

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 June 1980

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

## CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 2.20 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

*As to Amendment No. 1:*

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No. 2:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its amendment but makes the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 15, page 5, lines 11 to 13—Leave out "cause that direction to be reviewed by the Training Centre Review Board as soon as is reasonably practicable" and insert "thereupon give notice in writing of the direction to the Training Centre Review Board."

After line 13—Insert subsection as follows:

(lab) The Training Centre Review Board shall conduct its review of any direction made by the Director-General under subsection (1a) of this section—

(a) at the meeting of the Review Board next held after receiving notice of the direction; or

(b) if the Chairman of the Review Board is of the opinion that the matter is urgent, at a meeting of the Review Board convened earlier by him for the purpose.

And that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to. Although amendment No. 1 has an agreement by the Legislative Council that it no longer further insists on its disagreement, that probably is the more important of the two matters to which I should address myself, because at the conference an assurance was given by both the Chairman of the conference, the Attorney-General, and me that we would explain to our Chambers and therefore place in *Hansard* for permanent record the fact that we are not altering the present basic philosophy applied by the Children's Court. In fact, the philosophy that the court uses is based on a view of section 7 of the Act which essentially deals with philosophical matters and in consultation, not with Judge Kingsley Newman, who was out of town this morning, but with senior members of the Children's Court, we ascertained this morning that certain practices are currently followed.

Perhaps I should explain one or two points briefly. First, the court has considerable emphasis on rehabilitation of children, rather than solely on punishment. I think that was an implied fear at the conference this morning, that that was not the case. In fact, the court assures that it avoids recording a conviction wherever possible. There are certain differences, however.

Under section 51(11), group I or group II offences generally have to have a conviction imposed and, therefore, a fine or other penalty is imposed. This amendment would, in fact, allow the court to impose a conviction with no penalty. For example, if a youngster were appearing before the court with seven or eight cases under group I or group II offences, it would be legally

possible now, if this amendment were to pass, for the court to impose a conviction on one of them, and to impose no penalty on the other six or seven convictions. Incidentally, I am assured by the court that the Department for Community Welfare social background reports are made available to the Children's Court, other than for road traffic offences, and that the Children's Court has already assumed that it has implied power under the Act to impose a conviction without penalty. It asks that the matter be placed beyond doubt by the passage of the amendment, which the House of Assembly submitted.

The point was also made that road traffic offences—relatively minor matters—could be dismissed. There may be a persistent offender committing the road traffic offences. Here there are two categories. If a youngster is under 16 he is not licensed. Therefore, his offence is regarded as a general one. A first offence would be subject to no conviction by the court, in any case. Over 16 years, it would be possible that a minor offender could receive a conviction, but that there would be no penalty imposed, and that the demerit system would automatically be imposed, which is its own punishment. Were no conviction imposed, a young offender could go through a number of traffic offences and have nothing recorded against him, have no demerit points, therefore, taken from him, and the matter could just be allowed to slide, although he were a persistent offender.

The question of persistent offenders is also relevant, in so far as if a youngster is convicted without penalty, if it is found subsequently that he is a persistent offender and he develops into a hard-line persistent offender, these matters are brought before the courts on his record. Therefore, the court then has a complete record of that youngster's background to take into consideration. This does not imply, even then, that the court will automatically take that background into consideration and penalise the child. Humanitarian principles prevail.

One example was quoted of a youngster with eight previous convictions who goes without conviction, without being arraigned on any offence for quite some considerable time. It may be that he strikes a period of unemployment, he enters upon hard times and commits another offence. This is taken into consideration. It is quite possible that despite his previous record he may be allowed to go free without conviction, without a penalty being imposed.

So, this is just to reassure the House that the basic humanitarian principle of keeping children without conviction, wherever possible, is borne in mind. Also, we have extensive counselling through the police and the Department for Community Welfare long before the child is brought into court. This should be a reassurance that the Government does not intend to invoke hard principles by the passage of that particular clause, giving the courts three options instead of the two requested by the Legislative Council. The court can, under this condition imposed by the House of Assembly, impose a conviction without penalty.

The second amendment, which was the subject of some compromise, now removes from the Director-General of Community Welfare that unilateral power of reversing a judicially-arrived-at decision, in so far as he may decide that a youngster was wrongly sent to the old Vaughan House or McNally, and for a variety of reasons he may decide that the various training centres were the incorrect places to send the youngsters to.

Instead of his having that unilateral power to reverse a judicial decision, he now has to make his decision and thereupon (we said "thereupon", which implies some sort of immediacy, rather than "within a reasonable period"

because "reasonable" seems to be misinterpreted), he must in writing advise the Chairman of the Training Centre Review Board of his decision, and then the Chairman of the board will decide whether to hold a meeting of the review board very quickly (it may be a very serious and urgent matter) or whether at the next fortnightly session of the review board he will then bring the matter up as a matter of course for consideration. If the board decides that the Director-General has acted improperly in reversing the judicial decision and in transferring the offender to a different training centre, it will state its case and make its decision, and the Director-General will have to abide by that decision.

That outlines the summary of the discussions that were in train this morning with the committee of managers, and I am very pleased that an atmosphere of reasonableness prevailed. It was quite obvious that both sides were acting in a humanitarian manner and generally in the best interest of children.

**Mr. ABBOTT (Spence):** The Opposition accepts with some reluctance the agreement reached by the conference of managers of both Houses. While we on this side of the House were a little disappointed at not being entirely successful in relation to both amendments before the conference, they were debated and explored quite fully, and representatives from this side of the House were pleased with the spirit of compromise that prevailed. The Opposition was not prepared to lose this Bill completely, because we support not only quite a number of the amendments contained in the Bill but also the principal object of the Bill, which provides for a child who has defaulted in paying a fine with the option of spending a number of hours participating in work programmes. I pointed out during the second reading debate that the Labor Party supports that concept entirely. It is part of our policy, and consequently we agree with that.

The redrafting of clause 15, which deals with moving a child from one place of detention to another, now satisfies the objection originally made by the Opposition. I can only express regret that the Government was not prepared to compromise on clause 8, which allows the court to enter a conviction against a child who has been discharged without penalty. To a man, we on this side feel very strongly about this: we think that it is entirely wrong for a child who has been discharged without penalty then to suffer the sledgehammer by receiving a conviction. I think that the day may come when the Government will regret this decision, because I think each and every one of us in this place has at some time during our life been guilty of some minor offence. If a child receives a conviction, that is a stigma which will remain with that child for the rest of his life. That was our objection to that. We supported the main object of the Bill and other amendments, and we were not prepared to lose the Bill, so we agreed to the compromise arrangements. I support the motion.

**Mr. CRAFTY (Norwood):** I concur in the remarks of the Minister of Education and the member for Spence that this conference, of which I was a member, was held in a spirit of co-operation and conciliation, and there was no doubt that there was a genuine desire on the part of all present to seek out the most proper resolution of this conflict.

We are pleased to see that the amendments which originated from the Opposition have come into the Bill with respect to clause 15 and provide some further safeguards not only for the accused in the circumstances, the person who is in detention, but also for the Director-General of Community Welfare, and generally bring

about some consistency in the treatment of juvenile offenders.

With respect to clause 8, it is disappointing, as the member for Spence has told the Committee, that there will be power for a magistrate or judge to record a conviction where no penalty has been brought down. It has been the philosophy of the former Government, now the Opposition, that, where a court finds that no penalty is warranted, no conviction should be recorded, but this now alters that situation. However, it is gratifying to hear the Minister's statement and the Attorney-General's statement in another House that the current and existing policy of the Children's Court will be continued.

Motion carried.

#### PETITIONS: EDUCATION FUNDING

Petitions signed by 51 parents and staff members of Para Hills Primary School praying that the House would oppose a 3 per cent cut back in funding for the Education Department of South Australia were presented by the Hons. D. O. Tonkin and D. J. Hopgood.

Petitions received.

#### PETITION: BAKING HOURS

A petition signed by 530 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to allow the baking of fresh bread and rolls on weekends in the metropolitan area was presented by Mr. Crafter.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose the Bill to extend trading hours for retail food stores until 6 p.m. on Saturdays was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEATH OF JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is with profound regret that I inform the House of the death of the Japanese Prime Minister, Mr. Masayoshi Ohira. Honourable members will recall my advising this House last week that, during my recent visit to Japan, I had the honour and privilege of meeting Mr. Ohira, during which occasion we had encouraging discussions about the involvement of South Australia and Japan in the development of trade relationships in the context of a Pacific Basin community. It was therefore with great sorrow that I learnt of Mr. Ohira's death this morning.

I have been in touch with the Australian Embassy in Tokyo to ask that suitable arrangements be made to convey the condolences of the Government and people of South Australia to the Government of Japan, and I have personally conveyed my condolences to the Japanese Ambassador in Canberra.

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**Mr. BANNON:** I should like to link the Opposition with the remarks made by the Premier relating to the death of

the Japanese Prime Minister. Mr. Ohira, both in ideology and economic policy, was what one might call conservative and, therefore, did not subscribe to some of the policies of my Party. On the other hand, his record in Japanese public life, his role in the late 1950's and early 1960's in bringing about the Japanese economic miracle, and the general policies that he adopted in the short time in which he was Prime Minister were ones to which certainly due regard should be paid, particularly on the sad occasion of his death.

One of the features of Mr. Ohira to which commentators continually referred was the fact that he was the son of a poor farmer, had worked his way up by educating himself and going to university and, ultimately, into the very heart of the Japanese political elite.

The Japanese Prime Minister's reputation was of someone able to work with members of the Opposition. A leading Opposition member said the following of him.

He had a thoughtful and wise personality. He modestly and wisely sees the realities and follows public opinion.

In economic policy, it was interesting to note his statement on becoming Prime Minister, as follows:

Although we have to suppress inflation we must avoid increasing unemployment.

That tempered many of the policies he implemented as Prime Minister of Japan. His role and that of his Party was described as the lubricating oil that smoothed things out in Japanese politics. Despite the problems that beset his Government, culminating in its resignation some weeks ago, I think Mr. Ohira's work and his record in ensuring stability in Japanese foreign and economic policies will be remembered with great gratitude by the world.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PYRAMID MONEY GAME

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Government is concerned that the pyramid money game which operated recently in New South Wales now appears to be operating in South Australia. Information received from the Police Department Gaming Squad reveals that at least two meetings were held last night and that further meetings are planned.

The game operates by participants contributing \$1 000, thereby securing a position on a six-tiered pyramid. It is a prerequisite that any intending player introduce at least two further participants, each of whom must also contribute \$1 000. Thus the pyramid is built up.

A full pyramid consists of 63 players and each pyramid is split several times as the game progresses, the aim being for each player to reach the top of a pyramid and receive his so-called windfall. The inevitable result, as has been proved by experience in New South Wales and California, is that relatively few people even recoup their \$1 000. Even if the whole population of South Australia were to take part, only a handful would stand to gain anything, and the vast majority would lose their entire \$1 000.

The Government has now received advice that the pyramid money game almost certainly involves a breach of the Lottery and Gaming Act—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Who does get the money?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The money goes to the few unscrupulous organisers of this pyramid game.

**Mr. Millhouse:** And they're not in the pyramid.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** They are at the top of the pyramid.

**Mr. Millhouse:** And they stay there?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leave has been granted for a Ministerial statement.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** This is an important matter, and I am grateful to the member for Mitcham for raising it. It is the people at the top of the pyramid who organise several pyramids, collect the entrance money and disappear, having kept all the money that comes. I repeat that the Government has now received advice that the pyramid money game almost certainly involves a breach of the Lottery and Gaming Act and this has been reported to the Gaming Squad of the Police Department. The police will now be investigating any meeting held for the purpose of promoting the game and taking the appropriate action.

Members of the public are advised that if they participate in this game not only do they risk a conviction for a criminal offence but they stand little chance of recouping their \$1 000. It is obvious that, for every person who "wins" \$16 000, 16 other people must each lose \$1 000. I repeat my warning to the people of South Australia not to be taken in and duped by this pernicious habit. If they are they will be running the risk of conviction and, also, will be very foolish indeed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATURAL GAS

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** A report in this morning's *Advertiser* refers to a decision by the Government to commission Gaffney Cline and Associates to advise on natural gas production in the Cooper Basin. The *Advertiser's* report states in part that these consultants will undertake a six-months study "to determine the future of the gas fields". I wish to make it clear that my announcement on this matter yesterday related only to a study of production practices in the Cooper Basin. The consultants have no brief to advise on overall policy in relation to the Cooper Basin. Their only brief is to advise on the efficiency of production practices.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PATHOLOGY SERVICES

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** On 13 November 1979, I appointed a committee of inquiry to report on the provision of pathology services in South Australia. This committee was headed by a former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, Professor Sir Geoffrey Badger, and included as members Mr. Stan Huddleston, a former General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and Dr. Harold Kramer, a former Director of the Institute of Clinical Pathology and Research in South Australia and a Fellow of the Royal Colleges of Pathologists of Australasia and Great Britain.

In announcing the inquiry and seeking submissions, I indicated that the report of the committee would be made public, as would those submissions which were not of a confidential nature. I have today released the report.

The committee received 109 written submissions and consulted many individuals and organisations, both in South Australia and other States. From the committee's report, it is pleasing to note that South Australia maintains

a high standard and quality of pathology services and, as yet, does not suffer from many of the inadequacies and inefficiencies that are present in some other States. The committee has recognised these standards in both the public and private providers in South Australia, and has commended the current approach in the provision of pathology services. However, it has expressed concern that we should not become complacent and identifies examples of the erosion of these efficiencies which we have enjoyed. The Government is committed to improving the efficiency of health services in general and will be closely examining the need for controls in this regard.

In making the report public, I propose to allow a six-week period to 31 July 1980 before recommending any action to the Government on the committee's recommendations. During this time, interested parties and individuals will be afforded the opportunity to submit comments for consideration by the Government on the recommendations of the committee.

Public submissions to the inquiry will be available for perusal at the South Australian Health Commission. In light of the extent of the inquiry and the nature of the recommendations, we consider it reasonable to allow this opportunity for consideration of the report before the Government takes action to implement those recommendations that it adopts.

I believe that I referred to Dr. Kramer as a former Director of the Institute of Clinical Pathology and Research in South Australia; "South Australia" should read "New South Wales".

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WATER AND SEWERAGE CHARGES

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I give notice that it is the intention of this Government to introduce legislation in the August session amending the Waterworks Act, 1932-1978, the Sewerage Act, 1929-1977, and the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1954-1975. The need for this action arises out of problems encountered by the Government in recovering charges for water supplied and for sewerage services provided, which are made in substitution of rates determined on the value of property.

Such charges have to date been made in circumstances where properties are exempted from rating under the Waterworks or Sewerage Acts or under other Acts. The Waterworks Act (section 88) and Sewerage Act (section 65) exempt charitable and other bodies from the payment of rating on valuation. Such bodies, however, have always paid for the water used or the service provided, in certain circumstances at concessional rates.

The Crown Solicitor has advised that, as the Waterworks Act currently stands, the Government cannot legally impose a minimum charge or charge for water supplied to properties exempted under section 88 or to properties exempted under other Acts. By virtue of section 27 (d) of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1954-1975, that trust is not required to meet either rates or charges. While the Government believes that exemption from rates should stand, it considers that the trust should be no better off than local government, which is required to pay for services provided. The legislation that I am foreshadowing will be effective as from 1 July 1980.

#### QUESTION TIME

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the time for asking questions without notice to be extended to 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. BANNON:** Will the Premier inform the House what urgent and specific action he intends to take to deal with the growing employment crisis in South Australia? Figures published today by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the employment figures which the Premier has said many times are the only reliable employment indicators, show that South Australian unemployment rose by 4 200 in May as opposed to April. Looking at it on the basis of comparison of 12 months to 12 months to eliminate some of the seasonal factors from that figure, the rise in South Australian unemployment is from 44 500 or 7.5 per cent of the labour force in May 1979 to 50 200 or 8.3 per cent of the labour force in May 1980, by far the highest rate in Australia and a rate which is above the normal summer peaks which we experience for employment, an entirely new pattern for unemployment statistics. The New South Wales percentage of the labour force unemployed is 5.8, the Victorian percentage is 5.9, the Western Australian percentage is 6, Tasmania 6.5, Queensland 6.9, and South Australia 8.3. In December, the Premier said that the November Bureau of Statistics figures provided unmistakable proof that the new Government's policies were working. In the light of these figures, it appears quite clear that they are working; they are working in a retrograde and opposite direction. The South Australian economy is plunging into a deep unemployment recession and it is about time some action was taken by the Premier and put into—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would draw the honourable Leader's attention to the fact that commenting during the asking of questions or during a brief explanation of a question is out of order. A degree of latitude is often accorded to the Leader of the Opposition, but I believe that the honourable Leader is going beyond that benefit.

**Mr. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologise for transgressing, but the gravity of the situation and the horrendous figures that were released today indicate that my question, asking the Premier on specific action, needed some explanation and in particular the Premier needed his attention drawn to a five-point plan put forward by the Opposition for urgent remedial immediate action which, on a bipartisan basis, we would be prepared to join with him in implementing.

In asking this question, I am trying to get the Premier for the first time in this House to state clearly and unequivocally what he intends to do about this depressing and alarming situation in South Australia in relation to employment.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I totally agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it is a most alarming and disturbing situation. This is not the first time that I have agreed with the Leader on this matter. The Government is most concerned at the most recent figures. South Australia is at the forefront of the unemployment rate, and that is nothing that anyone in South Australia can be proud of, and certainly nothing of which we can be unaware. New South Wales also had a very steep rise in unemployment, but that is of little consolation to people in South Australia.

Let me deal with two of the aspects that the Leader has raised in his explanation. He first asked what urgent and specific measures this Government is taking. We are taking measures of the best possible kind. He referred to the five-point package, which he put forward to this House a matter of a week or so ago, which was in fact a regurgitation of the Whitlam package, and a repetition of the policies followed by the previous Government in South Australia for nearly 10 years. The whole point about that matter is that, although I said in November that it seemed that we have had unmistakable proof that our policies were working, there is no doubt that I did not allow for the long-term debilitating effects of the development downturn in South Australia over the 10-year period in which Labor was in office.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I find it very amusing, except that it is tragic, that the Leader of the Opposition, when it comes to every other positive achievement, claims credit for it, quite spuriously, but when it is something that reacts against the Government or against something which he has done, he dissociates himself from it and tries to place the blame on the Government of the day, a Government that has been in office for just nine months. You cannot have it both ways. The whole point is that we have not had in this State up until last September one worthwhile announcement of industrial expansion literally for years.

Since we have come to office, I am proud indeed to say that recent announcements by companies intending to expand their activities in South Australia cause me to believe that the climbing unemployment will, in fact, be arrested in the medium term. For some reason, the Leader of the Opposition seems to believe that the announcement of an expansion, the spending of money in development, and the creation of jobs over a period mean that that money will be spent tomorrow and that those jobs will be created tomorrow. That, of course, is quite ridiculous. That money has to be spent, and jobs have to be created as the projects move ahead. That is something over which no Government has any control.

But, what this Government has been able to achieve is the announcements that have been made and the commitment by those companies to expand, to spend and invest capital, and to create jobs, which is something that the previous Government was not able to do. Just this month there have been four separate announcements relating to significant investment in South Australia or export contracts won by South Australian firms. On Tuesday 3 June—and I intend to put this on record for the Leader of the Opposition—General Motors-Holden's announced that it was to establish a plastics factory in Adelaide at a cost of \$8 000 000. The Leader of the Opposition took every opportunity he could to denigrate that announcement.

Sir, \$8 000 000 is minor in comparison with some other projects. General Motors-Holden's is confident that it will lead to a much larger investment. The important part is that, by making this investment and this commitment to South Australia, future development by General Motors-Holden's will occur in South Australia. We have consolidated the car manufacturing business in this State, whereas it could have left it. By announcing the Mitsubishi decision, which honourable members again looked at with sidelong glances, we have again consolidated the establishment of the car manufacturing industry in South Australia, an industry which could well have been lost.

On Friday 6 June, Seeley Brothers announced that it had won a contract to send \$5 000 000 worth of evaporative air-conditioners to Iraq which resulted in an

addition to its work force over the past seven weeks of about 70 people. They are also looking to expand still more. Only yesterday, John Shearer announced an export order of \$3 000 000 worth of agricultural machinery, also to Iraq, and at the same time said that it would close down its Queensland operation and expand its Adelaide plant at a cost of \$5 000 000. In other words, having gone to Queensland to escape the previous Administration, it has now decided that it can come back.

Simpson Pope Limited has also won an export order to Iraq for wringer washing machines worth \$1 700 000. I have spoken about the medium term rather than the short term because of necessity there will be involved in all of these announcements, and with others which I know are in the pipeline and which will be coming, lead times which must be observed: it is impossible to bring on these projects any more quickly than they are coming. If anyone had a magic wand to make it possible, I am quite certain I would be the first one to use it. However, one has to be practical. What the Leader of the Opposition is very carefully failing to say is that at least now we have lead times to look forward to, because in the time of the former Government there were no lead times; there was no investment; there was no development; and indeed, there was no hope.

#### MINING EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. GUNN:** During his recent tour of my electorate, was the Minister of Mines and Energy told of any increased employment opportunities by exploration and mining operations in that important part of South Australia?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. That question is a logical follow-up to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. The policies of this Government in clear contradistinction to those of the Opposition, will be such that we will generate employment in the area of mining which would be denied to the State if the policies recently enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition were followed. I undertook an extensive tour of the North of the State recently in company with some officials from the Department of Mines, and the local member who services that area so well, Mr. Gunn. We covered about 3 200 kilometres in a matter of four days, and I am told that the extent of that tour has not been matched by any mines Minister for the last decade.

We chartered an aircraft and visited Mount Gunson, Roxby Downs, Andamooka, Coober Pedy, Mintaby, the Aboriginal settlements of Amata, Ernabella, and Mount Davies in the Far North-West of the State. We would have called in at Maralinga to see what was happening there, but the aircraft did not have enough fuel. I had the pleasure of accompanying the local member on a very extensive tour of that part of the State. I am pleased to report that there is evidence of significantly increased activity at Roxby Downs. Only a week ago we heard the policy of the Leader of the Opposition, namely, that he is opposed to that project.

**Mr. Bannon:** I am not.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am referring to page 2275, column 2, of *Hansard*, and it is quite unequivocal; there it is in black and white. I have read and reread it, as it is such interesting reading. It was 4 o'clock in the morning, and maybe his resistance was low, but the truth will out, and there it is: and it is perfectly clear, even to the meanest of intelligence.

The Leader cannot get around it. He, along with Mr. Apap, Mr. Scott, and the absent Hon. Mr. Duncan are opposed, as they pointed out in Hindmarsh Square with

their anti-uranium protestors, to this development. It is good to have it on record.

In the short term, these are the sorts of prospect to which the Premier refers. Mining developments have played a very significant part historically in the development of this State. In the early days, the Burra copper mines made a significant contribution to an ailing economy. In the middle of the last century, the discoveries at Moonta, Wallaroo and Kadina also gave a fillip to the economy of the State. In this century, the development of the iron-ore deposits in the Middleback Ranges and the intervention of Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd., encouraged by those progressive years under Playford, did a great deal for this State. We are on the threshold of similar development. I point out to the House that, in anyone's terms, the Roxby Downs development will be a world-class mine which will generate significant employment (up to 5 000 at the mine) which—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to all honourable members, particularly on this occasion from the Opposition benches, that constant interjection whilst a Minister is answering a question does not enhance Question Time in the House: it only tends to inflame passions, and lead to an increase in the length of time taken by a reply.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Roxby Downs development would support a town of the size of Mount Isa or Whyalla. The multiplier effects of such a development, depending on whom one talks to, is conservatively, five to one. If you talk to people from Saskatchewan, Canada, which is heavily dependent on mining, the multiplier factor is 20 to one. This is the sort of development which the Leader of the Opposition, in his carping question to the Premier on employment, would deny the State. It must fall heavily on the ears of the member for Hartley, who, when he was Premier, successfully negotiated concessions of between \$50 000 000 and \$60 000 000, in relation to the exploration activity.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** It was \$50 000 000.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It will be more than that. It is \$18 000 000 in terms of the shaft they are about to sink. It must fall heavily on the ears of the member for Hartley to hear this new breed of Leader who is opposed to this development. It ill behoves the future of the Labor Party. The signs are encouraging. I was told at Roxby Downs that employment will increase from 90 to 170 this year.

**An honourable member:** Wow-ee!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** "Wow-ee" they say; if a brickyard closes down at Halletts or anywhere else, and 63 people are put off, it is front page in the morning daily but, if 90 go on the pay-roll at Roxby Downs, it does not rate a mention. At the Mount Gunson copper mine (by most parameters, perhaps a modest operation), it is intended to increase the work force by 25.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** As you know—

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

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The signs are encouraging. The build-up in employment is presently with us, but the Leader of the Opposition would deny this to the State. As the Premier has rightly pointed out, the lead times in these developments are not a matter of weeks or months, although the build-up is over a period of months, but are a matter of years. Given the developmental policies of this Government, the future of the State in these areas is rosy; given the dead hand of the Labor Party, the future is bleak. I thank the honourable

member for his question. The prospects for his district are rosy, and the contribution to the economy of the State will be great indeed.

#### JOHN SHEARER LIMITED

**Mr. WHITTEN:** We welcome the expansion of John Shearer Limited as announced yesterday by the Premier. Since the South Australian Government has made substantial financial incentives available to that company to enable it to expand its South Australian operations, can the Premier say whether he ensured that no member of the Government Party stood to gain direct financial advantage from this arrangement? If he did, what action did he take?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The arrangements that were made to provide the necessary incentives to persuade John Shearer Limited to expand its operation in South Australia were the usual ones and, as usual, they were considered, as the honourable member well knows, by the Industries Development Committee of this Parliament. I would think that the honourable member well knew before he asked his snide question that the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw declared his interest and, in fact, dissociated himself from the decision made. I am rather surprised that the honourable member, for whom I have a great regard, should in fact ask such a question and raise such an innuendo by so doing.

#### PORT LINCOLN ANCHORAGE

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister of Marine advise the House of the result of preliminary investigations undertaken to improve anchorage facilities at Port Lincoln? When is it expected that work will commence on the construction of a marina at Porter Bay? The Minister will be aware that, from time to time, considerable damage has been caused to vessels and to harbor facilities at Port Lincoln. Further, there has been considerable risk to those persons who endeavour to move their vessels to safer anchorage, particularly when there are strong northerlies or north-easterlies blowing. I am aware that a local committee, with representatives from all interested groups on Lower Eyre Peninsula, has been working in consultation with officers of the Minister's department, and that there have been some grounds of common agreement as to likely planning and development.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The member for Flinders is right when he says that the strong northerlies or north-easterly winds pose a real problem for vessels moored at Port Lincoln. Port Lincoln, contrary to general opinion, has been, and is, an area that can be quite hazardous, as it was a few weeks ago when a number of the fishing fleet vessels suffered considerable damage. I was able to inspect the damage caused to those vessels and to see at first hand the need for the construction of a facility for the fishing fleet at Porter Bay.

However, there has been a continuing discussion with AFIC about the need for the marina that the honourable member mentioned and for certain improvements to be made to the slip at Porter Bay. We have made some progress with arrangements for extending the facilities to take vessels on to the slip. That consists of the provision of another winch, which will improve the existing facilities. The question of a marina is still under discussion in my department. The industry is yet to say what its wishes are regarding the final construction, whether it wants a marina or a pier to which fishing vessels can tie up and unload their catch in Porter Bay, rather than at the main jetty, as is the practice now. The damage seems to occur when the

strong northerlies blow up and vessels are tied at the main pier. They suffered considerable buffeting a few weeks ago. With the advent of the 200-mile fishing zone, Port Lincoln, because of its position, does merit research to ensure that adequate facilities are provided for the larger fishing vessels that will, and should, operate from there, making it their major port of call. With that in view we are having discussions with members of the industry.

#### JOHN SHEARER LIMITED

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I preface my question by saying that the Opposition has absolutely no criticism of the actions taken by the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, the Chairman of the Industries Development Committee, in disqualifying himself from the decision made by the committee. In fact, we respect him for that action.

Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether he owns almost 10 000 shares in John Shearer Limited? Did the Minister inform the Premier of a possible conflict of interest when financial incentives to John Shearer Limited were being discussed by Cabinet and, if he did, what course of action did the Premier advise the Minister to take? Does the Minister agree that it is not proper for a member of Cabinet to hold a direct interest in a company that receives substantial financial assistance from the Government?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The Premier and the Cabinet are totally aware of my situation in regard to that company. The member for Stuart is alluding to the fact that John Shearer was my great grandfather and, as a result of its being a private company many years ago, shares in the company were handed to my mother that ultimately flowed to me.

**Mr. Keneally:** The question would need to be asked—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** On being elected to Government on 15 September, I made a full statement to the Premier which is in writing and which is available for the Cabinet and everyone in South Australia to see. There is no secret about my holding in that company, which was formerly a family company but which is now a public company.

#### INTERPRETERS

**Dr. BILLARD:** Will the Minister of Health say whether there is any difficulty in acquiring sufficient numbers of interpreters to work in the area of health care in this State? It has been brought to my attention that there may be some difficulty in supplying sufficient personnel to act as interpreters within State Government community health care programmes. Since such a service can be a vital part of the delivery of health care, especially within migrant and Aboriginal communities, it is most important that any deficiency that exists be made up as soon as possible.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I am not aware of difficulties in regard to recruiting interpreters, but I am aware that there is a need for more interpreter translators in the health services. This need will be filled following a recent decision made by the Commonwealth Minister for Health to provide funding on application by South Australia for an additional eight translator interpreters for health services in South Australia. The working party which examined the need for these interpreters and which was set up under the previous Government recommended that more interpreters should be employed.

On assuming office, I discovered that, in some hospitals,

the staff found little or no need for the interpreters who were already employed and, upon examining this situation, I found that the same circumstances applied in hospitals principally patronised by second generation migrants who had either acquired a sufficient knowledge of English or had younger members in the family who were able to translate. This is the case at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and at the Queen Victoria Hospital.

However, in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital the need is still quite acute, and that need will be met by the provision of eight interpreter translators. These translators will be part of a health care team and will be available not only to assist with direct translation but also to explain to patients the meaning of certain health terms, to advise social workers, and generally to contribute as effective members of a health team. I would like to assure the honourable member and the House that the needs of patients of non-Australian origin are being looked at and will be dealt with more efficiently in future than they have been in the past.

#### PETROL RESELLERS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I should like to ask a question of the Premier, as it is really a matter of policy. In view of the resolution passed by the House last evening, will the Government immediately have withdrawn the circular letter of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs dated 12 May 1980 that implies that service stations are ripping off the public? Last night the Government got through unamended, on your casting vote, Mr. Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There will be no reflection on a vote taken in this House.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I was not reflecting on it; I was merely pointing out that it was the first time the Government had had to rely on your casting vote in this Parliament. The resolution asks the Federal Government to enact the Fife package. Those on the Government side who spoke in the debate expressed sympathy for the petrol resellers. Then this morning I was shown a letter dated 12 May which was signed by a Mr. Noblet, as Acting Prices Commissioner (it is a circular letter obviously, although it is individually addressed), and which was written to service station organisations. In part, the letter states:

Following a number of complaints from interstate travellers and local residents concerning high prices for petrol in South Australian country towns, a series of checks has been conducted which indicated that in some areas excessive prices appear to have been charged.

This letter was not addressed to a reseller in a country town. It continues:

Having regard to all factors, a realistic money margin is 4.85 cents per litre.

In fact, on my information most petrol resellers are making between 1 cent and 3 cents a litre and no more. The letter concludes:

It would be appreciated if you would set prices within this maximum pricing basis voluntarily, as it is not desired to reintroduce the fixation of maximum retail prices. Should monitoring show that prices in excess of the level considered reasonable are being charged then a request for justification of the money margin being added will be sought by this department. Failure to supply such an explanation or inability to justify the margin being applied could lead to the fixation of maximum prices for motor spirit for individual resellers.

In other words, there is a threat there of price control if they do not toe the line. I conclude my explanation by quoting briefly from a covering letter, as follows:



Though Michael Wilson tries very hard in his capacity of Acting Minister of Industrial Affairs it is like dealing through an intermediary.

I did not mean to read that; it is the next paragraph that I want to quote. It states:

Burdett's department pulled a clanger recently by sending out the enclosed letter to all service station proprietors, and I am sure he wishes it was never sent. At a time when proprietors are being used as slave labour by the oil companies it did seem in poor taste to infer we were ripping the public off.

He then goes on to make the point that they are getting between 1 cent and 3 cents a litre. That letter and the direction from the department are absolutely contrary to what we heard last evening, and I therefore ask the question of the Premier.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I will take up the matter with the Minister, but my information at this stage is that that circular, if it has not been withdrawn, is to be withdrawn. I cannot throw any further light on the matter except to say that I tend to agree that it was unfortunately worded in the circumstances.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Can't the Minister control his department?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Minister will be looking into the matter in some depth.

#### WHISPERING WALL

**Mr. BECKER:** Can the Minister of Tourism say what action the Tourist Bureau has taken to promote the Barossa reservoir whispering wall, which I understand is a unique tourist attraction? Apparently, there are only three such whispering walls in the world, and the Americans have tried unsuccessfully for many years to copy the wall at the Barossa reservoir. In view of the appointment of a new vigorous advertising agent for the Tourist Bureau, I ask the Minister whether this attraction could be included in its programme.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I doubt whether many South Australians are aware of the unique attraction of the Barossa reservoir whispering wall. It is a quirk of engineering that can occur on rare occasions. It appears that it cannot be copied for all the trying in the world, as has been attempted in other countries. It is possible for people to stand at either side of the valley and conduct a conversation with each other in whispers lower than the tone I am using now. Obviously, it would be regarded as an attraction, especially by children. That kind of attraction is, of course, an appropriate one for promotion by a regional tourist association. Now that this Government has provided regional tourist associations with incentive grants, they have the capacity to identify tourist attractions within their own areas and promote them. The member for Hanson is correct in saying that it is an attraction that probably transcends regional barriers and it is one that could well be taken up by the advertising agency. I shall certainly refer the matter to the Director of Tourism for it to be taken up with the agency.

Members might be interested to know that following the selection of the agency by the Department of Tourism and its confirmation by Cabinet, I have arranged a series of presentations of the promotion that the agency will embark on in media and in display for the industry. I intend to invite every member of this Parliament to attend one of those presentations. I think it is essential that we take a bi-partisan approach to the promotion of South Australia as a tourist destination. I hope that every member of this Parliament will want to participate in that

promotion. In the first instance, it is imperative that we are all informed and I hope that, when the invitation is extended, as many members of the Government and of the Opposition as are able to do so will take advantage and attend a presentation and talk about it to their friends. If they travel interstate they will be well informed and able to inform others of what this State has to offer.

#### JOHN SHEARER LIMITED

**Mr. BANNON:** In answer to the member for Price a moment ago, why did the Premier fail to mention to the House the interests of the Minister of Water Resources in the John Shearer company? What advice did he offer the Minister in relation to the consideration of this matter by the Cabinet and Government, and what action did the Minister take? Was the Industries Development Committee informed of the Minister's interests by the Premier, and will the Premier table the schedule of financial interests of members of Cabinet referred to by the Minister in his reply?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader has asked a number of questions. I must say that, in my distress at having a question asked by the member for Price on that matter—

**Mr. Bannon:** I do not think you should make a joke of it.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not joking at all.

**Mr. Bannon:** It sounded like it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader seems to be extraordinarily sensitive about this. I am about to say that I must admit that in my distress about these questions being asked by the member for Price, particularly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It has been identified quite clearly that this is an important and delicate issue. It is not being assisted by comment from members on either side of the House, and I ask all honourable members to hear the Premier in silence.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the member for Price asked about the expansion of Shearers, involving as it did Perry's land, I immediately jumped to the conclusion that he was referring to the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw. In my distress I omitted to complete the reply, and I apologise for that. I am able to assure the House that the interests of the Minister of Water Resources in this matter are well known and recorded in the register which I have in my office of members' financial interests. I do not intend to make those public or release them to the House.

I have said that before and I say it again. I am able to assure the House further that the honourable Minister of Water Resources was not involved in the Cabinet decision to make the necessary arrangements for Shearers; not at all. I did not inform the Industries Development Committee of that interest, because, with the Minister not taking any part in the final decision, I did not consider that it was necessary.

#### MINERALS AND ENERGY POLICY

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Has the Minister of Mines and Energy noted the Leader of the Opposition's full endorsement of all aspects of his Federal Party's minerals and energy policies? Can the Minister say what impact this would have on South Australia?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The mindless and



uncritical support of the Leader of the Opposition for the Federal Labor Party's policies will have disastrous effects, quite frankly, for this State and the nation, especially if tragedy befalls and there is a change of Government. I was in Melbourne about a fortnight ago when the State Ministers gave State energy policies. We listened to a speech, delivered by one of the young Turks of the Labor Party, a Mr. Willis, in place of Mr. Keating, the shadow Minister for Energy in the Federal sphere. Mr. Keating was otherwise engaged; the Queen of England and of Australia was in his electorate.

However, I heard about or read a paper on the energy policy of the Federal Labor Party. I think it sent a cold shiver down the backs of most people in the auditorium. For openers, just let me give that policy in relation to off-shore exploration. All the States, including New South Wales and Tasmania, Labor States, met recently at a Ministers' conference and endorsed the package which gave a sharing of responsibility in relation to off-shore exploration and development. The States would have control up to the three-mile limit, and thereafter there would be joint responsibility.

The Federal Labor Party says it would revoke that legislation, and that this is a national responsibility. We would have a return to the centralist policies that we endured under the Whitlam regime. The Leader of the Opposition endorses that. He is out of step with the Labor Minister in New South Wales, with the Labor Minister in Tasmania, and with every other Minister in Australia. I believe that policy will have disastrous effects for South Australia, yet he endorses it.

As I pointed out previously, we have record exploration in minerals and energy in South Australia. We have 355 exploration licences. Although there were only 150 at 30 July last year, we now have 355, an all-time record. Recently, I announced an off-shore exploration effort. In the near future, I expect to announce very significant off-shore exploration activities. The Leader of the Opposition would put South Australia in queer street in relation to off-shore exploration by slavishly endorsing the centralist policies of the Federal Labor Caucus. But it does not end there. We know perfectly well the record of the late Rex Xavier Connor, with due respect to the departed. The Labor Party Federal policy scared off every bit of exploration effort in this nation, and it killed off Redcliff back in 1974.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We were subjected to a rehash, with different words, of the Connor policy. A fuels and energy commission is to be set up. I think a spokesman described it last week as one small step away from nationalisation, but I do not think it is a step away. That commission is to be involved in exploration, mining development and marketing. If that is not enough to scare away miners, I do not know what is.

What about the Labor stance in relation to world parity? It is interesting to note that, as late as August last year, the South Australian Government and my present department then under the regime of the former Deputy Premier, the Hon. H. R. Hudson, prepared a submission to the Senate inquiry on energy. The then junior Minister might not have been aware of this submission, but it was current up until the time of the election and it states:

The prices of crude oil to refineries should be maintained at a level equal to import parity.

The comments contained in the submission about the expected shorter term impacts were as follows:

Conservation of petroleum-based fuel; increased substitution of petroleum-based fuels by natural gas and L.P.G.;

stimulation of research and development into substitute fuels and alternative technologies.

We are seeing again the fact that the Labor Party, with the height of irresponsibility for what it perceives as short-term electoral advantage, is prepared to build up massive problems for the rising generation in the next 10 to 15 years. What would be the result of its fuel policies? Let me just mention how it was going to fund some of its new schemes.

**Mr. BANNON:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. I request that the Deputy Premier table the document from which he is quoting.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The Hon. Deputy Premier may table the document if he so desires, having regard to the request made of him. As it has not been identified as a departmental docket, I cannot require him to table it.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am quoting from notes. I was interested and I retained most of what the Federal spokesman, Mr. Willis, said. I am quoting the figures referring to the way in which the Labor Party is going to finance its schemes. It intends to impose a resources tax. In answer to a question, Mr. Willis stated that the resources tax would raise more than 3½ billion dollars, and would be imposed instead of the present levy. He said it would be applied selectively. He also said that, if a well was declining, he would not put the tax on it. The Federal Labor Party intends to impose a slug, a tax on profits, a resources tax, and not only was it to be on oil but it was to be across the board. The Labor Party also was going to get into coal. No wonder a cold shiver went down the backs of most of the people in Australia involved in energy. This is a rehash of the Connor years. It will effectively frighten off every major explorer. The Labor Party does not realise this. We suffered under the Hon. Hugh Hudson—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Minister to come back to the answer to the question.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am explaining the Federal Labor Party policy in relation to energy, which is mindlessly endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition, to the great disadvantage of this State and this nation. That tax would effectively scare off the sort of capital needed for off-shore exploration and hydro-carbon exploration. Companies need a deep pocket to get involved in those areas. If one is to deny them profits, they will go to another country, as they did when Whitlam, Connor and company were in office. I conclude by referring to the future of this country in relation to energy supplies and hydro-carbon supplies.

On the world scene, 22 billion barrels of oil are being consumed each year, while discoveries do not reach that figure—18 billion barrels are discovered. The parity pricing policies of the present Federal Government have led to significant conservation effort, and in fact consumption has recently declined. I will not take the time of the House to quote the figures that I have, but the Leader of the Opposition is quite at liberty to see them. They cannot be challenged. In Australia, unless significant new discoveries are made, indigenous production to meet our requirements will fall from the present 70 per cent to less than 50 per cent in the latter part of this decade, and to less than 10 per cent by the turn of the century, which is only 20 years away.

The philosophy of the Opposition is: let us have a short-term (so-called) benefit; let us appeal to the hip pocket; if the crisis that would develop if we did not follow this policy occurred, so what; let us leave it to future generations. What an irresponsible approach to Government and to the future welfare of the rising generation in

this State and nation. This is the sort of policy to which the Leader of the Opposition gives mindless support.

### CONSTITUTIONAL MUSEUM

**Mr. LANGLEY:** Will the Minister of Environment, representing the Minister of Local Government, say whether it is correct that visitors to the Constitutional Museum will pay \$2 for adults and 90 cents for children, and on Tuesdays, teachers and scholars will be admitted at a reduced rate? If it is, does this indicate a change in Government policy? Along North Terrace there are many fine and interesting buildings, such as the Art Gallery, the Museum and the State Library, which one can admire and also be admitted free of charge. These buildings also are Government controlled.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I will seek that information from my colleague in another place. I agree with the member for Unley when he says that this is a building of significance and will fit in very nicely with the other important buildings on North Terrace. When the Constitutional Museum opens on 31 July, it will provide an excellent and quite a unique opportunity for people to study South Australia's Parliamentary history through a variety of media. By that, I am referring to video equipment, tape recordings, artifacts and various other forms. It is just another excellent example of the desire of people in this State to protect the buildings which contribute significantly to South Australia's heritage and which must be kept for the appreciation and education of future generations. The Minister in another place is to be commended for the interest he has shown in this project, and we are all looking forward to the opening of the Constitutional Museum on 31 July.

### CIGARETTE TAR CONTENT

**Mr. RANDALL:** Has the Minister of Health heard of a proposal that the tar content of cigarettes should appear on all cigarette packets? Does the Minister agree that many diseases, which collectively are a preventable health problem, are caused or exacerbated by cigarette smoking? Increasing concern has been expressed to me from members of the community who do not smoke about the problems that they incur having to enter and sit down in a smoke-filled room. Also, doctors are now starting to express an increased concern, and it has been reported to me that they have observed a steady increase in the number of children who are smoking on a regular basis, by which I mean that they are smoking a packet a day. Finally, I want to express my concern, as a member—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. I indicate to the honourable member that permission is granted for an explanation, but, from the manner in which the honourable member has just spoken, he is obviously going to make a comment, and that would not be acceptable to the Chair.

**Mr. RANDALL:** I take the point, Sir. I was making the point that I concur in the comments that have been made to me from time to time that non-smokers are being forced to inhale unfiltered smoke in smoke-filled rooms.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The honourable member has made some very valid points in his explanation. He is certainly right when he says that the incidence of smoking among children is increasing. It is a matter for widespread concern throughout the community for educators, for parents particularly, and for health

professionals, and indeed for all the tax-paying public who ultimately pay the price of tobacco addiction which is now being shared by so many children at a younger and younger age. However, the question concerned the tar content of tobacco. The answer is that since 1969, at least, State health Ministers at their annual conferences have been concerned with this question. At this year's conference, I raised the question and invited the other States to indicate what their policies were in regard to the desirability of labelling all cigarette packets with the tar and nicotine content. Obviously, as the tobacco companies operate on a national basis, it would be difficult for one State to bring down legislation requiring this to be done unless that was being done by several States and it had to be implemented on a national basis. The conference resolved on my motion to refer this question to the Ministers' working party on tobacco, which operates on a continuous basis and makes regular recommendations to the Ministers of Health about the operation of the voluntary code and about legislative recommendations.

The recommendation to identify tar and nicotine content on cigarette packets was one of the recommendations of the report from the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare in 1977. The reason for this is that there is evidence to suggest that low tar and nicotine content tobacco has a reduced adverse effect on the smoker. Obviously, whilst it is desirable for people to give up smoking if they wish to live a longer and healthier life, at least the smoking of cigarettes with a low tar and nicotine content is a step in the right direction. People should be given the opportunity to make an informed choice as to the level of tar and nicotine in the cigarettes they choose. Therefore, the proposition that these levels should be identified on the packet is one which I believe should be widely supported. I hope that the Ministers' working party will study this question and identify the various attitudes of the States with a view to recommending national action on this problem.

The general question as to the preventability of disease which is induced by smoking must be taken far more seriously by the community. In 1977 the record shows that tobacco contributed to the death of 8 000 Australians from heart disease, and approximately 3 500 deaths were caused by lung cancer. When one views these deaths as being preventable, the cost in human and economic terms is devastating, and it is a problem on which Governments should certainly be taking action. I assure the honourable member of my interest in this matter and of the deep concern of the South Australian Health Commission, and I hope to be able to inform him in due course of what action will be taken.

### PROROGATION

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 15 July at 2 p.m.

In doing so, I pay a tribute to the staff of Parliament House, all of the people associated with it—and it is traditional to go through them—for the very great assistance they have given to members of this Parliament during this first session. It is, I believe, a traumatic experience, to some extent, for members coming into this place for the first time, wondering where they are going, where they are allowed to go, what they should be doing, and there is no question but that without the staff, from

the messengers, the people from the Joint House Committee, from the dining-room, the refreshment room, the Parliamentary Library—all of the people who make contact with the members—we would be tremendously lost. I pay a tribute also to those people behind the scenes—the cleaners, caretakers, the electrician, and the air-conditioning expert, all of whom make the building a comfortable place in which to work.

In saying “thank you” to all of these people for helping new members, I place on record my appreciation, as Premier, and the appreciation of the Government of the help which is being given to a new Government.

Just as it is difficult for a new member to come into this place and find his way around, so, too, is it difficult for a new Government. We have had nothing but the greatest courtesy and co-operation from all of the people to whom I have referred, particularly from the officers of the House. They have gone out of their way to be of assistance, as they have for new members, and I am indeed grateful to them. I hope that honourable members and staff members of this place will have some pleasant respite and an opportunity to take some well-earned holiday before the House comes together again for the second session of this Parliament.

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I certainly endorse the remarks of the Premier and join the Opposition with him in the sentiments he has expressed. There have been many new things in this session of Parliament, after a period of relative stability and one or two personnel changes over some years, but I do not think that there have ever been such wholesale changes as there were following the election in September 1979. That poses particular problems for the working of the House, both behind the scenes and here in the Chamber, and I express our appreciation of the assistance provided. We have the unique situation of a new Premier, a new Leader of the House, and a new Government, a new Leader of the Opposition (one who has had a little over two years experience in the House and who, therefore, is not fully familiar with the forms and requirements of the House). A new Clerk, who has recently been confirmed in his position, his Deputy, and you, Mr. Speaker, whose election was a particular pleasure to us. The choice of the House in supporting you for the Speakership has indeed been vindicated in the productive and creative way in which you have approached the task, both in the House, in the Chamber, and behind the scenes in the administration of the House.

I thank you, Sir, and your staff officers, those in the Library, particularly Miss Stengert and her staff for their work in providing the sustenance that keeps us going until all hours of the morning (sometimes to the despair of the Leader of the House). Nonetheless, we find replenishment in the ministrations of the staff, and will continue to do so. I appreciate the smooth workings in what has been a difficult period for all of us in adjusting to the new roles and positions in which we find ourselves in this place.

**The SPEAKER:** It is, by tradition, an opportunity for the Speaker of the House to acknowledge the accolades that have been made by speakers from both sides on this occasion, more particularly on behalf of the staff, and I accept on their behalf the comments from the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

We live in a rather unreal world inside this place, particularly when the sittings are long. I think that members have to experience the situation within a Parliamentary sitting event rather than sitting on the sidelines believing that they know what takes place and being critical of some of those actions. I thank all members for the manner in which they have accepted a

responsibility for the conduct of this place. Certainly, it is the role of the Speaker to adjudicate on a number of matters and to give guidance, and I thank members for their acceptance of the guidance that has been given.

Opportunity was taken recently to acquaint all members of the House through their groups that the Standing Orders of the House are not necessarily a fixed body of rules, and that there can be an input to the Standing Orders from individual members. A request has been made that consideration be given to the current Standing Orders, and meetings will be held between the conclusion of this session and the commencement of another. Eventually, it will be the decision of all members of the House whether there will be an alteration to Standing Orders, or whether they will remain as they are.

Sitting in this position, and as a result of the experience, which it was my good fortune to have had during the earlier stages of the session by attending at the Palace of Westminster, and observing Question Time and other activities of the House of Commons, it is necessary, I believe, to draw to the attention of members on both sides of the House that the Prime Minister, in the quarter of an hour between 3.15 and 3.30 p.m. on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons, can receive and answer up to 17 or 18 questions. I believe that that was the original intent of Question Time, and the Standing Orders, and an attitude to Question Time to which all members may wish to give their attention.

I indicate to the new members that this has been their first experience of the Parliamentary system. In many respects, (and I suppose that I am seeking some justification for actions taken on their behalf), they have been recognised as wearing a P plate. However, as from the commencement of the next session, the P plates are off. That is not by way of a threat, but I believe that the Parliamentary system is better for a period of education of those who come here to make a contribution. Having taken the opportunity to read a number of publications about the Parliamentary system, I have been interested in statements attributed to the person who was recognised as the father of the present system of Speakers, more particularly in the Westminster system. Arthur Onslow, who was the Speaker from 1728 to 1761 in the House of Commons, indicated, on the conclusion of his long service, his honest belief, as follows:

That freedom, the dignity, and the authority of this House may be perpetual.

I believe that he expressed most important sentiments in that comment. I also believe that the surest way in which to uphold the dignity of any institution is to preserve its historic continuity and to that role I am committed.

Motion carried.

*At 3.40 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### **POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 27 February. Page 1294.)

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** The Opposition supports this Bill. It is a measure which I believe is long overdue and amends the Police Offences Act to make it an offence to tattoo minors under 18 years. It is only a short Bill, but the important clause is clause 3, which amends the principal Act by inserting a new section 21, which states:

Any person who tattoos a minor shall (except where the tattoo is performed for medical reasons by a legally qualified medical practitioner or a person working under his direction) be guilty of an offence and liable for a first offence to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars and for a second or subsequent offence to a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars.

The Bill raises the question of how far or to what extent the State should go in protecting people from themselves. In the case of tattooing of juveniles, I feel it is important that persons of impressionable age should be protected against themselves for an action which is practically irreversible, and which most of them regret in later life. South Australia is one of the few remaining States where the tattooing of minors is not an offence. In the 1960's the Victorian Government amended its appropriate Acts to prohibit the tattooing of minors in New South Wales in the 1930s, in Western Australia in 1976, and in the United Kingdom in 1968. Acts were passed to prohibit the tattooing of minors under 18 years. Many American States have or are considering legislation to prohibit the tattooing of minors.

It is worth examining the age-old practice of tattooing and its significance in various parts of the world. There have been occasions when it has been a fashionable practice, and other times when it has waned in popularity. It is claimed that Captain James Cook introduced the practice of tattooing into Europe because of observations made by him of the natives of Tahiti.

In Western European countries this practice has usually been associated with pursuits related to the sea. Naval personnel and people in merchant navies have played a significant part in the practice of tattooing. I understand that the incidence of tattooing has ranged up to 20 per cent among males associated with the navy. In countries of Eastern Europe the practice has been rare, although no statistics are readily available.

In the Arab world, it is a rare practice as tattooing is prohibited by the Koran. No orthodox Muslim would consider being tattooed. In Africa, although dark skin is not conducive to the pricking-in method of tattooing, the Africans use a scarification technique during which, after cutting and burning the skin, vegetable ash is rubbed into the wounds to encourage lumpy scars or keloids to form. The motives seem to be a combination of tribal identification and, in the males, a demonstration of courage and virility. The ceremony is often a public ritual, and is often used in African tribes as part of an initiatory course that all youths attend to join the male tribe.

In women the scars made from the practices of skin marking have strong sexual connotations. In the East, in India, China, the Philippines, New Zealand, and particularly in the Pacific Islands in Samoa, the New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands, tattooing has been widely practised for many years and the degree of decoration corresponds largely to social status.

In modern society it is claimed that professional tattooing is a harmless operation. However, it has not been without medical hazards. Let us look at some of the compounds used in the modern practice of tattooing. To obtain the colour black the compound used most commonly is carbon, which is charcoal suspended in an ammoniacol solution containing phenol. For rare use for obtaining the colour black, which is potentially sensitising, the compound used is logwood, which contains chrome. To obtain red or scarlet lake, an organic pigment, the potentially sensitising compound is cinnabar, vermilion, and mercuric sulphide, and cadmium red (selenide). To obtain brown, the compound is hydrate of ferric oxide and cadmium salts. To obtain yellow, yellow ochre or hydrate

of ferric oxide is used. The rare and potentially sensitising pigments are cadmium sulphide, chrome zinc and lemon yellow, which is chrome salts. To obtain green, chlorinated copper phthalo-cyanine is used. The rare and potentially sensitising pigments used are viridian, which is emerald green (chromium sesquioxide). To obtain blue, copper phthalo-cyanine is used. The rare and potentially sensitising pigment is cobalt aluminate. I know that the member for Morphet will probably pick me up on my pronunciation of some of these chemicals, because he is no doubt familiar with them; I am not suggesting, of course, that he uses them for tattooing processes. The last colour, white, is titanium white, which is titanium oxide, or zinc white, which is zinc oxide. The rare and potentially sensitising pigment is flake white, which contains lead carbonate.

Those are most of the compounds used by modern tattooists. It is interesting to note that mercury sensitivity to tattooing may occur anything up to 40 years after the operation. There is no satisfactory explanation for that, except in cases where there is a history of ingestion or application of mercury for other purposes. These can be found in dental amalgams, fungicidal foot powders, and ointments of some kinds. The pigments I have listed are, presumably, trouble-free.

Regrettably, there is no guarantee that further experience in the handling of these compounds in the practice of tattooing which may be considered non-toxic today may not be harmful in the long run, so there is a potential hazard in tattooing which continues to worry health authorities. Many of our young people who subject themselves to this practice regret their impulsiveness as they grow older. The process, I believe, is practically irreversible unless painful surgery is undertaken, which leaves scars on the body. The financial cost involved is expensive and the results largely depend on the extent of the tattooing and its location on the body. Juveniles normally have tattoos applied at an age when in some emotional conflict and immaturity and when they perhaps do not have an understanding of the long-term consequences.

There is a tendency in the community to equate tattoos with juvenile delinquents. However, this is not always the case. There is some evidence to suggest that a person may have anti-social tendencies and that the indulgence in tattooing may have some significance in recognition by a group, with these groups having anti-social attitudes. Certainly, psychiatrists look on tattooing as a mark of sexual disfunction, but perhaps psychiatrists see only people with psychiatric problems. What effect tattooing has on a person's psychology is therefore an area of conjecture.

However, the physical aspect of tattooing carries a measure of mutilation of the skin and is frequently embarked upon by people without regard to the permanent consequences. Multiple tattoos (and many of us have seen photographs of people with multiple tattoos over most parts of their body) can more often than not be associated with persons who have some kind of personality problem. Their desire may be for acceptance by a certain group, similar to the status symbol of tattooing in African and Pacific Island tribes. Many young girls accept tattoos for this reason—to create an impression that they are associated with a certain group. An article in the *Advertiser*, under the heading "Impressing the boys is the big thing" and written by Dr. Karl Lashchuk, a child psychiatrist, who deals with many children who come before the juvenile court and the Department for Community Welfare, stated:

To find out how these teenagers viewed their own tattoos, I visited the South Australian Remand and Assessment Centre, formerly Vaughan House. There I talked with a 15-year-old girl, "Blondie" and several of her friends. All had tattoos. They were aged between 14 and 18.

"Blondie" was awaiting a court appearance on an assault charge. She was medium height, neatly dressed with dyed hair and carefully applied make-up. She had volunteered to talk about tattoos because of the effect they had had on several friends. She did not have any visible tattoos. When asked whether she had any tattoos she pulled down her jumper and displayed a multi-coloured tattoo on the top of her right breast.

She also had a faded tattoo of a spider between her breasts. She had the first tattoo, the spider, applied by a group of male friends when she was 14. "I had black satin bikinis at the time and I thought it would look really good," she said.

Three days after it was done it became inflamed and very painful. It was covered in pus. Instead of going to a doctor, "Blondie" went, with friends, to a professional tattooist. She told him she wanted to have it taken off. He said that he could do it but that it would be very painful.

He tattooed, without dye, a large square over the spider. He used his normal tattoo needle but did not try to make a pattern. The effect was to remove most of the home-made tattoo. However, it was still visible.

On the same day "Blondie" had a professional tattoo applied on her right breast. She admitted that it was quite painful for a while. "I sat on my hands because it was so painful", she said, "and the tears were pouring. You sort of feel big. The guys have got them so why can't the women have them? The feeling of having a tattoo when I was with boys gave me a thrill. I was shy, but now the boys were more interested in me. I sort of regret having them and sort of not" "Blondie" said.

Another girl, 18 year-old "Kerry," said that most of the kids these days had tattoos. About 60 per cent of teenagers had them, she said. Some kids at Salisbury and Elizabeth had made their own tattoo guns from tape recorder parts. She did not regret the home-applied tattoo on her arm but she said she would not have any more.

A third girl "Dina" said her tattoo had not hurt, but a friend of hers had had a "home-made job which went infected." "She had to go to hospital and get it taken off. The scar was really bad."

"Blondie" told of a friend who had tried to get tattoos out with burning cigarettes. Another girl, who had her first tattoo at 13, became so depressed about her tattoos that she refused to return to school.

Despite her dislike of the tattoos, she kept getting more because she thought her body was so ugly that "it didn't matter any more." She was convinced "nice boys" would not like her with tattoos. Yet another girl got so depressed about her tattoos that she tried to cut them out with a kitchen knife.

The Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee, known as the Mitchell committee, recommended an age requirement for tattooing. Social workers, doctors and magistrates have all called for the banning of tattooing of minors under 18 years of age.

As I have previously stated, most Australian States, the United Kingdom, American States and Western Europe have accepted that this should be so by passing legislation, and even the service most closely associated with the practice of tattooing, the Royal Navy, has banned the tattooing of sailors under 18 years of age. As the law presently stands, a young child can be tattooed from head to foot, and it would be within the law.

I believe that this legislation is long overdue. For the reasons that I have expressed in this debate, and for the reasons expressed by honourable members in the Upper

House, we must enact legislation, as provided in the Bill, whereby the tattooing of minors under 18 years of age will be banned. This practice is ancient and barbaric and has nothing to commend itself in modern times. Minors should be afforded the protection of the law in their interests and in the interests of the community. The Opposition strongly supports the Bill.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I compliment the honourable member for the extent of his research and the obvious concern and interest he has shown in this matter. The Bill is obviously supported by the Opposition. The evidence that he produced against the practice of tattooing, particularly of minors, is known to members on this side. I believe that the majority of this information appeared in an article in the *Advertiser* of October last year. One point that has been repeatedly made by medical practitioners and surgeons who are associated with young people, who subsequently express great regret at having been tattooed, is that, while the practice costs little in the initial stage, it can cost as much as \$1 000 or more in hospitalisation and extensive surgery fees to have tattoos removed.

I also point out that it is a common misconception that tattoos can be removed relatively simply. That is not so. The removal involves extensive surgery and, furthermore, there is no guarantee that that surgery will not leave marks. Almost invariably, noticeable scars are left and, in some cases, surgeons have found that scars have proved to be a psychological disadvantage to youngsters who have had tattoos removed, to the extent that those youngsters have covered the scar with a subsequent tattoo. The problem is complex. There are psychological and sociological reasons for young persons wishing to tattoo themselves. Such people may then go through a subsequent phase of remorse and regret, and then be dismayed at finding that the remedy is not simple or cheap, so that the scars are not only physical but psychological. I believe that this Bill is long overdue, and I commend it to the House.

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

#### CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Later:*

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March. Page 1527.)

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** The Opposition supports this Bill. These amendments tidy up a number of matters that will give benefit to the community. First, they bring up to date provisions of the Act in relation to persons of unsound mind and they are in line with the recent—

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Mr. Speaker, for the second time in less than a minute, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. CRAFTER:** This measure brings up to date the

terminology in the Local and District Criminal Courts Act with that in the more recently enacted Mental Health Act. The second measure is to provide a right of audience in certain limited matters to students of the graduate diploma course in legal practice at the South Australian Institute of Technology. The Opposition agrees with this right being given to those post-graduate students of law who are gaining in the main practical experience at the Institute of Technology, and it is a right given to other graduates who are engaged in the traditional form of articles of clerkship. The graduate diploma course will eventually supersede the traditional form of articles of clerkship with a legal practitioner. That is a move which I believe is welcomed by the legal profession and by graduates in law who wish to enter the legal profession. The ability to enter into the legal profession with skills and to be able to take a full and active part in the profession depends very much on the non-academic training which a legal practitioner receives before his admission to the bar, and the inception of the graduate diploma course has enhanced the standing of the legal profession considerably in the short time it has been operating. It will no doubt serve the profession and the people of South Australia well in the years to come.

The Bill also expands the special equitable jurisdiction of local courts of full jurisdiction to include claims for contributions up to \$20 000, and this is another matter which the Opposition joins with the Government in supporting.

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

#### TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 June. Page 2426.)

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** The Opposition similarly approves this measure. It is substantially a Bill which was prepared by the previous Government, and it in fact gives effect to a number of recommendations of the Law Reform Committee and other matters which are not of any controversial nature.

The Bill extends the scope of authorised trustee investments. It deals with a number of other matters which to some extent are a clarification of the common law or provisions relating to the liability of a trustee for actions taken in administering an estate which results in a loss to the trust estate; the validity of charitable trusts when they are founded in conjunction with other trusts; and the extension of the power of the courts to approve a scheme altering the purposes for which property may be applied in pursuance of a charitable trust, to some extent clarifying the common law or the equitable rules in this area.

The only comment that the Opposition wishes to make on this matter is that, while it does clarify the law, which has been unclear in certain respects to certain trustees, often eroding estates because of that lack of clarity and denying beneficiaries the benefits of an estate, the Government has not taken the opportunity in this measure to look at the wider areas of trustee companies. This is particularly true in relation to private trustee companies and their activities and the lack of safeguards that exist within the private Acts which establish those private trustee companies, particularly for beneficiaries. There is a paucity of law to protect members of the community who deal with private trustee companies. This area needs attention.

I am sure that most people working in that industry would say that those very old Acts that established those

companies are now out of date, and afford little protection for clients. The Opposition does not oppose these measures; it welcomes them. It is pointed out, however, that there is need for further law reform in the broader area of private trustee companies.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:  
That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River):** I wish to make a few comments about one of the more significant events which will occur in South Australia and which will be held this weekend. Owing to the journalists' strike, this event has not been widely reported in the media. Hopefully, with the return to work of journalists we will now see a reversal of the situation. I thought it pertinent to draw the attention of the House to this event, as it can influence the policies of the alternative Government of this State. These factors could (and I say "could" advisedly, as I do not think the opportunity will arise) affect our lives and future. I refer to the A.L.P. convention this weekend.

**Mr. Slater:** Are you coming?

**Mr. OLSEN:** I have not yet received an invitation. Over the past 10 years or so these conventions have been held without faction fighting coming to the surface. The Labor Party had a unity of purpose, namely, maintenance of Government. However, now that Labor is in Opposition we are now seeing the push from the two factions both striving to obtain supremacy in directing the A.L.P. in future years. This development has surfaced, because the Opposition now has nothing to lose, as it is in Opposition. It was amazing to see how the spoils of power compromised Opposition members' ideals.

The problem is that they are unable to compromise between their basic ideals and meeting the shift to moderation in public opinion in Australia, and, indeed, worldwide.

Their ideals and objectives include, amongst other things, the "democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange". The powerful left wing is pushing the Leader of the Opposition to be more aggressive on all issues. He knows that course would be disastrous; he has to demonstrate a more moderate approach and style. It is significant that he supported the branches in the card vote debate, and he was soundly defeated.

Therein lies the real dilemma of the Labor Party— inability to sort out its policy priorities. The Hon. Peter Duncan, in a recent article, criticised the A.C.T.U. President, Bob Hawke, as follows:

He does not in any way give one the feeling of creating the mood or the setting for a great crusade towards equality and social justice, as one might expect from Bob Hawke, who seeks to lead the A.L.P. On the contrary, one gets the feeling from the overall tone of his lectures that Hawke's purpose is simply to massage the concerns and fears of the middle class and business community in an endeavour to programme them so that when they hear or see Hawke they will neither feel fear nor threat, but merely a secure glow, regardless of the content of what he is saying or doing.

The member for Elizabeth emphasised the Party's lack of direction by referring to one of those objectives, namely, industry socialisation, production, distribution and exchange, to which I already referred.

The other view is to downgrade that objective by merely

marking it as one of the 10 principles of action by the Party. A dilemma exists: do those members push the historical purpose or do they moderate? I have no doubt what will happen in South Australia because the man with the numbers on South Terrace (and no doubt he is working on them on North Terrace) is the honourable member for Elizabeth, and he wants the historical purpose emphasised. He made that clear in his article in the *National Times*. At least he is prepared to stand up and be counted for what he believes in, and does not try to dupe the public into a false sense of security, which this State experienced for nearly a decade. Whilst I am diametrically opposed to his view, I give him credit for his veracity, at least.

Despite the A.L.P. rule stating that there should be free elections under universal franchise, equality and the like, we see its members in practice, under their own Standing Orders, at their last meeting, have 259 delegates cast 98 398 votes. If that is not hard enough for the general public, to comprehend (and it certainly lacks credibility) there is also the situation that 44 unions were represented by 141 delegates who were able to muster 90 449 votes, whilst the 106 branches had 118 delegates but could muster only 7 949 votes.

That is an unbelievable practice: 94 per cent voting strength is with the unions and 6 per cent is with the branches. The disproportionate voting system will continue to generate division and bitterness within their ranks. Factionalism is a reality within the A.L.P. Their hypocrisy of one vote one value to the fore, emerging is the new power broker, the Hon. Peter Duncan, pushing his socialist policies and unwilling to compromise, but at least honest in his endeavours. It is a catch 22 situation for the South Australian Branch of the A.L.P. The special State convention was a disaster for them, and more particularly for the Leader of the Opposition, who backed the wrong horse.

He indicated after that convention that compromise would emerge. Has it emerged? Will it emerge this weekend? It will be interesting to see. Other Leaders have called for moderation. John Bannon said at that time that consideration of the voting structure of the A.L.P. had not ended. He said that it would be a matter of continuing discussion, and he hoped that unions would be able to look at any proposal with open minds. Hugh Hudson said:

Continuation of such a system would enshrine permanent divisions between left and right.

At the same time, Peter Duncan supported giving unions a stronger voice than their current 94 per cent voting power. Will it be debated again this weekend? Will Peter Duncan be back from overseas to participate in those debates? I have no doubt that he will be able to make it back from Helsinki to do so.

One of the interesting things I have had pointed out to me is that, of the four positions available at the Federal Executive, seven nominations have been received, one being that of the member for Elizabeth. I expect that he is assured of a position because of the support that he has on South Terrace. The real question, I suppose, in this never-ending saga is who the other successful candidates will be. Who will be the heavies that will miss out on representation on the Federal Executive. Of course, the vote will be an indication of the likely outcome of the forthcoming preselections of the A.L.P. Of course, the dilemma that Labor faces is evident not only in South Australia but also in Australia as a whole, so ably pointed up in the article by the member for Elizabeth concerning the divisions between the A.L.P. federally. Also, Roy Jenkins has made numerous statements and spoken repeatedly in the United Kingdom about the need for a

new Labor movement, where he and Mr. Steele, the Liberal Leader, have looked at *de facto* coalition with the right wing members of the Labor Party, the Labor leaders in England. Whilst the Labor Party marches into the wilderness, the Liberal Party looks forward to positive identifiable policies in this State and consolidating its hold.

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

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** I want first to make some reference to the remarks made by the member for Rocky River. I invite him to attend the convention over the weekend as a visitor. It is open to visitors, although they cannot participate as delegates. It appears from the remarks that he has made that he is getting his information second-hand, or possibly third-hand, so it would be advantageous for him to come along and see first-hand what happens.

The member for Hanson, during the adjournment debate on Tuesday evening, spoke about his disappointment for the young South Australians and Australians who, through their devotion and dedication to their chosen sport, have been denied the opportunity to represent their country in the highest area of sport, namely, the Olympic Games.

I share that disappointment. However, I do not agree with his comment when he said that he does not blame the Australian Government, the various sporting bodies, or the individuals who have chosen to boycott the games. The boycott (which is an American-made boycott) can be blamed fairly and squarely on the Prime Minister of Australia. Prior to the decision of the Olympic Federation, the Prime Minister, aided by his sycophantic supporters in the press, heaved the A.O.F. into supporting the boycott. Although it had been stated previously that the Federal Government would accept the final decision as to whether or not the athletes would compete at Moscow, when that decision was made we witnessed a campaign, which was intensified by both the Government and the press, and well-known sporting personalities were used, some in an indirect way.

I refer to Marjorie Nelson, whose remarks about the boycott were reported in headlines in the *News*, but the report was not the true indication of what she had actually said; it was slanted to a degree. If one read right through the article, one would see that the facts were completely opposite to what the headlines suggested. That gives an indication of the type of tactic being used to demoralise and heavy the Australian community against the athletes. I noticed yesterday that those who are going to the Games will have to sneak out of the country, because they might be in danger from some element in the community that might take physical action against them. I think that is a disgraceful situation. It is entirely hypocritical to boycott the Olympic Games whilst still maintaining trade and diplomatic relations. Let us look at some of the nations supporting the boycott—Albania, Argentina, Chile, Indonesia, Pakistan, France, The Phillipines, Saudi Arabia, and Taiwan, just to mention a few. These are countries that believe in democracy and human liberty—the record shows this. If the Olympic Committee were to ban nations under totalitarian regimes from competing in the Games, whether on the left or extreme right of politics, there would not be too many countries that would be able to compete at the Games.

**Mr. Lewis:** Certainly not Russia.

**Mr. SLATER:** No, Russia would not be one of them; however, even Australia is in doubt at the moment, the way the Prime Minister is carrying on. The important aspect is that concerning the athletes themselves; they are



not interested in politics. We have all witnessed scenes on television, at the conclusion of the Olympic ceremonies, where athletes, despite the country they come from, have joined in the spirit of goodwill and friendship of the Games; that is what it is all about, and that is what it should be about.

I decry the attitudes of the Americans and the Russians. I am not referring to their political attitudes, to which they are entitled, but, when this attitude enters into the arena of the Olympic Games, it is tragic for the rest of the world.

One innocent victim of the situation is a South Australian. I refer to Mrs. Yvonne Hill, Australia's top woman small-bore shooter. She said that she refused to abide by the decision of the Australian Shooting Association to withdraw from the games. She has taken out an injunction to stop the association from preventing her from going to Moscow, and I hope that she succeeds. She gave her reasons in a statement to the press, as follows:

First, I don't believe that the ASA has the right to withdraw anyone from the team because it doesn't pick the team in the first place.

Second, I am a fighter and I don't like being trampled upon.

Third, the Small Bore Rifle Association last weekend voted to support the Olympic team and also voted to invoke an escape clause in the ASA constitution which allows it to dissociate itself from proposals which affect it specifically in its field of interest.

Fourth, I personally have spent a lot of time and effort and money preparing to go to the Games and I don't intend to waste that.

And fifth, I have signed a competitor's agreement with the Australian Olympic Federation which I do not wish to break. They were her reasons for attending as an Australian sportswoman at the Olympic Games, but what do we find?

**Mr. Lewis:** She should be attending as Yvonne Hill.

**Mr. SLATER:** Of course she should, and as a competitor representing Australia. The following day, a malicious article appeared in the *News* under the heading "A bullet for peace". I believe that this is probably the most vicious and appalling attack on an individual. We, in politics, have come to expect this on occasions in the *News* editorials. We had a fair taste of it in September 1979, and we took it but, when a person such as Yvonne Hill is the subject of an editorial of this nature, that is tragic. It is certainly an indictment of the *News*, its Editor, and its proprietors, and we all know who is the master stroke behind *News Limited*.

**Mr. Keneally:** The letters coming in from the public are supporting what you say.

**Mr. SLATER:** Yes. They believe that the attack on an individual by a paper in circumstances where the opportunity is not given for her to defend herself (although she is capable of doing so) is a malicious attack. In politics, one expects this, but a sportsperson, who wishes to represent her country to the best of her ability at the games, has the right to choose. It was the decision of the Australian Olympic Federation, which Fraser said he would accept, but he did not accept it. I wish her well. I hope she goes to the games, and I hope she wins a gold medal.

**Dr. BILLARD (Newland):** I address my remarks to the subject of the North-East transport system, and they are prompted by a report in today's *News* from Mr. Price, representing the Walkerville council. I believe that it is vitally important that there be a rapid-transit system of some form to serve the North-Eastern suburbs. This commitment was shared by all Parties, and I believe it is a

commitment which must and will be fulfilled. There is some suggestion in the report that an adequate system would be a simple extension of the present bus system, but I do not believe that to be so. An extension of the present bus system could not conceivably be construed by anyone as being a rapid-transit system: therefore, I believe that the suggestion of the Walkerville council is simply not on. Suggestions have also been made by people in inner suburbs that an upgrading of North-East Road would be adequate to serve the needs.

Having lived in the inner suburbs area, I feel that I have some knowledge of what it is like to live in the inner and the outer areas. My knowledge of living in the inner areas leads me to say that North-East Road is already overloaded, and I believe that there is clear evidence of that. In 1975, I was speaking to people who were living on Walkerville Terrace and who were complaining at that time of the overload of North-East Road traffic travelling down Lansdowne Terrace and along Walkerville Terrace to escape the heavy use of North-East Road during peak hours. As a result, there have been various road closures and proposed road closures to solve the problem. People do not leave the main road and travel through back streets if the main road is under-utilised. So, it seems apparent to me that the main road is over-utilised at present, and it is simply not possible to load more on to that road without causing more troubles for inner suburban areas.

I think that, if we followed a pathway of putting more buses on North-East Road (and presumably also Lower North-East Road), we would have more traffic finding new ways through the suburbs to take so-called short cuts (short in time, but longer in distance) through the back streets to get to and from town during peak hours. For this reason, I believe that such a pathway would not be acceptable either to the people of the outer suburbs or, ultimately, to the people of the inner suburbs. The only way in which the inner councils could solve the problems would be by closing off more streets and denying access to their own people. For that reason, I think that that argument should be put to rest.

I recognise the criticism that was made that there could have been more research into some of the bus options. I take that not as a criticism of the officers involved, but simply as a recognition of the difficulty of trying to predict what the costs of each system would be. I have read through the reports in detail and have compared some of the predictions with what obtained previously for the l.r.t. I can illustrate this matter simply by looking at estimated patronage figures for the various systems proposed for the north-east area. If we look at the recently released report titled "Progress report on a technological evaluation of guided buses, North-East corridor", page 36, patronage figures are given showing estimated total corridor patronage for each of the options for 1986 and 1996.

The total patronage was then apportioned between the new facility and the remnant facility of bus services which, of course, must remain to service those people who want to embark and disembark at intermediate points, and who want to travel from one suburb to the next, but not necessarily from Tea Tree Plaza to the city. Those estimates show, for example, that in 1986 the total corridor patronage for the bus option, which includes a guideway or busway down to Park Terrace and thence to the city, would be 37 900 daily passenger trips.

It was estimated there would be 39 000 daily passenger trips on the l.r.t. One might be tempted to think from that, there being a difference of 1 100 daily passenger trips, that the l.r.t. would be more popular, but we have to look at these figures more closely to see the significance of the differences. If we look back to the final NEAPTR report,

we find that, when the total corridor patronage was apportioned between two new facilities and the remnant bus fleet, it was thought that there would be a total of 43 000 daily passenger trips in the corridor, of which 34 000 approximately would use the l.r.t. system and 9 000 approximately would use the remaining bus system.

However, between that final NEAPTR report and the current report the figures have changed drastically. Now we find that the best estimate is that only 23 000 people would use the l.r.t. system, while 16 000 people would continue to use the remnant bus fleet. In other words, the original estimate of l.r.t. system patronage was 50 per cent high. This is a drastic change in anyone's book, and shows just how difficult it is to try to predict how many people will use a new facility. As we well know, a great many factors influence the number of people who use public transport; quite apart from the energy crisis we all know about, even subtle changes in public attitude can lead to quite substantial changes in patronage, so we see that the very minor differences between the bus option and the l.r.t. option really have no significance at all.

However, given that, I would say, further, that in my view the differences estimated are, in fact, not a representation of current attitude. People who have spoken to me have indicated that they would prefer not to have to waste time co-ordinating at Tea Tree Plaza, and that they would prefer an all-through system. Moreover, it is not generally recognised that it is assumed in the bus options that all passengers will be seated, whereas in the tram options a large proportion, and in some estimates greater than half, of the passengers will be standing.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 15 July 1980 at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of *God Save the Queen*.