, they would be \$3 better off by working one less day. The travelling time would be shortened by 10 per cent so the worker would be better off with a nine-day fortnight than he would be with a five-day week of 35 hours. The workers would also have more leisure time. The 40-hour week commenced in 1948. If technology has not improved in that time to enable a shortening of hours, it has done nothing to help the wealth of Australia. The pace of technological change is causing many workers in industry a great deal of concern.

Employers have made no effort to upgrade tradesmen's knowledge by allowing them time off to attend classes to catch up with some new technology. Automated machines coming into factories are doing away with an enormous amount of manpower. I think it is called workerless production. It can be seen in banks, supermarkets, and offices as well as in factories. Those people who were interested enough to see *When The Chips are Down* and who were not affected by it have no conscience.

I want to talk now about a project in Port Adelaide that was the brainchild of one of the community development officers there, Jim Kilgour, who had an idea that, instead of young people running in the streets, they could be trained and given an opportunity to learn a skill, which would be much better for them. He talked with various people. The Housing Trust was good enough to allow a factory to be given to the Port Industries Training Centre. In Dale Street, Port Adelaide, a large old shed was cleaned out, and a haulage company made forklift trucks available so that young people could learn to drive them. Eight lads were given certificates of proficiency, which were presented by the Premier just before Christmas, and four have passed the course since that time. Nine of those lads have permanent jobs in industry driving forklifts.

Mobil Oil Australia Limited has become interested in the project and has referred it to people such as the Rev. George Martin, from the Port Adelaide Central Mission, Mr. George Ridgway, and the part-owner of Messenger Press, who has done quite a lot to assist. They were able to lean on Mobil and the Port Haulage Company. A series of training sessions is now taking place, and Mobil supplies drivers to train the young people to drive heavy vehicles. They are properly trained in a 10-week course.

The previous Government gave permission for Harbors Board land to be used. I hope that the present Minister, who is not here at the moment, does not take away that privilege given to Mobil and the Port Industries Training Centre to use heavy vehicles on the D.M.H. land, so that young people can be trained to drive heavy vehicles and receive a certificate for that. Mobil drivers will train these people, and then they are taken to the Motor Registration Division and tested in a heavy vehicle supplied by Mobil, to get their licence to drive heavy vehicles.

I believe that these people will get jobs. It is a tribute to those who have helped in their getting a better knowledge of working conditions at the Port Industries Training Centre. Another school is being conducted at present, and the students are doing a good job. Not only does Mobil supply the trucks and drivers, but also the fuel used. The Port Haulage Company supplies all the transport.

Another problem in the electorate of Price concerns the position of Actil Limited. If the Federal Government

adopts the Industries Assistance Commission's report, which it commissioned, Actil will close, with 980 employees losing their jobs. The draft report was prepared at the Commonwealth Government's request, and its effect is that jobs will be exported to Asian countries. There is no way in the world that Actil or any other cotton-producing textile company could exist if the I.A.C. report was adopted. Not only will 980 Actil people lose their jobs, but the State will lose \$500 000 in pay-roll tax, water and electricity charges, and local council rates. Woodville council is greatly concerned about what would happen if a factory near it, employing almost 1 000 people, were to close.

I have seen that factory, which is most modern. The spinning and weaving sections are highly automated. One workshop would cover almost an acre. Four people look after all those machines, with only a few back-up people. If the I.A.C. draft report is adopted by the Fraser Government, 1 000 jobs will be exported from Port Adelaide. I see a great future for Port Adelaide and a greater future when we get rid of the Fraser Government this year and when the Labor Party is returned to the Treasury benches here in 1983.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion, and this is the first time since I have been in this Parliament that I have been able to do so from this side of the House. I notice that Opposition members are very comfortable in their cosy little positions, and I hope they will be there for some time.

In my previous speech I congratulated the new members of the House. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to your position in this Chamber. I also pay tributes to members who retired voluntarily, and other than voluntarily. I congratulate them all on the job that they did whilst in this Chamber, to whichever side of the House they belonged. I think that most members enter this place to represent their constituents to the best of their ability.

The difference, of course, is that of policies and philosophies. No matter who the members are, they generally try to do the best for their constituents, irrespective of the side of politics to which they belong. I am sure that the retiring members from this place all worked to the best of their ability for their constituents.

As I have said, the philosophies and policies of the Parties are quite different. My ideas are quite different from those of members opposite. To me, socialism is most unpalatable, for many reasons. It tends to punish those who have initiative, and it does not allow or encourage rewards for merit. It does not encourage those who are gifted. Indeed, in many cases it levels people down rather than allowing them to proceed up or encouraging them to do better.

We have heard much election talk during this debate. Many remarks have been made about the election, and about all the whys and wherefores. Of course, the election was called under pressure, and it was called earlier than it ought to have been. Over the years that I have been here, that was the usual bad habit which was set by the architect of political opportunism—Don Dunstan. He is the noted cook and previous Secretary of Actors Equity who read poetry to the animals in the zoo, and he always called elections at a politically opportune time.

When the election was called under pressure, the public of South Australia showed in no uncertain manner what they thought about the mismanagement of this State. Members cannot see it in any different light, because this State declined under socialism, and there was a colossal waste of taxpayers' money during Labor's term of office.

For instance, Monarto was one area in which millions of dollars was lost. The Monarto Development Commission's interest on loans to date is \$7 600 000, and accrued interest on Commonwealth and State Government loans now totals \$5 900 000, and that relates to Monarto alone. We must also look at the situation regarding the Land Commission, about which I spoke when the matter was originally brought into this House. I reminded the then socialist Government that its friends of the same colour in the United Kingdom had given the Land Commission away because of its failure in that part of the world. During its six years of operation, the Land Commission has made a net surplus of \$124 273. Of course, that is a great success story, considering the millions of dollars now outstanding on the project. Loans from the Commonwealth have totalled \$52 700 000. As at 30 June 1978, \$45 500 000 was spent on land acquisition. In 1978-79, \$2 600 000 was spent on land acquisition and improvements. Repayment of deferred loans and accrued interest at the end of a 30-year term could exceed \$280 000 000. That is a very sad and sorry story.

In looking further into the mismanagement of the State under socialism, I make some reference to the transport situation. Although I know full well that few, if any, transport systems in the world are making a profit, the amount of money that has been lost in transport in this State is considerable. The excess expenditure over income for the financial year ended 30 June 1979 was \$45 600 000, compared to \$37 500 000 in 1977-78. The anticipated loss for the present financial year is another \$46 000 000, and the combined losses for three years will be approximately \$130 000 000. To me, and I imagine to most members, this is a colossal amount of money. In relation to the South Australian Film Corporation, there was a financial loss last year of \$1 800 000.

The people of this State realised that the spendthrift Government that previously held office had to be removed from office. Of course, from the Labor Party's point of view, the election was a disaster which was started by Don Dunstan. There was an average loss of 13 per cent in all metropolitan seats. During the debate we have been subjected to members opposite whining, wailing, and blaming everyone else but themselves. Of course, they have blamed the media for most of the ills.

Mr. Randall: The member for Price spoke from the News some time ago. He reads it sometimes, when it suits him.

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Price reads the paper now and again, and he quotes—

Mr. O'Neill: You've got to know the lies they're telling about you.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is always all right for the muscle man of Trades Hall to have his two penn'orth. He will have his opportunity.

Mr. O'Neill: That went close to libel, too.

Mr. MATHWIN: Well, try to prove it. The information I have had is that you were known as the muscle man of Trades Hall. It is obvious that the election was called too early. That is a wellknown fact. Even the people who lost the election realise now that it was called too early. We know that the Party had to keep Peter Duncan out of the News while the election was going on. We know that the Socialist Party had no policies at all. In fact, what it boils down to is that the Labor Party was a tired Government; it was full of tired Ministers who were flushed with the power of office that they held at that time. The Party generally believed that it could not be beaten. Indeed, one of the members who is now not here (the previous member for Brighton) had a lot to do with boundary changes. I think he believed that the boundaries were pretty well

fixed for the Labor Party, yet even on those boundaries some members were well and truly beaten. The general atmosphere of members of the Labor Party of that day, Ministers included, was that they were untouchable and could not be beaten.

Mr. Abbott: We fixed McNally.

Mr. MATHWIN: Well, that is one of the weaknesses of the member for Spence. He did not fix McNally. Of course, he learnt a lot about it when he used to cross conversation with me, but he never ever fixed it.

Then, in true Labor fashion the Party looked for a scapegoat to try to find out where it went wrong. An interesting document given out by Mr. Ron Elstob, a Senator for South Australia, refers to an announcement of the election and the problems involved. The document also gave details of the Glenelg District, which was interesting reading for me.

Mr. Gunn: Was the Glenelg election marginal?

Mr. MATHWIN: The margin in the Glenelg District used to be 1.3 per cent. The member for Hanson and I were on a razor edge for a few years. We have now up to 67 per cent of the vote, which is fairly comfortable for us. It just shows what one can do with hard work and a crook Government on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. Randall: Were you a oncer?

Mr. MATHWIN: They called me a oncer. The previous Minister of Transport, "violent Virgo", as we called him, said that the member for Hanson and I were oncers, but we have both been here for 10 years and we are going ahead. This can show some new members on the other side how we have brought the electorate up and what has been done on behalf of the Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: We have the strength, from Alexandra right down the coast. We have a bit of trouble with the French Baudin in the middle, but we will fix that. We have the power right down the coast. Although the honourable member to whom I will refer is not here at the moment, let me say what a state of panic the Labor Party has now reached. One of my constituents—a very happy constituent—told me that he voted for me. If he had come to me with a sad, long face, I would have known that he was a Labor supporter, but he came to me with a happy, cheerful face and I knew that he supported me at the last election. He told me that he had received a letter postmarked from Hindley Street; it was sent in a Parliamentary envelope, with the usual sticker on the front. The letter stated:

Dear elector, I notice from the records of the Electoral Department that you have recently been enrolled for the State Assembly District of Glenelg.

I had to read on, because I was the member for Glenelg. The letter continued:

As a Labor Party member of Parliament and Justice of the Peace, I have undertaken to make myself available to those constituents of Glenelg who require my assistance.

I presume that all the constituents in the honourable member's district are so happy with the Liberal Government in this State that he receives no complaints; he has nothing to do and he has decided to put his time in somewhere, so he decided to help people in Glenelg. The honourable member is new and inexperienced and does not know the ropes. He does not realise that Glenelg has been well looked after for the past 10 years. Previous to that, the district was in a bad way because the member for Glenelg was a previous Minister. However, for the past 10 years the district has gone from strength to strength. Anyone with experience would have known that, but not this gentleman, because he was a new boy. The letter further stated:

I wish you to know that I would be pleased to advise and assist you on any matter in which you feel that I may be able to help you. Some problems, of course, have no easy solution, while others are the concern of the Federal Government or your local town or city council. However, even in these cases I may be in a position to advise you as to whom you should approach.

I will not read the next fluffed-up paragraph. The letter is signed by a rubber stamp and it looks like "Pluckett," but I think it is "Plunkett". The letter is not dated, of course, because the Labor Party hangs on to letters until it has enough postage to put them all out. I presume that this is done all over the State in the districts of Liberal members.

The point I make in all sincerity is that, if anyone comes to me with a problem and they live in another member's district, whether that member is one of my colleagues on this side or a member on the other side, I say, "I am sorry, you are not in my electorate; you do not live in my district, and it is only right that you should go to your own member of Parliament." I explain that members of Parliament are jealous of boundaries. I would be angry if someone advised my constituents. I tell people that they should approach their own member, whoever he is.

However, we see that this gentleman has called off that practice, so it would now appear that all bets are off. It is now an open go for anyone to poach and pirate into any other member's district. This was a matter of principle. We did not do it. We understood that this was something that did not normally take place. Members look after their own constituents and suggest to people in other districts that they approach their own member of Parliament. That is only right, whether that member is Labor or Liberal. Constituents should approach their own member for the service they want. That is fair enough. I have always done that ever since I have been here.

On one occasion, I did not follow this practice in relation to a constituent of the previous member for Ascot Park, Geoff Virgo. I had connections with a school, because my son attended that school. One of Geoff Virgo's constituents approached me. As soon as I realised the situation, I immediately rang the Minister and explained what had happened. He said "That is all right, John; if you have fixed it up and your boy goes to that school, you continue." The last thing I would have done, up until today, would have been to issue a letter, such as that I have cited, in any other member's district. It is disgraceful, a matter of principle for anyone on the other side let alone the new member for Peake. I am surprised and disappointed that he should start to break rules in this area. I am disappointed in the gentleman. I listened intently when he made his maiden speech and I thought he was a reasonably decent fellow. I am disappointed, if these are the tactics he employs. He has not been long getting down there.

Mr. Randall: He learnt it from the member for Florey.

Mr. O'Neill: He does not engage in defamation.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have the letter here to prove it. Let us get back to the original document about which I was speaking. The document continued:

As was shown by the electors, the decision was an unpopular one and, having regard to the fact that the A.L.P. vote dropped by an average of 13 per cent in the metropolitan area and by 6 per cent in rural areas, it was indicative that our heavy loss in the metropolitan area was caused by the following factors:

1. The calling of an election too early.
2. The lack of knowledge by the electors of our policies.

What policies? Is this a joke? What policies did they have? None—only the fact that they wanted an early election because they thought they were riding on the pig's back.

The third point referred to the bus strikes. Now they are going back on the poor old workers in regard to the bus strikes. That was the third priority. The fourth priority was the political blackmail of employer groups, supported by the media. The report does not talk of the money that was ripped off the trade union members to put in Party funds to help run the election. It did not mention the sustentation fees and the political levies that go into Party funds to fight an election. Mr. Elstob went on to say:

The calling of the election was counterproductive to the efforts of electorate assemblies, similar to Glenelg, who were progressively working to establish a creditable public image, to enable the Party to have some hope of success of capturing the seat in 1980 or 1981. The impatience of those responsible resulted in an unpopular vote, which culminated into yet a further disaster for the A.L.P. which must be considered, in terms of State elections, a major catastrophe.

It was a Labor Senator who wrote that. It is sad, really, because he likens the media to the methods employed by Goebbels, the arch-propagandist, who brainwashed the gullible and naive people of Nazi Germany. The Labor Party has brainwashed the gullible and naive people of this State for 10 years. The Party knows the rules. Let us not forget that the Nazis, the National Socialists, were another branch of the Socialist Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that it is upsetting. The report was secret until I got hold of a copy. I thought it only fair that the Opposition should know what the report contains; that is only right. My independent friend, the member for Semaphore, certainly would not have received a copy of it in his letterbox. The report continues:

The effect of the Tramway Employees Union bus strike was damaging to the Labor vote.

The report states that the strike affected the seaside electorates of Mawson, Brighton, Morphett, and Henley Beach. It also states:

Other electorates were similarly mauled where bus operators were on strike.

The Party even blames the poor workers now. The report further states:

The Labor Party and union played into the hands of our opponents and as a consequence we lost Hugh Hudson, Terry Groom and Les Drury. These men we can ill afford to be without.

The Party insinuates that these members would be better as Opposition members than as Government members. The report continues:

I further mention the stupidity of a Party member, not referring to the new member for Florey—

Mr. Becker: He was the heavy.

Mr. MATHWIN: He was the heavyweight. The report continues:

Mr. Fairweather, in his capacity as a union official, made a public announcement, threatening the withdrawal of union labour and blacklisting employers who had joined the Liberal campaign. This member only added to the worsening of our campaign, which gave electors the impression that our Party was as bad if not worse than the employers.

That is the end of that gentleman's remarks. Following that are the remarks of the man who opposed me, namely, the Glenelg candidate for the Labor Party. The report states:

The campaign in Glenelg was one which was designed to show the electorate that the Labor Party in this area was efficient . . .

That is a challenge for anyone. The Labor Party was going to show the people of Glenelg how efficient it was in the Glenelg area: that is a real challenge. It was going to show how responsible and creditable was the organisation. I will

not quote the entire report, but I will quote from another part of it, under the heading "Doorknocking", as follows:

During the course of the campaign doorknocking was a major part of our programme.

Supporters knocked on 6 000 doors, and the impression the inhabitants gave was that they all voted for me. The report continues:

I would like to thank the member for Mitchell, Ron Payne, M.P., and Senator Ron Elstob and the Hon. B. Wiese.

I take it that the two Ronnies were working hard in my district, namely, Ronnie Payne and Ronnie Elstob. Now, we know the secret of my success!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that he should not refer in a disparaging manner to other members of this House.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the member for Mitchell, but I could not resist saying that we had the two Ronnies. The reference in the report to the member for Mitchell might give him a boost. I thank all three of them for their help in the campaign at Glenelg.

Mr. Becker: Will you hire them for the next election?

Mr. MATHWIN: They will have to get their names down early, because there will be a rush for the job. I refer now to the Brighton High School, among other matters.

Mr. Gunn: What about the Parole Board?

Mr. MATHWIN: Although I should like to talk about that and other matters, I will not have the time to do so. I have been concerned about the Brighton High School for some time. I believe that it has been penalised because it has been so successful. It has always had good staff and good personnel on its committees, which are hard-working, and there has been tremendous support from the parents over the years. The school was built on the cheap over the years (and I refer now to all previous Governments because the school has been in existence since 1952). The school has been given a low priority, which is wrong and which should be corrected. There ought to be some inquiry into why the school is on such a low priority. Enrolments are up and are climbing because of the school's reputation. Enrolments will increase over the years, because the school is a good one with very good results from the staff and students. I asked the previous Minister of Education what was taking place and whether he would make an inspection of the school. Because he did not answer a number of questions I had asked him, I thought that he did not know what was going on at the school, and perhaps it would do him good to have a look to see what was the situation. The Minister wrote me a letter, part of which states:

While I can appreciate the school council's concern regarding the large number of wooden buildings, it does also enjoy many modern facilities—

and these have been supplied mainly by the parents—

and in 1978 a master plan was prepared for the total redevelopment of the school.

This is what I am trying to get at. The Minister said there was a master plan prepared, yet we find, by questioning the present Minister, that there was no master plan prepared, although the previous Minister said in 1978 that a master plan was prepared. That was misleading not only me, but the House, about the situation at Brighton High School. Since then I have made further inquiries and I have found that no moves were made by the previous Government to relieve the situation at the school. I will quote some of the problems that exist. The need is for redevelopment, and a report put out by the parents committee states:

The original building, comprising the east and south wings of Brighton High School, and being of solid construction, was

erected in 1952. This contains 10 classrooms and an exceedingly restricted administration area . . . Two or three years later the temporary timber classrooms—

and we all know what that means. When we talk of "temporary" in the education area, we are talking about "temporary" being "permanent," because this goes back to 1954, when they talked of "temporary timber classrooms," which are still there. That is a long time to be temporary, although some temporary members last longer than that. The report continues:

Two or three years later the temporary timber classrooms, as we now know them, began to spring up in the school grounds. We now have approximately 29 temporary structures, excluding the galvanised iron sheds.

Mr. Keneally: Is that at Brighton? I thought you were bragging about the good job we did in your district.

Mr. MATHWIN: I wish the member for Stuart would stop mumbling in his beard.

Mr. Keneally: I thought—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will please resume his seat. The honourable member did relate to the House earlier that he had been here for 10 years, so I am sure he does not need the assistance he is receiving. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. Keneally: He does.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. The main building of the Brighton High School has 13 classrooms, and there are 21 wooden classrooms. There are three laboratories in the main building and four wooden laboratories. There are five wooden art classrooms, two wooden commercial classrooms, and a wooden classroom used as a music centre. If a fire were to occur it would be serious indeed, because it would be impossible for a fire appliance to get anywhere near the buildings; that is the worrying part of the whole situation. It is time the matter was reassessed by the department. Indeed, it is about time the promised plan (the one said to be here, which is not here and which was never prepared by the previous Minister of Education), was proceeded with. The report continues:

The building of a Commonwealth library (resource centre) and a new school hall have considerably improved the facilities but have added to the congestion of single storey buildings over a small area of land.

The report continues, later:

The science laboratories are obsolete and unhygienic. In the biology laboratory the odour of mice kept for experiments penetrates the rooms where the children work. So, the story of this school continues, with reference to the complete lack of covered ways so that students and staff may move from one area to another. Time is wasted because of the long distances between buildings which have been sited regardless of convenience. There is an increased fire hazard since entry by the eastern end is obstructed. Thoroughfares are small gaps between the groups of prefabricated rooms at the western end of the school. Inadequate ventilation promotes fatigue amongst students and teachers, and there is a lack of area for matriculation students—an interesting fact that I draw to the attention of the House.

Recently, the Public Works Standing Committee, of which I am pleased and honoured to be a member (because it is a good committee with good members from both sides of the House), heard evidence at Murray Bridge High School. It was stated there that one of the reasons that extensions were needed was the lack of area for Matriculation students. They said they had a number of students doing Matriculation. I questioned the department about the criterion for an area to be supplied for

Matriculation students and I was told that the number is 100 students. I questioned the people at Murray Bridge and was told that they had 75 Matriculation students in 1979 and they expected to have 85 in 1980.

Brighton High School, which has more than 125 Matriculation students has no area at all for Matriculation students. In fact, they tried to provide a common room for those students in one of the upstairs corridors, so that the students would have somewhere to gather. I think that is disgraceful in this modern day and age. It is also disgraceful that Brighton High was built at about the same time as the Norwood and Enfield high schools and both of those schools have been upgraded and rebuilt, but Brighton High School has not. In fact, all that has happened is that it has been given more and more wooden classrooms, thus creating a greater fire hazard. I ask the department to look seriously at the situation at that school.

I turn now to the Governor's Speech, which referred to the abolition of succession duties on estates of persons dying on or after 1 January, the abolition of gift duty, the provision of remissions for pay-roll tax and a reduction in stamp duty. Immediately we came to office these promises were honoured. It did not take us long to get on with the job of honouring them.

A Bill to abolish land tax on a taxpayer's principal place of residence is to be introduced. We promised that, in the field of local government, hospital levies, which have long been a bone in the throat of local government in this State, will be dispensed with over a three-year period. That is needed. Local government has been asking for that to be done for as many years as I have been in here, and for as many years as I was in local government as a councillor, alderman, and mayor.

Mr. Keneally: You're going too fast.

Mr. MATHWIN: I cannot understand what the member for Stuart is bleating about over there, but obviously he has been with his sheep too long. Premature termination of the life of the Parliament for reasons of political opportunism will be dealt with. Of course, the pace was set by the former socialist Government. As I said earlier, Mr. Dunstan never ran his full term, and that was carried on by the person who took over from him, Des Corcoran, who thought, "This is the pace set by my predecessor, he did all right, so we will do the same thing." We are going to change that, and we will make sure that Governments run their full term of office and do not take every political opportunity to call an election.

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

Mr. MATHWIN: In his Speech, His Excellency said that the Government would repeal or revoke directions that imposed compulsory union membership. That was a strong part of His Excellency's Speech, and I look forward with much interest to seeing that change come about. I recently procured a copy of the Federated Furnishing Trades Society of Australasia's log of claims and conditions. It reads like a fairy story, and although I cannot read the whole claim because it covers such a wide field and contains many pages, I draw attention to some parts of it. Honourable members know that the claim is what is known as an "ambit" claim, but how wide the ambit goes is anyone's guess. The log seeks to obtain for grade A furniture makers \$1 000 a week, and that sum diminishes in respect of class A1, class A2, class B and class C workers to \$550 a week. If a grade A furniture maker becomes a charge hand with more than 20 employees, he will under the claim get an additional \$50 a day.

If that log of claims were put into effect, the minimum wage paid to an employee over the age of 18 years would be \$550 a week. The service grant for each year of service would be \$50, and after two years the service grant would be \$100. Rates for apprentices are included, but the most interesting part of the claim concerns the industrial democracy policy. In part, the claim states:

In each factory employing 30 or more persons, the employees shall have the right to elect a workers council, consisting of one person for each 10 employees or part thereof.

The system that they desire is that which is already in operation in Yugoslavia. Honourable members who attended the industrial democracy conference in Adelaide about three years ago will recognise that this claim is part of the submission presented on behalf of the Yugoslavian people, and it mirrors the set-up existing there. They had workers councils with tremendous power. The claim states:

Members of the workers council shall be granted three weeks paid leave each year in order to participate in training programmes which are designed to properly prepare them for the task of effectively representing interests of their fellow employees.

Members of the workers council may not be dismissed except with the express approval of the council and shall be given paid time off to carry out their duties.

Personnel changes, i.e. hiring, firing, transfer of employees, alteration of production lines, alteration of working times, shall only take place with the participation of the workers council and the employees concerned.

Foremen and leading hands shall be elected by and from the employees in each factory or department.

This means that employees would elect their own leading hands, which is not always desirable. The claim continues:

The workers council shall be given company information necessary for making objective decisions with respect to wage claims, redundancy, industrial safety and shall be heard by the employer on any social or economic matters concerning the company and its employees. Where no workers council exists, such information shall be available to the society.

That means to the union concerned. In regard to bereavement leave, the claim seeks the following conditions:

An employee shall on the death of a wife, husband, father, mother, child or step-child, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, sister-in-law, brother-in-law, grandmother, grandfather, grandchild, aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, be entitled to leave including the day of the funeral of such relation, such leave shall be for one week...

I am sympathetic where a near relative has passed away, but I would not go as wide as this claim goes and give people a week off, especially when people so far removed as, say, a nephew are involved. That part of the claim is not only silly but damned ridiculous!

Incentive schemes or piecework are taboo in the eyes of the union. At page 12 of the claim the following appears:

All work performed under the award made from this log shall be on a time-work basis. No operator shall operate piece work, incentive system or any system of payment by results unless with the direct consent of the society and under conditions agreed to by the society.

Honourable members can see where the union is leading us with such a log of claims. Finally, I refer to another area of special leave—maternity, paternity and prenatal leave. The claim is as follows:

An employee who is eligible shall be entitled to maternity leave on full pay for six calendar months, together with six weeks pre-natal leave.

Mr. Gunn: What about twins?

Mr. MATHWIN: For twins, I suppose it would be doubled, and for triplets it would be tripled. The claim continues:

All time taken for maternity and pre-natal leave shall be counted as time worked for the purpose of calculating annual leave and long service leave entitlements. Immediately on the birth of his child, a male employee shall be entitled to one month's paternity leave on full pay.

One wonders who is bearing the child. We are now in the era of sex equality and the like, but that is stretching the point.

I draw attention to the situation of builders who go broke, to the detriment of their workers and particularly their subcontractors. After going broke, or after being declared bankrupt or bankrupting themselves, they are then adopted by some \$2 company, which takes them on and allows them to run a job. Because of their experience in the building trade, they run that job, and finally the company goes bankrupt. In many cases, the people in the company are professional people. I am talking about people in Adelaide in particular. The unfortunate people who are buying units or houses built by the company are then left without recourse when repairs are needed. These include such things as tiles that have not been fixed properly or timberwork that is not correct. When this occurs, these people have nobody to whom to go, and they have to pay for the renovations themselves. I think the Government has a responsibility to tighten this situation, and certainly to take some action to stop builders who have gone bankrupt from going into a \$2 company set up by professional people who have taken the responsibility for building homes and who then leave the purchasers to fare the best way they can.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: How do you think you are going to stop that?

Mr. MATHWIN: We will leave that to experts in the law. We have a few in this place. One would think that the honourable member would have taken some action before this, as he was in a very strong position as Attorney-General to do something about the matter.

A constituent of mine went over to Port Lincoln to obtain a job, and he was employed by Ekos Constructions Pty. Ltd., which built a big project in Port Lincoln in two separate operations. I suppose one could say he was fairly lucky, because all he got done for was \$800, but to him that was a large sum of money, as he is a young man with a young family. The bricklayers on that project were in for \$20 000. One could say that they were fools for letting the matter go that far. Nevertheless, when one is seeking work and there seems to be plenty available, such as in that project, one is tempted to take the job. It seems to me unfortunate that this sort of thing should continue and that it has not been stamped out before now.

Recently, some colleagues and I visited the Yatala gaol. We were all surprised and affected by the number of young people who were there. I expected to see many middle-age and older men in that gaol, and I was surprised to see that the average age of the people there was between 18 and 19 to about 28 to 30 years.

Mr. Millhouse: That is quite a normal pattern.

Mr. MATHWIN: Maybe it is a normal pattern for the past few years, but I do not think this has always been so.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, it has.

Mr. Gunn: What about McNally? Have you been there?

Mr. MATHWIN: We have not been there for a while, but we are about to visit that place.

Mr. Gunn: What about the Parole Board?

Mr. MATHWIN: I could say a lot about the Parole Board. We toured the gaol and were allowed to inspect all sections of it. In the high-security section, I was surprised

to see one area which was very well maintained. As most members would know, it is a very old building. This area was painted and quite clean, and in very good condition. It was better than most parts of the other high-security area, yet it was empty. The modern method of cameras for security was in evidence. I was disappointed to learn that it has been empty for the past 12 months or more, the union having refused to man it because it wanted an extra person there because of the new security system. I thought how much better that was compared to some of the other areas in the unit, and I was most disappointed to see that, because of the union, some of the inmates were confined to some far worse quarters than they needed to occupy. It was disappointing to see that such a situation could come about because a union had refused to allow a better area to be manned.

We then visited the women's prison at Northfield. There was a colossal difference between the two prisons, and I seriously suggest that it was very similar to a motel. It was very well set out, and I am quite sure that, if it were closed today, within a week it could be put into operation as a motel. What surprised me was there were only 19 inmates. I do not believe in sex discrimination, but I wonder why we have only 19 naughty ladies in South Australia. There must be more than that, and there certainly must have been more than that before the courts, yet the Yatala prison is full, but only 19 women are imprisoned at Northfield.

Mr. Plunkett: How many more women do you require to fill the place?

Mr. MATHWIN: What I am suggesting is that there is a colossal difference between what is handed out to the men and what is handed out to the women, and I say that is discrimination. I am surprised that the Women's Electoral Lobby or a similar group has not said that there is a problem of sex discrimination in prisons, in that the males rather than the females are being discriminated against.

I will have the opportunity this year to visit other institutions when I go on a study tour, and I shall be investigating the situation in relation to correctional services for juveniles in many different countries in the world. I shall be visiting some of the countries in the Eastern bloc, and I shall be comparing the situations in some of those countries with the situation here, and finding out how well they treat their prisoners, and how well prisoners fare in their institutions. I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have little, if any, enthusiasm for this motion. I have hesitated to speak in the debate, particularly because during the last session of Parliament it was, I think, the only speech I made. I thought I made quite a good speech, but it did not get any coverage at all outside this place. Then the election was called, and everybody started reading my speech and saying, "Well, that must have been Millhouse's swan song—he sounded as though he thought he was going to be defeated."

I must say that I did not expect to survive the last election to be here to take part in this debate during this session. I was as surprised as anyone else at the result of that election, both in my own electorate and generally. However, I must say that a few days before polling day I realised that things in Mitcham were going rather better for me than I thought would have been possible. Indeed, the result in Mitcham was quite satisfactory to me.

I had been told during the whole of the life of the last Parliament that I would be beaten at the next election. In its arrogance and over-confidence, the Labor Party had told me that I would be defeated, and I well remember

hearing on the night the election was announced by the former Premier, when he was asked a question about me on television, he said "Yes, Mr. Millhouse will lose his seat." During the election campaign I had to be in touch with the Hon. Hugh Hudson, who was then still a Minister, because I was trying to obtain some money for poor Mrs. Kotarski, on whose behalf I was thrown out of this House by the member for Unley, as he is now. I had several telephone conversations with the Hon. Hugh Hudson and on each occasion he commiserated with me and said "You know, Robin, it is a pity the way it has gone; we'll miss you after the election. I am sorry it has turned out this way." Although I said nothing, within increasing confidence as the days went by, I wondered whether he was right. Well, he was not right, and I now understand that the Labor Party is looking for a seat for the Hon. Hugh Hudson, but cannot find one. There we are; that was one of the amusing things about the last election.

The result in Mitcham was that only 8 per cent of the voters followed the Labor how-to-vote card. For those members who are interested (and I am sure every member is, whether he admits it or not), Dean Jaensch's swing of the pendulum diagram shows that statistically Mitcham is now the safest seat from Labor of any seat in the State. I believe that Mitcham was the one seat in which the vote of both the Labor and Liberal Parties declined dramatically. The Liberal vote (and it was probably because it had a second-time-around candidate who had been well exposed to the electorate) went down by 4.5 per cent. My vote went up by 12.8 per cent and the Labor vote went down by 8.6 per cent. Therefore, the Labor Party received a total vote of 17.3 per cent. As the Labor *Herald* newspaper said, of that vote of 17.3 per cent, Crowley's preferences (and Rosemary was an excellent candidate, and on merit she should be in here well before a number of other members on both sides of the House, and I hope that one day she does make it) were distributed with 1 469 coming to me and only 1 226 going to the Liberals, to which Party they had been directed by the Labor Party.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think she likes you, Robin?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I like her. We get on pretty well; she is a runner, and she is good. The only thing wrong with her is that she still smokes cigarettes. The situation before the election was that the arrogant over-confident Labor Party decided that I must go. In fact, the Labor Party co-operated with the Liberal Party to that end, and that is also mentioned in that self-pitying issue of the Labor *Herald*, which states that the co-operation between the Labor and Liberal Parties really assured my victory more than anything else. This meant that the Labor Party vote in Mitcham was absolutely shattered. The Liberal vote also declined very markedly.

The result of the election was a fluke, and there is no doubt about that at all. The result in the Norwood by-election is a pretty good indication of that. I suggest with charity and respect to some of the members on the Government benches that they had better decide what they will do after the next election because a number of them will certainly not be here.

I suppose that every member who has spoken in this debate has said something about why the result was as it was. I have already implied that the main reason for it was the obvious arrogance of the Labor Ministers and their supporters in this place. They had been in Government for 10 years, and the over-confidence they exhibited was related to the appalling performance of the Liberal Party in Opposition.

Mr. Mathwin: Ha, ha!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg does not have the brains to realise what an appalling performance his Party put up before the last election. The over-confidence exhibited by the Labor Party was best exemplified by a jibe from the then Premier, the member for Hartley, when he said, when the then Leader of the Opposition reshuffled his so-called shadow Cabinet, "It is like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic." I believe that it was that attitude that led he and his colleagues into an early and disastrous election.

What really determined the result of that election was the bus strike in the last few days of the campaign. By Saturday people in South Australia, especially in Adelaide, were fed up to the back teeth with the Labor Party. I think that the member for Florey in this debate said something about enemies of the working class getting into the trade unions. The Labor Party should realise that a policy of compulsory unionism, which they pursue in all but name, by taking over the private bus lines—

Mr. O'Neill: That is a plain untruth, and it is obvious that you are ignorant of the situation in the trade union movement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I expect that interjection will be typical of the interjections we will hear from the member for Florey. I would have thought that he would be quiet at this time, because he is one of the architects of the defeat of his Party at the last election. The member for Florey received an easy ride into Parliament, but he is one of those responsible for some of the 15 of his Party members who were defeated at the last election and are no longer here. I suggest that the member for Florey should be quiet. The fact is that the bus drivers were sick of union directions; they were sick of the Government. They did not care what happened and they were going to show it.

On the Thursday afternoon before the election a member of the executive of the bus drivers' union came to see me and told me that his union wanted me to know why they were on strike. He said that if the Government had been prepared to give them the day before what it was now prepared to give them, there would not have been a strike at all. I asked him, "Don't you realise that if you go on with this strike you will be the death of the Government?" He said, "Look, I have voted Labor all my life and my father has voted Labor all his life; I know nothing about politics and I do not care". That was that union's attitude. Undoubtedly it was that foolish attitude of the Government towards that union that caused that strike and brought about the Government's downfall.

Perhaps it is poetic justice that the Hon. Mr. Virgo, who was the then Minister of Transport, was unable to do anything to stop that strike. He had been the Minister, the Secretary of the Labor Party, I think, before he came in here, he had been in office for nine years, and even after that time his relationships with the blokes who were responsible to his department were so bad that the strike occurred and he defeated the Government of which he was a member and the Party of which he had been a member. I must say that politically I do not much care for Mr. Virgo, and it is perhaps poetic justice that the last words recorded in *Hansard* by him on 21 August last year were blasphemous abuse of me.

I am rather pleased about this because it was typical of the way he reacted in office, with more arrogance than anyone else I know, and that is saying something of the previous Labor Ministers. I make an exception of the previous Minister, the member for Mitchell. He was never like that; he was one of the better ones. The former Minister, Mr. Virgo, said to me (and these are the last recorded words of his in this place):

... obviously the honourable member wants an empty

bus—

I was asking him a few questions about the revision of the time tables for metropolitan buses—

running backwards and forwards to Westbourne Park so that he can get on with his gold pass and not contribute one brass cent and read his Bible in his pious, hypocritical way on the way to the city.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: And I ate apples coming down here at lunch time, but I do not do so now because since the election, realising that members of Parliament ought to set an example and recognising that the cost of fuel is going up and up, I have taken to riding a bike, so I cannot read the bible on the way into town and I cannot eat apples on the way here. I have had to change all my habits. I will come back to the bike-riding later. Let me now develop my speech in logical sequence.

I have said something about the Labor Party and its appalling performance. Let me now turn to the Liberal Party. The Liberals were as stunned by their victory, I suggest, as anyone else. They had been foolish enough before the election to make extensive and detailed election promises; I have what I think is a complete set of their policies—24 policy documents—that we will consult from time to time.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: All ready to go into Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What did the Minister of Agriculture say?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of his seat.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was only a couple of weeks before election promises were being broken. I raised one of those matters during the Budget debate—the question of the Public Accounts Committee and of giving the member for Hanson the Chairmanship of the committee and a motor car to go with it as solace for his not getting into Cabinet. That action was directly contrary to the policy laid down for the Public Accounts Committee, which was to be strengthened instead of weakened, as it has been. Since the Government has been in office, it has behaved much like the previous Labor Government. Government members seem to be more interested in the perks of office than anything else. All those senior members of the Party who dipped out on Cabinet, whether surprised or not by that, have been given motor cars or one sort of perk or another. Even the member for Gouger, disappointed not to be occupying the seat that you, Sir, now embrace, has become the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, in your place, I understand, and he received his motor car. He was, of course, the last member to get it, but nevertheless it was a pretty good consolation prize for the defeat that was suffered by the Government on the floor of the House on the first day.

The Government's political supporters have been given Ministerial positions. My two time opponent, Mr. Robert Worth, is now the vice Minister of Community Welfare on a very generous salary. He is down here all the time. I found him sulking in one of the interviewing rooms only this afternoon. Undoubtedly, he is being nursed to have another go at me in Mitcham. He has said as much, and that has been relayed to me. I suggest it is really an unconscionable use of Government money. Then, there is Mr. Nicholls, called Mr. Rob Nicholls now. He was the Liberal candidate for Unley. He is now an adviser in the Premier's Department. I came across his name only today in relation to Victoria Square and that vexed question of Moore's, about which I will speak in a few minutes. Then, too, there is Mrs. Barbara Hardy, Tom Hardy the winemaker's wife—a staunch Liberal Party member. A

couple of days after the election she was working for the Hon. Mr. Wotton in his office.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not say she was being paid. She is an inveterate letter-writer and, when I took the Government to task in November about the lavish use of Government cars, she wrote, the next week, to a newspaper saying:

I am heartily sick of the whinges, whines, moans and groans of Robin Millhouse.

She finished her letter by saying:

Come on, Robin, stop that constant carping; it might get you some notoriety but it does not get you many friends. Well, I know I do not have too many friends left. I have a few friends in Mitcham, but I do not think I have any in this place. All the people to whom I have referred have, as far as I know, been given substantial preferment by the Labor Government.

Mr. Hemmings: The Liberal Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I am so used to the other.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Transport has interjected. The matter of Ministerial cars was mentioned a few minutes ago. I wrote the Minister a letter and he said that he was putting proposals to the Government for the curtailing of the use by Government Ministers, and no doubt others, of Government cars and that he would make a public announcement shortly. Well, that must be two or three months ago, and as yet we have heard nothing from him. I tell him that it is a matter that I propose to follow up with him in due course. I think that every able-bodied member in this House should ride a bike. Even Ministers (those who are fit enough—and there are not too many in that category) could walk or ride a bike and save petrol. That would be an extremely good idea.

The Government has now had six months in office, and I must say that during that time I have tried to contain myself and not to be critical, because I think that any body of people should be entitled to some time to settle down and to get into harness, certainly a group of people who are thrust into office as unexpectedly and with so little experience as were members of the Government. To be a success during its term of office (and I do not expect the Government will have more than one term, but one does not know what will happen and I was surprised last time), the Government must clean up the excesses and messes of its predecessors. No doubt we can argue about what should be cleaned and what should be left, but if members opposite do no more than that they will have served a useful purpose in the community.

They do not have to be very innovative unless they feel moved to be. If only they could undo some of their predecessors' mistakes, that would be enough. However, they do not seem to have done even that so far. They have perpetuated most of the mistakes, and have gone on doing much the same sort of thing, no doubt dominated by the same public servants as were their predecessors.

I now refer to another matter which I have mentioned several times previously. It involves only a modest reform, and I have written to the Minister of Transport about this. There is no doubt whatsoever that as time goes on petrol will be more expensive and scarce in our community, and we must get away from the lavish use of motor cars. Bicycle riding in a city like Adelaide is an obvious alternative, yet, now that I have taken to it myself, I find that those roads are damn rough and very uncomfortable and, if the Government does nothing else but improves the facilities for cyclists with bicycle tracks and by making roads such as Hyde Park, Unley and King William Roads a little more comfortable, it will be a good thing.

May I also suggest that the trains and buses should have better facilities than they now have for the carriage of bikes. There is room on the red hen trains for a few bikes, but on the buses, as far as I know, there is nothing.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am told that there are only four spaces on the new carriages. Is that all?

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not particularly interested in this byplay between the two Parties. They both made lots and lots of mistakes, and indeed many of the same mistakes. That is one thing that should be done.

Mr. Becker: Where will you get the money for your suggestion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member gave up his motor car and driver, and a few of his perks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —there would probably be enough money at least to provide for spaces on buses for bikes. A few hooks on the back might be enough.

Mr. Becker: What have you got to say about legal fees being increased?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think something is wrong with the member for Hanson. I seem to have provoked him a bit. Perhaps I have pricked him into making one or two unwise interjections. I think it would be better if the honourable member shut up.

If I may say so with charity (I want to deal now with some specific matters), the Government has in a number of instances acted in an arbitrary fashion and made decisions obviously without thinking through the results. One of these, which was debated in this place this afternoon and with which I intend to deal, is the purchase of the Moore's building. If I may say so, this afternoon's debate missed that point entirely. I know that the Labor Party is in a difficult position because it must admit that it was going to buy the building for one purpose or another, and it weakens the thrust of their attack on the Liberals.

The real point about Moore's is that it is a disaster to the other retailers in the area. The Leader of the Opposition and the former Premier (Mr. Corcoran) this afternoon did not mention that point at all.

Mr. Bannon: Yes, I did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Leader did, it certainly did not come through to me, and I listened attentively to the whole of his speech, which related to whether Mr. Jack Weinert was or was not justified in what he did. Of course, the Premier latched on to that, but it is still completely irrelevant to the main point, which is whether the loss of Moore's will kill that retail area in Adelaide.

I have here a little bit of information about that matter. On 21 December, I wrote to the Premier asking him not to proceed with the purchase. I gave three reasons for it, the first of which was that the Government already owned two sites for the purpose of erecting new court buildings. It has owned for many years the site to the west of the present court buildings on which there are now derelict buildings.

It is absurd to say that the plans that have been drawn will cost \$30 000 000 or \$50 000 000 to put into effect. There is no reason why, if they are as elaborate as that, they cannot be redrawn. I do not know how many members have looked at that area. However, I went into the Moore's building today and talked to Arturo Taverna about what has happened to him. That gentleman has lost 80 per cent of his business since Moore's closed, and it is still going down, his staff in that area having been reduced from 20 to five.

It is ironic that the people who are complaining the loudest about this are the strongest Liberal supporters. I

refer, for example, to Lou Ravesi (who was at one time a Liberal candidate and a card-carrying member of the Liberal Party), Myer Solomon, and people like that. I refer also to Mr. Taverna himself, although I have never talked to him about politics.

These are the people who are being hit hard, but not one word is said about the 300 retailers and the 5 000 people whom they employ and who are now at risk because of Moore's being closed. I do not know who received this letter, although I certainly received a copy. On 25 January, Lou Ravesi himself wrote to me. Part of his letter is as follows:

I am writing to all members of the Liberal Government as I am very concerned with the decision taken by the Government to convert Moore's for law court use. As Chairman of the Victoria Square Traders Action Committee, representing some 300 independent small traders and about 5 000 employees, I am concerned at the uncompromising attitude taken by the Premier and Ministers.

He goes on on the second page of his letter to say:

In June last year the Central Market Area Committee commissioned a market research study of the area, and this clearly demonstrated the importance of Moore's. It showed that 64 per cent of shoppers surveyed came to Victoria Square to buy goods from Moore's—whereas just over 50 per cent of the same people made purchases at the Central Market.

That is the real point of it, not the bosh that we heard this afternoon from the Opposition. It was their first concerted attack on the Government, and I thought they might have done a bit better than that. However, they are not really interested in small business at all, whereas the crowd on the other side (that is, on your right-hand side, Sir) ought to be. They are hurting their own supporters by what they have done. I am sure that that decision could not have been thought through. The fact is that Moore's, even though it was ailing as a business, was a magnet and an entrance into that retail area of Adelaide.

I was told this afternoon that, unless the whole ground floor of the building is used for retailing in future, it will be like a locked door to that area. People will be kept out of there, and these traders will suffer even more. It is all very well for the Premier to say, or for the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Mr. Brown) to say as he did this afternoon, that it would save the Government \$7 000 000 or \$10 000 000. What about the injury that it is doing to the people in private enterprise?

The Government is talking in exactly the same way now as the Labor crowd spoke when they were in office. It is all "the Government, the Government, the Government", and what it will save the Government. What happens in the community does not seem to matter to them. The sooner that the Government snaps out of that, the better it will be. That is all we heard from the Minister of Public Works, or whatever his title is, this afternoon. He ought to be ashamed of himself. The Minister always says that he sticks up for private enterprise, but the Government does not give a damn about it when told by its public servants what to do.

I now return to the question I asked this afternoon regarding the site for court buildings. I do not know how much land is involved, but there is a lot of land to the west of the Supreme Court. In fact, it comprises the whole block between Gouger, Wright and Mill Streets, which area abuts the present court premises. What will the Government do with it? There is on that land a derelict old building which was once the Supreme Court Hotel and which is getting worse and worse. There are also derelict cottages and some room for car parking there. What will happen to that land?

This is something that annoys me even more, because I see it day after day. I refer to the blasted sign "Bottoms or bust" on the back of the Murray Hill building, the old King's Ballroom building. The Labor Government bought that building, on the corner of King William and Carrington Streets, apparently for the same purpose.

That was for court buildings, yet it has been derelict ever since the fire, and nothing apparently is to be done with that, either. The Government owned both those sites, and it cannot be said that they are not central. One is absolutely adjacent to the court buildings and the other is 50 metres across King William Street, instead of across Gouger Street.

Mr. Bannon: There is also the Commonwealth site.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the site they have made into a so-called pocket park now. They have had that for 15 years, and that is not being used for court purposes, whereas it could be. Why did they have to buy a building like Moore's and now stick to it? I suppose it is a matter of saving face more than anything else. It was obviously an ill-considered purchase that was not thought through. I asked these questions in my letter to the Premier, and I have never even had an acknowledgement of it from him. I find that, when things are hard, you do not hear anything at all. In that respect, they are even worse than the Labor Government used to be. I put the following questions:

- (1) How much money was spent on:
 - (a) buying the land in Gouger Street to the west of the present Supreme Court, and what is assessed as its value now?
 - (b) the plans for the new court building on that site originally drawn during the time when I was Attorney and what is the estimated cost of building in accordance with those plans on that site?

We heard today some broad estimate of it. If the plans are too elaborate, just because they happen to have been used for that site does not mean that they cannot be modified and other plans drawn to use that site. My first question continues:

- (c) on buying the site of the derelict Murray Hill building, and what is assessed as its value now?

My second question was as follows:

What does the Government now propose to do with these other two sites?—

stony silence, not a word was heard—

- (3) What is the estimated cost of converting Moore's to court premises?

We have not heard anything about that, either, except in the broadest terms. Mr. Taverna has a licence that runs until March 1981, with the right of renewal for three years. It is not a lease, as the Leader of the Opposition described it this afternoon. He does not have security of tenure, but it will cost him well over \$100 000 to relocate if he has to leave that area, as undoubtedly he will if the Government persists (there is the plumbing, air-conditioning, and so on). Does the Government think that he is going to have to bear those costs? Has it taken that into account in the \$2 400 000 that has been spent on it? I bet that it has not.

Even worse off is the little cafe called Minsky's. Its proprietors are facing bankruptcy because of what the Government has done. They cannot make their cafe pay now, because there is no trade in the area. What thought did the Government give to that matter before the decision was taken to buy Moore's? It is a very regrettable decision, one which the Government now, in its weakness, is stubbornly sticking to.

I thought that the Leader of the Opposition might have used this topic today. I have a memorandum prepared on this matter by Mr. Harry Williams, of Peoplestores. No-

one could accuse him of being a red ragger or anything but a staunch supporter of the Liberal Party. He states:

The loss of Moore's as a principal attraction to shoppers in the Central Market-Victoria Square shopping area.

(1) Any shopping area is dependent on a limited number of prime components to act as the principal attractions for its shoppers.

(2) Our research shows that the three main attractions in the Victoria Square complex are:

- (a) The market
- (b) Chas Moore
- (c) Coles.

(3) It is obvious that, if one of the attractions is removed and is not replaced by a correspondingly vital commercial oriented enterprise, which has this same drawing capacity to the area, a considerable loss of business will result.

All the Premier can say is that they have been plagued over the past years in that area. I would have thought that what Harry Williams has written is common sense. He continues:

(4) The traders are well aware of the danger of this happening, and see the Government's decision to take over Moore's for the operation of law courts as a definitely retrograde step.

(5) To attract business there must be a vital, bright and competitive atmosphere—anything which does not fit into this category will be damaging to the environment in which we trade.

I am a member of the legal profession, and I do not think one could ever describe courts as having a "vital, bright and competitive atmosphere". Mr. Williams continues:

(6) Moore's site, at the entrance to the Victoria Square shopping centre, is a key position. It must be redeveloped so that it will attract custom, create business and generate a flow of people through to the heart of the trading area.

That memorandum is dated only a couple of days ago. That is the position, and that is how people in their business will be ruined by this so-called free enterprise Liberal Government. It was not a very good start for the Government, in my view.

I come now to another matter, one on which I will not spend too much time, because I hope it will get an airing tomorrow. I think that it has already been aired in another place. I refer to the question of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill. I asked a question on this matter last week, not that I thought that I would get an answer from the Premier, because we only get waffle and a bit of pontificating from him in answers to questions. I carefully put the history of what has happened to see whether he would deny the accuracy of what I said. He did not deny that the Bill was introduced and the Select Committee appointed after the Bill was supported at the second reading by the now Minister of Education; that the members of the Select Committee were unanimous in their decision (and that included Liberals); that the Bill came in; and that now it is being repudiated. He did not deny any of those things.

If that is not dishonesty, I do not know what is. To stick to one's word is a fundamental virtue in public life. But just to change one's position because one happens to be in a position of power (and that is the only reason for the change—now that they are in office, they can do what they like; they are not constrained, as was the previous Government) is utterly dishonest. That is what we have on the Pitjantjatjara matter. The very fact that people like old Billy McMahon, in Canberra, are subscribing to a fund to see that the Bill gets through should cause at least some shame to members of the Liberal Party here. Not on your life!

This morning, I noticed at the declaration of the

Norwood poll that not one Liberal turned up to support Frank Webster in his defeat. We looked around. The Leader of the Opposition and I were there to support our candidates, and quite a number of other Labor people were there, too, but none of the Liberals turned up. The only thing that I saw which made the blue-rinse ladies who were there (Liberal supporters, no doubt) look uncomfortable was the mention of the Liberal Government's attitude to the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill. They looked distinctly uncomfortable when, I think, Mr. Crafter, the now member for Norwood, reproached the Government for what it was doing. I suggest that Government members search their consciences and have a few discussions with their Party members on this matter to see whether there cannot even now be some kind of change of heart.

I move on now to another matter, which came to my notice only today. Here again, it is one of these things for which both Parties must bear some blame and on which they do not have unblemished records. The matter concerns the Fire Brigade. A few weeks ago, I received a glossy document called "The South Australian Fire Brigade Inquiry, August 1979". I suppose that every honourable member received one of these about last December. It is the report of the committee set up by the Labor Government into the organisation of the Fire Brigade. I do not know whether it has penetrated the skulls of Government members, but there is a great deal of unhappiness in the brigade about the recommendations that have been made.

It is particularly about the fact that, as they interpret the recommendations, control of the Fire Brigade is to be taken out of the hands of officers who are experienced members of the brigade, experienced fire fighters, and so on, and given to public servants. That may have been the objective of the previous Government: I do not know. However, certainly that is how members of the Fire Brigade interpret the report, and a number of them have made submissions to the Government about this, as they were invited to do. I have a submission by the Deputy-Chief Fire Officer, Mr. Morphet. It is a detailed submission in which, in the summary on page 41, he sums up what I think I have said. He states:

The constant innuendo permeating the report that existing and potential management expertise is lacking amongst operational staff seems to indicate a strong desire to pave the way for one or more senior appointments to be made from some area outside the operational sector of the brigade.

To whom are these comments to go? They are to go not to some independent umpire but to Mr. Graham Inns, who was Chairman of the original committee that made the report. That, too, is causing much discontent, because the chaps feel that it is simply an appeal from Caesar to Caesar. The one who wrote the report is to evaluate the comments on it, and the men do not like that.

What they object to most particularly, though, is the point-blank refusal of Ministers, including the Premier, to see them to discuss this matter. That is why they came to see me this afternoon to find out whether we could get some sense into the Government. The Chief Secretary is primarily responsible for this matter. I do not hold any grudge against Mr. Rodda, but I think he is afraid to meet these people. He wrote to Mr. Pat Wilson, President of the Fire Fighters Association, on 19 December last, stating:

Cabinet recently decided to release the report of the South Australian Fire Brigade inquiry and in due course decisions will be made regarding the various recommendations contained therein. It would be of considerable benefit if the views of organisations such as yours were available to the Government at that time. I should therefore be grateful if

after perusing the enclosed copy you would let me have your comments on the report.

They wrote him a letter that must have crossed with that one dated 20 December and stating that a committee had been set up (which they call a select committee) to look into this matter. Mr. Clyde Buttery, Secretary of the Fire Fighters Association, said this:

It is intended that the findings of this committee will be available before Parliament resumes in February. We would seek a meeting with you early in February to present these submissions and explain our reasons, if you would be available.

Not on your life! Allan Rodda was not going to see them. They have tried to make appointments and have been refused. This morning, in desperation, they turned up at his office to try to see him. They saw only Kelvin Bertram, who said that no-one would be seeing the Minister on this. However, they believe that Mr. George Joseph has an appointment to see Mr. Rodda on Thursday about the matter. They are incensed at the treatment that they are receiving and they told me that at least Mr. Simmons, when he was Chief Secretary, told them that his door was always open to them if they wanted to see him, and they found that that was so. Now, with the change of Government, the position is different and they cannot get to see the Minister.

Mr. Max Brown: Open government!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be. I have a letter of 11 February that they wrote to Mr. Rodda. On 14 or 15 February (the copy I have is not dated), but certainly before 18 February, when the Premier replied, they wrote to the Premier, because they could not see the Chief Secretary. Mr. Buttery's letter states, in part:

My committee, and all officers of the brigade, are very seriously concerned with certain areas of the report which are considered to be inaccurate, ill-researched, misleading, ill-advised, defamatory, and in general, an insult to the South Australian Fire Brigade, which is considered among our peers, to be one of the most efficient fire services in this country.

The letter goes on:

However, since forwarding this submission to the Chief Secretary, I have been informed that the Minister does not intend to meet with any of the parties that were invited to comment on the report.

Because of this and the very grave concern of the officers as to the future of the South Australian Fire Brigade, my committee requests that you meet with representatives of the select committee, as a matter of urgency, so that the select committee's comments and suggestions can be explained and so that the Government can adopt a policy on the brigade that will be in the best interests of the public and of the brigade.

What sort of reply did they get from the Premier? He stated:

I have received your letter . . . I must say that the tone of your letter to me is in distinct contrast to that which you addressed to the Chief Secretary . . . If, as you suggest, you are now of the view there are certain areas of the report which are inaccurate, ill-researched, misleading, ill-advised, defamatory and in general an insult, then I feel you should pursue this with the authors of the report.

What a thing for the Premier of the State to say when people ask to speak to him! The Premier goes on in a rather pompous and patronising way, which I am afraid is typical of David Tonkin in office, and he states:

You would be aware that the Head of my department, Mr. G. J. Inns, was Chairman of that committee and I would suggest that you make contact with him to discuss those areas that you so critically refer to.

I seem to remember that the Premier did not want to meet the Pitjanjatjara elders, either. I do not know what position he thinks he is in, but I believe that any Minister, whether the Premier or a Minister who holds any other appointment in the Government, always should be prepared to see people who want to see him, unless the people concerned are cranks or nuts. We all know that there are some of those about, but they are the exceptions. Certainly, these people are not in that category and yet, while they are nursing a grievance about the report, they can see neither their own Minister nor the head of the Government, the Premier. I think that is disgraceful and I hope that, having said that tonight, there will be second thoughts about the matter, as there were regarding seeing the Pitjanjatjara people. If that is how the Government is going to behave, it certainly will not have more than one term in office.

I refer now to one of my pet subjects. I was very annoyed a few years ago when, in pursuit of what I was convinced was a republican outlook on the part of the Labor Party, the letters "O.H.M.S." were taken off Government envelopes in this State. I protested at the time and said that what was done was wrong. I put Questions on Notice, asking why it had been done and who had been responsible for it. I was told, "No, in future we will have 'South Australian Government' on them." This was not said but was undoubtedly behind it. There was to be none of this Royalist nonsense for us. We were South Australians and we were going to break all the links we could with the Crown. I thought that, when we got a new Government, that would be time to ask for a reversal of the decision, so I put a Question on Notice early in the life of the present Government. I asked:

Is it proposed to print the letters "O.H.M.S." again on Government envelopes and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

The only reply was:

No. It is considered that "S.A. Government" more appropriately identifies official South Australian Government envelopes.

I do not know whether the Liberals are republicans as well, but to me it seems that we should have every link we can retain and every reminder that we can have that we live under a monarchical system of Government. I wonder how much thought was given to that reply and to the matters I have mentioned. The Federal crowd still have "O.H.M.S." on their envelopes and there does not seem to be any more trouble about letters going astray than there ever was.

I hope that members opposite (who may say that I am a crank about this and that it does not matter anyway, and, "Who the hell is the Queen?" and that sort of thing) will do some rethinking about this, because symbols like this are important; they ought to know that. I was, I must say, disappointed at the reply I got from the Premier. I can only believe that the same public servant drafted the reply which I got from the last Government as the reply I got from this Government, and I hope that that will be taken up. There is just one other matter.

Mr. Keneally: You promised the last one would be the last.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought of something else. I forgot to mention this earlier. I meant to go on from Moore's to this matter because, again, this is an area of discontent that has welled up in the community. I refer to the question of the proliferation of shopping centres and whether there should be a moratorium on the building of shopping centres. I was approached only this morning by Mr. Stephen Bates, President of the Norwood Parade Association, who told me (and whether this is right or not

I cannot say) that the attitude displayed by the Liberals at the meeting on the eve of the election was one of the reasons Mr. Webster lost his seat. I think that may be a slight exaggeration, but the fact is that the people at that meeting were bitterly discontented and annoyed at what they heard from the Minister of Environment, who was sent by the Government to represent the Premier and the views of the Government.

Mr. Keneally: He had the Minister of Agriculture with him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not know that; he certainly had Mr. Webster with him. I was told he got there at 8 o'clock and waffled on saying nothing until half past eight when he said, "Come along, Frank; we have two other appointments tonight and we had better go", and they left the meeting. Whether it was meant to be a brush-off, whether they did not know what to say, or whether they wanted to stall until after the election, I do not know, but the fact is that the Norwood traders, and others, realised that there has not been a moratorium and that the Bill that has been introduced (and I do not propose to canvass this) does not provide for the moratorium they were seeking.

To me, the way in which shopping centres in the metropolitan area and nearby areas are proliferating is utterly crazy. I am very much opposed to yet another shopping centre at Blackwood, which was once in my electorate. I believe that is wrong. I understand that the Colonnades is a financial disaster. People are worried about development in Norwood. We know that the North Adelaide complex is causing trouble, because it is not getting nearly the trade expected. There is no doubt, I would have thought as a matter of common sense, that there are far too many retail outlets in the metropolitan area now and that there should be a moratorium on them; it would do no harm whatever, and it may save quite a number of bankruptcies. Certainly, that is another group of people the present Government has put off-side and I guess, as time goes on, there will be more and more. That will be the last thing I say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Langley: That will get you on-side, though.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I only speak when I have something to say.

Mr. Keneally: What about the Olympic Games?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am not going to talk about the Olympic Games, but I must say, finally, that I cannot support this motion because of the present incumbent of the Viceregal office but, nevertheless, I wanted to take the opportunity to raise the few points I have and I hope that, as the session progresses, I will be spared in this place and for the rest of the sessions of this Parliament, and maybe into the next Parliament, to raise issues as I see fit.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I suggest that, unfortunately, an atom of hypocrisy has crept into this whole debate. We have found, for example, that Government members rising in their seats to start their remarks in this debate have, without exception, turned to you, Mr. Speaker, and congratulated you on your appointment to your high office. They, unfortunately, did not proceed to tell us whether they voted for you. In fact, I have yet to find out who was the person who ratted on you. I believe that can only be described as pure hypocrisy.

Then, earlier this evening, we had, shall we say, the misfortune of listening to the member for Glenelg. He went on with some hypocrisy, too, because we were bombarded for about a half an hour by his self-importance on the basis of how he built up his majority in the seat of Glenelg. What he failed to do for incoming new members was to tell them (and this, in my opinion, borders on the

verge of hypocrisy) that his electoral boundaries have been changed at least twice, giving him areas from just about blue ribbon electorates. I hope that members of the Government did not fall for the line that the member for Glenelg endeavoured to put over this House, that he alone, through his personality and good looks, increased his majority.

Mr. Randall: He had the help of the two Ronnies.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I can assure the member for Henley Beach that that is not correct.

Mr. Keneally: The Liberals threw him out once.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is correct. I am reminded by the member for Stuart that, at one time, he left the Liberal Party and went to the Liberal Movement. He was a member of that Party for some time.

I am sorry to have to mention the member for Mitcham, but I believe that, although he did speak on important matters, he did touch on a matter of hypocrisy concerning himself. Once again we heard from the member for Mitcham about the perks of Parliamentarians. I believe that his perk now, apparently, is pushing a bike. His colleague in another place (the Hon. Mr. Milne) was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal that his gold pass, which he uses on public transport, saves him about \$100 to \$120 a year. That, to me, is absolutely appalling. I have been in this House for 10 years and can quite honestly say that I have never at any time used my gold pass on public transport in the metropolitan area or in any other place in this State. In fact, I do not even have my gold pass on me. I will be quite truthful; I have used that gold pass on one occasion, some seven years ago when I went to a football match at the Adelaide Oval. I paid to go in, but it was fairly crowded so I used my gold pass to go into the members' stand. That is the only time I have ever used my pass.

I believe, quite seriously, that for a person holding down a responsible position to go on record saying that they are using something they describe as a "perk" to save them \$100 to \$120 a year is absolutely appalling, to say the least. I do not even use my gold pass to go into the Zoo.

What makes it even more appalling is the fact that both the member for Mitcham and his colleague in another place talk about perks and quite openly refute any suggestion that they ought to get a wage increase, for example. Yet they have, time and time again, publicly said that they could not live on the salary of a Parliamentarian; they have to have two jobs. If that is not hypocrisy, I have never heard the word. Let us have that bunkum out of this sort of debate. That is hypocrisy of the highest order.

Further, I bring to the attention of the House the fact that the better speakers, with their ability to sum up the debate, have been left to speak last. Like good wine, the longer they are kept the better they become. The next speaker in this debate is the member for Stuart, and I ask him to pay particular attention to my contribution, because I am now going to deal with the achievements of the Government since it has been elected and, if there is anything I miss out, I would like my learned colleague to fill in the gaps.

Having dealt with that matter, I now turn to a couple of speeches made by Government backbenchers. First, I refer to the contribution by the member for Henley Beach, and I am pleased that he is in the Chamber. In the beginning of his speech, the honourable member stated:

I indicated that I was a union member and displayed my union membership card in the House. Within two days of displaying that card I received a letter from my union requesting return of that card and my resignation. I am no longer a member of that union. I want to know from those gentlemen whether they have retained their union

memberships.

Obviously, he is referring to colleagues of mine who were former trade union officials and trade unionists. I can only assume that he is referring at least indirectly to me, because I was in that category. Obviously, I must explain the situation again for the benefit of the member for Henley Beach. I am a former trade union official and have held membership of my union for some years despite the fact that some people have tried to get rid of me. I am still a financial member of my union, but I do not say that in all unions this position applies. Some unions are adamant that, once one leaves one's employment, one has to resign. That can be the situation, but it does not apply to all unions.

I can understand why the union of the member for Henley Beach wanted him to resign: in the next part of his speech, the honourable member states:

It becomes a bit of a problem for the union movement when members of unions say that they are members of the Liberal Party—

he can say that again—

I had problems when it became known to my union that I was a Liberal Party candidate. Whenever I spoke at union meetings there was a hue and cry because a Liberal candidate dared to speak at a union meeting and dared express an opposite viewpoint. That is the problem with unions today; they are not prepared to listen to the alternative viewpoint. I ask honourable members to look at the alternative viewpoint. Does the member for Henley Beach suggest that workers would not have difficulty in accepting a Liberal member and a Liberal Government as an ally? Does he suggest that they truly offer an alternative for the working class people of this country?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. MAX BROWN: If the member for Henley Beach examined the proposal, I suggest he would have to agree that Liberal Governments and Liberal Parties throughout Australia have created and fostered the most vicious anti-working class legislation ever envisaged in this country.

The honourable member has the gall to suggest that he has an alternative to the Labor Party for the working class people. Again, I point out to the member for Henley Beach that Liberal Governments, both State and Federal, have consistently opposed applications for wage justice on behalf of workers, they have opposed any advancement regarding conditions of employment and, in fact, they have fostered and fed the problem of unemployment. More importantly from my own point of view, over many years they have been renowned as union bashers and groups supporting anti-welfare policies.

Mr. Mathwin: Rubbish!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Glenelg, who has just returned to the Chamber, can say that, but I am talking about the anti-working class legislation and the attitude of Liberal Governments and the Liberal Party. I point out to the honourable member that it was his Party, federally, that initiated and carried out viciously, the penalty system which we knew some years ago and which existed in regard to awards. Both he and I know that those penalties were responsible, unfortunately, for the fleecing of trade unionists and working-class people in Australia out of thousands and probably millions of dollars. Yet the member for Henley Beach has the gall to suggest in this House that working-class people ought to respect and appreciate the viewpoints of Liberal people and Liberal Governments as another way out of their problem as working-class people.

Mr. Mathwin: Most of the rights you got were from right-of-centre Parties.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for

Glenelg has made his contribution to this debate.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I can tell the member for Henley Beach that I have extreme doubts that workers would unite in any circumstances with the member for Henley Beach to obtain wage justice or equality. Also, I point out to the honourable member, as an example and as an even worse situation, if that is possible, that one has only to look at the position in relation to Mr. Bjelke-Petersen in Queensland. He has even gone further as an anti-ally for working-class people. Over a long period we have got to the stage in Australia where, if South Australians travel to Queensland as working-class people, they are not allowed to walk; and if working-class people from South Australia head west to the State administered by Sir Charles Court, they are not allowed to talk.

In his speech the newly-elected member for Todd stated:

Before I do so, I would like to speak briefly about why I am a Liberal and about what I believe is a good Liberal philosophy. Basically, I believe in the freedom of the individual to choose. This, of course, is a basic tenet of Liberal philosophy. Freedom is strongly associated with enterprise, and I think nothing shows that more clearly than the exodus in recent years of Indo-Chinese from communist countries ruled by communist regimes.

I suggest to the member for Todd that it has been seen throughout the world over the years, particularly in any country that is reasonably well off, that, before some regime takes over from the Government, people will flee from it.

I hope the member for Todd is not suggesting that there has not been an exodus from capitalist countries into communist countries. We know that that has happened, whether he likes it or not.

Mr. Lewis: What is your example?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I suggest to the member for Todd that people are leaving Kampuchea, which is not a communist country, and going into Vietnam. So I do not believe that that philosophy is correct. Whyalla has recently been occupied to some degree by refugees from Vietnam. I suggest to the member for Todd that, if we thoroughly examined the occupations of those refugees who fled Vietnam such as those we now have at Whyalla, it would be fairly hard to visualise that they originated from the paddy fields of Vietnam. I suggest that they are people who were holding down fairly high positions in Vietnam.

Mr. Lewis: Well, you are wrong.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I see: they originated from the paddy fields?

Mr. Lewis: You said that none of them did.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am glad the member for Mallee has decided that what I am saying is correct. The member for Todd said:

I believe that industry makes money for the State. I do not believe, as does the member for Stuart, that Governments have a responsibility to produce an egalitarian type of society. Society will only progress when there is the opportunity for personal achievement, so that those with a higher degree of drive reap the rewards of their drive and success and not be held back by socialist ideas of mediocrity.

I am wondering whether the member for Todd is suggesting that, during the time of the shut-down of the Whyalla shipyard, liberalism was concerned with private enterprise and what could be done at that time. At no time did the Federal Liberal Government of this country come forth with any proposals or suggestion that there ought to be a shipbuilding industry in this country and that the industry in my own area should be retained. If Liberals talk about liberalism and private enterprise, I sometimes

wonder whether they do so with tongue in cheek.

An article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 28 January is a very good article, because it points out very strongly the fallacy in the philosophies of a Liberal Government. Under the headline "Economic Strategy Ridiculous—Stretton" the article states:

Running down the public sector of the economy to improve the private sector was a ridiculous strategy, Mr. Hugh Stretton said at the weekend. Mr. Stretton, Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust, was addressing the Australian Institute of Political Science's summer school. The school's theme is "The politics of taxation". Mr. Stretton said: "Some of our present Governments, and quite a lot of our economists, are proposing to increase private activity by the method of reducing public activity—and are promising that this shift will increase productivity and income per head.

I remind Government members that that is exactly what the Labor Party said prior to the election. I agree with what Mr. Stretton said with regard to that topic. Government spending on such things as the advanced education building in my area, and now the extension of the Whyalla Hospital, and hopefully very soon the cultural centre, which has been promised to the city, and the Houghton recreation centre, have played and will play an important part in providing employment and improving the economic climate of Whyalla. I point out that that economic strategy laid down by the previous Labor Government was what was required when the city of Whyalla was going so badly. I am not saying for one moment that that was the entire solution to the problem. However, I point out quite seriously that if the past State Labor Government had carried out a policy which was suggested by the present Liberal Government during the closure of the Whyalla shipyard, conditions in the city of Whyalla would have been much worse than they were. I believe that is something that we ought to be taking into consideration. The article in the *Advertiser* continues:

Mr. Stretton said this sort of mixture meant it was a mistake to think Australia could beat inflation or increase national output only by reducing the public sector so the private sector could grow. "It is silly to talk like that of two sectors," he said.

It also was simply not true that private investment was the crucial element of economic growth, he said. The only long period in Australian history in which public, rather than private, investment had not been the leader of growth was the past 30 years. During that time, most of Western Europe had come from behind and passed Australia in growth rates and income per head.

I believe Mr. Stretton can be commended on that statement, because I believe it is very true. When it is looked at in depth, one can realise what he was alluding to.

During this debate, an interjection was made by the Minister of Agriculture, who is not in the House at present. He questioned whether local government elections should be compulsory. This is a fairly difficult question to answer, as you, Mr. Acting Speaker, in your capacity in your area would well know. It is true to say that local council elections from time to time could really be classed as a joke. On the other hand, I believe that considerable thought will have to be given before a system of compulsory voting is decided upon.

The Minister implied that there should be compulsory voting in unions. This has also been bandied about in the past months. Some months ago somebody was suggesting to public servants that there ought to be some compulsory voting system in their union, and I was pleased at that time to note that the suggestion was completely rejected. I

point out to people who suggest that we ought to have compulsory voting in unions that it will not work. The reason is that, when an industrial dispute occurs, as any trade union official will tell you, nine times out of 10 it is instantaneous; something has happened, and a trade union official receives a phone call to the effect of, "Look, get out here, we are on the grass."

If members of the Government do not believe that, I suggest that they make some inquiries of trade union officials, because they would be told that that is the situation eight times out of 10. In relation to compulsory voting, the first thing that a trade union official would say when telephoned would be, "How did you get out there? Did you call a compulsory vote? Did all members vote on this issue?" What a joke it would develop into, because the situation would be completely farcical. The trade union representative would have to run around an establishment taking a vote to decide whether members would go out the gate or not. On most occasions something has occurred instantaneously, and something has upset somebody.

The other thing about this issue is that invariably during the course of an industrial dispute a union will find itself before a commissioner or a conciliator. During the course of negotiations some proposition is then put and invariably a return to work is initiated. Again, it would be an interesting exercise to find out how a compulsory vote would be conducted to initiate a return to work. I believe that members opposite would be surprised, to say the least, to find that in some cases it is very difficult to get a return to work during an industrial dispute. Compulsory voting would only make a situation more difficult. How should a compulsory vote be carried out? Should it be done by court ballot, because if it were I suggest that all hell would break loose.

Mr. Mathwin: Why should they be above the law?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I will ignore that interjection because the member for Glenelg just does not understand the situation. I am trying to point out that members opposite are peddling a dangerous policy. Whether members of the Government believe it or not, no trade union official deliberately goes out, puts his hand up and says, "Hey, out the gate." That proposition is crazy, and I believe that compulsory voting for trade unions is something that members of the Government and their henchmen who peddle that type of dangerous industrial policy should think twice about.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the election of representatives—should that be compulsory?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am not quite sure what you mean but, if you mean the election of a trade union official, that is already done by vote.

Mr. Mathwin: It is not compulsory though, is it?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I assure the member for Glenelg that in my experience members were only too pleased to vote, particularly for me.

Mr. Mathwin: A lot did not go back for Johnny Scott, you know.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is true. Members opposite should think twice about this question, because it is not quite as simple as saying that we should pursue the line of compulsory voting, as was reported in the *Advertiser*.

I now turn to the state of the Ministry, and what a state it is in! Soon after the last election I took the liberty of writing to the Minister of Fisheries, who is not in the House at present. I am pleased to say that after a while I received a reply signed W. Allan Rodda. The correspondence did not mean very much, but at least I received a reply. I found out later that W. Allan Rodda was the Minister of Fisheries. I then wrote to the Chief Secretary

and received a reply signed W. Allan Rodda, and I found out that he was the Chief Secretary. A few weeks later I had to take up another matter dealing with education. I wrote a letter to the Minister of Education, and I know you will not believe this, Mr. Acting Speaker, but I received a reply signed W. Allan Rodda. I thought that this fellow had to be good.

Mr. Mathwin: He is.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I accept that. I then had to deal with a question relating to the Whyalla Hospital and I wrote to the Minister of Health and, to be truthful, I received a reply signed W. Allan Rodda. I then thought that this fellow had gone too far. When I take up a question dealing with the legalisation of prostitution, I want to know to whom I should write and from whom I will receive the reply. At this stage I do not feel that William Allan Rodda would dare sign that reply.

Mr. Mathwin: The girls will be in tomorrow.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am going to meet each one of them personally. I will not be like Government members. I will not hide behind propriety and so forth, so I will want to meet every one of them. I will not go any further than that at this stage. I point out to the member for Glenelg that I am in a situation similar to his own. I have to be convinced that the proposed legislation is correct.

I now turn to an article that appeared in the *Australian*. I want to voice my grave concern about this article. The article is headed "Who needs Siberia; we've got Whyalla". This type of article, which was written by a gentleman named Buzz Kennedy, does not do much good for my ego. I suggest that Mr. Kennedy is not related to Senator Kennedy in America, that he has never been to Whyalla, and that he himself should buzz off. I am putting a submission to Mr. Fraser, who at this stage is the Prime Minister of Australia that, if we are going to put an embargo on the Moscow Olympic Games, consideration should be given to Australia having its own Olympic Games, which could be held in Whyalla. The Prime Minister is referring to places all over Australia at the present time, so we might as well go to Whyalla and be done with it.

I also suggest to this House and to Buzz Kennedy that, although I have never been to Siberia, any resemblance between Siberia and Whyalla—particularly in view of the 53° temperature in Whyalla last Wednesday—is non-existent. Seriously, I believe that it ill behoves newspapers, particularly the Murdoch press and the *Australian*, in any way to degrade areas of our population in this country who might live in isolation. In my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the Australian people, the people of these isolated areas play a very important role in the economy and the lifestyle of this country.

Port Hedland and Mount Newman in Western Australia could be included in this category. I am sure that the people living and working in those areas endeavour at all times to improve their life-style and play their part in the needs of this country. It is a great pity that writers such as Buzz Kennedy do not take that into consideration.

I now refer to previous members of this House who, since the last election, have left the Parliament. I refer to members such as John Olson, Reg Groth, Geoff Virgo, Don Simmons, Charlie Wells, Charlie Harrison, and Glen Broomhill and, from the Liberal side, Howard Venning and Bill Nankivell. I am sure that they, in their own way in politics, played an important role as they saw the interests of the people they represented.

Regarding the result of 15 September, I simply say that it is my opinion that the people of South Australia may unfortunately live to regret their desire to have a change of Government. I think that already in the Norwood by-

election the people of this State may be showing that they have regretted their earlier decision. I can recall vividly the years between 1952 and 1968, years of consecutive conservative rule in this State, during which time I was an active participant in the trade union movement in what I described earlier as a so-called decentralised area, decentralised because the B.H.P. company had developed an industry in that area. It is interesting to compare the type of assistance provided by a conservative and Labor Governments. Here lies, in my opinion, the difference between those Governments.

Conservatives, during their time, bent over backwards to assist the big monopoly of B.H.P., whereas the Labor regime paid more attention to what I believe is the important part of the industry—the people who work in the industry. Under the conservative Government, B.H.P. received housing at a priority that was better than anywhere else in the Commonwealth. The housing was produced continually in a carbon-copy fashion, so much so that I suggest that, unless the occupier of the house planted a different type of tree in his or her front yard, even the immortal Lassie would have had some difficulty in finding her way home. I saw Lassie find her way home twice on the big screen and four times on television, so she was fairly good. The housing was made available to B.H.P. at a maximum priority rate to the near exclusion of anyone outside that company. We all know the infamous Act called the Steel Indenture Act, whereby conservatism made it legal for B.H.P. to pollute the land, sea and air without any possible redress to the community at large or any human being.

I hope that members do not mind if I raise some doubt whether, if we ever build any other industry in the North under conservatism, we would not have the same type of environmental procedure. I wonder whether the present conservative Government will be prepared to allow money-hungry companies, such as Western Mining, that are currently delving into uranium, the same splendid allowances to pollute the lives of the workers. I could draw the attention of the House to the fact that under conservatism in the years between 1952 and 1968 at no time did a conservative Government provide one amenity, one facility or one single unit of currency (and that goes for B.H.P. also) for the people concerned.

Mr. Mathwin: That's not true.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I can assure the honourable member that during the years I am talking about what I have said is absolutely true.

Mr. Keneally: The member for Glenelg was in London at the time.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, trying to get a job as a painter.

Mr. Mathwin: I wasn't in London at all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The conservative Government of the day played a lone hand and a hand-in-glove activity with B.H.P. to recruit workers. I emphasise the word "recruit" rather than saying that the company attracted people from no less than 60 nations of the world. The company recruited people to an environment that was completely unknown to them and unwanted by them. These people were recruited to isolation and, despite what the member for Glenelg has just said by interjection, they received no over-award payments in an industry that adheres strictly to the letter of the industrial law; they had no opportunity to sell their labour to a more lenient employer; there was no television; the drinking laws were as archaic as the people who governed the State; and during that time Whyalla was represented by a local governing body which, since its abandonment, has been described by a commission as an undemocratic local

governing body which should have been disbanded years before it actually was and which really should never have been initiated.

I also point out that during those years education facilities were supplied by conservatism under a stop-go programme, so much so (and I remember this vividly) that provision of two high schools in my area during the reign reminded me, particularly in one case, of a Red Indian settlement in the days of Sitting Bull—the only thing missing was Sitting Bull. There was, at that time (and I can assure this House that this is truthful), in the Eyre High School, a greater area of portable buildings provided after the school was presumably completed than the area of the permanent school. I hope that that state of affairs in education does not return.

I could outline the fact that water reticulation was provided at a cost to the people of this area greater than in the metropolitan area and more cheaply to B.H.P. than anyone, and so the saga would continue, but I point out that everything I have said in my remarks shows that a conservative Government during the years from 1952 to 1968 assisted big business completely and gave no assistance whatever to the people who, in my opinion, were the lifeblood of that big business.

During the years from 1952 to 1968, the people made the environment livable. They then developed, and have continued to develop, a feeling of friendliness, courtesy and togetherness that has prevailed more than in any other decentralised area of this kind in this country. One could possibly be forgiven if one asked, "So what? How did the Labor regime change this hum-drum existence?" The answer is simple. It paid much more attention to what was needed by people in a decentralised area. It concentrated its attention on the important part of decentralisation.

The deposed Labor Government for nearly a decade gave to the people in a decentralised area more than a Conservative Government had given them in more than three decades. It altered to a large extent the design of housing, revolutionised the State's licensing laws, gave television to country people, took action in relation to community welfare matters, and provided education facilities equal to if not better than those in any other area of the Commonwealth. I refer also to the provision of an advanced education college at a cost of \$8 000 000, which was paid out of the State Treasury, no assistance whatsoever coming from the Commonwealth Government.

I also refer to consumer protection, decentralisation of State Government offices, water reticulation at a cost similar to that in the metropolitan area, as well as assistance to sport, local government and the needy in our community. So, the list could go on. I point out strongly that every one of the numerous things to which I have referred was done by a Labor Government in just a decade for the people who were working in that decentralised area. I hope that this Conservative Government does not repeat its past history, giving every assistance to big business and no assistance to the people who are really needed in any society to make that business pay. I assume by the Government's attitude in relation to Charles Moore's that that will not happen and that we will squeeze out the small business man altogether.

I now turn to what I can only describe as the Government's living a dangerous fantasy in relation to the unfortunate fate of people who are unemployed through no fault of their own. I refer to the 25 January issue of the *Advertiser*, where, under the headings, "Government aid to get overseas tradesmen" and "Disgusting and outrageous—union", the report states:

The Federal Government is helping to recruit overseas

tradesmen for Australia's metal and engineering industry, and the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights' Union describes the drive as "disgusting and outrageous". The Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Department has put advertisements in British newspapers inviting qualified tradesmen to inquire about migrating. The Government help was sought by the Metal Trades Industry Association.

The report continues:

The A.M.W.S.U. Assistant Federal Secretary, Mr. L. Carmichael, said yesterday: "The proposed M.T.I.A. and Federal Government delegation to indulge in so-called recruitment of skilled workers from overseas is disgusting and outrageous.

"It will be another luxury trip to try to get skilled workers on the cheap without paying for their training," he said. "Some young Australians are desperately in need of skilled jobs and are being offered part-time unskilled jobs on the cheap."

Mr. Carmichael said the Government had had the chance to train thousands of skilled workers in apprenticeship training schemes. "But they've only trained sufficient to create what they consider a shortage," he said.

The *Advertiser* generously came out in an editorial in support of the recruitment drive. It never ceases to amaze me how the daily newspapers act. It does not matter what happens in this country: I will bet London to a brick that the daily newspapers will come out with an editorial and will have two bob each way or have a complete answer to a problem, as well as stating their own desires.

I now refer to unemployment in Whyalla and what the Federal Government's proposals mean to Whyalla. Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has improved dramatically the production of steel, a move that I welcome. Steel making provides employment for unskilled and semi-skilled workers. However, bearing in mind that the closure of the Whyalla shipyard involved, in the main, skilled labour of all types, it created some adverse and difficult human problems.

I refer, for example, to the lowering of the standard of living and to the lowering of dignity, which are two of the factors involved. Unfortunately, the age problem is yet another to be dealt with. B.H.P. now advertises for labour. However, I point out, in case anyone is contemplating replying to the *Advertiser* advertisement, that applicants will have to be supermen, under the age of 40 years, be willing to work on rostered shift work and, in relation to having a trade, be prepared to give away any training skills that they might already have acquired.

I refer to Whyalla's unemployment position and the proposal to recruit skilled labour from overseas. Let us look at Whyalla's unemployment figures. I want to deal with registered unemployed, not with those people who do not register, of whom there are some. We should not run away with the idea that there are none, because some do exist.

I should like first to deal with the figures that I have obtained from the Commonwealth Employment Service in relation to unemployed people in Whyalla, and specifically to the metal trades field. In the blacksmiths field there is one person unemployed. There are 15 welders, 41 boilermakers and two juniors, seven fitters and one junior fitter, one machinist, one electrician, eight electrical mechanics and one junior, one toolmaker, one tinsmith, one turner, one patternmaker, one panelbeater, and seven in the metal trades unemployed, making a total of 90 registered unemployed.

I assure the House that there are others. I suggest that, instead of Governments and employers looking overseas for skilled labour, they should turn their attention to the great need that exists in this country to assist in every way

the labour-intensified industries, even if it means employing the use of (that so-called dirty word) subsidies.

This country has lost its shipbuilding capacity, which, as I have said many times, we will live to regret. We are now in danger of losing our motor car industry. Before I refer to that matter, I point out that last year B.H.P. at Whyalla had an intake of apprentices. This company takes more apprentices than any other company that one can name. Although 51 boilermakers applied, only 32 were accepted; and, of 47 fitters and turners, 46 were accepted.

Of the 64 electricians who applied, 29 were accepted and, of the 76 motor mechanics, only 10 were accepted. The one sheetmetal worker who applied was accepted. Of a total of 239 young lads who applied for trades, 118 were accepted. I stress that these figures are good figures, probably the best that any community could produce. Even in those circumstances, it does not add up to a 50 per cent intake.

Turning briefly now to the very important matter of the threat to the motor vehicle industry, I point out that General Motors-Holden's and Chrysler made statements in the *Advertiser* which I believe had some merit, because these organisations are not playing the role of knights in shining armour. They are interested in one thing only: profits. Once the industry loses that flavour, a simple decision to close plants will be made with no concern or guilt by the company concerned for the future of the many thousands of workers who would be thrown out of work.

In concluding my remarks, I suggest seriously that the time has come for industry, trade unions, and politicians to make themselves very aware of where our manufacturing industries are heading. I have talked about the need for subsidy in industry, whereas other members have talked about leaving it to private enterprise. The member for Salisbury suggested rationalisation. I emphasise that the real necessity in this country is to fall in line with what has been and is still being done in France, Germany, Sweden, Japan and other countries: participation by Government in the key labour-intensive manufacturing industries is absolutely essential.

I am inclined at this stage to support the partnership of Government with private industry. It is somewhat ironic that not even the Labor Party has remotely suggested at this time that one of the solutions to the problems in manufacturing industries might be the 35-hour week, with perhaps more leisure time for workers in industry, and so on. If anyone suggests it, we seem to run for cover. Yet, in Sweden, the question of six months on and six months off has been a policy of that country's Government for some time, as I understand it, whereas in Australia none of us has said that we ought to support a 35-hour week or more leisure. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): First, I congratulate the member for Whyalla on the contribution he has just made to this debate. I point out to members, particularly to those Government members whom I see smirking now, that when the honourable member speaks about Whyalla he speaks from a basis of knowledge given to very few. I point that out, because he is a modest member indeed, and is not one to blow his own trumpet. He has given between 25 and 30 years service to the community at Whyalla, as a union official, as Secretary of the Combined Unions Council in Whyalla, a member of the City Council of Whyalla and, for the past 10 years, as the local member for Whyalla. I was most interested in his comments. They

were laced with the validity and experience of a man who has given the greater part of his life in service to his city. Few members can boast of such a record of service to their own community. I suggest that those who wish to smirk about some of his comments and about the comments I have made about him should think again about those smirks. The fact that the member for Whyalla would be returned to the House for ever and a day, if that was his wish, would indicate that the people of Whyalla appreciate his value.

It is customary for members when speaking in this debate to thank their electors for returning them again to the Chamber, and I do that. The September 1979 election saw a dramatic reduction in the vote for the member for Stuart, and I am unable to ascertain the full reason for that. I suspect that in the 1983 election the percentage vote lost to the Labor Party in my district will be regained, if not increased. I make that forecast. This means not necessarily that the candidate for Stuart is a very valuable member but that this Government's occupying the Treasury benches for the next three years is the greatest assurance I could have that my vote will increase in 1983.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation to the position you hold. Having had some experience in the post, I am sure that you will enjoy it. I also congratulate the Speaker (the member for Light). I think that he has been one of the most outstanding members of the 1970 brigade that came into the House. The fact that he is not a member of the Government in a senior Ministerial position can only suggest that there is a personal reason for this. It has absolutely nothing to do with his competence, his ability to work and to articulate matters dealing with policy and with the health and welfare of the citizens of South Australia. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that you could well have found yourself on the front bench.

The member for Goyder, who for a period before you assumed the Chair was Acting Speaker, is a thorough gentleman, and I wish him well in his position. It is regrettable in a sense that he was unable to be Speaker, because he would have been a good one. However, we can have only one Speaker, and there were two outstanding candidates for the position. I am glad to see that the member for Goyder is Chairman of the Public Works Committee. I voted for the present Speaker, and I am sure that my vote in that ballot will prove to be a sensible one. Had the ballot favoured the other candidate, I would probably have been as happy to say that the member for Goyder was a remarkably good Speaker.

I have one other congratulation to make, and it is a most pleasant duty. Members have previously referred to the presence in the House today of the member for Norwood, and I am most delighted to welcome him back. I said, when he was here last year, that he followed in the footsteps of a most illustrious member of Parliament in South Australia—probably the most illustrious—Don Dunstan. I am sure that the calibre and competence of the current member for Norwood are such that he will prove a worthy successor and that he will have a great future in politics in South Australia. The rather stupid suggestion by Government members that they are going to win the seat of Norwood back from him rather amuses me. Amongst the reasons for the Opposition's winning the Norwood seat, two in particular stand out.

The first is the excellence of the candidature of the Australian Labor Party, and the second is the absolutely appalling mess that the Liberal Party has made of Government in South Australia, particularly the Premier. Since the election he has tried to find every reason he can to explain the loss of Norwood by the Government and

one outstanding reason, a reason which he refuses to contemplate, and one which some of his back-bench members ought to consider, was the inability of the Premier of this State to act as a Premier should.

Another reason was the obvious inability of some of his front-bench colleagues to perform their duties in the way that the people of South Australia have come to expect because they have had 10 years of very good Government. One thing that has been told to me by a very senior person, whose word I take because he would know, is that, when the members of the Government assumed their responsibilities, they were stunned to find out initially the extent of the work load, that the Labor Government had been a very good administrator of the State, and that we had an efficient and lean Public Service with very little fat, if there is any fat at all, to be trimmed off.

This is the cleft stick that the Government finds itself in, having made grandiose promises before the election, in the full knowledge that that Party would lose. After making all sorts of promises to the better-off people about taxation concessions, it now finds that, in Government, having given the concessions it promised, it will have enormous difficulty balancing the Budget over the next few years. Having been critical of the Premier, I am prepared to give him some advice. He is always prepared to give the Opposition advice in a rather patronising way. I am serious about my advice. I know, and I have read in the press, that it is circulating widely in the community in South Australia that there is about to be a Cabinet reshuffle, brought about because some Ministers cannot cope with their duties.

Regarding one Ministry, I have had to write, pointing out that I have been waiting for answers to correspondence since the present Government assumed office. I have received a nicely worded reply, apologising, and pointing out that they have not been able to get around to answering my correspondence. I have known the answer for six months, but they have not been able to provide the simple machinery matter of Government, answering correspondence. This week we have had the Minister of Health lecturing the Government on matters dealing with management. That is laughable because, if one Minister has shown clearly that she cannot cope with the work load and is making an absolute mess of management, it is that Minister. I think that the widely circulating rumour that that Minister is one who will be changed has much validity.

I suggest to the Premier that he should not be put off from making a reshuffle merely because it has been canvassed in the press and because members of the Opposition are speaking about it. He should be courageous enough to do what needs to be done for the benefit of the people of South Australia. As soon as possible he should rid himself of those Ministers who are not measuring up. Doubtless, he is in a predicament. It is easy to think about getting rid of Ministers who are not doing the job. The really difficult proposition is to replace them with people who can do it, and unfortunately some of those have been given jobs elsewhere, and have been given cars to go with them, so there is little to choose from.

I suggest that the member for Fisher is a logical choice. He has not a car but he has two jobs and he may be interested in taking a position in the Ministry. I should not refer to the fact that some members have cars. That is unworthy, because it tends to lighten or make less serious the remarks I am making in all seriousness. I suggest to the Premier that he ought to take the steps that are essential in the best interests of the people of South Australia and that as soon as possible he should rid himself of those Ministers who are obviously incapable of fulfilling the task of a Minister. It is not the easy task that members opposite

thought it was. They thought that the Labor Ministers were sitting around doing nothing. However, I suggest that any brief discussion with the present Ministers would show that they have changed their mind very much about that. I do not envy Ministers their tasks: they have an extremely difficult task, but I criticise the reluctance of the Government to accept the genuine endeavours of the Public Service to assist it in matters dealing with the interests of the State.

That is one problem that the Ministers have, because I understand that they question every matter that comes before them. The reason for that is that they are sure that the public servant who has brought the matter in is a tool of the socialist Government, no longer there, so there is some sort of plot about it. The sooner they accept that the Public Service is there to serve the Government of the day, the sooner they will be able to do the things that their charter requires them to do.

In their contributions, the new members on the Government benches invariably described themselves as small "l" liberals and they went to great pains to show that they were dedicated to the free enterprise system. I ask them whom they thought they were kidding, because, after saying that they were small "l" liberals and were dedicated to the free enterprise system, they went on to say what the Government ought to be doing, what sort of assistance it should be giving, and what sort of intervention there should be by the Government in their pet projects. Of course, the member for Mallee did not say that. He was good in giving us a Mat Fitzpatrick travel talk about wandering around the District of Mallee. I wonder whether, if the member for Mallee gets into the Ministry, we will be regaled about the corners, cornices, stone work and masonry of the State Administration Centre building. That would take up an hour quite easily and he does it well. He is not one that I am suggesting has been asking for Government favours after saying how much in favour of free enterprise and opposed to Government intervention they are.

I point out to those members who described themselves as small "l" liberals that the creator of the Liberal Party, one Robert Gordon Menzies, probably the most overrated politician Australia has seen, describes small "l" liberals as "half commos anyway". There are plenty of red-neck conservatives in the Liberal movement around. There are plenty in South Australia. There are more in New South Wales, who are going to set up a new right-wing branch of the Liberal Party. That will be difficult to do, because I think there are a fair few extreme right wingers in the Liberal Party. Those people would describe the members for Morphett, Rocky River, and Newlands as "half commos anyway".

That brings me to one point that has always interested me in the political debate in Australia. That is the rhetoric compared to the facts of political life. The rhetoric goes something like this: the Liberal Party is dedicated to the free enterprise system and the A.L.P. is a bunch of radical socialists. The reality of the situation is that the Liberal Party is not a free enterprise Party. It is not dedicated to the support of free enterprise. I will not canvass the Moore's situation or the small shop situation, nor do I wish to talk about the Bonds, South Australian Oil and Gas, or any of a dozen other instances that I could quote to indicate that the Party is not a free enterprise Party.

Alternatively, the Labor Party, of course, is not essentially a socialist Party, because the electorate in Australia would not accept a socialist Party; it has proved this quite conclusively on a number of occasions. Whilst there are members in the Labor Party (and I am one) who would wish to describe themselves as socialists, and who

have quite strong socialist feelings, we know that that is not what the electorate of Australia wants, so we take account of that in our electoral policy. We do not go to the electorate saying, "We are going to socialise everything in sight," but we have people like the member for Glenelg who, in his rantings, in a most forgettable speech that he made today, says he cannot come to terms with the socialists on the other side of the House.

The real political debate in South Australia, as it is in Australia, is that both Parties are entrenched in a mixed economy and the debate is on how much involvement in that mixed economy should the Government have; that is the question. We say that the Government should play a much greater part than members opposite say. Cut through all the rhetoric, that is the plain fact of life: we are both committed to a mixed economy. We are more inclined to have Government involvement and members opposite are more inclined to have a greater private enterprise involvement. I do not blame members opposite for going to the people with this free enterprise ethic; it is a winner, and people do respond to that. They are very sympathetic to this free enterprise ethic that everybody promotes.

We have had Joh Bjelke-Petersen saying that the last bastion of free enterprise is in Queensland, where there is a Government insurance office that he has had ever since he has been there, bringing in millions of dollars to the Treasury in Queensland for him to use—a socialist undertaking. Bjelke-Petersen has never got rid of any socialist undertaking in Queensland that is of benefit to the State, and there are many. As I recall (and I may be wrong), many years ago Sam Lawn, who has now departed (a great gentleman, for those new members who did not have the pleasure of knowing him), made a speech in the House one day in response to the same sort of debate—socialism *versus* free enterprise. As I recall, Sam Lawn, said, referring to the Premier of the day:

When the Premier gets up in the morning, if he does not use the socialist sewerage system he will use the socialist water supply, probably heated by a socialist electricity supply, and probably eat breakfast heated by a socialist gas supply. He might then be required to make phone calls to people within his constituency, or members of his own staff, on a socialist telephone. He is very likely to be listening to the ABC (if he has any taste), a socialist radio station, to listen to the socialist news. A socialist car will pull up at an appropriate time with a socialist driver and his socialist secretary to take him to his socialist work place—the State Administration Centre—where he will there be looked after by a great number of socialist public servants. He will, of course, be paid by the public purse.

Honourable members opposite seem to think this is strange. This is all socialism, to which they object most violently. But when it is put to them in plain facts, in nothing they do within their daily lives can they evade the effects of socialism within this State.

Members opposite who worked in the Health Department, or any Government department, who send their kids to State schools, and so on, know exactly what I am talking about. Those people who use the socialist transport system, or ride on roads provided by socialist instrumentalities (local government is a socialist instrumentality), know what I am talking about. We are firmly entrenched into a mixed economy.

Industry and commerce in this State, as has been said (and was said by the member for Whyalla), is also entrenched in a socialist system, so when any Government is so unwise as to restrict the public sector, as this Government says it is going to (but will not, and frankly cannot), then I think it will reap the whirlwind because

there is no way it can be done. The world is, inevitably, becoming more socialistic; despite what I call the reactionary response that is paramount in the world today, we are becoming more socialistic.

Honourable members opposite who see themselves as the bastions of the free enterprise system were regarded, quite rightly, by Sir Robert Menzies and his ilk of 30 years ago as being "half commos", and that is how far honourable members opposite have come. What has happened over the past 30 years is not that the Labor Party has become more conservative, but that the Liberal Parties in Australia have become more radical, in a sense, in terms of politics. It is hard to imagine this when one listens to people opposite. I say they should forget the rhetoric and have a look at what people do. Forget what Malcom Fraser says (it is hard to forget what he says), but look at what he does. Look at the things he criticised the previous Government for and look at the things he has done. They will not find a great deal of radical change by old Malcolm, because he knows, as members here know, and as we know, that in Australia we are in a mixed economy, which means that we are going to have Government involvement and private enterprise involvement. We accept that, and it is about time our opponents accepted that as well.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: They have nothing else to say.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is right. I confess that there is a great temptation for them to keep promoting this garbage (and that is what it is), because, in a sense, it is an electoral advantage for them. The reason we are not able to get a rational debate about what is the sort of economy in which we live and work is probably as much the fault of the Party of which I am a member as it is the reluctance of our opponents to discuss that at all.

I want to get on to one or two matters of a serious nature, one local and one international, before I finish my comments. Today's headline in the *News* screams about yet another sexually oriented crime. I can remember, not 12 months ago, that the member for Glenelg, the present Minister of Health, the Minister of Transport, the member for Hanson, and others were regaling this House with statistics upon statistics upon statistics, and saying that the Government of the day had the prime responsibility for the crime rate at that time. I want to know what has happened to these defenders of our law and order, of our moral values in South Australia, because, if honourable members look through the daily papers in South Australia in the year 1980, they will see that there have been numerous accounts of sexually oriented crime, yet not one word has been said by members opposite.

This suggests to me that they could not care one whit about the crime rate, the victims of those crimes, or what happens to the perpetrators of those crimes. They are interested only in the political capital they can make out of a situation like this. If that is not a fact, why are they not now saying exactly the same things as they were saying then? They can still say those things, the press will still give them coverage, and the people of South Australia will still be interested to hear their comments. The fact is that it is not Governments that create crime, but society. The Government is part of that society, but now that the Liberal Party is in Government it might accept that what I am saying is the truth. It will not have members of the Opposition jumping up and trying to scare the people of South Australia into thinking that there is an unreasonable crime wave in South Australia and that it is because of the activities of members of the Government. That is the level of debate with which we put up for a great number of years.

If the new members are somewhat astounded by what I

am saying, I ask them to go back and look at some of the comments made by the member for Coles, as she then was, and the statistics she presented to this House. It distresses me that the Government is now completely quiet on this issue, because it still has a platform, it can still express its concern and tell us what it is going to do about this. Members opposite had plenty of say when we were in Government about what we could do about it. Now the silence is deafening, and I wonder why.

Another matter that I wanted to refer to briefly is a matter that I have not discussed with any of my colleagues or the people to whom I am about to refer, that is, restaurateurs and people in the motel industry. I believe that owners of restaurants throughout the State should be required to place in a prominent position outside the door in the window the menu, the price of the food and the price of wines that they sell (and, for the member for Baudin, the price of Coca Cola and lemonade), so that people are not placed in the embarrassing position of going into a restaurant, sitting at the table and picking up the menu only to find out that they are almost compelled to partake of a menu that is much more expensive than they would wish to pay. The same situation applies with the wines.

Restaurateurs should be required to put their menu and prices outside for public display. I do not know the best way to achieve this—whether through legislation or otherwise, because I have not thought it through. I am stating my own thoughts on this matter in the hope that someone might pick it up and give it some publicity, and I will then get a response from restaurateurs and other interested people.

I make the same suggestion in respect of motels. Persons driving into Adelaide and past motels should be able to see a sign showing whether or not there is a vacancy, and they should also be able to see what is the tariff and such information. There could be a range of accommodation standards within the motel, and the different tariffs that apply should be displayed. This information should be on view so that people are not placed in the awkward position of having to go to a motel office to ask about the tariff and whether there is a vacancy, and then having to make a decision, finding out that it is expensive, especially if they find difficulty in saying, "I am sorry, that is too dear, I will go elsewhere."

Some people find it easy to do that, but others do not find it easy, especially if the charges are more than the amount they wish to pay. I have not discussed this suggestion with any of my colleagues or with people within the industry, and I do not know what is the best way of having the operators of restaurants and motels provide that information as a public service. As I do not know the best way of doing it, I hope to receive some response to my suggestion. If the response is favourable, perhaps it could result in legislation, but that is for the future.

I now wish to raise two important issues, one of which is a State matter about which I have been concerned for three years. I pursued it vigorously with the former Government and was about to make the sort of contribution that I hoped to make when we lost Government. I am most concerned about the fishing industry in South Australia, particularly the prawn industry. For some time I have been trying to increase the number of authorities that exist for prawn fishing in South Australia.

I do this in the interests of people within my own district who have been trying for some time to get into this lucrative industry. Indeed, it is a most lucrative industry, as I will go on to show. In the area from Shoal Water Point to Port Broughton, in a straight line across Spencer Gulf,

according to industry spokesmen, in any year there will be a \$3 000 000 crop of prawns to be farmed. Presently, within that area two authorities are owned by fishermen in Port Broughton, one is owned by a fisherman at Cowell, and there are none at Whyalla or Port Pirie.

Right on the doorstep of fishermen in the northern part of Spencer Gulf is a crop worth \$3 000 000, yet few local fishermen are involved in that industry. My interest is mainly to secure authorities for fishermen in the northern part of Spencer Gulf and, hopefully, a processing factory within Port Pirie or Port Broughton (preferably at Port Pirie, because that is where my responsibility lies), as a result of increasing these authorities.

Much publicity has been given, in the time that I have been fighting this battle, although I have not gone public previously, to the supposed difficulties that prawn fishermen are facing. I listened to an A.B.C. programme last Friday night when the reporter claimed that, if one is a successful prawn fisherman in Spencer Gulf, one can expect a return of up to \$100 000 a year.

On 11 May 1979 I sent a series of questions to the then Minister (Hon. B. A. Chatterton), and amongst those questions I asked him what was the average income for a prawn fisherman in South Australia. The Minister was only too happy to provide me with that information, which was that the average in Spencer Gulf for this year is expected to be \$200 000-\$250 000, with the top vessels exceeding \$300 000, and the Gulf of St. Vincent vessels are likely to be \$100 000 lower.

To confirm that information given to me by the then Minister, I put Questions on Notice to the present Minister so that I could make the matter public. The present Minister has told me that, during the last fishing season, 39 authorities applied to Spencer Gulf, and the people concerned had obtained a return of \$8 600 000, an average of \$220 500. In St. Vincent Gulf, 14 authorities applied, the return being \$1 320 000, an average of \$94 280. In Investigator Strait five permits apply, the return being \$864 000, an average of \$172 800. I have no figures of people fishing in the western zone. Because of the limited numbers it would be unfair to provide this information, because it would be easy to determine who I am talking about.

The average declared income of prawn fishermen last year was \$186 000. I have spoken at great length to people within the prawn industry. People who are trying to get into the industry say that that figure is only the declared figure of the prawn fishermen, but at least one-third of the prawn fishermen's sales are for cash and do not appear at all on fishing returns. I have it on good authority that some prawn fishermen during the last year had a fishing take of more than \$400 000. These are the people who are asking the Government for protection and more protection. These are the people who tell us that they need to have an investment of \$400 000-\$500 000 to get into the industry.

That may be so, because I can tell the House that one of the reasons why that sum is so high is that the premium placed by prawn fishermen on the transfer of a prawn authority from one person to another is up to \$250 000. That was a claim made in an editorial in the *South Australian Fishing Industry Journal* last year. It has not been refuted and, in fact, it is the case. I have evidence that it is the case. If prawn fishermen are prepared to pay \$250 000 for the authority, and on top of that are prepared to pay the price of the boat, that indicates that the Government's policy of restricting the prawn fishery to a few people has almost given these people the right to print their own money. What is happening within the prawn industry, in my view, is that the fishermen concerned know that people within the community, of whom I am

one, are worried about this situation.

They knew quite well my point of view, and so does the current Minister, the previous Minister and the Fisheries Department. I have made no secret about this at all. I find this to be a matter of great principle. In an area where scale fishermen in a large number of cases are battling to make a living, people can come up that gulf from as far as 300 or 400 miles away and reap a bonanza while the locals have no right to participate in that industry at all.

I think the member for Rocky River would support this. I know that he has fishermen in his electorate who have been knocking on my door for three years because they know what I am trying to do. These people also want to participate in the prawn industry. I know also that people in his electorate who have small boats and who do not want to make huge fortunes are being forced off the water by the big, hungry 80 or 90 foot giant fishing boats coming from Port Lincoln and similar places.

There should be a place within the prawn industry for smaller fishing boats. When I asked the previous Minister whether it was possible for smaller, less expensive boats to participate in the prawn industry, he replied that eight-metre to nine-metre boats involving a capital investment of \$80 000 could quite readily be part of the industry. He said that they would not be as efficient as the big boats, but they could make a good living for a great number of fishermen. The Minister told me that 100 extra authorities could be allowed for the waters of South Australia if the boats were small and the fishermen were prepared to make a good living. If every prawn fisherman in South Australia was prepared to have a gross catch of \$100 000, the number of prawn authorities in South Australia could be doubled.

That is not what is going on, however. The big fishermen, the people with money, are able to purchase authorities and big boats; they are trying to concentrate this very lucrative industry in fewer and fewer hands. That is quite contrary to what I stand for, and I believe it is quite contrary to what the members of the Government say is their philosophy.

I do not believe that the prime factor in the prawn industry ought to be efficiency, because if that were the case we could get two monstrous trawlers, trawl the whole Spencer Gulf in one trawl, and that would be it. That would be very efficient. One would need only a \$5 000 000 or \$6 000 000 trawler to do that, and only two or three authorities would be needed.

If by efficiency we mean that fewer people will be allowed in this industry, I am vitally opposed to efficiency in those terms. I am strongly in favour of spreading the benefits of the prawn crop from South Australian waters as far as we are able to do so. What I am saying pertains mainly to sheltered waters—St. Vincent Gulf from Cowell to Port Broughton North. There are waters south of that where larger craft would be needed; the waters there are rough, and there is an argument that more capital investment in bigger craft is required. I am prepared to accept that, and I am prepared to concede that argument.

It has been my endeavour to have a zone created north of Shoal Water Point to Port Broughton which allows a small prawn fishing industry to operate. The larger boats can go out in the deep waters and fish south of that line. The small fishermen, with reasonable capital investment, who would be able to make quite reasonable returns on their investment could fish north of that line. That seems to me to be quite a sensible suggestion, but it is totally and vitally opposed by the industry.

Industry spokesmen from Port Lincoln and such places have declared a closed season for the northern Spencer Gulf. They say the reason for that is that they want to

allow the prawn crop to grow to a commercial size. It does grow to a better commercial size, but I suspect the real reason is that the lower part of the gulf is open; the majority of the fleet fishes in the lower part of the gulf, and they do not want the smaller craft fishing in the sheltered waters in the northern part of the gulf, so they use their numbers to declare a closed season for the northern Spencer Gulf and, after the closure is over, 30 boats come into the northern part of the gulf and clean it up in two or three nights. That may be an exaggeration, but they do clean it up. They oppose the smaller fishermen fishing in that area, because they say that it affects the quality of the crop. Evidence that I have suggests that that is not the case.

In my view, the real reason for this is that the majority of the prawn fishermen fish in the lower part of the gulf and want to be able to have first crack at those waters; they also want to have first crack at the northern part of the gulf and they do not want smaller craft to be part of the industry at all. I have evidence that suggests that a great deal of terrorising goes on in Spencer Gulf. Big boats can make life very difficult for the smaller craft. I know of prawn fishermen, and people who are not prawn fishermen but who might accidentally pick up a few prawns, who would be prepared to tell a committee of inquiry (which I would hope would be set up in this industry) just exactly what does go on.

It is a policy of the South Australian Government that the owners of boats should be on those boats when they are fishing. Of course, that does not apply in the prawn fishery. I wish it would apply in the prawn fishery, as that could have a dramatic effect.

The prawn fishermen within St. Vincent Gulf have one out-rig. The prawn fishermen within Spencer Gulf have a double rig. Some of the bigger boats have four nets on the double rigs, as the boats have the horsepower and the capacity to drag four nets. They are not content with two nets or with sharing the crop equally. They want to get as much as they can while the going is good.

In St. Vincent Gulf, with single rigs, there is a viable industry for the participants. In Spencer Gulf, one of the double rigs could be taken off, allowing them to fish with a single rig. A small boat during last year's fishing season in northern Spencer Gulf fished single rig for the whole season, and the catch for the year was \$148 000, and there were only two employees. That should be able to provide wages, a reasonable return on capital, and a reasonable return to the owner, who probably is fishing in the Gulf of Carpentaria and who does not consider that \$148 000 is a great deal of money anyway.

There is a great deal of resentment in the fishing industry in South Australia. Great numbers of scale fishermen are finding it very difficult to make a living, and I suggest that, if the larger scale fishermen in the northern Spencer Gulf waters were given prawn licences to go into the prawn fishing industry (not replacing those lost scale licences with other fishermen), it would have a two-fold effect. It would provide greater access to the prawn industry by local fishermen, and it would take an enormous load off the scale fishing industry that currently exists. Also, it may have the added benefit of encouraging a processor to set up a processing business in the northern Spencer Gulf, where a considerable quantity of fish is caught, and it would be where we want it.

I ask the Minister and the Government to take seriously what I am saying, and not merely listen to what the industry says. I have read articles in the paper and viewed television shows, and I hear the industry spokesmen and read their handouts. I suspect that the journalists know that they have been conned, that they are writing articles

in the press and stating on television the point of view of the industry, and no-one else's. I am putting an alternative point of view. If the member for Eyre or the Minister suggest that anything I say is inaccurate, I refer them to the answers the Minister gave me to the questions that I put on notice. I refer them also to the answer that I received from the previous Minister which quite clearly states the position with the industry.

It is a difficult problem to solve and it should not be shelved, because in the meantime many fishermen are finding it very difficult to make a living while a select group, as I said earlier, are virtually able to print their own money.

Mr. Gunn: Why did you not bring that to Chatterton's attention?

Mr. KENEALLY: If the honourable member looks at my contribution, he will see that I have been fighting for this for three years. I have spoken to the previous Minister and the department about this matter. The honourable member can check with anyone about that, because my hands are clean. The previous Minister and the department found me to be a darned nuisance in relation to this matter and, equally, the present Minister will find me to be just as big a nuisance if nothing is done about this disgraceful situation.

The other situation that really makes my blood boil is an international matter dealing with the total hypocrisy of our Prime Minister and President Carter in matters relating to the Olympic Games. How is it that the Prime Minister, President Carter, and the Australian and American Governments at this late stage in 1980, when the Olympic Games are almost ready to be held, have suddenly decided that Moscow is not the place to hold the games. I notice that members opposite do not want to listen to my contribution on this subject, because obviously they have some conscience. The members for Morphett and Eyre do not want to listen to their own Prime Minister's hypocrisy being pointed out in this debate. Why was it not said eight years ago, when the Olympic Games were given to Russia, that Moscow was not the place to hold the games, because of all the reasons now being publicised? The answer is that at that time 1980 was not an election year for the Liberal Party in Australia or for the Presidential election in America.

The hypocrisy of the Prime Minister's stand toward the Olympic Games and Afghanistan was quite clearly stated in an article in the *National Times*. I advise all members to read that article, because it relates to a report that the Prime Minister received from a top level committee that he set up as a result of the Hope inquiry into security last year. That committee was asked by the Prime Minister to inform the Government about the position in Afghanistan. We all know how the Prime Minister wanted that position to be categorised. I give thanks that in this day and age there are publications within Australia that provide an even-handed view on politics in Australia. To members opposite a publication with an even-handed view is regarded as a socialist rag, because they have grown up believing that a capitalist-oriented press is the normal sort of press in this community, as it is.

According to the *National Times*, the Office of National Assessment reported to the Prime Minister that the Soviet move was defensive. I know that nobody has been prepared to say that the Soviet move was anything but aggression. It is interesting that when the Americans went into Kampuchea it was referred to as an incursion, but when the Russians go into Afghanistan it is an invasion. That is a small play on words, or "newspeak"; incursions are not as bad as invasions. Anyway, that top level committee said that the Russian move was defensive. I am

not an expert in this area, but that seems to be quite a logical conclusion. No country in this world, apart from perhaps Kampuchea and Vietnam, has been so demolished by war as was the U.S.S.R. in the two world wars. That is not a fact that members do not know about. As a result, the Russians are absolutely paranoid about their security. Therefore, it is reasonable that, if there is a problem in a country with a thousand-mile common border with Russia, the Russians would be concerned. I would like to see the reaction of the Americans if there was a Communist eruption in Canada. I am sure the Americans would feel that they had a responsibility to go in there, because their own security would be at stake. Thus, it is reasonable that the Russians thought that way. That the Russians over-reacted is beyond question, and I am not about to defend that.

The totally hawkish attitude of the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, in view of the professional advice that they are receiving, quite infuriates me. Malcolm Fraser keeps saying that it is a non-aligned country, but Afghanistan is not a non-aligned country. In 1978, Mr. Kissinger said that Afghanistan was 80 per cent within the realm of Russian influence; it is not a non-aligned State. Another finding by the Office of National Assessment was that the Soviets were not aiming for the oilfields. In fact, they are closer to the oil fields through their common border with Iran, so they do not have to go through Afghanistan. Another finding was that the real danger in the region was not the Soviet Union but the internal instability of countries. Mr. Fraser rejected this report because he said the committee was complacent. The findings did not suit his political point of view, which he has very strongly propagated, but it is starting to react against him.

I do not believe the Russians will notice Australia's proposed boycott of the Moscow Olympics; they will not even notice that Australia is not there. That is a hard fact of life, because Australia no longer plays a part as a leading athletic country. Unfortunately, that is a fact and one of the reasons for this is the total lack of support given to the athletes of this country by Governments. Therefore, if Australia does not attend the Moscow Olympics I doubt whether in terms of performance on the field we will be greatly missed. Sadly, our own athletes will miss the opportunity to attend the Moscow Games.

The Prime Minister of Australia and most of his senior colleagues are farmers. Their decision to boycott the Olympic Games will not affect their financial position at all, but it will greatly affect the financial position and the future of a great many of the athletes who, as our spokesmen for sport and recreation (the member for Gilles) has said, have been our best ambassadors over the years. There is no ban on the sale of wheat, wool, rutil, and so on to the Russians. In fact, there is the rather extraordinary situation where bales of wool with Nareen printed on them have been shipped off to Russia. That is exactly the case, and it is no good for the member for Rocky River to try to suggest otherwise.

It seems strange that in today's papers we received a small notice from the Australian Wool Corporation saying that it made a mistake in the publication it forwarded to us just recently. That notice states:

The Australian Wool Corporation's Chairman, Mr. Asimus, was quoted as saying Russia took 400 000 bales of Australian wool in 1978-79 out of a total for Eastern Europe of around 700 000 bales. This should have read 530 000 bales out of a total of around 850 000 bales.

So we sent over a lot more wool than was first stated. I watched a programme on television on Saturday night and saw a gentleman named Forbes Carlisle. I know his work

very well because I am interested in amateur athletics and am a devotee of the Olympic Games. In fact, I was very fortunate to attend the last Olympic Games in Montreal. I would like to attend the Moscow Olympic Games, but I will not be fortunate enough to do so. Forbes Carlisle is typical of the hypocrisy of those people trying to oppose Australia going to the Moscow Olympic Games. He said that Australia should boycott the games and that the athletes should not be allowed to go. However, the interviewer, a Mr. Ross, asked, "Should the athletes go, Mr. Carlisle, what is your position?" He said, "Of course I will go if the athletes go." What about the hypocrisy of that gentleman? If he sincerely believes that the situation in Afghanistan is so bad and that the Russian Government is so bad that it warrants the boycotting of the Olympic Games, he should have the moral fibre to stay home.

I say exactly the same about Mr. Mark Morgan, who is the captain of the Australian swimming team. He made the most extraordinary statement, which I do not think anyone would take seriously, that, if the world had boycotted the 1936 games in Berlin, the Second World War would not have taken place. This is totally ridiculous. He uses this as a justification for Australia's boycotting the Olympic Games in Moscow.

I say to Mr. Morgan that, if he sincerely holds that point of view (and I do not question his right to hold it), he should declare himself unavailable to go to Moscow and let other people who do not hold that view take his place. I cannot abide the hypocrisy of people such as Forbes Carlisle, Mark Morgan, and Malcolm Fraser and his colleagues, who will not affect their own position one wit, but who want other people to make serious sacrifices. What the Prime Minister wants to do is to make the Olympic Games an arm of our foreign policy. I hope that the International Olympic Federation and the sponsors of the Australian Olympic team resist the pressure of the Federal Government in this matter. Mr. Ellicott, on television on Saturday night, tried to justify the Federal Government's stand. He was quite embarrassed about this matter, because I know he does not hold the view of his Leader. That view derives from a paranoid fear that the Prime Minister has had about Russia probably all his life.

I can recall that not so long ago our political enemies were telling us what a terrible bunch of people the Chinese were. Suddenly, the Chinese are great people. I can recall the time when Yugoslavia was beyond the pale. Mr. Fraser is now talking about going to the funeral of Marshall Tito, the President of Yugoslavia, should he die. These are all communist countries. We have come a long way, have we not, since kicking the communist can? The people of Australia will not continue to accept the hypocrisy of a Government that wishes to make the amateur athletes of this country, who receive precious little support, who work very hard for the country and who are our best ambassadors, suffer, while the rest of us go scott free.

If Mr. Fraser and his farming cohorts in the Federal Ministry want to continue this boycott, let them make some personal sacrifice. Mr. Fraser does not know what athletes are about; he has never been an athlete. He has no idea of the time, effort, and pure guts that these people have to put in for years to acquire a high standard. The Prime Minister thinks that athletes can get ready for an Olympic Games in mid-year, not complete, and then be ready two months later. The suggestion that the games can be held in Melbourne is ridiculous. As an Australian, I am totally ashamed of what we are doing to our athletes. I hope that the South Australian Government has the fortitude to support South Australian athletes by acknowledging their right to go to the Olympic Games, and to reject the pressure that is brought to bear by the

Federal Government. I ask the Premier of South Australia to make a statement in that vein. If he is not prepared to do so, he must be lumped along with his hypocritical colleagues in Canberra, and those hypocrites who are part of the amateur movement and who say they oppose the Olympic Games being held in Moscow but who also say that, if athletes go, they will go along for the ride. In my view, these people have no principles and they should be condemned for that.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. Both members spoke ably and will no doubt be a great asset to this House, as will many other new members, particularly those on this side. I believe that they are a great acquisition to the Parliament and the districts that they represent.

Mr. Keneally: They are like stars flashing across the firmament; they'll disappear as quickly as they came.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I also take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation to the position of Speaker, and I also congratulate those other members who have received office through the system of Parliament to represent different committees and different sections of the Parliamentary operations.

I refer to a statement made today by the member for Hartley. I will not say where I heard this statement but I did hear him say that when he was the Premier of this State he took a proposal to Cabinet regarding the spending of over \$2 000 000 of the people's money on the Moore's proposition, because he believed that there would be some development around Victoria Square and the Government should be in on it. That is basically what he said—that he, as Premier of the State, was prepared to spend in excess of \$2 000 000 of the people's money for an unknown future purpose. The honourable member said that he was just going to spend the money. He put the proposition to Cabinet hoping it would be approved so that taxpayers' money could be spent.

The Hon. H. Allison: Verbally.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, verbally; the proposal was never in writing, and that seems strange. Let us be honest. What was the previous Government's intention regarding the Moore's building and Victoria Square? It would be interesting to know what was going on in the background.

I refer now to fires in the Hills. Some years ago, when I advocated that certain action be taken in the Hills so that properties and lives would not be at risk, I was referred to by certain sections of the news media, or a person commenting through that media, as the rapist of the Hills. When something as disastrous as last Wednesday's fire happens, we realise just how serious is the situation. As we sit in this Parliament during the next few weeks, there will be days when the temperature is high enough and the wind strong enough for a catastrophe to occur that is 10 times worse than that which occurred in South Australia last Wednesday, because we as a society, a Government and a Parliament have become complacent, and it is no good denying that. Those who drive through the areas now ravaged by fire will feel sickened, when comparing areas that have not been ravaged by fire, to think that people live in a situation where any day their properties can be totally destroyed by fire and perhaps members of their families or themselves killed.

It may be that no death was caused by Wednesday's fire because it did not occur on a Saturday or a Sunday but on a Wednesday, when children were at school. Every week a fire starts somewhere in the Hills, sometimes because of devices that are cunningly made; people would like to

know who deliberately sets them up. People who live south-east of the foothills and whose properties are not insured to the total value, or who are unconcerned, or not prepared to take the necessary action at least to give their property some chance of being saved, are really placing themselves in jeopardy.

If we had another fire on a day such as last Wednesday in any part of a densely wooded Hills area, I do not believe it could be stopped easily. That is a human impossibility when a fire is travelling at possibly 10 miles an hour. Therefore, we must be conscious of the action that should be taken. I am told that one can buy in South Australia a plastic material that one can place over one's gutters to stop leaves and other flammable material from dropping into the gutters. I am also told that that plastic covering was the first thing to burn in the fire.

This is the sort of thing about which we as Parliamentarians and Governments should be concerned: the products that are sold to people supposedly for fire protection and fire prevention when, in fact, they are highly flammable. We have spoken about our concern regarding water pollution in the Adelaide Hills, involving those properties which happen to be within a water catchment area but which are outside areas defined as townships. Such places are not given a reticulated water supply. I have fought during the term of office of both Governments (not so much the present one, because there has not been time for me to do so, although representations have been made) to have a reticulated water supply connected to most properties that were burnt last Wednesday. However, it has been the Engineering and Water Supply Department's attitude that pollution of the reservoir will be increased if a reticulated water supply is given to people living in a catchment area. I do not believe that the amount of pollution that can be created as a result of giving people a reticulated water supply is of great significance. This has not been proven.

I sat in on an appeal conducted before the Planning Appeal Board. An officer was asked whether, if a certain amount of stock was taken off a property, and an extra house was built thereon, the department could measure the amount of increased pollution in the stream immediately below the new house. The reply was in the negative. So these people have for years lived in an area that has in some cases been densely populated without a reticulated water supply. The title to the land allowed those people to build; indeed, the relevant legislation was approved by Parliament, the titles having been issued by a Government department. Those people purchased their properties believing that they could within the law build houses on them. All members know that, if a person is permitted to build a home, he is entitled to a reticulated water supply. We have taken reticulated water to vast outback areas of this State; indeed, 94 per cent of South Australia has a reticulated water supply. However, in an area that is in a dangerous fire zone and is prone to the ravages of fire, we have not been able to give it a reticulated water supply, because it will supposedly pollute the reservoir water.

If six people living in a house have a septic tank, which they are compelled under the Health Act to have, and those people have an inadequate water supply, is it more likely that they will create pollution because of their septic tank by having a bit of green around their house with an irrigated garden? They should be given a reticulated water supply, and we will eliminate much of the risk that is involved. Also, there will not be a great pollution increase in the reservoir.

If it is argued that there are already many titles to land on which houses could be built, land that people have

purchased recently, believing that they had a right to build on it (as they have by law in this State), will they not build on it because they do not have a reticulated water supply? That is certainly not so. Those people believe that they will have a high rainfall that should give them at least a reasonable water supply and, because they love the Hills, they will build there, thus creating a greater danger for the future.

In five years, if we do not take the right precautions, such areas will be regrown to a point where a fire could ravage it again. We all know that in our hearts. We may, like previous Governments and Parliaments, forget about it and hope that the problem does not rear its ugly head again. However, we know in our hearts that it will. Perhaps we will hope that the next Parliament or the next Government will have to face it. I say clearly that we have a responsibility to give a reticulated water supply to those areas which have enough titles to show that the area will be reasonably densely populated in future. At least we will in that way give some satisfaction to people and make them realise that they have a little more protection.

We will have to say to owners (be they private owners or the Government) of properties that have dense scrub and trees on them that they have a responsibility to put adequate fire breaks around the property in order to give volunteer helpers some chance of stopping any fire that occurs. We asked for years to have a fire break built around the Belair Recreation Park, previously known as National Park. We have a fiddling little break on the southern side at which a fire on a bad day would laugh, yet immediately on the other side of the road stands a row of houses that could be devastated on our next hot day. Those people asked the former Government for a reticulated water supply. However, that request was denied because, we were told, it was too expensive. But, how expensive is \$200 000, \$300 000 or \$400 000 compared to the millions of dollars that can be lost in a fire? I asked the present Minister to consider this matter before the recent fire occurred. I know that he will give it every consideration.

If we are to have parks and land that we believe should be conserved for future generations, let us be willing to cut a fire break around the edge of it and to put through the centre of it at reasonable intervals a fire break that will at least give us a chance to preserve some of the park if a fire occurs in or near it.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department property at Mount Bold has massive fire breaks that are possibly 100 metres wide. Those breaks, which were cut through native bushland in its virgin state, are effective and they work. We could therefore have around the reservoir some protection, keeping as much vegetation as possible, so that the run-off would not take silt into the reservoir and, with other materials, pollute it. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has therefore proved that fire breaks will work. We have reached the stage where the average householder can be asked whether he has insured. We compel people who drive a motor vehicle to take out third party insurance. Do we need to say to people, particularly those in the Hills, "Have you insured against fire or earthquake?" If they have not, do we need power to encourage or force people so to insure? I do not like compulsion.

Mr. Keneally: What do you think?

Mr. EVANS: I should like to see an education system, whereby a council could at least have an officer available, either through the Government or straight through the council (if it can afford it), which officer could interview people and ask people whether they realised that they were in a dangerous area. He could ask, "Have you fully

insured your house, furniture and fences for replacement value?" It is no good one's looking at the value placed on those things 20 years ago, because inflation has taken their value to a much higher figure.

Mr. Keneally: Would you compensate those who didn't?

Mr. EVANS: I believe that, if people cannot be encouraged to insure, it is a pity. I believe that by community charity, namely, donations and gifts, through voluntary organisations, they should be helped to at least get back on their feet. I sympathise with and have the deepest concern for the people affected by the most recent fire. However, if Governments are going to be involved, we must say to people, "It's your responsibility to insure." It has to be. Where people do not have the finance (and in the case of this fire there were such people) to carry insurance, in some instances it is a different argument and perhaps comes back to a social responsibility within the community.

Some of the people involved in this most recent fire are my personal and closest friends. I have worked, lived, and played sport with them, and no-one regrets more than I do what has happened to their properties. I have lived through two such fires, and I was on the tail-end of this one. I have seen policemen burnt, three having been killed, although that was many years ago. Every time a fire occurs there is much talk in the news media and in Parliament that we should do something, and people say where they believe the fire started, but two months later they are out bandying about the argument that we should not have slow burns or put fire-breaks around national parks, because we are destroying some of the native bush. They are saying that we should take a chance until another day. Some people say, "Plant native trees near your home." I invite anyone to see which tree is the most prone to explode in a fire: it is certainly the eucalypt.

Many of the old people knew what should be planted near a home. It was not because they or their ancestors came from Europe that they planted oaks, elms, maples birches, or cottonwoods from America. They knew that they were not as flammable or dangerous as the eucalypt. This fire proved that the stringy bark again was the most vulnerable to fire and radiata pine the second most vulnerable. The cedar was not as bad, nor was the cypress. In the main, the English or European trees are the safest. For 15 years people were told, "Plant natives near your home," and they believed that they had to do so. Feature articles appeared in the press, organisations were set up to plant native trees, and people were generally encouraged to plant them near their home. I love them, and believe that they should be planted, but they should be a reasonable distance from the home.

Areas should be kept in their native state, except for a slow burn every so many years, depending on the opinion of the Country Fire Services at the time; but to have dense numbers of native trees near the home is a serious risk. I believe that people can get away with a few without risk. The other thing we need to remember is that, where a house is on a steep slope, with dense highly flammable vegetation below, large windows are a risk because, with the heat, they can explode, and automatically the fire is inside and the home is gone. In this fire, we learned, I hope, that, after the fire has gone past and you have saved the house, it is important to have a person stay behind in each house, because when the final outcome was known some men who had saved their homes returned to them only to find that they had gone. One man returned to his home two hours after the fire had passed, and he could not save it because the rear wall was burning.

We have learnt some lessons. The members of the Police Force, the C.F.S. and all the volunteer

organisations gave everything they had to fight the fire. They had to keep on chasing the main head of the fire to stop it broadening and ravaging the towns of Echunga, Meadows, and so on, and it must have been heartbreaking for those people, when they returned, to have to say, "We thought we had saved it." That was another lesson we learnt from that experience.

One honourable member in another place used Parliamentary privilege today to say some malicious things that I believe he knew were untrue, and for a man who claims to have fought in the armed forces for democracy and to have some principles to take that sort of course shows him as he really is. He accused me of lying. I will repeat what I said before: I have no financial interests in F.S. Evans and Sons Pty. Ltd. I never lied. That person knowingly told untruths not only about me but also about councillors. I cannot prove that, but I hope that the councillors will at least read what the gentleman has said and take it up with him face to face. A man elected to Parliament and paid a high salary in that capacity who uses this place to tell untruths, as I believe they are, about people elected by a community to serve and give their time voluntarily must have low standards. If he chooses to attack other people, such as my wife, I ask him to remember what one of his colleagues in the House, the former member for Brighton (Hon. Hugh Hudson), used to say about that kind of approach. Former Government members know that I have been Whip for 10 years and that I have been approached on very dicey issues in relation to at least two of their own colleagues, in addition to a personal matter involving another of their colleagues.

I never broke a confidence in any of those instances or used any material in any way, let alone tried to fabricate something that was an untruth. I say again that I did not lie in this House or to any newspaper. What I said was the absolute truth: that is the truth. I will never take that approach. I can give you that undertaking, Mr. Speaker, and the sooner we take the approach that we be sure before we raise matters about individuals, the better.

I will finish my speech by dealing with the situation in the Adelaide Hills. The area has been ravaged by fire, and it is sad for anyone to travel through it. I consider that the Government departments have done all in their power to get over the initial problems that existed and still exist in some cases. The Department for Community Welfare carried out its role well. The Country Fire Service, Red Cross, and all the other voluntary organisations, such as Lions, Apex, and Rotary, have carried out their roles very effectively. Officers of the Police Department, even though they had a harrowing time in trying to convince people that they should not break the barriers to go back to their homes, were patient, humane and understanding. They had to back their judgment on what they thought was the best thing to do at the time. That was their role.

The Minister of Agriculture, through forestry, at least is helping by having his people look at the pines that have been burnt or are not likely to recover. He is having the mills take as many as they can and at least some royalty paid to those people. It will be vital to one man's financial survival (or it will give him a chance to survive) if he can have his area of about 10 acres cut out.

I have been told that the loss assessors have recommended to companies that, where a person's home is situated on some acres of land and the people have a household insurance policy, whereas normally it would be considered that the fences around the property would not be insured under the household insurance policy, those persons shall be taken as being insured as far as their boundary fence is concerned. In other words, the home is there and the allotment is to be considered a household

allotment as far as the policy is concerned. If that is accepted by insurance companies, it will be a magnificent gesture, because people who insure overlook the fences, which are of major importance. If people are getting income from a property, they are regarded as being in agricultural pursuits; it will be considered a business, and will be in a different category.

There was one story that I wished to check out. That was that a person lost \$270 000 worth of motor vehicles. I have been told that this is not accurate and that many of the vehicles were not severely damaged at all. If that is the case, I will be thrilled, because the man has worked hard. He is a personal friend and a great community man, with many friends. He deserves success, not the destruction that he or anyone else could have suffered from that fire.

We will never be able to replace the personal possessions that many people lost, such as photographs, letters, jewellery, and presents. One simple example is that I had a telephone call to my office from a primary school, because I am president of a football club. One young boy lost the trophy that he won for football last year. It was his pride and joy. At least, that is something that the club can replace. It will not be the original, but to him it is a token of his football work.

In most cases, those types of possession cannot be replaced and I hope that many people who at present live in the other parts of the Hills realise how heart rending and soul destroying it is to lose all. It is no good talking about the types of home that went in the fire. You will see a log cabin still standing where a fire went through. You will see an aluminium caravan that burnt and a wooden one unburnt in the same paddock. How some homes and properties survived is unbelievable. Unless you saw it you would never be able to understand how people survived as individuals in that sort of heat.

Now that that part is over, I say, while the Premier is here, that he have a major responsibility in encouraging, through the media, and each of us as members of Parliament in our districts, the community to give to the Lord Mayor's Bushfire Appeal, 1980, so that we will get as much money as possible (and I hope that the Government makes a greater contribution later, directly or indirectly) and so that we will have a reasonable chance of offering compensation to a larger extent to those people who were not insured for everything that they had. It is no good saying that people should have been insured. It is too late. The possessions have gone and, if we are to have a chance to put people back on their feet, we need to pay as much compensation as possible and give wise counsel for the future that, wherever people live, they should insure to market value or somewhere near it the material things that they own.

I have lived through it. I have dreaded the day that it would occur. The position had been reached in recent years that, if one talked of clearing bushland or suggested that we should not plant native trees along the sides of the roads, one was condemned by the news media and other people. Those who knew the inevitable and the heartbreak that would occur backed off, hid in the woodwork, and prayed that when it came it would not be as bad as it has been. It arrived. It can occur again within the next week. Few people made a move to do anything about the position as individuals. If they are not going to do anything about making the area safer around properties where they still have them, particularly on the western slopes of the Hills, I pray that they will take out as much insurance cover as possible. Last Wednesday was a sad day for South Australia. In future, if we do not look for solutions and protection, there will be a sadder day. It will be too late to talk about it after it has occurred.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the motion. I congratulate Greg Crafter on his re-election for the District of Norwood. I have congratulated you, Mr. Speaker, and I think all Opposition members agree that you are doing a good job as Speaker. It is seldom that I, after another member has spoken, do not at some stage agree with that honourable member. However, as the honourable member knows, in this House at times people have spoken under Parliamentary privilege. This has happened on both sides since I have been here. Tonight the honourable member did not name anyone, but made an innuendo about who was the person concerned. As I have said, it happens on both sides, and I do not believe in it. If a person says something in this House and cannot say it outside, that is not very good.

During my 18 or so years in this House I have never done that, and I do not believe in doing that. The honourable member tonight did not name the person concerned, but made it clear by innuendo to both sides of the House who that person was. This sort of thing has happened before, but I do not believe this is the place to raise such matters. A member of my family has a home in that area and he is lucky, like the member for Fisher, but it has happened and now we have to help the people concerned. The Leader of the Opposition (and this has not been done often enough in this House) congratulated the Government for what it did and I was pleased that the press noted that, because that does not happen often in this House. It does not matter which side of the House a member is on, he knocks, according to the Premier, and he has been knocking all his life. Times have changed and things are entirely different. I want to make my position quite clear; no member will hear me say anything in this House, using Parliamentary privilege to say it, because that could ruin a person's business and that person has no rights in the matter. I will not be in it. I am surprised at the member for Fisher saying what he said tonight. Recently, Mr. Ahern started an inquiry into what happened during the fire, so any confusion will be ironed out.

The member for Fisher also spoke about the Moore's situation. This afternoon, the member for Hartley challenged the Premier to table the documents related to this matter (and anybody knows verbal evidence is no evidence at all). One of my greatest friends, Mr. Graham Black, was the greatest advocate of the Liberal Party during the course of the election campaign. I have seen him in here once, and he has now gone the opposite way concerning the Moore's situation. When one speaks to Mr. Black nowadays he makes no comment. I find this as I travel around. I read the newspapers (although I believe little of what I read in them), which state that the Government is going down the drain because of the Moore's set-up. If ever a Government made a bad blue, this one has concerning Moore's. The very people who supported the Government and spent thousands of dollars doing so are now spending thousands of dollars going against it, against the Party they supported previously. There is no doubt that the Government is in a lot of trouble about Moore's. I hope it will be able to get out of it, but I can assure members opposite that the Government is in terrific trouble, because its supporters have turned against it.

I notice that there are no members from the press present—they are not my favourites. There is no doubt that, before the recent by-election, the press had to stir, and this headline appeared:

My sacking was a political plot. I am seen as crooked, corrupt.

How many years ago did this happen? It must be two or three years ago. Then, suddenly, just before the Norwood

by-election, the whole thing starts again. I suppose the writer for the *Sunday Mail* is told what to do, and so am I, I will admit to that, but at least I have had the opportunity of having my say. If I am defeated, I will abide by the decision reached, but the writers for this paper are told what to do. There is another section of the *Sunday Mail* headed "On North Terrace", which is the greatest show of all time because it never refers to the Labor Party; there is no member of the Labor Party who is worth a mention. People who are floating voters have come to me (and there are a few of them in Unley, as honourable members might have noticed during the recent election, and I nearly lost them all), and asked me what is going wrong, because nobody gets a mention. They are saying, "Isn't the Labor Party ever around the place at all?"

I say that one has to pay attention to the press, because the press wins elections; members opposite did not win the recent election, the press did. There is not a member on the other side of this House who doorknocked as much as any member on this side of the House. It is not the freedom of the press, but the power of the press, because it can make or break anyone. I have been through the mill in the sporting area and I know for sure that the press can get you in the team or put you out. It is as easy as that. When three select a team, if you have two on your side you must win. I thought some of the editorials were magnificent, especially those in the *News*. I am not sure whether it is paying anything into Liberal Party funds, but it is making sure that every time anything happens it is pleased to put the rubbish in and get stuck into the Labor Party. According to the press, in every election I have been involved in, except the last one, I have been in a doubtful seat; when I get 60 per cent of the vote, I do not think I am in a doubtful seat.

I remember an editorial which stated there was no chance of Labor winning the Perth election and that Labor was in disarray. I do not know whether Gallup Polls are any good, but, according to the *Advertiser*, which had a 55-45 show for Labor versus Liberal, the Labor Party holds 49 per cent. Maybe that is not enough to win, but it is not a bad average. That was reported on 18 February. According to the press, Labor had no possible hope in the election in Western Australia last Saturday.

Mr. Mathwin: It was—

Mr. LANGLEY: I will answer any interjection the honourable member for Glenelg likes to make.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't encourage me.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not want to encourage the honourable member. These two things are not correct in any way at all. I refer to the showdown concerning the Olympic Games, when the athletes became puppets of the Australian Government (people who have trained for years and years to be good and suddenly all their effort is wasted). The member for Glenelg can shake his head, but these people are amateurs, not professionals, because they do not compete for money. I am not talking about athletes in other countries; I am talking about Australian athletes. They are all proven amateurs, otherwise they could not go to the Olympics. Maybe they are subsidised by working for Coca-Cola, or something like that, but they are amateurs.

Every time I have been overseas, the people have said that the best people who come from other countries are the sportsmen, who are the greatest ambassadors that a country would ever have. I want only to touch lightly on this score, because I do not want to get mixed up in the sporting situation. This is my personal view. The member for Glenelg is entitled to his own opinion, but why should athletes be puppets of the Government, which says, "If you do not do what we say, we will not give you any

money."

Mr. Mathwin: Why kow-tow to the Russians?

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not kow-tow to the Russians. I do not care what country I play in. I once met some Russian people while I was in England. They wanted to learn about cricket, and I did my best to help them.

Mr. Mathwin: That would be good!

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already spoken to the member for Glenelg, and I ask him to desist.

Mr. LANGLEY: They were interested in cricket. Sport has one great thing in its favour: it brings countries together. I now refer to my old friend the *News*, which was most alert in relation to Mr. Salisbury. I do not know him, and I have nothing against him. I refer particularly to the editorial of 15 February.

Mr. Randall: Do you read the *News*?

Mr. LANGLEY: I did not read it that week. I do not buy the *News*, if the honourable member wants to know. I am a unionist, too. I pay my dues, and I am allowed to be a union member. Occasionally, my neighbour lends the *News* to me. The *News* of that date is a perfect example of the way these people work. The Minister of Agriculture, in his electorate of Alexandra, has one champion bloke over there, I think named Mr. Buick. He is a beauty, and he has not been seen since the incident to which I refer. Certainly, he is a courteous gentleman—one of the loveliest people of all time! If Labor Party members ever stooped to that type of business, I would have to resign.

On one page in the *News* is Don Dunstan up high, looking well—

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: What do members of the Government mean by "high"? That is the type of thing I went through in my district when it was "Langley the larrikin", but I still won my seat. I suppose that is how members opposite work. It is about time they stopped rubbishing people. Perhaps one day someone might have to look into the life of the Minister of Agriculture, and that may not be so good either, although I do not know anything about his life. I do not make such statements. One has only to win the plebiscite in Alexandra and one is home. I am sure the member for Price is winning the plebiscite in his district, too. I will be out after the next election, but I have had a good time in this House.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: It was not my greatest loss. I won by 43 votes the first time, without preferences.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That's about the number I won by the first time, so stop boasting.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister will have a chance to speak during debate. The Liberals made so many errors that I should have won by 2 000 votes. I beat a sitting member, but I will bet the Minister of Agriculture did not win his seat against a sitting member. He is jealous that I won the District of Unley. In my time there have been several tied Houses, with only one vote holding the balance. Perhaps the Minister can remember when Mr. Teusner was nominated as Speaker, but had to vote against himself for Mr. Stott to become Speaker. If I were the Minister I would not talk too much about Speakers in this House, especially after the last election: someone must have done the wrong thing (I do not know who it was), because someone abstained from voting.

I refer to the photograph of Don Dunstan when he was not well. That was really good stuff! The *News* does not rub it in; it just keeps it quiet! The report states:

Tomorrow the voters of Norwood are required to go to the polls for the third time in a year. Each poll has been Labor provoked, firstly the Dunstan tragedy, then the Corcoran election and now the consequence of the ruling on the A.L.P.

candidate's case before the Court of Disputed Returns.

I do not want to go any further than that, because all honourable members would have read that report, which is a most biased article. There has been more than one Court of Disputed Returns. The Hon. J. D. Corcoran won his seat by one vote, there was a Court of Disputed Returns, and he again won the next time. That is what happened in Norwood. I doorknocked the area, although I did not meet the Minister of Agriculture; indeed, I did not meet any members of the Liberal Party while I was doorknocking, although I did see some of the things pushed under the doors, so someone must have been doing his job. I left those things there, because it is up to people to make their own decisions.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What has that to do with the price of eggs?

Mr. LANGLEY: It shows how the *News* backed down. If one plays sport, even if one is beaten by a point, one shakes hands with the winner, but that is not the case here. I am a sportsman, and I congratulate the winner, just as the Leader of the Opposition congratulated the Government when it did the right thing last week. The *News* could not do that. The campaign was well run. Not everyone I met while doorknocking agreed with me, but one cannot expect anything else. One cannot win everything. At least we did win the election, but the *News* did not have the stomach to say anything. It was then reported that the Premier would look into the stacking of votes, and at one stage he was almost going to have a Royal Commission.

Regarding the Western Australian election, the *News* suggested that our Party would not do any good, yet there was a 3.5 per cent swing against the Government.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Why are you crooked against the *News*?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am entitled to be crooked on it. I am a person who believes in fair play, and I think most people on either side believe in fair play. I am glad that the honourable member has come forward because, as luck happened, I have been studying this quote for some time; one would almost think that I had written it. I refer to an article headed "Press freedom threatened, says A.J.A. leader", as follows:

Freedom of the press in Australia was under threat, not from external forces but from within, the South Australian branch secretary of the Australian Journalists' Association, Mr. N. W. Swancott, said last night.

Mr. Swancott of the A.J.A. saw me during the course of my retirement a year ago. I found him to be a very nice fellow, and I was very happy with him. Also, he was very informative. I will not read all of the article, but will just refer to the parts which are relevant. The article states:

Mr. Swancott, speaking at the Kiwanis Club of Glenelg, identified three major areas where he said the threat existed. These were:

- The increasing control advertising departments were exerting over newspapers.

It is only natural that, if a person is advertising in newspapers, the newspaper will not write anything about their customer which could cause them to lose business. The article continues:

- The increasing tendency of media organisations to diversify their operations into potentially conflicting areas of business, and,

- The growing tendency of the media to impress a point of view on readers.

There is no doubt about it; I can understand that. The *News* was wrong, but what will Mr. Murdoch do about it? Nothing. He could not care less about you and me. We must give him credit for being a good business man. He is

such a good man that we play the Rupert Murdoch Cup in cricket—and that is supposed to be a fair game! I would not even be the umpire. He is so crook in his newspapers—he is trying to kill us all the time. I do not care what he does to me, however. I do not know whether he is very helpful to the member for Flinders, but he is very helpful to the Liberal Party. I do not know what number his ticket is. Mr. Fraser has No. 1 ticket for the Sturt Football Club—nothing is serious. I think John McLeay's number is 2, and the Minister of Works has No. 3. After all of them I am No. 13—I am the unlucky one! I went out there and ran around the oval a couple of times, and they said that I did not look too bad, so I got a game. That goes to show you how you can use your influence if you so desire. The same applies to the *News*, which used its influence over a period of years. It is about time the *News* took notice of the A.J.A., because they have been crook for so long. As a matter of fact, they have lost their lustre. I know of one place where their papers only went down 33½ per cent. That is not that much, they are a big management, turn shares over every day and make \$20 000 000 just like that. It does not affect us in any way at all. He did one great thing at the time the election was on—he put the Premier away on ice.

Mr. Mathwin: I'll bet that hurt him.

Mr. LANGLEY: Sometimes ice is needed to cool the Premier down. I will say here and now that there is no freedom of the press these days. I do not mind freedom of the press, but everyone must be given an equal chance.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: If you had not had the press on your side, you would not have won the election. You know that. I have never heard of Mr. Buick since. If he is your friend, good luck. Some of the people were framed with absolute untruths. The member for Florey is supposed to be a Communist. Mr. McLeay has him walking under the red carpet. He stood against me once. He did not stand against me a second time, as the member for Mitcham will tell you. I can tell you here and now what they did to him—he went up to the camp, and they bought the ticket to make sure he got in. They kept Mr. Millhouse out of the Federal Government. I know what happened.

Mr. Becker: Tell us about the bias of the press in New South Wales.

Mr. LANGLEY: What news does one hear in New South Wales about South Australia? What news does one see about New South Wales in South Australia?

Mr. Becker: Murdoch backed Wran in the New South Wales election.

Mr. LANGLEY: He was definitely backing a certainty. The member for Hanson is not going to tell me that he was not surprised when his Party won the election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has the floor.

Mr. LANGLEY: If I lost an election I would be one of the first to congratulate the Minister, but not one member of the Liberal Party attended the declaration of the poll.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LANGLEY: That is the truth; if it was not the truth I would not say it. You can deny it; I am only too pleased to move away from this area. I have a great opinion of the former Premier of this State, Don Dunstan. I will not go any further than to say that some very great benefits have come to this State during the course of that gentleman's career.

Mr. Mathwin: Where?

Mr. LANGLEY: I will tell the honourable member. In all the years that the Playford Government was in power

nothing was done for pensioners in this State. The Labor Government altered the remission for pensioners from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. It is a fact that the Playford Government did nothing to help pensioners.

Mr. Evans: Didn't the Playford Government set up the Housing Trust and didn't that help the pensioners?

Mr. LANGLEY: I agree with the member for Fisher, but since the Housing Trust came into being the Labor Government has kept the rents down within reason. In fact, some people are paying rents of \$15 a week.

Mr. Becker: You put them up by \$4, on one occasion.

Mr. LANGLEY: You cannot tell me that pensioners cannot afford Housing Trust flats. The member for Hanson could go along to the Housing Trust and put forward a case on behalf of any of his pensioner constituents. The Housing Trust does not have a bad attitude, and it will probably reduce the rent for a deserving case. People's incomes rise, and I do not believe they would complain about a rise in rent as long as it conformed with their rise.

I only have a few pensioner flats in my electorate, but I have not received any complaints over the years. If there was a complaint, like all members I would go along to the Housing Trust and put the case forward. During the Playford Government's term in office there were never any remissions for pensioners. The Labor Government, has always been helpful towards pensioners. Some dirty stinking remarks have been made about Don Dunstan. I know where they have come from and I have proof. When I have been out door-knocking people have told me certain things.

I used to be called Langley the larrikin; maybe I am, maybe I am not. Anyway, that name does not hurt me. After all, I am not perfect; no-one is born perfect. As long as I receive 51 per cent of the votes I am happy. The fact is that these things should not be said. Don Dunstan has been through a lot of hard times. During the course of his life he has been through a lot and there have been a lot of rumours circulated about him. I am speaking up for him. I am not saying that every member of this House spreads these rumours. But these strong rumours have emanated from someone, and I can assure you that they have not emanated from the Labor Party.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What has Don Dunstan achieved in this House?

Mr. LANGLEY: I will have a 10-minute spree in the grievance debate shortly and I will list all Don Dunstan's achievements. Perhaps I will not have time; I might have to ask for an extension of time.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You've got 25 minutes now.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not intend to take the full time.

Mr. Mathwin: He spoke poetry at the zoo.

Mr. LANGLEY: That is about the level that the member for Glenelg will stoop to. He is one of the greatest "leakers" of all time. He used to have a friend who came from McNally, I believe. He would always get all the information—

Mr. Kenelly: Wrong!

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not know if it was right or wrong. He was getting it from somewhere, and it was definitely a leak.

Mr. Mathwin: It was always true.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not know whether it was or it was not. Every time the Minister answered the question—

Mr. Mathwin: He never answered the question.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have been on both sides of the House for a number of years and you must be joking when you talk about answers to questions. The member for Glenelg has a lot to learn in this game. I do not know how long the member for Glenelg has been here, but he must be in a

bluc-ribbon seat. The Minister of Environment used to come in here with leaks. According to him someone in the department would not tell him, but the information would accidentally come to his notice. However, things have changed now, and the Government has changed its ideas. In the *Advertiser* something about a casino is mooted by a spokesman for the Premier. The next day the Premier denies it. It gets two runs. That is nearly as bad as Sir Thomas Playford and the deep-sea port at Peterborough. I am glad that the member for Glenelg reminded me about the leaks.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: The Prime Minister has made sure that life is not easy. He will go back to his farm and he will be all right, but the rest of us may not be all right.

At different times during the course of Parliamentary sessions, when a Minister speaks for too long, members complain about not having time to ask questions. This session is now in its fourth day and as yet the Opposition has not complained about this matter. My goodness, over the past couple of years I have heard so much from the Opposition about questions, yet I do not believe that at this stage as many questions have been answered as was the average during the Labor Government's term of office. Things are not quite the same when they are different. There is no doubt about it; there has not been any improvement. As a matter of fact, the situation has gone backwards. All members know that politics is a numbers game, as has been demonstrated over many years.

[Midnight]

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You've got plenty of time; list a few of Don's achievements.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister will have one thing in his favour: I will let him know when I will speak about the achievements of Don Dunstan and, if he is away on Government business, I will ensure that I curtail my speech until he is present. Our team is willing to give and take, and we do not have to worry about this kind of thing.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Are you retiring?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, I am retiring, but one thing in my favour is that I have not been kicked out yet. I have had an unblemished career as a politician—I have won every time. That is hard to achieve because one does not win all the time. Members have been in and out of this place, and I am not sure that some present members will be back after the next election. The way things are going in the

community, members on the other side will have trouble holding their seats. A great swing will not be needed. The member for Henley Beach will be remembered as the greatest unionist of all time.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: I am a member of the Labor Party, and the honourable member is, I suppose, a member of the Liberal Party. What is the difference?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: A fair bit, according to what you said earlier.

Mr. LANGLEY: I was not bringing in personalities in your Party; I spoke principally about the press. I had a shot at the Party concerning Don Dunstan, and I will say it again.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You haven't listed any of his achievements.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister and I will have plenty of time to speak in the future. I could continue, but I think I have said enough.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Give it away.

Mr. LANGLEY: One minute the Minister wants me to speak, and then he says he does not. He does not know where he is going, or where his department is going, either. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DISTRICT COUNCIL OF BURRA BURRA (VESTING OF LAND) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.4 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 27 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 February 1980

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SCHOOLTEACHERS

474. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What reduction will occur during this financial year in the number of seconded teachers working on curriculum writing committees?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There has been no reduction in the total number of seconded teachers working on curriculum writing committees. There has been an internal adjustment between curriculum writing groups. Some have been reduced in number and others increased. However, the matter is now the subject of a thorough investigation and it is possible that some changes will be implemented over the next few months.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

528. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has Government approval been sought to operate a passenger ferry from Second Valley to Kangaroo Island and, if so:—

- (a) what terminal installations will be required at Second Valley and on Kangaroo Island;
- (b) what is the estimated cost of the terminals; and
- (c) what are the proposed fares to be charged?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The question should have been addressed to my colleague the Minister of Marine. However, since you have asked, the answer is "No".

RAILWAYS TRANSFER AGREEMENT

536. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to amend the South Australian Railways Transfer Agreement Act to allow the S.T.A. to make direct appointments within the Rail Division and, if so, when will such legislation be introduced?

2. Does the Government intend to consult with all unions that have members involved in the railway industry and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

3. Should the respective unions object to such legislation, will the Government proceed with the amendments?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:
1. The Government does not intend to introduce legislation to amend the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975, with regard to this matter.

2. The State Transport Authority will consult with unions if it is proposed to make any change to the basis of appointment of personnel required for metropolitan railway operations.

3. Not relevant.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

556. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What was the cost to the Government of pages 17 to 20 inclusive of the *Advertiser* of 19 January 1980?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The cost of pages 17-20 inclusive in the *Advertiser* of 19 January 1980 was \$7 866.16.

MURRAY RIVER CONCENTRATION

559. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Over the quinquennium 1974-78 what has been the minimum, maximum and average concentration in River Murray water of the following materials as measured at Mannum, Renmark and Goolwa, respectively—

- (a) total dissolved solids;
- (b) calcium;
- (c) magnesium;
- (d) sulphates;
- (e) chlorides;
- (f) fluorides;
- (g) nitrates; and
- (h) phosphates?

2. What generally has been the trend of detergent and pesticide concentration and radioactivity in the same water over the same period?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Location	Ionic Concentrations (mg/L)							
Mannum	T.D.S.	Ca	Mg	SO ₄	Cl	F	NO ₃	PO ₄
Av.	324	21	14	24	116	0.18	0.6	0.50
Min.	117	10	5	2	23	0.09	<0.1	0.15
Max.	714	55	28	82	300	0.25	2.0	0.09
Lock 5 (near Renmark)								
Av.	310	20	15	26	111	0.15	0.4	0.42
Min.	146	12	8	11	36	0.01	<0.1	0.20
Max.	434	28	20	34	164	0.21	2.0	0.56
Goolwa								
Av.	1 046	41	40	72	487	0.18	0.2	0.39
Min.	386	24	17	25	144	0.13	<0.1	0.14
Max.	2 178	68	83	150	1 125	0.28	2.0	0.65

- T.D.S. = Total Dissolved Solids
- Ca = Calcium
- Mg = Magnesium
- SO₄ = Sulphate
- Cl = Chloride
- F = Fluoride
- NO₃ = Nitrate
- PO₄ = Phosphate

2. Detergents: Detergent levels have also been low and there have been no significant trends in either the frequency of detection or concentrations other than the general lower concentrations apparent at Goolwa.

Pesticides: Pesticide residues have only rarely been detected in the River Murray and then only in low levels compared to recommended maximum levels for drinking water. There has been no significant trend in either the frequency of detection or concentration and change.

Radioactivity: A maximum level of beta radiation of 590 millibecquerels per litre was detected on 8 August 1974 which occurred towards the end of the French nuclear tests (WHO recommended unconditional level: 1 100 millibecquerels per litre) following which the level reduced to non significant levels.

TOURISM

564. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. When will the review of the promotion of South Australia as a tourist area be undertaken?
2. When is it likely the working parties to advise the Government on specific aspects of tourism will be formed?
3. Who will be the persons on the working parties?
4. What specific aspects of tourism will the working parties consider?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. My department has recently undertaken a major review of South Australia's relative position within the national tourist market, which is leading to a comprehensive examination of the means by which we can improve our present standing. I propose to release a report describing the current situation and will be seeking responses from all sectors of the State's tourist industry.

2. Under the auspices of the newly upgraded Tourism Advisory Committee, I have already established a number of working parties to advise me on various matters of concern to the development of tourism in this State.

3. Members of these and future working parties are drawn from the main committee which comprises representatives of every important segment of the tourist industry. Additional members are co-opted as necessary.

4. The various working parties will consider a range of issues of current and long term relevance to the promotion and development of tourism.

SPORTING COMPETITIONS

565. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

Does the Minister support the encouragement and funding of mature age sporting competitions for male and female competitors and, if so, what encouragement and funding is likely to be made available?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I fully support the encouragement and funding of mature age sporting competitions for male and female competitors. The Recreation and Sport Division makes funds available for these and other competitions and takes account of the relevant State association's recommendations when considering allocation of specific funds.

VICTOR HARBOR RAILWAY LINE

571. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What action is the Government taking to

ensure the retention of the Adelaide to Victor Harbor railway line as a tourist asset?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Following discussions between myself, the Commonwealth Minister for Transport and officers of the Australian National Railways Commission, it has been agreed that the passenger time table will be revised to provide a better service for tourist traffic. In addition, improved service will be provided during the summer holidays and other school holidays.

LIFE. BE IN IT

575. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister support a readjustment to the "Life. Be In It" programme to ensure that media presentation is linked with specific goals for people to aim at in order to achieve a particular standard of physical fitness?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The "Life. Be In It" programme is a long-term national campaign carefully designed to influence large numbers of people gradually towards:

1. more positive attitudes towards active recreation;
2. awareness of leisure opportunities and the enjoyment to be gained;
3. greater participation in active leisure pursuits.

National media presentations have, therefore, not emphasised the achievement of particular standards of physical fitness. Rather, they have stressed greater participation in physical activity which may provide the attendant benefit of higher physical fitness to some people.

Following a national evaluation study the "Life. Be In It" programme will move in a new direction in its media campaign. It will aim at specific groups in the community which have been identified as remaining unresponsive to the current programme. A series of advertisements will be aimed at people who are "too busy" and encourage them to find 30 minutes a day for physical activities.

Rather than change the successful strategy of the "Life. Be In It" campaign, the Recreation and Sport Division is already taking the initiative of pursuing the objective mentioned by the honourable member through the Community Physical Fitness Scheme. One hundred and twenty three instructors have already been trained and a further 40 will commence training on 10 March 1980. This scheme will also support the establishment of fitness classes, initially in seven metropolitan and country council areas.

TORRENS RIVER

579. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What was the general thrust of a report by the Adelaide firm of consulting engineers, B. C. Tonkin and Associates, commissioned by the E.& W.S. Department's water resources branch on the impact of flooding of the River Torrens?

2. What residential development in the Campbelltown, Dernancourt and Felixstow areas has taken place on the Torrens flood plains that would be affected by what is referred to as a "50-year flood"?

3. Is any single body responsible for the River Torrens as a whole, from its origin to the sea?

4. Do many houses in the western suburbs face a similar potential fate to that encountered in the Brisbane floods several years ago?

5. Was a second study, following the Tonkin Report, commissioned by the previous Government on what could be done to lessen flooding in the Torrens and, if so, has this been completed?

6. What action does the Government propose to take on this matter?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. B. C. Tonkin and Associates were commissioned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to determine peak flow hydrographs for the River Torrens. Their report, "The River Torrens—some Hydrological Aspects", was released in March 1976 and identified the flood risk for developed areas adjacent to the river.

2. Insufficient information is currently available to provide a clear picture of the number of dwellings that would be affected. This matter is being investigated at present (refer answer to question No. 6.).

3. No.

4. No. Houses in the western suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide would be subject to general low depth flooding up to one metre over a large area on either side of the river. Flood flow velocities would be low. The Brisbane floods generally provided higher velocity flows and deeper water than would be expected to occur in Adelaide's western suburbs.

5. In the period 1976 and 1977, B. C. Tonkin and Associates prepared three additional working reports, commissioned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, giving follow-up highly technical information.

6. On 18 February 1980 Cabinet approved the expenditure of \$478 000 for accelerated investigations into the optimum solution for flood mitigation on the River Torrens. This is expected to take about 12 months to complete. The investigation will be undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, B. C. Tonkin and Associates and the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation, and will also identify more precisely the areas subject to flooding risks.

VICTOR HARBOR LAND

582. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the Minister of Housing, or any of the companies associated with his family in which he has held an interest, have an option on any seafront land at Victor Harbor and, if so, would any such land be affected by a closure of the Victor Harbor railway line?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No.

BALLOT-PAPERS

604. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What are the details of legislative changes proposed by the Government that were alluded to by the Attorney-General in his correspondence to me on 8 February in response to the proposition put to the Government, during the Budget debate, to have both Legislative Council and House of Assembly ballot-papers dealt with together for purposes such as postal voting?

2. What are the details of arrangements being made to ensure that postal voters, wishing to personally deposit their votes at the State Electoral Department outside of office hours, have a letterbox facility at the premises available to assist them to do so, as proposed to the Government on 24 October during the Budget debate and

was this facility made available in time for use by voters during the Norwood by-election?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Attorney-General, in his reply to Mr. Trainer on 8 February 1980, indicated that a change to the Electoral Act to allow both Legislative Council and House of Assembly voting papers to be placed in one envelope for the purposes of postal, absent and section 110A voting would be considered when next the Electoral Act is being reviewed. That is still the position.

2. A letterbox for the Electoral Department is being installed by the owners of the building at the entrance to the building. It was not possible for it to be provided in time for the Norwood by-election.

O'BAHN SYSTEM

605. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the report on the O'Bahn system, which the Minister announced in the *News* of 27 November would be ready early in 1980, yet completed?

2. What would be the likely routes of such an O'Bahn system as it traversed the inner suburbs on its way into the city?

3. Will the rising costs of liquid fuels be a factor to be considered with the O'Bahn system *vis a vis* electrified light rail systems?

4. Will pollution along the route, induced by the consumption of liquid fuels, be a significant factor for consideration *vis a vis* an electrified light rail system?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The technical report on the O'Bahn system has been completed and is now subject to detailed review.

2. The routes referred to will be ascertained as a result of the review.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

COMPUTING CENTRE

607. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Can the Minister provide any further information as to the Government's intentions concerning the previous Government's plans for a Computing Centre in Wakefield Street on the site of the old Menz biscuit building?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government is actively considering this matter.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

608. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Has the Minister prepared a reply to my correspondence of 11 January seeking information which the Minister has undertaken to seek out in response to a question on the South Australian Film Corporation's film library put to him during the Budget debate?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: This question was answered on Tuesday 19 February 1980.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PLANT

620. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Can the Premier give an unreserved undertaking that no nuclear energy plant, or any other plant to in any way treat or enrich uranium, will be established within the borders of the Electorate of Playford?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No decision has been taken on the siting of a uranium enrichment plant and no nuclear reactor is being planned by this Government.

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

623. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is an inquiry now proceeding into the Legal Services Commission and, if so, who is conducting this inquiry, and why?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No.

District of Florey during each of the years 1978-79 to 1981-82, respectively?

2. What number of those units will be available for rental and purchase, respectively, and how many of the rental units will be pensioner units, how many two-bedroom flats, and how many villa flats?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. 1978-79—Nil.

1979-80—One Government department sale single unit.

1980-81—Nil.

2. Nil.

FLOREY HOUSING

644. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the number of housing units which were constructed or are proposed to be constructed by the South Australian Housing Trust in the State Assembly

HOUSING UNITS

645. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: What is the present stock of housing units owned by the South Australian Housing Trust in the State Assembly District of Florey currently available for rental or being rented?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The reply is as follows:

Suburb	Rental Dwellings	Special Rental Houses (acquired)	Total
Clearview	115	6	121
Enfield	164	11	175
Gilles Plains	215	6	221
Ingle Farm	154	—	154
Northfield	306	1	307
Valley View	—	1	1
			979

COUNCIL RATES

662. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Is it intended to amend the 5 per cent fine imposed on late council ratepayers and if so, will there be an increase and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The flat 5 per cent fine as indicated by the honourable member is not correct.

Section 259 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1979, presently provides for a fine of 5 per cent to be added after the expiration of 60 days from the date of the notice of payment of rates for a particular financial year. A further 1 per cent fine is added on the expiration of each month thereafter. The 1 per cent is added to all unpaid previous amounts including the previous fines. No amendment is proposed to this section.