

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 4 June 1980

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

## PETITIONS: EDUCATION FUNDING

Petitions signed by 93 staff and parents of Payneham Primary School, 47 residents of South Australia, and 18 staff of Broadmeadows Primary School, all praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cutback in funding for the Education Department of South Australia were presented by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran and Messrs. Hemmings and Keneally.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: ELECTRICITY CONCESSIONS

A petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant concessions on electricity charges to persons receiving social welfare pensions was presented by Mr. Evans.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by the Hon. R. G. Payne.

Petition received.

## PETITION: WOMEN'S ADVISER

A petition signed by four residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to appoint immediately a women's adviser to the Department of Further Education was presented by Mr. Keneally.

Petition received.

## PETITION: NOARLUNGA LAUNCHING RAMP

A petition signed by 1 466 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a safe all-weather launching ramp and associated facilities on the City of Noarlunga foreshore was presented by Mr. Schmidt.

Petition received.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Northfield Security Hospital (Prison Infirmary).

Ordered that report be printed.

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on the Deputy Premier, I indicate that he will take today any questions for the Minister of Education.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Honourable members will no doubt be aware that there have been significant increases in the price of shares in the South Australian Gas Company. For instance, it was stated in this morning's *Advertiser* that the price has increased from \$1.05 last Monday to a closing price yesterday of \$7.60. Earlier in the day shares changed hands for \$8. In the company's, and the Government's view, this increase is not justified. Indeed, because of the possible impact of the speculative trading on small as well as other investors, the company very properly issued a statement to the Adelaide Stock Exchange this morning to clarify the situation. This is a further statement to that issued last week and, because of its importance, I draw it to the attention of the House. The letter to the Stock Exchange is dated 4 June and reads as follows:

Mr. T. J. Thurgarland,  
Assistant General Manager,  
The Stock Exchange of Adelaide Limited,  
55 Exchange Place,  
Adelaide

Dear Sir,

The directors of the South Australian Gas Company feel obliged to reiterate a previous statement made by them to the effect that they know of no event or development in the company's affairs which would influence the value of its shares.

It appears that speculative buying started following publication of a New South Wales based investment letter. However, the board of this company disagrees with the general tenor of this letter, and in particular points out that the statement that the company's interest in the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Proprietary Limited is being financed by a levy on gas sold is factually incorrect. It has also been rumoured that a new issue of the company's shares is in prospect in order to finance its participation in the further development of the Cooper Basin through the agency of the corporation. This is also incorrect. Such an issue has never been and is not contemplated.

The South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation was formed to carry out South Australian Government policy with regard to the search for and the development of oil and gas resources in South Australia. In particular, it was formed to purchase the interest of the Australian Government in the Cooper Basin. It has always been accepted that if profits were to be generated by the corporation such profits would be used to further the objectives outlined above.

The directors do not see any likelihood of dividends from the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Proprietary Limited in the foreseeable future and, in fact, such a distribution would be contrary to the basic philosophy under which the corporation was created. Rather was it to be the vehicle for carrying out the programme referred to above on behalf of the people of South Australia.

This company's original investment in the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation was \$25 500—all in B class shares. However, voting control at a general meeting lies with the holders of the A class shares—Pipeline's Authority of South Australia. Since this initial investment, the company has not subscribed any further funds nor is it contemplating doing so.

Although the public has been reminded of the restraints under which the South Australian Gas Company operates,

these restraints are again repeated in order to give them the necessary emphasis:

(1) Dividends which may be declared by the company are subject to Ministerial approval and there is no indication that the State Government will surrender its control in this matter.

I confirm that. The letter continues:

(2) Likewise any issue of shares, whether by way of bonus or for cash, is subject to Ministerial approval.

(3) Government legislation limits individual shareholdings to 5 per cent of the issued capital and to a maximum of five votes per shareholder at any general meeting.

(4) Prices which the company may charge to its consumers for gas are subject to price control.

The Government has retained that. The letter continues:

Finally, it is the view of the directors of the South Australian Gas Company that the shares in this company are not an appropriate vehicle for speculation.

Yours faithfully,

Bruce R. Macklin

Chairman of Directors.

There is little that the Government would want to add to that statement. However, two points should be made.

First, with regard to the possibility that South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation might one day pay dividends, the Government agrees with Mr. Macklin's assessment that such a possibility is unlikely to occur in the foreseeable future. To put it bluntly, there is a great deal more very costly exploration required to prove up the additional natural gas reserves to assure supplies from the Cooper Basin to Adelaide beyond 1987. It is South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation's role to ensure that this necessary exploration is undertaken and this activity is expected to use up all the funds available to it. Indeed, as Mr. Macklin has pointed out, when South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation was set up it was not contemplated that it would pay dividends, for that reason. In this sense, South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation should not be regarded as a normal commercial enterprise.

In the unlikely event that dividends do become payable, it is expected that these would be used by the shareholders, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia and the South Australian Gas Company, to offset the costs of transporting and reticulating natural gas to consumers in South Australia.

Secondly, while changes to streamline the South Australian Gas Company's Act are contemplated, as Mr. Macklin correctly states, the Government has no intention of altering the legal framework applicable to the South Australian Gas Company described in his letter.

This framework has been built up over a long period of time, under successive Governments, with a view to protecting the interests of the people of South Australia as a whole as well as shareholders and debenture holders in the South Australian Gas Company. This is because of its role as a utility company supplying an essential commodity to the people of this State.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with these matters at length because of their importance not only to investors, and particularly small investors, but also to the citizens of this State. I urge that this statement be given very careful consideration.

Finally, I understand that these purchases may have been prompted by newsletters issued by a Mr. Ian Huntley of Sydney. Having perused these newsletters I wish to point out that these are misleading and not founded on a correct evaluation of all the facts. Mr. Huntley and his clients would do well to heed the statement that I have just made.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ABORIGINAL HEALTH UNIT

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** On 19 February, I answered a question without notice from the member for Henley Beach about the numbers of Aboriginal people who are employed in various health related positions in South Australia. In my reply, which appears on page 1042 of *Hansard*, I indicated that the 43 Aboriginal health workers employed by the Health Commission in the Aboriginal health unit were Europeans. This is not correct. The Aboriginal health workers are in fact Aborigines. The information I provided to the member for Henley Beach was based on my interpretation of advice from the Health Commission that there are no doctors, registered nurses or dental assistants who are Aborigines and on my assumption that the phrase "health workers" would cover those categories. The full details of Aboriginal health workers statistics are provided in answer to a Question on Notice from the member for Napier. I reiterate my intention to encourage Aborigines to become involved in their own health care and to be effectively trained to enter the health services.

## QUESTION TIME

### GAS COMPANY SHARES

**Mr. BANNON:** My question, which is directed to the Premier, bears on the statement made by the Deputy Premier a moment ago. Has the sharp rise in the price of South Australian Gas Company shares in recent weeks been fuelled by speculation that the State Government either is planning to dispose of its substantial equity in S.A. Oil and Gas Corporation or is planning actions which would alter shareholding rights or allow a sharp lift in local gas prices to occur? Why has the Government made no statement of its intentions until today, particularly in view of the fact that the Chairman of the South Australian Gas Company has today been forced to issue a second statement on the price of his company's shares? Will the Premier put his Government's policy clearly on the record?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I can understand the Leader's great disappointment that the Deputy Premier has made this statement in the House today. I have been in much the same position. I assure the Leader that there has been no fuelling of the situation by the Government. The Government has no plans to sell SAOG, and it certainly has no plans to lift the price control on gas.

### GENERAL MOTORS-HOLDEN'S

**Mr. GUNN:** Is the Premier aware of statements that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition today in which he questioned the Government's welcoming of yesterday's announcement that General Motors-Holden's would build a plastics component works at Elizabeth? As the Premier told the House yesterday, G.M.H. will soon invest \$8 000 000 in the first stage of a plastics works to supply components for its vehicles in the future. However the Leader, since the announcement, has attempted to pour cold water on this significant development by suggesting that the establishment of the works will put more people out of work than—

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to recognise the fact that he may not comment. He must give detail relevant to the question he has asked only.

**Mr. GUNN:** Certainly, Sir. I think I have explained my question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have been made aware of statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in the past hour or so, I understand, in which he damned, with very faint praise, the announcement made yesterday in relation to the establishment by General Motors-Holden's of a plastics factory in the Elizabeth area. I understand that the Leader is saying that more jobs will be lost because of this establishment than will be created as a result of the setting up of the factory. I am at a loss to understand why he continues with this continual negative attitude.

It seems to me that we all have an interest in ensuring that South Australia goes ahead. There is no reason to resort to untruths in order to make a political point that is not valid. Obviously, the Leader has not been in touch with the management of Uniroyal, which he quoted as being one of those firms to lose substantial employment as a result of this factory. He could easily have picked up the telephone and spoken to the management. I am certain, having spoken to the management, that they have been well aware of this potential development for more than 12 months, in fact for a couple of years. Not only that but also they were not aware that the factory would be sited in South Australia or in any other State.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The management simply knew that it was inevitable in the long-term plan that General Motors-Holden's would establish a plastics factory somewhere. I am pleased indeed (although the Leader is not) that the decision was taken to establish the factory in South Australia.

I understand that Uniroyal has plans for diversification, and that firm is quite confident that, by the time the factory in question is operating for General Motors-Holden's, their plans for further developments will have come to fruition. Uniroyal confidently expects not only that there will be no reduction in its work force but also that its own work force will expand. I may say that all of this will depend on a sound economic basis in this State, and that is something that we will not see if the Leader and his Party continually do the best they can to denigrate the State and destroy the confidence that is now being built up.

*Mr. Langley interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Even now the member for Unley is engaging in the same procedure. General Motors-Holden's has given an assurance that there will be no cut-back in its orders at present as a result of the establishment of its plastics plant. From investigations that I have made, particularly from Uniroyal, I have no reason to doubt that statement and, indeed, I have every reason to condemn the Leader for his negative approach to South Australia's development.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Will the Premier say whether it is a fact that 50 new jobs will be created following the announcement yesterday of a plastics division at G.M.H. or, alternatively, will those jobs be provided to people already employed by G.M.H.? Will he also say what Government incentives were provided to G.M.H. to assist this expansion? Yesterday in the House, the Premier announced what he described as a victory for South Australia, which showed that this State could attract significant development. If that is so, well and good.

However, I have some doubts about that. Today, however, Uniroyal is reported as saying that its business, as a supplier of plastic parts, will be progressively reduced as G.M.H.'s new models are introduced. Uniroyal is reported as saying that the G.M.H. decision places in jeopardy the long-term viability of Uniroyal's automotive plastic parts division, which employs 350 people, 120 of whom are employed directly on G.M.H. work. What Government incentives were promised to bring about what the Premier has called an exciting new development for South Australia, particularly as regards those jobs?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Obviously, the Deputy Leader has not been listening, so I will repeat my statement for him.

*The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I know that this upsets Opposition members. Every time that they go on creating in this fashion, they are simply establishing their own reputation as knockers. Uniroyal has made clear to me that it has planned for the turn-down (and I can give the Deputy Leader the particulars, if he wishes) in orders to G.M.H., and that it is, and has been for some time, expecting it. Uniroyal is pleased that the decision has been taken to locate the factory in South Australia, which obviously the Opposition is not. It is, and has been, prepared for the situation, wherever the factory was to be established. By the time that the present G.M.H. new vehicle range is phased out, the first effects of these orders are likely to be felt at the end of 1981, and about one-third of the orders will have gone by the end of 1982. About 80 per cent would have been taken up by the end of 1983. In that time, as I have already told the Leader, Uniroyal, in diversifying, is creating new developments that will take up the employment slack.

So, there is no question of exchanging jobs at Uniroyal over the next three years for the jobs that will be created at G.M.H. That is clear. It is a categorical statement, and the Deputy Leader will have to accept it. There is no question of whether or not these are 50 new jobs: they will be 50 new jobs, but not at the expense of Uniroyal's employees. That is absolutely clear.

**Mr. Abbott:** Are they additional jobs?

**The Hon. D. A. TONKIN:** Obviously, the member for Spence is not thinking clearly, either. I have made clear that those jobs will be created at G.M.H. but not at the expense of jobs at Uniroyal. That is what the Leader is trying to convey. Indeed, the Deputy Leader is doing his best to convey it. However, they are not doing it very well.

The incentives involve establishment payments under the Establishment Payments Scheme and undertakings by this Government that Housing Trust assistance will be available in the construction of new factory premises when that development becomes necessary. I notice that the Leader, in pouring more cold water on this proposal, referred to the fact that no factory premises were to be built. He is quite right. At present, there is none, but I draw the honourable member's attention to the statement that I made to this House yesterday, when I said that this scheme represented the first stage.

One of the incentives we have given General Motors-Holden's is that there will be favourable lease-back provisions for factory premises provided by the Housing Trust, as has been provided in many other instances by former Governments. I am delighted that General Motors-Holden's has decided to establish its plastics factory in South Australia and not in Victoria, New South Wales or somewhere else in Australia. If the Leader does not like that, he must be about the only person out of step with the rest of the South Australian community.

### NUCLEAR POWER INDUSTRY

**Dr. BILLARD:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what relevance to the development of the nuclear power industry he attaches to recent media reports of a steadily increasing proportion of carbon-dioxide in the atmosphere? Recent reports have suggested that the amount of carbon-dioxide in the atmosphere is increasing steadily at the rate of .5 per cent per annum. It is said that this increase has been brought about by the continued burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil, combined with the decreasing area of the world's major forests. As power generation from coal is the major alternative to nuclear power in those countries having access to coal, it is necessary to assess the impact of each power source on the world's environment on a comparative rather than simply an individual basis.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I thank the honourable member for that question. Because of the preoccupation of some people (including, it seems to me, the Opposition) of attacking any activity in relation to the provision of uranium, they overlook the real hazards that exist in the generation of power from other sources. I believe that the matters raised by the honourable member are cause for some concern and, certainly, for some investigation. A report to the American Congress on the direct use of coal said the following:

First, fossil fuel combustion (along with the clearing of forest land) appears to be causing an atmospheric carbon-dioxide build-up that may lead to significant changes in global climate. Carbon-dioxide is not likely to become a serious problem before the next century, but, if it does, a dramatic world-wide reduction in both fossil fuel combustion and deforestation may be the only way to halt or reduce climate change. Coal is the fossil fuel of greatest concern because of its large reserves and high carbon content; the faster coal use increases the sooner a critical point will be reached and the more difficult it will be to switch to non-fossil fuels.

Secondly, there is a possibility that present ambient air standards are inadequate to protect the public health from problems resulting from long-term exposure to low levels of pollutants. Some controversial analyses suggest that current exposure levels may be responsible for tens of thousands of premature deaths annually. Increases in coal combustion-related pollutants could aggravate existing problems.

This report has every bit as much validity as (indeed, I suggest a good deal more validity than) a lot of the reports quoted to us by anti-nuclear proponents in this House. The report continues:

Thirdly, acid rain, which has been linked to extensive damage to aquatic ecosystems and may also cause terrestrial damage, may increase as a result of increased emissions of sulphur and nitrogen oxides from coal combustion.

I will quote briefly to the House the figures relating to typical emission from a 1 000 megawatt coal-fired power station, which is a fairly small plant. The daily emissions are as follows:

230 tons of sulphur-dioxide—

which leads to acid rain; one can talk to the Scots about that if one wants first-hand information—

3 tons of carbon-dioxide—

that causes the long-term effects to which I have alluded: there is a greenhouse-glasshouse effect—

48 tons of oxides of nitrogen, 15 tons of fly ash, 30 lb. of mercury, arsenic, cadmium and selenium.

There are other substances which are, to some degree, cancer causing, such as benzpyrene. Also radioactive elements are discharged from a normal coal-fired station into the atmosphere.

These come from uranium, thorium and radium in coal. With regard to radioactivity, members may be interested to know that coal-fired plants do emit certain levels of radioactivity to the atmosphere. Indeed, a typical coal-fired power station emits considerably more radium and daughter products per year to the atmosphere than does a normally operating nuclear reactor.

That is a fact of life. I consider that precious little research has been done in relation to the radioactive emissions that are spewed daily into the atmosphere from coal-fired powered stations.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Coal-fired power stations are environmentally acceptable to the world population at present. In fact, it is seen as the salvation of our problems in relation to coal generation, largely in Australia and America.

Leaving aside the deaths which occur statistically and which will continue to occur in the mining of coal and the safety record of the uranium industry, we still have these strident opponents who are not prepared to look at matters on a factual basis. I thank the honourable member for his question. There are matters of concern in any energy conversion and we should pay careful attention to all of them.

### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. TRAINER:** Will the Premier say how he arrived at his conclusion yesterday that the South Australian share in national unemployment has been falling, and in particular whether he used Commonwealth Employment Service figures, the reliability of which he queried in the House on 26 March, and whether he ignored different seasonal patterns in monthly unemployment? Will the Premier also say how a conclusion such as that arrived at by him can be reconciled with the Australian Bureau of Statistics' unemployment figures which indicate that the South Australian share in national unemployment rose from 9.9 per cent in April 1979 to 11.3 per cent in April 1980, a period of comparison that eliminates the differences due to seasonal patterns?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I suggest that the honourable member check his figures or perhaps those done and provided for him by someone's research staff. In fact, the figures which I quoted yesterday in this House and which I will quote again show quite clearly that, although one can play around with all sorts of unemployment figures as they relate to different people and different sections of the community, the only adequate way of determining exactly how South Australia is faring is by a share basis. Yesterday, I quoted figures from the Commonwealth Employment Service, which figures showed that from October when the figure was 11.1 per cent, we have improved to 10.4 per cent at the end of March of this year. There has been a positive improvement since that time.

**Mr. Trainer:** That is not a comparable period is it?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** If the honourable member will contain himself, I will refer to the April-to-April figure to which he refers, because they are the figures that I am now going to quote from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. It seems, again, that the honourable member is in some difficulty here, because the share of the total nation's unemployment as at April 1979 was 10.1 per cent (these are on A.B.S. figures), and in April 1980 it was 8.8 per cent. Again, on both of these, the C.E.S. and the A.B.S. figures, our share of the nation's total unemployment has fallen during that period.

I do not in any way suggest that it is a desirable situation that unemployment is at such a high level. All members in this House share a concern for the number of people who are out of work.

However, when we are talking about confidence in and the performance of South Australia in the economic and industrial senses, the share of unemployment becomes an important measure. In both those areas it can be shown quite clearly that South Australia's share of unemployment has fallen during the past few months.

### GOVERNMENT SHACK POLICY

**Mr. BECKER:** Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether there has been any change in the Government's shack policy? Several constituents have approached me recently expressing concern that the Government has changed its announced shack policy, particularly as it affects shacks at Aldinga Beach and the transfer of leases affecting shacks in non-acceptable areas. In fact, the Shack Owners Association of South Australia wrote to all members on 3 June 1980, referring to Government policy. Part of that letter is as follows:

We are also concerned with other changes to the policy, and changes to policy guidelines, which have occurred since the policy was announced last November.

The letter continues as follows:

We accept the policy as announced by the honourable Minister last November. Our case relates to the way the policy has been abrogated and modified since then by the Minister and his department, and not enforced as announced. We also abhor the way that the District Council of Willunga has held the policy in contempt by ignoring the Minister's directives contained in a letter which he sent to them on 27 November 1979 outlining the policy and instructing them to apply the policy to shacks under their control.

Paragraph 13 of the letter states:

In the meantime, a clerk in the Lands Department took it upon himself to amend the Government policy, and dated his amendment 26 November 1979 (one day prior to the official policy announcement made by Mr. Arnold on 27 November). Mr. Arnold was not aware of the amendments to the policy as evidenced by the fact that, when our deputation met Mr. Arnold in January and sought clarification on the point of the amendments, Mr. Arnold admitted he had no knowledge of it and referred the matter to the clerk, who was also in attendance.

The other area in which concern has been expressed relates to the transfer of leases in non-acceptable areas. I therefore believe that the time is now appropriate for the Minister to make a statement to the House to clarify the situation once and for all.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The honourable member has raised a number of aspects in his question. First, I want to clarify one thing once and for all, namely, that there has been no alteration or amendment to that policy since it was initiated on 5 November. In fact, the claim made by the Shack Owners Association of South Australia that a clerk in the Department of Lands took it upon himself to amend the Government's policy is quite ludicrous.

That is precisely why I was totally unaware of any amendment: because there has been none. For the benefit of certain persons who are not able to read and interpret the document accurately, a footnote was included at the bottom thereof to spell out in more simple terms the provisions of that policy. In no way has that policy changed: it is still identical to the policy announced on 5

November.

The honourable member has also asked why the Government has not enforced this policy on prior decisions of the Willunga council. In 1971, that council decided to terminate the leases that it issued to its shackowners in the Aldinga Beach area. The shackowners were informed that their leases with the council would terminate on 30 June 1980.

The Shackowners Association is requesting the Government to make its policy, announced on 5 November, retrospective to 1971. I do not believe that any member of this House would agree that that sort of action should be taken. Retrospectivity, whether by way of legislation or by way of policy, is undesirable at any time, and local government and the community at large would be justified in being very concerned and alarmed if any Government were to enter into that area. In no way is the Government prepared to do it.

The issue at Aldinga is clearly in the hands of the Willunga council, which has the power to make the decision to fall into line with the Government's policy. The Willunga council is required to adhere to the Government's policy in relation to Aldinga Beach as from 5 November. In no way is this Government prepared to enter into the area of retrospectivity, especially to the degree of 10 years, and I would be surprised if any future Government would be prepared to do so.

The honourable member has also referred to a number of other points, and I will just indicate to him what has happened in recent years in relation to shack site policies. Prior to 1975, any shack leased from the Department of Lands or from the Government was on an annual licence basis and could be terminated at one month's notice. Progressively since 1975 the tenures have been extended to the advantage of shackowners in the following way. Under the policies of the previous Government, 10-year miscellaneous leases on non-acceptable sites, and 20-year miscellaneous leases on acceptable sites, were issued. The policy now in effect under the present Government provides for life tenure for existing owners and spouses on non-acceptable sites, with the right to sell a leasehold interest for 15 years, not going beyond 1999, and the right to obtain a freehold title in acceptable areas. So, there has been quite a dramatic progression during the period prior to 1975, and in many respects the policies of the present Government and of the former Government have been very closely aligned. There have been minor variations from time to time, but by and large the policies have been very close indeed.

The matter is clearly in the hands of local government, which must be recognised as a responsible level of government, particularly in South Australia. This Government is endeavouring to persuade local government to accept a greater degree of responsibility, not less, and for us to enter into what has been proposed would only undermine the confidence of local government. Local government is an important part of government, and in this instance the matter is clearly in the hands of the Willunga council. If, as stated in the letter from the Shackowners Association, residents of the Aldinga Beach area clearly support the retention of the shacks (I have no objection to that whatsoever, and I have stated it on nearly every occasion), I would be more than happy to see the Government's policy applied, if the Willunga council wishes to repeal its earlier decision. If the people in that area are concerned, the answer is in the ballot-box, the same as applies in relation to the State Government and Federal Government. A local government election is to be held in the near future and, if the voters of the Willunga council area are not satisfied with the decision that has

been made by the council, the answer is in the ballot-box.

### PROSTITUTION DEBATE

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Will the Premier say whether the Government will make available time at some time during the remainder of this session to ensure the completion of the second reading debate and the taking of a vote on the second reading of the Prostitution Bill. There is still a good deal of Government and private members' business on the Notice Paper. I understand that the session is to be brought to an end tomorrow week. The Deputy Premier has already given notice of a motion for tomorrow that private members' business will end after today. I remind the Premier that the Prostitution Bill has attracted some public attention and controversy. Indeed, one of the most respected political journalists in the State, Mr. Terry Hehir, said on the wireless—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I apologise for the comment, Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Hehir richly deserves it.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to come back to his brief explanation.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes, Sir. Mr. Hehir said yesterday morning that this piece of legislation is the centre of attention for this two-week sitting. Finally, I point out that I introduced the Bill in this session at the first opportunity and because of the invitation of the Minister of Transport (who was Chairman of the Select Committee) that such a Bill should be introduced as a private member's Bill. Thus, it would be a pity to have the Bill talked out and a vote avoided. The only remedy for that is in the Government's hands. It does not seem that the Government is pushing its own business very much.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Well, we did get up at half past five yesterday when we thought we would go late into the night. Not to take a vote on this Bill would be political cowardice.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is quite obvious from the honourable member's remarks that he expects that flattery will get him almost anywhere. I note, however, that he has not flattered me particularly much of recent times, and perhaps he does not expect to get anywhere. Nevertheless, the situation is quite clear: if the debate on this Bill is completed before 6 o'clock this afternoon, a vote will be taken on the matter; however, if it is not, I point out that no vote will be taken on the matter and no additional time will be made available during this session.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I point out to the honourable member that he introduced his Bill—

**Mr. Millhouse:** At the first opportunity.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Certainly, at the first opportunity; the honourable member introduced the Bill before the debate transpired in relation to the report's being noted. It may have been at the first opportunity, but it was late in the session. Whether or not the member for Mitcham subscribes to this theory (and I expect he does), there is a firm rule in the Westminster system of Parliamentary democracy, particularly in relation to matters such as this, which are matters of conscience, that those members who wish to speak to a matter should be allowed to speak to that matter and given every facility to do so. On making investigations, I have found that quite a large number of members on both sides of the House wish to speak to this matter. From my investigation, there is no way that the debate can be—

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** From both sides of the House?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Well, I can speak with great authority for this side of the House.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** You said you made inquiries about both sides.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I understand that some members from the other side also wish to speak, and I imagine that this is a subject on which every member would want to voice his views. There will be no chance of concluding the debate so that every member who wishes to speak has the opportunity to do so. I cannot see that happening in this session.

### WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

**Mr. RANDALL:** Will the Minister of Environment inform the House of the activities to be undertaken by the Department for the Environment to celebrate World Environment Day tomorrow? June 5 will be celebrated in South Australia as World Environment Day, in conjunction with United Nations environmental programmes. World Environment Day is recognised by many different countries, and I understand that many activities are to take place in South Australia. Because of my interest in environmental matters in this State, I should appreciate an explanation from the Minister of some of the activities planned for tomorrow.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I thank the honourable member for his question; I know how interested he is in the environment in this State. As most people in this State would appreciate, I hope, the theme for World Environment Day is "Living better with less". The department has organised a week of activities to help the people in this State become more aware of the need to manage all of our resources carefully (and I think that we all realise that this is extremely important). The week's programme includes a display at the Savings Bank of South Australia that will deal with the importance of good land resource management. There will be another display at the Bank of New South Wales and, in addition, the department is distributing about 20 000 trees and shrubs that were grown at the Black Hill Native Flora Park.

There will also be a special schools activity week at Cleland Conservation Park, which has extended its interpretative exercises over a fortnight. The first week, which was during the school holidays, catered mostly for family groups, and the second week is concentrating particularly on exercises for schoolchildren and school groups. The trees and shrubs to be distributed have already gone out to 20 local government districts throughout the State. I believe that the linking of this scheme with World Environment Day has created an awareness in local government areas, and I know that many councils throughout the State are organising functions at which plants will be distributed on 5 June.

I am sure that all members support the theme of World Environment Day "Living better with less", and I trust that tomorrow's events will raise the awareness in the community that our resources are finite and that development and conservation of our natural resources go hand in hand.

### YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** In view of both the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Commonwealth Employment Service unemployment figures for April which show higher South Australian youth unemployment of 400 and 777, respectively, than in April 1979, does the

Premier still stand by his statement in the House on 26 March that we once again see that "there has been a trend towards a reduction in the number of unemployed young people"?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The rate of youth unemployment in this State is cause for grave concern: indeed, it increased enormously and alarmingly in the past few months of the Labor Government.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Have you any figures to back that up?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, I have indeed.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Seasonally adjusted?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, seasonally adjusted, but that is not the question the honourable member asked. He asked whether I stood by my statement, and the answer is, "Yes, I do." The pay-roll tax incentive schemes undertaken for youth unemployment have been successful: about 1 500 young people, from memory, have been assisted in this way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It keeps going up because more people are taking advantage of it.

**An honourable member:** Sacking the older ones.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Regarding the question of sacking older ones, there seems to be an obsession with trading off employment. The Opposition tries to pretend that where employment is created it is at the expense of other employment. The honourable member who interjected knows that the scheme provides for additional employment, and that close checks are made to ensure that they are additional employees and not people appointed at the cost of other people.

The point is that we are very concerned about young people. If it were not for the pay-roll tax youth incentive scheme it may well be that our level of youth unemployment would be even higher. I can only say to the community once again, that the only way in which we will create the jobs needed to employ our young people, particularly (and everyone else who is unemployed), is by stimulating industrial and economic development in this State, by getting behind those firms that are prepared to invest money and technology in this State and by supporting what those firms are trying to do. Opposition members must stop knocking and being negative all the time. Whether or not the Leader is proud of himself for that attitude, I do not know. Whether or not he is supported in this attitude by all members of the Opposition, I do not know, but I strongly suspect that he is not.

### RABBITS

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** In view of the large overseas industry in rabbit meat and fur, will the Minister of Agriculture state the Government's opinion on the establishment of an industry producing rabbit meat and fur, and say whether the Government would agree to issuing licences for such an industry to go ahead? I am led to believe that, except in exceptional cases, it is not possible to raise rabbits commercially for meat and fur, owing to pressures of large pastoral groups and graziers who, of course, regard them as obnoxious pests. I further understand that in the United States of America, as in Europe, they are raised commercially for both meat and, importantly, their fur. Coney fur is, of course, well known and is a multi-million dollar business. Apparently, such rabbits as the New Zealand White, which is a non-burrowing species, are widely accepted as a commercial variety and not a pest. In view of the potential of a

localised industry in this field, and a world wide accepted and proven market, I seek the Minister's view on whether it could be acceptable in South Australia as an industry, and under what conditions it could be established.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** South Australia is not prepared to support a breeding and cultivation programme, as outlined by the honourable member, in isolation from the other States of Australia. On 2 August 1977, representatives of the States attending an Agricultural Council meeting resolved that there would be no importing of New Zealand rabbits to this country, nor would there be agreement to a commercial enterprise along the lines proposed by the honourable member.

I note from the minutes of that Agricultural Council meeting that the Minister representing New South Wales at that time had decided to permit a commercial rabbit enterprise to be established in a remote area near Broken Hill. He gave an assurance that sufficient controls would be exercised to ensure that it would present no problem in relation to the control of noxious animals. I am not aware whether the New South Wales Government allowed that project to proceed, but the suggestion that the Australian States import rabbits, or support the intensified industry of rabbit meat and fur production in this country, is just not acceptable.

The member for Brighton referred to so-called great pressures brought to bear against this move by pastoralists in this country. I hasten to say that I can understand such pressures coming from pastoralists and or agricultural groups in the community. We have had a fair gruelling from the problems associated with rabbits that were brought here in the early stages of the country's settlement. I support those protests that have allegedly been made by the pastoralists and agricultural interests. I agree that opposition has been expressed by those groups, and I support the opposition that has been made. I cannot, therefore, even tell the member for Brighton at this stage that I would be prepared to recommend reconsideration of the subject by this State Government.

Another point worth mentioning is that the local government system in this State has within its respective council areas certain requirements for the control of vertebrate pest rabbit, and in order for those councils to exercise that control and effectively keep down the numbers they need the support of the State Government. Any action along the lines that have been proposed would, in my view, be an indication of a, if not an actual relaxation of those restrictions, thereby lessening the motivation of landholders to uphold the laws and requirements of local government in respect of that vertebrate pest.

### GOVERNMENT POLICY

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Can the Premier say whether the Government has changed its earlier policy, referred to in a minute from the Minister of Industrial Affairs, of transferring all possible work of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to private interests by 1 July 1980 and, if it has, was the reason for that change the fact, as stated in that minute, that it would have forced the State into double payments totalling \$21 000 000 over a three-year period?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No, that policy has not changed. The honourable member is quoting from a leaked memo from the Minister of Industrial Affairs to the Premier on attrition rates. I am terribly sorry to disappoint the honourable member by saying that the information contained in that memo is now very much out of date. The

figures used were from about January. We are still maintaining our policy of reducing the day labour force by attrition, and while we have on occasion, because of departmental requirements, not let particular works out to tender, the major works as considered by the Government are still being let out to competitive private tender. The later figures show a stepping up in the rate of reduction of staff through natural attrition and through voluntary transfers, and we are close on target in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department and the Highways Department.

The memo to which I think the honourable member referred was one which examined how the Government's aim of giving as much work as possible to the private sector was proceeding. The main thrust of the report was to stress the need for careful planning to ensure that enough work is retained in Government hands to provide useful and meaningful work for Government employees. The references in the report to surplus labour are theoretical; they do not mean that the people referred to are sitting around doing nothing. On the contrary, we are making sure there is a constant flow of work. The rather extravagant claims which were previously made by the Leader of the Opposition that the State Government was wasting, I think, \$12 000 000 were said at the time to be complete and absolute nonsense, and I repeat that they are complete and absolute nonsense. This is very much like the so-called \$40 000 000 deficit, a statement the Leader of the Opposition will probably regret to his dying day.

**The Hon. R. G. Goldsworthy:** He could not even read the leaked document.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** That is another point. When honourable members opposite use documents which are not properly their property, they should be extremely careful about putting their interpretations on them.

#### BUSH FIRE RELIEF

**Mr. EVANS:** Can the Premier say when I may expect to receive a more satisfactory reply to my letter dated 2 May 1980 than that which I received from him on 13 May 1980 in relation to financial relief for the bush fire victims in the Adelaide Hills? I wish to refer briefly to the letter I sent to the Premier, as follows:

There is an uneasy sense of hostility in the Hills area now regarding the amount of money the Government directed toward bush fire relief. Many people were of the belief that the \$100 000 initially given was just an amount to build on for the Lord Mayor's Appeal.

The community response in the Hills to fund-raising to help the disadvantaged was quite exceptional. For example, the Heathfield High School students alone raised \$10 000. The service clubs between them raised in the vicinity of \$20 000, either through goods or cash which was made available. Of course, there was individual help given by so many people. It is hard for the community to accept the public announcement that \$500 000 will be made available to the Adelaide City Council for private entrepreneurs to operate a hotel, and the other press statement that at the moment we have a Budget surplus of approximately \$59 000 000, when the Government could not contribute substantially more to the relief fund.

I am led to believe there is in excess of \$1 500 000 worth of claims. I am not suggesting the Government should pick up the total bill, but I do believe that it is not unreasonable for the Government to contribute another \$500 000 to help those who have been disadvantaged.

**Mr. BANNON:** I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker,

could you ascertain what the honourable member is doing? He seems to be commenting or reading what purports to be a letter that he wrote himself. Is that permissible?

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to indicate briefly to the House the source of the information which he is currently giving to the House.

**Mr. EVANS:** I said at the beginning that it is a letter I sent to the Premier on 2 May, and I am using the letter as an explanation.

**Mr. BANNON:** On a point of order. The honourable member is quoting information that he, himself, has provided. Just because it happens to be by the device of a letter he has written surely does not mean that it escapes the ruling that it is comment.

**The SPEAKER:** There are now two points of order before the Chair. The honourable Leader raised a point of order, and I sought some clarification from the honourable member before dealing with it. The Leader has now raised a second point of order. I believe the two points can be taken together. It is possible for a member to refer to a document of which he is the author. That situation has obtained in this House on earlier occasions. However (and I want this point clearly understood), if the letter and the manner in which the information is being given is by way of comment, then that quite clearly is out of order. The honourable Leader drew my attention to the doubt in his mind as to the content of the honourable member's statement. However, he will be aware that I was involved in discussion with an officer of the House and therefore was not particularly aware of the nature of the honourable member's contribution.

I would ask the honourable member to desist if, in fact, he is making comment and not stating facts, quite apart from whatever the source of the information may be. He has been given leave to explain his question briefly. He has authority to continue, provided leave is not withdrawn by a member of the House. In the circumstances, I ask the honourable member to be very careful in the manner in which he proceeds; otherwise he might find that I need to accept the two points of order which have been raised by the honourable Leader.

**Mr. EVANS:** As time is short, I will not read the rest of the letter which was factual and which I wrote to the Premier. The Premier wrote back to me on 13 May saying he would contact the Lord Mayor, ascertain how the funds were distributed, and consider the position when he was better able to respond to my request. I ask now whether he is in a position to do so.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The member for Fisher is, of course, naturally concerned indeed about this particular matter, being as it is in the heart of his electorate. I appreciate that concern. There is no question that the honourable member will be pleasantly surprised by a letter that should be on its way to him at present.

Apart from the direct assistance that was given by emergency services, Government departments and instrumentalities at the time of the bush fire, the question of relief funds was left in the hands of the Lord Mayor's committee, consisting of Mr. Simon Galvin, Mr. Peter Owens, Mr. Lloyd Clifford and Mr. Graham Inns from my department. The amount that was raised by that committee was \$410 000, of which the Government gave \$100 000. I have received a letter, which was acknowledged, written by the member for Fisher. I have inquired from the Lord Mayor, and I propose now to read extracts only from his letter dated 20 May, as follows:

So far as the distribution of funds is concerned, the committee has looked firstly to ensure that all owner-occupiers of homes destroyed or damaged have had a house



of reasonable proportions (\$30 000 limit) to replace it or to ensure that a damaged house was reasonably repaired. Next, the committee looked to allow replacement of destroyed or damaged furniture to a maximum of \$2 000 and clothing to \$250 per person over 16 years of age; \$150 between five and 15 years and \$100 for children under five years. For losses of equipment, sheds and fences, the committee determined a maximum figure of \$2 000.

From a review of the claims, it is reasonable to say that, as far as the committee can ascertain, all necessitous claims will be met within those criteria by the fund and from insurances. As you may be aware, claims for assistance were in the vicinity of \$1 800 000, whereas the amount likely to be available from the fund is in the vicinity of \$450 000, including interest on invested funds and a Commonwealth Government contribution.

The difference of \$1 350 000 is made up of claims from people where the property destroyed or damaged was not their principal place of residence; claims from people whose house value was often considerably in excess of \$30 000 and who were insured for something more than \$30 000 but less than the actual house value; claims from people whose house contents were apparently of fine quality, but were considerably under-insured; and claims from people who lost other assets related to their work. This is an area which is most difficult and may present opportunities for further assistance.

The committee adopted a "tools of trade" category of assistance. Assistance in this category was designed to give the opportunity to the claimant to start his business again.

The committee may have given enough by way of grant to provide the means of starting again, for example, a short period of living sustenance or enough to buy a broken-down vehicle or so, so that they could recommence the restoration or repair and resale and begin the cycle of work again.

The Lord Mayor goes on to say that he has put on record his appreciation of the enormous amount of work undertaken by the council staff in dealing with the applications submitted. He also places on record the valuable assistance given by a voluntary committee advising on claims and grants formed by representatives of the service clubs from the Stirling area, the Stirling council, the Department of Community Welfare, and the Fire Loss Action Society for the Hills.

Further, following receipt of the letter from the Lord Mayor, Cabinet last Monday considered an approved proposal whereby a further \$25 000 will be made available, as requested by the Lord Mayor, to meet any shortfall in the fund that may be called upon because there is not enough money in it at present. That decision was made by Cabinet only last Monday, and the notification should be on its way to the honourable member for Fisher now.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** As Leader of the House, I should make clear what are the arrangements for private members' business. I indicated earlier that private members' business would conclude today. I make clear that, if any matters in the charge of private members have reached finality today and the debate has concluded, a vote will be taken. No votes will be taken in other circumstances during this session of private members'

business.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. LYNN ARNOLD

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I move:

That two weeks leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Salisbury, Mr. Lynn Arnold, on account of absence overseas.

Motion carried.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER TRAFFIC

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I move:

That by-law No. 7 of the Corporation of Mount Gambier relating to traffic, made on 17 January 1980 and laid on the table of this House on 19 February 1980, be disallowed.

The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has considered this regulation to close a portion of Gray Street in the City of Mount Gambier, which lies within 46 metres of Commercial Street West. After representation from the local member and others, the committee's view is that the regulation should be disallowed. Some persons said in evidence that they believed that the present operation of the street, with the closure, had given them a quieter lifestyle. That evidence came from one resident who lived on the corner of Gray and Commercial Streets. Another person who owned a store on the corner believed that, if the street was closed, it was possible to create a small mall, which would enable him to incorporate a new shopfront in that section. Since his earlier statements, this person has said that, whatever decision is made, he will be happy to abide by it, and he is already going on with those shops.

The biggest objection came from the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce in relation to the effect that it would have on some motels and other business houses in the area. That was the most serious complaint made. The member for the area makes the point that, if the regulation is disallowed, it will give the Mount Gambier City Council the opportunity to re-assess the situation so that Gray Street could perhaps be made a one-way street, permitting traffic to leave, but not to enter, busy Commercial Street. The view is held that, if this takes place, it will not seriously adversely affect the business houses which are in the street and which are affected by the closure, or even those further on. Indeed, it would give the City Council the opportunity to see how it would work as a one-way street.

Also, a report was made to the council itself by its traffic surveyor. It was conducted by the engineering adviser to the Mount Gambier City Council, Mr. Mostyn Lower, who advised that Elizabeth and Gray Streets should be widened rather than closed in order to allow peak-hour traffic on Commercial Street to obtain swift access to the Jubilee Highway situated north of the town. The recommended closure ignores the earlier recommendations by their own adviser to reduce the amount of traffic congregating at the busy Commercial Street, Penola Road, Bay Road intersection in the centre of the town.

So, the committee is of the view that this Parliament should reject the regulations, giving the corporation the opportunity to reassess the situation. The local member states that he is in no conflict with the City Council. He believes that it has looked at the matter up to this point with proper discretion, but that he would like to see the council giving due regard to other opinions held in the city, and allow for the one-way operation first to see whether that is not a better proposition than the one that exists at the moment. I ask the Parliament to support the motion to

disallow the regulation.

Motion carried.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE ACT: REDUCTION OF SALARY

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I move:

That the regulations under the Public Service Act, 1967-1978, relating to reduction of salary, made on 6 December 1979 and laid on the table of this House on 19 February 1980, be disallowed.

The Subordinate Legislation Committee really supports the continuation of the regulation, but because some representations were made by Parliamentarians who may wish to speak on the regulations and the time for giving notice of motion for disallowance had elapsed, the committee felt obliged to give honourable members an opportunity to speak on it if they still wish to do so.

I would draw attention to a report that appears in *Hansard* of 14 August 1969, when the then member for Glenelg raised with the then Speaker the matter of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation's taking a long time to decide an issue, leaving a notice of motion for disallowance on the Notice Paper, and members perhaps expecting that they would be able to speak to that disallowance motion when it was moved, but subsequently the Subordinate Legislation Committee did not wish to go on with the disallowance motion and as a result members were denied the right to speak to it. I wish to read part of that speech so that members on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in the future will not move for disallowance when they do not support the disallowance. The Speaker at that time said:

If the committee has not finalised its consideration within the 14 sitting days, and gives a safeguarding notice of motion for disallowance on which a private member relies, and subsequently the committee's notice is not proceeded with, the private member concerned is deprived of any opportunity to move for the disallowance. The only safe course—

I emphasise this—

for the member to pursue in such circumstances is to give his own notice of motion before the expiration of the 14 sitting days, even though this means there will be two identical notices on the Notice Paper. I view with some apprehension the occasional extension by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation of its consideration of a regulation beyond the date on which a notice of motion can be given for its disallowance.

The Joint Standing Orders (No. 25 and No. 27) governing the relevant proceedings of the committee are mandatory, and I quote: "..... the Committee shall consider the regulations before the end of the period during which any motion for disallowance of those regulations may be moved in either House. . . If the committee is of opinion that any regulations ought to be disallowed, it shall report that opinion and the grounds thereof to both Houses before the end of the period during which any motion for disallowance of those regulations may be moved in either House." I know of no authority to depart from the spirit and letter of the Joint Standing Orders. However, I have suggested to the Chairman of the committee that, if safeguarding notices of motion are to be given in the future, the committee's report to his House should include a warning to the effect that the committee may subsequently not recommend disallowance of that regulation.

That has been the practice of the committee since I have been Chairman, and also previously, and we have given that warning. The Speaker's remarks continue:

This should help to alert all members to the position. I have done that again today so that all members will know

they have the opportunity to give a notice of motion even though there may be a similar notice on the Notice Paper.

Motion negatived.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT REGULATIONS: PARKING

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I move:

That the regulations under the Local Government Act, 1934-1979, relating to control of traffic—parking, made on 24 May 1979 and laid on the table of this House on 31 May 1979, be disallowed.

In moving this motion, I refer also to notice of motion No. 6, which is tied to this motion. It is related to the Road Traffic Act and to certain changes in regulations that are in operation at the moment under that Act.

The committee has deep concern in moving for the disallowance of these regulations. We put to the Parliament that they should be disallowed. If they are disallowed, no regulations will be operating within the Adelaide City Council controlling parking and similar matters. The committee was concerned about these regulations to the point where it had representations from Mr. Howie, a person who is well known to local government and Parliamentarians and who has a wide knowledge of local government regulations in general, and parking regulations in particular. He is renowned for his research and his dedication to making sure that regulations are applied correctly.

The committee was of the view that it could not carry out the research necessary to check the 200 errors that Mr. Howie believed existed in the regulations, so it asked the Government whether it would make available to us a solicitor to help research the complaints and errors that Mr. Howie said he had found. We are appreciative that the solicitor was made available to us. Of course, it took a few weeks to achieve that, and that was part of the delaying process and the reason why we are considering the disallowance so late in this Parliamentary session.

Another factor that slowed the process down to some degree was that it was necessary for the solicitor to have two periods with Mr. Howie, each period lasting in excess of two hours. The solicitor discussed the matter with the Adelaide City Council and with the Local Government Association, and all parties agreed that the regulations were badly drafted and that there needed to be a complete rewrite, and also that there was no benefit in attempting to amend them. Part of the solicitor's report stated:

I spent some considerable time with officers of the Department of Local Government and the legal advisers to the Adelaide City Council. In conjunction with those people I worked on a draft of new regulations which we hope can replace the regulations in due course.

He went on to say:

It has been felt necessary to draft an amended set of regulations rather than make amendments to the regulations for the reasons (a) the number of amendments required is large, and (b) further regulations are required.

The report continues:

Many points raised by Mr. Howie during the course of our discussions touched upon matters of policy, interpretation of regulations by various councils, and a method of implementing the regulations by various councils.

They are not matters about which the committee had much concern. We did not believe we had to be concerned with that as much as with the other drafting errors that occurred within the regulations. The committee has today tabled all of the evidence that was given to it as a committee, together with the complete report by the

solicitor, which runs into some 10 pages, detailing areas where he sees changes should be made and also a few areas where he suggests that Mr. Howie was going to extremes.

In the main, the number of corrections that need to be made showed the committee that the regulations were totally unsuitable and should never have been presented as they were presented, that Parliament should reject them, and that the Government will have to decide how to handle the situation in future. The exercise will be time consuming. Today is the last day for private members' business. I could point out many areas in which the regulations should be amended if I went through the 10 page report, but I assure the House that the committee is concerned that regulations, containing so many errors, were presented to Parliament and ended up in operation as they have. I ask the House to support the motion to disallow the regulations under the Local Government Act as presented to this House on 24 May 1979.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport):** The Government is extremely concerned about the report of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. It is extremely concerned that the committee has found, in consultation with Mr. Howie and other people (and I must say that the Government is grateful to Mr. Howie for the diligence that he has obviously put into this work), drafting errors and mistakes in the regulations. Because of this, the Government must reluctantly agree to this motion. However, as the member for Fisher has pointed out, if this motion passes there will be chaos in the community because there will be no regulations controlling parking, particularly in the City of Adelaide. Therefore, the Government has no alternative but to introduce the same regulations in Executive Council tomorrow.

Of course, that does not mean that the Government rejects any points brought forward by the committee. The Government will take this action only as holding action in order to avoid chaos in the community. The same regulations, which will be reproclaimed tomorrow, will also be subject to disallowance of the House when it meets again. If the present regulations were allowed to continue without a motion of disallowance today, they would no longer be subject to disallowance. However, the new regulations (which will be a copy of those that will be disallowed today) will be subject to disallowance. In saying that, I assure the House that the Minister of Local Government and I will ensure, with the utmost expedition, care and concern, that a new set of regulations, which will take into account all the points raised by the member for Fisher and the report of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, will be drafted forthwith. I undertake to ensure that those regulations are introduced into the House as soon as possible.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I do not wish to speak for very long. However, I have listened with little more than half an ear to the Minister's remarks. What the Minister has said illustrates one of the vices of our system. The Government can get around a disallowance of a regulation by immediately making a similar regulation in Executive Council. That is what the Government will do, and perhaps that is the only way to do it now.

When the Minister talks about the utmost expedition and the fact that the Government will push the matter on as quickly as it can, he should know that I have had sufficient experience to know that the process can be damn slow. It is no good giving back the matter to the Crown Solicitor (and because it is not a by-law but a regulation it

must go to the Crown Solicitor's Office) and say, "Do it." Unless someone sits on the tail of the boy in that office whose job it is to do the work, it will be shelved for three, four, or five months. I noticed that the Minister gave no undertaking in regard to time; I wish he had done so, because he could then be pinned down to it.

This is a device to get around the disallowance, but also attached to it (and I approve of this) is the undertaking to do something about the matter. It is a pity that this process was not started some time ago. The Subordinate Legislation Committee must have made its decision some time ago and, for the process to be only now started, as I understood the Minister to say, is not really good enough. I warn the Minister that he must ask the Attorney-General to keep on the wheel (and I use another colloquial expression, perhaps not as objectionable as the last) and ensure that the work is done by the person whose responsibility lies in that area. I know that they hate this kind of work, and it will be put aside if any opportunity is given to do so.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I should like to explain one point which I did not mention earlier but about which the member for Mitcham has reminded me. The regulations that the House has been asked to disallow have been operating since May last year, so they are law now, and they have been working. Secondly, by the time the committee examined the regulations after the change of Government, after meeting for the first time, it realised that a lot of research was needed. The new Government was then asked to provide an officer from the Crown Law Office to work with Mr. Howie. That officer's completed report was first made available to the committee yesterday.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That illustrates my point, doesn't it?

**Mr. EVANS:** The committee decided this morning that the regulations should be disallowed. I believe that a lot of work is involved. For the honourable member's information, a lot of the redrafting work has already been completed. However, I believe that some time (possibly one or two months) will be needed to complete it. If the Government introduces the regulations again tomorrow, the situation will be no worse than it is today, except that Parliament will be left with the opportunity to disallow those regulations when it sits again in August, if a satisfactory redrafting has not been achieved and if the redrafted regulations are not operating by that time.

Motion carried.

#### PARKING OF VEHICLES

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I move:

That the regulations under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979, relating to parking of vehicles made on 24 May 1979 and laid on the table of this House on 31 May 1979, be disallowed.

I do not wish to repeat the arguments. The two sets of regulations are interwoven. For the reasons that I have already stated, I ask the House to reject the regulations.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport):** So that members will have no doubt, I give the same undertaking in this case as applied to the previous matter. Motion carried.

#### FIREARMS ACT REGULATIONS

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That the general regulations, 1980, under the Firearms Act, 1977, made on 6 December 1979 and laid on the table of this House on 19 February 1980, be disallowed.

I do so for a number of reasons. I point out that I have had the benefit of lengthy discussions with members of the Police Force. I have examined existing records, as well as the computer and the means by which it was intended to operate. I also make clear that I am aware of the concern expressed by members of the community, in particular sporting shooter organisations, regarding the manner in which these regulations could be used.

In no way do I cast reflections on the members of the Police Force and others who have been involved in preparing these regulations: their motives have been beyond question. However, as one who is concerned at over-regulation and over-control of people, I believe that the same intentions could have been put into effect in a different manner. I have had lengthy discussions with my colleague and friend, the Chief Secretary, in relation to this matter, and I have had lengthy discussions with members of the Sporting Shooters Association of South Australia Inc. prior to the election. It would be interesting if I brought to members' attention some of the letters that I have received. I will quote from a letter I have received from the Sporting Shooters Association of Australia Inc., as follows:

The shooting organisations were originally advised that the new Bill was simply an amalgamation of the old and much-amended Pistol Licence Act, 1929, and the Firearms Act, 1958. Unfortunately, this amalgamation had the effect of imposing these same restrictions on long-arm ownership as were applied to handguns, which was a major reason it has met with such resistance. Another reason for resistance is that the 1977 Act achieved nothing but irksome restrictions at massive cost.

Please be sure to inform yourselves on this issue so that a new Act can be introduced which will do what the community wants—control of the criminal, not of the legally-owned firearm.

I have had sent to me a document headed "Well-meaning, but without understanding", and the first quote is from a member of the United States Supreme Court, as follows:

Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty, when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding . . . Frequently, members of state legislatures (talking of the U.S.) are poorly informed on the pros and cons of firearms legislation. They may be impressed with the good intentions of some who propose such legislation but may fail to achieve the understanding unless those who have the greatest stake in preserving the right to bear arms energetically discharge their responsibilities. Apply to every firearms Bill introduced in your State a few simple, common-sense tests.

1. Is it an enforceable law?

about which I will say something shortly—

2. For what purpose is the law intended, and will it actually achieve that purpose?

3. Could the law be used by an unscrupulous person or party to extend or perpetuate its own power?

4. Is the law really necessary or does it merely contribute to a network of technical restrictions which can trip you or some other conscientious sportsman into being an unintentional violator?

5. Is the law an attempt to accomplish by prohibition what can be accomplished only by education and training?

Is the law enforceable? It has been brought to my attention that people will be able to get around the law by

purchasing firearms in other States. We can do nothing about that. However, what concerns me is that, unfortunately, this legislation, particularly the regulations, will not really affect the person with criminal intentions. There is no way that a person who is going to hold up a bank will register his firearm, whether a pistol or shotgun, and obtain the appropriate licence. We all know that, unfortunately, there are criminals in the community who illegally trade in and sell firearms. Unfortunately, therefore, we will be extending further controls on the law-abiding citizens. I believe (and I believe that it would be accepted by the community) that any person who uses a firearm in the commission of an offence should be dealt with severely.

We should be looking at greatly increasing the penalties for people who use firearms for holding up banks or for other criminal activities. Any person who uses a firearm for shooting at road signs, or to annoy members of the public, or who shoots illegally on properties should forfeit the right to own firearms. I do not object to that. However, where people are engaged in legitimate activities, they should not have unnecessary controls placed on them. The simplest way to achieve what we desire is to license the shooter. I also believe that we should pay much more attention to educating the community in the use of firearms. It is not the firearm itself that causes the problem; it is its misuse. I have received one further letter, dated 13 November 1979, from the South Australian Clay Target Association, from which I quote, as follows:

We have received the latest draft copy of the regulation issued by the Chief Secretary and consider little change has been made . . . As a member of the Combined Shooters and Firearms Council of South Australia (representing most shooting organisations) through submissions made previously by that organisation, we have expressed our opposition to the registration of long-arms. My association's policies support the implementation of shooter licensing, on the basis that it is . . . not the firearm which needs to be controlled. At a meeting of the Shooters and Firearms Council, held on 22 November 1979, a number of objections were raised to the regulations. The considerations of this meeting will be forwarded to the Chief Secretary . . . The implementation of the regulations will impose a tax on our members and all firearms owners for the establishment of a system which we do not consider will achieve its proclaimed aims of "controlling criminality in the community". Submissions have been made by our Federal body expressing concern over what we feel is an unjustified impediment on the sporting shooter.

I conclude by saying that I hope the Minister will consider amending the Firearms Act to put into effect those undertakings that have been given to the community. I realise that sections of the community have expressed concern at the actions of criminals who use firearms for the commission of offences. I am also aware that the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the police are armed with the necessary powers to carry out their difficult duties.

However, I also believe that we have a responsibility to ensure that those legitimate law-abiding citizens have a right, in my view, in a democracy to own a firearm. I do not think that any democrat could dispute that point. These people have a right to go about their business, particularly when, owning a firearm, they are involved in organised clubs, with as little control as necessary. With those brief comments, I bring this matter to members' attention, as I believe that it should be discussed in the House.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I do not, as a rule, adopt the remarks of the member for Eyre as my own, but, simply because there is no time for me to develop my own arguments, I do so in this case. I am strongly opposed to these regulations, which ought to be disallowed. I do not like the legislation itself. I know that it is a foregone conclusion, because I understand that most Liberals and the Labor Party are in favour of these regulations. So, there is no way in which they can be disallowed. Certainly, I do not want to be taken as being other than strongly opposed to them, for the reasons that the member for Eyre has given, and for other reasons as well.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** I want to explain why I withdrew my own motion earlier. The member for Eyre had moved a motion seeking the complete disallowance of the regulations, and I fully support his motion. However, it was my intention that, if that measure failed, I would address myself to a certain part of the regulations relating to gun barrel lengths and their connection with guns being classified as a dangerous firearm. I have a constituent who has a Winchester rifle with a barrel length of 38 cm. It is a factory-made weapon. The Winchester factory made the same gun with barrels of 36 cm, 38 cm, and 40 cm in length. As such, they are a perfectly workable and certainly very attractive weapons. I believe it would be most unjust if that weapon were taken from the owner. It was handed down to him by his grandfather. It was given to his grandfather on his wedding day some 70 years previously. We believe that the weapon was manufactured in the late 1800's. The regulations as they are presently before the House would not allow that person to keep that gun.

I have been contacted by the department and assured that it was never the intention to take away from people such genuine weapons as that one. A departmental representative has assured me that machinery measures are under way to ensure that necessary amendments to the regulations are instituted to prevent this happening. As the regulations still state that a gun must have a 40 cm barrel, I have no alternative but to vote against the proposed regulations in total.

The other matter being looked at by the department concerns the firearms used by yacht clubs to start races and those used by other organisations for sporting purposes. I question the whole purpose of firearms legislation. I know its objective is to provide the means of clamping down on weapons presently held by known criminals, but why penalise the whole community because of some 200 known criminals in the State who are presently in possession of weapons. I believe to do that is wrong and unjust, and law-abiding citizens are having further restrictions imposed on them because of the actions of a minority group. I support the motion.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### FUEL RATIONING

Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 9: Mr. Blacker to move:

That in the opinion of this House, if petrol and/or fuel rationing is implemented in South Australia, absolute supply priority should be given to the needs of primary production and fishing.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** I move:

That this Notice of Motion be discharged.  
Notice of Motion discharged.

### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1978. Read a first time.

**Mr. BLACKER:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The purpose of introducing this Bill at this stage is to give those persons concerned with this aspect of the Licensing Act time to examine the proposal I have presented. Under the present Licensing Act there is no power for the police to go into the main bar of a hotel and evict under-age persons. The problem has been further accentuated by modern licensed premises where there is a main bar, main foyer and lounge-bar divided by wide expandable doors. When those doors are open people under age can move from one section of the hotel to another, and the licensee and police have no power to prevent them from going into the main bar area.

This measure will enable the Licensing Court to delineate on a plan just where the prescribed bar will be, thereby giving the police an avenue by which to work. The law, as it stands, states that that can be done only when the Licensing Court prescribes the bar area, and this means that the Licensing Court must visit every licensed premises and delineate where the prescribed bar starts and where the rest of the general bar facilities are located. Unless that is done the police and the licensee have no power to remove people under age from these area. At present, if an under-age person is sitting on a bar stool at the main bar but is not actually consuming alcohol, no action can be taken. This matter was brought to my attention by the Community Council for Social Development in Port Lincoln, following complaints. As many licensed premises are in a similar situation, it was felt that action should be taken about this matter.

**Mr. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I move:

That Orders of the Day, Other Business be postponed and taken into consideration after Notices of Motion, Other Business have been disposed of.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I will support this motion on receiving an assurance from the honourable member for Fisher (which he has already given me privately and he can perhaps now give it in this House) that this is only for two or three minutes to enable certain business to be finished, because I want as much time as possible for the Prostitution Bill. If I receive that assurance, I am prepared to support the motion before the House, but not otherwise.

**Mr. Evans:** It is given.  
Motion carried.

### INCOME TAX

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** With the concurrence of the member for Playford, I seek leave to move Notice of Motion, Other Business No. 11 standing in his name, on his behalf.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I move:

That in the opinion of the House a Select Committee should be appointed to consider and report on the various methods, either in use or proposed for consideration, of apportioning income tax between the Commonwealth and the States and in particular this State and to advise the Government on the various effects which may be induced by the "New Federalism".

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

### GUNS

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** With the concurrence of the member for Playford, I seek leave to move Notice of Motion, Other Business No. 12 standing in his name, on his behalf.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I move:

That in the opinion of the House in view of the increase of firearms in crimes of violence the Government should urgently implement and enforce the new regulations on obtaining and keeping guns and further that the existing guidelines should be much strengthened.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

### PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the opinion of this House a system of proportional representation should be introduced for the election of its members, as contemplated in the Constitution.

(Continued from 2 April. Page 2074.)

**Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I will be fairly brief with my comments on the issue of proportional representation because I believe that other matters are to be dealt with that are of some urgency, and I am rather sceptical of the sincerity of the member who introduced this motion for the introduction of proportional representation for the election of members to this House. I have no recollection of the member for Mitcham having had anything to say about the merits of proportional representation back in his earlier days in the House when he was a member of the Liberal Party or, indeed, when he split away from it in the formation of the Liberal Movement. His enthusiasm for proportional representation certainly seems to be very new. If I have misunderstood the honourable member on this matter I will gladly withdraw what I have said. I certainly did not hear him say anything in the course of his earlier remarks to indicate why he had suddenly developed this enthusiasm.

I would be interested in any explanation the honourable member might care to give at a later date as to why he suddenly developed this passion for proportional representation, since he apparently showed no particular interest in it when, for example, he was Attorney-General. In introducing this Bill, the member for Mitcham did say that he had become convinced within the quite measurable past of the merits of the proportional representation system. However, he did not really give any explanation at that time of what were the merits of the proportional representation system, other than implying that it made it easier for Parties other than the major Parties to be represented, and the self-evident fact that proportional representation allows major Parties to receive representation that is proportional to their vote more precisely than do single-member electorates.

I have no strong opposition in principle to the concept of proportional representation, but I have not heard anything from the member for Mitcham to persuade me that I should support his motion for the introduction of proportional representation into elections for the House of Assembly. Indeed, I believe that there is a great deal of merit in proportional representation, and that it does provide an opportunity for minor Parties to be represented. However, the honourable member did not see fit to mention that we already have just such a system of voting (admittedly with some modifications) for the Upper House in this Parliament. A system of proportional representation is already used in the Legislative Council.

One of the justifications sometimes given for our bicameral system is that the two Houses supposedly act as checks and balances on one another. However, this is rather futile if the two Houses are more or less mirror images of each other, being both elected under exactly the same system at exactly the same time. So we have different systems applying to avoid their being just mirror images of each other. One difference between this Chamber and the other place (as it is euphemistically termed) is that the members in the other place are elected for six-year terms with only half retiring at each election. That in itself provides some variation from the election results of the Lower House. On the other hand, it is probably more significant that the election results in the other place, the Legislative Council, are determined through the elections being based on a State-wide electorate using proportional representation, a method that contrasts with the single-member electorates that are the basis for elections to this House.

In the six State Legislatures, some variation exists in the methods used to elect members to the two separate Houses, with four States using proportional representation for one of the two Chambers. This difference between the two Chambers also applies in the Federal arena.

In the case of Victoria and Western Australia, the Legislative Council is elected on the basis of half retiring each three years, with the only other difference from the Lower House being that the individual electorates into which the States are divided are much larger than those applying in the Lower House. In Queensland, there is no Upper House to speak of, and in any case the whole political system in Queensland is pretty unspeakable. However, let us consider the Federal situation and that applying in South Australia, New South Wales and Tasmania.

In the Federal arena, the traditional system of single-member electorates is used for the House of Representatives.

By contrast, in elections for the Senate, Australia is divided into six electorates, each electorate being a single State, with 10 members elected from each of those six States. The normal situation (unless there is a double dissolution) is that five members are elected at three-yearly intervals on a proportional representation basis within each State. I am sure that the member for Mitcham would be satisfied with that arrangement, since his Party was able to take the fifth Senate seat in both Victoria and New South Wales. Indeed, the proportional representation system has made it possible for quite a few minor political Parties to be represented in the Federal Parliament without necessarily disturbing the stability of Government. For example, the D.L.P. for years was unable to gain representation in the House of Representatives, based as that Chamber was on single-member electorates, because it was unable to concentrate enough voting strength within a particular electorate.

By contrast, the National Country Party, which over the

same period had an overall vote that was on a par with that of the D.L.P., was able to gain quite substantial representation in the House of Representatives—indeed, probably far more than was merited. Possibly the member for Flinders, who I understand is supporting this motion, may not like to have it pointed out that the Country Party across Australia has been one of the main beneficiaries of single-member electorates. In fact, in proportion to the sort of vote it has been able to muster, the N.C.P. has been the outstanding beneficiary of the single-member electorate system. In other States, indeed it would have had far less representation by proportional representation than it achieved under the single-member electorate system, particularly in the Eastern States of Victoria and New South Wales and the rotten boroughs of Queensland. The same would probably apply in the case of elections to the House of Representatives. It is for these reasons, amongst others, that I find it strange that the member for Flinders has indicated his support for proportional representation, in view of his Party's privileged position in the Eastern States and the House of Representatives resulting from single-member electorates. I am also sceptical at the late conversion of the member for Mitcham.

As there are other urgent matters to be dealt with, I will postpone my remarks to a later date, when I will have more specific comments to make to indicate the reasons for my opposition to the motion. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### BRIGHTON BY-LAW: BATHING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Evans:

That by-law No. 1 of the Corporation of Brighton relating to bathing and control of foreshore, made on 10 January 1980 and laid on the table of this House on 19 February 1980, be disallowed.

(Continued from 2 April. Page 2074.)

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** Last week I moved that these regulations under the Corporation of Brighton be disallowed. I did that, not on behalf of the committee, because the committee's view is that the regulations should be allowed but on the basis that some members may wish to express an opinion in regard to those regulations and by-laws. Also, at that time the committee had not been able to table the evidence it had received. That evidence has now been made available earlier today for members who want to look at it. The committee believes that the regulations should stand. Even though I moved for the disallowance, I will be supporting the regulations continuing. I formally moved the motion to give members the opportunity to discuss the regulations, if they wish.

**Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** The control of dogs on beaches is a problem that vexes many people. I refer, in particular, to the Brighton City Council by-law No. 1, which bans dogs from the foreshore and the sea, from November to February inclusive, between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m.; and during October, March and April, between midnight and 6 a.m. The council, in drawing up this by-law, was advised by the Crown Law Department that it is quite legal. Therefore, it has been laid on the table of the House. However, it could well be argued that it contradicts the spirit of the Dog Control Act, particularly in relation to the effective control of dogs.

Whilst a majority of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has moved that this by-law be allowed, it may well be said that consideration has not been given to the provisions of Joint Standing Order 26b, which states that the committee may consider whether the by-law unduly trespasses on rights previously established by law. Notwithstanding that, the council has the ability to enable the by-law to be made, which prohibits the taking of dogs on to the foreshore. Dogs can be taken on to the foreshore with permission, or subject to the condition that dogs are on a leash or, having been taken on to the foreshore, are not allowed to stray there or into the sea.

The Dog Control Act, 1979, states that councils shall administer and enforce the provisions of the Act, and there are those who believe it should be enforced by the Brighton City Council, and that the council rightly discharges its obligations under the Act regarding dogs being under effective control or wandering at large. It would then follow that there would be no such dogs on the beach for which to make by-laws. There is also a belief that, because dog owners contribute 100 per cent to the cost of administering the Act, they should have the right to expect the council to carry out its obligations without them being further penalised. Some people feel that the council should not be able to claim that it needs the by-law because the new Act is not working. However, the Local Government Act gives the council the right to incorporate a by-law such as this.

During the months covered by the by-law, with the exception of the school holidays and long holiday weekends, the foreshore is generally not crowded, and this makes one wonder why the by-law is supposed to be protective. The provisions under the by-law for dogs to be held by lead conflicts with the Dog Control Act provision relating to dogs being under effective control. I believe that this is the provision which has largely determined the council's action in this instance. The indiscriminate actions of a few irresponsible dog owners have now caused a major problem to those responsible dog owners who are now to be excluded from exercising their dogs during restricted hours between November and February, particularly along beaches in the Brighton council area. The fact that a few dog owners have allowed their dogs to be a nuisance to other beach users has caused the council to bring in this by-law.

Beaches have always been regarded as a national playground; I do not think anyone would disagree with that. However, dog owners walking their dogs responsibly will now be banned at certain times of the year. It is unfortunate that a compromise was not reached between the Brighton City Council and the dog owners, and that some parts of the beach could not have been made available. However, as I mentioned, the joint committee has ruled on the validity of the by-law and acted accordingly. Dog owners, if they feel strongly about this, have only one option left to them—to stand for council election, and, if elected, to move for a rescission of this by-law.

Motion negated.

#### PROSTITUTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 2 April. Page 2083.)

**Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder):** On 19 February this year the report of the Select Committee of Inquiry into Prostitution was laid on the table in this House. Following that a motion was moved that the report be noted. At that stage,

the Minister of Transport, Chairman of the Select Committee, said:

This motion is moved for the purpose of ensuring that the report is debated fully by this House. By moving that the report be noted, I am giving members of this House the opportunity to debate the report in full. Far more importantly, it will give the public a chance to take part in the debate. I believe that is an important matter. Because I have moved this motion I will have a right of reply, so I will not deal with the report in detail. Some of my colleagues from the Select Committee may deal with the report in detail this afternoon. It is hoped that the Government will (and I am assured by the Deputy Premier that this will happen) allow time to ensure that every member of this House who wishes to take part in this debate may do so.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Keneally):** Order! The honourable member for Goyder is now referring to another motion that is before the Chair during this session. He is not in order in doing so. I point this out not to inhibit his contribution to this debate, but to let other honourable members know that there are two motions on this matter before the Chair, and that the debate should concentrate on the motion we are now debating. I do not want to make things difficult for the honourable member. This is a very important subject that has some public interest, of course. There can be some leniency shown, but he should relate his remarks to the motion before the Chair.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Does that mean that at no time during debate can I refer to the report?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Of course not; the report is the basis of the matter that we are now debating, but up until now the honourable member has been debating the motion of the honourable Minister of Transport that the report be noted. That is what I was trying to indicate.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I will conclude by saying that the Minister suggested that, in the months to come, a private member's Bill might be introduced. I only mentioned that because, when the Bill was introduced on 27 February 1980 (the first opportunity the honourable member had to introduce it), the Bill took precedence over the motion that the report be noted and therefore, in effect, stifled debate on the report, denying members the right to debate that report.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That's absolute rubbish.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. I think the debate would be much better if interjections were kept to a minimum.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** The member for Mitcham has come to an attitude of intolerance and non-acceptance of anybody else's point of view. On television last night, he referred to a debate with a representative of the Festival of Light, and said that what was said at that debate by the Festival of Light representative was utter nonsense. In the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday the honourable member referred to a meeting with that same group of people, and it was reported that he stated that what they said was utter nonsense.

I think that we still have democracy in this country. As a matter of fact, the honourable member for Mitcham belongs to a Party, the members of which call themselves democrats. We have the right of free speech and the right to say what we wish. The member for Mitcham should have the decency to accept other people's points of view and he should not say that everybody else, apart from himself, speaks rubbish.

This is not just my own opinion, but it is the opinion of others also. I would like to refer to the editorial in the *News* of 3 June 1980. I shall read it in total, so that I can

present an unbiased attitude. Headed, "Consider the human factor", it states:

In matters of social conscience and reform, South Australia has always been a fairly adventurous pacesetter, despite its reputation over the borders for wowerism, prudery and other assorted ills. Changes have come after necessary public agonising and debate. And commendably so in most cases, too.

In one matter, however, South Australia has been a little loath to hold the "hot potato"—prostitution. Tomorrow, at the instigation of Mr. Robin Millhouse and his private members Bill, Parliament will pick up that potato once more . . . and more than likely drop it just as quickly.

Bringing forward the suggestion of decriminalising prostitution is a perfectly reasonable and responsible thing to do. It is a matter that has to be faced squarely. After all, isn't it curious duplicity that allows massage parlors to flourish on our streets when those who offer the trade are deemed to be indulging in criminal actions, while those who seek their services aren't?

The next point, which I wish to stress, is as follows:

By all means let us debate it. Let us make quite sure that any action we take does not open the way for exploitation of children in brothels. Let us make quite sure we are not decriminalising something simply because the laws we possess do not eliminate it.

Let us not rush into change simply because someone has suggested that legal controls may keep criminals at bay. Continuing the debate is not prevarication—it is a necessary process when the human factor has to be considered.

That editorial suggests that there should have been open debate on the report. Also, we find in the *Advertiser* of 3 June 1980 a report on comments made by the Archbishop of Adelaide, the Most Reverend Doctor K. Rayner, which states:

Dr. Rayner said the Social Questions Committee wanted to encourage reasoned public discussion on this complex social issue.

So, the people want a debate, and in my opinion the member for Mitcham, in his usual flamboyant publicity-seeking style, proceeded to promote this Bill without giving serious consideration to what real value it could be to South Australia.

I wonder how many people in this State realise that, if this Bill is passed by this Parliament and becomes law, it will introduce a whole new legal and social situation as far as prostitution is concerned. Clause 2 of the Bill provides:

This Act operates to the exclusion of other laws under which offences relating to prostitution are established.

In other words, if this Bill becomes an Act, it supersedes anything else on the Statute Book.

I turn now to the report. The member for Mitcham in his opening words of the debate said that he had introduced a Bill with the exact (and he used the word "exact" a couple of times) recommendations of the report. The report outlines the Acts that would be amended. First, the Police Offences Act is referred to; 2½ pages of the report concerns sections of that Act that would be repealed or struck out—everything pertaining to prostitution that was in that Act. It is too voluminous for me to read, but it mentions soliciting, the occupation of properties as far as brothels are concerned, and everything that relates to the conduct of brothels.

The other Act concerned is the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, and two sections and part of section 270 are mentioned. The recommendations of the report state:

That section 63 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act be repealed and that, in section 65 of the Act, the age be raised to 18.



However, the Bill strikes out both those clauses in full. Section 65 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act provides:

Any person who, being the owner or occupier of any premises, or having, or acting, or assisting in, the management or control thereof, induces or knowingly suffers any person under the age of 17 years to resort to or be in such premises for the purposes of having sexual intercourse, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and liable to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding seven years.

I would suggest that, if we wished to amend that and raise the age to 18 years, which is all the Bill provides, we have only to amend that section. That is what the report suggested, but the Bill strikes out the section, and I suggest that the amendments are not exactly as the report suggests.

On page 22, the report gives the only two conditions that will apply to the trade of prostitution. Paragraph 12(8) of the summary of recommendations states:

That living off the earnings of prostitution should continue to be punishable where the prostitute is under the age of 18 but otherwise be punishable only where it is accompanied by violence, threatened violence or coercion and that the onus of proof in such cases be placed on those charged where a prima facie case is established.

They are the only two conditions that would be applied to the trade of prostitution in South Australia: first, that the prostitute be under the age of 18 and, secondly, that violence not be used. I suggest that those two ideals could have been achieved by amending the provision relating to age in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Let us examine the moral issues as seen by the committee. I suggest that this matter was swept under the carpet by the committee. Under the heading, "Moral issues surrounding prostitution," it is stated (page 12 of the report):

Arguments were presented relating to the moral aspects of the operation of prostitution. Although these issues raise serious problems, the committee felt that they could be only dealt with on the basis of individual conscience. It was not an area in which the committee could agree.

I am acting on my individual conscience in relation to the moral issue of this matter. As far as I am concerned, the committee swept aside this issue and examined only the physical aspects and the advantages for those involved in the trade.

What is the attitude of the church on this matter? This issue is important because, in his opening speech, the honourable member who introduced this Bill stated that the main opposition to the Bill was religiously based. He then quoted from letters from people associated with the church, and he also quoted a church advertisement. Therefore, this aspect is most relevant to the debate. An article in yesterday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Anglicans don't support Bill", stated:

Some people had wrongly drawn the conclusion that the Anglican Church supported the prostitution Bill, the Archbishop of Adelaide, the Most Rev. Dr. K. Rayner, said yesterday. "This was not so," he said.

Dr. Rayner's statement follows a statement by Mr. Millhouse, MP published in the *Advertiser* yesterday, that the Social Question Committee of the Diocese of Adelaide had agreed in principle to the Bill but could not agree with it in totality because of some of its provisions.

I wonder whether the honourable member misunderstood that report, or perhaps he misled the people in his interpretation. If the honourable member misunderstood that article, and if he has misled the public and others, I ask whether he has misled the public in other areas in relation to this matter.

A publication called the *Southern Cross*, South

Australia's Catholic weekly, contained three letters to the editor. I was sent a photocopy, on the side of which was written:

So say all of us! Australian Democrats' policies not acceptable to us. Far-reaching consequences. Toss the Millhouse Bill right out.

A letter appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* written by a Catholic priest, who also divorced himself from support of the Bill. Also in this morning's *Advertiser*, a spokesman for the South Australian Baptist Union is reported as saying:

The church did not want people to mistake its silence on the issue as an endorsement of the Bill. The church "tended to take the Festival of Light's view on this matter".

At the bottom of that page, it was stated:

Meanwhile, a meeting of the South Australian branch of the National Council of Women has also voted not to support the Bill.

A reference was made in the same article to the following effect:

The social justice officer of the Uniting Church in South Australia, the Rev. Dr. Geoffrey Scott, said that while members of the church's social justice commission did not endorse the Bill, they had given it qualified support.

He said the commission had thoroughly reviewed the proposed legislation and was preparing a more comprehensive report.

I made it my business this morning to contact Dr. Geoffrey Scott, who was somewhat disturbed about that report. I have received, as I suspect have most other members of Parliament, a copy of the news report that was released yesterday. There was also an accompanying letter from the Moderator of the Uniting Church synod of South Australia. The news release, dated yesterday and headed "Proposed prostitution legislation", stated:

The Rev. Dr. Geoffrey Scott, Social Justice Officer for the Uniting Church in South Australia, wishes to state that the Uniting Church has not endorsed the proposed prostitution legislation and is not amongst those churches which Mr. Robin Millhouse referred to in his statement about church support for the legislation.

The Social Justice Commission of the Uniting Church has reviewed the legislation and is preparing a more comprehensive statement. The members of the commission's working group have not given unqualified support for the Bill and share, with other Christian denominations, reservation about the proposed legislation.

The accompanying letter, dated 4 June 1980, stated:

Dear member of Parliament,

Enclosed is a news release issued yesterday (3.6.80). The Uniting Church Social Justice Commission has not given qualified support to the proposed legislation on prostitution, as reported in the *Advertiser* today. You will see that Dr. Scott's statement makes it clear that we have not endorsed the proposed legislation.

I personally urge you to oppose this legislation. It creates quite as many problems as it purports to solve. The legitimisation of trafficking in persons, which is the cornerstone of this Bill, constitutes a backward step at a time when the community has accepted the dignity and equality of women.

Yours sincerely,

Rev. Keith Smith

Moderator

In addition, I have received letters, asking that the Bill be opposed, from the Union of Australian Women, the League of Women Voters of South Australia—

**Mr. Millhouse:** They have gone out of existence.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** This group met in 1978 and made a submission to the Select Committee; I have a copy of that

submission. I have received a letter from "Men Alive" Ministries, opposing the Bill, as well as other private letters. I have received a communication from the Festival of Light and Community Standards Organisation, and I could cite others. I received perhaps one letter in favour of the Bill.

All social legislation extends the licence. It is strange to me that the same honourable member who has introduced this Bill was the member who introduced the Bill relating to abortion. He also introduced an amendment to the Police Offences Act so that people bathing on nude beaches in South Australia could not be apprehended. Now, he has introduced this Bill.

One should take any social legislation that was introduced in this Parliament in the past 10 years, and examine it. My time will not allow me to pursue that point further. However, I believe that the member for Mitcham said only recently that he was sorry and disappointed about the escalation in the number of abortions in South Australia. I am sure that, if this Bill is passed, that is what the honourable member will be saying in 10 years: that he is disappointed that there has been an extension of what he thought would control this problem in our State.

I believe and accept that this is a problem in our society, but I say again that we should debate it and not pass the Bill hurriedly. The honourable member has been forcing and saying publicly that he would like a vote on the Bill today. This afternoon, he wanted the time extended so that he could get the Bill passed. I do not believe that this matter has been debated sufficiently. The general public does not realise at this time the far-reaching consequences that the Bill will have.

Let us take soliciting, referred to in clause 6. Soliciting is not permitted today, but clause 8 goes on to talk about advertisements and permitting advertising to take place in the trade of prostitution. Someone in the street may be accosted, but perhaps the number could be counted on both hands. The report says that soliciting is not a problem in South Australia but, when it comes to advertising, fancy soliciting through an advertisement in a newspaper that goes into every home. Several papers can be circulated in one day to many thousands of people as a means of soliciting trade through this avenue. That is something to which I cannot subscribe, and there are other aspects.

What is the effect? Why do women go into prostitution? Four reasons are given, namely, women are severely disadvantaged socially and economically; women who are poor, unemployed and have supporting children; and women who are coerced. The other reason given for entering the profession is that women want money for a specific purpose (which does not matter to me), such as going overseas, which is a personal matter. Let us look at the cause, and not the effect. The Bill looks only at the effect. Governments are doing their best about unemployment, and the Education Department is doing what it can about education. So, let us get at the cause.

The report suggests that these matters be referred to the Minister of Social Welfare. I believe that that is one way in which we can assist: in treating the cause, and not so much the effect. I have in my possession a letter from a responsible group of women who say that this matter was discussed by the group, and that the following three conclusions were reached: that the Bill should be rejected; that the Select Committee's report is inadequate; and that the membership of the Select Committee was unsatisfactory, in that neither a woman nor a medical practitioner was represented; and that the proposer of the Bill was a member of the committee. They give other reasons.

I believe that the honourable member shot at the church when he said, "What has the church done about it? What

have those people who are resisting the Bill done about it?" The church is the people, and the church has been and still is in this world in order to provide a substantial contribution to the level of morals in our society. One can never assess what a school teacher does and how much good he does. Therefore, one can never assess what the church is doing.

I support what the church is doing in this respect. Secondly, who picks up the pieces? The church, in many respects, does so. My conscience is one reason why I oppose the Bill. Members might say, "What about the people you represent? A member should not support something merely on his own conscience." Not only my conscience dictates me to oppose the Bill, but also I could not, as a result of letters, personal conversation, and communication with my electorate support it. In not supporting it, I am satisfying my conscience and the majority of the people who elected me to this House.

For those reasons, I suggest that every honourable member search his conscience and assess what his electorate needs. As a result of letters and information from people in this State in the past few days, I suggest that most people want the Bill opposed.

**Mr. OSWALD (Morphett):** We have before us a Bill to give effect to the recommendations of the Select Committee of Inquiry into Prostitution. First, I congratulate the committee members on pursuing what must at times have been a most distasteful exercise. I regret that I cannot totally agree with the conclusions that have been published. I listened with interest to the evidence quoted by the member for Mitcham in his speech but, like so much of the evidence in these types of inquiry and report, we heard only what the mythical "they" had to say, followed by surveys from unknown numbers of respondents. Unfortunately, we cannot confirm the evidence and, secondly, we do not know how small the random sampling of the respondents was who supplied these statistics.

There seems little doubt that the evidence given by those prostitutes in the industry who were interviewed was accepted uncritically, and I fail to find enough documentary evidence in the report to back up the final conclusion. I concede that the committee would have had access to reams of reports and submissions which would not have been printed in the final report, but which would have been available at the time of the compilation of the report. However it is the admission of certain hard, factual evidence that makes it difficult to agree with the committee's ultimate conclusions and recommendations.

To be specific, I refer to paragraph (c), entitled "organised crime" on page 11 of the report, under the heading "Problems associated with prostitution". The report quotes at great length from witnesses within the prostitution industry. Through the witnesses' evidence, the report builds up a case that implies that organised crime does not exist in South Australia in that industry. Yet, we do not hear in the report any evidence of what the police had to say. Perhaps it appears in the committee's files, but it certainly does not appear in the report that we are asked to consider.

I, for one, would like to know what prompted the committee to state in the report, "The committee is well aware of the continuing danger of intrusion of criminal elements into this industry, and legislation should ensure as far as possible that this does not eventuate." Surely, if the committee holds this view on the danger of the intrusion of criminal elements into the industry, it must have been privy to certain evidence that has been omitted or suppressed from the report, because the only evidence

printed indicates that crime does not exist in South Australia in the brothel industry. I only hope that the committee is right, but I am sure that some genuine printed documentary evidence from senior police officers, rather than from the prostitutes, would have set both my mind and that of the public's more at ease.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Don't you think that's something we've done?

**Mr. OSWALD:** Well, put it in your report so we can be objective about it. The same argument holds for the lack of factual evidence to back up the industry's claim that drug dependency amongst prostitutes is low to non-existent. Of course, the industry will seek to protect its image. I sincerely hope that drug dependency is low in the industry, but I ask, "where is the evidence from witnesses other than the working prostitutes and madams to back up these claims?" I searched in vain for some comment from the Drug Squad which would give some indication whether that claim was true.

I also failed to find any section of the report that gave any serious coverage to evidence that might oppose the final recommendations published on page 21. It appears to me that there is strong evidence to suggest that the wording of the report, and the evidence published, could have been tailored to fit and back up the recommendations. I might be wrong in this assumption, but only the publishing of further evidence from the police and other responsible bodies that made representations against the brothel industry can prove my assumptions to be wrong.

I turn to the recommendation made by the committee in its report, that the law be altered to provide for decriminalisation of prostitution, but with appropriate safeguards. If ever a statement has confused the public as to its intent, it is this one. I do not intend to canvass the differing legal implications of the words "decriminalise" and "legalise", as by now all honourable members should have some idea of the meaning of those words, but be assured that many members of the public are totally confused as to the real meaning of those words and are relying on us in this place to make a correct judgment when either supporting or rejecting this Bill.

The situation in South Australia at the moment is quite clear. An act of sexual intercourse for money between a man and a woman is quite legal. The fact that the woman has prostituted her body for financial gain is immaterial to the argument. The position is that prostitution is already legal in this State, and the State is not trying to intrude into the privacy of the bedrooms of consenting adults. In fact, this State has an attitude which, quite correctly, respects the right of consenting men and women to do as they wish in private without any fear of persecution. By no stretch of the imagination can the act of prostitution be called a criminal offence. To press to decriminalise it only adds to the confusion and clouds the real effect, which will follow much later after the implementation of this Bill, if it is passed by this House.

The present law provides that it is an offence to solicit or loiter for prostitution purposes. A person cannot live off the earnings of a prostitute, keep a brothel, or receive money in a brothel for prostitution. A person is not allowed to aid and abet the receiving of money paid in a brothel, keep a bawdy house, or attempt to procure females to set them up as prostitutes.

This Bill sets out to change those provisions dramatically. I believe it would be quite immoral for this Parliament to move to amend the law just so that the pimps and madams of this world are free to run their businesses and derive a living off the earnings of their staff. I do not believe that this Parliament should have on its conscience the condoning of the commercial exploita-

tion of the greatest gift between man and woman, namely, our human emotions and sexuality. Whilst no attempt has been made to remove the prohibition on soliciting, this Bill, if enacted, will allow anyone to live off the earnings of a prostitute and keep a brothel, provided the staff is not intimidated into committing the act of prostitution.

Fortunately, the Bill forces brothels out of residential areas and into commercial and industrial zones. After the applause has died down for this measure removing brothels from residential areas, I wonder how many members will have stopped to consider what responsibilities this Bill would place on the shoulders of local government. The Bill specifically excludes brothels from residential zones. It is clear in the report that brothels should be permitted only in commercial and industrial areas. As I see it, the implications for local councils are administratively and morally complex, and in many cases will be unacceptable to some councils.

This Parliament, if it passes this Bill, will be instructing local councils to condone brothels in their commercial and industrial areas. The Bill, by its very nature, in decriminalising the industry allows prostitution to establish itself as a legitimate business in a commercial area. This implies that councils must treat the establishment of this type of business in the same way as they treat the establishment of any other type of business, whether it be a delicatessen or local butcher shop. The business premises must be registered. Health regulations and by-laws will have to be initiated, and policed later by either the police or council officers. Employees' conditions will have to be considered, time books kept and taxation paid. I wonder if members opposite intend enrolling employees in this business in the Shop Assistants Union or Miscellaneous Workers Union in case they want to invoke industrial action. The suggestion of union participation might be hypothetical, but if this Bill is enacted the other implications for local councils are very real. If the Bill were passed, this Parliament would be asking local government to accept the brothel industry as a condoned, legal, commercial venture in its region.

I point out what I think is another fallacy in the Bill. The spirit of the Bill appears to be to remove the girls in the trade from the threat of persecution, bribery and harassment. I support that philosophy as a commendable sentiment. However, by keeping the act of soliciting in a public place an offence the girls are wide open to prosecution in the event of the police or a council wanting to shut a brothel down or move the staff on. The girls are also wide open to pressure from individual police or council officers who wish to harass them on their premises for a financial kick-back.

If members are wondering how this could happen if this legislation were enacted, let me explain. Under the present legislation brothels are conducted in private homes in residential areas, residential streets, and, in some cases, old business premises converted for that use. To get into those premises, clients must get past someone at the door who screens them. Under those circumstances, any soliciting, as such, if it were going to take place, would have already taken place out in the street, or by some other means.

The new legislation provides for a quite different situation with open access to premises by the public provided, of course, that the member of the public is not under 18 years of age. This Bill provides clearly that it will be an offence to solicit another person in a public place for the purposes of prostitution. One major factor which has been overlooked by the drafter of this legislation is that the business premises, if it is proposed to set them up in local council commercial zones, will be as much a public

place as the local delicatessen, butcher shop or chemist shop. The natural English meaning of the words "public place" is also the common law meaning.

In that sense (and the definition in section 3 of the Bill is quite compatible in this respect), it covers every place to which the public may at the relevant time wish to go. It is quite immaterial that there are times when members of the public may not be present. It is also immaterial how the right of the public to go to such a place arises. It may arise, as in this case, from an Act of Parliament. It may arise from the invitation of the owner of the premises. All that is necessary is that, at the time in question, members of the public may go to the place if they choose to do so. There may be regulations covering the conduct and decent behaviour of those who go there, but compliance with their duty to behave under these regulations does not narrow the right of the public to go to the place.

It may well be that, in such a public place, a woman may loiter with every intention to commit an act of prostitution. Under the new Bill, this would be an offence. The word "solicit" is not defined in the Bill, although it carries a penalty of \$500 or two months gaol. I think it is relevant to remind members that a woman does not have to do very much to be guilty of soliciting. By definition, the word "solicit" generally involves a woman accosting or importuning men for immoral purposes.

It is also clear that solicitation does not have to be done by word, but can be actively pursued by acts such as smiles, winks, body gestures and general attitudes calculated to attract prospective customers. It does not have to be in a street, but may happen in any public place, however apparently private it may appear. A young woman, scantily clad, sitting on a stool in a brothel in a local government commercial region, because of the fact she is on premises used by prostitutes might just as well have a sign at her feet saying "I am a prostitute. I am ready and willing to give the services of a prostitute, and my body and these premises are available for that purpose." That girl is soliciting in the sense of tempting or alluring prospective customers for the purpose of prostitution. I take heart from one section of the report which said:

In relation to organised crime, South Australian police are remarkably honest and have not established the wide system of pay-off operating elsewhere.

From my knowledge, I have no reason to doubt the integrity of police officers in this State. My point here, though, is that, under the Bill, the girls in the brothels could still possibly be involved in bribery in order not to be harassed, with the alternative of facing the penalty for soliciting the public who enter their public premises.

Only yesterday we had a delegation from New South Wales, and I believe the situation there is such that the girls are being apprehended for soliciting in the brothels. It is legal to solicit on the street, but there are still restrictions on soliciting in the brothels. The research I did for this speech would indicate that the same situation could arise in South Australia.

One final area in which I believe the Bill will be ineffective is in preventing the criminal elements from moving into control the madams who will be running the brothels for profit. The report clearly and correctly highlights this danger and the Bill, if anything, makes it easier for the criminal elements to move to control the industry. I believe that would be easier than would be the case while the offences of keeping a brothel and living off the earnings of a prostitute remain on the Statute Book.

To me, the report, as presented to the Parliament, contains insufficient hard, factual evidence to arrive at the same conclusions as the committee. I also believe the Bill contains sections which would be incompatible with local

government, public expectations of the Parliament and its members and of the girls in the industry themselves. I cannot support the Bill.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WAITE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That in the opinion of this House—

(a) The Waite Agricultural Research Institute of the University of Adelaide should be formally recognised as a Research School in the Agricultural Sciences in the Australian universities system as referred to by the Australian Universities Commission in May 1972, paragraph 8.55 of their Fifth Report.

(b) The Waite Institute should be funded in accordance with this role without prejudice to the funding of Roseworthy Agricultural College or other institutions.

(c) The Premier be asked to convey the substance of this motion to the Prime Minister so that the necessary action can be taken by the appropriate authorities.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I move:

That the resolution be agreed to.

In speaking briefly to it, perhaps I should explain that it has passed through another place with unanimous support this afternoon and I understand, having canvassed members in this place, it is likely to be supported unanimously here. While I certainly do not want to prevent any honourable member from speaking, I understand that the debate on this matter is likely not to be very long and, that being so, I propose to explain it as briefly as I can and then commend it to the House in the hope that it can be speedily dealt with and we can get back to the Prostitution Bill for the rest of the afternoon.

Members will recall that, when the Commonwealth Government established the Australian National University in the 1950's, it established a number of research schools in the Institute of Advanced Studies. These were to be "centres of excellence". In other words, they were to be, and are becoming, not only schools of national importance, but with world recognition as well. One of the disciplines which is conspicuous by its absence is a school of agricultural science. A school of agricultural science was not created amongst the others in the 1950's, yet agriculture was then and still is one of the most important, if not the most important industry, when we consider the vast ramifications of it and those directly and indirectly associated with it. Although there is no record of anyone actually saying so, the reason for the omission of the research school in the agricultural sciences must have been because of the existence of the Waite Institute, which at that time already had a reputation in successful research.

Since 1973, it has been University of Adelaide policy that recognition should be sought for the Waite Institute as a Research School in the Agricultural Sciences, attached to the university, as it is now (and has always been, because the Deed of Gift of Peter Waite made it obligatory). That relationship should obviously remain, provided that the university does not allow the Waite to be treated as Cinderella was by her ugly sisters.

Twice during the past five years or so the University of Adelaide has been asked whether it believed the Waite Institute should be funded by an ear-marked grant, but the university rejected the proposal on both occasions,

presumably because it feared that such a procedure might interfere with the university's autonomy. The Council of the University of Adelaide has been unable to prevent the serious erosion of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute's research capability. Here we have in South Australia a school of excellence, with a proven track record in research, and the Commonwealth bodies are apparently prepared to help us to upgrade it.

It would be of immense value to the State, to the industry, and to the farmers and graziers of the whole of Australia to do so, and the University of Adelaide itself would gain in stature. If we are not careful, we may find that the research school of excellence in agriculture has been down-graded to such an extent that Adelaide is no longer regarded as the Australian and international centre in this field.

The crux of the whole matter is that, if this resolution is agreed to, it will be conveyed by the Premier to the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister and the Federal Government agree, it will mean more money for the Waite Institute.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** If he agrees.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The member for Hartley is a little sceptical about it. I am able to tell the honourable member (and it may reassure him) that the Prime Minister has already been told that a resolution such as this may be passed by the South Australian Parliament. The information I have is that he is not unsympathetic to it. Whether that means a damn, we do not know. We will see.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Until it hits the pocket.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Maybe, as the member for Hartley says, and he has had a good deal of experience in these matters. This is an opportunity to get more money for the Waite, if the Federal Government agrees.

It will not disturb the relationship between the Waite Institute and the university (of course, the Waite Institute is part of the university), but it will enable it to get on with its greatest function, a research function, which has been sadly handicapped in recent years because there just has not been the money available. There is no need for me to stress to members the importance of the work done by the Waite Institute for the future of mankind. I think it is not putting it too strongly to say that. The production of food, and so on, is of crucial importance to us. Therefore, I hope that members will support this resolution in the hope that the Federal Government will accept the suggestions made in it, and that this will be to the benefit of the Waite Institute, therefore to the university, to the State, to Australia and to the world.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** I do not want to take up any more than about 45 seconds of the House's time because of the time constraints which are on us in relation to another matter, but I support the motion which has been introduced into this House by the member for Mitcham for the reasons he has outlined.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** The Government, too, supports the motion but there are one or two matters I would like to put on record in support of the motion and to clarify some of the background to it. It is apparent that the Waite Institute is suffering financial difficulties. In particular, senior officers at that institute are required by the State, by the pastoralists and probably by those beyond our own State. Anyway, as a result of the jeopardy in which one officer in particular has been placed because of the proposal by the Federal Government to cut funding from 30 June, the State Government some months ago was approached to assist.

Notwithstanding the motion before the House, I can

report that the whole exercise of undertaking the continued and assured assistance of the Waite Institute is becoming a bit historic. I appreciate the support that has been demonstrated on this occasion by the member for Mitcham, but really it amuses me that, after recent articles that appeared in the press (of which the honourable member should be aware) what the State has committed itself to, and the efforts the State has made in relation to official approaches to the Federal Government, at this time he should see fit to introduce a motion with, I suspect, a view of capturing attention.

**An honourable member:** Clever politics.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** It may be clever politics but I hope that the public at large recognises the synthetic element that prevails at this time on this issue. But all that aside, we on this side of the House recognise the importance of the Waite Institute, its discovery of trace elements; its control of crown gall, a cancerous growth on the roots of stone fruit trees; its effort in biologically controlling red scale; the improvement in the various grain varieties in which it has been instrumental; and indeed its programme for future improvement in wheat varieties, in particular. It is important, as I said, not only for South Australia but also for the nation that the institute be funded. Our varietal research in this State, whilst it is applicable and available to us, is really of national significance. On that note, we support the motion. In the meantime, of the \$75 000 required by Waite Institute to fund the programme to which I referred, the State has already committed some \$30 000 for the 1980-81 period. It has sought through the State Wheat Research Committee to draw from the wheat industry, from the growers themselves, a more appropriate levy to pick up the balance. At the rate of 20c a tonne, the levy that is applicable at this time, I have no qualms whatsoever in supporting that move. In fact, from discussion with prominent wheatgrowers from a wide area of the State, it is obvious that they are ready and willing to make a greater contribution towards research via a levy. It is about time that that obligation was met and a more appropriate contribution was made from that level.

It has not been the practice of the State to move in and prop up such organisations in isolation from the responsibilities of the other States. I am not sure of the background that has led to this situation, but it has been drawn to my attention that at a meeting of a Federal wheat industry research council, of which one of our prominent professors at Waite Institute is a member, a recommendation went to the Federal Government that this exercise be recognised as a State responsibility. I do not know who has been dabbling, seeking to manipulate or whatever in this exercise, but it appears, on the information I have received since becoming Minister, that it is not quite as clear cut and as clean as one would hope in the circumstances of the importance that prevails in this instance.

However, I regard all that as history. The situation at this time was that we were faced with the possibility of losing a very valuable officer in this research field, if not officers, and back-up staff. The pastoral industry, in particular, and the State generally, cannot afford that. As a State Government in office since September last year, we had exercised our efforts not only to get further Federal funds but have made funds available out of our own revenue, along with the parallel step of extracting more from industry. I support the motion.

**Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River):** I would like to make a few brief comments in support of the motion. The agricultural industry in this State, on the last figures available to me,

contributed something like \$716 000 000 a year towards the income of South Australia. Therefore, because of the industry's significance there is need for research and new technology to increase production, thereby increasing returns to a very vital sector of the South Australian community. That research is needed to offset cost increases in production in relation to machinery and other components of production, and also the staggering increase in taking a commodity to markets overseas. Efficiency in the industry is essential, not to mention the contribution to the world food production cycle. This sector is a part of the community that cannot, like others, pass on the increased costs of production automatically to other sectors of the community. Therefore, there is a need to provide it with the best available advice so that it can compete profitably, economically and efficiently in all areas.

My concern is that, under the existing funding arrangement, the University of Adelaide Council has a number of competing requirements, and thereby the institute has not received adequate funding in the past, despite the fact that the Adelaide University, as I understand by Australian comparison, receives reasonable, or generous, funding arrangements.

I wish to quote from a letter written by the Chairman of the Government Parties Rural Committee in Canberra, Mr. Geoffrey Giles, the member for Wakefield, written on 9 May 1980. I quote, in part:

The stage has now been reached where we have an acknowledged problem. The solution has not worked, and I believe that we should ask Professor Karmel and the commission to provide you with an acceptable answer.

That letter was addressed to the Federal Minister for Education, Mr. Fife.

Australia established a series of research schools some time ago to stop the so-called Australian brain drain overseas. There were a whole series of these, and perhaps the best example is the John Curtin School of Medicine. There was no such school established in the field of agriculture because of the existence of the Waite Institute, and that was operating at that time basically on bequests, which I understand had been reducing and had not been making up the component against inflationary costs. The institute has been a world leader in many areas of research, such as the successful original research on molybdenum as a trace element and soil component.

In terms of its history, achievements and structure, the Waite Institute was the only part of the Australian university system used as an example of a joint centre of excellence in the report of the Birch Committee of Inquiry into the C.S.I.R.O. Therefore, it rightfully has a pride of place in the achievements of the institute in South Australia, Australia and world wide.

Some months ago the member for Goyder and I met with Professor Quirk and discussed the subject of funding. As a result of that, we had the recent announcement by the Minister of Education in consultation with the Minister of Agriculture to preserve the position and security of tenure in the short term of Dr. Rathjen, because of the invaluable wheat breeding programme that the institute was undertaking to protect that well-founded and vital part of South Australia's rural industry, and in making those programmes and advice available to the industry generally.

I understand that, following some three discussions that Mr. Giles has had with the Federal Minister, Mr. Fife has indicated that the Universities Council Tertiary Education Commission, as part of its site inspection of all universities, is due in Adelaide in August. Therefore, what this House should aim to do is give complete support for

separate funding. Successful funding can be achieved in two ways—either by direct funding or by exchanges of letters of intent committing funds to the Waite Institute by the Adelaide University Council. Because of the time constraints, I will confine my remarks to that. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

### PROSTITUTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 2221.)

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I speak in this debate as the member for Kavel, because one of our functions in this place is to represent the people who put us here. I think I can say that my electorate is probably one of the most stable as regards population shifts in the State, and the attitudes and mores of that electorate are fairly entrenched. It is a happy coincidence in a matter such as this that my own views coincide with that of the majority of my constituents. I am not suggesting for a moment that all of the 18 500 or so people that I represent here are of the same mind, but I am quite sure that the vast majority are and that they are strongly opposed to this Bill.

In a representative democracy, my constituents have put me here as their voice, and it is my fortunate experience in matters such as these so-called conscience votes that my own views largely coincide with those expressed to me by my constituents. As far as this Bill is concerned, I have had no opinions expressed to me other than what I have just stated. Those people who have taken the trouble to contact me have indicated that they are solidly opposed to this Bill. I have presented petitions to this House; I have had letters written and approaches made to me, and everybody has indicated that they are solidly opposed to what is in this Bill.

I have been interested in the attitudes, and the developing attitudes in one or two cases, since this measure was first rushed in to the House. I remember one lady appearing on television during the early days after its introduction. As has been pointed out by the Premier, the Bill was introduced before we had an opportunity to note the report of the Select Committee. The lady who appeared on television was the proprietress of an escort agency (I think that is the way it is properly described), and she is a very wellknown lady in those circles. She appeared on a panel interview on television, and I think the proponent of this Bill was present, so he can correct me if my memory does not serve me correctly, but I am sure that it does. Her view was that this Bill would be undesirable and, in fact, dangerous. She said that it would allow criminal elements and operators from interstate to move in and control prostitution in this State. She went on to say she was quite sure that a direct approach would be made to her. She said, "I might say no, I am not interested in your running my business, and they might go away" but she added that they would surely come back and ask her again whether she was prepared to sell her business and allow them to take over. She stated that, if she said "No" a third time, it was likely that she would be found floating in the Torrens.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I can tell the member for Kavel that the same lady rang me this morning and wished me luck with the Bill.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I shall continue with the point I am making, namely, that attitudes appear to

have changed during the course of the continuing debate on this matter. However, my own conviction is that there was a fair element of truth in her initial reaction and that I would not have to search far to find an explanation for her changed attitude. I think one could find an explanation in the terms of her initial explanation as to what would happen.

**Mr. Millhouse:** So you think she is under some—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know, but she spoke up quite clearly, and I thought that what she said was more than a strong possibility. If there is money to be made out of legal operations of this type, criminal elements will be attracted to it. There has been a lot of hoo-ha and semantics as to whether we are decriminalising something or legalising it. I have talked with one or two lawyers other than those who are available to us here, and I am told that, in essence, there is no distinction other than the finest of distinctions between legalising and decriminalising something.

Some groups in the community appear to have been misquoted, even by the major proponent of this Bill. I believe that they have a right to be heard in this place, and I intend to quote from some of the things that people have been saying, even people such as a representative of the Festival of Light. The member for Mitcham jumped on the band wagon and tried to vilify these people, saying that they were a mob of cranks. I think I heard him use words to that effect on the media.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I said "Absurd."

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I believe that the honourable member expanded further than that. I read most of the correspondence which I receive and about which I am interested. I read correspondence put out by the Festival of Light, and I found it to contain rather logical statements. I say that knowing that it is rather unpopular to align oneself with that sort of group, because the group's opponents regard its members as cranks. However, I believe that the Festival of Light has a legitimate point of view, and it has a right to have that point of view aired in this place; I am not ashamed to quote remarks made by the Festival of Light, or to align myself with that body and others who share that body's view. I do not think any more of the member for Mitcham for the denigrating remarks he made about those people.

Some of the things I am saying may have been said during this debate. I make no apology for repetition, because one cannot hear every pearl of wisdom that is dropped from people like the member for Mitcham. I do not apologise for referring to things that have already been said, because even the member for Mitcham has been repetitious on more than one occasion in this place.

The church to which the member for Mitcham belongs is against his proposal. The Archbishop made his views perfectly clear in, I think, today's *Advertiser* or perhaps in yesterday's *Advertiser*. We do not mind independence of mind; I differ at times from the opinion of the church of which I am a member. However, the member for Mitcham is certainly not on the same wavelength as the church of which he is proud to be a member. Dr. Rayner has said that the social questions committee of the church has unequivocally stated:

Christians see prostitution as a denial of the human dignity of women concerned.

Dr. Rayner added that his own opinion was that while certain reforms were needed in the present legislation in relation to prostitution, this Bill is not the best way forward. He further stated:

It would be better not to proceed with the present Bill in view of its likely consequences in increasing the incidence of

prostitution.

I do not think that those statements were made lightly. Dr. Rayner further stated:

I would hope that our legislators would see some better way of making necessary reforms in existing legislation while not giving the encouragement to prostitution that would be likely to follow the passing of the Bill.

Another prominent spokesman of that church, whose contributions to the *Advertiser* quite often attract my attention, is Father John Fleming, who made his attitude perfectly clear some time ago by stating in the *Advertiser* of 17 March:

The report itself—

the report that we have not had a chance to debate because of the interposition of this Bill—

is a most unsatisfactory document which gives no documentation of evidence. It seems to accept uncritically

*Mr. Millhouse interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the member for Mitcham would do me the courtesy of listening, he might learn something. Father Fleming further stated:

It seems to accept uncritically evidence from those who make their living from the trade of prostitution and yet gives little or no detailed coverage to any strong representations made against the trade . . . In any discipline, a report which is based on undocumented evidence would be regarded as seriously incompetent. How does the committee expect serious minded people to discuss such a thoroughly inept document?

In the past few days, there have been other strong expressions of opposition to this Bill. The South Australian branch of the National Council of Women has voted overwhelmingly not to support the Bill.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That is not right; it was not "overwhelmingly".

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, solidly. The South Australian Baptist Union has stated that it does not want people to mistake its silence as an endorsement of the Bill. The Lutheran Church, which has a strong following in the district that I represent, is not in the habit of involving itself in political issues to the extent that it makes public statements. I rather applaud that attitude, quite frankly. However, the church believes that a member of Parliament has a job to do in representing his district. I have frequent contact with the leaders of that church, because I see them at functions, and I know that the attitude of that church, as is the case in relation to many churches regarding social questions, is unashamedly conservative.

If I were convinced that social change will bring about some benefit to the community I would certainly support that social change, and indeed a lot of people that I have mentioned would support it. But, until it is clearly demonstrated that social change will bring benefit, the onus is on the proponents of that change to show that it is desirable and will benefit the community. Unless that is done, I believe that a conservative attitude is the only sensible attitude. I am unashamedly conservative in relation to many changes which have been introduced since I have been in Parliament and which have had demonstrably harmful effects.

I could refer to other correspondence. The *News* editorial of some days ago stated that this sort of Bill should not be rushed through, and I entirely agree. Once this Bill is passed, it will remain with us. This has happened so often in regard to social change. The so-called reformists want to make social changes (and what a wrong use of the word "reform"). One is stuck with a label by one's political opponents because of a conservative

attitude. When we look at a whole range of matters, we see that the pendulum has swung too far in relation to some so-called reforms. Perhaps the climate is appropriate for a touch of conservatism. When we look at what is happening in the community daily, we see that there have been changes that were not experienced 10 years ago.

The *News* editorial to which I referred sounded a sensible note of warning; we should not rush this Bill through. Further time is needed for people to examine this issue. I am sure that a lot of people do not know what is involved. The member for Mitcham suggested that, if one did not support the Bill, one was a hypocrite. That statement was a great play on the word "hypocrite". One of my down to earth country constituents asked me to supply him with a copy of the Select Committee report. I did so and he said: "It seems to me that the thinking behind this is 'If you can't beat them, join them'." That seemed to be a fairly earthy comment, which summed up the point made by the member for Mitcham in his initial introduction of the Bill. He tried to suggest that, if one did not support this measure, one was a hypocrite, because prostitution could not be stamped out.

One could logically apply the same argument to a facet of activities. It could be said that theft and murder cannot be stamped out, so they should be decriminalised. That is the same argument carried through to its logical conclusion. There is difficulty in controlling prostitution; we know that. We also know that there is difficulty in controlling crime of any nature, and that is why criminal offences are declared as such. Perhaps the honourable member's argument should apply with equal force to things like theft. Theft in the community has increased since I have been in this place; this is indicated by statistics. Police have a major job in trying to detect that sort of crime. However, no-one suggests that theft be decriminalised or that we are hypocrites in not decriminalising it because it cannot be stamped out.

They were the words the member for Mitcham used: "We won't stamp this out, so we're hypocrites if we don't decriminalise it." That is absurd.

**Mr. Keneally:** Corporate theft, to all intents and purposes, is decriminalised.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Obviously, the honourable member is not up to date with the companies legislation, which has been agreed throughout the Commonwealth and which will clamp down on white-collar crime, as it is popularly called, and a white-collar crime committee has been set up to come to grips with it, because of that problem. That highlights the fact that white-collar crime, so-called, is increasing in the community, but has anyone suggested that we decriminalise that or do not try to stamp it out? The member for Mitcham would do so, if he is to be consistent.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** You know he's not consistent.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I could talk about his hypocrisy as regards Parliamentary salaries and other matters over the years, but I do not want to become personal in this debate.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Oh, come on! You've got 14 minutes to do so. You might as well talk about that as anything else.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** All right. I resent being called a hypocrite by a person like the member for Mitcham because I happen to be opposed to him on a matter such of this.

**Mr. Becker:** He's not here half of the time.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will not deal with that. I could talk about hypocrisy, if I were so minded, but I am not. Regarding the Uniting Church, we have received a letter, as reported in the *Advertiser*, saying that qualified

support was given to the Bill. The letter, which was from the Rev. Keith Smith, states, "Dear member of Parliament". The letter is from the church of which I am a member, although perhaps not a good member. Mr. Smith's letter states:

Enclosed is a news release issued yesterday (3.6.80). The Uniting Church Social Justice Commission has not given qualified support to the proposed legislation on prostitution, as reported in the *Advertiser* today. You will see that Dr. Scott's statement makes it clear that we have not endorsed the proposed legislation. I personally urge you to oppose this legislation. It creates quite as many problems as it purports to solve. The legitimisation of trafficking in persons, which is the cornerstone of this Bill, constitutes a backward step at a time when the community has accepted the dignity and equality of women.

There is also a statement which, I suppose, was read to the House, from the Rev. Dr. Geoffrey Scott, Social Justice Officer for the Uniting Church, which makes clear that what I have read is the position of the Uniting Church, and I agree with him.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I think he had to resile from what he said earlier.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Festival of Light is a bunch of cranks, according to the member for Mitcham. Although the Rev. Dr. Geoffrey Scott has not been called a hypocrite, everyone seems to be out of step except the member for Mitcham. I have another letter, which I doubt has been read to the House. It is from a body called "Men Alive" Ministries, and it is signed by the director.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I've got that, too.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Premier will resume his seat. This is a serious debate which, hitherto, has been conducted with due decorum, and I trust that that will continue to be the case.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not able to judge whether or not they are cranks. They have a legitimate voice, and have a right to be heard here. The committee comprises Mr. Ross Gaskin, Dr. Harold Steward, and Messrs. Ted Dewing, Chris White, and Geoff Mills. The director's letter states:

On behalf of the above organisation I am writing to express our very strong concern about the proposed Bill on prostitution. We believe that the passage of such a Bill would be most detrimental to the well being of our State and society and would not bring about a solution to the problems posed by prostitution. On the contrary it would lead to a more vigorous promotion of prostitution as a way of life. We therefore humbly urge you to use your personal vote to prevent the passage of this Bill.

I intend to do that when the Bill goes to a vote, as I guess it will. There is also a letter to which, I have been told, the member for Goyder referred. It is from the Women's Council of the Liberal Party. I understand that the member for Goyder read the conclusions of the committee, although he did not read the reasons, which state:

Supporting reasons for these conclusions include the following:

- (a) The Bill is widely misunderstood within the community. It is being presented through the media as a Bill to decriminalise prostitution when, in fact, it is currently not illegal for a person in South Australia to prostitute herself or himself.

That tends to make superfluous the argument about decriminalisation and legalisation which was introduced in the debate earlier, and it deserves some comment. The reasons follow:

The real subject of the proposed legislation is the "trade"



of prostitution.

(b) Decriminalisation of the trade does virtually nothing to help women who chiefly for economic reasons resort to prostitution, in that there is no provision for legal protection in areas such as wages and conditions. They work at the mercy of those who promote and of those who use their services.

(c) By wanting to push brothels, that is, the trade, out of residential areas, it is tantamount to saying "out of sight out of mind".

The Policy Committee respectfully ask that you take their deliberations into account at the next Cabinet and Party meetings.

We are in the happy position of not being required, as I have said previously, to sign a pledge to toe the Party line, but I agree with the sentiments of the Women's Council of the Party, whose auspices have sent me here. I also have a letter written by Arthur Handley, whom I have known since I was a small boy. It is addressed to "Dear Robin", and a copy has been sent to me. He believes that the member for Mitcham is completely wrong.

I come now to the literature sent by the Festival of Light, which I read a night or two ago and which made sense to me. It did not strike me as being the effort of a bunch of cranks, but it is popular to denigrate its members, and the member for Mitcham jumped on the band wagon. I quote from the United Nations Convention that the Festival quoted, as follows:

Prostitution and the accompanying evil of the traffic in persons for the purpose of prostitution are incompatible with the dignity and worth of the human person and endanger the welfare of the individual, the family and the community.

That seems like a sensible statement to me. The Convention also states:

The essence of the convention is contained in articles 1 and 2:

Article 1. The parties to the convention agree to punish any person who to gratify the passions of another:

1. Procures, entices or leads away, for purposes of prostitution another person, even with the consent of that person;
2. Exploits the prostitution of another person, even with the consent of that person.

Article 2. The parties to the present convention further agree to punish any person who:

1. Keeps or manages, or knowingly finances or takes part in the financing of a brothel;
2. Knowingly lets or rents a building or other place or part thereof for the purpose of the prostitution of others.

There are other things in the pamphlet which, I thought, were sensible statements. I shall not pursue that any further. I sum up my attitude to the Bill by saying that I am far from convinced that it is a step in the right direction and will not lead to an increase in prostitution. It will make it easier, as the proprietress of one of the escort agencies suggested, for organised crime to enter the scene. I am not convinced that the provisions of the Bill absolutely rule out that possibility. I thought it was a cogent and strong argument. If experience in other areas which could be likened to prostitution is any guide, that would be the result.

I have consulted others in relation to this matter, such as members of my own family and my wife. I am convinced that the provisions of this Bill would be detrimental to the community—far from being beneficial—and, for these reasons, in a representative democracy, I believe that it is not only my right but also my duty to express the views of my electorate, which have been put to me so strongly, in matters such as this. I heartily endorse them, and oppose

the Bill.

**Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** From the modest public reaction so far indicated by the presentation of this Bill, I am led to the conclusion that most people are unaware of the current position and of the proposals put forward in this Bill. I believe that the Select Committee's report leaves many unanswered questions. All we have received is 24 pages of conclusions, the evidence being locked away from us. I am sure that many people are taking a negative approach to prostitution and are inclined towards the philosophy of saying "It has always been here, it is here to stay, so why not legalise it or decriminalise it?"

Prostitution, or the act of sexual intercourse where a fee is paid for sexual services between one person and another, is legal in Australia; the State has never prosecuted a consenting prostitute or her client, or prohibited prostitutes' activities, except where a third person was making money out of the act. We have heard that prostitution is not a criminal offence, so it is totally misleading to imply that the act will be decriminalised.

I want to look quickly at some of the things that are illegal and against the law, such as habitual consorting with known or habitual prostitutes. That is an offence that the Select Committee recommended be abolished. The reason given was that in recent years there have been no police prosecutions for this offence, so its abolition would probably make little or no difference, whereas soliciting, which is regarded as offensive and embarrassing to the public, is illegal. The Select Committee recommended that the law remained the same regarding this offence and should include both men and women.

I was interested to discover from a list of statistics provided by the statistics division of the Vice Squad that there were only three arrests for soliciting in 1979. This indicates that the committee probably felt that it was offensive and embarrassing in principle. I was surprised to see that the figure in relation to actual arrests was so low. Living off the earnings of prostitution is illegal, but if this Bill is passed a new legitimate consensus would be applied, because the committee recommended that it be punishable only where the prostitute is under the age of 18 years, is a minor, or where prostitution is accompanied by threats of violence, coercion, or violence itself.

In those statistics I noticed that there were 66 arrests in 1979 of people for receiving money paid in a brothel. This year there were 24 arrests in the first two months, which indicates a 100 per cent increase over the whole of last year. Over the past 10 years or more the police have made arrests in this area and succeeded with their prosecutions because the law does assist the police in getting evidence that can be proved in court.

I will deal now with procuring or enticing people to be a party to prostitution. We all realise what a serious criminal offence this is at present, because it carries a maximum sentence of seven years imprisonment. The Select Committee recommends that section 63 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act be repealed, thus making the act of procuring legal. The present law protects the people of this State from being tricked, trapped or coerced into becoming prostitutes. The proposed Act suggests that it be dropped.

I turn to the question of zoning. Many councils have experienced great problems in the past in trying to police brothels and massage parlours under zoning regulations. They restrict them to areas of commercial and industrial zones. The Select Committee admitted the self-same difficulty. This Bill endeavours to solve that problem by restricting such places to other than residential zones. Of course, such a definition is difficult to interpret. I will

continue later on this point.

The advertising of brothels is illegal, just as running a brothel, or massage parlour for the purposes of prostitution, is illegal, yet we find the Bill suggesting that one could, provided it did not cause offence and did not include the word "massage", "masseur", "masseuse" or the word "health", be permitted. Let us look at the Bill more closely, particularly Part IV, which deals with child prostitution. This Bill provides that a person under the age of 18 years shall not commit an act of prostitution, yet in existing circumstances a person who has reached the age of consent can indulge in sexual activity. As I have already pointed out, that person can do that for money, provided a third person is not involved. In that case, the person has not committed an offence.

If this Bill becomes law I suggest that this clause will have as much clout as the drinking laws have now on the under-18-year-olds. One might also imagine a client answering an advertisement and asking for evidence of age before he committed the act; or, having committed the act, there is a raid and the police find out that the girl is under the age of 18 years, which means a penalty for the girl of \$500 and, I would suppose, the man could be charged on a morals count, yet the girl might be above the age of consent. On whom does the onus fall to prove the age of the girl? If one asks most publicans whether they can identify people under 18 years of age who are at any time drinking in their hotel, they would tell you that they have enormous difficulty in so doing. This Bill would make sex for money illegal for minors, but I doubt whether the police, or the client, would be given the opportunity to ask for evidence of a birth date. If people work in an organised brothel with all its protection techniques, and if the police had no power by law to gain entry other than by warrant, just how are the police going to see an act take place?

The Act does not say that a minor cannot work in a brothel doing other jobs or acts; it simply says that a child shall not commit an act of prostitution or have sexual relations with a prostitute. It further states that a person who receives money from a child, or enters into an agreement or arrangement with a child under which he may take or share in any proceeds of acts of prostitution committed by a child, shall be guilty of an indictable offence, etc.

In Australia it is the age of consent laws that give the best protection to young women from being exploited as prostitutes, simply because the fact of sexual intercourse can be established in courts, whereas establishing the payment of money is most difficult. I agree with the consensus that, if the Bill set out to protect minors, it would have moved for the age of consent to be changed from 16 to 18 years of age. If the demand for young girls was there and there was an increasing number of girls available, it would be relatively easy, with the detection aids available to brothel keepers, to breach such a law, and provide the services and employ minors.

If the trade between adults becomes acceptable, it will be extremely difficult for anyone to keep minors out of this occupation. Again, ask the publican faced with the same problem in relation to young people drinking in his hotel. Can we ever believe the assurances given to the Select Committee that massage parlour owners would refuse to employ persons known to be minors? Can we believe that people who run brothels illegally and employ girls from 16 years upwards today will be saying that they will not be doing that any more and that, if prostitution becomes legal, they will say to the same girls, "You have no job; you are under age." The suggestion in this clause of the Bill is hollow and does nothing to protect young women from unscrupulous operators.

I turn to section 5 relating to intimidation and ask whether honourable members can imagine a young woman standing in court, or going to the police, and saying that Mr. So-and-so coerced her into prostitution and that he had intimidated her, etc. Should Mr. So-and-so, or Mrs. So-and-so, go to gaol and they happen to belong to an organisation, what of the future of that victimised girl? Would she be allowed to live a normal life? Would she live in fear of reprisal? More importantly, would she live at all? As we have heard, Article 1 of the United Nations Convention requires punishment of any person who procures, entices or leads away for the purpose of prostitution another person, even with the consent of that person.

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

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1980

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 June. Page 2164.)

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I think we have learnt a bit about the new Premier over the past few days, a few facts about his methods of operation that not only we, on the Opposition side, but I think the public at large are beginning to find somewhat disturbing. I refer to the Premier's tendency, in his eagerness to exude confidence and wellbeing (both of which, I hasten to add, and which I have consistently stated, are desirable qualities), to overstate the case and not to tell the whole truth. I am afraid that the Bill before us tonight and the Premier's remarks in relation to it are very much symptomatic of that tendency which we have seen in the Premier over recent weeks. It is a very disturbing tendency because, whilst confidence is something to be desired, false confidence has within it in the long term the seeds of disaster, and the South Australian economy, while basically sound, requires considerable fine tuning and realistic assessment if indeed it is to be made to operate properly.

Unfortunately, the Premier is so consumed with the rhetoric of his years as Leader of the Opposition that now, having reached government, he cannot restrain himself from using the same sorts of technique in his approach to the business of government, and that is a pity for him personally, but it is also a danger, I suggest, for the Government and the State.

Why do I make these remarks in the context of this Bill? The reason is that the Premier has made a great deal of the fact that, having budgeted for a \$2 100 000 surplus in this financial year, he has achieved a result that appears far more favourable than that; in fact, the result is something of the order of a surplus, we are told, of \$30 000 000. That is certainly a remarkable result. I shall analyse that apparent achievement in some detail, and I think we will find that it is not quite as glowing as the Premier suggests.

It is a remarkable turn-around. One would question at the beginning, in the current economic situation in South Australia, whether indeed this is a good thing for a Government, one of the major economic wheels in our region, having budgeted and predicted a surplus of a particular nature (let us recall that the previous Government attempted to balance the Budget and on most occasions succeeded and, when it did not balance the Budget but went into deficit, it was for sound and good economic reasons). If such a different result is being achieved in the current economic climate, one could ask, first, what has gone wrong with the Government's predictions and whether the Government, in this situation,

should be hanging on to these amounts of finance. I shall come back to that.

Let us analyse the Budget Estimates and results to date, the Premier's predictions of the surplus that he believes will appear at the end of this year, and what that means for the South Australian economy. The Premier has claimed this as a remarkable achievement for his Government. I would suggest that, if one looked at it superficially, one could say that it was quite a substantial achievement. However, in making his Budget comparisons yesterday the Premier looked only at the initial Budget Estimates for this year. In order to assess the full impact of the Tonkin Budget in 1979-80, we should compare the revised figures in this Bill with the actual Budget result in 1978-79, because only then can we see the true impact on the economy of South Australia of the way in which the Tonkin Government has managed our finances. That will enable us to gauge the full impact of the changes made.

The Premier initially proposed a full year's surplus of \$2 100 000. The actual surplus in 1978-79 was \$7 100 000. That was above the estimated surplus. I think we budgeted for the order of \$600 000, a Budget as good as balanced, but the actual surplus was better than that. We achieved a very good result under the Dunstan and Corcoran Administrations, which the Tonkin Administration is now claiming has been made even better, turning a \$2 100 000 prospective result into a major change of some \$30 000 000.

The \$2 100 000 has been made up of various elements. Pay-roll tax claims are up \$2 000 000. What does that mean? Pay-roll tax is not a tax that we on this side of the House believe is a productive or useful tax in philosophical terms. Unfortunately, it is a disincentive to employment. The problem with pay-roll tax is that it represents one of the few growth taxes we have at our disposal at the State level, and, as it contributes a substantial proportion of our State revenue, it cannot be simply abolished overnight.

I have suggested at various times over the past six months, and I have written to the Prime Minister, to other Premiers, and to our own Premier along these lines, that a national conference be called to attempt to find an alternative to pay-roll tax, because the States cannot afford to forgo the revenue of a growth tax of this nature. Only by national action and national consideration can we abolish pay-roll tax, with its regressive effects on employment. Unfortunately, my calls so far have been in vain, and it is a pity the Premier has not taken up this issue far more vigorously. He has fiddled around with pay-roll tax by giving concessions here and there—for instance, a pay-roll tax incentive scheme for youth employment which, from the figures we have, apparently has been a signal failure. We have had a concession scheme to country employers which has had enormous problems, the first being that it has a blanket coverage, which means that those employers in healthy industries in country areas who are going to employ individuals anyway simply pocket the proceeds; whether or not there is an aid to decentralisation in that cannot be gauged. The evidence suggests that there is no aid, but that this is simply the cream on the cake for those businesses.

On the other hand, it has excluded, by the narrow definitions of the pay-roll tax scheme, businesses in the outer metropolitan area. By drawing a line as it has, an area such as the District Council of Mount Barker, which most people would say is a decentralised area, has been included in the metropolitan area for the purposes of pay-roll tax, the result being that concessions are not available to businesses there.

The whole approach has been fairly insensitive and is not, I believe, the way of tackling the basic problem of

pay-roll tax. Unfortunately, however, the Premier has seen fit not to take up our calls for consideration at a national level to get rid of pay-roll tax. Pay-roll tax has yielded an extra \$2 000 000. We are not told where this has come from. Is it the effect of higher inflation or higher wage indexation? It could be argued that the extra \$2 000 000 has come about through increased economic activity. If only that were so! The stark fact is that employment in South Australia is down, and down quite significantly, over the last six months or so. Therefore, the increase in pay-roll tax receipts has come not from increased employment but from the impact of wage indexation, wage settlements, and inflation.

The \$2 000 000 extra is the result of higher payments of succession duties than estimated. This is an interesting, and perhaps, one would say, an extraordinary thing to find in a Tonkin Budget, because the Premier made great play of the fact that he had abolished succession duties, a quite significant contributor to the State's revenue and a progressive tax, and that people would no longer be required to make those payments.

So, how do we have a Budget result that suggests that we will get \$12 000 000 extra from succession duties? The answer is clearly that succession duty is being phased out. It was not abolished at a stroke, as the Premier is so keen to tell us. In fact, a number of States are still liable to, and indeed are paying, succession duty. It is interesting that in this Budget part of the result that the Premier is claiming to be so favourable comes about from increased collections from a tax that he regards as abhorrent and has abolished. I supposed that that is an irony of political life.

We then have \$4 000 000 from the Department of Marine and Harbors. That, too, is a good result. Of course, it relates very largely to the fact that we have had a rural boom. There were much greater shipments of wheat and various other products, such as live sheep, and so on, which have resulted in the Department of Marine and Harbors collecting \$4 000 000 more than budgeted. That is a very good result indeed. The rural boom must be of benefit to the State and is something that we applaud. Of course, it is dependent very much on seasonal factors. It is interesting to note that, during the period of our State recession, one of the major factors in that recession, particularly as it affected employment at the meat works and in other areas of activity, was the drought in South Australia, which was beyond the control of Government but which the then Leader of the Opposition blamed on the Government of the day. I suppose that, if he blamed us for drought during our period of office, he will expect to have credit for the good seasons that occur while he is in office; no doubt, he will take full credit for that.

That is the reason why the Marine and Harbors Department receipts are up. Incidentally, it seems to be a fairly large increase when one could anticipate that there would be some sort of boom. I wonder whether or not the estimate was perhaps not very soundly based to begin with. Unfortunately, we do not have access to the basis for many of the estimates that appear in the Budget and, therefore, we cannot really examine or go behind the figures as they appear before us. However, that increase is a bonus for the Government and the State's economy, and is a good thing.

It is important that the full cost of particular revenue and expenditure items be available for public scrutiny. Their accuracy is doubtful, and therefore I think that, as part of any Budget document, we ought to have that basis of estimates outlined to us where possible. So, over all, including the above, the net increase in Revenue Account receipts over the Budget is \$5 000 000. The items that I have outlined total eight. Some items have declined, but

the net result is an increase of receipts over the budgeted amount of \$5 000 000.

I now turn to the expenditure side of the Revenue Account. We find there that there is little change compared with the original Budget. The Premier refers to savings here of only \$2 000 000 on expenditure proposed at the beginning of the year. That is, he has achieved a \$2 000 000 reduction in a total expenditure of \$1 300 000 000; that is a fraction of 1 per cent, a very small saving indeed. This \$2 000 000 is all that the Premier can show for his rhetoric about Government waste and mismanagement. Therefore, it is important that we concentrate on this figure. If indeed there was major waste, as well as mismanagement and inefficiencies in the Public Service as the Premier claimed constantly in his carping and knocking manner throughout his time as Leader of the Opposition, surely he can achieve something more than a cut of less than 1 per cent in this area in the Revenue Budget. However, he has not done so.

The Premier has had a \$2 000 000 saving; that is all he has been able to discern or find. It simply gives the lie to the case that the Premier was putting while he was in Opposition. The Labor Party, when in Government, always maintained that the State Public Service was fairly lean, that it was very efficient, and, in fact, that it had a high reputation among public services in this country. The Premier rejected that, saying that it was a repository of bludgers, of inefficient managers, that there was waste, mismanagement and extravagance. One should have thought that, with a few strokes of a pen and with the application of his business efficiency principles, the Premier would have been able to achieve vast savings. What he has achieved is a saving of less than 1 per cent in that area, an extraordinarily small result. Indeed it is an endorsement of the efficiency with which the Public Service is run.

I turn now to receipts and expenditure, which I will take together. One finds that, if one adds the savings of the increase in revenue and the minimal savings on the expenditure side, we have a surplus, in improvement on the Revenue Account of \$7 000 000. As a surplus of \$6 000 000 was originally proposed, this means that we now have an overall surplus of \$13 000 000. As is usual with such surpluses, transfer is to be made to the Loan Account, and \$13 000 000 is available for such a transfer from Revenue Account to Loan Account. However, if one looks at the document and at the Premier's speech, it can be seen that he proposes to transfer, not \$13 000 000, which is the figure before us and which I have detailed, but a sum of \$20 000 000.

The Premier says that he is proposing to transfer more funds than he appears to have on hand "in the hope that the recent revenue improvement in May will continue in June. The view seems to be that in the last months of this financial year finances are improving at an accelerating rate". Indeed, if that is so, the Premier will probably have the \$7 000 000 extra that he needs to make the \$20 000 000 transfer that is embodied in this document, but it is a bit of a gamble. He is simply looking at the indicators and making a prediction. It is not money in hand, nor is it money that can be said to be available for collection at the moment.

Perhaps the one thing that is going in the Premier's favour is the delay in the national wage case because, if that case is not decided before the end of June, and no payments have to be made as a result of any award made in that instance, considerable savings could result for the Government. Part of that \$7 000 000 may be achieved in that way. However, even though we are now a few days into June, the case is quite well advanced. Indeed, if it

resumes on Friday, as I understand it is hoped, the Government may be up for expenditure in this financial year. But, we still have this \$7 000 000 extra.

If the revenue growth is not as high as predicted and it does not come from that source, whence will the Premier get it? It may be that he is obtaining it from reserve funds taken out of other accounts. If that is contemplated, he should detail that contingency plan and tell us whether, if the receipts do not live up to the estimation that he has made, he intends to adjust that part of his Budget or that he will find the money from elsewhere.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. BANNON:** I suspect that he is battling with some of the concepts in the Budget, so that he will not be able to answer me tonight. However, we will see.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader should refer to the Premier.

**Mr. BANNON:** I apologise, Sir. If the Premier is not able to get advice tonight, I suspect that he will not be able to answer me. I now turn to the Loan Account. The Loan Fund is to receive an extra \$14 000 000 from Revenue Account. This is \$20 000 000 above, when one looks at the proposed transfer of \$6 000 000. I have already outlined how that transfer is to be achieved. What then is happening to the Loan Account on the payments side? We see there a considerable improvement over budget, and that that improvement is achieved by reduced payments on works as follows: for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Water and Sewerage, there is to be a saving of \$7 000 000, which is a very large amount indeed. There is a saving, on payments for works on schools of \$2 000 000; that is, \$2 000 000 budgeted to be spent on schools is not to be spent. The sum of \$3 000 000 budgeted to be spent on general Government buildings is not to be spent. Also, the \$5 000 000 budgeted to be spent on hospitals is not to be spent.

That, together with an improvement of an extra \$1 000 000 on minor items, makes a total of \$17 000 000 savings, so payments on works have been cut by a total of \$16 000 000, plus the \$1 000 000 on minor items. There are four major categories where major savings (as the Premier would describe them) have been made on the budgeted amounts; the Opposition would describe them as "major cuts". Overall, the transfers will leave Revenue Account in balance, and that is as it should be. The surplus in Revenue Account will be transferred to Loan Account. The Loan Account surplus has therefore improved from the original \$2 100 000 by \$14 000 000 from Revenue Account and \$17 000 000 from reduced payments on works, making a total of \$2 100 000 plus \$31 000 000. That is where the \$30 000 000 figure, the general estimate about which the Premier has been speaking in the past two days, comes from.

I have already outlined those contributions. An extra \$7 000 000 will come from the Revenue Account and \$16 000 000 will result from reduction in payment on works. Respective payments on works, expenditure on worthwhile Government projects, is to be cut this year in a way that will mean a run-down in community assets, which, in the longer term, will have to be restored or replaced in future years. In other words, projects are being deferred (there are as yet no available details about whether projects have been cancelled) in such a way as to suggest that they will eventually find their way into a Government budget. This work will have to be done because it involves necessary public works. After all, the programme had been cut back to the bone in previous years, and I will outline those figures shortly. In this financial year, payments that might have been made are being deferred to next year to give the impression of an

overall healthy budget situation. Not only will actual expenditure be below what was estimated for this Budget but also it is way below the actual level of 1978-79.

It is in this area that disturbing figures arise. In 1978-79, \$232 000 000 was spent on payments on works by the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments in the context of a balanced Budget. The Tonkin Government proposes a reduced expenditure of \$218 000 000. With the extra cuts now proposed, total expenditure could be about \$204 000 000.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr. BANNON:** For the honourable member's enlightenment, I indicate that \$232 000 000 was allocated in 1978-79 as compared to the Tonkin Budget of \$218 000 000, which is now being further reduced by these so-called savings to \$204 000 000. Therefore, in pure money terms, there has been a cut from the level of 1978-79 of \$28 000 000; in straight dollars, without any allowance for inflationary effects, that sum is no longer available in the South Australian community for spending on these essential public works.

The real impact is much more severe. With inflation in non-house building materials running at 13 per cent, South Australia would need to spend about \$262 000 000 this year to maintain the real expenditure level of 1978-79, which was a pretty tough year. A lot of projects were cut back to the minimum in order to fit into the context of a balanced Budget. However, the Tonkin Government Budget in real terms, with these adjustments that have been made by the Premier, means that there is a difference between 1978-79 and 1980-81 of \$58 000 000 reduction in real expenditure on works. That is an extremely large sum, and it is alarming not to the public sector of our community but to the private sector, which is so heavily involved in public works, because that expenditure in real terms has been withheld from our community. The Premier claims that this new reduction over the past eight months results from a more critical examination of projects and competitive tenderings.

I question whether it is possible that there could have been a cut of about \$16 000 000 in a few months simply by the critical examination of projects and competitive tendering. It would appear that the critical examination to which the Premier refers is, in fact, a euphemism for cut-backs in and deferrals of projects to later years, including next year. A deferral of expenditure in this way is a cosmetic way to achieve in this financial year a Budget surplus that will eventually catch up with the Premier and the State in terms of public works and public facilities available to it in succeeding years. This is not good enough, because Government expenditure must somehow attempt to iron out the peaks and troughs; it must maintain itself at some level to keep the general economy of South Australia running.

The Premier has simply achieved cut-backs and deferrals, which means that money that could have been used in the South Australian economy this year has been withheld because of deliberate Government policy. When one looks at the unemployment figures and the level of economic activity in South Australia, one sees that the situation is pretty scandalous.

**Mr. Langley:** They will open their first building in 1986 if they're in government.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader does not need the assistance of the member for Unley.

**Mr. BANNON:** In recent months, an impression of considerable activity in South Australia has been projected. A number of major public works have been opened. One or two major public works are in the construction stages. The Premier has attended a number

of other functions and has opened some establishments, but all of these projects were conceived and, in large part, executed under the works programme of the former Government. What is new on the drawing board for forthcoming years? The Premier has not been very explicit about this matter, because there is very little in the pipeline, due to the way in which the current Government has approached its responsibilities in terms of the provision of Government facilities.

What is disturbing in this whole scene is the prospect that substantial double payments will result because of the Government's letting out work to private interests. This is far from what the Premier calls competitive tenders, by which he means letting out work to the private sector, resulting in savings. Indeed, as the minute from the Minister of Industrial Affairs to the Premier indicates, it means possible double payments, which will cost the Government far more than if the Government maintained its own work force and did the job itself in the same efficient and appropriate way that it has done in the past.

By the pursuit of his ideology and the way in which he has approached the issue, the Premier has cost the State extra money and has not reduced the costs. The cosmetics of this Budget will hide this fact, but in future the results will show up. I do not suggest that airily; one could look in from the outside and say, from examples of which one hears, that this must occur and that, if the Government is to maintain a work force that it will not sack or render redundant (nor should it), and at the same time let out work to the private sector, there will be an element of double payment. A minute circulated by the Minister of Industrial Affairs contains a clear statement by the Government of the sort of figures involved, and those figures are quite alarming.

In the case of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which is the largest element of the \$16 000 000 saving, a further \$12 000 000 has already been put at risk, we are told, because of the Government's pursuit of its policy. This policy is outrageous in a time of economic difficulty in South Australia. The figures that I have cited indicate the real impact on the South Australian building and construction industry of the Tonkin Government's policy and, as is well known, the industry is struggling at present. Over 1 000 jobs have been lost in the private building and construction industry since the Tonkin Government came to office.

That is an alarming figure, particularly for a Government that claimed it would increase private sector employment. The Premier said that employment in that sector would increase by as much as 10 000 jobs in the next three years. In the months he has been in office, in the building and construction industry alone, 1 000 private sector jobs have been lost. That is a startling figure and leaves him much leeway to make up to achieve his 10 000 jobs lost by the time of the next election. Private housing approvals, a forward activity indicator, are down by about one-quarter on the levels applying in the middle of last year. There was some slight increase in March, but the averaging over a three-month period indicates that building approvals are far from healthy.

They predict what will happen in building in future, so the industry is on hard times and it is not helped by the sort of boosting that the Premier attempts to instil, the exhortations that are so badly based. Instead of exhorting the private sector to respond to his calls for confidence, the Premier could ensure confidence in the private sector by injecting some of the \$58 000 000 of cuts in public works he has had up his sleeve and let it get on with the job. The withdrawal of \$50 000 000 or \$60 000 000 from building and construction seems to be a very stupid way

for the Government to be getting out of the way of business, as the Premier so fondly tells us. It is the formula disastrously cried both federally and by Mrs. Thatcher in Britain, whose philosophies accord very closely with those of the Premier.

There are some other aspects of this Bill. In the last line of the first paragraph on page 4 of the explanation given by the Premier, there is what may be a typographical error. The Premier refers to the Supplementary Estimates making provision for the transfer of \$20 000 000 from Revenue Account to Loan Account on the assumption that the unexplained improvement in May continues into June 1980. If that is a typographical error, I am not sure what word one would substitute for "unexplained", but if it is as it says in the text, unexplained, it is hard to understand what the Premier means.

If he cannot explain his own Revenue Estimates, there is not much hope of anyone else understanding them. Why, indeed, is the Government proposing to transfer \$20 000 000 to Loan Account, when at best it has only \$13 000 000 in the Revenue Account to do that? Is the Government playing with funds that it does not have, or will the expansion money be taken from reserves?

What a situation it is to have a Premier saying that an item in his Budget is unexplained! It is not a very good approach to finance. Without the \$16 000 000 manipulation of Loan payments and the unexplained \$7 000 000 of revenue funds, the State may be looking at a \$10 000 000 surplus this year, and I suggest that, if there is a surplus in a real sense, that is probably about the order of that surplus—\$10 000 000.

That brings me to my final point. If there is a \$30 000 000 surplus and if at least \$10 000 000 is of a real nature, surely some of this money should be used to stimulate the State economy. I do not say all of it should be used in that way, because the Premier has prophesied that 1980-81 will be a very difficult year for the State financially. We have had disastrous unemployment figures released lately, showing fewer people in jobs.

Surely, the Government could use some of the surplus to restore capital works and bring projects on stream now immediately, to try to do something about the position. Now is not the economic time for the Government to stack up a surplus of the size that the Premier is attempting to do. We believe that \$10 000 000 of this sum could be allocated for the relief of unemployment. It would be a curious state of priorities that would have \$30 000 000 in surplus on the one hand and record unemployment on the other. There is a clear obligation in this instance to use some of that money to stimulate our economy and employment, yet the Premier resists it.

One reason why he resisted it is that he wants to save as much as he can now to provide for major projects, such as the Redcliff infrastructure and the transport arrangements in the north-east corridor, but the fact is that this year's Budget, as with Budgets before it, was formulated on the basis that money would be available for those projects in future years, anyway. We have Loan Council approval to borrow for the Redcliff infrastructure. We do not need to save money this year in order to pay for those projects in future, particularly in the parlous economic situation in which we find ourselves today. That is something that the Premier should remember.

We have the capacity to pay for those projects. His \$2 100 000 surplus this year envisaged providing for those projects. Now he happens to have achieved this result (and I have demonstrated how he has achieved it), I would say that he ought to be using that money at once to try to do something to aid the unemployment situation. None of his financial transactions can gloss over the fact that there is a

substantial deficit in prospect from 1980-81 if things go as it appears they will, not only from all the economic indicators but also from the Premier's own words.

That brings up the matter of the famous \$40 000 000 deficit. At no time did I suggest that that deficit would occur this year. This financial year, as plainly stated by the Premier in his explanation, he was providing for a surplus of \$2 100 000. We have never suggested that he would not achieve that result. Indeed, he has achieved a better result by various means. That is not at issue. The \$40 000 000 is not a figure that I invented or devised or that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition or anyone else thought up. It was a figure set down by the Premier, in his handwriting, in a document that he signed. It was in a memo of 4 January 1980 that appeared in the *Advertiser*.

The text of that memo, which is now in wide circulation, made quite clear that, in the Premier's words, because of various reasons the South Australian Government now faces the prospect of a \$40 000 000 deficit on Revenue Account next year. That "next year" is the financial year 1980-81. The figure of \$40 000 000 is not our invention, and the deficit in 1980-81 is not our prediction: it is the Premier's alone. If he believes that that memo should be cancelled, and that the results will be very much different in 1980-81, let him tell us, but let him stop trying to say that we stated that it would be in this financial year.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** You did to start with.

**Mr. BANNON:** We did not.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Yes, you did. We've got a press release of yours.

**Mr. BANNON:** We did not. We said it would occur in this coming financial year of 1980-81. That is what the Premier's words said it would do and, if he has changed his mind, let him say it. That is where the figure comes from, and let him not try to duck away from that. That deficit that he has predicted could be compounded in subsequent years by the decisions of the Commonwealth Grants Commission in the relativities review. The commission, early this month, is to begin an investigation of whether South Australia's share in total income tax claims should be cut back.

Unless we can make a compelling and sound case to that Commission and come out of that relativities review well, we will be in even greater financial difficulty. If our share was cut by just one-half of 1 per cent, we would lose \$30 000 000 every year. That is a huge sum of money that we cannot afford to lose. It is well known that the Eastern States are out after South Australia. They are going to attempt to gun us down and cut back our share of Commonwealth revenue, among other things, because of the benefits we achieved by the sound agreement hammered out by Premier Don Dunstan in the transfer of the railways. That has been of substantial benefit to this State, although it has been deplored by those on the other side. We have to fight to retain the benefits of that fairly-won agreement, and that is what the relativities review is in part about.

It does not give us great confidence when one looks at some of the economic statements being made by the Premier that the best possible case will be made for South Australia in that relativities review. Our finances are at risk. We have the prospect of a deficit declared by the Premier next year of a very substantial sum, and the further prospect of cutbacks in our share of the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement. Let us not be carried away by this Budget result. Just as the Premier announced a new industrial development for South Australia yesterday which would supposedly bring a lot of jobs, we must look at the other side of the balance and find that other jobs will be lost as a result of that development,

so in this case, just because the Premier announces that in this financial year certain savings have been made to come out with a substantial surplus in the Budget does not mean that in future years we will not be on hard times.

Let us not get carried away about it. Let us look at the position realistically. I call on the Premier to act responsibly by injecting some of those moneys into our economy to stimulate not only the general community's activities but also those of the private sector about which he has talked so long and odiously.

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** I want to speak this evening because, first, the Premier raised issues yesterday of how, according to him, this State was on the threshold of an exciting era and, on that basis, I believe that I should have some say in this supposed excitement. I find no excitement in the unemployment problem in South Australia, and the Bill now before us feeds that so-called excitement which causes unemployment. I stress my concern that, obviously, there is no regard now, nor will there be in the future, from the Liberal State Government for the inhuman problem of unemployment, and for the continuing problem of unemployment.

Certainly, we have heard words emanating from the Premier and his various Ministers and, from time to time, Government back-benchers regarding their concern; in fact, they have told us that they are particularly worried about youth unemployment. Despite all this concern, the State Liberal Government pursues the Liberal-Fraser policy of a continuing subsidisation for changes in technology and automation in industry which provide extra production with less overhead. It thus continues on its way of trying to solve the economic ills of this State, by a means that creates the most inhuman factor facing us in the community: I refer again to unemployment.

This supplementary Budget does nothing about the problem of unemployment. We have a boastful Premier talking about, in one instance, a \$30 000 000 surplus (that matter was covered adequately earlier this evening by my Leader) and, further, about the State's recovery being just around the corner. What we are really talking about is a multi-million dollar capital expenditure, with little or no improvement in this State's unemployment position.

I will deal now with the announcement yesterday by the Premier of the \$8 000 000 expansion by General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth. As the Leader has already pointed out, this expansion, according to the Premier yesterday, was the expansion of all expansions. The Ministerial statement, which the Premier so forcibly made in the House yesterday, was made after the Leader of the Opposition had moved an urgency motion. The Opposition recalls yesterday very well—the gestures of grandeur, the waving of arms as though we should say a few Hail Mary's in front of him. He was putting over to the Opposition that he was the saviour of the State, as a result of the \$8 000 000 expansion at G.M.H. We were to have absolute happiness; all our problems were solved. It took the Premier two hours after the Leader had moved his urgency motion to get a Ministerial statement typed. The Leader yesterday, and again tonight, in my view (and I am sure in the view of my colleagues), rightly pointed out that, although we welcomed this proposed expansion at G.M.H., we had our reservations about it, as regards the employment per capita outlay, and some reservations that we were pursuing a lost cause, in that we accept a change in technology, which, in turn, produces more with less employment.

We all recall the takeover by the Japanese of Chrysler Australia. This announcement, if I recall correctly, was welcomed by the Government in the press, but no-one,

except the trade union movement, questioned the Japanese about their future intentions in respect of the takeover intentions that might possibly mean additional jobs. This was the issue the movement was taking up. The movements approaches at that time were not approaches of condemnation or despair, but of sincere concern about what the takeover meant to workers in the motor vehicle industry. The movement rightly pointed out that the history of the Japanese had been one of semi-automation and a depletion of jobs. The Japanese also have a history of tariff protection, subsidy protection, and import protection. Despite all this protection, the Japanese Government which introduced it fell because of corruption and intrigue.

**Mr. Hemmings:** That was after the Premier's visit.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Yes. I can only infer from that that everything in Japan did not receive protection. Turning to the Premier's second reading explanation of the Bill, I will quote part of it, because it came home to me personally. He said:

I am sure that I need not remind members of the major development projects which confront this State, nor of the immense economic and social benefits which those developments will bring to South Australia and the nation as a whole, although after what has happened in the last half hour or so I think that it should be spelt out more clearly for the benefit of the members opposite.

In the case of Redcliff, I believe that development is close at hand. While the Australian Loan Council has approved special borrowing arrangements for this project, there will still be a heavy demand on State funds for such infrastructure components as port and harbor facilities, water and sewerage services, schools, health services and housing. I can recall the time, not long ago, when the Premier (then Leader of the Opposition) did not know where Redcliff was. I have always believed in the future of Redcliff but, unfortunately, it is true to say that that project has a tremendously long history. I believe that Redcliff is the only worthwhile alternative industrial development proposal for the Iron Triangle area and for this State that has raised its head. I have always supported this development. I recognise its potential employment capacity on completion, together with the flow that may come from its ultimate development.

Aside from that aspect, I point out that, during its construction stage, Redcliff will probably employ about 1 400 to 1 800 men (that is on record), and that is a very important point. When that project is finished I believe it is anticipated that it will employ about 600 people permanently. I remind the Premier that in his election promises he said that, I think, 7 000 jobs would be created. Someone questioned that figure and suddenly overnight I believe it reached 14 000 jobs. Those figures are rather strange to say the least, because I have just quoted the actual employment figures in relation to Redcliff, which is the biggest possible development this State will see. Therefore, I find it very strange that overnight, as it were, 7 000 to 14 000 jobs will be created. Redcliff is a multi-million dollar project—not an \$8 000 000 project—yet the ultimate employment of people in this State from such a project falls very much short of the projected 7 000 to 14 000 new jobs predicted by the Premier in his policy speeches last year.

I now refer to the latest television advertisement currently appearing on television. I believe that the commercial has been sponsored by the television, radio, news media and so on in this State for the benefit of the South Australian community. I do not know whether any other members have seen this commercial, but it is worth looking at even if you want to pull it to pieces. That

commercial tells how well our State is progressing. From memory, the commercial begins with a picture of a glass piggy bank, which is half full of 50c coins, and so on, and someone is placing another 50c coin into it. Suddenly, someone comes along and smashes the piggy bank, and implies that if a citizen, instead of saving his money, was to spend \$1 extra a week out of his income, that extra expenditure would in some magical way create a \$50 000 000 industry in South Australia. That industry is un-named and unexplained.

However, I get the message that magically a \$50 000 000 industry will be created, and out of that industry 500 jobs will be created. Redcliff is a multi-million dollar expenditure, but it will not create that sort of situation. History tells us that the type of capital expenditure suggested in the television commercial, even if it became a reality (and I am giving it the benefit of the doubt) under the method suggested in the commercial, would not create 500 jobs. I seriously suggest that that commercial is cruel, false and misleading. I believe that it should be banned from television pursuant to the legislation covering misleading advertising.

I now turn to the latest editorial by the *Adelaide News*. It is an absolute gem. That editorial is headed, "It is our State, mate", and I believe I have heard that somewhere before. The editorial reads:

What this State can do with right now is a fair measure of confidence, tangible signs that the economy is on the mend. I could not agree more, but I have not seen it yet. That editorial goes on with a lot of bunkum and nonsense.

*Mr. Becker interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The important issue in that editorial, although it is hidden, is contained in the following:

Certainly, it represents only 50 new jobs: certainly, many jobs have been lost in recent months elsewhere. I suggest that those jobs will still be lost under this proposal. I also suggest to Mr. Murdoch, who I understand owns the *Adelaide News* amongst other things, that he is having his own problems in relation to the very thing that I am discussing tonight; that is, he is spending X amount of dollars in new techniques for the production of newspapers and he has a strike on his hands.

The editorial should have turned away from its criticism of the Leader of the Opposition and not evaded what the Leader is endeavouring to warn the people of this State about—the lack of job creation. Those are the simple ethics of the whole matter. Rupert Murdoch and his *Adelaide News* stand condemned on that issue because they in turn are playing around with people's employment possibilities. Through the injection of large sums of money the newspapers, television stations, radio stations, and the news media generally are attempting to degrade the Labor Party's honest and sincere efforts whilst in Government, as well as the proposals made now by the Leader of the Opposition, to create and provide employment for our young people and our work force generally. The *Adelaide News* and any other ultra-conservative multi-national company are supporting to their utmost policies of full automation, semi-automation and subsidised multi-million dollar expenditure with absolutely no regard for the future of the work force of this country. Once again I say that expansion of industry is welcome. We have in the past, we do now and we will in the future continue to point out the lack of job creation.

I now turn to the issue referred to by the Premier yesterday, and this issue touches my heart greatly, as I am sure you appreciate, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I refer to the mammoth B.H.P. steel production company. I believe the

Premier said that that company would be spending about \$90 000 000 in this State. About \$30 000 000 of that will be spent in the relining of No. 2 blast furnace at the company's works in Whyalla. That relining work will take about four months and will probably create about 300 jobs. I applaud that situation because I believe that is very good and I am very happy about it. However, one must not forget that when the project is finished that blast furnace will be one of the most modern and most effective blast furnaces for its size in this country, if not in the world, although I am not getting away from the fact that there are larger blast furnaces in existence.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What shape is it?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** If the Minister of Agriculture wants to joke about the unemployment situation in this State, that is fair enough. The Minister's behaviour is a glaring example of what I have been talking about: Government members have absolutely no humane concern about the unemployed people in this State whatsoever.

Honourable members can laugh about this if they wish. I am suggesting to this House that, even if it has an expenditure of \$30 000 000, B.H.P. will ultimately employ not one more person; in fact, it will employ fewer persons than at present. So much for the \$90 000 000!

Let us have a look at the other announcement, made in May, of an increase in expenditure by the B.H.P. We all know that the rolling mill, or what is called the finishing end of the steel works at Whyalla, is to be expanded at a cost of \$32 000 000 to produce 250 000 tonnes of rails a year. The B.H.P. Co. Ltd. has received an order to produce all of the rails for the railway system of Australia (if Fraser gets around to doing something about it). An article appeared in the *Whyalla News* on Monday 5 May as follows:

Site preparations are under way and the first contracts have been let for major extensions to the Whyalla steelworks. The work is part of a \$32 800 000 expansion programme at the rolling mill and finishing end. When completed by next March the project will make Whyalla Australia's major producer of rails. B.H.P.'s Whyalla operations will then have the capacity to produce 250 000 tonnes of rail a year.

The article also points out the various contracts that have gone to Japanese firms. I can remember the great shemuzzle that went on in this place at one time about the Japanese getting contracts under a Labor Government. I point out that, according to a B.H.P. spokesman, the development is significant and will provide security of employment plus additional jobs.

The \$32 800 000 expansion (and I believe the expansion will, ultimately, be greater than \$32 800 000) will provide employment, I understand, for approximately 60 people. The company appears loath to state the ultimate increase in employment, but it is quick to gain headlines about the expenditure. I reiterate what I have said all along, that here we find a capital expenditure of \$32 800 000 providing employment for no more than 60 people. In other words, the \$90 000 000 expansion project will, I suggest, provide no more than 70 extra jobs. That is a lot of expenditure per job in anyone's language.

I point out that the B.H.P. has rather dramatically improved its production of steel. I am not knocking that concept any more than the Leader is, but I point out that B.H.P.'s policy in relation to the employment of people leaves something to be desired. Employment in the steel works is mainly for unskilled and semi-skilled labour. People over the age of 40 years need not apply, because they will not get a job. I can assure honourable members that, unless a person is a superman or can pass the most stringent medical examination, he need not apply either.



I conclude by drawing to the attention of the House an article in *National Construction* titled "Huge ICI Botany Bay Job". The article points out that the first project is valued at about \$200 000 000, and that the second part of the project will bring the total cost to \$400 000 000. An expenditure of \$400 000 000 is not a bad amount for someone to sink into the welfare and future of this country, and it will produce, according to this article, 750 jobs. I am pointing out to the Premier and honourable members that it is time we stopped this tomfoolery of talking about capital expenditure at the cost of decent, honest, working class people, who cannot get a job, whether we like it or not, and did something positive about job creation. The Government should use the apparently large amount of surplus money it has in this Budget for job creation schemes and to do something about future employment for the ordinary people in this State.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** The honourable member for Whyalla said a number of things, most of which were not worth answering. However, two points are worth answering. The first is the criticism he made of the electronic media's campaign and its encouragement to get behind South Australia. I am disappointed in the honourable member. I have become accustomed to his Leader's criticising and denigrating South Australia, but it did not necessarily follow that every member of the Labor Party would follow that lead. The interesting thing is that this is an independent, non-politically motivated campaign. It was motivated by a number of people who wish to see South Australia move ahead and who are prepared not only to put their money where their mouths are (in other words, to support the campaign) but also to promote the campaign with the best interests of South Australia at heart.

**Mr. Whitten:** Like they did last year!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! When the Leader spoke he was not interrupted, and I ask that the same courtesy be extended to the Premier; in fact, I intend to insist upon it.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** In answer to the honourable gentleman, and in case he feels that this is some way an initiative of the *News* (for which the Labor Party has an undying hatred), I point out that this is, in fact, an independent group, a group which was, I believe, supported by the Leader when he attended the launching of the second phase of this campaign with me only recently at the Festival Theatre. In my hearing, he there spoke glowingly of the campaign and of the tremendous dedication these people had shown towards the future of South Australia, so I think the member for Whyalla is very sadly off the track—either that, or his Leader is. That, of course, is open to some question.

The other thing I want to answer is this rather quaint idea the member for Whyalla has developed that spending capital is a bad thing. He has said that spending capital in developing this State is not good, because it does not create as many jobs as he would like to see created. I can assure the honourable member, who obviously has not done much in the way of economics, that there certainly will not be any jobs created without expending capital, and if there is no investment (as he suggests) there will certainly be no jobs. Unless we spend capital and get that sound, solid base, we are not going to create jobs. Where capital is being expended (and the honourable member kindly outlined the amounts being spent by B.H.P in his own town), jobs certainly will be created. I am grateful to the honourable member for agreeing that capital is perhaps a good thing after all.

I turn now to the Leader of the Opposition. I believe

that most honourable members in this House are becoming thoroughly sick and tired of his current carping attitude. He says that it is disturbing that there is an oversimplification, that there is only telling half of the truth. I believe that, if anyone tells only half of the truth in this House, it is the Leader of the Opposition. We have heard him come forward with some of his wild prognostications and theories again this evening. He says that to obtain a saving—and I believe that that is something of which the Government can be very proud indeed—in excess of \$30 000 000 is, in some way, a very bad thing. If one takes the \$40 000 000 deficit that he once prognosticated and adds to it the \$30 000 000, one finds that he was \$70 000 000 out. He is the man who is the alternative leader of this State. Lord help us! He wants to know how it is achieved. We earlier said that there would be \$2 100 000 surplus, and now he is worried because it will be more than \$30 000 000. What has happened—what terrible thing? There must be something wrong, because the Labor Party, when in Government, could never achieve it. It is sour grapes; it is nothing more or less. The Leader says that pay-roll tax receipts are up by \$2 000 000. He says that that is a tax on jobs, and with that I quite agree. As a member of the Opposition, he is opposed to pay-roll tax, and he says that he has sought to initiate a national conference on its replacement. That is a very worthy ambition, and one which I beat him to by some time. However, what he has not said is where was his concern and that of his colleagues while they were in office and in Government.

Where was the concern 12 months ago to change the pay-roll tax system? Did we hear of it? We certainly did not. Indeed, in the last election campaign (and I am sorry to raise a matter so hurtful to the Opposition), the present Government, the Liberal Party, offered some concessions; it offered youth concessions, regional concessions for decentralised industry, and an increase of the maximum exemption level. It offered pay-roll tax exemptions. Did we see the present Leader of the Opposition stand up and say, "Yes, I support that platform—I will take up those suggestions of the Liberal Party. That is what I believe in, and that is what I will support." Not a word did we hear from him, and I find it extremely hypocritical for the Leader to stand up now and profess this enormous concern. He was not concerned before. I wonder why he is suddenly concerned.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** There will be a few concerns when they have their corroboree next week.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is not a corroboree: it is a convention. It will go down as the one vote one value convention of the Labor Party. It will be interesting. It depends on who uses more votes in the card system. Is it not 94 per cent to 7 per cent?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Not one of the policies offered by the Liberal Party in the election campaign was matched by the former Government. In fact, it offered nothing at all by way of pay-roll tax relief. If the previous Government had, by some chance, retained office in the face of the enormous revolt on the part of the people, we can say that the additional unexpected receipts in pay-roll tax would have been far greater than the \$2 000 000 that we have presently got. It would have ripped off far more than that sum and would, I am sure, have justified it. The extraordinary remarks about succession duties show an abysmal lack of understanding.

**Mr. Becker:** He'll have to speak to Maguire.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not know who is advising the Leader, but he would do well to look around for

someone else. Succession duties have been abolished from 1 January. Obviously the Leader seems to think that, for some reason, estates are wound up the day after a person dies. I do not think he really believes that. He must know that it takes some 12 to 18 months, or even two years or more, to finalise estates. When they are finalised, the sums due in respect of deaths occurring before the beginning of January this year will undoubtedly be paid to the Government, and so they should be. There can be no exemptions made in that, yet the Leader finds something peculiar in the fact that there are still succession duty receipts.

*Mr. Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think everyone else in South Australia knows it except the Leader. Perhaps we should apologise to the Leader for not being able to arrange the demise of wealthy South Australian residents at a time more convenient to him. There could be times that better suit his argument. The only reason that receipts are up, as he well knows, is that a small number of large estates is being processed in this financial year, and we cannot anticipate whether they will be in this financial year or the next. It so happens that they have come in this financial year. For the Leader to try to find fault and in some way to suggest that we have not honoured our commitment to abolish succession duties, simply because we are still receiving revenue, is not worthy of reply.

We move now to the Loan Estimates. The Leader says that these are being underspent by \$16 000 000, and he goes into the \$232 000 000. Apparently he can add up. He says that the amount of \$218 000 000 budgeted being reduced to \$202 000 000 means that we are down \$30 000 000 (or \$58 000 000 after allowing for inflation), which means services are not being provided to the public, and the private construction sector is being starved. However, that is not what the private construction sector has said directly. Rather, it has given the lie to the words the Leader has tried to put in their mouths. He trots out the \$12 000 000 duplicate spending argument again when it comes to the day labour force. I repeat that the information he has is well out of date. It was dealt with today, and it has certainly been proven quite conclusively that the Government's balance and the move to competitive tendering is saving the taxpayers. I repeat for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, because I did not hear him refer to the taxpayers of this State once, that it is saving the taxpayer millions of dollars a year, and I am proud to be able to do that. That is one of the reasons why the people of South Australia put us here; they were sick and tired of having their money wasted by a profligate Government.

What the Leader is saying in stating that we are down on Loan spending compared with last year completely ignores the fundamental fact that \$20 000 000 is to be transferred to the Loan Account. It is all there in the speech, and he could have read it. In other words, we do not have nearly enough in our original Loan Estimates to meet the commitments ahead.

Those commitments are particularly in relation to the Redcliff infra-structure, housing, and the transport link to the north-eastern suburbs. All of these projects are income generating and employment generating. I am sorry that the member for Whyalla has left the Chamber. We are now transferring funds from Revenue to Loan in a most responsible way so that, through the private sector, our construction projects can be funded in the immediate future. All the Leader is bleating about is that the original Loan Estimates are not being spent this year, but that does not mean that they will not be spent at all. It is ridiculous to say so; they will. The fact that funds have been

transferred from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account ensures that even more will be spent in this area. We will be able to afford to spend more in providing the infra-structure we need. We will be able to do a better job and we will have to borrow less money to provide the infra-structure for these projects than would have been borrowed had the present Opposition remained in Government. I think that is a sound business arrangement, one, obviously, that the Leader of the Opposition does not believe in.

Regarding housing construction and housing approvals being down this year as compared with last year, as alleged by the Leader, I suggest once again, very kindly, that he should refer to the A.B.S. figures. He may care to do that before I elucidate the real position in this House on a later occasion. There is no doubt that that position is totally the reverse of what he has quoted in this Chamber tonight. Approvals for new buildings, new construction, housing construction and alterations are all concerned, and the expenditure in these spheres, on A.B.S. figures, is well and truly on the increase. If the Leader does not want to acknowledge that, I am sorry for him. Indeed, the whole tenor of his speech has been one of sour grapes—this from the man who promoted a \$40 000 000 deficit, who was \$70 000 000 out in his assessment, who is complaining that our surplus is not \$2 700 000, but \$30 000 000-odd.

It seems to me that we have our own resident Jeremiah continually whingeing about what happens. We have talked about succession duties and pay-roll tax. He complains that we are \$4 000 000 up in receipts from Marine and Harbors. Is that a bad thing? Is it a bad thing that we are making more money from Marine and Harbors because we are exporting more and there is more trade? The Leader would have us believe that it is a very bad thing; he damns it with faint praise.

I took some exception to his description of officers of the Public Service as bludgers. That is a word I have never even suggested, yet the Leader takes it upon himself to try to put that word into my mouth in relation to members of the Public Service. I bitterly resent that description of worthy officers of the Public Service.

**Mr. Bannon:** Your description.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** If the Leader can find where I have ever said that, I shall be very interested. He will not say that I said that word.

**Mr. Bannon:** You got as close as you could.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He is not in a position to say that word. He is twisting the truth again, one more example. I will not have words put into my mouth by the Leader, particularly when they have such connotations in relation to officers of the Public Service. This is a disgraceful thing that the Leader has done, and I hope he is ashamed of himself.

I turn now to the savings on the Loan Account and the Revenue Account. Why the Leader is so upset about this is that it is all sour grapes. He said it could not be done. He said, when in Government, that the former Government could not achieve savings. We have achieved savings. We have put a tight control over expenditure, we have had a close examination of Loan works, and we are letting works out to private tender. Yet the Leader sticks to this amazing attitude, this classic collectivist argument of increasing Government activity and involvement, increasing taxation, depressing private enterprise, and taking away all the initiative and enterprise from individuals.

He says that money will be withheld from the community. That is not so. It will be spent to benefit the community in development projects in the next year or two, and we desperately need those funds. We cannot afford to borrow large sums and, if we can put aside

money now, so much the better. Once again, I am distressed that he forgets that the money which he says is being withheld from the community is money that belongs to the community, to the taxpayers, and that is what the taxpayers of South Australia knew when they voted the A.L.P. out of office. This whingeing Jeremiah is trying desperately to defend his position. He has denigrated anything that looks like being to the advantage of South Australia. He has been proved wrong before. Figures will speak, and they are speaking in the Supplementary Estimates and in the way in which the Budget is shaping up toward the end of the financial year.

I pay a tribute to the people the Leader has denigrated by implication, the members of the Public Service. They have risen to the occasion admirably, and I am proud indeed of the way in which they have responded to the present Government's call for controls of expenditure and of unnecessary spending.

Just as the Leader quotes from the staff of Uniroyal, denigrating the G.M.H. proposal, I must say that I do not know to what staff member of Uniroyal he has spoken. I have been speaking to the Chairman of the company and I imagine that he would be in the best position to know what the company was going to do. The Leader has not spoken to the Chairman. He has not wanted to speak to the Chairman, because it does not suit him; it does not fit his prophecy of doom. I believe that the people of South Australia will judge, and that our record will stand up. I repeat that the figures speak better than anything else, as they do now. It is apparent that the Leader has little understanding of the budgetary situation. If he had had any understanding at all, he would not have made such foolish remarks.

What is more to the point, I should like to ask him why he does not admit that we, as a Government, are beginning to do what the former Government was totally unable to do: we have been able to make savings and at the same time reduce taxation. Why does not the Leader get behind South Australia? That is what all South Australians are asking. It is up to the Leader as to what his reputation will be with the people of South Australia from here on. He can, if he wishes, continue in his carping Jeremiah fashion. He will earn no credit at all. I suggest that the sooner he joins with the bulk of South Australians and gets behind the effort currently being made to restore confidence, to inject capital, and to create jobs, the sooner this State will get back on its feet.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I move:

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

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I move:

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

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question should not have been put. The Leader should have been given the opportunity to rise before the taking of the vote. With the concurrence of the House, I rule that the vote was not taken, and I call upon the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I suggest that, after listening to the contribution made by the Premier, if I were the member for Newland, the member for Henley Beach, or the member for Todd, sitting on the margins that they have, I would be somewhat concerned about my future as a Parliamentarian.

Returning to the subject of this debate, the Premier, in

fact, has spent some considerable time over the last week or so attempting to paint a picture of the Opposition and, in particular, myself being intent upon knocking the State and undermining confidence. As was so appropriately interjected at another stage by the member for Ascot Park, it is a real case of the poacher turned gamekeeper. However, I shall deal with that shortly. In one sense it is a compliment to the Opposition that what we are saying is having some impact on the Government; it is beginning to affect Government members and it is beginning to hurt them. Indeed, if it results in the Government modifying its approach and changing its policies, something will have been achieved for the community of South Australia. However, if, as I suspect, the Government simply becomes more obdurate and more determined and seeks refuge in the kinds of abuse to which it is attempting to subject Opposition members, then I am afraid that that does not bode well for the State of South Australia.

One of the tactics used at present by the Premier in attempting to discredit and attack the Opposition's realistic appraisal of the economic situation in South Australia has been to say that statements we have made are based on untruths or that they have been twisted or distorted. The Premier has accused me of saying things about him that he has never said. A classic example of this occurred during an interchange in this House when I referred to his promise to create 10 000 jobs during the life of this Parliament. The Premier replied quite clearly across the Chamber, "Oh, no, I didn't." In fact, he is on the public record; the words are his, not mine. In the *Advertiser* of December 1979 (I do not have the precise quotation in front of me at the moment) that particular figure was announced by the Premier as being his intention, and he also said that this was an improvement on his election promise of 7 000 jobs. These words are his, not mine, and in raising them again and reminding people of them, it is not our intention to misrepresent what the Premier said, but to remind people clearly of his record and what his promises were, to enable them to measure that record against those promises.

The Premier has repeated again and again this suggestion that in some way we in the Opposition said that the Government faced a \$40 000 000 deficit in this financial year. I have dealt with this matter adequately on another occasion, but he still persists in saying it. The \$40 000 000 figure comes from a document of his own. It was his figure; it referred to the 1980-81 financial year, and we simply publicised the fact that he had said it. For him constantly to deny it, and to suggest that we misrepresented the position is totally wrong, but I am afraid his technique of doing this is one that we are being bedevilled with quite constantly at the moment.

Admittedly, in politics there is much give and take; there is a lot of rhetoric used; there is a lot of use of figures in a way that will most favourably present the other person's case. I do not deny that occasionally every politician, including myself, is sometimes guilty of that kind of glossing of figures in the course of debate or whatever. I hope I am honest enough to admit that, and to be corrected on those occasions when it happens. However, I think the Premier is going beyond the bounds of normal political give and take in the way he is attempting to misrepresent the Opposition's opinion, and to fudge what he himself has said.

I shall take another example. The other day the Premier denied that he had ever said that State charges would rise. He said that this was a ridiculous claim made by me and that he had never contemplated a sales tax. He said again that it was a ridiculous claim that had been invented by me for political purposes. Let me refresh his memory. The

*Advertiser* of 8 December reported as follows:

State charges were almost certain to rise as a result of the Premiers' Conference.

Those words were said by the Premier; it is there in the record in black and white. He then immediately tried to shift any blame on to South Australian wage earners. He went on to say:

Any increase in wages in South Australia from now on will have to be passed on to the consumer through increased State charges.

They are the Premier's words, not mine; he said it. Incidentally, he ignored the fact on that occasion that he had budgeted for an increase in wages in his own State Budget. There was no need for him to pass increases in wages on to consumers because his Budget included \$55 000 000 to cover the eventuality of wage increases during this financial year. So that was a misrepresentation in itself. But the references to State charges having to rise were his, not mine.

On 1 February, again in the *Advertiser*, we see the heading "Charges will go up—Tonkin". That is a quote from the Premier. That is the public record, which the Premier thinks I have trumped up and invented. It is a pity he is not in the Chamber at the moment to listen to my remarks. The Premier has specified increases in transport fares and Government charges, water rates, electricity charges, sewerage charges—the whole range of Government services. Is it any wonder that we on this side of the House, faced with those statements made publicly and clearly by the Premier on at least two occasions, referred to it as a mini Budget? After all, at the State level, there is very little difference between a tax and a charge. If one does not collect revenue through taxes, one collects it through charges for State services, and there is no need to put a gloss on that—the two amount to the same thing. Any Premier, advising us that these charges would have to go up as a result of the Premiers' Conference in December, we believed could be fairly told that he was talking about a mini Budget. That is precisely what they said. The Premier makes much of the fact that those increases have not occurred to date, and I am very pleased that they have not occurred.

One of our purposes in raising the issue and reminding people of this was to put the maximum pressure on the Government to reconsider any decisions about State charges. Taking transport, for example, we believe it is very important that the use of public transport should be encouraged; that it is proper for the public to subsidise public transport in order to keep the fares at the level which will ensure that the maximum use is made of public transport. In relation to water rates, electricity charges and sewerage charges, we believe that it is important that those rates be kept at a minimum. The reason for that is simple, in industrial terms, namely, to maintain cost advantages which are so essential to South Australian industry. Therefore, we are very pleased that those charges have not risen, but I do not think the Premier can take too much credit for not having increased them. They were not increased because of the publicity given to this matter by the Opposition in the context of the Norwood by-election. The Premier knew that it would be politically disastrous to raise charges at that time, and so he deferred the proposed increases, and he has not trundled them out since.

The Premier denies ever having contemplated a sales turnover tax. It was reported on the front page of the *Adelaide News* of 22 January 1980 in a headline that could not have been much bigger: "Budget troubles hit shoppers—new South Australian sales tax tip". The story said that sources close to the Government had considered

this as the most favoured option to make up the expected shortfall in the 1980-81 financial year, and confirmed that the Premier had indicated that a sales turnover tax was one solution to the Government's problems that had arisen from the bad deal given to the States at the Premiers' Conference. The Premier mentioned this, and he was reported in the *Advertiser* in December as referring to a sales tax and also in the *News* of 22 January. Further, when the Premier was in London, addressing a group of London business men, he made some complimentary remarks about the value-added tax that they apply in that country, and he suggested that this could be some solution to the State's financial problems.

The Premier raised these issues; I did not. We have heard him talking about the \$30 000 000 that he has saved this year in the Budget. I am not decrying the saving of Government moneys or the proper use of taxpayers' money. Money collected from taxpayers is a trust that Government holds on behalf of the community. It is paid to the Government in return for services of the highest efficiency and of the most value to the community, and that is what any Government should seek to achieve.

However, one must look at the source of savings in any particular year. I have developed the theme that there is now a need for an injection of money into the economy. If the Government has the capacity to inject that money, that is a responsible action on behalf of taxpayers in our community. After all, the taxpayers do not belong to only the private sector; taxpayers include many people (a quarter of the State's work force) in the public sector. These people pay taxes, they expect work, and they expect some return for their payment of taxation money. It is fair to make the point, in the context of a Budget surplus, that, because of South Australia's present unemployment situation, some of that money could responsibly be used to stimulate the economy. Little waste and mismanagement was found by the Premier (a mere \$2 000 000, if his Budget is to be believed; that is 2 per cent of the total Budget). The Premier denies that his statements about public sector waste and mismanagement are an indictment of the public servants who manage these schemes; he has made some amazing claims. There has been a campaign to denigrate those employed in the public sector. People should be under no illusion about that or any disclaimers made by the Premier about his attitude to public servants. The campaign to denigrate the public sector amounted to cheap political point scoring, in my view.

Yesterday, we saw a further example of a significant new development (to use the Premier's words). Within a few hours, we found that the scheme would involve 50 jobs and an investment of \$8 000 000. Well, that is significant enough, and reasonably impressive, but what the Premier did not say, and what he has been hastily trying to decry, is that there will be a direct employment effect created in another sector of the economy because of the development at G.M.H. Two aspects are involved: first, the work that will be done at this plant is already being done in South Australia. Those employees engaged on it will not be doing that work. The Premier stated that Uniroyal knew about the situation and allowed for the fact that it would run down its automotive components section. Why did not the Premier tell us that yesterday? The Premier chose to keep quiet about that fact, if he knew it; he was less than honest with the public in announcing that significant new development (as he described it).

Secondly, who will fill these new jobs? It would appear that the 50 new jobs will not be 50 additional jobs at G.M.H. but will result from wastage and retrenchment in other areas. It has been made clear that the plastic componentry that will be produced at the plant will

replace metal componentry presently produced by G.M.H. at the Elizabeth plant; the workers who presently make metal components will no longer have jobs. These workers will have to go somewhere else. My deputy will deal with that aspect and the precise effects in greater detail. The Premier has every right to make these announcements and to say that this investment is a good thing because some capital will be injected and jobs will be created, but he has no right to mislead the public and the work force into thinking that this investment represents an aggregation of employment—no right whatsoever.

The Premier also stated that there had been a large number of investment projects in recent years; I repeat that there has not been much evidence of anything new since the Government came into office. However, let us hope that there is; the Opposition would welcome this if it came about. The Premier cited two specific projects: one referred to Adelaide Brighton Cement, which involves the commissioning of a vessel to increase the ability to produce for export. That project was on the drawing boards long before the change of Government. The other project cited by the Premier was a \$17 000 000 investment being conducted by Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers, which will establish a new sulphuric acid plant. The Premier claims credit for that as an example of the confidence that has been created in South Australia by his Government. That is the Premier's claim.

What are the facts? I examined the annual report of the Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers, which was lodged in the Stock Exchange on 31 January 1979, more than 12 months ago; under the heading "Redevelopment" it is stated:

During the year detailed planning proceeded with the object of increasing the operating efficiency of the company's Adelaide based works activities. . . The first stage will involve the construction of a new sulphuric acid plant at Port Adelaide to replace the obsolete plant at Largs North, and will be followed by the modernisation of the fertiliser manufacture, storage and despatch facilities.

This annual report was for the accounting period ended 30 September 1978. So, clearly the investment was planned and committed months before the change of Government, at a time when the present Premier stated that no-one wanted to invest in South Australia. The Premier is now claiming credit for that investment. That is quite dishonest, and it should not be allowed to continue.

The Premier stated publicly in this House that this investment is a symbol of the confidence in his Government; in no way is this project a symbol of confidence in his Government, because the project was conceived, developed and committed in the time of the previous Administration. I would not make a big deal about this if it had not been for the way in which the Premier chose to treat the matter. We have had discussions on the economy, on employment, and on the upturns that the Premier claims are taking place in the building industry at a time when the industry itself is describing its situation as critical. Certainly, there was a recent upturn in building approvals, we do not deny that, but we are still well below the levels for April, May, June, July, August and September of last year—all months in which a Labor Government was in office in this State. The Premier should not be allowed to forget that.

The Premier says that the private sector is now more confident than it has been for many years. Where is his evidence for that? His evidence is certainly not the Chamber of Manufactures' survey of private sector employment, which has fallen by 400 jobs in the past six months, a total of about 5 000, if one compares this figure with the equivalent seasonal period of the previous year.

The Premier has now come up with a defence of the parlous situation in relation to unemployment. He states that South Australia's share of unemployment is low; it is the discovery of some new economic indicator. It is interesting that, in describing the situation, the Premier used Commonwealth Employment Service figures, yet, on 26 March, he told the House that C.E.S. figures were quite unreliable and should not be used. However, it suits the Premier's purpose to use those figures now. In the way in which he uses those figures, he ignores seasonal variations, which are quite crucial in any examination of figures of unemployment, because of seasonal patterns of employment, which are pronounced in all States, particularly in Queensland. Seasonal adjustment or comparison on a 12-month basis are the only ways in which one can make a realistic comparison of such figures. The Premier chose to use these figures in a way that suited him—selectively.

I do not know whether the Premier can be convinced about the unemployment problem in South Australia, but I hope that his private discussions and conferences with his advisers are more realistic than he has stated in public. Other examples of the Premier's techniques have been seen. In this situation, I suggest that he is using tactics to create some sort of smoke screen to get over the criticism, which he must now be receiving quite intensely from those who supported him at the last election, because he has not brought about the improvements he promised.

I will finish on this important point, on which I am under most attack at present from the Premier and those on his side. I refer to the question of knocking South Australia. For two years, we had the spectacle of the then Leader of the Opposition peddling doom, maligning this State, making scandalous statements here and in other States, and attacking what was happening in South Australia. Now, when I talk realistically, but I hope positively, about our economy, he is accusing me of doing exactly what he did. I will not do what he did, and I am not doing it. I rejected it at the time in Government, as we all did, and I think that it should be rejected now that we are in Opposition. However, in Government the Premier's style has unfortunately tended to be the same.

I will give two major examples. A speech made by the Premier, similar to speeches he has made to Chambers of Commerce in Sydney and Melbourne, was made to the London Chamber of Commerce on Wednesday 9 April 1980. It is a sort of unwritten rule in politics that, when one enters the international stage, one tries to leave behind the more petty or parochial political points that one may be making domestically for domestic consumption. In other words, if the Prime Minister is in New York, Rhodesia, Zimbabwe, or anywhere else, whatever differences there may be between him and the Opposition in Australia, he presents himself as a representative of Australia and tries to ensure, as much as possible, that he is speaking on behalf of a bipartisan view of Australian attitudes.

I imagine that, to an extent, the present Prime Minister of Australia has followed this convention. Certainly, Prime Minister Whitlam did so. In the face of quite major differences in Australian society, his public statements internationally were quite impeccable. It is a kind of unwritten convention that one makes positive points in defence of what one is doing but one does not take time off to score points against one's opposition. I say that to set this speech in context. This was the first major overseas address given by our new Premier and was given to a group of London businessmen at the London Chamber of Commerce on 9 April 1980. This is the kind of thing he was saying:

The downturn in my own State of South Australia was

more intense and more prolonged than elsewhere in Australia.

That is not true, but nonetheless he said it. He went on:

Our performance was poorer, our confidence was lower and our prospects were dimmer, because throughout the decade South Australia was ruled by a State Government committed to collectivist doctrines. It was a Government which defined progress solely in terms of high taxation, radical legislation, and public sector expansion. It was a Government which actively discouraged private enterprise by creating reams of unnecessary and obtrusive red tape. In some cases it established Government corporations to compete openly with its own citizens.

As a consequence, not only did many people, many businesses and much capital leave South Australia for greener pastures interstate, but prospective new businesses steered well clear of South Australia. There began a serious and substantial decline in business confidence which was to last throughout the entire decade of the socialist experiment.

So it goes on. If that is how our Premier comports himself internationally, if he believes that it is his duty to take his ideological differences overseas and traduce a Government that managed this State well for 10 years, I do not want to know much about him as Premier. He is harming our democratic procedures, because, when the Government changes in this State, as I hope it will in the not too distant future, he has created in London an atmosphere that suggests some sort of fear and loathing of the Labor Party and its policies. This extravagant language sits poorly on a Premier of South Australia who is attempting to sell and develop this State overseas. It is not good enough. It is counter productive, as my colleagues say, and, if that is the sort of thing we are going to get internationally, all the Premier's accusations against me about being a knocker must sound absolutely and totally hollow. I would not be guilty of saying overseas things about his Government, much as I dislike its policies, as he can so airily and dishonestly say about the previous Administration in this State.

The Premier is the man who is saying that I am a knocker, and he is peddling that sort of stuff overseas. It is quite outrageous. I will give one final example of what I would call his knocking and overweening approach, his thrusting of ideology down the throats of people in a way that eventually will be unacceptable in South Australia. It is a minor example, but it is a good tip of the iceberg.

Every year a register of business and commerce in this State is produced. It contains a full list of all the businesses and is a useful and widely circulated document, produced by a private company under the name of the Register of Industry and Commerce. Each year the Premier is asked to write a foreword, to give a message, which the company places at the beginning of this widely circulated index of business and commerce. Premier Dunstan submitted such messages each year when he was in office and, in 1980, fittingly, there is a message from David Tonkin, M.P. However, if one reads the text of this message, as a South Australian, one should be appalled at the blatant politicking that is a misuse of the Premier's rights to represent this State to business men and others here and in other States where this directory circulates. The first three paragraphs of the message state:

South Australia is under new management. Saturday September 15 1979 was a most significant day, one which won't easily be forgotten. The Liberal Party—

this is the Premier, writing on behalf of the Government of South Australia and our State—

with the active support of employer organisations, removed from office a Labor Government which had been largely responsible for the decline of South Australia's

economy during the last decade. It was the employers as much as anyone, who felt the brunt of the anti-business policies which previous administrations had foisted on them. No wonder our economy suffered.

He goes on. I felt that that was an outrageous contribution, but I thought that perhaps the nature of this publication was to be so political. I therefore checked back to some of the contributions made by Don Dunstan in previous years. They were very different in tone, nature and spirit, so I wrote to the Editor of the journal and said that, although I found his publication valuable, I was disappointed to find that a publication that played such an important role in promoting the State had allowed itself to be used by the Premier as a vehicle for Party-political propaganda. I made my protest, I felt, reasonably. I referred to previous contributions and compared them to the Premier's, which was almost a direct reprint of his election policy speech. This week I received from the Editor a reply, which I will read to the House and on which note I will conclude:

We understand your displeasure in the printing by us of the style of the "Foreword" supplied to us by the Premier, Mr. Tonkin. Believe us when we say that this was inadvertent. The writer was interstate (for some time) when the material was received and sent on to production. Unwittingly, this article was then printed in full, although the length was more than double that requested, and the heavy political bias out of character with previous submissions by the office of the Premier. You may rest assured that in our next edition the "Foreword" will be under the strictest scrutiny of a responsible officer of this journal.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide):** In finishing on that note, my Leader has left me happy indeed. I want to speak about the Public Buildings Department in South Australia. For a short time, I had the opportunity to be the Minister in charge of that area and was able to meet most officers. I think I met practically all the senior ones, and I was able to do thorough inspections throughout the service in this arm of Government. I believe that it was a great organisation. It was well managed, and in my view it was doing a tremendous job for South Australia in attending to its many duties.

I also found, on inspections throughout the workshops, a high standard of workmanship. I refer particularly to the employees of the department who are responsible for making the furniture at Netley. I noticed that some of that furniture is now in certain offices in Parliament House, and I believe that it is of an extremely high standard. I also visited the Demac unit which was owned privately by the Government. It was virtually constructed by the Government, initiated by it, and served the State exceedingly well for five or six years in have buildings constructed on site and built all throughout the State. We see them now at schools and other buildings.

I believe, for those reasons, that this was a most important arm of Government which was doing a tremendous task, as required by Government, with the money available to it. It was recommended to me that there ought to be an internal review into the public buildings area, mainly because of the down-turn in the economy and a population non-growth at that stage, when schools were not going to be required, and to ascertain what would be the future of the public buildings over the next seven to 10 years. That was a recommendation from officers of the department and, having considered the matter, I thought that it was a proper thing to do.

Members who were in the House at that stage will recall that I initiated an internal review into the department in order to make some plans and recommendations for the

Government, and a very competent and able committee was appointed to undertake that review. The committee had commenced its operations only a few weeks before the election took place, under terms of reference laid down by the then Labor Government. Immediately (and this is my grave concern about this instrument and arm of Government) the new Government took office, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who was placed in charge of the department, with a portfolio similar to the one that I had had, changed the terms of reference under which the committee had to undertake its task and the membership of the committee, by adding to it someone from private enterprise.

There was tremendous pressure on the former Government to add someone from the private sector to this review committee. However, I took the view at that stage (and I have not changed it) that there was no need for anyone from the private sector to make recommendations to or instructing the Government on what it ought to do with its own work force, buildings and construction areas. That was resisted strongly. I place on record the new terms of reference that were laid down by the new Government for this inquiry. The first term states:

That steps be taken to reduce the scale of activities of the Public Buildings Department to enable as much as possible of its work to be undertaken in the private sector.

That, clearly, is taking away from Government employees the work which had rightly been theirs and which had been built up over a long time, and passing it directly over to the private sector. The second term of reference stated that the Construction Division be reduced to a force of about 100. That term coincides with the first term, whereby most of this work was to be passed over to the private sector. The third term states:

That Demac production cease as soon as possible.

We have already seen advertisements in the press in which the Minister of Industrial Affairs has called for bidders to buy the Demac operation from the Government. Between 300 and 400 workmen will be affected in that area. The fourth term states:

That cyclical and programmed maintenance work suitable to be done by contract be undertaken by contract as soon as possible.

That is a wide term: that is practically passing all of the maintenance work as well over to private enterprise. Not only was this Government wanting to pass over the construction work (having said that it wanted to reduce the construction area to a work force of 100 from about 500) but also it wanted to ensure that any maintenance work would be passed over to the private sector. The fifth new term of reference, which is a wide one, states:

That furniture manufacture, and other manufacturing activity, cease as soon as possible.

That was in October 1979, so it is hardly surprising that these decisions are repeated among the committee's recommendations. The result of that inquiry, when it was announced by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, was completely consistent with those terms of reference. Could it have been any other way? In setting down terms like those, I believe that the Government was making it positively clear that the department had to go. All of this work had to go back to private enterprise. We have seen what has happened in that area.

For the first time in 10 years, we have seen two 24-hour stoppages in protest at the Government's decision about wanting to take this work away and give it to private enterprise, and about the proposed secondment which, so far, the Government has not been able to initiate or with which it has not been able to make much progress. We have seen for the first time a 24-hour stoppage in this

State, of which, I believe, the Government and the Minister ought to be completely ashamed. It should be ashamed that actions taken by a Government should cause such a large-scale stoppage, involving many people throughout the Public Service area. The Government was fortunate that the whole Public Service did not go out; it was a close vote.

I warn the Government that the more it interferes and meddles in this area the greater difficulty it will get into with the trade union movement and the work force of this State. The second stoppage, which was necessitated a few weeks ago, was over the attempted implementation of the report in the department. Wherever I go and talk to public servants or to those lower down the work scale (blue-collar workers, shall I call them for want of a better description), the complaints coming to me are almost unbelievable. No-one in the Public Service has a good word for this Government, and that will continue. There is no question that the morale is low (and the Minister of Health can smile, but in her department as well the morale is at an all-time low) in every facet of Government. If the Minister, and any other Minister, do not know that they have created this situation in South Australia at present, they are not keeping in touch with their departments. It is about time that they talked to the work force and created a situation where it would be possible for them to communicate with their employees, rather than stay away from them.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Keneally):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr. LEWIS (Mallee):** Fortunately, or unfortunately (I do not know which), I have never had the misfortune to hear such a batch of drivel as I have heard during the past 30 or 40 minutes. It seems to me that the Opposition does not understand, has never understood, and will never understand how to manage the State's economy, or to realise what is needed in Government.

On the front page of the *Advertiser* about 11 weeks ago we witnessed one of the most disgraceful character assassinations that has ever taken place in South Australia for some time, in politics or out of it. I refer to the conclusions of the Australian Labor Party's "committee of inquiry", that infamous announcement into its massive defeat at the polls last September that sought to make a scapegoat of the former Premier, the member for Hartley. Leaving aside the myopia of the A.L.P., which is obvious from its inability to understand the reasons why it suffered such a massive rejection, it is a sad comment on the political and, I dare say, personal morality of the members of that committee that they were seeking to crucify the honourable member for their collective incapacities.

Here we see a person who at one time at least enjoyed the confidence of a majority of the A.L.P. Caucus made a pariah for a decision, however poor in retrospect, which could not possibly have been made by him (to quote the report) "unilaterally". The member for Hartley, having sacrificed his family life and health for the A.L.P., both in and out of Government, has been lumbered with the humiliation of being made to publicly bear the blame for the failures of his colleagues both in and out of this House. One can only presume that this is part of an incomplete hatchet job on the member for Hartley to try to force him to resign so that some other bright young thing can be offered a sinecure in return for toeing the socialist left line when the time comes.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. LEWIS:** Honourable members opposite may well laugh; that exactly reflects the ineptitude to which I referred at the outset of my remarks. The fact of the

matter is, of course, that the A.L.P. did not lose the election last September because of some imagined failing of the then Premier, but because the public of South Australia realised just how dangerous the lunatic policies of the kamakaze left (who now control the A.L.P.) really are. If Mr. Corcoran had enjoyed the loyalty he was entitled to, and been perceived as such by the electorate, the election result may have been somewhat different. Instead, of course, he was being white-anted from within and behind, and now the same people who were doing that white-anting (and, by continuing to interject, they are attempting to do likewise to me) are seeking to shift the blame for their overwhelming defeat on to the very person who over the years so unselfishly served his Party.

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Two, four, six, eight, 10, 12, 14, 15—there not being a quorum present, ring the bells.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Mr. Acting Speaker, there is a quorum present. I object, there are 16 members present.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Two, four, six, eight, 10, 14, 16. There is a quorum present.

**Mr. LEWIS:** In fact, this so-called "committee of inquiry (the inquisitors) and its membership, is being totally dishonest with the membership of the A.L.P. and with the public of South Australia, by trying to represent not only the former Premier, but any Premier, as having the power in the first instance to make any such unilateral decisions of this nature. As the Opposition well knows (only too well, since they came to this collective decision last August) a decision to dissolve a Government and to call a general election can only be made by the Governor, acting on the advice of Executive Council. In other words, the whole Cabinet participated in the decision that was attributed solely to the former Premier. That included both the member for Ross Smith, and the member for Adelaide who, according to the *Advertiser*, participated in the so-called committee of inquiry which has released these vicious meretricious conclusions.

It is a thorough disgrace that any member of this House should be treated in such a reprehensible manner by any other member of this House, much less by members of his own Party. The only thing that could possibly be said (and I am not in a position to judge the veracity of such a statement) is that the former Premier decided that he wanted an election, and the rest of the then Cabinet (one of whom is now Leader) were too weak-kneed to dissuade him.

Indeed, we have the personal statement of the member for Hartley, issued to the media, to this effect. Given that this inquisitors' committee has already tried to mislead the South Australian public as to the nature of the office of Premier, I am sure that the words of an honourable man will carry more weight with the public than this despicable attempt by what a past President of the Federal A.L.P. has described as a "phone-box minority" to whitewash themselves in the public's eyes by maligning one of their own colleagues. They have done it before.

It is a sad fact that we can probably expect (if this kind of disgraceful behaviour continues), Federal intervention in the South Australian branch of the A.L.P.; and one is tempted to wonder whether it was in fact this consideration that prompted the South Australian delegates to the Federal Executive of the A.L.P. to oppose Federal intervention in the corrupt, incompetent Queensland branch of the A.L.P. I will bet they are running scared. One wonders how this attempt to smear the member for Hartley, who in the past has represented many of the people whom I now represent and on whose behalf I speak, fits in with the wider machinations of the

power struggle that is presently going on within the A.L.P. across this nation.

We all know, of course, and we have the word of the former Premier on this matter—that at least one of the reasons for the calling of an early election last year was the impending publication of the book *It's Grossly Improper*, and the revelations and allegations contained in that book. About the only hard comment one can make about those revelations, or allegations—call them what you will—is that, despite the continued insistence of various members of the Opposition that, if the revelations or allegations contained in that book are untrue, the appropriate response (libel action through the Supreme Court) has not been forthcoming. We can thus draw our own conclusions, not only as to the nature of the allegations or revelations, but also as to the impact of them on any decision to hold an early election.

I make these points in order to relieve the misapprehensions from which the rank and file of the A.L.P. and the general public may be suffering. The Leader and Deputy Leader, together with their several other co-conspirators, have speciously tried to foist these outrageous untruths upon them. Shame! That is no way to treat a man of such outstanding service to his Party as a member of this Parliament for such misdemeanours as he has never committed.

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

**Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I did not intend to answer the repeated attacks made by the members for Fisher and Henley Beach, and I believe the name for the member for Henley Beach amongst the trade union movement is "scab". However, I would like to reflect on some of the things said by the member for Fisher last night in relation to the trade union movement. I know I am quoting the member for Fisher out of context, but he said, "These organisations have compulsory membership"—he was talking about the trade union movement. I was somewhat surprised to hear those comments coming from the member for Fisher, who is now a member of the Government. One would have thought that if the Government was really against the compulsory membership of any organisation it would put its own house in order. However, the Minister of Transport has been very reluctant to answer a question I placed on the Notice Paper about three months ago about the fact that State Transport Authority members are compelled to join the State Transport Authority Employees Club.

The objects of that club (and I hasten to suggest that they sound very similar to some of the objects of the trade union movement) are to promote good fellowship amongst employees; to operate a retiring allowance fund for the benefit of members; and to promote sporting clubs. Membership of the club is applicable to employees who are over 18 years of age. Subscriptions are reasonably cheap, as they are for membership of the trade union movement. Retiring and death benefits are also available, along with membership with associated clubs.

**Mr. Keneally:** Compulsory membership?

**Mr. HAMILTON:** Yes. The Minister of Transport's reply dated 3 June 1980 was as follows:

The State Transport Authority provides facilities for the sporting, recreational and leisure activities of its employees and the Employees' Club operates and maintains these facilities. The authority assists the club financially to conduct these activities . . . Because the benefits provided by the club are available to all employees, the authority considers it essential that all should be members. Consequently, it is in agreement with the club's constitution which requires all



employees to be members.

We are talking of compulsion on the one hand by the Government, and on the other hand, Government members talk about compulsory unionism. Government members should forget their hypocrisy and sort out their own instrumentalities before they come here and talk about the trade union movement.

*Mr. Randall interjecting:*

**Mr. HAMILTON:** I am not going to be put off by the member for Henley Beach, because I want to come back to the hypocrisy of the Government and refer to some of the dangerous practices it has been involved in relating to public transport. Members opposite would know that I know what I am talking about. I refer now to an article that appeared in the *Clarion* on Wednesday 28 May relating to overcrowding on public transport, something the Minister has been reluctant to make public statements about, even though I have asked him to go on radio and confirm or deny what I have put forward.

For some time railway employees have telephoned me at home and have come to my house to inform me about overcrowding on public transport. The Minister is well acquainted with what has been taking place, as is evidenced by the fact that a committee has been set up as a result of pressure applied by railway employees. The article in the *Clarion* stated:

"Last Saturday there were 18 000 people at Alberton Oval and a further 9 000 at Cheltenham Racecourse," Mr. Hamilton said. "This created intolerable conditions."

That was a total of 27 000 people at two fixtures on that weekend, yet only three cars were provided by the State Transport Authority to carry patrons away from those fixtures. When this was brought to the attention of Mr. Frank Harris, General Manager of the State Transport Authority, he said it was impossible to predict the number of people going to these functions. What a load of hogwash! All the General Manager of the State Transport Authority had to do was to direct one of his officers to liaise with the sporting clubs to find out at half-time or some appropriate time how many patrons were attending those functions. Contrary to what the Minister is saying (that he wants people on public transport), because of his penny-pinching exercises, he will not book employees on Saturdays or provide stand-by crews. He will not provide cars, which are standing idle at the diesel depot, for public transport for people in South Australia. Yet the Government talks about conservation of fuel and cheap energy.

Last Tuesday an employee of the S.T.A. came to my house and asked me to look at a document that comes from within the authority. That document states that it is the intention of the Minister to increase peak period fares to drive people away from public transport, because the S.T.A. does not have sufficient cars for morning and afternoon peak periods to provide for the travelling public in South Australia. That applies to the rail division.

Another matter that concerns me is that the Government contemplated sending some of these cars to Victoria, but that had to be kept under the lap. I have that here in writing. What concerns me in relation to this overcrowding of public transport is that the Government would have known (and this was recognised by the previous Government) about the problems associated with increased patronage, yet it now says that it was not aware of these facts. That is not so; it was known in 1978 that there would be an increase in patronage. It concerns me that the Minister has apparently overridden a recommendation made by the S.T.A. that the 860-class railcars that are in a dangerous condition should be withdrawn from traffic. He has said that they should be put back in traffic

to provide for bicycles, etc. I quote from the document, which states:

Some of these cars have now reached the stage where they can no longer be used because they have reached condemning limits. Wheel flanges, for example, have reached the condemning limit on some cars and further use in traffic will sooner or later result in a derailment with possible loss of life. For this reason, Car No. 862 is being withdrawn from service on 31 March and three cars . . .

The report then quotes the numbers of the cars to be withdrawn. The report continued, later:

Following a discussion with the Minister on the question of the carriage of bicycles, the following steps were taken:

The 860-class trailer cars, which have a reasonably large baggage compartment, were restored to train consists to avoid problems with bicycles. This required the rostering of collectors who had previously been taken off the trains because of the reduced consists.

This document purports to be true and claims to be a working document of the S.T.A. If this document is correct, the people of South Australia are entitled to know the exact position. I would like the Minister to confirm or deny whether people are travelling on dangerous public transport. In addition, will he increase fares in order to drive people off public transport in South Australia? If that is the case, he is worthy of condemnation by this House.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** This afternoon we were treated to the spectacle of a Minister of the Government endeavouring to extricate himself from a position that no Minister ought to place himself in. I am referring to the occasion during today's Question Time when, by way of what all members would know was a Dorothy Dixer (and I have no quarrel with that aspect of the matter) from the member for Hanson—

**Mr. BECKER:** On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable member referred to the question I asked the Minister of Water Resources this afternoon as a Dorothy Dixer. As you, Sir, and members on this side of the House would know, it was not a Dorothy Dixer. I deny the allegation and ask for it to be withdrawn.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I cannot uphold the point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I cannot hear the member for Mitchell. He is entitled to be heard in silence.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I understand that all members have witnessed similar outbursts from the honourable member you have just castigated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I am certain they paid no attention whatever to the honourable member's claim. The position is that a question was asked of the Minister of Water Resources in an endeavour to enable him to extricate himself from a position he had got himself into, and it is not one in which any Minister should find himself. I will elaborate, for the benefit of the honourable member opposite. If he wants to maintain that his question was not a Dorothy Dixer, he is entitled to do so. I will place the facts before the House and let members judge for themselves what the real situation is.

All members would know that, over a long period of time, there was a vexed question in this State known by the short title of shack policy. The shack policy from time to time raised its head on the public scene. Last year, on 27 August, as a result of action taken by the previous Premier, the job having been given to me as the then

Minister of Planning, we tried to bring some current policy into the area and I was able to make an announcement in relation to shacks generally throughout the State. Subsequently, the Liberal Party announced a policy very similar to that policy, with minor variations. The Liberal Party was elected at the last State election, and its policy subsequently came into being. On an earlier occasion since the Government came into office last year you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, asked the following question of the Minister of Lands on 7 November 1979:

Will the Minister of Lands say what is the Government's policy in relation to shack sites, particularly in areas previously classified as non-acceptable sites?

The reply, as recorded in *Hansard*, by the Hon. P. B. Arnold, was as follows:

On Monday last the Government determined its policy in relation to shack sites.

The Minister was speaking on 7 November, so I take it that he was referring to 5 November. The Minister goes on to compliment you, Sir, on your interest in the matter generally, and further stated:

The new policy retains the most acceptable aspects of the previous Government's policy, which was announced on 27 August, and also the very desirable aspects of what was contained in the then Opposition's policy as announced prior to the recent election. The honourable member is particularly concerned about non-acceptable shack sites, and he has asked where the Government's policy will leave those shack sites and owners. In cases where indefinite retention of the shacks may lead to public disadvantage in future, the present shack owners will be given various options.

The Minister then went on to specify a number of options, which I will not bore the House by repeating at this stage, except to say that they were in line with the same policy to which I have referred and which was mentioned as being in force during the election period last year. Subsequent to that date, on 27 November 1979, the Minister wrote to the chairmen of all councils and district councils throughout the State concerned with that matter, a copy of which letter was sent to the District Council of Willunga, in the following terms:

You are probably aware from recent publicity in the press that the Government has reviewed the policy relating to shack occupation on waterfront Crown lands and Crown reserves. A copy of the policy which has been adopted by the Government is attached.

The situation exists in the Willunga council area at Aldinga. The letter then says, "Your attention is drawn in particular to the following:". It then cites paragraph 4, which relates to the transfer, and paragraph 5, which states:

Those councils exercising direct tenure control of shack sites are expected to apply the new policy in a responsible manner, failing which control will be resumed by the Government.

There is no quibble about that. It is clear that the intention, in relation to the matter at Aldinga, is that the council is required to apply the new policy in a responsible manner, failing which control will be resumed by the Government. Yet, the Minister was suggesting something different in the House today. He said that there was never any intention that the policy would act in a retrospective manner, and he went on at some length to try to explain and, in effect, pervaricate out of the position which is clearly shown in the letter dated 27 November last year and which indicates what the Minister's intention was. The facsimile I have is signed "Peter B. Arnold, Minister of Lands". Another pertinent date is 19 December. If there is any argument as to what the Minister intended, certainly the Willunga council was under no misconception, as it

wrote to the Minister on 19 December in the following terms:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of 27 November 1979 advising the policy of the Government relating to shack occupation on waterfront Crown lands and Crown reserves. To now change the long-term arrangements for the shack sites made by the council, with the knowledge of your predecessors, would place the council in a most untenable and embarrassing position.

The council was under no misapprehension as to what the Minister wrote to them and what he now says was never intended. The letter continues:

You are therefore asked to not apply the new policy to those shack sites under the care and control of this council and permit the present arrangement to run its course.

We know what the present arrangements are; people have to be out of those shacks by 30 June this year. The Minister quite clearly, in the original policy, as I have demonstrated by using the Minister's own words in every case, indicated a different policy from that which he now claims was intended. That is not an honourable action by a Government or a Minister. I look to the Minister concerned—the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Lands—to do something about the problem that he has caused. The problem to which I am referring is that he has placed the Government and himself in a very parlous position with respect to the words of both himself and the Government of which he is a Minister.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** Tonight has been one of those nights when I wonder whether it is worth being a member of Parliament at all.

**Mr. Trainer:** And think about the Bench!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I had not thought of that tonight, but it does look attractive when I have to listen to the garbage I have heard from the members on both sides of the Chamber. I have never seen a more tedious waste of time than we have had on both sides. What makes it all the more tedious is that I have heard it all before. When the sides were reversed, Tonkin was saying what Bannon said tonight, and *vice versa*. If there is any way in which members of Parliament can discredit the institution of Parliament itself, it is by going on in the way in which we have gone on tonight, and I bet that it will go on for a few more hours yet.

**An honourable member:** You won't be here.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** No fear I won't: I certainly will not be wasting my time here. I agree with the member for Mitchell. There is no doubt about the shack issue; whether it is the Minister of Agriculture as the local member who has leant on his council, I do not know. There can be no doubt whatever that that shack policy was all-embracing and had no exceptions in it at all, and it applied to Aldinga as much as it applied to anything else. It is sheer weak dishonesty on the part of the Government and the Minister that they will not acknowledge that. There is no doubt about it: I have read the policy, I know the problem, and the member for Mitchell is entirely correct about it. Those shack owners, many of whom voted for the present Government because they thought they were going to get a better deal, have been betrayed. The Government may say that it does not matter a damn and it does not care, but that is the fact.

Let me come now to something the member for Albert Park said. I am against him on this. There is no doubt that the campaign by the blokes in the railways is to save their jobs. They are frightened that they will lose their jobs with the cut in services. They are going the right way to lose public sympathy if what I have heard is correct. I am interested, as honourable members know, in the carriage

of bikes on trains. I am a bike rider myself now, and people have been complaining to me about the carriage of bikes on trains. My daughter had a most unfortunate experience when she and a group of friends arranged some days previously that their bikes would be carried on a certain train on the Sunday. When they got to the Mitcham station to put the bikes on the train, the guard refused to let them on. They had telephoned that morning to confirm the arrangement, but they were not allowed on. The Minister knows about that, and also about another matter which I shall now mention.

A few weeks ago on a certain train on a Friday evening about 7 o'clock at the Goodwood station, two young lads of 10 or so wanted to put their bikes on the train, but there were three bikes on the train already and the guard refused. The lads were left there in the dark. There were only three bikes on the train, and they were not allowed to put their bloody bikes on.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I withdraw, absolutely, utterly, and unreservedly. That makes me very annoyed. If that is the heartless way in which railway employees, whether unionists or not, will go on to try to make their point to the S.T.A., they do not deserve to succeed. I mention this only because the member for Albert Park was bleating about rail services. I hope someone will tell him about this, and I am looking forward to a report from the Minister on what happened about it.

The problem I want to raise in the six minutes I have left is the concern of a Minister who is away in another country for the time being, the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Everyone knows that the petrol retailing industry is in turmoil and change, and there is a great deal of hardship. Many small business men whom the Liberals, so-called, on the other side prate about protecting and representing are suffering grievously because of what is going on, and that suffering could be alleviated if not avoided altogether if this Government would take some action.

I have here and I propose to read out a letter written by Mr. Clive Tonkin, of Southern Cross Petroleum, to the Minister on 6 March. He has not had a reply, and neither have I, although I followed it up on a couple of occasions. The letter states:

Dear Mr. Brown,

In January 1980 I wrote congratulating you upon your firm approach towards resolving the problems of selective discounting as practised by oil companies in the retailing of fuel.

He said it was a good warning, and he gave examples of how it was still going on. The letter continues:

In view of these actions by oil companies it would appear that they have no intention "to examine their approach to the setting of differential wholesale prices," and your Government must surely now be committed to act for the good of small businesses in this industry.

As of this day petrol can be purchased for 30.8c per litre at many sites, so I sincerely trust that your Government has not treated this matter as resolved to the satisfaction of petrol retailers, for nothing could be further from the truth.

He sent me a copy of the letter, and I wrote on 28 March asking whether he had a reply. The answer was that he had not. Mr. Tonkin wrote as follows:

Dear Robin,

In answer to your letter of 28 March I have not as yet had a written reply from Dean Brown to my letter relating to selective discounting and the oil companies' failure to heed the Government's warning of 17 January 1980.

On Monday 24 March a Martin Evans from Dean Brown's

department rang and advised that they had received my letter and agreed with the sentiments expressed therein but Dean had been unable to reply personally due to hassles over trading hours, Fauldings take-over bid, etc.

From the trend of the conversation I had the feeling that either Dean Brown didn't know quite how to back up his warning with action or else he had spoken without receiving the blessing of the Public Service.

The situation has now worsened since my letter to Dean Brown and currently fuel is being offered to Southern Cross sites at Gawler and Victor Harbor via Amoco agents at one cent per litre cheaper than the full buying power of the Southern Cross group.

He goes on about this, and then the letter continues:

Because of the Government's failure to act on their promise and because many resellers are in desperate trouble I would appreciate it if you could bring the matter to Dean Brown's attention.

And so I did. I wrote and asked what about it, and I got a reply back on 1 May, as follows:

It is anticipated that an equitable solution to this problem will soon be forthcoming.

No jolly reply yet! I wrote again on 28 May and asked what the solution was, but I have not had an acknowledgement of that. The real problem is that the Liberals in Canberra will not introduce legislation to give effect to the Fife package. Don Chipp introduced a Bill in the Senate last year, but that was stillborn. Despite repeated promises, and despite all the inquiries that have gone on, the Feds will not move on that matter, and they are being backed up by their henchmen in South Australia.

It is a crying shame that this Government, which has said so much about helping small business, will not take any action whatever to help, and now we have the Amoco problem, the putting up of rents, the service station on the Anzac Highway, and I have had only today a copy of a letter written by the Automobile Chamber of Commerce to Mr. Trevorrow, the State Manager of Amoco, whom I know of old—and not as a friend, I may say. I know that a copy of that has gone to the Government with a request that it take action. I can only hope that the Government will take some action and that, for once in the life of this Government, its actions will be matched to the promises made before the last election.

If there is anything which is beginning to characterise this Government, it is a lack of action and a breach of the promises made before the election. I know that this is a conservative Government and therefore it does not really want to make any changes, but as far as I can see it is doing absolutely nothing to justify its existence as a Government, and that will ensure that it has only one term of office.

**Mr. OSWALD (Morphett):** I should like briefly to give my thoughts on a few problems with hire-purchase agreements experienced by young people. I preface my remarks by saying quite clearly that I am not a lawyer and have no legal background, but I am concerned with a couple of aspects of hire-purchase. The ease with which young people can enter into hire-purchase agreements should concern us all. It is so easy now for a young couple to go to a hire-purchase company, to enter into an agreement, and to be signed up for an expensive motor car when they are probably living with parents, totally financially committed. The parents have to inherit the problems of the young couple, who go home to live with the in-laws, committed to the eyeballs with expense, and it is only a matter of time before we have social problems on our hands in that family, because obviously they cannot meet the hire-purchase commitments.

To get out of the agreement is extremely difficult. I know that an argument can be put on how people can be protected from people, but it is a matter of concern, and I think we should address ourselves to how difficult it is for young people, under pressure of a salesman in a salesyard, with a flash new motor car, when the girlfriend or the young wife is there to be impressed, and when members of the peer group have these vehicles. The young person signs a contract, and this is a worry to which I believe we should all address ourselves.

I would like to raise the matter of the plight of a resident in this State who got caught up in a hire purchase agreement at a time when a company went into receivership. This problem has come to my attention through a constituent, and I think it amply illustrates a couple of points which I believe the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs should look at seriously. I shall put forward an example that occurred as recently as March of this year; it concerns a secondhand motor vehicle industry. On this occasion a Mr. Terry Harrington purchased a motor vehicle from Bowden Ford. He traded in a vehicle under finance to Custom Credit. The payout figure to Custom Credit on the car he traded in was \$2 300. I believe the retail value of the car was in the vicinity of \$2 600. The credit union put up the \$2 300 to pay out the original car, and Mr. Harrington had to provide a further \$300. He delivered the car he was trading in to Bowden Ford with an arrangement that Bowdens would send a cheque to Custom Credit for \$2 300 to pay out the car.

Prior to 17 March this year, in good faith, Mr. Harrington had paid \$2 600 to Bowden Ford and delivered his car for trade-in. At the time of this transaction the relevant dealer's book was signed, and Mrs. Harrington was assured that Bowdens had sent a cheque for \$2 300 to Custom Credit and that the previous car had in fact been paid out. The Harrington's then took delivery of their new car. It now appears that Bowden Ford did not post the cheque before they went into receivership, and Consumer Affairs are powerless to act on their behalf. A.G.C., which stepped in as creditors of Bowden Ford, stopped all payment of company cheques, as is normal action when a receiver is appointed. The company under receivership then took back the car and immediately offered it for sale on the lot, which I believe is suspect anyway, and I understand that they have now seen the error of their ways and withdrawn it. However, I pose the question: what would have happened legally if that car had been sold, and whose property is it?

I believe there are several issues here that we should look into for the benefit of both the consumer and the dealer. There should be protection against those consumers or customers who trade in a vehicle when there is money owing to hire purchase companies. There should be protection for dealers who are not informed by the customer when he comes in that there is money outstanding to a hire-purchase firm. I am concerned about the ease with which a customer can hand over money and a car and be caught by a dealer who is in financial difficulties and who knows that a receivership is imminent. Also, I am concerned with the ease with which a dealer can be caught by a customer who trades in a car and who does not advise the dealer that a hire-purchase agreement exists on that vehicle. It can be seen quite clearly that there are problems that could arise when a dealer takes over a car with an outstanding payout value which is extremely high. The person trading in the car may then flit interstate and the dealer is caught. Therefore, it is a two-way objective here—one has to look at both sides of the coin.

I am also concerned with the question of whether the L.M.V.D. board should allow a company to continue to

hold its L.M.V.D. licence after a receiver has been appointed. Should we allow them to trade themselves out of trouble, or should we start looking at protection for those who may be caught during this interim time? I am also concerned about what protection there is for the Harringtons in this case, who have neither a car nor the \$2 300. I think we should show some human compassion for persons who are caught in the sandwich; people who went along in good faith and paid out the money. Also, I would like to know why the company should be permitted to continue to trade. In this particular case I am referring to Bowden Ford's Goodwood Road branch. Clearly, at the time of the receiver being appointed, it lost its secondhand dealer's licence, and the company has not yet gone to court for another one. That position was current as of yesterday. The reason the police seem reluctant to move on the question of trading without a current secondhand dealer's licence is a matter for the Chief Secretary's Department, and I raised this matter with him this morning. If one owns a secondhand motor vehicle yard one needs two licences; you must trade with the L.M.V.D. licence, but at the moment you must have a secondhand dealer's licence as well if you want to stay open for business.

What I am concerned with here is that a dealer can get away with trading a vehicle, accepting money from a customer, completing the sale book requirements under the Act, and the customer has no proof of actual ownership at the time of delivery. Whilst the problem mainly occurs at the time of liquidation, as I have already outlined, it also happens frequently to retailers who have difficulty in establishing whether a car is in fact on hire purchase when it comes on to his lot. I would like to see the Public and Consumer Affairs Department take this matter up and to investigate whether some form of title or some similar document is economically feasible and capable of protecting, first, consumers in times of a dealer going into receivership, and secondly, dealers, to prevent the dumping of vehicles on their premises with high payout values still in train.

It is not for me to come up with a solution, but I have aired my concern of the problem. I believe that people are being hurt considerably in the motor vehicle game by taking on agreements which they cannot handle. They are being caught at times when liquidation occurs, and I am also concerned that dealers can be landed with enormous costs because of fly-by-nighters who may dump a vehicle with a large pay-out value and then leave the State. It is something that should be looked at very seriously. On behalf of members, I would appreciate it if Consumer Affairs could take up this matter.

**Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake):** On Tuesday 29 April the Minister of Education attended a meeting at the Thebarton Town Hall, in my electorate, to discuss with parents and teachers in this area a proposed 3 per cent cut in education funding. The meeting was chaotic. The Minister was unable to answer the questions put to him. The parents and teachers were disgusted at his lack of understanding, and they showed this in a pretty vocal manner. Throughout that area he is referred to by teachers and parents alike as Alice in Wonderland, and a lot of those people have said that he is a disgrace to the Government and that he should be immediately sacked.

On the night that I have referred to he sunk to the stage of having to ask for some advice from the member for Henley Beach, and I think you would agree that this is sinking pretty low. The member for Henley Beach recognised some teachers from his own electorate, and he asked the Minister to make sure that the teachers gave

their number and the name of their school every time they took up a complaint. Some of the teachers complied with this request, and others did not. It was a stupid request, but it was the type of reply that one would expect from the member for Henley Beach.

*Mr. Randall interjecting:*

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** My main concern is that the Government is not honouring its pre-election promises. These broken promises mean that the quality of education offered to children in South Australia will slip back. Class sizes remain high, despite promises that they would be reduced.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Teachers will have higher work loads, and in many cases equipment is inadequate. I would advise some of the members who have just interjected that they should attend some of these meetings and hear what the parents and the teachers have to say. Those members would then agree with what I am saying.

Although there is a record of teacher unemployment, the Government is determined to cut costs in education. This is a blueprint for more unemployment and larger class sizes, fewer school assistants, and a reduction in the number of advisory teachers to help in the quest for better and more realistic education projects.

In my district, there is a need to provide sufficient opportunities for adults in the ethnic communities, particularly in regard to literacy and numeracy. What has this Government done to provide these opportunities?

**Mr. Randall:** What would you do?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I can cite one of the things that the Government has done; it has stopped the education division of the Thebarton centre from going ahead. The Minister of Local Government stopped the setting up of this division as soon as he was appointed as a Minister; the issue was handed to the Minister of Education, and is now in the hands of the local council. Nothing has been done in regard to the Thebarton Community Centre. The Government has destroyed plans for that centre and has taken away from ethnic people in this area what they desperately need—the opportunity to increase their skills.

It is quite clear, as the Hon. Mr. Allison has proved, that the provision of facilities must fall to the parents, who, in my district, are often unemployed. This Government will return to the system of parents providing 50 per cent of the funding for school programmes; parents will have to raise money for special equipment and buildings, like sports halls, because funds will not be provided by the Government. We all know what this means: a return to the dark old ages prior to the Labor Government's coming into power in South Australia, when parents in the wealthy areas raised money with apparent ease, and the less fortunate schools became more and more run down because of a lack of funds.

In these times of economic hardship with rising prices, decreasing wages and rising unemployment, an unfair burden will be placed on parents, particularly the low-income earners. Cut-backs in the Public Buildings Department have also caused unnecessary hardship in my district. I have received a letter from the Thebarton Junior Primary School, Hayward Avenue, Torrensville, which states:

We wish to draw your attention to the problem associated with the drainage in certain areas of the school in Hayward Avenue. This letter is directed to you for some action owing to the lack of response the school has received following submissions on the subject to the respective Education Department authority.

During the winter season, there are pools of water adjacent to the grassed playing areas which are due to

blocked drains. Another concern is the areas surrounding the transportable classrooms where water run-off from the rooms provides instant floods which makes access to them impossible . . . also wet shoes, muddied floors and wet children's clothing.

We therefore seek your assistance.

I went further and did something for the school: I rang the Public Buildings Department and I was informed after about half an hour (because things have changed since the Liberal Government has come into power—one cannot speak to any officer but only to a certain person, who has direct instructions from a certain Minister) that the work involved was to have been done in this financial year but it had been taken off the priority list, and the person to whom I spoke did not know why this had been done. I asked when the work would actually be done and I was told that there was no certainty about this.

I intend to ask the Minister of Education a question about this matter. It is unfortunate that he is not present, because he might have been able to answer some questions. I have also been informed that the playground at that school requires upgrading. This work was also taken off the priority list. The Government should provide equal and adequate facilities for all South Australian children, a concept which the Labor Government strove so hard and successfully to achieve while in office, and which it will continue to implement when it returns to Government at the next election. The 3 per cent cut in education spending is only a starting point and follows the Fraserisms of the Federal Parliament.

I am concerned because I have noticed that, in regard to prominent Labor districts, the Liberal Government appears to take the attitude that, because a certain district is a safe Labor seat, money will not be spent in that area. I will get to the bottom of the situation and I will find out whether the Minister of Education has the guts (when he returns to this Parliament) to explain why the work that is required at the Thebarton school has been taken off the priority list. The Labor Government was never guilty of these tactics; it spent money on education and other improvements in the Liberal district of Victoria, which is considered one of the safest Liberal seats in South Australia. I will ask the Minister of Education questions in relation to this matter. Perhaps the member for Henley Beach can give him some advice about why money is not being spent in districts represented by A.L.P. members.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call on the next speaker, I draw to the attention of all new members particularly the fact that, when a Minister is absent on Ministerial business interstate, it is not normal for reference to be made to his absence from the Chamber. I am sure that this is a courtesy that all members would like to know about so that in the future they can phrase their words accordingly.

**Mr. Plunkett:** I apologise, Mr. Speaker.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I listened with some interest to the member for Peake as he referred to a recent meeting at Thebarton Town Hall. It so happens that I was in the area and I attended that meeting. I can tell the House that the honourable member was right when he said that the hall was packed; I do not remember the estimates made on that occasion, but certainly 600 or 700 people were present. It was obvious to me, on entering the hall, that the meeting was well organised. Some of the first people I met were the member for Peake and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I recall the comments made by the Deputy Leader about how well the meeting had been organised but, because he made those comments outside this place, I will not cite details of the conversation. The meeting was clearly stacked; there is no question about that. The Minister of Education found

himself in what I can only describe as a hostile climate on the platform of that meeting, and if ever there was a need for an unbiased Chairman to apply his skills, it was on that occasion, because, as I said, the meeting was stacked with rabble-rousers.

I thought he did a tremendous job in his address to the meeting. When question time came, though, he made the point to the Chairman that he would seek, if possible, a fair sharing of questions from the teaching staff and the parents. He asked the Chairman to convey to the meeting that those who sought to ask a question should identify themselves as to whether they were teachers or parents, so that there would be some record of those who were asking questions, simply to ensure that questioning was shared between the parents and the teachers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Regardless of whether it is discrimination, infringement of a person's rights, or whatever, I assure the House that the motives behind that request were quite sincere. When the Chairman conveyed that message to the meeting in a most biased way, he conveyed other than what my colleague had requested. However, he did not go so far as to convey to the meeting what has been conveyed to the House tonight. He did not ask any persons in the room to identify themselves by number, and on that point the member for Peake has grossly misled this House tonight.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Agriculture is correct; he was at the meeting. However, the statements he is making now are completely untrue, and the member for Henley Beach would even know that.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The honourable member, if he feels aggrieved at the statements made as to the veracity of what he said, has the opportunity in due course to make a personal explanation.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I do not propose to take up that point, and I have no axe to grind. I have no direct affiliation to that area or those people, but I sympathise with some of the concerns expressed by parents and by some teachers on that occasion. I do not share the views expressed by others. The Minister guaranteed that meeting that there would be a steady reduction, albeit minimal, in the student-teacher ratio in this State and in that area.

The honourable member referred to the need to upgrade some premises. In particular, he mentioned upgrading the playing facilities. I attended the supper after that meeting, but the honourable member did not, nor did his mate. At that supper I had the pleasure and opportunity of discussing some of the deficiencies at that school with the staff and the parent council members. In regard to upgrading the playground, I offered that parent group the services of the Woods and Forests Department, because I believed that it had something to offer in the form of literature, advice on what trees they should plant, and advice on what pinus materials they should use for playground facilities, and at the right price. Appreciating the needs of that community and those parents it seemed to me to be the best I could do. To my knowledge, there has been no follow-up by that school parent council member, but at least the offer was genuine.

Regarding the other matters, I am sure that my colleague, on his return from Ministerial business, will take up the challenge on the allegations made by the member for Peake and answer them appropriately. However, I would like to refer to the lull that fell over the meeting when my colleague told the people there that, of the \$1 300 000 000 Budget that we passed soon after coming into Government, about \$340 000 000 went to

education. The lull came, particularly over the parental section of the meeting, when he said that 89.9 per cent of the total allocation went to salaries and wages and that, with this persistent call for extra funding, the vast majority goes into the wage area, not into the facilities and other requirements of education.

Frankly, I understand the concern of any school council or teacher group where the student-teacher ratio is about 30:1 and above, but I know of some schools in this State where the ratio is down to 10:1. I also know that my colleague is very anxious to pursue this situation and try to rationalise it so that some fairness can apply. However, the overall student-teacher ratio across the education system, as he explained to all present that night, is not nearly as bad as has been conveyed by the member for Peake.

In any event, what did his colleague do in that district during the period of about 10 years that his Party was in Government, until nine months ago? The rot did not set in at Thebarton Primary School since 15 September, and I think that the further the meeting went, that was recognised by the majority of people present. It was certainly very vividly discussed by those parents at the supper, where they conceded and admitted that they had not had any attention from their former member that solved their problems and that they could not fairly blame the new Minister of Education for all the ills in the Thebarton district. If the member is honest, he will realise the facts.

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

**Mr. ABBOTT (Spence):** The Premier, in his Ministerial statement yesterday on his overseas trip, said that his Government was a hands off the private sector Government and that he was applauded on his statements that his Government was reducing the size of the public sector and in turn minimising the extent of regulations that hitherto had restricted private sector development. He said that he believed that these assurances were an important factor in the momentous Mitsubishi Corporation decision to purchase the remaining shareholding in Chrysler Australia Ltd.

The Premier stated that he was not certain whether members on this side appreciated the significance of that decision, but he felt sure that I did, anyhow. I am not certain whether that means the kiss of death for me, and I do not know whom the Premier is trying to kid in this matter, because everyone in South Australia knew, even before the present Premier became Premier, that it was only a matter of time before Mitsubishi would purchase the remaining shareholding in Chrysler Australia Ltd. The Premier went on to say that, without the Mitsubishi purchase, the motor vehicle industry in South Australia stood to lose a significant portion of its motor car manufacturing base.

What is the future of the automobile industry in Australia? Australia is the eighth largest national market for motor vehicles. In recent years we have absorbed between 560 000 and 600 000 new vehicles a year. It is also through the automobile that the biggest volume of consumption of manufacturing generally takes place, such as in steel, glass, paint, plastics, rubber, petrol and so on.

However, given the instability of the capitalist economy, there is little likelihood of Australia producing cars at any higher level than we do at present, and new vehicle registrations have dropped markedly over the past few months. Furthermore, the never-ending price increases in petrol and the oil companies' cartel which, by monopolistic pricing practices, exhorts ever-more profits, are increas-

ingly pricing the automobile out of the market for many people. Global nationalisation under the disguise of "complimentation" leaves the big multi-national corporations with the power. In fact, it strengthens their power, for they can make arrangements on a cost basis through internal company transfer pricing and increasingly seek to reduce substantially production in Australia or in any other country where it suits the object of profit.

These companies, whose profitability has been guaranteed by huge Government investments to manufacture in Australia, will themselves become more and more vocal and determined to bring changes in policy that allow them to resolve the matter in a manner that suits their foreign boards of control. One of the many decisions facing the industry as a whole this year was its reaction to the changes sought, and lobbied successfully for, by General Motors-Holden's. The Government's acceptance of the G.M.H. world car concept has meant additional lobbying and researching by the trade union movement to measure the effect of those changes on workers in the industry. The changes in the car industry have been caused during the year by the general economic down-turn that has resulted from the Federal Government's continued repressive economic measures, by the slow introduction of new technology into the plants in the form of new machinery and equipment, by the adjustment to changes in international currencies, and by industry changes in other countries.

The world car concept has caused much alarm. However, unless economies of scale are achieved in the industry, through modernisation and rationalisation, it will remain internationally non-competitive. That the motor car will play a different role in the community in the new decade is obvious, with disposable income patterns already changing. Rising fuel prices, ecological and conservation concerns, as well as quality of life issues, have meant people spending what disposable income they have in a different manner. These changing values are likely to result in more changes to the shape of the car industry, and to the role that the car plays in community life.

In the Premier's announcement yesterday of the \$8 000 000 G.M.H. expansion, he said that 50 people would be employed initially in the new plastic component works. However, Mr. Chapman, Managing-Director of G.M.H., said that the company's decision to establish its own plastics factory would not mean a sudden loss of business for G.M.H.'s current suppliers of plastic components.

That may be so, but it will be a loss to those suppliers in the future, and it could cost many jobs in that area. So, really, nothing is gained as regards employment. We heard today of the possibility of 100 jobs being lost in future at Uniroyal. There is tremendous fear among workers that robots are coming. I understand that robots have already been introduced in the Victorian Nissan plant. I will quote some comments that were made by the U.A.W. President Bluestone, at that union's production workers' conference, in Detroit, U.S.A., in March. He said:

There are many who have felt for years that it would be impossible to totally automate a moving assembly line building automobiles. That is no longer the fact. We have been accustomed for the last 20 years to the introduction of numerical computer control equipment, and the use of computers has been growing and accelerating at an enormous rate in all the plants, whether they are big three operations or parts and supplier plants.

In more recent years the industry has begun to introduce robots. World-wide it is estimated that there are only about 5 000 robots in place in industry—about 500 of them in the

United States. In G.M. there are approximately 150 total; that's not a large number of robots.

The introduction of robots so far has been for the purpose of handling parts or performing spot-welding operations, for instance, on an assembly line. These robots have been developed on the basis of the use of one of the human senses, the sense of touch.

What has happened is that the first generation of computerised robots have been developed so that they can touch and they can feel. That's why you can have spot-welding performed by robots.

The second generation is now about to be installed in some of the plants. And over a period of years, more and more of the new equipment will be computer controlled. The second generation of robots will not only have a sense of touch, but it will have the sense of sight.

We have seen robots, for instance, which are designed and instructed to pick up various different contours of parts as they come down the conveyor line and see those parts through a television camera, which then instructs the built-in computer in the robot to pull out its fingers, pick up the parts and put those parts in different sections around the conveyor belt. Some in one pan, some on a gong, some on a table, etc.

So now, we know that they have computers which not only have the sense of touch, but they have the sense of sight. They actually see. You can well imagine what that means to parts sorting operations or inspection operations.

One of the third senses is the sense of hearing. And it will not be too far down the road, the next several years, when they will have developed robots which actually hear and will conform with instructions which are given to them verbally. One will be able to speak to a robot and the robot will be actuated in conformance with a computerised program to follow the instructions that are given verbally. Sounds incredible, but it will be done.

By that time, we will have robots which have the sense of touch, the sense of sight, and the sense of hearing. In the next 10 years, 15 years, 20 years, we are going to see an enormous explosion of robots, computer controlled, which will have these three senses with which to produce. This is why it is feasible in the foreseeable future.

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

**Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River):** Following the speech of the member for Peake, I was going to speak on so-called taxation cuts as they relate to the Education Department. However, as I will get another opportunity to speak later, I will speak on that subject then.

In the presence of the Minister of Agriculture in the Chamber, I will make some remarks in relation to the Rural Youth Movement in South Australia. I believe that the movement has the potential to provide a unique major facility for post-school agricultural education for young people engaged in agricultural industries in this State. As such, it deserves Government support to provide that facility for people in rural areas of the State, so that they may have the opportunity to receive some of the facilities that are so readily available in many other forms to our metropolitan counterparts.

The basic aims of the movement are in three areas, namely, to learn some of the problems relating to the agricultural industry; to achieve something in the aims of leadership and in the quality of leadership training; and to take some other activity and inspire community organisations and agriculture bureaux in South Australia. The movement in South Australia has, since its early history in 1952, had a colourful and significant career in the number of people who have participated in the movement over that period. During the life of the former

Administration, we saw the movement almost starved out of existence.

Let us look at the governmental support only in terms of advisers to assist the Rural Youth Movement in its programming and its endeavours in relation to providing those aims and objectives, to which I referred earlier, for young people in rural areas of South Australia.

**Mr. Keneally:** It's a training ground for Liberal policy.

**Mr. OLSEN:** That is exactly the reason why the Labor Party starved the Rural Youth Movement out of existence in this State, as the figures indicate. When the Dunstan Government came to power, about four or five advisers in this State served the Rural Youth Movement, providing back-up support, giving encouragement for programming activities within rural areas, and encouraging participation in the rural industry in this State. Let us now look at when the rot set in. The decline began in 1972 and continued up until 1979 when the number of advisers had been reduced from five to one, and in the latter part of 1979 down to nil. Members should also consider the corresponding number of members of the Rural Youth Movement in this State during that period. South Australia could once boast nationally that its rural youth organisation had the largest membership of any State in Australia.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Are you suggesting that they can be brought back?

**Mr. OLSEN:** I am not suggesting that they can be brought back at all. I am saying that the movement deserves minimal basic support in addition to the support provided by the former Government. In a moment I will give some figures in relation to the contribution made to service these organisations interstate, compared to the contribution provided by the former Administration.

In relation to membership, at its peak about 4 690 persons were members of the Rural Youth Movement in South Australia. That membership declined to about 1 000 persons in 1978. There is a direct relationship in terms of support, participation and membership of persons in rural areas. I note the mirth of members opposite when I mention providing some basic facility or service to support organisations for young people in rural areas. It is quite easy in the metropolitan area to undertake a number of leadership training courses and other facets of community life that are not available within rural areas.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. OLSEN:** When dealing with the number of advisers made available to the movement and the subsequent decline associated with the Dunstan decade in South Australia, one should compare what is made available to its interstate counterparts. For example, in Western Australia the movement receives a direct grant of about \$200 000, which it spends on services, facilities and back-up support to the various functions of the movement. In Victoria, about \$212 000 is made available and the movement has six advisory officers to support it. In Queensland, there are about 15 persons employed to support the movement and service the various functions, such as the State Executive, the State Council and various regional, zone organisation and club facilities. In comparison, South Australia has one clerk and an allocation of \$5 500 for State Executive, travelling and printing expenses. In other words, South Australia is certainly the poor cousin in terms of support for the Rural Youth Movement across this nation. This situation was deliberately created in South Australia by the former Administration. In the words of the member for Stuart in an earlier interjection tonight this is so because of the way in which the former Administration considered the

criteria—wrongfully I might add—with disastrous effects for country people. Mr. Frank Hill, a long standing member of the council in this State, has said:

It is inevitable that traditional attitudes will persist if there is no understanding of changes in the support system, and there should be no criticism of a movement with a geographically scattered membership because of this. After many years of administration verging on the autocratic, the movement has fairly suddenly found its support drastically diminished and, while it would be correct to acknowledge that some activities have become rather sloppy as a result, it would be equally correct to assert that the membership has coped with a difficult situation with praiseworthy vigour and initiative. It is recommended that a clear statement of future changes and intentions be made as soon as possible, with a reassurance of continued basic support at whatever the minimum level may be.

We have gone beyond the minimum level of support for the organisation. The strength of the organisation and its membership does in fact reflect that. However, we have a basis and a nucleus from which we can work. I hope that the Government will pick up the challenge and provide assistance to some of the people who have been disadvantaged and discriminated against in relation to the allocation of resources in this State.

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

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** I am very pleased that the Deputy Premier is present in the House. I hope that, as Minister for Mines and Energy he has been involved in the particular matter that I wish to raise. With my few remarks in the next 10 minutes perhaps I can explain to the Minister the problem that I wish to refer to, because it is obvious to me that he does not understand it.

I point out that I have always believed that there has been a great need to establish, particularly in decentralised areas, diversification of industry. I particularly welcome the establishment of new viable industries within decentralised areas such as Whyalla. Because of that I was pleased to hear that the firm of Pacific Salt was to be relocated from the Eastern States to the city of Whyalla. I point out that that company was to be relocated through a low interest loan arrangement between the company and the Commonwealth Government. At that time, I felt that a golden opportunity had been presented to the city of Whyalla to assist employment and diversification, and to establish a viable industry, besides the B.H.P., in the city of Whyalla. Unfortunately, my enthusiasm to accept that state of affairs was soon to be dampened.

I turn, first, to a letter I received from the mother of a 16-year-old girl employed by this firm because it began quite an episode of my involvement with this company. I will not read it all, and I do not intend to name the girl or her mother. The letter states:

I am writing to you as I believe someone should be looking into the workings of the management at the salt works. She was referring, of course, to Pacific Salt. The letter continues:

My daughter started there three months ago as a receptionist. The day she started she was informed the only other woman in the office was going into the hospital for two weeks and she would have to take charge of everything—and they meant everything—

such as switchboard, telex, typing, making of the pays for 40 or so employees, stocktaking of the warehouse, invoices, stock reports, preparing all documents for the ship—typing letters for the two under-managers, making tea and coffee, doing all the messages in town, collecting lunches, using her own car and not getting paid for it, and working back and not



getting paid for it.

Apart from that, she had nothing to do! Three months later, the owner of Pacific Salt came over from Sydney and sacked her on the spot. Obviously, she forgot to sweep the floor, or something. Because of that her mother wrote to me.

All those things were supposed to be done by a girl aged 16 years. I began to make inquiries about this matter. I made my first inquiry of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I wrote to him on 18 December and advised him that I had been approached from several sources (by people other than the mother of this girl) concerning what seemed to be the unco-operative attitude of the management of Pacific Salt. The letter was as follows:

As you would be aware, this company was subsidised to a large degree by the Federal Government and the previous State Government to shift their operations from New South Wales to Whyalla, and I believe that this assistance afforded the opportunity to Pacific Salt to embark on an operation in Whyalla which would gain them not only profits but certainly a new deal in their operations interstate.

Further to the shifting of Pacific Salt to Whyalla, the Federal Government has embarked on a scheme whereby employers generally are afforded a subsidy of some \$57 per person per week to train unemployed or inexperienced people in their particular operations.

In the past few months Pacific Salt has seen fit to mass dismiss employees of their company and employ others. I went on to say that the company could have been in receipt of the \$57 a week subsidy. I suggested that it was using the Commonwealth scheme through the Commonwealth Employment Service in Whyalla. After making some inquiries about this matter, I found that it was not using the Commonwealth Employment Service at all. It was worse than that. It was not using the \$57 a week subsidy, which was fair enough. What it was doing, however, was using a long waiting list of potential employees in a most undesirable manner. I point out that, once a young person is employed and then sacked, any future employer becomes ineligible for the Commonwealth wage subsidy under the unemployment benefits scheme. That was even worse than not using the \$57 a week, because the firm's action deprived any future employer of this girl from partaking in that scheme.

After writing to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, I had discussions with officers of the department in Whyalla. It was then I discovered that the Mines Department was the only department that had the legal right to deal with the problem in relation to this company. I point that out to the Minister. Any evidence contrary to that is just bunkum. In the case of this young girl, the matter finally went to the State Industrial Court. After that hearing, the girl received an apology from one of the owners of Pacific Salt and was offered her job back. Unfortunately, from my point of view, that offer was not accepted.

To take the matter a little further, an industrial action occurred at the plant which I took up with the Deputy Premier. His final reply to me about this matter was in a letter dated 11 April, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

The operation is subject to regular inspections by the Inspector of Mines and on his next visit, which is scheduled for late April or early May, he will be pleased to contact you and clarify any aspects which you may wish to raise at that time.

It is now June, and I still have not seen the Inspector of Mines. I can only anticipate that I am not going to see him. That letter was signed by Roger Goldsworthy, so I can assume the Minister knows all about this matter. Finally, I asked a question in the House to which I received the

following answer:

The Department of Mines and Energy's inspector investigated and reported on an accident in the packaging section of Pacific Salt Proprietary Limited. Other matters raised are outside the jurisdiction of the Mines and Works Inspection Act.

That is absolute bunkum. I point out to the Minister that the only department outside of his own that has any jurisdiction at all in that factory is that of labour and industry and it simply deals with the wages structure of employees of that establishment. I ask the Deputy Premier to do something about this matter.

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

**Mr. SCHMIDT (Mawson):** Earlier this evening we heard the member for Albert Park on the subject of unions again. What he has done is follow the true brand of the A.L.P.; he has tended to label rather than do. Again, he has shown his lack of research; like all other Opposition members, and like a sheep, he tends to follow. If he had done his research before he used the word "scab", he would know that that word is a colloquialism used only within the trade union movement and that it originated within that movement. If he had taken the meaning of the word further he would also know that in the trade union movement it occurs mainly amongst those people who work in the sheep industry as a whole. The word "scab" comes from a disease caused to sheep by mites. It is called "scab" and causes some irritation to the skin. Hence, every time we have some form of strike, the irritation to the skin of the union leaders is so aggravating that the only way they can retaliate is to cause those people who wish to work on their own merit, or uphold their own principles, to be labelled "scabs".

Again, that is a clear indication of how the A.L.P. operates—it can only label, it cannot do. If we take the meaning of the word "scab" further, we find that it can be used as a noun or verb. True to tradition, the A.L.P. uses it in its noun form. In other words, A.L.P. members label in all cases in order to discredit people rather than performing some action. We have seen this time and again. One classic example of this was during the 1975 election when Mr. Whitlam tried in vain to discredit Mr. Anthony.

He labelled him left, right and centre only to find out that it all fell back in his own face: he lost Government in 1975, and lost badly. For the sake of those in the A.L.P., I point out that the current cure is the nicotine dip. The nicotine dip is a very apt sort of cure, because it reflects the attitude of the A.L.P. and sets up a smoke screen to cover what they are really trying to perpetrate upon the community through their strike action.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley will have the opportunity to speak later in the debate.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Thank you for protecting me, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are all bleating away again—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will not answer interjections.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** I was not: I was referring to the bleating by members opposite. Earlier tonight they labelled one of their own men as the black sheep of the A.L.P. The member for Hartley was solely discredited. I do not know whether it was by design or whether it was just the nature of the A.L.P. At election time we had the slogan "Follow the leader". That is what sheep do—follow the leader. In that campaign, other black sheep of the Party were left out of advertising programmes.

**Mr. Trainer:** All we can see on the other side is a lot of goats.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will cease interjecting and reflecting on honourable members opposite; otherwise, I will name him.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** In that campaign, the Labor Party was trying to pull the wool over the public's eyes, but it was unsuccessful and it lost Government and we are now holding the Treasury benches. Members opposite are so sheepish about the loss of the election that they have now been trying to pull the wool over our eyes, and they are always painting a black picture of this State. Thank goodness it is not as black as the black sheep. Members opposite try to demoralise the people of South Australia time and time again. They talk about the high record of unemployment, but they do not talk about the fact that any job attracted to South Australia is a plus for South Australia. If these jobs were not attracted, the situation would be far worse. I am surprised to see that the member for Peake is not here after his bleating. He made no reference to the fact that the Education budget has been increased by \$380 000. Where would all his crying and bleating be if we had not increased the budget by the amount that we did? I am sure that, under the Budget proposals that the Opposition put forward, no further increases would have been made in education at all. We can be thankful that the black sheep were not brought back into Government.

Referring back to the word "scab", we know that if it is used as a verb, it is a doing word. I believe that by default the member for Albert Park gave the member for Henley Beach a commendation and compliment when he referred to him as a scab. According to Black's Medical Dictionary, a scab is a covering on a wound, and when it forms the wound is healing. When the wound is healed, the scab falls off. Members opposite have recognised the healing qualities of some members on this side and they know the healing qualities of those people who are labelled scabs when they attend strike actions or wish to continue work on their own volition because they know the healing effect to themselves and to their own dignity if they can continue to work as they desire to work.

*Mr. O'Neill interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Florey will have the opportunity to speak in the debate. I have been lenient with him, and I will not speak to him again.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** These people who are often labelled as scabs know the true healing power of dignity if they can go and work as they wish to work and are not labelled if they are prepared to give work for value. Again we see this nicotine smoke screen set up, and a classic example of this was seen last week when a national strike was perpetrated upon the nation. We saw the dismal failure of that because at last, the populace itself has seen the need to bring back the healing salve to Australia. We can do that only if everybody takes some action to do a good day's work, and work with dignity, rather than be led by the black sheep of leading sections of the trade union movement. The main reason I refer to this is that there are also other sectors in the community that try to pull the wool over our eyes. The member for Morphett has already raised an issue that I was going to raise, as I have been approached by the same person, and that is in regard to car dealers who do false deals. As a Government we should seriously consider either the identification system on licences or possibly an I.D. system itself. There are many sectors in the community that try to pull the wool over the Government's and other people's eyes in order to defraud

them. If we had a proper identification system, as used in Europe, many of these ills would be alleviated. This matter has been raised on a number of occasions, one being in the *Australian* on 5 May 1977 when it was stated that maybe it would be a good thing if all licences throughout Australia were issued under the same system as I.D. cards for security purposes, with the person's photograph accompanying that with their licence number.

An article also appeared in today's *News* about bus drivers having difficulty in identifying people's correct age. It shows an attractive young lady of 14 years and states that it is difficult for a bus driver to determine the age of a person. If one looks at the clientele in hotels, one finds that hotels are being grossly abused. I feel sympathetic towards any hotel proprietor who has to try to identify an 18-year-old girl and try to evict her because she is under 18 years of age. I have seen children who I have known to be only 15 or 16 years old sitting in hotels drinking, and nobody is telling them that they are under age. There is no way that the proprietor can identify those persons. Having a licence is no proof of their age, because they can say they left their licence at home. We see the same thing happening in regard to the cashing of security cheques.

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

**Mr. LANGLEY (Unley):** The member for Mallee is scratching his head: he seems to forget things. He cannot remember when the present Speaker was Leader of the Opposition and his own Party, when he lost by one seat and a few hundred votes, got rid of him as Leader of the Opposition. That is one of the things he has mentioned tonight, but he does not want to remember such matters in relation to his own Party. I can assure him that he is off the mark with what he said tonight.

I wish to speak on a subject that is dear to my heart and to the hearts of many Australians and which, at the present time, has been brought to a head by the way the Prime Minister of this country has brought sport into disrepute. I have played in many sports and have always abided by the umpire. In this House, during the course of many Parliaments, there have been many close tussles. On many occasions, Parties have relied on the casting vote of the Speaker, and it has always been abided by at all times.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Who was the umpire?

**Mr. LANGLEY:** The people were the umpire. They are always the umpire. The Minister has one thing in his favour: he does not quite understand what is going on. Suddenly, the whole matter of the Olympic Games has become very political, and that situation has been brought about by the Prime Minister. In every field, one must abide by the decision of the umpire, which is sacrosanct.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Who is the umpire?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Speaker will be the umpire, and he will take stern action if interjections continue.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** Thank you, Sir. Every item of sporting equipment purchased in this country is subject to a tax of 15 per cent, returning a revenue to the Government of \$34 000 000 or more. The Prime Minister puts back into sport no more than \$3 000 000. Where does the rest of the money go? Why do the biased newspapers not report how much revenue is raised by tax on sporting goods from all sportsmen, even down to 6-year-old children whose sporting goods are paid for from the pockets of their parents? It is a shocking situation, and it is shocking, too, when the Prime Minister interferes with the umpire's decision.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What did Gough Whitlam do? Did he take 15 per cent during his term in office?

**Mr. LANGLEY:** I am talking about the present situation. The former Prime Minister never at any time stopped anyone from going overseas, nor did he try to tell everyone what they should do, as the present Prime Minister is doing. The Australian Olympic Federation made a decision, and the Prime Minister will not accept it.

There is no doubt that Mr. Murdoch wants to rule the world, but he is not doing too well. When a decision is made against them, the Prime Minister and the press cannot take it. The newspapers say now that athletes who go away are traitors to their country. I was lucky to be able to represent my country, and the first thing our politicians say is that our sportsmen are the best ambassadors the country could have. Marjorie Jackson spoke her mind, and did an excellent job. The newspaper report was a little out of context, but next day in its editorial the *News* said that she was very good for three-quarters of the time, but when there was something they did not agree with she was no good at all.

Letters to the Editor were about fifty-fifty on this subject, but suddenly they are all one way. If our athletes cannot go to Russia, why should we be sending wool to Russia? Australians are great sportsmen, and they will live with the outcome. The *Sunday Mail* last week quoted Herb Elliott, a champion sportsman, but it did not give the other side of the argument. That is how crook our newspapers are. I do not like them and they do not like me, but that does not worry me.

The Premier must have had a phone call from the Prime Minister. He did not even know which committee he was on, and I do not know how much he had put in, but I am sure he must have withdrawn it.

*Mr. Randall interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** The member for Henley Beach plays croquet, a girl's game. He would not understand. The Minister of Recreation and Sport has one thing in his favour; he is a sporting man. It became a case of Fraser *versus* Fraser.

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

**Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** I want to take up a point raised by the Minister of Agriculture earlier, when he said that 89.9 per cent of the expenditure in the Education Department comprised salaries and wages. I notice that the member for Baudin raised the question and said, "So what?" Perhaps that shows his ignorance of how business works. If education was run as a business, one would assume that he would know that the amount spent on wages and salaries in a commercial enterprise would average between 50 and 55 per cent.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** I am trying to indicate that it is not necessary to spend almost the entire budget on salaries and wages. Very often, one comes across teachers whose major complaint is that they have to spend so much time dealing with the welfare needs of children rather than teaching them. This is a matter that interests me greatly. If we look at some of the statistics we find, as I have said in the House previously, that in my area alone some 1 600 breaking and entering crimes are committed each month.

Forty-nine per cent of these are committed by children aged between nine and 17 years of age. When one looks at the relativity of those types of statistics, one asks this question: why should the statistics show such a high level of youth involvement in crime? Perhaps that can be looked at in the light of some facts that were brought out in an article written by Doug Steele in this evening's *News*. He indicated that 30 per cent of children attending the schools around the State come from single-parent homes. Of

course, the children who come from these homes have individual problems and concerns.

One of the points that concerns me is the relationship between those problems and the children's school life, and the feed-back that goes to the Department for Community Welfare officers, because we often find that teachers try to fix the problem themselves without referring the problem to the Department for Community Welfare. Very often we find that the only time that the Department for Community Welfare officers find out about the problem is when the child is called before a juvenile aid panel.

It could be said that some educationalists have some training in the solving of some of these juvenile problems, but we might look and say that it should be horses for courses, and that it should be for the teachers to teach and for the community welfare officers to look after the welfare of children. I have come across situations where instances of truancy have not been followed up by schools; had they been referred to the Department for Community Welfare officers, there would have been an opportunity for the problems to be solved long before the child got into trouble.

If we acknowledge the fact that we have problems derived from television; if we acknowledge the fact that we have a break-down in family relationships; if we acknowledge the fact that sometimes the churches have failed to pick up the problems, we come back to the educational area, where it is the teachers who very often are the first people to pick up the problems that are happening. I would like to think that the relationship between educationalists and the Department for Community Welfare is such that problems arising could be referred back to that department for solving. However, what we see is that schools and school councils are asking for welfare aid. The article in this evening's *News* suggested that welfare workers should be available at primary schools in South Australia. They are needed, it was claimed, to take the burden of social problems in schools off the shoulders of principals and staff. In the weeks leading up to a marriage break-up, parents are fighting for custody of the child, and each wants to see the principal or the senior members of a school separately.

This puts tremendous loads on the principal because the schoolmaster has the duty of settling in other children to perform. The point that people miss is the fact that, if these problems were referred immediately to officers of the Department for Community Welfare, that department would be given the opportunity of visiting the home, finding out the problems, and seeking solutions so that the problems do not grow any further. Unfortunately, this does not happen in a great many cases. So it is that, when a child comes before a juvenile aid panel, it is because it is too late; the crime has been committed. If we are to solve these problems to any great degree, and if we are to save the costs involved in going through court procedures and juvenile aid procedures and the costs involved in finding foster parents for children in difficult circumstances, we must seek to find the solution at the root cause, and this is when it first comes to the notice of somebody in authority.

It has been said that the costs of looking after a child, once that child has got into trouble, are in excess of \$12 000 a year. When we look at the statistics of juvenile delinquency we find that the juvenile aid panel figures are climbing remarkably.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber.

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** I look forward to the day when we have a closer co-operation between the two departments in solving the glaring problems because, if we are not going to come to grips with the problem, we will end up

with varying generations of misplaced people. It is interesting to note from statistics that the people in Yatala (where we find that the average age is 22) have a very large degree of learning difficulty which has been carried on from their childhood. This can be traced back to the problems that they have encountered; a child may have come from a difficult home or a broken home situation, and he may have played truant from school—

**Mr. O'Neill:** An economically deprived home.

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** They come from all sources, but the major problem is that we have not come to grips with the reality of the relationships between one department and another. Each wishes to go its own way. I think if we could find a method of solving this problem between the two departments we would go a long way towards solving some of the problems with children. I urge everyone to think closely about the amount of money that it costs and the lost effort that results when this liaison between departments does not come to fruition. I hope we will find the solution in the near future to this growing problem that we have with our juveniles.

**Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart):** This Liberal Administration that the State is currently suffering under is winning for itself a reputation of being a Government of broken promises and inaction. One wonders whether perhaps Liberal members might be modelling themselves on their colleagues in Canberra, for no Government in the history of Australia has such a well-earned reputation as it has in that area.

I would like to suggest to the Government that there is an area where it can do something for the benefit of people in South Australia, particularly country people in South Australia. As I am a member representing a country area, living in a country area and as you are, Sir, and as many members on the Government benches are also living in country areas, I would expect that they would support me in the proposition that I am about to put to the House. Recently we have heard a rather strange debate that has taken place between some sections of the university, the Minister of Health and the A.M.A. It is all about the strange problem that this State appears to be facing, namely, an oversupply of medical practitioners. In fact, if we do not already have an oversupply, it is maintained that the State is facing this possibility. As I live in the country I should point out to the Minister of Health and to other members that an oversupply of doctors is not a problem that country areas are suffering from. Yet the country areas offer great advantages for members of the medical profession who seek to make their living there. There are a large number of country towns and wide areas of this State that have no medical practitioner at all immediately close to them.

The Flying Doctor Service is a rather remarkable facility, but that is stretched to its utmost. There are a lot of towns in your district, Sir, and in the District of Rocky River, which is close to my district (I could name a dozen reasonably sized towns) that do not have a resident doctor. We wonder why this is the case. It is quite obvious that medical practitioners will not go into the country to practise. This is because medical practitioners are not so much unlike other members of the community; they like to stay where they can maximise their income in the most comfortable circumstances possible, and that is obviously in the city. We have been told that there is an over-supply of doctors, which has brought to the community a cost that it would not normally expect—the cost of over-servicing.

Doctors expect a high income and, if they are not able to receive that income through people becoming ill and needing services, they stoop to the rather dubious practice

of over-servicing. During a discussion with one of my colleagues, it was suggested that South Australia is faced with a conflict concerning what we understand as the free enterprise system—the supply and demand situation. If there is an over-supply of a certain product or service, the price of that product or service should drop; however, remarkably, if there is an over-supply of doctors, obviously the cost to the community will increase. I can suggest a remedy for the problem. The Minister of Health believes that one of the reasons why South Australia is unable to accept into its medical schools the number of students that have been accepted in the past is that there are not enough intern positions in South Australian hospitals.

I suggest that, if the Minister looked past Gepps Cross, she would see a number of Government hospitals in the north of the State in which interns could be placed, like the Whyalla Hospital, the Port Augusta Hospital, the Port Pirie Hospital, the Port Lincoln Hospital, the Mount Gambier Hospital, and hospitals in the Murray and the Barossa Valley; these hospitals would be able to take in young graduates and give them a period of 12 months for the necessary training that is so vitally required. I appreciate that specialists are not as readily available in some of these hospitals as in the city. Nevertheless, there would be two benefits: first, resident medical officers would be provided in hospitals in the country (and people who live in the country know that this is necessary); and, secondly, young graduates would see what life in the country is all about, and this experience might encourage them to take up their profession in a country practice of their own or to join an existing country practice. Doctors are badly needed in country areas.

A large percentage of country doctors come from overseas, and I do not reflect on these people, because they provide a very valuable service, and we are pleased that they have picked up the slack because Australian trained doctors are obviously not interested in going to the country. A system must be found to encourage doctors to go to the country. It is not sufficient for the A.M.A. and the Minister of Health to say that South Australia is facing an over-supply of doctors, and therefore the training of doctors will be cut out. Any over-supply is not apparent in the area in which I live and in the areas that border my district.

I am strongly in favour of a system of salaried doctors, practising from health centres. I am also interested in preventative health, and I am aware that there is a great need for medical attention for people in Aboriginal centres in the north and north-west of this State. Some doctors in these areas are grossly over-worked, and they are poorly paid in comparison with their city colleagues. When the situation is analysed honestly, it becomes apparent that doctors are led to expect a high income, and that is a motivating factor as to where they will provide their services. In situations like this, it is incumbent on the Government to ensure that a system prevails whereby everyone in the State has equal opportunity in regard to health care. Everyone should abide by this basic principle. The Government and the Minister should abide by this principle.

The Minister has said that South Australia is facing the problem of too many doctors; if the Minister sincerely believes that, she must examine the needs of people who are under-serviced at present in relation to medical care. The possibility of placing doctors in country Government hospitals as resident medical officers must be examined so that young graduates will obtain the opportunity to finish their internship in South Australia. I know that some graduates have had to leave the State over the past few

years in order to obtain training, and it is not good enough. Training should be available in South Australia. There seems to be a blind spot in the Minister's understanding of this situation.

Before any member says that the previous Government did not do anything about this matter, I point out that the previous Government was not faced with the problem of over-supply of doctors. An attempt was made to encourage doctors to work in country hospitals as resident medical officers, but the rewards were not sufficient to attract doctors to country areas. I ask members opposite who represent country areas as I do, and as does the member for Whyalla, to support me in my request, because it is in their interests and the interests of their constituents as much as it is in my interests and the interests of my constituents that medical care be provided more equally throughout the State. I know that the member of Eyre is concerned about the situation, because he visited my district with the Minister of Health, and they examined the available facilities. It is a pity that they did not take the trouble to advise the local member that they would be in the area; I found out about the visit while reading the local newspaper.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I have listened to the contributions of members opposite with interest. From the tale of woe that they have recited, one would think that this Government had been in office for about 35 years and that it was responsible for the current economic situation in South Australia. Members opposite talked about the projects that should go ahead and how Government policies would have a detrimental effect on the people of this State. Where do the member for Stuart, the member for Whyalla (who talked about Redcliff), the Leader of the Opposition and the Federal member for Grey stand in regard to the development of Roxby Downs? Not one word has been heard in this House, either yesterday or today, about this issue. One would gain the impression that the project is dormant.

*[Midnight]*

We have not had one word from the Leader. I would like the Leader and his colleagues to tell this House and the people where the Labor Party stands regarding Roxby Downs. Has the Labor Party still got the policy that it will repudiate all agreements? In August 1977, Mr. Uren said:

A future Labor Government will not permit the mining, processing or export of uranium under agreements which are contrary to A.L.P. policy. Our policy is not a string of polite, meaningless words. We say to the uranium mining companies that if you go ahead and sink your \$250 000 000 or so into uranium mining in defiance of Labor policy, then don't expect any mercy from the next Labor Government.

Not one member has corrected that statement, and obviously it is current A.L.P. policy. Then we had the spectacle of the alternative Premier of this State and his offside, Mr. Muirden, who was obvious on television, addressing an anti-uranium rally. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition is totally opposed to the mining, processing and exporting of uranium. I challenge him and those member who represent the Iron Triangle, whose areas would benefit from this project, to tell the electors where they stand.

Where does the member for Stuart stand in relation to the construction of a processing plant at Port Pirie? Mayor

Jones has made clear where he stands. His council and the population support it, and I also understand that, following his recent trip overseas, Mayor Jones has reinforced the statements by his council. One would have thought that the project at Roxby Downs has stopped. However, the Mines Department will spend \$120 000 at Clayton Bore to put down another artesian bore so as to test it to make sure that there is enough water in the Great Artesian Basin to service the project. I understand that there will be a requirement for as much water as is currently used at Whyalla. What is happening at Roxby Downs? Listening to the A.L.P. spruikers opposite, one would think that the project had withered on the vine. However, 90 people are employed there at present.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. GUNN:** If the honourable member would be quiet, he might learn something. He has been interjecting all evening, making foolish and irresponsible interjections. He is obviously anti-South-Australian. He does not want the project to go ahead, because he and his colleagues are adopting this stance for two reasons. First, they want to do everything they can to frustrate the Fraser Government. They do not want these projects to go ahead because they realise that they will benefit the community. They do not want the South Australian Government to be successful with this project, because they realise that that would stand the Government in good stead.

At Roxby Downs, a large airfield has been constructed so that there is a daily air service to the area. A team of contractors is building roads so that all the rig sites will be accessible. The work force will be expanded to about 170 people, because 11 drilling rigs are operating about 20 hours a day. I also understand that more drills are on the way, and a shaft will be sunk to determine the best area when the mine gets under way. Also a large workshop and a large laboratory have been constructed so that testing can take place.

**Mr. Keneally:** All Labor voters.

**Mr. GUNN:** That is wishful thinking on the part of the member, because all those people and people of the Northern Territory know that their jobs will not exist under A.L.P. policy if this State and the nation were unfortunate enough to be burdened with another Labor socialist Government, because not only its uranium policy but also the other taxing policies of Hayden would drive the miners out of the country in droves, as took place between 1972 and 1975. I want the honourable member and the Leader to explain clearly where they stand. It is no good whingeing all the time, telling us how bad things are and completely ignoring a project that will do great things for South Australia.

The member for Stuart has been vocal on other issues. Where does he stand on the development of Port Pirie, on Roxby Downs, and on the other uranium developments in the northern Flinders Ranges and at Plumbago? Does he support the development of these projects, or will he follow like a parrot the preachings of his left-wing colleagues? It has been interesting to note the divisions in the A.L.P. Mr. Hawke has supported mining. He is fairly realistic. We have Mr. Hayden, the captive of the left wing—

**Mr. Plunkett:** Whom do you think they are following?

**Mr. GUNN:** I think they will follow Hayden to his doom. We have the union movement split. Federally, the Australian Workers Union is supporting mining and the development of the uranium industry. We have had the case in Queensland where the hierarchy of the union has issued orders to employees to stop working and the employees have told the hierarchy to mind their own business.

We have the farcical situation where so-called representatives of the workers are trying to make them unemployed and to take away their livelihood. That is the policy of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in this State. They want to take highly-paid jobs from people who are making a considerable contribution to the welfare of the people of this State.

I refer now to the recent trip by officers of the Department of Mines and Energy. This Government has sent some of its officers overseas. I want to put before the House in detail, in the Address in Reply debate in July, the information that I gathered overseas late last year on this subject, and I hope that I will convince members opposite that it is not only essential but also desirable to develop a uranium industry in this State.

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

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** I never cease to be amazed by some of the rather outlandish statements made by the Premier. Amongst those statements was one made yesterday in this House, as follows:

We are managing well and the State's economy has never been better.

I do not know with whom the Premier talks or associates or who gives him advice, but it appears that he is not talking to about 46 000 persons in this State who are unemployed or to many small business people here who face financial difficulties, in many cases liquidation. He is not talking to many workers in industry who are in fear of their jobs and whose livelihood and that of their families depend on these jobs. Obviously, the Premier has not been talking to the teaching profession, which certainly is concerned at the proposed 3 per cent cuts in education. Obviously, he has not been talking to the Public Service, the morale of which has never been lower. He certainly has not been talking to employees of the Public Buildings Department or the Engineering and Water Supply Department, whose jobs are on the line.

The Premier may be talking to the so-called captains of industry and commerce in this State who, after all, are motivated by the same philosophy or desire as is the Premier, namely, private profit and indeed public squalor. I was interested, as no doubt we all were, yesterday in the Premier's Ministerial statement, which has been referred to again today by questioning and comment in this debate, on the plastics component factory at Elizabeth. The Premier said that the State Government was able to offer General Motors-Holden's more incentives to build the works in South Australia than were other States. That statement is incorrect, because the company did not build the works; it is utilising its current premises. However, the Premier corrected that statement later in his comments.

What intrigues me (and I understand that the question was asked during the press conference at which the Premier made his statement) is what incentives were given by the Government to G.M.H. to initiate the plastics components section of the industry in South Australia as against the incentives offered by other States. The question was asked today by our Deputy Leader, and here again the Premier avoided giving the answer to that question. Why is he not prepared to make public the incentives offered to G.M.H. to establish its plastics section here? I am aware of what they are, and I expect the Premier to make these incentives known to the public. However, he avoided, in the press conference and in reply to questions in the House, saying what incentives were given to G.M.H. Perhaps he believes that it is not in the interests of the Government or of G.M.H. to reveal what incentives were given to the company in relation to its

establishment here. I ask the Premier to make public the incentives that were given to G.M.H.

I referred earlier to the concern of teachers and parents (and this aspect has also been aired in this debate), and the member for Peake has referred to a meeting that was held in the Thebarton Town Hall recently. The Minister of Agriculture entered the debate to answer some of the points made by the member for Peake. All of us, during the past few months, have received letters from schools in our districts that are concerned at the proposed cuts in education funding. I will refer to two letters that I have received from schools in my district. The first letter I received was from the honorary secretary of the Klemzig Primary School Council, who wrote to the the Minister of Education originally in December 1979, as follows:

We wish to draw to your attention this motion which was passed at our meeting of 15 November 1979:

That a letter go from this council to the Minister of Education pointing out the inadequacy of the grounds maintenance grant.

For your consideration, here are some figures relating to the period January to November 1979.

The letter lists a number of operations that need to be undertaken to maintain the grounds of the school, the cost of which is \$1 990.67. The letter continues:

These figures do not include November, December and January mowing, fertilising, aeration and weed spraying . . . In previous years council employed a groundsman to do some of this work. In our attempts to economise we are attempting to dispense with this expense. Grounds maintenance grants received this year are:

Primary School . . . . .	\$372.69
Junior Primary School . . . . .	\$80.96
	<hr/>
	\$453.65

This grant is quite inadequate for maintenance of our school's grounds, even at a level below that recommended by you. To spend more money on the grounds would cut further into the funds we wish to spend on our children's education. Please see fit to increase the grounds maintenance grant to a level that will enable us to maintain the school's grounds in the manner you recommend.

The letter was sent on 14 December. On 13 March, the Secretary of the school council again wrote to the Minister, as follows:

After almost three months, I am still waiting for a reply to our request for an increase in the grounds maintenance grant. The council contacted me early in April, and I directed a letter to the Minister asking him to pay attention to the school's request, also indicating that it would appreciate an early reply. I also mention that the council (and I know this from personal observation) has over many years worked hard to ensure that the grounds were adequately maintained. The school can be justifiably proud of the efforts made by the council and voluntary helpers in ensuring that the grounds are properly maintained. I also have not received a reply to my letter of 23 April, and, as it is now 5 June, I request the Minister to give attention to the matter and at least be courteous enough to reply to the school council and to the letter that I directed to him on its behalf.

The other school in question is the Gilles Plains High School, which has written to me expressing its concern at the proposed cuts in education funding. The letter is signed by, I take it, a considerable number of members of the school staff. In the time I have left, I make the point that the five main areas of concern relate to the school's desire to maintain existing programmes in the school at least at current levels.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time

has expired.

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** I noted with interest the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture, when he intervened in this debate earlier this evening, about the request by the Minister of Education, as I understood it, in requesting that the names of teachers be given before they addressed questions to him at a recent public meeting. He defended that by saying that it was a fair approach to take at a public meeting. When so many teachers in the teaching service of this State are on contract employment and know that their jobs can be terminated at short notice and at the will of the Minister, based on reports provided by departmental officers, it is intimidating to be put in a position where, if one wants to criticise the priorities given in funding in education (particularly as such a high percentage of education funding is in salaries), it is their jobs that are at stake. This is a most unfortunate attitude to be taken by the Minister.

However, the attitude taken by the Minister of Agriculture, even in attending that meeting and playing a prominent role, as he obviously did, is consistent with the attitude that he took at a public meeting in Norwood, just prior to the recent by-election in that district, when once again we had the odd spectacle of a country member (the Minister of Agriculture) coming into an inner suburban area and interfering in the conduct of that public meeting in that community.

He spoke three times on that night about a matter outside of his Ministerial portfolio, and then, when I rose to speak at that meeting, he criticised me and said that I had no right to speak. In fact, he wanted to prohibit my freedom of expression at a time when I was a candidate in that election. The Minister went on to explain that he thought he had arranged a deal with the Chairman of the meeting and those responsible for it so that I would not speak at that meeting. That attitude towards discussion and debate in the community on a Government's priorities, particularly when they affect such vital issues as planning and education, is to be deplored.

In recent months we have seen a continued decline in employment opportunities in this State, and I link that with a decline in both home building in the private sector, and a reduction of real money available for housing in the public sector, particularly in relation to funds available from the Commonwealth.

As we have heard earlier today, in April 1980 there were 46 800 people unemployed in South Australia. Therefore, with some assuredness it is safe to say that there are several thousand more people than that who are actually unemployed and seeking work but who are not registered as unemployed in this State. I understand that more than 20 000 families are seeking public housing in this State at present. Clearly, more families each week are falling into the category of those who can only hope to obtain secure and sound housing at a rent they can afford from the public sector.

Many families find themselves in that position because of unemployment: they find that the breadwinner of the family loses his job and sooner or later they must sell their house. There is a limit to how long a lending authority will allow an unemployed person not to pay his mortgage payments. Unfortunately, this situation is befalling more and more families in the community.

The prime provider of public housing in South Australia is, of course, the South Australian Housing Trust, but other Government departments also possess large stocks of rented housing, particularly the Highways Department, which is probably second to the Housing Trust as the largest landlord in this State. By analysing the trends in

unemployment, the demand for public housing and the response of the Government to these needs, the community can clearly see the priorities of the Government of the day. In South Australia, we can see that the Government is, week by week, slipping behind in the promise it made to create 7 000 jobs for South Australians, particularly for young people. The incidence of youth unemployment in this State since the present Government came to power is nothing less than scandalous.

The Government is prepared to downgrade the importance of public housing in the community. A recent decision by the Government to sell off double unit rental housing will reduce the available stock of rental housing markedly in this State. In the next decade or so, when those houses have been sold, resold, renovated and refurbished, the unemployed, the sick, the disabled, widows and single parents will of course not be able to purchase those houses and will have to wait years longer for a rental home. That decision primarily increases the waiting time for those families seeking public housing. Further, many of those houses are now in a condition where an alternative would be to bulldoze them and rejuvenate some of those areas with a different style of housing. The ability to rent houses means that the land is preserved for public use for future generations, but to sell those houses means that the land is lost for future public use for all time.

As the bulk of the stock of public housing is in the outer suburban areas of Adelaide, I believe the Government should provide greater funds for inner suburban public housing schemes. Fortunately, in my electorate, there is still some space available for housing projects. The Doctor Kent's Paddocks housing project at Kent Town is an excellent example of how public housing can help bring about a renewal in a suburb. The suburb of Kent Town is rich in services, facilities and housing, but lacking residences that are occupied as dwellinghouses. There are still many livable houses in this area, but they are used for other than living units, mostly for commercial and industrial purposes.

That position exists in many other inner suburban areas, where the living units are being transferred to non-residential use. There is a clear role for the Government to come in and purchase more of these houses and return them to residential use. I do not mean that the Government should go into these areas and purchase, creating a false market, but when these properties come on the market there is an opportunity for public intervention to return those properties to rental homes, particularly for low-income families. Those families can then enjoy the fruits of living close to the city, close to the major employment centres, hospitals, specialised education institutions, and other community support programmes, rather than over-burdening those much younger less established programmes to support needy families in the outer suburbs.

The Premier has made great play in recent days about the creation of 50 jobs at General Motors-Holden's Elizabeth plant, although he did not say whether these jobs would be filled by persons already employed by G.M.H. at Elizabeth. He did admit, however, today under questioning that there would be a resultant loss of jobs in other areas of industry in this State. While the provision of some jobs receives publicity, I understand that a decision taken by the well-known firm of Woodroofes at Norwood to dismiss a substantial number of employees has not received any publicity at all. That firm is almost as old as Norwood itself, and I believe that over 20 employees, some of whom have spent most of their working lives with

that company, have received notices to quit. No public statement has been made that I could find by anyone on this matter. Dodson Industries in Norwood formerly employed over 120 people, but that company has now phased out its operation. Similarly, the Freeman Motors plant, also in Norwood, is just a shell of factories.

The interesting thing about the Woodroffe's decision is that, like many industries in the inner suburbs, it owns 26 dwelling houses, some of which are still being rented, while others are used for commercial purposes. That is a perfect opportunity for the Housing Trust to purchase those houses and return them for rental properties in that area. There is a sufficient number of houses to make it an extremely attractive proposition for public housing by way of an urban renewal project. If, in fact, as I understand it, the plan is to sell those houses off after they have been refurbished, that will mean a further increase in the waiting list.

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

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** It seems that the member for Hanson has not got his act together to say his piece tonight, so I will cheerfully follow the member for Norwood. Much has been said today and tonight about the \$8 000 000 expansion programme at General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth. I believe it has been pointed out quite clearly by members on this side that the 50 so-called additional jobs will come from existing employees at that plant through wastage and attrition. Even if they were new jobs, that gain would be nullified by the announcement by Atco, which is also situated at Elizabeth, that 69 employees were retrenched last Friday. Perhaps that highlights the point made by the member for Norwood. The Government is very loath to make any comment about retrenchments. Even if there are an additional 50 jobs in Elizabeth, 69 have been lost. Therefore, there is a net loss of 19 jobs in the Elizabeth area. The Premier claims that he is holding the line in relation to unemployment, but, as far as the people in my district are concerned, he is leading a full-scale retreat.

Last week the Premier came to Elizabeth to launch the Northern Adelaide Development Board. He made some rather soothing noises at that meeting about non-political participation, "It's a great State, mate" and "Let's get everything moving." Yesterday he tried to make political capital of that board. I will quote from the speech he made in this Chamber when, going on about "It's a great State, mate," he said:

It is also evidenced, as the member for Elizabeth would know—

I am sure he was referring to me; he obviously does not realise that there are two Labor members in Elizabeth—by the formation of the Northern Adelaide Development Board, which has a wide spectrum of interest from the community. Trade union leaders, industry leaders, local government and community bodies are represented, and all of them are dedicated to one thing, namely to get this State back on its feet again and to get industrial and economic development moving.

Let me tell the House and the Premier that the formation of that board was not in any way prompted by support for this Government's policies. It was formed because of sheer frustration about what was happening in the northern Adelaide areas. Unemployment in those areas is among the worst in the State, particularly for young people.

Even going back to 1977 when we were in Government, I have yet to hear one member of the Liberal Party, the Country Party or the Australian Democrats say one thing to highlight the plight of the unemployed. They are quick

to bash the trade union movement, and to say that the introduction of the 35-hour week is going to create havoc in this State, but I am yet to hear one person on the opposite side say something about the state of the unemployed.

Let me tell members opposite what it is like to be unemployed. I dread to think of any worker who has a Liberal member representing him, because I have had instances of people coming to me from Gawler and Virginia because they are loath to go to the Liberal member who represents them in their area. The member for Henley Beach, who is asleep at the moment, made the point that members on this side encroach on other members' districts. We retain the right to do that because we represent the workers in this State.

Let me tell the House the state of the unemployed in my district. They are being forced to sell their furniture. They are being forced to sell their freezers because they can no longer fill them. They are being forced to sell their motor cars, if they are not being repossessed. They are being forced to cash in their insurance policies to meet their repayments on articles they have purchased, but we never hear anything from the opposite side of the House about those people.

*Mr. Randall interjecting:*

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I am glad to hear that the member for Henley Beach has woken up. On 2 May an article appeared in the *Advertiser* which was thought sufficiently serious to warrant an editorial on the subject. It spoke of the Elizabeth community fund, which had run out of money. It could no longer supply the needs of those people who were, through being unemployed, unable to meet their household commitments. It stated that not only was one fund having to close its doors, but that there was another fund that had only enough money to last for five or six weeks.

I immediately tried to contact the Minister of Community Welfare. I could not get him because he was flying over the northern part of the state in an attempt to persuade the Pitjantjatjara people that the policies the Liberal Government is pursuing are the correct ones. I spoke to a Robert Worth, who I think was an unsuccessful candidate during the last State election. Mr. Worth assured me that he felt the matter was of considerable importance and that he would contact the Minister as soon as he returned from the Far North. That was on the Thursday.

On the Friday Mr. Worth rang me and said he had contacted the Minister, that they had carried out a check (obviously to check whether I was making up the whole story; they were not satisfied with what they had seen in the *Advertiser*), and that he was contacting the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, Senator Guilfoyle, to get emergency funding into the Elizabeth area. That was on 3 May. I have yet to hear from the Minister of Community Welfare concerning that emergency funding that was to be arranged for the Elizabeth people.

At the same time, more than 60 per cent of the people who are going to the Elizabeth community fund for financial relief are being referred to that body by the Department for Community Welfare, because that department has had its funding cut back so it cannot give relief. Thus, what is in the Liberal Party policy is hypocritical. It states:

The aim of a Liberal Government is to enhance the dignity, security, self-reliance and well-being of all South Australians and to assist people to overcome hardship and insecurity in ways which ensure that they retain the maximum scope for independence and achievement.



I hope that a Minister in this House will defend the Minister of Community Welfare in another place, as the Minister of Agriculture defended the Minister of Education, because the people in my district are waiting for this State Liberal Government, the Government that wants to assist voluntary bodies to help the people who are disadvantaged. We are waiting for some positive move by this Government to help the people of Elizabeth. I think I can say quite clearly that the help will not be forthcoming.

**Mr. Keneally:** You'll wait in vain.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Yes. I hope that what I have said tonight will sting the remaining few members opposite who are to speak in this debate to say something about the unemployed. Perhaps the member for Hanson has got his act together now and will say something about the unemployed in his district. Members on this side are concerned about unemployed people. We are concerned that the unemployment rate in this State is 7.7 per cent, the highest in the Commonwealth. We are not convinced by the Premier's juggling of the figures so that he can make us think that everything is going well for this State, mate. We know on this side (and the people will know shortly) that things are not right, so far as we are concerned.

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

**Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park):** In view of the Premier's huffing, puffing and strutting earlier today, I think he should be reminded of the old political proverb:

Today a rooster, tomorrow a feather duster.

I attended a performance of *Evita* last week, and while there I was reminded of the Premier by the character of General Peron, the Argentinian ruler, not because of any physical resemblance to Peron or to the actor portraying him, or to any similarity to Peron's Italian idol who was executed in Milan in 1945 and who had the same predilection as the Premier to pose pompously with his arms folded. My mind turned to the Premier because of a verse sung in the opera by Peron as he looked behind him to see whether his position was secure, a verse which opened with the following words:

Dice are rolling,

The knives are out,

Would-be Presidents are all about.

Listening to that I immediately thought of the Premier and mentally altered the last line to constitute a reminder to the Premier that would-be Premiers are all about. Indeed, had the surprise win of his Party in the election last year not occurred, his leadership would have been overthrown, so poor was his performance as Leader of the Opposition. For the time being his position is safe, but time will tell; would-be Premiers are all about.

With the results of the State election last year and the Norwood by-election in March, many members opposite have had two election shocks in the last 12 months. The first shock was on 15 September 1979, when many were surprised to find that they had won the election. The result was somewhat of a fluke, as the member for Mitcham has pointed out when he stated that, if the election had been held on the Saturday before or the Saturday after September 15, the result would have been quite different. Nevertheless, the Liberals got the best election result that money could buy, and many of them were quite surprised at the relative ease with which they won that election.

**Mr. Lewis:** Hang on; you blokes—

**Mr. TRAINER:** One just has to look at the sort of members who find themselves on the back bench opposite, like the one who just interjected, and at the calibre of them. Most of them would not be in the big guns category; rather they would be in the big bores category. Some had

been preselected for only a very short time before the election. Indeed, in the case of the member for Mallee, the top cards somehow trumped each other in the pre-selection and the joker in the pack came out on top. Some had been members of their Party for only a short while before the election. If one looks at the back bench opposite, one sees that it is not terribly impressive, particularly when one looks at the member for Henley Beach. I will not use unparliamentary language as one of my colleagues did: I will merely refer to him as an incrustation on the trade union movement. The member for Henley Beach denied that any 3 per cent cut was contemplated in the education Budget and then, in criticism of the education Budget, said:

An amount of \$1 000 000 a day is being spent on education in South Australia. No wonder we have to look at trimming back some expenditure.

The \$1 000 000 a day is trotted out as a figure of some significance. How much a day does the honourable member think it should cost? That works out at less than \$8 a day per student, which is less than child-minding fees. The honourable member then went on to complain that 90 per cent of the Budget is taken up by salaries. He must be aware that education is a labour-intensive occupation that deals with people and employs people. It is not capital intensive, unless he wants to see the technological revolution replace teachers with teaching machines. He does not seem to be aware that the building costs come not from the general Budget but from the Loans side of the ledger. He further complains:

This is the result of the system that they set up over the past 10 years. What sort of education system is that, with 89.8 per cent being spent on salaries?

The 10 per cent which is not spent on salaries, the 10 per cent which disappoints him, covers such materials as chalk, text books, electricity, stamps and so on. Perhaps he thinks that 90 per cent of the Budget should go on chalk.

We then get the inanity of the member for Brighton compounding this error by repeating what the member for Henley Beach said earlier, that in a good profit-earning enterprise only 50 per cent of the budget should go on salaries. I am not sure what he thinks the other 50 per cent should go on. Maybe he thinks that 50 per cent should be spent on chalk. Judging by the sort of speeches that have come from the back-benchers on the other side tonight, not only do they get Ministers to write their questions as Dorothy Dixers but they should also get them to write their speeches so that they do not come out with such inane statements as those made in respect to the education budget.

It is unlikely ever again in the near political future that members opposite will have so much working for them at one time as they had on 15 September, such as the problems that ensued for the Government of the day by the very nature of the calling of the early election, and so on. Probably they will still, at the next election, have the armchair ride that they were given by the Murdoch press, which co-operated with all the knocking that the now Government and the then Opposition took part in, in the weeks and months leading up to that election.

The Premier yesterday had the gall to refer to my Leader as a knocker simply because of his well-founded criticism of the general economic slide that has taken place in recent months, regardless of how much the Premier might deny any setbacks. The current Leader of the Opposition, in contrast to the previous Leader, goes out of his way to try to be reasonable in his criticism, to be the Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition and not be the unmitigated knocker that the previous Leader of the

Opposition was. Criticism that is offered by the Leader is constructive and is given with the best interests of South Australia at heart, despite what back-benchers and some front-benchers on the other side have had to say, yet the Premier has the gall to refer to the Leader of the Opposition as a knocker. I suppose he ought to be an expert on knockers. Judging by his performance in the months before the 15 September election, it could be said that the team opposite have the biggest knockers since Sabrina. However, I am astounded at his about-turn, now that he is Premier, on the subject of knocking and his Damascus-like conversion to the road of righteousness. Nothing is worse than a reformed alcoholic or a poacher turned gamekeeper. He knocked away right up to the election, and suddenly he will now not accept honest constructive criticism, but instead calls it knocking.

Consider the genuine knocking that was done by the current Premier with the help of certain figures in the business establishment with axes to grind, as well as the help of those people who are now his Ministers. That knocking did its work. Large sections of the community were obviously able to be convinced that some sort of socialist cataclysm was just around the corner if the Labor Government remained in office. The Premier, knocking away on the television night after night, spent a lot of his time and put a lot of effort into the task of talking the economy down. Now that he is Premier, he has found that it is a lot more difficult to talk the economy up again than it is to destroy confidence in the first place, but he tries to hide the situation with phoney figures and statistical gymnastics.

Another strange aspect of the election last year was the peculiar behaviour of employees of the State Transport Authority with the series of lightning stoppages that took place. These seemed to be almost deliberately orchestrated to achieve the maximum disruption to commuters and the maximum inconvenience. People were put off the bus or left stranded by a bus going straight past them in pouring rain, and this took place just a short period before the election. The roster on which the dispute was based was apparently such a matter of life and death that employees concerned could not possibly wait any longer; the issue had to be dealt with immediately, regardless of any other matter and regardless of the fact that an extraneous factor was introduced into the election campaign by their actions. Yet, almost by magic, the dispute came to an end on the very next day after the election. Here we are again, nine months later, with those rosters that were a matter of life and death at the time of the election still in existence and we have heard no more about them. The coincidences are extraordinary. I know that circumstantial evidence does not hold much weight in court, but some circumstantial evidence is very strong indeed, and I believe the exquisite timing of that activity suggests something about the motivations of some of the members who took part in that dispute. There is an old saying about circumstantial evidence that some circumstantial evidence is overwhelming, like a trout in the milk. This would seem to be one such case.

**Mr. O'NEILL (Florey):** I am rather concerned and, given the fact that the Liberal Party was found guilty by a court of the land of defamation in the 1979 election, I was hopeful that members opposite might have lifted their game a bit. However, it seems that they intend to persist in attempts to denigrate members on this side with personal attacks. I refer to—

**Mr. Lewis:** What about the attacks on the member for Hartley?

**Mr. O'NEILL:**—attacks by the member for Henley

Beach on a couple of my colleagues. I said, in an interjection, that he could compromise some of his own colleagues, and he said, "Name them". I said, "I will". However, having given the matter some thought, I consider that I should just give him a warning that, when I was secretary of the A.L.P., a couple of things were brought to my attention in regard to the use to which the mailing facilities of this House were put by members of the Liberal Party, and at least two senior members of the Liberal Party engaged in precisely the practice that the member for Henley Beach found so abhorrent. I am also informed from a reliable source that another senior member infringed protocol to some extent in respect to a stamp allowance.

If the member for Henley Beach wants to resort to the type of attack he launched on the member for Peake last night, he should be careful, because there are instances that can be quoted which may impeach some of his senior colleagues.

Another matter that concerned me somewhat was the reference made by the same member to interference in the affairs of the electorates of other members. I made a statement in relation to the member for Todd, and he made some remarks about not wanting to associate with me in any way at all. That is his prerogative. He knows the criteria by which I am prepared to associate with him, and he has done nothing about it, but I will not lose any sleep over that.

I attended a meeting recently at a high school in my district. I was introduced, but later in the proceedings I was amazed to hear the Chairman say that he had an apology from the local member, Scott Ashenden. It was nowhere near the Todd District, and if the member for Todd did not put in the apology in those terms I will stand corrected, but it did seem to me that he had put in an apology in terms intended to lead people in the area to think that he was the member.

**Mr. Slater:** What school was it?

**Mr. O'NEILL:** Para Vista High School. That was the reason for the interjection. Another matter that I wish to mention concerns something that arose tonight. The member for Mawson seemed to have his metaphors mixed; he seemed to think he was doing the member for Henley Beach a favour when he referred to him as a scab, and went to some extent to justify that. What he thinks of his fellow members is his own business, but he said that a scab is something that covers a wound, and, when the wound heals, the scab drops off. My interpretation of that is that, when the Labor Government gets in, the member for Henley Beach will drop off. That will be not a moment too soon.

I took exception to the use by the member for Mawson of the words "black sheep" in relation to trade unionists. He seemed to be enamoured of the advertising to which I referred earlier in which his Party had fallen foul of the law. However, it was interesting to note the derogatory use of the word "black". I have often suspected the attitudes displayed by that member, and people have said through history that we should beware of zealots, so I was not greatly surprised when he used the word "black" in such a derogatory and racist way.

Having said that, I want to turn to a matter which arose yesterday concerning the fiery little member for Fisher, who made some very inflammatory remarks about the trade union movement in a rather disjointed and quite untrue presentation of what he called facts. He started off by referring to an article in the daily paper which is being written at the present time by scab journalists, and which refers to allegations about Australia's top 100 unions having a total of \$83 000 000 and property worth

\$63 000 000. He seemed to think that that was a huge amount of money.

In the brief time available to me, I have managed to get together some figures which concern not 100, but 65 of the larger companies in Australia, and the figures relate not to accumulated funds but to the profit made in the last 12 months. When we talk about who in this country is powerful and who is not powerful, we can see how stupid are the remarks of the trade union incendiary from Fisher. Over their history, 100 unions of the trade union movement have accumulated \$83 000 000. In a period of 12 months, 65 companies accumulated \$1 403 220 000 profit. The honourable member went on and tried to zero in on certain unions, and referred to approximately 20 unions—

**Mr. Trainer:** He was just "arson" around.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** Yes. He referred to approximately 20 unions having amassed funds exceeding \$53 000 000 during their history. Of that list of companies, 10 companies extracted from the list showed an accumulated profit for one year of \$778 400 000.

**Mr. Lewis:** They worked for it.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** They worked for it, I agree. The member for Fisher made some amazing statements about unions not declaring their finances. He should know, and so should the member for Mallee, that, under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act of the Commonwealth of Australia, Federal registered unions are required to make available to the Registrar and to supply free of charge to members of the organisation a copy of the report and copies of accounts and statements prepared in accordance with section 158ab of the Act. Similar provisions apply in the Industrial Court in South Australia.

He then went on to say in respect of the trade union movement that the unions operate in an illegal way, standing over people and forcing them to join unions. The hypocrisy of that statement is clearly exposed in Government memos which have been circulated and which show quite clearly that the Government supports the proposition of preference to trade union members seeking employment in Government departments. The member for Fisher probably has a personal interest in it, and I believe I know the union referred to. The only reason why members of his family who are members of that union do not know the financial situation of the organisation is that they do not bother to attend the annual general meeting and they do not bother to read the journals that are printed throughout the year by the union which indicate the financial state of the organisation. Exhibited in the February copy is a statement signed by the auditor to the effect that the books are in order. The audits are done by chartered accountants or by other people recognised in the accountancy profession, and they must be done in accordance with the requirements of the Act. A lot of rubbish is spoken in this Chamber.

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

**Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd):** I wish to start my speech with a personal explanation in relation to something said by the member for Florey. I believe he said that I had apologised at a meeting at a school in his district, and I think I heard him say that it was the Para Vista school.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. I said an apology was tendered in those terms.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I have indicated previously that statements such as those made by the member for Florey are, of necessity, made by way of personal explanation if there is any difficulty, and not

during the course of another member's contribution.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** The member for Florey said that an apology was tendered at a school in his electorate, and I think I heard him say that it was the Para Vista High School. I was elected by the people of Todd to represent the people of Todd, and I have 11 primary schools and two high schools in my district, with many of my constituents having children attending two high schools just outside my district. Para Vista High School certainly does not come into any of these categories. If that apology was placed, I can assure the House and the member for Florey that I did not ask for it to be tendered, and tonight was the first time I had heard of such an occurrence.

I was elected by the people of Todd and I have enough concerns in that area without interfering with problems in other areas. Obviously, those of us who are very keen and concerned about the people in our electorate will work very hard for them. We do not have the time to go outside our own electorate, as obviously some of the members opposite do.

Members opposite certainly have brought up a number of spurious points tonight. I shall not go into all of them, but some of them need replying to. The first concerns the new work coming to General Motors-Holden's in the form of plastics. Members opposite seem to be overlooking a couple of points, and I think that possibly the member for Gilles might even be a little embarrassed about some of the things that have been said, because he, as a member of the Industries Development Committee, would know how hard we worked to get that employment available here in South Australia. There is no doubt that there was very strong interstate competition for the plastics plant to go to New South Wales or Victoria. I believe that our getting the plant is a credit to all of those who were involved, including the two members of the Opposition who are on the Industries Development Committee.

The point that seems to go begging is this: members opposite are saying that all that will happen is that people will be taken from other places and also that consequently we will have jobs lost at Kelvinator and elsewhere. Even if such statements were factual, those jobs would have been lost anyway, and at least we now have the plastics operation in South Australia. However you look at it, it is a plus for industry in South Australia.

If members opposite knew anything at all about the car industry they would realise that plastics will become more and more important in the development of the new generation of vehicles.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** What's new about this?

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** It is obviously new to members opposite because they know nothing about it. The point is that by getting those new jobs now, the future will be extremely bright. As the need for plastics in vehicles increases, it will be the G.M.H. plant at Elizabeth that will be catering for that new business. It will not be G.M.H. at Fishermen's Bend or G.M.H. in New South Wales. Therefore, this small start, this tip of the iceberg, will become even more important as time goes on.

**Mr. Trainer:** It is rather a pity that plastics are made from petro-chemicals.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** I wonder whether the member for Ascot Park knows what he is talking about. I will take great delight in rebutting his comments during the Address in Reply debate in the next session. I believe that members opposite are severely embarrassed by the fact that this Government is getting new business to this State. All they can do is show that embarrassment by attacking the Government for the work it is doing. The Premier has pointed that out very well, and certainly made the Leader of the Opposition look like the amateur that he is in the

debate earlier today. I think the term "sour grapes" was used concerning the Opposition. Obviously during the nine months that the Liberal Party has been in office it has shown that it can come up with the goods and it will come up with many more as members opposite will find out in the next few weeks.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** What are the goods?

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** Just be patient. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will be sorry that he raised these points. Members opposite do not know what "new" means. The plastics business in South Australia is new, and there are other new industries—there are no two ways about it.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** We have had plastics plants here for years.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** At General Motors?

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** Members opposite were also talking about robots in the car industry. Perhaps they should ask themselves why it is that manufacturers are looking at this type of innovation. There are two major reasons: first, the unreasonable demands by unions (not by workers) regarding wages and penalty rates.

*Mr. Hemmings interjecting:*

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** For the member for Napier's information, at least I can say that I have worked in the industry, and I know what the workers say, they do not make flattering comments about their union representatives. Again as far as the robots are concerned, another point is that employers are finding that robots are able to do a better job at a much lower price, and the point comes back to just what can the manufacturers afford. As it is, vehicles are becoming very expensive and manufacturers must keep costs down so that people can afford to buy them. It is as simple as that.

Members opposite have also shown abysmal ignorance as far as education matters are concerned. They have spoken of a 3 per cent cut in the education budget. I would like them to show me where this Government or any member of the Government has said that there will be a 3 per cent cut in education. Members opposite believe their own propaganda, and when that happens, gentlemen, you are in serious trouble. Members opposite are the only ones who have said it, and they are now perpetrating this outside. Members opposite have been critical of the Government's spending on education this year, but they are overlooking completely the fact that this Government increased the education Budget of the former Government. What would have been going on if the Labor Party was still in power? There would have been even less money for the education area, yet the Opposition is critical of this Government, which has provided more.

The member for Napier has raised yet another issue, the 35-hour week, and then he wonders why manufacturing industry cannot compete. Obviously, he is a supporter of the 35-hour week, but if he cared to look in the papers, he would find that he is certainly in the minority, because the workers have indicated that they are not the least bit interested as far as the 35-hour-week is concerned.

**Mr. Hemmings:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Todd stated that I was a supporter of the 35-hour-week—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. I have already warned the House previously this evening that this form of intrusion into a member's contribution will not be tolerated by the Chair.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** The point is that obviously the member for Napier is a supporter of that. Of course, this does not have Mr. Hawke's support or the support of the majority of Australians. The workers do not want it;

management does not want it; Mr. Hawke does not want it; sensible thinkers do not want it, because no doubt it will increase the cost of manufacturing even more than now. It is absolutely ridiculous and spurious to say that it will increase employment. All it will do is to give the present workers more money because they will be working more overtime.

**Mr. WHITTEN (Price):** I am concerned with what I have heard from the member who has just resumed his seat. To me it seems really hypocritical for him to talk about people working a 35-hour-week, and for him to condemn that, when he himself has at no time worked a 40-hour week. I want to refer to a matter that I think is of great concern—

**Mr. Ashenden:** I have always worked more than a 40-hour week and I had never received overtime for it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WHITTEN:** The matter I want to refer to concerns the young people in South Australia. Last year the member for Spence (then Minister of Community Welfare) drew my attention to a report concerning the practice of petrol-sniffing which is very prevalent at Yalata. Since that time I have made some inquiries about misuse of hallucinatory drugs. During the latter part of March I put a Question on Notice to the Minister of Health. I asked the Minister whether she would give consideration to, first, restricting the availability of hallucinatory substances, including certain glues and aerosol packs; secondly, requiring additives to be included in such hallucinatory substances to render them offensive to smell; and, thirdly, instituting rehabilitative programmes to assist those addicted to habits caused by inhalation of such hallucinatory substances.

I received a reply yesterday, which stated "Yes, yes, yes". I am pleased that the Minister considered my questions. She also stated that the whole question of abuse of volatile solvents, both from pressurised aerosols and glues, is under consideration at the present time by the health authorities.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** It is a very difficult problem to solve. Your Government tried to solve the problem, too.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I would be the first to agree that the problem is difficult. If the Minister will listen, I will explain my views. It was stated in the *Messenger* press last week that the Parks Community Centre had instituted an inquiry, and I believe that a good job has been done. It was also stated:

A nine-part plan to combat youth problems at Parks Community Centre, Angle Park, has been released to the public.

It looks at youth programs, the drop-in cellar, glue sniffing, vandalism, use of centre facilities . . .

It was further stated:

Other sections of the working party's report deal with glue sniffing . . . "Young people in The Parks area are subject to a number of pressures which affect their inability to cope with life tasks."

"These include a very high level of youth unemployment and peer group pressures which are sometimes disruptive to the young person and others," . . .

I am concerned that, in the Angle Park area and the Parks area in general, which is in my district, there has been a high degree of glue sniffing.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** In other areas, too.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I know that, but I refer specifically to my own area. The use of volatile substances that affect moods should be discouraged; this can be done without the Government's using heavy-handed methods. The Health Commission, in particular, should encourage an

awareness of the problems in order to assist young people who have experimented with glue sniffing. A large range of materials is available, which have hallucinatory effects. Some of these substances are used to good effect, but others are abused. Model aeroplanes require a glue that contains a solvent that is highly hallucinatory. I believe that the model-aeroplane clubs control the use of this substance.

Some young people are pressured by peer groups to use aerosols, and they experience trouble. There is also a problem in regard to industry, because many paint thinners contain solvents that change the mood of workers. Paint sprayers who use these substances may experience a change of mood because of the vapours that are inhaled during the day. Some substances are more harmful than others and there are ways in which the problem can be overcome. Manufacturers could be encouraged to reformulate their products. They could refrain from using toluene and benzene, which are highly hallucinatory. Retailers could also be discouraged from selling these products to abusers. The problem has been widespread.

In April to June of 1979, 141 sniffers were reported by police; police believe that only one third of misusers are detected, and some say that the figure is as high as 10 per cent. Various controls can be enforced. Aerosols that can produce sudden death, benzene (certain glues, cleansing fluids and paint removers that are toxic to the blood forming tissues), toluene (certain glues and paint thinners), which can produce brain damage, and halogenated hydrocarbons (petrol), which can produce kidney damage and hepatic toxins—all these substances should be controlled. Benzene and toluene are both abusible solvents, representing significant health risks. Toluene is in many glues, and is often abused. The principal short term effect of toluene abuse is confusion, fatigue, stupor, nausea and unco-ordination.

I am pleased that the Minister will consider this matter. Acetone is a liquid that is widely used and can affect young people to a great extent. Different hydrocarbons, like ether, cannot be controlled effectively. An effective education programme should be carried out.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I wish to protest about what I consider has been a very poor effort by the Opposition, with the exception of one or two speakers, to make a contribution that is worthy of this Parliament. I remind the House of the statement made on 1 April by you, sir, when reference was made to the language of members in Parliamentary debates. It was left up to individual members to take whatever action they wished in relation to reflection by other members. I believe that the time has come in South Australian politics when the Government deserves a reasonable Opposition. For some unknown reason, the present Opposition does not appear to be organising itself or structuring any kind of campaign that can be of any benefit to South Australia, and that is not good for the State. I remember that, on many occasions, the former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, reminded us, when we were in Opposition, about how important it was that the Opposition should perform well, because he believed that it was beneficial to his Government that the Opposition be strong. When we came forward with beneficial ideas and suggestions, many of them were accepted by the Government of the day.

Many of us can point to many areas that have brought benefits to South Australia, but we have not had that from this Opposition. For some unknown reason, it has not accepted its role as true Opposition. We have heard much this evening in the analysis of State finances, and basically

we would be discussing the financial figures for April and May. It is still early to predict what would happen at 30 June, but there has been an improvement in State finances due in some measure to the Government's programme of sound management.

We said during the 1979 election campaign that we would try to introduce cost savings of between 2½ per cent and 3 per cent. On current figures quoted by the Premier, we seem to have a surplus of about \$30 000 000, which would be about 2½ per cent of the total Budget income. We went to the people with that statement. The people knew that we would be looking somewhere in that vicinity, and at present the Government is maintaining that programme, in an attempt to reduce the cost of Government administration. That does not mean that it is reducing the cost at the expense of health services, education, welfare services, or the other main services demanded of any modern Government.

It is totally erroneous for any person to say that the State Government will slash education spending by 3 per cent. No-one knows what is being prepared for the next Budget and, until we see that Budget, it is wrong to speculate and cause anxiety that this or that will happen. The Government is clear in its policy that there will be no dismissals of employees, whether they are weekly paid or public servants. Therefore, we must maintain the levels of those salaries.

What, then, is the real beef in relation to the Government's efforts to prove that it is an efficient Administration? I am concerned that the Opposition is trying to frighten the community, because to do that is irresponsible. If anything came through in the debate this evening, it is the concern of Opposition members about unemployment, yet not one idea has been put forward to improve employment in South Australia. The Opposition has not made one suggestion on what specific projects the Government should implement to create employment. Any attempt by the Government to encourage new industries and any attempt by industry to expand in South Australia is being criticised because of the huge capital content required to create employment opportunities.

I think Opposition members for the first time are suddenly finding that it will cost millions of dollars to create a few jobs. That concerns me greatly, as does the unemployment situation. The whole problem is to get the confidence and backing of the people to attract industries and create employment opportunities. How can any Government or person do this when the Opposition is disjointed and will not encourage confidence within the State? If what I have said is not the Opposition's intentions, it is about time that it started to spell out its intention. The Opposition's performance is not organised, and it is about time that it got its game together. Yesterday the Premier announced four main projects that meant the injection of \$179 000 000 worth of capital into South Australia. That is not bad, in the first few months of office of the new Government. Although the Government has been attacked on unemployment, I remind the House that the Premier said (I will quote from *Hansard*)—

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member may not quote from *Hansard* of the current session but he may refer to statements made.

**Mr. BECKER:** The Premier informed the House yesterday that our share of national unemployment had fallen from a high point of 11.1 per cent in October 1979 to 10.4 per cent in March this year. We must bear in mind the impact on those unemployment figures of last year's school-leavers. Even so, as the Premier has said, it is not a very comforting figure. Let us get on with the job of creating employment opportunities. Let us get the backing

of everyone in the community, including the Opposition and the trade union movement. Let us give the encouragement that will create development and expansion opportunities.

**Mr. Abbott:** Lower prices.

**Mr. BECKER:** As the member for Spence has said, lower prices and tight profits through efficiency of management will create the confidence so that the people spend their money. That is what the campaign in the media is all about, and I should have thought that any socialist would say that the secret of success is to get the community to turn their money over as much as possible. By generating spending, we create demand, which in turn creates the need for the consumer goods manufactured and sold in this State. This is the only way in which we can do it in the short term; but in the long term we must look for worthwhile projects for the benefit of South Australia.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** From time to time members on the Government benches have paid significant compliments to the Opposition. Government members are not always conscious of the fact that they are doing so, but it is done usually in relation to our organisational ability. Earlier tonight the Minister of Agriculture suggested that the organisational ability of the A.L.P. was such that we were able to stack the famous Thebarton Town Hall meeting and flood the place with our supporters.

We have been told in this Chamber that the Opposition has sold the story of all sorts of problems occurring because of the prospective cuts in the education budget. This is somewhat familiar to me, because when I came here 10 years ago the then Opposition, having only just been turfed out of Government, was bitter about what it regarded as an A.L.P. campaign conducted through the schools against the former Minister of Education, Mrs. Joyce Steele. It was not that there was any genuine concern in the schools at that time, apparently, according to Liberal spokesmen. It was simply that the A.L.P. had been able to use its apparently superb organisational technique to stack meetings, get the right sort of resolutions through, and generally make life miserable for that former Liberal Minister.

We are starting to hear echoes of that campaign all over again. On behalf of my colleagues, I thank the Government for the compliments that it is paying to us. One almost imagines that it would be prepared to abdicate the Treasury benches immediately, because any Party that has all that organisational skill should surely be trusted with being able to run the State. However, it is not quite as simple as Government members make out. True, there is much concern and unrest in our schools. I have before me a file of some of the letters that have been written to my Leader, to me or, in some cases, to both of us from schools throughout the State. I should like to be able to take time to go through them alphabetically and read out the names of the schools that have written to us expressing concern at the 3 per cent cut.

Clearly, there is widespread concern. Indeed, I have not seen as much concern since the days of the Liberal Government, when Mrs. Steele was Minister. However, I never believed that it was her fault, because a Minister of Education stands or falls according to the support that is given to him or her by his or her Cabinet colleagues; that was the problem in 1968-69. Who is to blame here? Who has really initiated this campaign of concern throughout our schools? The Government is to blame, because it has initiated this whole matter. I remind the Government of two things that happened before we came back into session in this calendar year. True, no-one has said that, in

the 1980-81 Budget, expenditure will be cut by 3 per cent. No-one is suggesting that that has ever been said.

What happened was that, first, a document appeared, and was given wide publicity. It suggested that the Government was looking to save a considerable sum. It needed to save \$40 000 000 of the 1980-81 Budget. No-one denied that that was an authentic Government document. People immediately asked whence the money was going to come. Saving money in Government terms is a euphemism for not spending as much. Then we had the Premier coming out on, as I recall, 27 January (I have the newspaper clipping), when certain journalists asked how his austerity campaign was going. He said, "Very well, but we need to save more." When the Premier was asked where this could be done, he said that there were still some areas in education where services were being delivered too expensively. What can the Government expect, but that the people in those areas will immediately take fright? They know, because it has been authenticated, that the Government wants to save \$40 000 000 of the coming year's Budget.

Here is the Leader of the Government coming out and pinpointing two areas where he says that savings must be made. One would have liked him to go specifically into those areas so that he could have put the finger on the areas where savings needed to be made. They may have saved a great deal of heartburn or his Minister from the embarrassment of being snowed by these hundreds of letters. Obviously, he must have had something in mind. Surely the Premier and Treasurer does not pull departments out of the air simply because he has to say something to the journalists. He must have had something specifically in mind. So, why did he not spell it out at that time?

It may have had nothing to do with the schools area: it may have had something to do with the post-secondary area, the D.F.E. area, or colleges of advanced education, although, in that case, in case the Premier does not know, they are funded by the Commonwealth. If the Premier had been prepared to be a little more specific on that occasion, there may not have been so much concern; but he was not prepared to do so. He came out and confirmed the fears already growing in people's minds.

Why were those fears growing? It is because Treasury officials know that it is always easier to save money in the large departments than it is in the smaller departments. As I have said previously in the House, "How do you save money in the Department of Labour and Industry when, of course, it is all salaries in a department like that?" Government members complain about education not being efficient, because 89 per cent goes in salaries. There must be Government departments in which nearly 100 per cent is spent on salaries because that is the nature of the department. Service in our schools is delivered via the teacher, as my colleague, the member for Ascot Park, has adequately explained. Naturally, a high percentage of that Budget will go into salaries, and that cannot be any indictment of policies on the part of previous Governments. Of course we built up the number of teachers in the teaching force, and we would have been severely criticised had we not done so. We were under some criticism for not having built it up at a greater rate.

The other aspect concerning people in the schools is that we do not know what will happen in the forthcoming Budget, and we have merely to go on statements and documents emanating from Government sources. We know that, in the first Liberal Budget, the number of teachers was reduced by 30; that was the first time in living memory that the total teaching establishment had declined. That was not too good a start, and that is the sort

of thing that caused people to worry. Mr. John Gregory was quoted in, I think, the first institute journal after the election as saying that he had spoken to the Minister, who had promised to implement some of his Party's policies in the forthcoming October 1979 Budget. The Minister has never denied that that conversation took place or that that sort of commitment was made. What happened in that Budget? Absolutely nothing happened in terms of the furtherance of the Liberal Party's commitment to education at the State election.

What has happened about the reduction of rents for teachers? This Government has been in office all that time. One should ask the member for Whyalla or the member for Stuart what the teachers in their provincial towns think of this whole business. It is important that the Government come clean and give some reassurance to this State's education community, to which I am committed. I want to see that our commitment to education remains high. I have a selfish interest in the matter, because I expect to be the Minister of Education in this State before long, and I do not want to be in the position of having to build up large numbers of teachers because of the deterioration that has taken place under the Liberals.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Treasury, \$640 000—passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$18 280 000.

**Mr. BANNON:** In relation to the line, "Transfer to deposit account as interim provision for repayment of indebtedness to Commonwealth in respect of Monarto", I am not quite clear from the Premier's second reading explanation just what is involved. As far back as January, statements were made by the Premier in relation to the future of Monarto, and in particular I refer to an article in a newspaper of 10 February which stated:

Detailed discussion aimed at winding up South Australia's Monarto new town project would begin within the next few weeks, the Premier Mr. Tonkin announced last night. The new move follows a recent meeting in Adelaide between Mr. Tonkin and the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Howard.

Quoting the Premier, the article continued:

There has been some suggestion that the Federal Government would be prepared to waive interest bills which have been accruing on Federal loans. I think that is unlikely. Actually, I believe I was one, among others, who made that suggestion. The article continued:

Obviously it will cost us money to withdraw from the agreement. Just how much will depend on the progress of the talks and the Federal Government's attitude when the talks reach Ministerial level.

The Premier then referred to the fact that interest on Federal Government loans would cost South Australia \$2 300 000 this financial year. Is the amount of \$2 000 000 in relation to regular interest payments? Is it part of a possible agreement that has been reached, and what is the situation regarding the State's indebtedness to the Commonwealth in relation to Monarto?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The situation in relation to Monarto is reaching a critical stage. At present, the accumulated accrued interest and the accumulated debt is running at a level of about \$27 000 000. There has been considerable activity between officers of the South Australian Treasury and the Federal Treasury. The agreement which is presently being considered is a capitalisation of the debts and the moneys involved through the Commonwealth and the State Governments.

I am not able to go any further into the negotiations except to say that there are two extreme positions. One position is that the State Government, this being a State

Government project, should continue to bear the entire cost of the capitalisation of those debts that are involved in the total sum. I need hardly say that that situation is not particularly acceptable to the Government. The other extreme view that we have put to the Commonwealth is that, since his whole project of Monarto was in large measure stimulated and encouraged by the Commonwealth Whitlam Government, therefore the Commonwealth Government should bear the entire capitalisation cost. I need hardly say that that position has not been found acceptable to the Commonwealth. Therefore, at present, I believe the likely solution is that a figure will be arrived at that will represent the various investments. From memory, I believe that figure runs to about 53 per cent by the Commonwealth and 47 per cent by the State, and the indebtedness will be capitalised on that basis.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** It should be no less than was agreed for Albury-Wodonga.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** We have used Albury-Wodonga as a precedent in this matter. Just because Monarto has been a dismal disaster does not mean that we should not tackle the problem on exactly the same basis. Albury-Wodonga has been a success, and I suspect that the Commonwealth has made money out of it.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** It will.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Or will. I believe the Federal Government must be prepared to take the good with the bad. Obviously, I am not in a position to say what the final figure will involve for South Australia. I do know that the Government is anxious to clear this matter up as soon as possible and remove its indebtedness, so that it does not have to pay \$2 300 000 or \$2 700 000 in interest this year. This matter has cost us money for far too long, anyway. This sum which has been put aside is simply to provide for an interim payment in respect of the State's indebtedness. The final agreement is yet to be made, but I am very hopeful that it will be made within a matter of weeks. Treasury officers are working on this matter extremely diligently at the present time.

**Mr. BANNON:** I am still not quite clear what the Premier meant when he mentioned "a settlement within a matter of weeks". I presume the Premier means by that before the end of the financial year.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** I would like to think so.

**Mr. BANNON:** If that is so, moneys will have to be provided to begin payments. Is this \$2 000 000 an instalment on whatever money we are to pay to the Commonwealth if an agreement is reached?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The \$2 000 000 is there on the basis that, if we reach agreement before 30 June, the Government can make a front end payment, and can then top up on the next financial year. It does not necessarily mean that, because we are putting the money aside now, it will be paid in this financial year, but it would be very nice to think that we could.

**Mr. BANNON:** Can the Premier put a final figure on what it will cost the State to buy its way out of Monarto, and can he balance that against the long-term cost of holding the land and perhaps putting it to some further use in the interim? Some of that money could be recouped through farm lease or whatever, which would be consistent with a suggestion made in the report which was commissioned by the Government and which said that, looked at in the long term, at the rate of interest paid and the favourable agreement we had with the Commonwealth, indeed the land was extremely cheap and would remain so for another 30 or 40 years. That being so, rather than paying sums of money immediately and in effect opening the whole agreement for the Commonwealth to claim back the moneys expended, as it would have a right

to do, perhaps the situation should be allowed to run or be negotiated in a different way.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I cannot put a final figure on it at this stage, because that is a matter for some very hard bargaining. I am not going to prejudice the State's case at this stage by making any guess at what might be acceptable to the Commonwealth and the State. Nevertheless, the Government is very conscious indeed of the point raised by the Leader. I believe that the amount necessary to meet the indebtedness will take into account the continued upkeep of the land itself while we seek to dispose of parts of it. The report has been made available to the Commonwealth, which is well aware of the requirements. There is also the fact that if we have to dispose of the land it will take some little time, and the Government will have to bear that cost. That should also be a factor in this Government's favour when it arrives at a final agreement.

*The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am rather more confident than the honourable member. The Government intends to put its case as forcibly as possible.

Vote passed.

Supreme Court, \$350 000; Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$300 000; Education, \$8 300 000; Further Education, \$620 000; Police, \$650 000; Correctional Services, \$870 000; Marine and Harbors, \$550 000; Agriculture, \$300 000; Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous, \$3 400 000; Transport, \$250 000; Highways, \$490 000—passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 3. Page 2150.)

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I do not wish to detain the House long at the second reading stage. The Supply Bill, as stated in the Premier's second reading explanation, is one that it is customary to present to the House. There is nothing unusual in its nature, or in the amounts provided for and, as such, the Opposition is happy to accommodate the passage of this Bill, although we wish to have something to say at the appropriate stage in grievance.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

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

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** During the past day or so we have canvassed a number of important topics. At this stage of the early hours of the morning I do not wish to speak at great length, because many of the important matters that needed to be dealt with have already been dealt with, although a number of my colleagues have contributions to make on various aspects of public affairs. What I want to specifically address my remarks to is the whole question of public sector activity and the growing attack on the public sector, with the distortion of its role in relation to the private sector which has been occurring throughout many western economies, which has been part of the philosophy, particularly, of the current Prime Minister of Australia, and which has

recently been imported into this State by the Premier.

There is no denying the superficial attraction of some of the arguments he used, arguments relating to smaller government, less regulation, more stimulation of the private sector and less taxation. These are attractive catchcries to many people in the community and, indeed, seemed to find a mark here in South Australia on 15 September 1979. For the first time, probably, in South Australia we now have an opportunity to experience the Fraser—Thatcher type of experiment in public administration. Unfortunately, as with many of the ideas of the Premier, he is really coming to this particular approach to public administration after its time has passed.

All over the world, I think it is fair to say, the trend has been turning back, turning away from the sorts of philosophy being expounded by the present premier. It probably reached its high water mark at the time of the passing of proposition 13 and activities in the State of California and the United States, and part of the last wave of it was the election of Mrs. Thatcher as the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Already, we can see some of the enormous economic problems that have been heightened by the application of Thatcher policies to the mixed economy of the public and private sectors.

The Australian Labor Party is a democratic socialist Party. It therefore believes in public sector activity. It believes in the importance of a public sector for many reasons, not all of which I will go into now. It also believes in and accepts the reality of a mixed economy. That is what we are operating in at the moment, so the aim of Government and any Party's policy, should be to ensure the most productive relationship in a mixed economy between the public and private sectors.

Unfortunately, the present Government in its ideology rejects totally the role that the public sector can play. It rejects it in its rhetoric, but it does not reject it in practice, because the inescapable logic and fact is that without a healthy public sector, without the services and infrastructure it can provide, it is not possible for the private sector to act on behalf of the public interest or the good of the community. It may be that large profits can be made at certain times in certain sectors in industry and other areas of the economy, but greater exploitation, great dislocation and social disruption can also take place. Services, such as they are, would not be applied across the State and would not be made accessible to all people but would be extremely unequal. An unjust and inegalitarian society is the only result of a *laissez faire* situation which reduces the Government and public sector role to the smallest possible.

I am afraid that the evidence from all over the world is that the line that the Premier and his Government are pushing and the things that they are proposing to do can only lead us to economic disaster. It is particularly true of a small State like South Australia. It is no accident that the smaller the State the larger the numbers employed in the public sector. There is an inverse proportion so that in New South Wales the proportion of the work force in the public sector is the lowest in Australia. In Tasmania it is by far the highest. The reason for it is quite simple. If the States have a small base, if indeed their geographical area and the number of their population is such that it is harder to get an equitable or comprehensive delivery of services, a larger public sector is the inevitable result. That is the situation that we have, and it is a fact of life.

South Australia of all States can ill afford a Government that ideologically pursues a policy that is aimed at reducing, to the absolute minimum, public sector employment and activity. We are already reaping the rewards of this in the policies that the Government has



adopted in relation to public works and the major cutbacks in the programme, which has had an enormous impact, not just on the general level of building and construction in this State but also on private sector activity. The Government must realise the interrelationship between the two sectors, that it is not enough to say, "If we strip the public sector of as many activities as possible, the vacuum so created will be filled by the private sector and there will be greater and more soundly based prosperity for all." That does not happen; it has not happened in Australia in the last five years while Mr. Fraser has been attempting to put this policy into effect, and there is no evidence of this happening in South Australia in the few months that the new Government has been in office. On the contrary, because of the size and scope of South Australia's economy, the effects will show up much more sharply and will be much more disastrous. The facts are clear: a healthy public sector means that one has a healthy private sector, and *vice versa*—the two go together, and one cannot escape the logic of that situation.

*Mr. Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr. BANNON:** People like the member for Mallee should be concerned about decentralisation and the supply of adequate services to people in the country. I was down at Keith and Bordertown a week or so ago and spent some time in Bordertown looking around. It is a fairly prosperous town, and quite an attractive one, on the main east-west highway to Melbourne. Many members would be familiar with it, although I suspect that many have just driven through and have not looked around the town. If they did they would be surprised to see the facilities, the size of the population, and the sort of community that exists around that area, and particularly Bordertown itself.

The thing that strikes home most of all is the degree to which a service town like that depends totally and heavily for its residents and its economic prosperity on public sector activity. What are the major employers in a town like that? The major employment base is all public sector. There is a large number of people employed at the hospital, which is a public service activity; it is not a private hospital. It is heavily dependent on State and Federal funding for its existence. Without that funding the hospital would close. The farming community that is served by Bordertown would have no hospital facilities and would have to come long distances in order to get them. An immediate service is provided to that community by public sector activity and an employment base created by it. Most of the other employment areas are in public sector activity—things such as the local government work force, the Highways Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the post office, which employs a number of people for postal and telecommunication services, and so it goes on.

If one looks around a town like that, one realises that the schools are an important feature of a country town, particularly for the teachers who are employed and live there. All are receiving incomes from public sector activity. They are spending their money in that town, and the spending of that money helps the prosperity of the shopkeepers and others who also serve the surrounding farmers and others in the district.

**Mr. Lewis:** None of them would be there without the farmers.

**Mr. BANNON:** I completely agree with the member for Mallee's interjection. The point I am making is that there is interdependence between the group of farmers, the group of self-employed people making a living in the area, and the services and facilities that make it possible to live and work there efficiently, which services are supplied by the State and the taxpayers. Therefore, they are all inter-

connected. The honourable member himself is paid by the taxpayer for the services that he is expected to render to his electorate. Part of that contribution is made by the electors of Mallee and part of it is made, because of the general nature of tax collection, by people throughout the State. That is quite fit and proper, and it is an important thing to remember. Decentralisation, prosperity and employment in our community depend on a healthy public sector. If we remove that public sector activity we would have nothing. I agree with the member for Mallee: remove the economic activity, the rural and primary industries, and one will also have nothing, because there would not be a need for those services. The two are inter-connected and the two must be equally sustained. A Government that seeks to cut back and reduce or suggests that it is improper for there to be public sector activity is a Government that, in the end, will destroy the private sector.

I heard an interesting address by one of our leading town planners, commentators and historians, Hugh Stretton, whose philosophy would well bear some study by members opposite. He is basing his philosophical study in relation to "Why not very small Government", and an analyses of this new conservatism which seems to be overtaking us at the moment, by applying some historical principles to it and noting that the time when Australia had the highest standard of living, comparatively with the rest of the world, was a period in which our public sector was comparatively the biggest and most productive, and sometimes the sector which imported the most capital and invested the most in our community. That is a very interesting factor to look at, because it certainly supports the arguments that I am making. Look at the substantial building and construction projects that we have in our community on a decentralised basis: most of them are public works projects.

Many of them have been constructed not just with public sector workers or employees, but in association with private sector contractors, and that is something to which we on this side do not object. But we do insist that the Government of the day has a capacity to be able to carry out essential works and provide essential services, and that it works in partnership, in conjunction with the private sector. That is something which has been rejected by the present Government, and it is a great pity.

I shall use an illustration and then conclude on this point. The theme requires further development, which it will get over the next two or three years, because it is an important philosophical difference between the Parties which the people will have to decide on at the next election. Let me give one illustration. I attended a few weeks ago, towards the end of the previous sittings of the Parliament, a ceremony at which the Premier was present. It was the launching of a film "Enterprise in Steam". The film records the development and reopening of the Pichi Richi railway, in the Flinders Ranges. It is an extremely valuable and good project, a major tourist attraction, and I think its attraction will increase as it becomes more widely known. One way in which it will become better known is through this very good film.

The film was made possible by a grant, an award made to it by an organisation known as Enterprise Australia, a group of businessmen or companies that promote the idea of individual enterprise in our community. It is a quite worthy aim in itself and something worth supporting. For their award in 1979, they chose this project. They saw it as being a fine example of voluntary community spirit and effort, an example of individual enterprise and hours of work and skills put into the project by the people involved and, because of its intrinsic value, not only in the restoration of the trains and railway line, but the tourist

potential, and so on.

All those factors came together and it won a national award. The film was part of the award to commemorate the project. Up to that point, I think this is a very good project, and I would commend Enterprise Australia for supporting it and for enabling the film to be made. The film was made through the auspices of the South Australian Film Corporation, which one must remember is a State corporation, a statutory body. It is part of the public sector activity, although it uses plenty of private sector work in order to produce its film. I mention this because I think it is an example of what I believe is the dishonest approach so often taken by members opposite in relation to the public sector and the role it can play.

At the launching of the film, speeches were made by the Premier and the Director of Enterprise Australia, commending the project, talking about its voluntary nature, saying what a great thing it was and how really it demonstrated the hardy individualism of Australians and their innovativeness and their inventiveness, all things to be encouraged. Not one word was said by either of them, nor is any acknowledgement made in the film itself, of the fact that the project was given a grant of \$34 000 under SURS, and employed people under it, without which the project would not have been possible. There is not even the quick flash of a credit title at the beginning or end of the film referring to the assistance of the people of South Australia by means of a significant grant through SURS.

I thought that was scandalous. Whilst I did not object to this being shown as a project demonstrating individual enterprise and initiative, as it is, to my mind it showed graphically the sort of partnership between the public and private sectors and the way in which that partnership can be so productive, but it did not suit the Premier or those who commissioned the film to make any reference to that, because it goes against their ideology. That is not good enough. If that sort of thing continues, those views, which I believe are not viable anyway, will be totally discredited more rapidly than members opposite realise.

I felt constrained to write a letter making one or two of those points to the people involved, and saying how disappointed I was that there was no acknowledgment of State Government involvement in this project on behalf of the overall community. I have had no reply from Enterprise Australia, and I think that is a pity. Obviously, they do not feel themselves capable of mounting a sufficient case against the points I made. I sent a number of copies around. One response was very interesting. It came from the Pichi Richi Railway Preservation Society, the group involved in the enterprise. They agreed completely with the points I made in the letter and were very disappointed indeed that reference was not made to the State Government involvement, because they, as members of the society, knew that that assistance was absolutely vital to the success of the project.

There we have it. "Enterprise in Steam" is to be a supporting feature to "Breaker Morant", another successful film which the statutory corporation, the public sector corporation, has managed to produce. Enterprise Australia, in the preamble announcing their award, said that they believed that the achievements of the dedicated people who comprised the Pichi Ritchi Preservation Society deserved wider recognition, that they exemplified the spirit of Australian enterprise. I suggest to members opposite and the community at large that the spirit of Australian enterprise is exemplified as much by the work undertaken by public sector employees and the work done by the Government in ensuring that moneys collected on behalf of the community, on trust in the community, are distributed wisely and well as it is by the individual efforts

of private corporations or self-employed persons in our community.

That, to me, is as much exemplification of the spirit of Australian enterprise, and it is the Australian way of doing things. Traditionally in this country and in this State the major advances and progress we have made have been by public sponsored projects, public sector activity, and public employment in conjunction with the private sector—and long may it continue, because it will continue, whatever the rhetoric of the Premier and others. At his peril, he will wind down and disintegrate our public sector in this State, and to the destruction of our community. I think members opposite, particularly those representing country seats, should remember that and realise just where the ideology that they are supposedly supporting is leading them at present.

**Mr. LEWIS (Mallee):** I rise to address myself particularly to the inaccuracies stated by members opposite in recent days, and especially earlier this evening, in relation to this State's education spending as provided by this Government, the Government of which I am proud to say I am a member.

**Mr. Langley:** Not for long, though.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I will not be joining your outfit. It should be remembered that, during the year 1979-1980, the first Budget this Government brought in, the Tonkin Government—

*Members interjecting:*

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Ascot Park.

**MR. LEWIS:** The former Government, in its Budget proposals, set a final maximum figure for education of a commitment of \$324 400 000 for the Education Department. This Government increased that amount. The Education Department itself, however, had sought only that sum. If Labor's plans had been introduced (and they bleat about ours) there would have been a reduction in staffing of more than 100 teachers.

Those teachers who are critical of the budgetary proposals and the administration that this Government has introduced should remember that. Furthermore, Labor's plans would have meant no decrease whatever in student teacher ratios. We have increased the Education Department's funding, despite declining school enrolments, and the higher level of funding has meant that in fact there is an overall increase in the retention of staff, with a slight increase in the primary area. There are some funds available for temporary relieving staff and ancillary staff which were not available before. There have been substantial increases in school foundation grants and free scholar allowances. This is what our Budget has meant, and these things are in addition to what you would have introduced in your Budget that you were preparing prior to the election last September.

The primary school student-teacher ratio is 19.4:1 which is the best of any Australian State. There is a doubling in grants to ethnic groups teaching languages to students out of school hours. Further, 3 000 students will benefit from a rise of \$14 to \$28. Also, \$1 500 000 is available to employ relieving staff and replace staff on long service leave. There is a commitment of \$2 500 000 that has been given for this purpose for the coming financial year. The Tonkin Government has recognised the importance of education for the wellbeing of all South Australians, and it has recognised its responsibility in ensuring smaller government—restraint in the public sector, effective use of our taxes, and the need for a stimulus for the private sector which has been run down in recent times.

With regard to the kinds of proposals that we see in the

press, written by supporters of the members opposite (the trade union movement), let us look at the metal industries proposal. The introduction of the 35-hour week would result in an overall reduction of the gross national product. If you work for 40 hours and make 40 gismos and pay \$100 for that, then the cost of each of those would be \$2.50. That means there would be only one produced per hour. If you still pay \$100 for the week's work and reduce the numbers of hours worked to 35, then a worker can make only 35 items, and as a consequence the cost can only go up. If the cost of goods goes up, fewer people can afford them and if fewer people can afford them there will be less demand. A lessening of demand will mean that fewer will be made, and you will need fewer people to make them. It can be seen that the type of logic in that approach is quite false and misleading, and you all know that, but you do not have the guts to get up and say what Bill Hayden said, namely, that a 35-hour week is wrong, and that it is not on.

I refer again to education. The education dollar must be used as effectively as possible. It is important to realise that more money does not mean better education *per se*. Members would know as well as I do that you can throw all the money in the world at somebody who does not have the intelligence in terms of education to absorb the benefits of that expenditure, but that does not make such people better pupils. Such people's education will not be improved by one iota and that money will have been wasted. It is important to maximise the benefit; to get optimum benefit from the money that is taken from the private sector and given to the public sector.

The schemes that are spoken of often in such inane ignorance do not create more jobs. A dollar transferred from one area to another does not necessarily mean that it has been more profitably spent, except that some unproductive effort has occurred in the transferring of funds from one area to another. In fact, by the time it gets to another area it is worth less than a dollar. Money needs to be left in the private sector where it can generate real jobs that will last. That is fundamental, and it is a simple exercise in economics.

We need to look at the facts, especially in relation to teacher appointments. Opposition members have claimed that there are 2 300 unemployed teachers. The facts themselves dispute that; there are only 1 347, and of that number we do not know how many have sought and found alternative employment. Let us make no mistake about the fact that it was the policies of the Labor Government that mistakenly created the impression in the minds of many student teachers that they could get jobs as teachers merely because they were qualified. What an awful travesty that is—to impose that kind of thinking on a young person. There are not even sufficient numbers of children in the community that require the services of these teachers. Five years ago you knew that there was a fall in the birth rate and that there would be a reduction in the number of places filled by those children in the classroom. Yet you continued blindly and blithely to educate more and more people than were necessary to become teachers and trained them for jobs that were never going to exist. Now you blame us for creating teacher unemployment, but it was you who trained too many teachers, and too few engineers, because now there are too few engineers to do their jobs.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact, as I have done on a number of occasions, that the manner in which the member is using the word "You" is considered unparliamentary.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I withdraw the use of the word in that context, I should like to incorporate in *Hansard* a table of

statistics that relate particularly to student teacher ratios in all schools. These figures demonstrate that in South Australia we have the best ratio of teachers to pupils of any State in Australia. I seek leave of the House to do that.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the material purely of a statistical nature?

**Mr. LEWIS:** It is, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is granted. The honourable member's time has expired.

#### GOVERNMENT SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

Past	Primary	Secondary	Special Schools	Total
1975.....	150 428	82 708	1 576	234 712
1976.....	149 988	82 062	1 564	233 614
1977.....	150 578	81 079	1 553	233 210
1978.....	148 483	80 439	1 533	230 455
1979.....	145 301	77 690	1 534	224 525

#### PROJECTED

1980.....	143 300	75 950	1 550	220 800
1981.....				
1982.....				
1983.....				
1984.....				

#### STUDENT/TEACHER RATIOS

(a) South Australia

	Primary	Secondary	Special Schools
1979.....	19.0:1	12.0:1	5.0:1
1980 (est.) .....	18.6:1	11.7:1	4.8:1

(b) 1978 State by State Comparison (1978 most recently available).

Primary—Government									
S.A.	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	W.A.	Tas.	N.T.	A.C.T.	Ave.	
18.8	22.8	19.4	20.9	23.1	21.6	19.9	19.9	21.1	
Secondary—Government									
12.4	13.6	11.5	14.3	13.4	12.8	10.3	11.6	12.8	
Primary—Non-Government									
21.7	24.1	23.9	25.4	23.4	23.9	22.1	25.4	24.0	
Secondary—Non-Government									
15.2	16.6	16.0	17.5	14.4	15.1	14.2	16.1	16.2	

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** I would like to rise on a point concerning the use of this Parliament in enforcing morals in the community. First, I refer to what I consider to be one of the most important and far-reaching inquiries ever to be undertaken in Australia, namely, the Royal Commission conducted into the non-medical use of drugs. This Royal Commission reported to Parliament last year. Unfortunately, it appears that the various volumes of that report are gathering dust in Government department pigeonholes to a very large extent.

More disturbing than the predictable lack of interest by a conservative Government in much of the report is the official apathy for factual and balanced debate in the community on drug use and abuse. There were chapters in that report calling on the Government to co-ordinate and provide funds and staff for a wide reaching public education programme with respect to drug use and abuse

in the community. Fear generated by ignorance of the nature and effects of popular drug taking, particularly, of alcohol, tobacco, analgesic preparations and, more recently, cannabis, is causing divisions in the community and much harm to community life.

The views of many young people, in my experience, are in conflict with those of their parents, their teachers and those who traditionally fill leadership and moral-making roles in the community. In my view, this is a problem that relates to the application of the law; the law appears to apply different standards and penalties for the use of alcohol, tobacco, narcotics and psychotropic substances. Consumption of alcohol is prohibited for those under 18 years of age, the purchase of tobacco products is an offence for those under 15 years of age, and the possession and use of narcotic and psychotropic drugs are illegal at any age.

Compound analgesic preparations and other potentially harmful medicines have been freely available without criminal sanction, although in recent years the sale of these products has been restricted to some extent. In the past, they have been freely available in a wide range of outlets in the community, including shopping centres, and often in places where children shop for their parents. When the cold hard facts of the effects of drug taking in the community are unearthed, it is easy to see why there is a lack of respect for the law and for prevailing community standards by many people who are convicted in the criminal courts for using one of these drugs.

For example, drunkenness has recently been abolished as an offence in this State, yet it is estimated that 1 000 people die directly from alcoholism each year in this State. Many more die from alcohol related causes, particularly in regards to road accidents, and it has been calculated that 10 per cent of all health costs are related to alcohol. Tremendous costs are passed on to the community, particularly in regards to family life and to industry; other associated costs accrue from alcoholism. About 3 000 South Australians die each year from ischaemic heart disease, the principal causes of which are lack of exercise, excessive intake of alcohol, smoking tobacco and over-eating. Most of these deaths relate to people aged over 30 years and mainly to those aged over 50 years.

There are no laws that govern the use of many of these factors that cause heart disease deaths. About 15 people die every year from kidney failure through excessive intake of compound analgesic preparations, and I have already referred to the ease with which these products can be obtained. Regarding cannabis, there has been criticism of the current law and its application. Marijuana smoking has not been shown to be responsible for any deaths in South Australia, but about 600 people appeared in criminal courts last year for either smoking or possessing marijuana for their own use. Imprisonment and substantial fines are not uncommon in regards to these offences, and convictions carry great stigma in the community, which may affect future employment opportunities and other opportunities for—

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Do you think it should be legalised?

**Mr. CRAFTER:** No, I believe that there is a discrepancy in application of the law, which brings about lack of respect.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Do you think that random breath testing should be legalised?

**Mr. CRAFTER:** I believe that there is more justification in that area.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** I hope that you support the Government's next bill.

**Mr. CRAFTER:** There is conflict, because alcohol

consumption is popular in the community, but it causes loss of life and hardship. Few penalties apply to this area, apart from accidents relating to drinking drivers. There is conflict in the application of the law, which is harmful. How do we explain these differing standards in our community and why are disproportionate public funds expended in enforcing the criminal law? Is it simply that the battle against alcohol and tobacco use has been lost, and that this must be avoided at all costs in regards to cannabis and hard drugs? That is the attitude taken by many people in the community; they see that there is a rising consumption of a new form of drug taking—cannabis and hard drugs—and they believe that the law should rid the community of this problem. However, these same people may over-consume alcohol or tobacco at the same time.

Are the vested interests involved in the manufacture and supply of alcohol and tobacco respectable, whereas the individuals and companies associated with illegal drugs are involved in other criminal activities and are not acceptable to the community? Perhaps cannabis could be used legally if it were supplied by Hardys, Penfolds, British Tobacco or the like. If there was prohibition and if people had to rely on speak easies and other means for provision of alcohol or if tobacco could be brought only on the black market, what would be the community's attitude towards consumption of these substances? How effective is the criminal law in establishing and maintaining community standards, and what alternative functions can the government perform in protecting persons from exploitation and dangerous substances?

There should be more informed and balanced community discussion, and also more education programmes, as recommended in the Royal Commission report. Discussion is urgently needed in order to avoid any further division in the community and for the maintenance of respect for the law and for its administration, particularly in regard to those who must administer the law in the courts. It is distressing to see that the education programme is not co-ordinated and that there is often an unfortunate situation in which police officers, who talk to various community groups, are asked questions about the medical ramifications of drug taking and are not in a position to answer these questions, but attempt to do so. Similarly, doctors are asked questions about the legal enforcement of the law. There is much ignorance in the community in relation to drug taking.

I conclude my remarks by referring to what I call the inconsistencies that are perpetrated by the member for Mitcham. For example, he talked today about decriminalising prostitution; however, on Sunday, on the radio, I heard him say that he was in favour of banning cigarette smoking in restaurants and eating places. As a throw-away line, he said that he would not be opposed to the banning of cigarette smoking altogether.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** In Question Time today, I attempted to clarify a point by reading a letter that I sent to the Premier on 2 May and which, for some unknown reason, the Opposition took a point of order on. I was not commenting but reading from the letter.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** There was an important principle, which had to be resolved.

**Mr. EVANS:** I know all about important principles. I have read letters before in this House (as have other honourable members) that have been written by me and by other people. I do not know why I was stopped from reading this letter, but perhaps in the future I may come to know the reason. I was using the letter to the Premier as an explanation for a further question to him, and I was

refused the opportunity to do so. Something concerns the Opposition. I do not know what it is but I should be surprised if I do not get a clear indication of it soon.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr. EVANS:** I will not need to ferret it out, because the Opposition's actions are so obvious at times that we do not need to ferret out. I am sure that it will come out without ferrets. There will be an odour with it that will clearly identify it and we will not need to have a ferret to find it. I will read the parts of the letter that I wanted to include earlier, even though that may be repetitious.

**Mr. Keneally:** We'll give you permission to incorporate it, if you wish.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member does not make those decisions.

**Mr. EVANS:** The letter states:

There is an uneasy sense of hostility in the Hills area now regarding the amount of money the Government directed towards bush fire relief.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr. EVANS:** That is the sort of insinuation that the member would like to spread, and that is where part of the odour exists. I went on to say:

Many people were of the belief that the \$100 000 initially given was just an amount to build on for the Lord Mayor's appeal. The community response in the Hills to fund-raising to help the disadvantaged was quite exceptional. For example, the Heathfield High School students alone raised \$10 000. The service clubs between them raised in the vicinity of \$20 000, either through goods or cash which was made available. Of course, there was individual help given by so many people.

It is hard for the community to accept the public announcement that \$500 000 will be made available to the Adelaide City Council for private entrepreneurs to operate a hotel, and the other press statement that at the moment we have a Budget surplus of approximately \$59 000 000, when the Government could not contribute substantially more to the relief fund.

I am led to believe there is in excess of \$1 500 000 worth of claims. I am not suggesting the Government should pick up that total bill, but I do believe it is not unreasonable for the Government to contribute another \$500 000 to help those who have been disadvantaged.

Unfortunately, the way that this money is distributed, those who took out some insurance and at least tried to protect their property to some degree got virtually nothing.

A method of bringing about more justice is to have enough funds available to give at least a reasonable amount to those who are partly insured but lost substantial amounts. For example, one family you met on the day after the fire had substantial insurance on the property, but the total loss still would be in the vicinity of \$40 000, which is possibly four or five times more than some of the others who rented accommodation, and only lost some furniture.

I quite understand the feeling of disappointment that exists in the community, not only with fire loss victims but other residents, when they read of the amount of money that is available or is used in other areas. I trust you will ask Cabinet to give this matter urgent and serious consideration.

The Premier replied on 13 May, as follows:

Thank you for your letter of 2 May, 1980. I have taken steps to circulate it to other members of Cabinet. I have also written to the Lord Mayor asking for details of the distribution of funds raised in the appeal and to ascertain whether there is any significant shortfall in the fund to meet legitimate and necessitous claims that were received by the Lord Mayor's Committee.

When those details have been received I will be in a better position to respond to your request.

The House knows what the Premier's reply today was. All I can say is that I was disappointed at the paltry sum of \$25 000 extra that Cabinet has made available for those persons who are still, in my opinion, seriously disadvantaged, regardless of what claims they may have on insurance companies or in other areas. I hope that Cabinet will reconsider the situation, because it knows that the total amount lost through not being insured was substantially more than was covered by any donations or grants by the Government up to this time.

I want to pick up one other point. The Leader of the Opposition made a statement tonight, when referring to Mr. Hugh Stretton. I have admiration for Hugh Stretton's capacity and for some philosophies that he holds and arguments that he uses. The one that the Leader of the Opposition was using was that the period of time in this country when we were living in a most affluent lifestyle was when a lot of public works were taking place and a lot of money was being spent in the public sector. We all know that that is true, but the Federal Government in power was mortgaging the future of this country.

It is like a farmer saying that he will build a new hayshed, a new dam, new fences, and another couple of sheds down at the bottom, hoping that he will use them one day if the family grows up or if he has another sharefarmer or workman move in. He borrows outside his capacity to repay from the farm. That is what we were doing in this country in the periods of the Whitlam Government. The Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we get back to that stage, where we had to look overseas for funds outside the area where the Loan Council normally approved them, hoping to rig the system to get more money to pour in, and saying to the children of the future that we hoped they would be able to meet the bill and the interest repayments, just so that we could go on spending in the public sector.

That is what the Leader was advocating in trying to promote the public sector. He said that the money was collected from the people for the benefit of the people. He should ask people whether they like Governments collecting taxes from them so that the Government can spend that money. The Leader said that the money was spent wisely. Who could argue that the money was wisely spent in the Whitlam era? People knew that it was not spent wisely, and that is why they threw that Government out. The Labor Party at that time got the biggest hiding it had ever got because the people would not have a bar of the practices that it had put into operation. The Leader also commented on the \$34 000 made available for unemployment relief on the Pichi Richi railway. Let us make the point clearly: it did not have to be unemployment relief and could have been a grant for private enterprise to do it.

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

**Mr. LANGLEY (Unley):** There is no doubt about the member for Fisher. Each and every Labor member contributed \$10 to the Lord Mayor's appeal. We, like everyone else, are sorry that this disaster happened. I mentioned that to the Premier in a question about the provision of more money, and I agree on that score. Who knows what will happen in future concerning those people?

During the course of an earlier speech, the member for Fisher attacked the unions. The Government says that we need unions, but every time Government members speak they attack them. The unions are part and parcel of our life. The member also spoke concerning his two sons. If a person is not a member of a union, that person should not

get anything that the unions achieve for members.

**Mr. Trainer:** But they will take it.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** Yes, they will take it, and pay nothing for it. Any worker who does not belong to a union should not take what the union fights for. Such a person is letting down his mates. The greatest knocker in the House, when the Labor Government was in office, was the present Premier. I will make a point of going through *Hansard* to find out some of the things that he continually knocked. He has now changed his position completely. Every time that he speaks, the Premier uses the arrogant manner that he used when in Opposition, when he always had a prepared speech and hardly ever deviated from it. In contrast, our Leader does not need a piece of paper before him all the time in order to get his message across. He will get his message across to the people soon, when an election is held.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. LANGLEY:** I am allowed to carry on. Members opposite can say what they like in this House, as long as it is not unparliamentary. The Minister knows that. On the last occasion that I spoke, I thought that the Minister was making the speech. However, he will not get under my guard this time. I assure the honourable gentleman that he made a fool of himself previously. Whatever one cares to say, the Labor Party is a united Party.

I assure the Government that, on every opportunity I have, I will attack the press, because, any time that the press finds it necessary to correct a front-page item, the correction appears on about page 14. There is no need to worry about the press, especially Mr. Murdoch's group. One day, Mr. Murdoch will rule the world. If he does not, it will not be for want of trying. The day of freedom of the press has gone: it is now the power of the press, which can intimidate people just as it pleases. Perhaps the power of the press is diminishing, because of the fewer number of copies of newspapers sold as a result of increases in price. The *Advertiser* and the *News* increased their price from 15c to 20c, and the *Sunday mail* has increased its price from 20c to 30c. That can happen without reference to the Prices Commission. Mr. Murdoch has told us that, if he wants to back someone, he will back him whether that person is good or bad. The Minister of Health can laugh, but I assure her that she is not going so well. However, I will retire undefeated, although I have been challenged many times in my district.

Mr. McLeay, now a Federal Minister, was defeated in Unley. He bought all the tickets around the town to ensure that he had enough votes to defeat the present member for Mitcham, who should have been elected. Every time that the Minister answers a question in the Federal House, the Prime Minister almost falls over because he does not know what his colleague is going to say next. I would not want to stand in Boothby, because I would have no hope. I admit that.

I have in front of me a press report under the heading, "Press freedom threatened, says AJA leader". I also have a document headed, "How much for a free press?" It is only the power of the press. The A.L.P. took its case to the Press Council, and Mr. Murdoch was told that he was wrong. A report headed "News to quit Press Council" states:

The News Ltd newspaper yesterday gave notice that it would resign from the Australian Press Council. The Secretary of the council, Mr. C. McKay, received a letter of resignation which took effect from 30 June from News Ltd this morning. No reason was given. Mr. Shaw was one of the four delegates to the Press Council representing the Australian Newspaper Council on behalf of metropolitan daily newspapers. Mr. McKay said that Mr. Shaw did not

attend yesterday's full monthly Press Council.

That goes to show that, if everything does not go right with the gentleman concerned, he will pull out. Surely as members, at least when we are defeated (and we have all been defeated), we can take it and abide by the umpire's decision. Some of the most unscrupulous advertisements I have ever seen appeared in the *News* during the course of the election.

**The Hon. W.E. Chapman:** Tremendous advertising, though.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** If any person has to stoop to that kind of thing, he will not last forever. The *News* carried a report on the front page under the heading "Games Boycott looks certain". Of course, that was not meant to influence anyone. Suddenly, an independent body, elected by the athletes, held a secret ballot and, because it did not go the right way, someone in the Australian Olympic Federation said, "I did not vote for it." The Prime Minister carried on, because he did not get his own way. He could stop passports, if he so desired. I am disgusted over the whole issue, and there is no doubt who brought it about.

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

**MR. OLSEN (Rocky River):** Much has been said this evening and recently about the examination of spending effects by various Government departments in preparation for next financial year's Budget. Surely, any responsible Government would want to ensure that all departments were operating effectively and efficiently and that the South Australian taxpayer was receiving dollar value of his taxation. Recently, we have seen pressure groups responding, by way of paid advertisements, to a leaked memo from the Premier to all Ministers seeking an examination of the effects of a 3 per cent cut in total expenditure terms (I stress "total expenditure terms").

Some departments may incur larger than 3 per cent cuts, whilst others may not incur a reduction at all. The Government's objective is to halt the massive increase in taxation experienced in South Australia. During the eight-year period to the end of June 1978, taxes in South Australia had risen 312 per cent, which was 55 per cent greater than the national average. Government must be accountable to the electors for its actions, and therefore accountability should and must be required of all departments. Periodical reviews of expenditure will ensure that we do not have wastage of funds. The extension of that procedure is that we as taxpayers will not have to fund that wastage. The Government's concern is to meet its election promise of restraining growth in the public sector and reducing the tax burden.

The education budget this year, as many speakers have indicated during the course of the evening, is \$327 400 000. If one includes further education and miscellaneous education expenses, that figure escalates to \$397 200 000. That sum is provided, despite the fact that student enrolments have decreased in recent years—in fact, by 5 000 last year. The Liberal Government allocated more in its 1979-80 budget than the former Labor Government had intended to allocate. In fact, the Education Department received \$300 000 more than it had sought.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Standing Orders provide for one member to be speaking at any one time. The member who holds the floor at the present moment is the honourable member for Rocky River. I ask all other honourable members to desist from interjecting or otherwise making audible comments.

**Mr. OLSEN:** The higher level of funding has meant that

there has been a slight increase in staffing in the primary area. Consequential claims that the Government has already determined the areas and extent of cuts in the Education Department are untrue. Education should not be singled out. The responsibility rests equally with all departments. Additionally, we should all realise that it does not necessarily follow that increased spending automatically guarantees a better education. I believe that we need to overcome some of the anomalies in the system. Rather than decrease funding, it should be maintained so as to alleviate some of the extreme problems in the education field.

*The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr. OLSEN:** I did not say that this Government was reducing expenditure; I said that we need to maintain education funding, in my opinion, at its existing level, so that in some areas of extreme need we can achieve greater facilities in country areas, such as in the special teaching field and remedial teaching area. In some areas there is a need for special consideration to be given to remedial or special teaching needs. That certainly applies in some areas of my electorate.

To save repetition I refer members to the comments made earlier today by the member for Mallee in relation to the achievements of the Tonkin Government in a very short time. Those achievements should certainly not be overlooked. If the Opposition, and in particular the member for Stuart, would look a little more closely at the Government's achievements, it would not be necessary for Government members continually to repeat those achievements hoping that they will sink in and be acknowledged at last. This Government has made some inroads, particularly in the education field in this State. We should look at the truth of the situation as the facts apply in South Australia at the moment.

The other area I would like to speak about relates to my electorate. I would certainly like the Minister of Marine to ask his commercial director to look at the situation in relation to the export of live sheep from South Australia. As members would be aware, on one previous occasion when this State needed to export live sheep, the port of Wallaroo was able to come to the rescue of the growers and the wool industry of this State, through responsible unionists supporting the export of live sheep in that district. I point out to the Minister that, if there is some difficulty with live sheep exports and the penning of live sheep in certain areas, the District of Rocky River would be more than happy for the Government to establish Wallaroo as the major exporting port for live sheep, rather than the commercial district of Port Adelaide. As I understand it, some associated problems are involved affecting the residents of the Port Adelaide area. I can assure the Minister that the residents and the people of Wallaroo would be more than happy to have this industry established in the Wallaroo area, because it would provide employment in that rural area and would also contribute to the decentralisation of some facets of industry and the export trade in South Australia.

**Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I commented earlier on the calibre of most of the Government back-benchers, but the front bench is nothing to write home about, either. Consider, for example, the Chief Secretary, who has been asleep for at least the last hour. He is an affable, amiable chap indeed, but he gives the impression that he has dedicated his Parliamentary life to the empirical verification of the Peter principle through personal experience. For the benefit of those members who are not aware of this piece of popular culture, I mention that the Peter principle is an axiom that claims that an individual

rising in an organisation will continue to rise until he eventually exceeds his level of competence.

Consider the Minister of Transport. I read recently that a revisionist historian has shed some new light on the legend of Robert Torrens, who was, it is now said, a very devious character who was involved in some dubious deals connected with the Torrens land title system, with which his name is associated. It seems that this Torrens land title system was not his idea at all—he merely claimed all the credit for it. The electorate of the Minister of Transport bears the name of Torrens, and the Minister seems to have developed the same habit as Robert Torrens of claiming credit for someone else's work. In the field of public transport, improvements initiated by his predecessor, Geoff Virgo, are being announced regularly as though they were the exclusive result of the efforts of the current Minister.

The only consolation to all this is the fact that Ministers opposite will not be Ministers after the next election and the back-benchers to whom I referred earlier will not be in this Chamber at all. Members opposite cannot expect the lucky breaks that came their way in 1979 to be repeated at the next election, or for the underhanded type of campaign they used then to work in quite the same way.

One particularly odious feature, to which the member for Unley has referred, of the Liberal approach to the last election was the campaign waged by certain groups and individuals allied to the Liberal Party. Much of the material was of a quite scurrilous nature, but the Liberal Party was able to spuriously dissociate itself from these advertisements that were placed by individuals.

These individuals were acting as fronts for the Liberal Party, but these advertisements, with a remarkable similarity of style and content, were authorised at the bottom, supposedly, by individual citizens. The Party of members opposite could therefore, in effect, stand back and pretend, "It is not us throwing the dirt. It is just a few concerned citizens who have authorised this dirt. They might have gone a bit far, but it was not us that did it."

Yet, in spite of the vitriolic campaign waged against the Labor Party, we had the member for Newland making fatuous comments in this Chamber shortly after being elected about how he regretted the ill feeling that seemed to have been generated as a result of the campaign. Does he dissociate himself from the sort of vilification that took place then, or is he quite happy to accept the election victory and then plead for harmony—like the boy killing his parents and then asking for mercy on the grounds that he was now an orphan?

While researching another matter in the Parliamentary library, I came across a quotation in a *Time* magazine on 7 July 1952, in the letters to the editor section, which read as follows:

I should rather lose, fighting a clean campaign, than win in the ranks of a crooked one.

It seems rather appropriate to the last State election. I referred in my earlier remarks to the armchair ride given to the Liberals by the Murdoch press, an armchair ride which continued into the Norwood by-election but which was not enough to carry them all the way that time.

The *Sunday Mail* and the *News* are as biased now, and as silly, as they ever were. I choose this moment to dissociate my Party from the inference in an article that appeared in the *News* yesterday entitling the member for Semaphore as the "A.L.P. member for Semaphore". Whatever Mr. Peterson may choose to call himself, he is not a member of the A.L.P. and is not entitled to call himself one. I do not think he did call himself a member of the A.L.P. The error in the *News* is a result of sloppy work on the part of the scab journalists who are currently

producing the *News* during the A.J.A. dispute.

In my earlier remarks, I stated there had been two election shocks for the Liberal Party in the past nine months. The first one, of course, was the surprise of winning on 15 September. When we assembled here for the opening session of Parliament some of those Ministers sitting in the front row looked pretty surprised to find themselves there. I think some of them still have not got over the shock, judging by their performances since they have held cabinet portfolios. Their stunned expressions reminded me of the comment the former M.H.R. Fred Daly once made with respect to the unlamented Pat Field from Queensland when Mr. Field found himself in the Senate. Fred Daly said that Pat Field reminded him of an artificially inseminated cow: something wonderful was obviously happening to it, but the poor beast was not quite sure just what.

One thing is sure; most of those members who are now Ministers really just did not know how much was involved in the task of being a Minister and of looking after an electorate as well. Some of them look quite overcome by the work load. I think that they really believed that all that was involved in being a Minister was riding around in a white car (and we heard a lot about the big white cars before the election), having a few administrative assistants around them, signing lots and lots of dockets, and perhaps taking part in a few public openings of things, and that sort of public relations exercise. I do not think the new Ministers realised just how much work their predecessors in the Labor cabinets of the 1970's actually did.

Perhaps they have double the reason for being stunned. One reason is the surprise of actually finding themselves as Ministers, although their surprise was not much greater than that of one or two Liberal back-benchers who thought that they would be on the front bench. With apologies again to *Evita*, "Would-be Ministers are all about." To give him his dues, however, the Premier does not look quite so stunned as the rest of them—he is brimming over with brash arrogance. Unfortunately, he has still got the same capacity he had as Leader for bobbing up on television so often that it puts people off. But now he's not carping; he is making lots of fatuous statements about tremendous projects, a tremendous achievement, tremendous progress, and so on. He uses the word "tremendous" on the television so much, as my 15-year-old daughter Angela has pointed out on more than one occasion, when she shuddered at seeing the Premier appear on the screen, that if he took the word "tremendous" out of his vocabulary then his vocabulary would be reduced by 50 per cent. I really think the Premier ought to get a new adviser for his television appearances for the sake of himself and his Party and reduce his public exposure somewhat, as he is rapidly assuming the title of public enema number one.

The second electoral shock to which I alluded was, of course, the election result in March this year in the Norwood by-election. The Liberal candidate's campaign had been involved in some electoral shenanigans, and as a result a petition to the Court of Disputed Returns had resulted in his being ruled to be not the member for Norwood, and a fresh election was called. Anticipating correctly, as it turned out, that once again the *News* would give his Party an armchair ride through the campaign, the Premier was confident of victory.

Notwithstanding an embarrassing question or two regarding the business associates of Mr. Frank Webster, the Liberal Party candidate, the Premier assured us that Frank Webster (I meant to say Frank Webster) was an outstanding candidate and a man worthy of being in the House of Assembly. However, Mr. Webster never made

his maiden speech in the short time that he was in this Chamber as the member for Norwood. On that election night, it was quite a different Premier we saw when the preliminary result was announced. He stamped his foot with rage. The Liberal Party had lost the election and he, proclaiming himself to be the head of the State (there seemed to be some confusion with the role of the Governor there), declared that he would look into what had happened. The matter of the election loss would be fully investigated. Well, the matter was investigated, and a partial report was delivered in Parliament, a report that was a damp squib. The Premier refused to release the full report, so we can only guess how embarrassing it must have been for his Party. In fact, the antics of the Premier were pretty childish and disgraceful, but about par for the course, it seems.

Even more disgraceful was the conduct of the entire Parliamentary Party when it came to the declaration of the Norwood poll. For once in my life I actually felt some sort of pity for a defeated Liberal candidate. There at the declaration of the poll was this candidate who the Premier and other member of his Party had for weeks told us was a fine outstanding man, the sort of person that the Premier and the Liberal Party were proud of. But, come the declaration of the poll they did not want to know him. Not one Liberal member of this Assembly, or the Legislative Council, came on behalf of the Liberal Party to give any sort of moral support to the defeated candidate. It was absolutely disgraceful and members opposite should be completely ashamed of themselves, but I will bet they are not, because if they were capable of being ashamed of themselves they would never be members of the Liberal Party in the first place.

Anyone seeing the absence of Liberal members would have thought that they were embarrassed by the existence of Frank Webster. I suppose we could say, on that basis, that the election result had some bad news for the Government and some good news for the Government. The bad news for the Government is that it lost Frank Webster as the member for Norwood. And the good news for the Government is that it lost Frank Webster as the member for Norwood. Certainly, that is the only conclusion one can reach from the disgraceful conduct of members opposite.

**Mr. WHITTEN (Price):** This morning I want to pay tribute to school councils and parent organisations, and criticise the Minister's attitude towards those councils and parent organisations. We all know the great voluntary work school councils do, and the many hours given by so many parents who belong to school councils, and people who do not belong to school councils but who are interested in their school. They do this to further the wellbeing of their children, while at the same time assisting the department with its financial responsibilities. There are large financial responsibilities on parents and school councils. Finance raised by parent organisations goes to benefit the children, and it also provides a great deal of relief to Education Department funds.

These organisations raise this money by holding fetes, gala days, etc. Every year a lot more money has to be raised for schools, and it is becoming more difficult to raise. The tactics used by the Education Department at present make councils responsible for much greater expenditure than they have been responsible for in the past. The criticism I have at this time of the department and the Minister in particular relates to equipment which parent organisations have purchased and which has been stolen by unnamed people without a resulting rebate coming from the Education Department. It concerns me



that a school in my electorate had a small theft and when it applied, as it had done previously, for reimbursement from the department the representative was told, "No, you will not get it. You can raise the money; take it out of the school fund and pay for it."

I refer to a letter that I sent to the Minister on 2 May and, to his credit, it was acknowledged on 8 May but, unfortunately, that was all I have received. It is a very important matter which should not be allowed to go on for so long, with the parent organization stewing over the matter and the Education Department not caring what happens to their finance. The letter states:

I wish to draw to your attention two matters concerning the Ethelton Primary School which I consider are not conducive to good relations with parents and staff of the school and your department. They are:

1. The refusal to reimburse the school fund for the loss of equipment; and
2. That the allocation of additional hours for ancillary staff may not be restored to existing staff.

The Ethelton Primary School has a groundsman employed on the basis of 10 hours per week but the groundsman, being a person interested in the welfare of the school, spends more than 25 hours as well performing duties far in excess of his conditions of employment.

I mention that this groundsman has children at the school, and to help the school and his own children there he was prepared to come back late at night to look after the grounds.

**Mr. Lewis:** My dad did that, too, for nothing.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Perhaps the honourable member's people are in a much better financial position than are the people at Ethelton. Nobody in Ethelton is wealthy. The letter continues:

On Friday 7 December 1979, in compliance with a request from the department to conserve water by using sprinklers at times other than during the heat of the day, the groundsman was watering the grassed areas late at night. The water was turned off at approximately 11 p. m. that night with the intention of completing that particular section next morning (Saturday 8 December, 1979).

When the groundsman returned to the school to complete the watering of that section, he found that two 60ft hoses and a Buckner sprinkler had been stolen. The theft was then reported to the Port Adelaide police and a request made to the Education Department for the school fund to be reimbursed for the amount of the replacement cost of the stolen materials—\$72.82.

In the police report, a number was given along with the view of the police concerning this theft. The letter continues:

The request was refused, the reason given was on the assumption "that the equipment was not secured after use." This groundsman comes back at 8 o'clock in the summer to water the oval, and he had the sprinkler going for about three hours but was not finished, so he left the sprinklers in position so that he could turn them on in the morning. Thieves came in and stole the sprinklers, and the department still will not meet the cost of them. The letter further states:

It would appear that should that decision be carried to the ultimate no item of an outdoor nature, including seats, playground equipment or even trees and shrubs that may be able to be removed will be replaced, thereby placing the welfare of students at the school at further disadvantage in an extremely disadvantaged area.

The other section of the letter dealt with the replacement of ancillary staff. In 1977 the Ethelton school lost several hours of ancillary staff time and at the time that staff was told that, when a reassessment and reallocation had been

made, those persons who had lost their hours would have them restored. We now find that that is not the case, because the senior of the ancillary staff, who acts as secretary to the principal, had her hours reduced to 30. An extra 15 hours was allowed the school, but that person did not get the benefit given previously by the department. The letter states:

Concerning the allocation of additional ancillary staff hours, I have been advised that in 1977, when a rationalisation of ancillary staff occurred, an assurance was made that, should the school receive additional hours in the future, the staff that had their hours reduced would have the reduced hours restored. It now appears that this assurance may not be honoured.

The clerical assistant at Ethelton Primary School has an extremely heavy work load and the restoration of the 7½ hours she was reduced in 1977 would enable her to carry out her very necessary duties in a more satisfactory manner for the benefit of the school and the Education Department.

I conclude the letter by saying, "I would be appreciative should you give these matters your urgent consideration". I do not know what the Minister thinks; whether he thinks that it is urgent or necessary or whether it is a welching on previous agreements. I believe previously when equipment has been stolen, if it has been provided by the school fund, the Education Department was quite prepared to make good that amount. The unfortunate part of this matter was that the theft took place in the last week of the school term. The principal went out and ordered the extra equipment on the understanding that it would be paid for by the Education Department. It was necessary to keep the grounds in order over the school holidays and it was necessary to have those hoses and sprinklers. However, we now find, six months later, that the Education Department is still refusing to come to the party. It will not reimburse the school fund and the good work that has been done by the school council and parents is now being put in jeopardy. They say, "What is the use of it? Why do we help the department? We want to help our kids but this awful Liberal Government and the attitude now taken by the Education Department gives us no heart to carry on."

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** We have heard some interesting contributions this evening. The worst contribution made to date is that by the honourable member for Ascot Park. It was a speech that lacked any credibility whatsoever. The honourable member read to this House, in a low and dull tone—

**Mr. Becker:** Every word.

**Mr. GUNN:** Yes, every word. It was a sarcastic, sneering attack upon the Government. It did not have one constructive word in the whole tirade of abuse that was put before the House. It was obviously designed to discredit the Government. However, it discredited only the member who delivered it and his Party. If that is the type of conduct that members of Her Majesty's Opposition are going to put to this House, they will remain in the Opposition benches for a long time to come, as the public will not tolerate that type of criticism. The honourable member had nothing to offer. The section of the Education Department that that honourable member was involved in before his election into Parliament would be greatly improved since he left. If that is typical of the type of conduct in which he engages himself, obviously the alternative person who took that position could not help but greatly improve that section of the department. The honourable member is one of those persons with an academic record, and one would have thought that he would put to the House some well-researched and constructive viewpoints.

Obviously, he has such a chip on his shoulder that he has allowed his socialist philosophy to obscure his judgment. Any political Party that follows a philosophy without considering its long-term effects is heading for disaster. The previous Government paid the price, and I suggest to that honourable member that he should lift his game and realise that this Government was elected on a well thought out platform which was overwhelmingly accepted by the people of this State. Whether the honourable member likes it or not, the Government has a mandate to implement that platform, and it is doing that in a precise, constructive and responsible manner, considering the effects of the policies, thinking them out carefully, and implementing them.

We were given an interesting economic lecture tonight by the Leader of the Opposition and some of his colleagues who, unfortunately, believe that we can continue to spend whether or not we have the money. One member opposite suggested that we should borrow the money—no worry about who will pay or what will happen! The Premier went to great lengths this evening to explain the situation to the Leader of the Opposition, and I hope the member for Ascot Park was able to digest what he had to say. We have had a classic example of putting off the evil day. With the State's indebtedness up to \$27 000 000, money was borrowed with no thought of paying it back. Such a financial exercise will do nothing for South Australia. We have to get people to come here and bring capital and invest it, putting the money to work so that it can create more jobs.

**Mr. Bannon:** You get money in by borrowing.

**Mr. GUNN:** I have had some experience in the private sector. Every dollar borrowed must be paid back. One must be able to service the debt, to make sure that the money is wisely employed and that the extra expenditure will create and generate more income. The purchase of additional equipment involves guarding against over-capitalising on investment, and one must run no risk of becoming insolvent. Obviously, the policy the honourable member was putting forward was a prescription for making the State insolvent.

**Mr. Keneally:** Will you be sending your speech to John Howard?

**Mr. GUNN:** If the member for Stuart wants to do something constructive for the people of his State and for his constituents, he should do something about getting some funds for the construction of an airport at Port Augusta. It is about time he made some meaningful representations, instead of bleating around the country and talking nonsense.

I am sure everyone, including the honourable member, will agree that the Flying Doctor Service does outstanding work for the people of the outback. I have been appalled at the lack of action by the member for Stuart in relation to the airport. He has done nothing, and it is high time he did something constructive. The city is fortunate in having the headquarters of the Flying Doctor Service for the large area of South Australia, and the airport is poor.

**Mr. Keneally:** Get on to your Federal colleagues.

**Mr. GUNN:** He has got the same cracked record on again.

**Mr. Keneally:** Whose responsibility is it?

**Mr. GUNN:** The local community has to make some sort of contribution. I live in a council area where one of the best airstrips in a country area of South Australia has just been put in. I suggest that the member for Stuart should ask the local community where the money came from. Anyone visiting the area will see what can be done when a council is concerned about promoting its district. The member for Stuart should make some meaningful

representations on behalf of his constituents. If he does not know how to go about it, I would be happy to lend my assistance, because I think the airport at Coober Pedy will shortly be reconstructed and sealed—work which is long overdue. When that situation is rectified, it is essential that the airfield at Port Augusta should be upgraded, but that will not take place unless the proper representations are made.

As I said earlier, it is unfortunate that the member for Stuart, the member for Whyalla, their Federal colleague Mr. Wallis, and the Hon. Mr. Blevins are not prepared to support that part of the State by lending encouragement to the development of the Roxby Downs area. I am disappointed that the Leader is not supporting that project, and I hope that he will soon be in a position to make a statement clearly explaining where he stands on the issue. He has been most devious in his attitude, talking in riddles, but not once has he stated that he supports the continuation of that project, that he supports the building of an enrichment plant at Port Pirie.

**Mr. Bannon:** No.

**Mr. GUNN:** The honourable member says he does not support it.

**Mr. Bannon:** No.

**Mr. GUNN:** He is in total opposition to the Mayor and the City Council of Port Pirie?

**Mr. Bannon:** Yes.

**Mr. GUNN:** And you do not support the mining and export of uranium from Roxby Downs?

**Mr. Bannon:** No.

**Mr. GUNN:** As Premier, you would stop that project?

**Mr. Bannon:** I am opposed to it.

**Mr. GUNN:** I take it that, in going to the State at the next election, the Leader will be putting to the people a programme to halt the development of Roxby Downs. I take it that that will be part of his platform for the next election. I am very pleased that the honourable member has clearly explained that he would stop the Roxby Downs project.

**Mr. Bannon:** I didn't say that.

**Mr. GUNN:** Yes, you did.

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

**Mr. O'NEILL (Florey):** I rise to express my amazement at the editorial in yesterday's *News*. I wonder whether the Premier is writing for the *News*, whether the *News* is writing the Premier's speeches, or whether both are employing the same speech writer. It has been noticeable for some time that there seems to be a strange quirk in the statements coming from the Premier. A quirk is defined in the dictionary in this House as an artful trick, evasion, subterfuge, a shift. That has been quite clear in what has been happening here last night and this morning. I have been amazed at some of the things that have happened.

I want to draw attention to a statement by the Deputy Premier late last year, as follows:

I repeat again what I said publicly and what the Minister of Health will say publicly, that no mining will proceed in this State until we are convinced that it is safe for miners to mine uranium and that these problems in relation to disposal are solved.

On another occasion, he made the following statement:

Our view is that the mining and processing of uranium should proceed subject to all environmental impact statement requirements being satisfactorily met and all necessary procedures being followed in production and operation to ensure the proper handling of products and the sale of uranium to approved countries.

In May of this year the Trades and Labor Council received

a letter from the Premier in relation to the alleged dumping of radio-active waste at the Wingfield dump. The last paragraph is almost unbelievable, because in reference to safe working practices with uranium and derivatives therefrom, it states:

However, it is unknown whether an absolutely safe level of radiation exposure exists. For practical purposes, the philosophy is to maintain all exposures at levels which are as low as is reasonably achievable, economic and social factors being taken into account.

That letter is signed David Tonkin. I think that is nothing short of disgraceful, and I wonder whether the Premier and his Department are not keeping in contact on these matters, or whether someone has misled the House in respect to what is happening in these areas. This is a categorical statement by the Premier that he does not know what the safe level is for radio-activity, yet he and the Deputy Premier have been saying that it is perfectly safe to mine and treat uranium. This is a considerable worry, especially when we read in a United Kingdom newspaper of September last year the comments made by a group who had been to California to look at the safety in that area. The article stated:

The Diablo reactors—  
that is, reactors built by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company—

have been built precisely two and a half miles from the newly discovered Hosgri fault.

Even people not normally 'anti-nuke' were disturbed to realise that a fault, said by the United States Geological Survey to be capable of delivering a 7.5 Richter Scale shock, has been found so close to two gigantic nuclear reactors designed to withstand, on the builders' admission only a 6.75 shock.

When you consider what has been happening in the chain of mountains that runs down the west coast of the United States and the amazing tale that we have heard from President Carter that he considers (although he commiserates with the people who have lost everything) that it is not a complete disaster and that, because it resembles the site of a major nuclear explosion, it could become a tourist attraction for people to come and see. There is something warped in that statement, I am sure.

The point is that there have been lesser volcanic movements further down the chain, and it is well known that the Californian ranges are prone to seismic disturbances. It can be realised now that all the assurances that were given in respect to the two gigantic reactors that were built are not worth the paper they were written on, as they were only built to withstand a 6.5 Richter scale shock when in fact the faults that have been discovered have disclosed that they could be exposed to a 7.5 Richter scale shock, and as a consequence there could be a major disaster.

It seems to me that all the people who are getting carried away with the benefits of nuclear power are living on borrowed time, because the law of averages must dictate that sooner or later there will be a catastrophic occurrence. We understand from newspapers that one occurred in the Soviet Union some years ago, and this has radically changed the thinking of the Soviet nuclear scientists.

With respect to all the jobs that supposedly will be created, I was interested in the previous member's statements. If we look at Roxby Downs and consider what he said earlier, namely, that 170 jobs would be created in this present stage, when we are spending \$50 000 000; that means we are looking at a capital investment of about \$235 000 to produce one job. If we look at the situation of a new proposal of G.M.H., it should be realised that we

should not get too carried away with it, because what we are looking at there is an approximate capital investment of \$160 000 per job. If you apply this to the proposition that the Premier was intending to provide 7 000 new jobs, and that is the cost per job, he had better start looking for \$1.2 billion dollars to provide the 7 000 jobs.

Concerning the proposed uranium treatment plant, let us remember that some few months ago in Queensland a proposition was put that \$1.2 billion was going to be invested in a uranium enrichment plant in Queensland to provide a number of jobs. It worked out there that they were looking at the application of \$190 000 capital investment to create each job. If we are to overcome our unemployment situation in South Australia, we should start looking for some rather massive injections of capital into industry.

Members may recall that, when South Korea was being promoted as the bonanza for business men in the United States, one of the criteria laid down by those business men was that they wanted to amortise their investment in five years. Multi-nationals from the U.S. and other comparable countries wanted to get what they considered to be a fair share of the cake in five years. So the price we would be paying for this development that is projected along the Government's lines would be horrendous. The amount that G.M.H. has taken from this State over the years that it has been here would be nothing compared to that which would be taken out by the uranium industry.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** I was amused at the way the member for Eyre castigated one of my colleagues on this side for spending 10 minutes without allegedly making a constructive comment. He then proceeded to do precisely that. For my part, I shall follow the member's advice, which was excellent though misdirected, and not his example, which was deplorable. I refer first to a matter concerning the staffing of the Moana kindergarten. Some time ago I attended the first meeting of the Moana kindergarten which was held at the Moana Primary School. It is notable for being one of the very few Kindergarten Union pre-schools which are actually located on Education Department property. Sometime after that, I received a letter from one of my constituents, a Mrs. Lorraine D. Roberts of Seaford, soliciting my assistance in obtaining a kindergarten teacher for Moana. The letter states, in part:

... or should I say her wages, as there is one available, but apparently no order is yet forthcoming for her to be paid. Is there anything you can do to help, please?

She then goes on to explain how it is necessary for her to walk with her child some distance to the Seaford kindergarten, even though she lives at Moana. I have investigated this matter, and it would appear that most of the problem appears to be caused by red tape rather than lack of funds.

The Kindergarten Union has done its job; it has made the request to the Childhood Services Council for funds so that the matter can proceed. Apparently, there have been five approaches by the Kindergarten Union to the Childhood Services Council. I have been told that the problem arises not from the shortage of funds solely. Obviously, if money was less tight, staffing would be easier. However, I believe that the Kindergarten Union (from inquiries I have made locally) proposed to the Childhood Services Council that some of the unexpended funds from the delayed implementation of the Morphet Vale East 2 and Hackham, Brentwood Drive, projects could be used in the current financial year.

It is widely believed that funds are available because of the delay in relation to these projects, yet nothing has

happened. I appeal to the Minister of Education and/or his staff (after they have read my comments in *Hansard*) to contact the Childhood Services Council immediately to see whether this proposal from the Kindergarten Union can be funded immediately. I believe that what my constituent says is correct—that, in effect, the Kindergarten Union knows who will be appointed to this centre when funds become available. This area is growing reasonably rapidly, despite the slow-down in demographic trends. Such increase in population as is occurring tends to be young people, who have young families, who need kindergarten facilities. The Kindergarten Union believes that it has carried off something of a coup in obtaining this agreement with the Education Department in relation to the new Moana Primary School and the use of its facilities, but the proposal is now being held up for, seemingly, no good reason.

The second matter to which I refer is the continuing problem of a lack of a sheltered boat launching facility on the mid south coast. This matter was considered by the previous Government.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Where would you like it?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I will tell the Minister that, and I thank him for his interest in this matter. On one occasion, I flew along the coast with the then Minister, Mr. Don Simmons, in order to obtain a panoramic view of the coastline and to see where such a facility could be located. I would be the first to concede that it is not easy to find such a spot on so exposed a coast. One of the initial reasons for delaying the matter (and I will not speak about what was proposed for Marino Rocks, or even earlier for Hallett Cove, in those ancient days when I was a young member) was the fact that the Coast Protection Board proposed Witton Bluff as an appropriate site. I, and the city of Noarlunga, were opposed to this because of the obvious conflict that would arise between the use of the beach by local people and the use of areas for car parking by boat owners. A section of the beach would have been alienated from normal bathing use.

After further discussion (coming to the time when the Hon. Dr. Cornwall was the Minister for the Environment) an area was earmarked to the north of the Port Stanvac refinery. I understand that the present Government agonised over that decision because it is interested in extension of the special uses industrial area (the noxious trades area), because there is an opportunity for industrial development, but the city of Noarlunga believe that it was possible to obtain this sheltered boat facility and at the same time allow room for any industrial development. Therefore, negotiations have proceeded.

I am told that sufficient funds are available from the Coast Protection Board so that, if the project could be staged over a couple of years (and that would seem to be sensible), there would be no great financial embarrassment to the Government. I suggest that the Government would have a good opportunity, since the city of Noarlunga is committed to the project, to obtain a further commitment from the city of Noarlunga in relation to access to the site, because, obviously, a road would have to be built if the area that I have earmarked for attention is to be proceeded with.

The further delays are a little difficult to understand. One rumour that is sweeping the southern areas is that this matter came before Cabinet earlier this week and was further adjourned. This decision related in part (so I am told) to the suggestion that prime responsibility for the matter should be in the hands of the Minister of Marine rather than the Minister of Environment. However, I am open to contradiction about that. I have believed all along that the Minister of Marine would probably have the

major say in this matter, and as he is with us this evening and is listening very intently to what I am saying, I assure him that a large body of responsible opinion, not only in the southern areas but throughout the metropolitan area, is in favour of the development of such a facility—not a great ambitious facility or a mooring facility, but simply a facility from which boats could be launched from a ramp with some protection from the south-westerlies. There is certainly nothing of this kind in the south at present.

Secondly, if the area that I and others have suggested (and the suggestion did not originate with me, but I am pushing it) is adopted, there is no chance of any local objection. Land to the south of the suggested area is zoned for special industrial uses (noxious trades) and inland is zoned rural B. The area is comfortably south of Hallett Cove Beach, which would be the nearest residential area. Access would be a problem, but I believe that there is an opportunity to obtain a commitment from the city of Noarlunga in relation to that matter. The proposal would draw a good deal of favourable comment and support.

I ask the Minister and the Government to look closely at this problem to see what can be done. It is quite some time since anything new was undertaken in that section of the coast in relation to boat launching facilities. A good deal of work has been undertaken on the northern metropolitan coast, where already there are many launching facilities and where it is easier to establish a facility because there are natural protections against the south-westerlies. I concede that, on an exposed coast, the project will be more expensive and will take more time, but is also the more necessary.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I take this opportunity to make a final appeal to the Leader of the Opposition to control the behaviour of members of his Party in this Chamber. I would have thought that senior members particularly would be aware of what has happened during this debate, as has been the case on other occasions. Vindictive statements have been made by new members, particularly back-benchers, and I cite the contribution of the member for Ascot Park. I understand and accept the fact that new members tend to rush in and take the opportunity to score points whenever they can. I can speak from experience, as can many other members. However there comes a time when a little common sense must be applied in relation to the behaviour in, and privileges of, this Chamber. On many occasions over the years some incidents and modes of behaviour have occurred by accident or because of health reasons.

These incidents have been ignored. I believe that it is poor tactics to reflect on any member in this House, no matter what his condition may be at the time. I warn the member and other members that, if it happens again, I will not hesitate to bring up 10 years experience of what has occurred in this Chamber. No-one will win on the issue.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** Is it all filed away?

**Mr. BECKER:** I would not have to do that, because my memory is good enough, as the honourable member knows. He also knows that on at least one occasion I did all that I could to rectify a similar attack by one of my colleagues on one of his own colleagues and to have reference to the incident removed from *Hansard*.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** I don't know anything about it.

**Mr. BECKER:** If the member does not pay attention to what goes on in the House, he will need to be prepared.

*Mr. Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr. BECKER:** The member who is interjecting now knows that on two occasions I could have taken action to have disciplinary action taken against one of his

colleagues. I am concerned at what happens in the Chamber occasionally, but at times one must turn a blind eye, considering all the circumstances. I hope that from now on the new members will concentrate on getting down to their duty and the role for which our constituents have put us here. If a member wants to make a point forcibly, he can do so. However, when members start picking on other members, no-one wins. It has happened in the Federal Parliament and in other Parliaments. If members want to keep this thing going, it will merely lower the standard in this House. I think we have had enough of it, but, if members want to continue, I am prepared to throw down the gauntlet; there will be no holds barred. However, that does not do Parliament any good.

*Mr. O'Neill interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Florey has made his contribution. I do not want to have to speak to the honourable member again.

**Mr. BECKER:** The member for Gilles knows that this sort of tactic does not get one anywhere. No-one has done more than I have to protect members of his own Party on many occasions. I have done so because I sincerely believe that, if members made errors, we could always rectify those situations. However, I can easily turn on those previous situations.

There is an issue of grave importance in my area that I think has been blown out of all proportions. I refer to the call made on many occasions by certain business people for Adelaide Airport to be upgraded to international standard. Since 1970, I have been examining the situation. I have received numerous representations from constituents in my former district and in my new one, and have carefully considered the whole issue.

It is most important that any person who wants to continue the call to have Adelaide an international airport should bear two things in mind. The curfew was established many years ago and the people will always jealously guard it. I do not believe that any Government or the residents in the south-western suburbs will ever permit any change in these curfew hours. On several occasions, as a member of the Opposition, I have moved motions in this House, only to have them amended by the Government of the day to turn them to that Government's advantage, but agreeing in principle with what I want, namely, the prevention of the extension of runways.

At present, the north-south east-west runway will have to be extended by another 90 metres to accommodate the new type of aircraft ordered by both airlines. The foundation work for 30 metres has been completed, and the extra 60 metres can be done safely within the limits of the present boundary. It is envisaged that within two or three years these new aircraft will operate from Adelaide Airport. Those who make the call for international flights into Adelaide Airport should be reminded that, until recently, no overseas airline has applied for landing rights at Adelaide Airport and that there is an understanding between all international Governments that, if any overseas airline wishes to land at Adelaide, the Australian Government would want for Qantas reciprocal landing rights in that country. Similarly, if Qantas wanted rights in another country, the Government of that country would not agree unless reciprocal rights were given in Australia.

Those who want to make the call for direct flights or for flights via Tasmania to New Zealand must bear in mind that the New Zealand Government would not agree to such an arrangement unless Air New Zealand could have reciprocal rights in Australia, and it would not be at Adelaide. It would probably be at Surfers Paradise, which would be a lucrative run for New Zealand Airlines. I would be surprised if Qantas would yield to that sort of

arrangement. If Adelaide Airport is upgraded to international standard, it will be necessary (and it is necessary for the new aircraft ordered) for each airline to spend at least \$500 000 in upgrading terminal facilities.

These facilities will be amortised by the airline companies and the cost will be reflected in the air fare structure. Therefore, whatever expenditure is necessary at Adelaide Airport, more so for an international airport, will have an impact on those air fares. We must consider whether the situation is economically sound. Certain improvements will be made to the facilities at Adelaide Airport during the next 12 to 18 months; the present navigation equipment, which commenced operation in 1953, will be upgraded.

It is not considered to be a satisfactory standard of equipment now, and any equipment that has been operating since 1953 is a safety hazard, but at least the move is in the right direction. Furthermore, facilities for the staff will be upgraded. It is alarming that there has been no move to remove the asbestos from the area where the staff work, because it is a health risk. I was there recently, and the position is extremely bad.

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

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I am in a quandary. The Minister of Health is on the front bench, and I intended to make severe criticism of her. However, after what the member for Hanson has said, I should like to seek his leave to criticise the Minister.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is not necessary. The Chair will decide.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I will speak about a subject that is dear to the Minister's heart, namely, the never-ending saga of Modbury Hospital. That hospital was first referred to in the press on 27 February 1980, when a former patient referred in a letter to the *North-East Leader* to staff shortages, although there had been severe rumblings in the trade union movement and among members of the nursing profession at that hospital long before then. On the same day a memorandum was sent to heads of departments at the hospital, signed by Mr. D. J. Coombe, the Administrator, stating:

The Board of Management on 6 February 1980, adopted a plan to extend through to 1982 involving the reduction of hospital operating expenditures in respect of staff and goods and services.

The memorandum went on to say that the Administration would like to brief heads of departments about this plan, which was, in effect, to cut 23 per cent of the staff of the Modbury Hospital, involving 163 staff members.

That did not get much publicity, because it was kept under wraps. However, the Minister visited the hospital on 19 March, as a result of which a report appeared in the *North-East Leader* under the heading "Hospital has no staff problem". The report stated:

The Modbury Hospital is not understaffed, according to South Australian Health Minister Jennifer Adamson.

The report went on to state that the original problems and complaints were completely unfounded. That report released a rash of letters in the local paper. On one page of the paper appeared five letters which stated that the Minister was completely wrong. I will quote one letter (although I will not give the name of the writer) which was in the form of a rhyme that was published after the Minister said that there were no particular problems. The rhyme, headed "Where were you, Mrs. A?", states:

And where were you, Mrs. Adamson,  
the night that sister went to tea,  
and left me to my 16 patients,

fractures, concussions, water of the knee?

And where were you Mrs. Adamson, when six bells rang like heck.

Mr. J. was vomiting,

and Mrs. B. couldn't find her specs?

And where were you, Mrs. Adamson, when plastics failed the drip rate test,

and Mrs. Q. had turned to blue,

while Mr. S. had a cardiac arrest?

Well we'd like to believe you, Mrs. Adamson, but we can't quite accept your quotes.

Investigate the case Mrs. Adamson, and work on getting votes.

Obviously the Minister took that to heart, because the next time we had something in the *North-East Leader* it was about a pro's being needed at Modbury. At this time, the member for Newland and the member for Todd came out in defence of their Minister. I have much respect for the way in which the member for Newland stuck his neck out in relation to this matter. In the first place, he wanted two bob each way. One minute he was asking in the House, in the form of Dorothy Dixier questions to the Minister, "Is all well?" The Minister was saying, "Yes, it is," and he was reporting that back to the local paper. However, when being attacked by Mr. Klunder, he was sitting on the fence and saying, "Perhaps we need a pro." At least the member for Newland addressed a public meeting, whereas the member for Todd did not.

Events moved on to 22 April, when, after the Minister had said that there were no problems at Modbury, we had a report under the heading "Modbury under the microscope". The Minister had decided that consultants would be looking into the Modbury situation as well as into three other major teaching hospitals in Adelaide. That surprised me, because I went to visit the other teaching hospitals in Adelaide, and the administrators and boards were kind and considerate to me. It seems that there are no problems in the other teaching hospitals; there seem to be problems only at Modbury.

Perhaps the idea of putting Modbury, plus the other three teaching hospitals, under the microscope was for camouflage reasons by saying that the problems were not at Modbury alone but were throughout the whole teaching hospital system in this State. True to form, the local members of Parliament were delighted. The member for Todd (Mr. Ashenden) and the member for Newland (Dr. Brian Billard) are delighted about the decision of the Minister of Health to commission a management study at Modbury, bearing in mind that two weeks previously they were saying that everything was all right. We come next to the real crunch, when the unions, ancillary staff, nurses and doctors decided that they had had enough.

**Mr. Max Brown:** It's a bit of a saga.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Yes. They held a meeting, at which they passed a vote of no confidence in the board of management, the Administrator the Chairman, and everyone else but not, in the next logical step, in the Minister. Still nothing came from the Minister. A public meeting was held, which was attended by the member for Newland. I congratulate the honourable member on his courage; he was obviously briefed by members of the Health Commission, and was the only Government member present. Neither the member for Todd nor the Minister was present. The Administrator was present, but only in the audience. The member for Newland stood and took all the flack for his Minister.

What we have had all along is that the Chairman resigned: he took the flack. The Administrator had a vote of no confidence taken in him: he took the flack. The one person who could have attended the meeting or made a

statement to the press did not front up. One newspaper reporter was present (before they went on strike), so we were giving him copy. He rang me for a comment, and I was delighted to give him one. I said, "What is the Minister saying?" The Minister can check with the particular journalist; he works for the *News* and the *Sunday Mail*. He said "The Minister has gone to ground. I cannot get hold of her for any comment whatsoever."

In the *Sunday Mail*, when the Minister eventually held a press conference and released the information that the Mayor of Tea Tree Gully had resigned as hospital Chairman, she castigated the press for making these allegations of what had gone on at Modbury. I have passed on to the Minister all the allegations I have received, and the Minister has agreed to follow them up. The same journalist, who said to me over the telephone that the Minister had gone to ground and had refused to answer, is reported in the following issue of the *Sunday Mail* as saying that the Minister had handled the situation well and that the Opposition had failed to find her Achilles heel.

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

**Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd):** I will speak briefly, because the member for Napier has tried to do tonight what he has tried to do in the North-Eastern suburbs for the past few months, namely, to stir. He has absolutely no interest whatever in the health or welfare of patients or what should be done at Modbury. He and Mr. Klunder thought that they had found something on which they could make some political capital. He said, purely for political and probably vicious reasons, that the member for Todd was not present at a public meeting concerning Modbury Hospital. He knows that the member for Newland was present and that an apology was placed by me because there was another public meeting in the area which required the attendance of one of the North-Eastern suburbs members. It was decided that the member for Newland would attend the public meeting on the Modbury Hospital, and that I would attend another meeting in Tea Tree Gully. He did not mention that I had placed an apology and was unable to attend that meeting for other reasons. One would not expect that of him.

The honourable member merely wants to create as much of what he thinks is trouble, and he cannot put forward a logical case at the best of times. He was selective in his quotes from the *North-East Leader*. He did not pick out other points that the member for Newland or I had made, because that would not suit his case, also. Mr. Klunder is heading for just as big a fall on north-east transport as a result of the statements he is making at present.

Certainly all we found the member for Napier and the previous member for Newland doing was trying for their own Party political purposes to create trouble. The Minister of Health has rightly asked for a full investigation into and report on the Modbury Hospital, but Opposition members cannot wait to hear what is there because it might turn out that the Minister's action was correct. Of course they would then be left with a lot of egg on their faces. The Minister has done the right thing, she is seeking to get as much information as she can about the hospital because, let us face it, there are many conflicting aspects in that area. There are the points that the honourable member has brought forward, but at the same time surely the Minister has the right to look at the costs, because there is something in the Modbury Hospital that just does not ring true.

The Minister of Health is perfectly correct in having independent experts—and certainly no-one could consider

the member for Napier an expert in this area—come into the hospital to thoroughly investigate the matter and provide her with a report so that when action is taken it will be the correct action that will lead to good medical care at reasonable cost. Of course, the member for Napier cannot appreciate that, because he thinks money grows on trees. The member for Napier for any reason at all, in an attempt to create a nuisance, simply tries to embarrass. I point out that the people who will be embarrassed are the member for Napier, the ex-member for Newland and other members of their ilk who, to their discredit, have tried to create far more trouble in relation to the Modbury Hospital than has ever existed.

**Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart):** In a most forgettable speech early today the member for Rocky River challenged me to make some comment on the achievements of this Government. I am prepared to respond to that challenge and make a brief comment on each of the achievements of this Government. Having done that, I would now like to move on to something that is much more important to the people of Australia.

As Prime Minister of Australia we have the most divisive individual ever inflicted upon our society. This Prime Minister, who was elected in the most dubious circumstances, creating divisions within the community that still exist, believes that through the use of this divisive technique he is able to make some political capital. I am not the only one who believes that Mr. Fraser is a gentleman of that ilk, because a right-wing journalist, David McNicoll, agrees with me. The Prime Minister calls for unity, yet he practises division. As I said earlier, these divisions are caused quite deliberately for short-term political gain, for the accession to power and the retention of that power.

The present debate in Australia over this country's participation in the Olympic Games is a classic example of creating division for political gain. I am quite sure that the tide is turning against Mr. Fraser on this issue and that it will back-fire on him. The pressures brought to bear on our athletes by the Prime Minister and his Ministers warrant the greatest condemnation. That the Premier of this State and the Minister of Recreation and Sport should support Mr. Fraser brings shame to the State of South Australia.

We have had put to us a number of reasons why Australia should boycott the Olympic Games. I believe the first reason relates to the intervention by the U.S.S.R. in Afghanistan. Mr. Fraser has described that intervention as the greatest threat to world security since 1944. Never mind the report by his own Office of National Assessment or the report by Mr. Goldblum, who was the first Australian to go to Afghanistan and see what has actually taken place there. Mr. Goldblum is now back in Australia and was in South Australia on Friday telling people what has taken place in Afghanistan.

If we accept as true what the Prime Minister has said (and it is a most unlikely event that it would be true), then how can he continue to justify trading with a country that he believes presents us with the greatest threat to our security since 1944? Are we to understand that Mr. Fraser, as Prime Minister, would trade with a country which he regards as being a severe threat to our security? If that is the type of man who is in charge of this country, the security of this country is not safe in his hands and he should relinquish his leadership. Mr. Fraser does not believe his own rhetoric, and people in Australia are fast becoming aware of that, because they can see how he has been trying to dupe the Australian community.

**Mr. Oswald:** Have you read the O.N.A. report?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I have read the O. N. A. report and I have read reports on the O.N.A. report; so has the honourable member. Another reason for the boycott is that it is thought that the U.S.S.R. will use the Olympic Games as a propaganda exercise. Of course it will, as did the U.S.A. during the winter Olympics at Lake Placid. So did Canada, West Germany, and other countries that have had the Olympic Games in the past. That is a pity but it is a fact of life, and there is no doubt that the Russians will use the games as a propaganda exercise, but then so will other countries. If, in 1984, the Olympic Games are held in Los Angeles, honourable members can be sure that the Americans will do exactly the same as they did in Lake Placid in 1980.

Another reason in support of the boycott is that the U.S.S.R. will regard any participation by countries in the games as an acceptance of their political system. Much play has been made of some statement that was credited to Mr. Brezhnev on the point. If that is so, then how does the U.S.S.R. justify to its citizens its presence at Lake Placid in America at the Winter Olympics in 1980? How does the U.S.S.R. justify to its citizens its presence in the Olympic games ever since 1952? Are members opposite and supporters of Mr. Fraser going to say that the average Soviet citizen is a fool, because that is not the case? We know that Soviet citizens are well educated. They would know that for the U.S.S.R. to say that presence at the Olympic Games is acceptance of its political system would enable the reverse to be said when the U.S.S.R. goes to other countries.

All the arguments put forward in support of a boycott are so ridiculous, petty and easy to answer that I wonder why Mr. Fraser continues in this vein. Mr. Fraser has said that a boycott is the appropriate form of protest. What would be the appropriate form of protest if this were not an Olympic year. What will be the appropriate form of protest when the Olympic Games are over and the Soviet troops are still in Afghanistan? The slogan "Mal's wool keeps the Russians warm" is very much to the point.

It has also been said that Australia's absence from the Moscow Olympic Games will cause the U.S.S.R. great embarrassment and it will have to explain why Australia is not there. I do not believe the U.S.S.R. will have any difficulty in getting the national press there to justify the reasons why Australia is not at the Olympic Games. It might cause some embarrassment, but the U.S.S.R. will merely say that, because Australia is a capitalist country, the Australian Government is not prepared to allow its athletes to go to the Soviet Union to see the great achievements that country has made. It will be as simple as that to explain, and that is what is likely to happen.

We are supposed to understand now that going to the 1936 Olympic Games contributed to the Second World War. I always thought that Jesse Owens defeating the might of the German athletes was a great win for the free world against Nazi Germany. I now find that Jesse Owens was a traitor, and that he went to the games when he should have stayed at home. Incidentally, Soviet Russia boycotted the Olympic Games in 1936. Perhaps the U.S.S.R. knew a little bit more about it than we did. What contributed to the war in 1940 as a result of what the rest of the world was doing in 1936 was trading with the Germans.

If we had not traded with the German people we might have had some effect on them. Running against them had no effect on whether we had a war in 1939. Trading with that country did have an effect, and I would like people to take that point, because it is a valid one. Malcolm Fraser is prepared to fight the Russians to our last athlete, and that is exactly what is going on. This whole programme has

been absolutely disgraceful. The might of the political power in Australia has been brought to bear on our athletes yet, as the member for Unley said earlier tonight, these people have traditionally been regarded as the best ambassadors that this country has had. We are told that if they win Olympic medals in 1980 that those medals will be tarnished. What absolute rubbish.

The major athletic countries in the world will be at the 1980 Olympic Games. The two top athletic nations in the world are the U.S.S.R. and East Germany. The third and fourth nations are America and West Germany. The top two athletic nations at the Lake Placid Winter Olympics were Russia and East Germany. There will be competition at the Olympic Games. Any Australian athlete who is so skilled as to win a medal, or make a final in any event in Moscow, deserves the commendation and support of every Australian. For people to try to reflect on these athletes before they even get to Moscow is the lowest form of political adventurism that I have heard of in this country, and it is to be deplored. Our Prime Minister and his supporters are to be abhorred for their attitude towards these fine young people, who I hope will bring great success back to this country when they return from Moscow.

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** I want to speak for a short while on the subject that the member for Stuart has just mentioned. Members may recall that in February of this year I spoke in an adjournment debate about the proposed boycott of the Moscow games. On that occasion I made my position clear—that I supported the attendance of Australian athletes at the games. I still support that view. Since then, as we all know, much controversy has occurred about the issue, and much pressure has been applied by the Federal Government, supported by the press, for the Australian Olympic Federation to boycott the Olympic Games.

However, the A.O.F. took a decision to accept the invitation to attend the games, instead of bowing to the pressures that were applied by the Federal Government and the press. What we have seen since that decision was taken, as the member for Stuart mentioned, is tremendous pressure being applied to individual athletes not to attend and to withdraw from the team. There have been a number of cases where this has happened and for certain reasons these individuals and organisations have decided, unfortunately, to withdraw from the team.

Our present Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, has proven the most divisive Prime Minister this country has ever seen, and on this issue he has exceeded himself in dividing the community. He seeks to penalise one section of the community. In essence, he seeks to discriminate against the amateur athletes in favour of what I describe as the big professionals, the persons who want to trade with Russia, particularly the rural sector, as represented by the Country Party, which wants to trade with Russia in wheat and wool.

The area of sport is one in which the Federal Government has an exceptionally poor record. Its contribution to sport, as was mentioned by the member for Unley, has been negligible in comparison to the revenue accrued from sales tax on sporting goods. As the member for Unley mentioned, the Commonwealth Government makes a fairly meagre contribution in the Budget for recreation and sport (about \$3 000 000), when compared to the return from sales tax at 15 per cent on sporting goods. (Many of the taxes are higher than that; it depends on the type of goods. In addition, there are taxes on sporting vehicles, such as yachts, boats, and so on.) I believe that sales tax revenue is about \$30 000 000 per

annum.

If one is to accept that the Federal Government's attitude to sport has been one of take all and give nothing, I believe that it has no right to interfere in the decision taken by the Australian Olympic Federation, despite pressures applied by the press and the Government. I commend it for that decision. One of the unfortunate things that has occurred since that decision was taken is that a number of people and organisations that were sponsors of the athletes have withdrawn their support. They have done so, I believe, under pressure from the Federal Government to make it as difficult as possible for our athletes to compete at the Moscow Olympic Games. I feel sure that those athletes who decide to attend will prove, as they have in the past, worthy ambassadors of this country.

It is a great pity that the issue has been so divisive in the community. If Countries with totalitarian regimes, whether of the left or right, were to be excluded from competing at the games, few countries would be left in the world that could compete. Australia might be in that category, considering the way in which the Prime Minister carries on. I believe that the athletes should attend and that the public generally should not criticise them for their attendance. The A.O.F. has made its decision, and that decision was taken after consideration of all the factors, so I hope our athletes compete successfully at the games.

I turn now to another aspect of sport, which affects the local scene. I refer to the money allocated by the Department of Recreation and Sport to sporting organisations in South Australia. I want to refer particularly to the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association, which had a special meeting on Tuesday 15 April at the Adelaide Swimming Centre. That meeting was called by the President of that association because of a notification given by the Department of Recreation and Sport that it was to withdraw its grant to the swimming association. I will quote briefly from the minutes of that meeting. One of the persons present (and I will not give his name) said that he was affronted by the fact that this situation should have arisen, and he is referring to the withdrawal of the grant from the association, after 27 years of obtaining grants from various Governments. He said:

The Government apparently thinks we are no longer worth this grant.

The minutes say that so far as fund-raising efforts are concerned the S.A.S.A. efforts have been a failure, so the association relies fairly heavily on the grant which came to it in the past and which is to be discontinued.

The motion that was carried at the meeting reads as follows:

That this meeting of delegates deplore the action of the South Australian Government in the deletion of the grant and directs the executive of the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association to pass on this feeling to the Minister of Sport.

There was an amendment to this motion that the executive ask the clubs (that is, the individual swimming clubs that make up the association) to pass on their feelings to the Minister, and that was moved, seconded and carried. That is an indication of this Government's attitude to recreation and sport. This is one of a number of instances where the grants and money available to sport and recreation have been either discontinued completely or cut rather drastically, placing a very heavy burden on the sporting organisations to continue with their activities. It is deplorable that the Government should, in essence, take away the opportunity for young people to compete in sport by withholding grants and money that should be available to those organisations in the field of recreation and sport. I



believe that this applies not only to the one I have quoted but also fairly generally through sporting organisations in South Australia.

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** Now that the House is all alert and eager to get on with the business of the day, I have much pleasure in raising a matter very dear to my heart in the electorate that I represent. I refer first, to Government members in this debate, by interjection from time to time, either endeavouring to deny cut-backs in spending in the education field or endeavouring to justify the need, as they describe it, to pull in the reins of possible over-spending. We had a classic example of that earlier in this debate by the member for Mallee. In fact, we heard him in this debate, endeavouring to explain to us on the Opposition side that, where children are illiterate, money should not be spent at all. I find that exercise by the member for Mallee appalling.

I have, in my electorate, a school for retarded children that was fostered and put in to my electorate by the previous Labor Government. I have found, during my various visits to the school, that it is doing a wonderful job in educating these children in relation to the future community spirit as far as the city of Whyalla is concerned. I point out that the money spent in this school is, in the member for Mallee's term, on illiterate children. I can only say that, in my opinion, money that has been spent in the past at this school has been of great benefit to these people, and I am hopeful that the member for Mallee does not intend to endeavour to influence his Minister to cut or slash future spending in that area.

I turn to the promises made by the Liberal Party prior to its election to Government. From time to time one ought to remind Government members of their promises. For example, in the education field they promised kindergartens for 3½-year-olds. This promise has not been kept; in fact, there has been no movement in that direction by the present Government.

The second promise was for smaller class sizes. If anything, under the current Budget, I suggest to Government members that class sizes have increased. Thirdly, they have promised the appointment of remedial teachers. I find that rather a joke because although I do not know what other members find, I find that it is impossible to get a remedial teacher. The Government also promised special staff and equipment for schools with special needs. I have one or two schools in my area that could be classified as schools with special needs. On more than one occasion I have taken up the matter with the Minister of Education in a quest for added assistance. On the times I have taken the matter up with the Minister I have not even got a reply. I can only assume that he does not intend in any circumstances to approve such a proposition.

The fifth promise was that the Government would bridge literacy and numeracy courses for migrants. This is also non-existent. Sixthly, it promised to support disadvantaged secondary schools. I find this conspicuous by its absolute absence.

**Mr. Lewis:** You ought to check all the facts—you have got them all wrong.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The member for Mallee has arrived back on the scene; he has woken up, and all of a sudden he suggests that I ought to check my facts on what I am telling him exists in my electorate. I suggest to him that I would no more think of telling him what the position is in his electorate and question him than I would expect that he would want to tell me what is happening in my electorate without checking it. I pointed out, quite rightly, that the Government has not made one of these promises come to fruition. It is obvious that the Government, despite some

weak denials by members such as the member for Mallee has just done, embarked on a policy of cutting back Government spending.

**Mr. Lewis:** We have increased it.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I find the interjection of the member for Mallee very strange. If he came to the city of Whyalla he would find that there is a broad section of education, and if he examined it he would find cut-backs in most areas. He can say what he likes in this House, but that is the position. It is ironical that earlier in this debate the Premier wanted to take me to task for criticising a television advertisement which asks for the general public to spend \$1 a week more and thus create jobs. I am doubtful whether the general public would have a dollar a week to spend, yet this Government pursues a policy of not spending an extra dollar. I am finding it difficult to ascertain whether it is spending a dollar at all. To the Premier and the Government, I say, "Put your money where your mouth is". I turn to a phase of education that I have had a great deal of association with over the years. I refer to school dental care. I recall vividly this matter being discussed by the then Labor Government and finally being brought into reality.

Similarly, I can recall that in Whyalla a school dental clinic was set up as a pilot exercise at Nicholson Avenue Primary School. It was not long before we realised that what we had started was a recurring exercise, and it was obvious that the Nicholson Avenue school dental clinic would be capable of dealing only with the schoolchildren attending that school. It seemed that once a child's teeth were examined and treated by the clinic, they had to be re-examined and retreated on a regular basis.

Following the establishment of the clinic, in a few short years the Labor Government, as it was then, established two more clinics at different schools in Whyalla, and both were welcomed. In very isolated cases I have had the pleasure of having repairs to aged pensioners' teeth carried out at these clinics. Recently, I read that the Minister of Health, who covers this exercise, is not going to extend the school clinic service to secondary schools. The Minister nods her head in agreement. I have written to the Minister expressing my grave concern that she is going to do this, and I understand from remarks made that what she is intending to do is to subcontract secondary schoolchildren to private enterprise.

**Mr. ABBOTT (Spence):** Because we are often confronted with the message that Australian workers are strike happy, let me put on the record part of a speech by the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce and Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, the Hon. Phillip Lynch, M.H.R. The speech was made to an international business opportunity programme conducted in Switzerland on 1 February, 1980. The report states:

The number of working days lost as a result of industrial disputes fell by over 50 per cent in 1977. The next year, 1978, showed an increase, but the level still remains considerably below that of the mid 1970's. Australia's industrial relations record bears comparison with that of many overseas countries, Mr. Lynch said. The International Labor Organisation has estimated that in 1977, the latest year for which comparable data is available, Australia lost 700 working days per 1 000 employees in a wide group of industries. This figure of 700 compares with 790 in New Zealand, 820 in Canada, 840 in the United Kingdom, 1 080 in the United States and 1 480 days per 1 000 industrial employees in Italy, according to Mr. Lynch.

These statistics are from a body, the International Labor Organisation, which is a section of the United Nations, so they are hardly cooked figures. They give the lie to the

comment often made by the Federal Minister's own political Party that Australian workers are industrially irresponsible.

**Mr. Lewis:** It's not the workers, but the unions that run them.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** The member for Mallee has always held that opinion, and he is entitled to do so. The figures also prove what we on this side of the House already knew and what we have been saying for a long time, that workers take industrial action only when there is a genuine claim or grievance that is ignored by the employers. We continually hear in this House members of the Government criticising and attacking the trade union movement. It seems to be one of their pet subjects. Yesterday, however, when the Premier announced the \$8 000 000 expansion by G.M.H. to make plastic components for cars at the Elizabeth factory, he said that South Australia had won the commitment by G.M.H. from other States through South Australia's better industrial relations, lower wage structure, and its central position in Australia. "It is a victory for South Australia and proves that we can attract significant development", the Premier said.

Is it not amazing that the Premier, at last, has recognised that South Australia has a good record in industrial relations, or is it simply that, when things are different, they are not the same?

This information hopefully will be useful to members of the Government next time they hear someone commenting on workers taking "irresponsible action". Of course, if the Premier was fair dinkum, he would come clean and give credit to the former Labor Government, and in particular to the Deputy Opposition Leader, for this State's great record of industrial relations.

I want to refer now to a long-standing dispute between the Ferryden Park Primary School Council and the Child-Parent Centre Committee of the same school. The school is situated in my electorate, and the conflict has resulted in the school council's severing relations with the Child-Parent Committee, and vital community welfare services being transferred to a centre one mile away. On 2 May, I wrote to the Minister of Community Welfare and the Minister of Education requesting that a full inquiry be conducted into this dispute as a matter of urgency. To date, I have received an acknowledgement and a reply from the Minister of Community Welfare, but from the Minister of Education I have received nothing, not even an acknowledgement.

**Mr. Trainer:** He rarely answers letters.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** We are beginning to learn that he does not answer letters. However, according to a press statement, the Minister of Education said that regional officers of the Education Department and the Community Welfare Department had arranged for discussions to try to resolve the difficulties. It would appear that the school council felt that the D.C.W. staff was having too much influence over the whole of the school and, in a letter to the Minister of Community Welfare on 19 February, the school council advised that the following resolution was adopted at its meeting on 13 February:

That a letter of complaint be sent to the Regional Director of D.C.W. and the Minister of Community Welfare stating that in our opinion D.C.W. staff involved in Ferryden Park Primary School are causing disharmony in the school, and in doing so are having an adverse effect on children, parents, teachers, aides and other ancillary staff. Further, that in our opinion the unfounded and scurrilous attack on the Principal of Ferryden Park Primary School by staff of your department was a blatant attempt to have the Principal removed from the school to allow D.C.W. to extend their influence in the school. It is, in view of what has transpired, the reasonable

contention of the school council that the continued presence of the D.C.W. staff at present involved with the school can only continue to adversely effect the school community and further inflame an already precarious situation.

I believe that this is a most serious matter and one which requires urgent attention. If the Minister of Education is unable or is too busy to acknowledge my request for an inquiry, perhaps he should ask the Premier for some form of assistance. Being his Leader, the Premier could possibly provide him with an Assistant Minister if he is unable to cope with the amount of work.

The President of the South Australian Association of State Schools Organisations has stated that, at the request of that association's annual conference, it was decided to conduct a study of South Australian Government schools to find out how many students had serious social problems. He also said that there was a school with 30 per cent of students coming from single parent homes. He might well be referring to a school in my electorate where the percentage of single parent families and unemployed breadwinners is very high indeed. It is no wonder that the past President of Modbury South Primary School, in the news today, called for welfare workers to be made available at primary schools throughout South Australia. I support the claim for that.

**Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake):** I was surprised by the attack that the member for Fisher made on Tuesday concerning trade unions. I thought for a moment that the member for Glenelg was back with us. The member for Fisher may know what caused the fires in the Hills, but he knows nothing whatever about the way trade unions operate. He made the claim that a member of a union is unable to find out the wages, and the perks (as he put it), that are paid to the officials. This comment shows how much he knows about trade unions, along with many of his fellow members. His comment is a complete untruth. Any active member of a trade union, is able to find out such information, I can inform the House that the union to which I belonged for 40 years has its books audited each month. Any member is able to obtain a financial statement every six months. That audited report details all the costs of wages, the cost of running an office, and the details of the wages paid to all the people who work in that office. Also, it details all the benefits that the members would receive through cases taken through the union when, say, a person is injured. This even applies to the benefits that are available to a person who may be injured so badly that he will be a cripple for the rest of his life.

It would do some of the members opposite good if they took the time to have a look at some of the benefits that a trade union can obtain for its members. I point out that it is not the members of the unions who are making the noise, but it is Government members in this place who are making all the noise about trade unions. It is a pity that they do not find out a little more about the matter before they start getting up here and accusing trade unions of things that do not happen.

I was in my room for a short while and while I was there I heard the member for Hanson speaking. He was claiming that he is sick and tired of hearing members from this side of the House (especially the new members) attacking some of the Government members. I would like to add that I am sick and tired of listening to some of the members from the Government side attacking trade unions, and I wish that they would cease to do this. If they intend to make such attacks, I would like to see them putting up some proof of their accusations. I notice that the member for Henley Beach is not present; he has been a trade unionist. I would like to see members opposite put up some proof to back their allegations that some trade unions have robbed their

members. The member for Mawson is always attacking the trade unions. It is a pity he is not awake, so that he can listen to some of the comments of other members on this matter.

I have been a member of a trade union for 40 years and I am proud of every minute that I have been associated with the union. During those years I fought for my fellow workers, and this is what unionism is all about. One of my colleagues said that he was amazed by some of the things said by the member for Mallee. I do not think that the member for Mallee knows what a trade union is.

I have also heard claims that people go along and pull workers out on strike, and that it is all right for them to make such decisions as they are getting paid for it. I would like to point out to the people who think this way that that is incorrect. I have been personally involved in three national stoppages, and at such times I, as a union official, was never paid any wages whatsoever and there is no way that I would take wages on such occasions. Also, I might add that no other officials from the trade union that I am associated with took wages. To my knowledge, that applies in all other trade unions as well. That is another thing that members opposite should get clear before accusing people of pulling members out on strike and taking wages. This is on national stoppages that I am speaking about.

Also, I refer to the Liberal's idea that all work should be done by private contractors. I have had an opportunity to speak to many Government workers whom I know in different departments (and some whom I do not know); some have made a point of coming to my electoral office or ringing me up at home to inform me of some of the things that have been happening. These have included such things as a department running down completely because so many people have been transferred. They have informed me that they are frightened of saying anything in case they are threatened with a transfer to an area of such a nature that the transfer would be similar to being sacked. I am told that this attitude has been taken by some departments since the Liberal Party has taken office.

These people have been threatened with transfer to an isolated place, and it is known that these workers will not accept transfer because they will have to leave their homes. Virtually, this amounts to the sack. Members from the Government side have claimed that this does not happen, but I have received reports that it does happen.

Three weeks ago, I drove, on a Saturday afternoon, down Morphett Road towards Anzac Highway. I passed a Housing Trust construction, which was attended by a private contractor (about which the Government is always talking). I obtained the name of this contractor (which I will not cite); he is still working on the site and anyone can drive past and see what I saw. This contractor was operating a back hoe, and his wife was measuring the foundations. I suggest that, when some members opposite say that private contractors can do the job a lot more cheaply, this is one of the reasons. This sort of thing happened years ago when the Liberal Government was previously in office. In some areas, the wives of contractors measured and trimmed logs.

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

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** The Premier made a Ministerial statement on Tuesday in which he advised the House about his recent overseas trip to the United Kingdom and the Far East. He also indicated that a number of events had occurred during that journey, which he endeavoured to say had been influenced by the fact that he had taken this trip on behalf of South Australia.

Perhaps we should refer to the *Sunday Mail* of 6 April, before the Premier left for overseas, in which an article appeared which sets the scenario and which, I believe, will show members that the remarks they heard from the Premier can be seen in a different light. The article, under the heading "Tonkin to focus on cars, energy", stated:

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, tonight leaves for a three-week tour taking in Britain and the Far East. During the trip Mr. Tonkin will hold talks with three major companies likely to play key roles in future development in South Australia . . .

In Japan, Mr. Tonkin will talk with executives from the Mitsubishi group of companies which is likely, later this year, to take up an option to acquire a majority shareholding in Chrysler Australia . . .

Mr. Tonkin said there was no question of contract which might result from discussion, and it was impossible to put a value on contacts which would be made.

In the words of the Premier, there was no question of contract which might result from discussion. The Premier has now said in the House that he said, while in Japan, that his Government was a hands-off the private sector Government. He said that he was applauded in his statements that the size of the public sector was to be reduced and regulations that restricted private development would be minimised. These were important factors in Mitsubishi's purchasing the remaining shares holding in Chrysler Australia, according to the Premier.

The Premier referred to the fact that the extent of regulations that hitherto prohibited private development would be minimised. What regulations have been minimised in the past several months? Were they industrial safety regulations, which would be minimised at the expense of the work force in the Chrysler plant and in other plants; were they regulations concerning the health of the people who work in the plant and also possible effects on the health of people who live in the vicinity of that establishment; was the Premier talking about worker's compensation requirements in South Australia? We do not know; the Premier did not tell anyone in this House. He simply alluded, in a very vague fashion, to the fact that, because he had gone to Japan, an event occurred in this State. Mitsubishi took a financial interest in Chrysler because of what the Premier said during his trip, despite the fact that, before he went, he said that there was no question of contract which might result from discussion. This remark was made a few weeks before he suggested the opposite in the House.

The truth is that other factors influenced Mitsubishi, and these factors had nothing to do with the Premier and his minimising of regulations. According to the *Financial Times* of 12 May, the United States Loan Guarantee Board made \$1.5 billion of funds available for the Chrysler Corporation. The Premier also suggested in his Ministerial statement that, because Chrysler in America is in enormous financial difficulties and its collapse in that country would inevitably see the winding up of its operations throughout the world, in some magical way, a speech or two, and conversations between the Premier and contacts in Japan, made all the difference. Nothing could be further from the truth, and the Premier's attempts to reinforce his words in his Ministerial statement do nothing to enhance his credit.

It is far more likely that Mitsubishi was influenced by other factors. That company would have been delighted to know that the work force in South Australia has a good record of industrial harmony (and the present Government has nothing to do with that record). This harmony has continued during the 10 years of the previous Government's administration. A large operation like Mitsubishi preparing to enter in a big way into the car manufacturing

field in South Australia would know that Chrysler recently experienced success with its Sigma model. Those factors would have influenced its decision. In addition, as we well know, there is a pool of skilled labour in this State in relation to vehicle-manufacturing operations. Some people who have worked in this area no longer have a job. Factors like that would have influenced the decision.

However, the Premier was not satisfied to consider these factors when he made his statement to the House. He stated that he had been to Korea (I thought the country was called South Korea, but I am prepared to use the Premier's words in this case) and he said that discussions in Korea and Japan were such that South Australia ultimately saw itself at the forefront in the provision of enriched uranium to those countries, both of which have no option but to depend on the nuclear fuel cycle. I refer to the first part of that statement, in which the Premier said that South Australia ultimately saw itself at the forefront in the provision of enriched uranium to those two countries. I wonder whether the Premier was aware, when he made his Ministerial statement, of an item in the *Financial Review* of 9 May. It would be reasonable to assume that he might have known about it because it was some time ago. The article appeared under the heading "South Korea finds more uranium".

The argument being put was that we can ultimately (and one can think about why the word was there) figure in the supply, but here we have a contemporary article in the *Financial Review* quoting directly, as follows:

South Korea yesterday reported finding deposits of high-grade uranium ore near Okchon, 140 kilometres south of Seoul.

The Korean Resources Development Institute said that the newly found deposits contained an estimated 10 700 000 tonnes of uranium ore.

This was in addition to the previously found deposits of 20 300 000 tonnes in the same general area.

Here we have the suggestion that also in some way he was able to influence ultimate markets at the same time as additional supplies of uranium ore were being found in quite large quantities in South Korea. So much for the posturing to which we have been subjected recently in relation to the Mitsubishi operation and the justification of the tour overseas. There is no more substance in that than in many other statements by the Premier since he has come to office.

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

**Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Since I have come into this Parliament, it has been interesting to hear the rantings and ravings of members opposite, particularly their tactics in relation to union bashing. We have heard the Premier, on numerous occasions since I have been in the House, refer to the low industrial disputation in South Australia, yet we have the member for Fisher and the member for Henley Beach making continual reference to these radicals, these trade union officials who at the drop of a hat, pull the membership out on strike. In particular, last evening we heard the member for Fisher say:

... and yet the rank-and-file members of these associations do not know what wealth is under the control of the association.

The member for Fisher does not quote any particular organisation or association. He makes an ambiguous statement to try to brand the whole trade union movement and all the associations. He know full well that, if he named an association, we could check and find out what money it had. In the 25 years that I belonged to a trade union organisation, the balance sheet was there for the

union membership to look at, and they could know the wealth of the organisation. The member for Fisher went on to say, "They do not know exactly how much the Secretary receives in perks and salary, and they do not know how much the organisers receive." To me, that is just a load of clap-trap, and the member for Fisher would be well aware of that.

*Mr. Trainer interjecting:*

**Mr. HAMILTON:** He would know, but he could check that out. The information is there. It surprises me, because of his obvious paranoid hatred of the trade union movement and the fact that apparently his two sons had to join a trade union. I said earlier tonight that the Government had compelled members of the State Transport Authority to join a social club. It seems that when things are different they are not the same. I believe that, under the rules of any trade union registered under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, members would have access to the salary and so-called perks of people in that association. The member for Fisher goes on to say:

These associations do not submit to rank-and-file members every year a complete annual report as do big businesses.

**Mr. Trainer:** The books are subject to audit.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** That is correct, and I can only refer to the organisation to which I belong. Those books were audited every year and, if the auditor pointed out any errors or practices that he did not like, they were submitted to the council of the organisation for councillors to look at. The member for Fisher went on to say:

No annual report is posted out to rank-and-file members. I wonder how many companies post the annual report to all their shareholders.

**Mr. Lewis:** All of them.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** Certainly not all of them. The honourable member should be careful, when making statements like that, that he knows what he is talking about. The member for Fisher makes statements that are ambiguous; he just wants to win the argument. As has been pointed out tonight, people come here and want to make points without being factual. One would think that we had responsible members on the Government benches who knew what they were talking about rather than shooting their mouth off about something of which they were unsure, as is obviously happening. The member for Fisher went on:

No statement of how moneys are spent and how moneys are invested by that trade union movement is posted out to them.

If two members of that member's family were so concerned about the role of trade unions, one would have thought they could go to meetings, ascertained the procedure, and asked questions. If they found that something was wrong, they had the right under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act to go to an inspector and lodge a complaint about the functioning of that organisation. I see colleagues nodding to indicate that they know that that is a fact.

When I was Branch President of the Australian Railways Union and these furrphies arose, I reminded my members that they should read the constitution of the organisation and what their entitlements were. I told them that, if they did not agree with what I was saying or with the rules of the organisation, they could go to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and check their entitlements. If there were discrepancies with ballots, etc., there were proper channels to approach. It is obvious not only from statements he made yesterday but also from previous statements that he has made that the member for Fisher is paranoid about the trade union movement. He has an intense hatred of it, and is not prepared to give any

credit in support of what the unions are doing for the working class. The member for Fisher went on to say:

In fact, it is true to say that, when union members are asked to go on strike by the Secretary or the organiser, they make sure that the Secretary and organiser not only go on receiving their salary in total, but at times, if they have to move around the community to carry out extra activity, they ask for an increase in the perks that they receive.

I can only relate what I was involved in, and it comes back to the fact that all trade unions, to my knowledge, are registered with the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and are bound by those rules. If I went to any members that I represented when I was in the railways and told them that they had to walk off the job, they would have told me very promptly where to go. Further any union official worth his salt would not tell the membership that they had to go on strike, because members would know their entitlements and would ask on what authority the decision had been made.

I certainly disagree strongly with these inane statements made by the member for Fisher. He also said that, when the secretary or organiser was on strike, the union officials still got paid. I can relate only to the organisation to which I belong, but I can assure members that, when there was a State-wide stoppage of that organisation, the officials themselves lost a full day's pay. They are to be commended for taking that action, one which united the troops around the organisation and the officials, and, to their credit, they received tremendous support from the members.

Once again, in respect of the perks they receive, it is a load of hogwash from the member for Fisher. As yet, he has been unable to name in the House, to my knowledge, any organisation whose officials were pulling the wool over its members' eyes. I challenge the member for Fisher to name that organisation in the House.

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

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide):** It was not my intention to enter into this debate, which has been long and drawn out. Most of the things I wanted to say in the debate have already been said, but I am drawn into the debate by the management of the House. If the Deputy Premier is not managing his department any better than he is managing the House, I feel sorry for his department. We have been eight or nine weeks (I forget which) out of the House, with nothing of importance on the Notice Paper—no legislation brought forward other than the financial Bills for the six days on which we are to sit. We came back yesterday, sat for about 3½ hours, and were sent home last night like bad school boys, with nothing to do, and we are back today with these two pieces of legislation which are being forced through by the pressure of numbers and by the power of the Government, thus keeping people, including the police and staff of the House, here until 5.45 a.m.: that is absolutely ridiculous.

**Mr. Ashenden:** Don't keep speaking.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am entitled to speak for 10 minutes the same as are you and the other members have done. You are forcing me to stay here. There is no question about that, but that is not the point. The point is that we will be up by about next Tuesday, and we will not even have six days sitting, with the legislation now before us. There is no rhyme or reason why this legislation should have been forced through today in one sitting, particularly as we were forced home like bad boys last night, whereas we could have sat until midnight. I condemn and criticise the manager of the House, the Deputy Premier, and, if he does not improve, he will not get much co-operation in the future from the Opposition. He will need it if he is going to

get his business done.

I am still concerned over the Premier's statement yesterday about the plastics plant at General Motors-Holden's. Let me see whether I can reconstruct for the House what has happened about this statement. I believe that the Premier yesterday, having received notification from my Leader that he would move an urgency motion on the economy, dug around for an announcement to make. It seems strange that he chose yesterday afternoon at 3.30 or 4 o'clock, when he could have done it today or Friday or next week, but no, he chose the very day on which the House returned and when Parliament resumed sitting—the very day on which the Opposition had decided to move an urgency motion about the state of the economy, which is in a drastic state—and no-one can deny that. The facts and figures presented by my Leader today have refuted everything that the Premier has said, and the facts are there for anyone who wants to study them. My Leader's speech was one of the best speeches on the economy that I have heard in the House (and that includes Don Dunstan, the Premier himself when Leader of the Opposition, or any other member). They were excellent speeches today, and my Leader made the point.

We have heard from the Premier some statement from Uniroyal on the effects this plant will have on South Australia, but we have not heard from the workers on the job—at least the House has not, but I have. I was telephoned this morning by an experienced man in the motor vehicle industry. I will not mention his name, obviously, but he has worked at General Motors-Holden's for between 15 and 18 years. He certainly would know what he was talking about, and I have written down what he said. He rang to inquire on behalf of his fellow workers who were angry about the Premier's ill-informed boasting yesterday about more jobs in the car industry. He said, "This afternoon shop stewards are meeting to discuss the whole matter. But, on an early count, we are already able to see the promised 50 extra jobs in proper perspective. At General Motor's, Elizabeth, there are, just for a start, 60 women working on door foundations, five on headlinings and 15 workers on die-electric, all of whom will be affected by the introduction of this injection moulding plant, for that is what it is. The workers on the floor are certain that the Premier's grandiose announcement, his 'victory for South Australia', means absolutely no gain in employment. There could very easily be a net loss". This nonsense could easily turn against the Premier.

I am satisfied, after thinking this out and checking the facts, that there was an obvious reason why this statement was made. I do not want to get up here in any circumstances and knock any investment coming to South Australia. I want to make that clear. If the investment is there, well and good, but I do not want fabrications to be made out of that investment, either. It is not proper. In the light of the circumstances coming to hand, the Premier's announcement is not in line with the facts of the situation. It is not only I who is saying that. Uniroyal was out early yesterday making similar noises and, admittedly, there was some change from its stance in the afternoon.

We were given strong and solid information that the effect would be what Uniroyal claimed in the first place. We now have the situation from the people working directly on the floor at G.M.H., who would know more about the workings of the machinery and about what is happening there and the effects the installation of any plant will have on their factory. Those are the people I prefer to believe, rather than the Premier's figures on the situation. I am not sure how he based his facts in this situation. Perhaps he is wrongly informed. I am not sure how he has received this information, but he should go

into the facts and try to get to the bottom of this situation. Without trying to knock any development occurring in South Australia, one really has to come back to the situation of believing those people, surely, who will be directly affected.

It is my experience, whether working in industry or representing workers in industry or when I was Minister of Labour, that, if I wanted the real facts on any situation, it was absolutely imperative to talk not only to the management of the factory or to the foremen but most certainly to the people who were actually physically doing the job.

In an instant, they could tell anyone who wanted that information just what effect any new installation would have in their industry. I have cited this situation everywhere I have been; that has been my experience. I did not go fishing for that information today. I did not ring anyone at G.M.H. and ask them to contact me. This information came to me after a meeting was held on the floor, and it was said that someone should be told the true facts about the situation.

Information has been made available to us by the Premier through his announcement and through the

Uniroyal announcement, and now the real facts are emerging from the plants and from the workers who will be affected. Those workers know their plant backwards and know what the installation will be and the effect it will have on the economy. I certainly believe there will be no increase in the work force because of this installation. There may be 50 people working on it—I am not denying that at all. There may certainly be 50 people who will fulfil an occupation at this plant, but that is not what the Premier said. The Premier did not say that there would be a transfer of employees from the section I was informed about today. Quite clearly the Premier said that there would be 50 extra jobs. I put it to the honourable members that such evidence is not available.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.46 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 5 June at 2 p.m.