

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 7 August 1980

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

PETITION: STURT C.A.E.

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal that would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:
RIVERLAND CO-OPERATIVE**

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Soon after taking office I was invited to open the expanded premises of Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited at Berri. This opening took place on Friday 26 October 1979, and was the result of a considerable restructuring of the co-operative's affairs over a period since 1976. At that time the co-operative was threatened with closure because of liquidity problems. The previous Government was asked to assist, and major decisions were taken which were intended to utilise the asset structure of the co-operative to create a new industry for the Riverland. It was to create an opportunity for large-scale vegetable growing, the production of general lines as well as continuing the existing canning of fruit operations.

The expansion of the operation involved the purchase of plant from Henry Jones Proprietary Limited previously located at Port Melbourne and the entry into agreements with Henry Jones Proprietary Limited. The South Australian Development Corporation, the State Bank, Henry Jones (IXL) Proprietary Limited, and Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited were all involved in the arrangements. A South Australian Development Corporation summary at the time (9 April 1979) states:

Our involvement with Riverland Fruit Products has been one of the most challenging and important operations that the South Australian Development Corporation has undertaken. During the last six or eight months we have, together with H. Jones (IXL) Ltd., arranged for the movement of much of Henry Jones' food manufacturing operation from Port Melbourne to the R.F.P. plant at Berri. This move has involved the expenditure of some \$8 000 000 on capital works and the arrangement of some \$5 000 000 for additional working capital. The turnover of Riverland Fruit Products in 1977-78 was \$9 000 000, but it is anticipated it will approach \$30 000 000 in 1979-80.

On 5 June 1980 I was informed as Treasurer by the permanent head of the Department of Trade and Industry in the following terms:

Since recommending the payment of \$325 000 on 23 May (a payment to be made under the Establishment Payments Scheme), it has come to my attention that the viability of the co-operative may be subject to some question. Subsequent inquiries made by this department have indicated that there are severe doubts within the commercial community as to the

future viability of Riverland Fruit Products. These doubts have been echoed by the co-operative's bankers, the State Bank.

I ordered an immediate investigation and report, and consulted urgently with the Chairman of the S.A.D.C. Following detailed discussions, the Chairman of the S.A.D.C. suggested that he speak with the Directors of Riverland Cannery as soon as possible. This was done on 24 June, when the board resolved to freeze all debts owed by the company at that date, and to trade on a cash basis only from 25 June 1980, and to appoint a task force to inquire into the future of R.F.P., and to provide a solution for its continuing operation.

This decision was conveyed to me by letter on 2 July 1980, when the Chairman of S.A.D.C. indicated that the board of Riverland Fruit Products had approved a task force consisting of Messrs. Winter, Elliott and Cavill to carry out this investigation. The task force had taken over management of the cannery. The task force will not be in a position to submit its final report to me until the end of September. However, preliminary investigations have revealed that the whole situation could be described as a shambles. It is not possible at this stage to state the exact reasons for the current position of the cannery or to determine those responsible. It is possible, however, to give an indication of the gravity of the situation.

Current trade creditors are owed approximately \$5 000 000. Most of those credits have been outstanding for periods of up to 120 days. Fruit growers are still owed just over \$1 000 000 for the 1979-80 season. Peach and pear growers have already received 60 per cent payment, and apricot growers have received 80 per cent payment for fruit supplied to the cannery this year. The State Bank of South Australia and the South Australian Development Corporation both have substantial long-term and current loans of some \$12 000 000 with Riverland Fruit Products. The South Australian Government stands as guarantor for a large portion of these loans under the agreement reached by the previous Government. Total liabilities could well exceed \$20 000 000.

It is not possible to indicate the value of the assets, especially as the quantity and value of the substantial stock on hand are in dispute. Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited is a vital part of the Riverland economy, being now the sole fruit cannery in South Australia. Apricot, peach, and pear growers along the Murray River from Morgan to Renmark have become dependent upon it as the major processor of their fruit. The Government has a responsibility to ensure that at least the cannery continues if at all possible. It is also essential that creditors prior to 25 June be accommodated as well as the situation allows.

The decision of Cabinet as to what action should be taken has not been easy, and has been taken only after a very full consideration of the available facts. It is obvious that this disastrous situation has resulted from the major expansion under a previous Government of a cannery which at the time was itself already in serious financial difficulties. It would be simple to walk away from the problem, knowing it was not of my Government's making, but that would not be responsible government. Cabinet has decided upon the following course of action:

(1) All unsecured trade creditors prior to 25 June 1980 will be requested to accept a moratorium of payments and to agree to a scheme of arrangement proposed for ratification by the Supreme Court. These creditors will be asked to accept 50c in the dollar as immediate payment. The South Australian Government proposes to provide up to \$4 000 000 as an interest-free loan to Riverland Fruit Products to allow this part-payment of unsecured trade

creditors, subject to acceptance of the scheme of arrangement.

(2) All fruitgrowers will be paid 50c in the dollar in payment of outstanding amounts owed on fruit supplied in the year prior to 25 June 1980. I repeat that these growers have already received 80 per cent payment for apricots and 60 per cent payment for pears and peaches. To cover amounts still outstanding, the fruitgrowers may apply to the Minister of Agriculture for a loan under the Loans to Producers Scheme. Such a loan would carry low interest rates.

(3) The South Australian Government will guarantee the payment of all creditors, both general and for fruit, for the period from 25 June 1980 to 30 June 1981, subject to paragraph (6) hereunder.

(4) The task force will continue to be responsible for the management and operation of Riverland Fruit Products, and will be asked to present its report no later than the end of September.

(5) The Government will seek discussions with Henry Jones on various agreements involving that company and Riverland Fruit Products and associated parties. The suitability of those agreements in the long-term profitable operations of the cannery will be examined.

(6) The Government is not able at this stage to guarantee that the canning of general products, that is, products other than canned fruit, will be maintained until 30 June 1981.

The South Australian Government now awaits an urgent report from the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited board and the task force that has been set up as to the extent of the financial problems, and what future action it believes can be taken.

I will undertake to keep the House informed when those reports come to hand.

QUESTION TIME

PAYMENTS TO JOURNALISTS

Mr. BANNON: Was the Premier aware that his former press secretary (Mr. Maurice Dunlevy) and two Liberal Party members of Parliament offered large sums of money in early 1978 to Adelaide journalists Des Ryan and Mike McEwen to pursue their investigations of the former Premier; were those offers made with the prior knowledge and approval of the Premier; and can he name the members of Parliament concerned?

This morning, Associated Press released a syndicated report, based on a taped interview with Mr. Ryan, in which Ryan claimed that two Liberal members of Parliament, and a former aide to the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition, contacted Ryan and McEwen shortly after their resignations from 5DN and offered them large sums of money to pursue their investigations, which the two members said they believed would destroy the former Premier, Mr. Dunstan.

Mr. Ryan said that the two members of Parliament telephoned him and McEwen and said that the Liberal Party supported their investigation and that certain members were prepared to put up money to ensure it continued. Ryan said the inducements ranged from an initial offer of about \$15 000 through to unlimited finance. He said there were three such offers. Mr. Ryan said the members of Parliament and the Government aide made clear that they felt the inquiries would destroy the former Labor Premier's credibility. Mr. Ryan said he and

McEwen rejected the overtures as "crass, cynical and without foundation". Mr. Ryan also said that Mr. Dunlevy, who is now employed as a liaison officer for South Australian Liberal Senators, invited Ryan and McEwen to a weekend meeting with the Premier for talks over a beer. Perhaps the Premier can also say what was the purpose of that meeting and the nature of the invitation.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me say at the outset that this miserable business and the muck-raking that is being engaged in by the Opposition quite astounds me when there are such serious matters that should be coming before this House. Nevertheless, having said that, I now say that I have no knowledge of any proposed meeting between Ryan or anyone else and me over a beer at home. I cannot speak for the accuracy of the remarks that have been quoted by the Leader of the Opposition in the House today. I have no knowledge of any approach that was made.

According to the rumours that, as I recall, were going about at the time, there was considerable activity on the part of some people to try to find some finance for those people—Ryan and McEwen—to undertake their investigations. Indeed, from memory, I believe that they were mostly engaged in that activity themselves. I have no knowledge at all of the events that the Leader has outlined, and all I can do is repeat that, as far as I am concerned, the Liberal Party is not responsible for any of the allegations that have been made.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. OLSEN: Has the Premier studied the most recent survey of planned capital investment in Australian mining and manufacturing industries that was conducted by the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce, and is he able to indicate what that survey portends for South Australia? Yesterday, during the Address in Reply debate, the Leader of the Opposition stated that it was patently false to claim that South Australia was in a state of developmental stagnation before the election and that development projects had come rushing through the door since then. Can the Premier say whether the results of the Federal survey verify the Leader's comments?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, I certainly can, and will do so with great pleasure. It was only yesterday, during the Address in Reply debate, that the Leader of the Opposition stated that it was patently false (as the honourable member indicated), and that is not so. The most recent investment survey report produced by the Department of Industry and Commerce is most heartening and I, together with each Australian Government and certainly the Federal Opposition, regard it as a most reliable forward indicator of the development plans of the Australian industry.

As most members will know, this regular half-yearly survey monitors all new mining and manufacturing projects costing \$5 000 000 or more, and it estimates the approximate date of each project's completion and the number of jobs that would be created in both the construction and operational stages. Within the survey, a classified project either is committed or in the final feasibility stage, the preliminary study stage or the possible stage, and, of those four classifications, only the first two are taken as referring to projects that are likely to be developed in the next two or three years. Members may recall that, during my Address in Reply speech on 31 July last year—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, there are some good figures on employment today, and I refer the Deputy Leader to them. During my Address in Reply speech on 31 July last year, I referred to what was then the most recent investment survey conducted by the Federal Government. At that time, South Australia's levels of committed and final feasibility investment in mining amounted to a mere \$119 000 000, or just 1.5 per cent of the national total. Similarly, our levels of new manufacturing investment were then \$136 000 000 or 3.1 per cent of the national total. Bearing in mind, of course, that South Australia, with per cent of the population, should expect at least some comparable level, we attracted only 2 per cent of the nation's planned industrial development at that stage.

Since that time, two further surveys have been published by the Department of Industry and Commerce. The first of these showed that, between April and October last year, that is, during the last six months of the former Government's Administration, there was very little increase in South Australia's share of mining investment. In fact, our share rose by only half of 1 per cent. In manufacturing industry our share actually fell from 3.1 per cent to 1.5 per cent. The second and more recent survey to which the honourable member referred was released in June. It shows the planned investment levels as at May this year. In the mining industry, South Australia's committed and final feasibility investment levels have soared since last October from \$190 000 000 to \$3.27 billion, which is an increase of more than 1 620 per cent. Likewise, South Australia's share of mining investment has risen from 2 per cent to 17 per cent in just six months. I should also add that, since that survey was released, two offshore oil exploration projects in the Great Australian Bight have been announced, and they would add a further \$50 000 000 to South Australia's mining investment in the short term.

In the area of manufacturing industry, South Australia's investment levels were shown by the survey to have increased by \$30 000 000 or 27 per cent in the six months to May. This rise which, of course, is very significant in itself, does not include the planned G.M.H. investment in a plastics factory or the relocation of some of its Pagewood facilities. Nor does it include John Shearer's \$5 000 000 expansion, Simpson Limited's new dishwasher factory, or many of the new developments that have already been announced. When those latest development projects are taken into account, it becomes clear that planned investment in manufacturing industry has risen by at least \$50 000 000 since October last year. In both mining and manufacturing industries combined South Australia's level of committed and final feasibility capital investment has risen by nearly \$3.2 billion during the past six months, or by a figure in excess of 1 000 per cent. So much for the knocking claims made by the Leader of the Opposition throughout his speech to this House yesterday.

PAYMENTS TO JOURNALISTS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it is true that the Minister was one of the two members of Parliament who contacted Des Ryan and Mike McEwen in early 1978 and offered them large sums of money to continue their investigations, and who were the members of the Liberal Party who were prepared to provide the money to finance those inquiries?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The answer to the first question is "No". The answer to the second question is "I don't know".

FREE TRAVEL

Mr. LEWIS: In view of the Government's commendable practice of providing free travel on public transport at off-peak periods for social welfare recipients, pensioners, and others in the metropolitan area, and concessional fares at all other times, will the Minister of Transport consider ways in which people who live in isolated rural circumstances or country towns where no public transport is available can be provided with a similar essential form of assistance to enable them to commute from their dwellings to centres of health-care and welfare, food and clothing shops and other facilities? One of my constituents has written to me, as follows:

The Government is helping pensioners and the unemployed and others in like circumstances in the city, but what is it going to do about their country cousins?

I read yesterday where the Government has commendably announced the additional concessions of free rides to urban dwellers on public transport at off-peak periods but I have not heard anything yet about helping the people like those whom I have the honour and responsibility to represent. Whilst this constituent and other people living in Mallee (and in any other rural community) would want me to point out how very supportive they are of the less fortunate members of their communities by giving them lifts to the larger country centres to which they must travel, as well as giving help in so many other ways, as is their tradition, nonetheless not all people are catered for in this neighbourly way.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I will certainly look at the matter for the honourable member. I will be grateful to talk to him about it in the future when he can let me have his ideas on the matter. The Government does provide country people with a public transport subsidy by means of community bus programmes, as well as subsidised bus programmes in some country centres. The Government does not think for one minute that it could not go a lot further with this programme, if finance were available.

JOURNALISTS' INVESTIGATIONS

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Did the Premier at any time during the investigations of Ryan and McEwen, whether they were at the beginning when they were sacked from 5DN or when they were publishing the book, meet with either one of them individually, or both of them, in his car on Greenhill Road outside his electorate office. If he did, who arranged the meeting, what was discussed, and why? I believe this to be a very serious matter indeed. A very close friend and colleague of mine has suffered untold harm as a result of these investigations, and I believe the matter deserves the very serious consideration of the Premier. The question is quite direct, and I guess it will get a true answer.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, and it will get a direct answer, too. I did meet with Mr. Ryan, I think it was. It was outside my electorate office because Mr. Ryan did not wish to come inside. It was in the evening. It was for the purpose of inquiring about some information which Mr. Ryan was seeking in relation to a restaurant and premises at "Peanuts", which was the subject of a good deal of debate and criticism in this House when we were in Opposition. Mr. Ryan was anxious to hear about that. He was also anxious, as I recall at the time, and raised the prospect of whether or not the *News* would be likely to serialise the book when he finished it. I said—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What influence would you have on that?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I said it would probably be interested if it thought it worth serialising.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. OSWALD: Based on inaccurate early 1970 predictions of population, does the Minister of Health agree that there is an over-supply of doctors within the community, and that the training of too many doctors for the current population has led or will increasingly lead to the potential over-treatment of patients and the use of diagnostic services available, and to the potential increase in fee levels of patients in hospitals, as those fee levels rise to maintain income expectations of individual doctors, and that it will lead to increased costs to the Government and the private patients in the long term?

I ask the question after many months of discussions on the subject with medical specialists, general practitioners, nurses in hospitals, qualified nurses, clerks in hospital benefit funds, and members of the general public. There is a strong feeling amongst members of the community that unnecessary medical procedures are carried out to bolster up the incomes of medical practitioners. These procedures are carried out in both private surgery and in hospitals. If I were to use an example, I would cite the number of hysterectomy and gall bladder operations which have been performed, which appear to have reached the level of social surgery. It is almost the in thing to have one of these operations performed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting, and I ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

Mr. OSWALD: I will come back to the question. The other field is in the area of diagnostic tests.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on the honourable Minister to answer, I would indicate to honourable members from both sides of the House that there has been a tendency in the past two days to serialise questions to the point where they are asking not one but a whole multitude of questions. Standing Orders are specific that a single question will be asked, and I ask all honourable members to look to that Standing Order and to make sure that they comply with it. The question to which I now ask the honourable Minister to reply is not the only one that has had a number of components.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I address myself to the substance of the question asked by the honourable member, and that is whether or not there is an over-supply of doctors. It is certainly generally agreed by the Commonwealth Department of Health, the South Australian Health Commission in respect of this State, and the medical profession itself that there is an over-supply of doctors and, more worrying still, a pending over-supply which would cause extreme problems for Governments in the 1980's and for the community at large. Earlier this year, the Health Commission released a report on medical manpower which indicated that South Australia has the largest proportion of doctors per head of population of any State in Australia—10.3 doctors for every 10 000 people in the State. That figure is also more than the ideal ratio determined by Professor Karmel in his 1973 report.

The implications of such over-supply are considerable, and they are set out in a report recently released by the Commonwealth Minister for Health entitled "Medical Manpower Supply—a Report of the Committee of Officials". That report makes some recommendations, among which is that universities should review intakes into medical schools, in consultation with the appropriate State authorities. That is a question which I have already taken

up with the Vice-Chancellors of Adelaide and Flinders Universities, and I propose to consult with them further about it.

In respect of the consequences of this over-supply outlined by the member for Morphett, the report goes into some considerable detail and it lists that one consequence could be a reduction in the quality of service owing to the fact of the smaller number of patients per doctor. It lists the fact that there could be a provision of services which cannot be justified, as was foreshadowed by the honourable member. It also outlines the concerns which could occur if skills which doctors have acquired are not being used, because of lack of sufficient numbers of patients on whom to practise. It identifies the difficulty in providing clinical experience for interns, residents, and specialists in training. That is a difficulty which a committee I have established is currently facing. I have a working party, consisting of representatives of the Health Commission, the A.M.A., the two universities and the approved teaching hospitals, as well as the salaried medical officers, and that committee is trying to establish how the State can provide pre-registration training positions for the graduates for the forthcoming year, let alone for the years to come. One possible side benefit of the fact that this committee is required to look at pre-registration training may be greater breadth of vision in terms of the nature of the training that is being provided.

In the past, training has been in approved teaching hospitals, but it could well be that opportunities could be sought in community health centres in country hospitals and in a wider range of clinical experience than has been provided in the past. As the cost pressure on health services comes principally from doctors (because it is they who decide the level of resources necessary in providing health services), this could be considerable if there is an over-supply. This could lead to a situation whereby the health services were unable to determine the correct level of resource, because of the expectation that jobs and training opportunities would automatically be available for everyone who wanted to be a doctor. This matter deserves intense public scrutiny and debate, and it should be resolved by all parties working together to try to find a solution, without too much of the conflict that can arise when statements are made, such as, "Doctors are only looking after their own interests, and incomes", and so forth. I believe that the vast majority of medical practitioners are deeply concerned about this matter and are intent on finding ways of resolving the problem.

MINING EXPLORATION

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether it is true that the Yalata community has been negotiating with mining companies over exploration licences for the area north of the trans-continental line in the Lake Dey Dey and Lake Morris areas, and has the Yalata community come to any agreement with the Government over the transfer of unallotted Crown lands, in the Maralinga area and in the Lake Morris and Lake Dey Dey areas, to the Aboriginal Lands Trust?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: To the best of my knowledge, some negotiations have been in train for some months now between the Yalata people, through the Aboriginal Lands Trust, for mining rights with one or two companies in that area. It has not been a secret matter: it has been a matter of publicity in the State press over the past few months, and I am sure that most people would have been aware of it when either the Minister of Mines and Energy or I referred to the fact that some groups of Aborigines were

already negotiating in a happy frame of mind with major companies.

DEPARTMENTAL AMALGAMATION

Mr. ASHENDEN: Last May, the Minister of Environment announced the formation of a new department as a result of the amalgamation of the existing Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. Can he inform the House when we may expect to see the official creation of the new department, and can he say what progress has been made thus far in the amalgamation?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am pleased to inform the member for Todd and the House that the amalgamation of the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs into the new Department for Environment and Planning is running to schedule. As the honourable member rightly said, last May the Government announced that it would be amalgamating those two departments to form a new department. Indeed, several positive steps have been taken since that announcement. An investigation into the structure and responsibility of the new department is nearing completion, and I hope to be able to take a submission to Cabinet late in September on this matter. The position of a permanent head of the new department has now been formally created, and applications will be called for nationally from 16 August. They will close at the end of August, and we will be looking to make an appointment as soon as possible so that the successful applicant may be involved in the development of the new department, because I am sure that the House would agree that it is vitally important that that should happen.

I am able to inform the House and the member for Todd that, at this stage, it is proposed that the amalgamation be completed and the new department functioning by about the end of July next year. I remind the House that that was as originally planned, and everything is going according to schedule.

ABORIGINAL LAND

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I direct a question to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. During the recent negotiations involving Yalata Aborigines and mining companies over exploration licences, is it true that the Department for the Environment received a map from the Department of Mines and Energy nominating and marking sacred sites, and not the other way round as is the correct practice? Was that map drawn and prepared by Mr. Barry Lindner, the Superintendent of Yalata and, if so, what are Mr. Lindner's qualifications either as a surveyor or as an anthropologist, and were the heritage unit of the Department for the Environment or Aboriginal elders consulted during the preparation of that map?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Three or four questions are involved. I make quite clear that the honourable member seems to be under some misapprehension as to the precise *modus operandi* of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. In fact, we do not intrude into the work of other departments; we simply co-ordinate where necessary in regard to any deficiencies in operation. Regarding the first two questions, any negotiations between the Yalata people, the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the Aquitane Commission (which the honourable member did not mention but which has been common knowledge to both the Pitjantjatjara and the Yalata people over the past

several months) would have been in train between the Aborigines and the Department of Mines and Energy, not involving the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. Likewise, we do not intrude into housing, health, education or any other department's province unless there is an acute problem.

As I said, no problem has been in evidence and whether the maps were drawn up by Mr. Lindner, the Department of Lands, the Department of Mines and Energy or even the Aborigines themselves, I do not know. What I can tell the honourable member, however, is that, within the State Archives in the Public Library for the past 30 or 40 years, maps have been available that are the works of such people as Sprellow, Mountford and others of great repute in Aboriginal research and knowledge. These maps clearly delineate the areas of Aboriginal sacred sites. To imply that any one person had sole knowledge and presented evidence that was not readily available is incorrect.

My own research over the past 20 to 25 years, since I first became interested in Aboriginal affairs in 1956 or 1957, has evinced that information is available should anyone care to research it. There is no criminal aspect involved; if the honourable member is alleging that someone has acted with ulterior motives, he is wrong. There was nothing secret in what was presented. I believe that the information possessed by the Department of Mines and Energy was made available to Mr. Philip Toyne, who is the legal counsel for the Pitjantjatjara, and it was this information, which was really Government information possessed by the previous Labor Administration of South Australia, that assisted Mr. Toyne in defining more accurately the areas for negotiation under the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs assure the House that the wishes of the Yalata community will be considered when any land rights legislation is put before the House? The Minister would be aware, as would other members of the Government, that the people of Yalata have made quite clear that they do not want the land that traditionally belongs to them incorporated into the land in the north. I seek an assurance that the Yalata people's wishes will be considered in any negotiations that take place so that they can obtain independent title over their own land.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This question is relevant to the information solicited by the previous questioner in so far as this has been an area of concern for the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. In this case the Yalata people, through the Aboriginal Lands Trust, have for some several months made it quite clear that they would like to negotiate independently of the Pitjantjatjara for land rights to be vested in the Yalata people through the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I have been personally involved to that extent.

This matter is being considered directly in association with the current Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation. As I said in answer to the previous questioner, the relevance of areas of sacred significance to the Pitjantjatjara people is of great importance in considering which lands will be allotted to the Pitjantjatjara people and which land might ultimately be allotted to the Yalata people through the Aboriginal Lands Trust. It has become quite clear over the past several months that in fact the Yalata people had strong territorial claims to the areas around Woomera, where in fact they resided prior to the nuclear tests that were conducted some 20 years ago. They do in fact wish to retain those territorial rights, even though they are at present residing as a group at Yalata, much farther to the south-east. To that extent we will be protecting the Yalata people's rights through the Aboriginal Lands Trust. This matter has been made quite clear to the Pitjantjatjara

people with whom we are currently negotiating Pitjantjatjara land rights.

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether he will investigate claims by Yalata Aborigines that the Superintendent of Yalata, Mr. Barry Lindner, attempted to prevent delegates from Yalata attending the land rights meeting held earlier this year at Victoria Park racecourse by phoning the bus company's headquarters in Perth and telling it not to pick up Aborigines concerned because, supposedly, they were undesirables.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This sounds like a rather scurrilous attack on Mr. Barry Lindner. I am totally unaware of any such thing having happened, but I can assure the honourable member that Mr. Lindner has had the interests of the Yalata people at heart wholly and solely. This is the very gentleman who has been in charge of the Yalata mission for many years.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He is the adviser in so far as the people have put him in a position of trust. I did not place him there; he has been there long before and during the former Labor Government's administration, and no complaints have been raised previously in this House. If the allegation has been made, I can assure the honourable member that I will most certainly investigate it.

FLAGSTAFF HILL BUS

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Transport inform me of the estimated time table for the new S.T.A. hills buses reaching the Flagstaff Hill run and say when those services will be extended down Manning Road to the back half of Flagstaff Hill and the Aberfoyle Park area?

Over the past two months, particularly during the wet and rainy periods, many residents of the Flagstaff Hill and, I believe, the Aberfoyle Park area have validly stated that there is no transport available to them under a four-kilometre distance. The member for Fisher has told me that residents of Aberfoyle Park, an area adjoining my electorate, are also feeling disadvantaged by this. I have also been told by residents that they feel that they are taking their lives in their own hands every time they use the old S.T.A. buses. Therefore, the residents are vitally interested in knowing when the new buses will be on line. I seek the Minister's assurance that the Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park transport problems will be speedily attended to.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I appreciate the interest shown by the member for Brighton in the residents of Flagstaff Hill. Indeed, the honourable member has spoken to me on many occasions about these and similar problems. The bus routes to Flagstaff Hill are operated from the Morphettville depot, which operates some 27 hills-type buses on those routes, including the Flagstaff Hill route.

New buses to replace those 27 are being introduced into service at the rate of about one a week. Therefore, on that rate of replacement I would expect that the Flagstaff Hill route would be serviced with new buses within six months. I think the member for Brighton can assure his constituents that they should have a full service with the new hills-type buses by February next year.

The extension of the Flagstaff Hill route down Manning Road to the back half of Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park is one of the extensions which the S.T.A. intends to implement. However, there are still more densely populated suburbs in the metropolitan area which would require priority treatment, so I cannot give the honourable

member an undertaking that that extension will take place during this financial year.

LAND RIGHTS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what role Mr. Barry Lindner, the Community Officer at Yalata, had in negotiations with mining companies? Is it true that Mr. Lindner has been offered a position in the Department of Mines and Energy upon his retirement from his position at the Yalata community later this year? Can the Minister say whether Mr. Lindner has any pecuniary interest in mining companies interested in exploring or mining on Aboriginal land?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is abundantly apparent that it is a "get Lindner" session, among other things, this afternoon. The reports that come to me indicate that there have been amicable discussions over many months between the mining companies concerned in the area of the State which is preoccupying the minds of some of the Opposition at the moment and the Aborigines who live in that part of the State. A licence for Aquitaine was issued several months ago. That has been known by the Pitjantjatjara negotiators, and anyone who is interested in the subject knew that. All of a sudden there is renewed interest in Aquitaine and C.R.A., the other company with which we and the Aborigines have been negotiating. The reports which come to me about the negotiations on site indicate that they have been satisfactory. I forget what the second question was, but I have written down the answer to that question as "No".

CONTAINERISATION

Mr. RANDALL: My question is to the Minister of Marine. In a recent report on the A.B.C. current affairs programme *Nationwide*, concern was expressed about the fact that most of the container cargoes consigned to South Australia are shipped through the Port of Melbourne and then railed to Adelaide. Can the Minister say what are the implications of the trade drain resulting from the centralisation of cargo operations and what action is proposed to remedy the situation?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member raises a very broad question, but it is true that this State has suffered, and continues to suffer, very serious commercial and industrial difficulties through the trade drain to which he refers. Basically, container centralisation through the Port of Melbourne served a useful purpose in the early days of the container revolution a decade ago. It is now quite unsatisfactory and inadequate, and it most certainly poses grave and long-term disabilities for South Australian industry. In terms of cost, an eminent Queensland shipping authority calculated recently that the loss of a tonne of cargo to a port meant the loss of around \$20 in community money flow. The container drain has been cut back from about 95 per cent in the past two years or so to about 76 per cent at the present time. A container, on average, holds about 13 tonnes of cargo.

Container tonnages handled through Melbourne during 1978-79 totalled more than 500 000 tonnes; multiply that by 20 and we have some idea of the cost to South Australia. While that loss may sound significant in itself, and is, indeed, gravely disturbing, there are other effects which are even more disturbing.

Of most concern is the long delivery delays suffered by South Australian importers and exporters. These delays are not only costly but they can also disrupt business and

production. For containerised imports the average delay when handled through Melbourne is 12 days, but some cargo takes up to 29 days to arrive. However, the Government has taken action in an effort to remedy this situation. In conjunction with other departments and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and with the backing of individual companies and many other organisations, the Department of Marine and Harbors is undertaking a concentrated shipping and maritime trade drive.

We are negotiating with shipowners in Australia and overseas. We have prepared, in detail, direct shipping cases based on cargo volumes and economic port calls, we are actively seeking industrial growth for port industrial estates, and we are negotiating with many other organisations vitally concerned with the shipping trade drive. As well, our port development programme is planned to provide adequate facilities for immediate and future needs. Many members will also be aware that, with the strong co-operation of the commercial and industrial sectors, a South Australian Shipping Users' Committee has been formed to advise and assist the Government in its direct shipping campaign. This committee is also making direct representation to the conference lines in regard to both import and export services through the port of Adelaide. It is also seeking membership of the Australian Shippers Council to put the State case at the highest levels.

The honourable member conveyed a sense of real concern in asking his question. I trust that I have demonstrated the Government's very deep concern, and its determination to reverse this damaging trade loss.

URANIUM

Mr. CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy comment on two recent statements that have been made about the safety of the nuclear fuel industry? The first statement, which was made by Sir Mark Oliphant earlier this year when launching a book entitled *The Deadly Element*, was that treaties accompanying the overseas sale of uranium meant nothing. A senior Australian academic, Dr. Martin Indyk, said recently that commercial considerations have overridden Australia's nuclear safeguards in all cases where they have been in conflict. I ask this question today for two reasons: first, this weekend South Australians will be remembering Hiroshima with some public demonstrations and, secondly, yesterday the Government edged us closer to tying us in with the world nuclear industry.

I would be interested to hear from the Minister of Mines and Energy what he thinks of the comment by Sir Mark Oliphant, who is often held up by the Government as a paragon in these matters, and the comment by Dr. Martin Indyk, a former employee of the Office of National Assessments and now a lecturer at Macquarie University. A lengthy report in the *Financial Review* of 25 March cites Dr. Indyk's list of specific instances where financial considerations have been seen to override safety considerations. In this context I invite the Minister to add further comment to that which he made yesterday about the behaviour of British Nuclear Fuels, the British partner of Urenco-Centec, the people he is dealing with, in the gross cover-up at the Windscale waste reprocessing plant.

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

Mr. CRAFTER: Finally, I ask the Minister how can South Australians entrust our safety to people who behave in this way in such a potentially hazardous industry, and how can we be sure that we will not be forced into the position that we must take atomic waste back as part of the

whole deal?

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Deputy Premier, I indicate to the honourable member that he has asked on two occasions for the Minister to comment. During Question Time, members ask a question of a Minister. Whether the reply be a comment or a direct answer is the prerogative of the Minister, but the Minister may not respond to the request for comment.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I knew that that was the case, Sir, but the honourable member has not been here long enough to know what he can and cannot do. I am happy to make some reference to the views of Sir Mark Oliphant in this matter. Sir Mark is on record as having said that there is no alternative in the short term to the use of nuclear energy to supply some of the world's needs. He, along with one or two other eminent scientists, has come to that view in recent years. Sir Macfarlane Burnet is another who is on record as having said that he has come from being a hard-line "leave it in the ground" exponent to the realisation that nuclear energy is essential, as a bridging source of energy at least, until about the turn of the century. I share the honourable member's admiration for Sir Mark Oliphant, an eminent scientist who, in the light of evidence presented to him, is prepared to change his view. Everyone knows Sir Mark's hatred of warfare and of nuclear weapons, but despite that he is on record as supporting the use of nuclear energy for power generation.

On 25 September 1979, when he was addressing the Australian Conference of Air-Conditioning Contractors in Adelaide (and this will help the honourable member, whose admiration I share), Sir Mark said:

Partly because of its failure politically and managerially to keep up with modern trends in production, South Australia has fallen by the wayside and has the highest rate of unemployment in the continent.

This is a reflection of 10 years of pace-setting. Sir Mark continued:

New ideas, new methods of production, completely new products must be our life's blood. I am very glad to know that the new Government here means to develop the riches of Roxby Downs.

Let me quote the views of Sir Macfarlane Burnet, quoted in the statement by the Prime Minister in announcing the Australian Government's uranium decision, as follows:

I believe that a majority of thoughtful people—and that excludes most of those opposite, but nevertheless I shall read this for them—

accept the inevitability, for at least an interim period, of large scale use of nuclear energy in most parts of the world. Things being as they are, nuclear power generators will be needed for the next 20, or perhaps 50 years in most of the developed countries, with Japan and Sweden in particular need.

When will members opposite come to terms with the fact that there is no way in the world that they will close down the nuclear reactors in the Western world? They have even less chance of closing down those in the communist world. If those nuclear reactors were closed, there would be visited on this globe a depression, the like of which we have never seen. It is equally true that, if the nuclear programmes now outlined for the Western world, including Britain (from which our friend in the corner hails: I pointed out last night that, if he went back and if his will prevailed, he would be able to starve and freeze to death in the dark), do not take place, there will be a depression the like of which I do not believe has been visited on the Western world in this century. When will members opposite listen to the people of the intelligence and integrity of Sir Mark Oliphant, and not try to take snippets out of context in what he says, and not try to distort the truth, not talk about the disaster at Windscale,

where no-one was hurt or is likely to be hurt, according to the official reports? When will they accept that no-one was hurt at Three Mile Island (the disaster and tragedy, as it is called), except perhaps mentally, because of the furore that surrounded it? When will they read the official reports and the authoritative conclusions and come to terms with reality? Lord knows; I do not.

SOUTHERN AREA SCHOOLS

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Education inform me, and more particularly the schools in the southern metropolitan area, whether the committee comprising representatives from the Education Department, the Highways Department and the Public Buildings Department has completed its investigations and whether or not it has made any recommendations regarding the safety of schoolchildren? In response to a letter I wrote last year to schools in my area, asking them to write to the then Minister of Education requesting that he set up a task force to examine the safety needs of children arriving and departing from schools, the then Minister wrote a letter to the Seacliff Primary School. Dated 23 August 1979, the letter said, in part:

In reply to a letter circulated from an individual regarding safety of children arriving and departing from school, I draw your attention to the fact that a committee of officers from the Education Department, the Public Buildings Department and the Highways Department is meeting in an endeavour to find solutions to safety problems of existing schools.

He goes on to say:

The committee hopes to complete its investigation soon. It would be premature for me to anticipate their recommendations.

Has the investigation been completed, and have recommendations been made?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This matter has not been brought to my notice previously, but I will make immediate inquiries on behalf of the honourable member. I believe that, in the letter to which he referred, the previous Minister advised that the matter be taken up at local Parliamentary level. This has been done again, and the honourable member is obviously entitled to a prompt reply. I will see that he gets one.

RAILWAY STATION UPGRADING

Mr. PETERSON: Will the Minister of Transport say why the State Transport Authority is spending more than \$35 000 on upgrading Coromandel railway station before providing adequate facilities for the inner suburbs? In the *Advertiser* on 6 August 1980, under a heading "Railway stations to get face lift", a programme for upgrading—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No toilets?

Mr. PETERSON: No toilets. A programme for upgrading railway stations in the metropolitan area was announced, and \$35 000 is to be spent on the Coromandel station. For many months I have been approaching the Minister and writing to him and officers of the S.T.A., and I am awaiting a reply from the Minister about plans for providing a suitable platform at Yerlo, which serves the people living in the western area of North Haven, a developing suburb on LeFevre Peninsula. The platform currently consists of three planks in steps. Older people and mothers with young children in prams have great difficulty and run considerable personal risk in embarking and alighting from rail carriages at this station. I believe it should be given some priority in the upgrading project.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The upgrading of the Coromandel station was a pilot project, and it is to be a decision of the authority that railway stations will be upgraded progressively throughout the metropolitan area. The station at Yerlo will be one of those on the list of priorities. When the authority has made its final decision as to the upgrading of all stations, Yerlo will receive its due prominence. Decisions of this nature are taken by the S.T.A. in its own right, and that is how this Government wishes the authority to operate. The authority can come under Ministerial direction, and when it comes to a matter of Government or Cabinet policy the authority is subject to Ministerial direction. However, in the day-to-day running of the authority, the body is set up to do the job, and the initiative to upgrade the railway station is one of the initiatives of the authority.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier say whether the slight fall in unemployment figures in South Australia, as shown in the June period, has been maintained during July? A decrease in unemployment occurred in June which, of course, was lauded by all concerned, and it would be good news indeed if this decrease was maintained during the last monthly period.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful for the honourable member's question. It is usually the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who asks questions about unemployment in South Australia. I am to some extent reassured by the figures released today. I make the point that they are purely and simply based on samples, and are still far from satisfactory. The figure that has been inherited from the previous Government is still quite considerable and, working on that base, there is no question that we do not have a great deal on which to work. I remind members that the rate of unemployment rose from an all-time low of 2.5 per cent in 1971 to 7.6 per cent when the previous Government left office.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: And going up.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: They were going up. The rate of unemployment in South Australia in July was 7.5 per cent, compared to 8 per cent in June and 8.4 per cent in May. They are A.B.S. figures; I hope they are reliable. We would all like to believe that this is evidence of a trend back towards a better rate.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Despite the rather stupid indignation and petulant attitude of the Leader of the Opposition, I point out that I am still far from satisfied with the rate and with South Australia's position at the top of the tree.

Mr. Bannon: You ought to be alarmed.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would be a great deal more alarmed if the trend was still going the other way; I cannot understand the Leader of the Opposition at present.

Mr. Bannon: Look at last year's figures.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition that I regard those figures with some caution but, nevertheless, they show a tendency in the right direction, and that is exactly where we want them to occur. I will not be happy until we have the overall figures, that is, figures irrefutably lower than the national average, and the South Australian average on unemployment is lower than the national average, and we have a firmly established trend showing that the rate of unemployment is lower than the national figure. Only then will my Government and I be totally satisfied. As a result of the

measures taken hitherto to provide the industrial development and expansion which we have been so eagerly seeking for many years, and which we are now successful in obtaining, we have every prospect to reverse the disastrous trend of the past 10 years.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ABORIGINAL LAND

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I move:

That this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16(i) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966-1973, section 712, out of hundreds, be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto. Section 712 contains 1.795 hectares and is located within the boundaries of pastoral lease 2433, block 1196, situated west of and adjacent to Lake Eyre North and known as Anna Creek. This section was originally incorporated in pastoral lease 2433 held by Strangways Springs Pty. Ltd. Negotiations have taken place between the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs and the lessees for the occupation of the land in question and the erection of houses for Aboriginal tenants.

The Oodnadatta Housing Society has received a grant of \$50 000 from the Commonwealth Government to finance construction of the houses. It is proposed to vest the land in the Aboriginal Lands Trust, which will then enter into a leasing agreement to lease the land to the Oodnadatta Housing Society. The Pastoral Board has agreed to the proposal, and section 712 has been absolutely surrendered to the Crown as a necessary step to enable the vesting to proceed.

A plan of section 712 is exhibited for the information of members. In accordance with section 16 of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, the Minister of Lands has recommended that section 712, out of hundreds, be vested in the trust, and I ask members to support the motion.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): The Opposition supports the motion. Land access is an essential part of the Labor Party's policy. The vesting of this section of land, originally incorporated in pastoral lease 2433 held by Strangways Springs Proprietary Limited, in the Aboriginal Lands Trust is in line with our policy and, I believe, it meets a genuine request to transfer this pastoral lease.

What is more pleasing is that the occupation of the land in question is to be used for the erection of houses for Aboriginal tenants. The Oodnadatta Housing Society has received a grant of \$50 000 from the Commonwealth Government to finance construction of these houses. I doubt very much that this sum will build many homes. Will it be sufficient? Perhaps the Minister can advise the House on this matter and on how many homes are intended to be built on this section of land.

The Department of Aboriginal Affairs estimates that current Aboriginal housing is deficient to the extent of some 10 000 houses, and much of the existing housing is in need of maintenance. Waiting lists for Aboriginal housing loans from the Housing and Personal Loans Fund (soon to be incorporated into the Aboriginal Development

Commission) are over eight years long. Surveys have found that up to 63 per cent of Aboriginal housing is unacceptable and of a standard detrimental to physical and mental wellbeing.

Other surveys have found that the average Aboriginal household population is 13 per house. So, there is an urgent need to accelerate the trend towards financing Aboriginal housing associations. During my visit to the Upper North earlier this year, I was most surprised to find the Aboriginal pensioners' units located within the Oodnadatta township empty. These units provide accommodation for six Aboriginal pensioners in three twin units.

There is quite a large Aboriginal population at Oodnadatta, and for what reason those units were empty, I am not sure. However, it is obvious that problems in Aboriginal housing, health, employment, education and general living standards at Oodnadatta are at crisis point. The purpose of this motion is to allow for the transfer of land for certain housing development at Anna Creek.

The Opposition supports the motion. It is therefore not necessary to debate the motion at any length. However, in conclusion, I ask the Minister to clarify, if he is able, the number of houses planned and to say what type they will be. Will the Minister also say whether any sacred sites exist in the area and whether any public utilities will be provided? Among Aboriginal communities throughout Australia, 15 per cent have no water supply, 30 per cent have no electricity and 29 per cent are unsewered. It is important that more attention be given to these matters if we are to improve the living standards of Aboriginal people. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the motion. The land referred to in the Minister's remarks is to be transferred, as has been said, to provide Aboriginal housing. It is probably of interest to note that there are currently 217 Aboriginal housing associations in the State and the Northern Territory. The Oodnadatta Housing Society, which is one of those associations, has received a grant of \$50 000 from the Commonwealth Government to finance construction of houses. There are 11 Aboriginal housing associations in South Australia, some of which have been in operation for a considerable time. I believe that all members would support this motion as well as the conditions under which Aboriginal housing funding is provided.

The first of those conditions states that housing is to be provided exclusively to Aborigines; the second states that, where possible, local labour is to be used in the construction of houses. I am not sure, but it may be that, at Oodnadatta, this condition will pose a small problem; then again, it may be possible to make use of local labour. Another condition is that the rentals to be charged for Aboriginal association houses should be charged at rates determined by that association in accordance with departmental guidelines, which prescribe minimum rates or an alternative rebated charge of 15 per cent of family income, the lesser of which is applicable.

In relation to the supply of Aboriginal housing, another condition is that the Department of Housing and Construction is to oversee all construction programmes. I believe that all honourable members would agree that this is a useful and wise provision. The association is responsible for certain matters in relation to the provision of housing; it determines the number, design and location of houses; and it is responsible for the selection of tenants and for the maintenance of the houses. As was indicated earlier, the association is involved in determining the rentals that apply.

On behalf of the Opposition, I support the motion. However, I indicate to the Minister that, in his remarks, he mentioned that the plan relating to a section of the land concerned (section 712) is exhibited for the information of honourable members. I understand that the plan has been lodged and is exhibited in the House. When I first endeavoured to obtain the plan, it was not available. I make no criticism about that, but I indicate that I had no time to look at the plan before making my remarks. I am perfectly willing to take the Minister's word that the land in question is as indicated in the plan. I support the motion.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): This matter was first raised in 1974 during the previous Government's term of office. The Strangeways Springs Company at that time stated that it had no objection to the six acres being taken from the then pastoral lease, and subsequently it has taken six years for the matter to be brought to the present conclusion—the granting of a title. However, I understand that the latest grant of \$50 000 was made available for the construction of an additional two houses on the already established Housing Trust complex, which the Aborigines have been occupying probably since 1975-76. The land is already partly serviced, and, therefore, it is not a completely new development but an extension of an existing development.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 6 August. Page 135.)

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): In continuing my remarks from yesterday, I raise a matter of local interest which concerns the Local Government Act. This matter was recently brought to my attention by a number of irate constituents, who had not been advised about the installation of a median strip on a main road within my district. I took up the matter with the council concerned and I was informed that there had been agreement between the Highways Department and the council. However, I and my constituents believe that the Act should be changed, because, while the Woodville council had complied with and acted in accordance with the Local Government Act in advertising the work, the Act should be amended to provide the following:

That residents immediately affected by similar types of proposals should be written to personally by their city councils advising them of same. That (a) of above, if implemented would create better public relations between the council and ratepayers, and could thereby involve more ratepayers in the decision-making processes. That advertisements in the local press in accordance with the Act be printed in various languages for the ethnic language predominant in that area, because as you would readily appreciate many migrants cannot and do not properly understand the English language.

I conveyed this opinion to the Minister of Local Government and received an acknowledgement. However, the matter should be further considered because it applies on many occasions (of which I have had experience) when a median strip is constructed or a similar alteration is made to which residents object. If the amendments are agreed to, better relations will exist between councils and their constituents.

I refer to a matter that is of concern not only to my district but also to other metropolitan districts and country districts—the cuts that may hit the South Australian

hospital services. We read in the *Advertiser* of 29 July that the preliminary Budget allocations for public teaching hospitals are 3 per cent and 5 per cent below last year's level. Further, an article in the *Advertiser* of 5 August, under the heading "Unrealistic Budget Hits Big South Australian Hospital", stated:

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital did not have a hope of working within the limits of South Australian Health Commission preliminary Budget allocations, the hospital's chairman, Mr. T. B. Prescott, said yesterday.

The article also said:

The preliminary allocations for 1980-81, made available to the Royal Adelaide, Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria hospitals and the Flinders Medical Centre last week, showed a reduction of \$2.3 million for the Q.E.H. on its \$40 million budget for last year.

"There is no way in the world we will be able to achieve that," Mr. Prescott said.

The article continues:

"There is a feeling of depression over the hospital about the implications of the Budget cuts," Mr. Prescott said.

Information I have received indicates that this could mean a reduction in the Q.E.H. of between 180 and 200 jobs. Moreover, there is feeling within the hospital itself that this could affect the level of health services available to my constituents and to others who must use the services of this hospital.

Mr. Hemmings: But the Minister said we were making a public mischief when we made those comments.

Mr. HAMILTON: It is nothing unusual for the Minister to make outrageous statements and then have to eat humble pie. It is quite clear that the Minister is certainly not telling the truth. Paragraph 13 of the Opening Speech states:

My Government will continue to pursue its programme of expanding community health services.

The Minister may be expanding services in some areas, but we are seeing quite clearly the same thing that occurred federally in 1975, when Federal colleagues of the Government had a fistful of fivers to be given away in one hand but took them away doubly with the other. As far as I can see, these sorts of tactics are being used by this Government.

Mr. Randall: If you read the whole statement you would realise —

Mr. HAMILTON: Time will tell. Another issue that concerns me shows that the hypocrisy of this Government is coming more and more to light. I refer to the Western Rehabilitation Centre at Royal Park. I was fortunate late last year to attend the opening of that centre. I quote from *Hansard* a contribution that I made in this House on 16 October 1979:

I direct the attention of members to the statement made by the Premier at the opening of the new workshops at the regional headquarters of the Western Rehabilitation Service Unit at Royal Park on 4 October, in response to the opening address. On that occasion, Mr. Peter Pickering, Senior Administrative Officer for the South Australian Health Commission, requested additional funds from this Government for the erection of a therapeutic swimming pool to assist the rehabilitation of patients using that centre. The Premier stated, in part:

I have three new words in my vocabulary since becoming Premier: The first two words are "how much" and the third word is "No".

I shall also quote from *Hansard* comments made by the Hon. D. C. Brown on the same day, as follows:

The committee appointed last year to report on the rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work has issued a discussion paper inviting public comment on

various matters being considered by the committee. Workers compensation payments currently amount to more than \$1 000 000 a week in South Australia. The new Government had no hesitation in reaffirming the terms of reference and membership of the committee, which is to submit for consideration a proposed scheme with the following objectives: first, the rapid rehabilitation of the injured; and, secondly, compensation that is fair to both employers and employees.

In light of the statements made by the Premier on 4 October and the attitude of the Hon. D. C. Brown, I think it is about time that the Government started sorting out the direction in which it is going, because quite clearly it can be seen from those two statements that the Government does not know what it is doing. It was interesting to see some of the comments from an employee who worked at the Western Rehabilitation Centre. I shall quote some of the questions put to that employee, as follows:

What is the position in relation to the swimming pool at the Western Region Rehabilitation Centre at Royal Park in respect to the erection of a therapeutic swimming pool?

The answer was as follows:

Regrettably, there has been no formal response from the Health Commission. There are no allowances in this year's Budget. We have made several submissions and given all details to the committee, but there has been no formal response, and the executive has not met on this matter yet.

So much for the rehabilitation of people. A further question was put:

Is it a fact that currently approximately 30 people could make use of the pool if it was to be erected at Royal Park and seeing that they have no pool at all these persons must travel to the Parks Community Centre, Hillcrest or to a private pool area for aquatic therapy?

The answer to this was as follows:

Yes, this is true; these persons would respond to the use of a pool but because there is not one available people are not interested in travelling to the other centres. We currently use a private pool at Taperoo. This creates problems for the disabled as it is very difficult for them to enter and try and get out of the pool on the steps provided.

The following question was asked:

Could this pool be used for community use if it was erected?

The answer to this was "Yes," and it was also stated that it could be used in conjunction with a nearby school. The person also said that he was of the understanding that the Physically Disabled Association would make use of this pool also and that after hours it could be used as a recreation and sports pool for different schools. The final question asked was as follows:

Is it a fact that the Government will assist with \$200 000 and that the remainder must be found by the centre or from the public?

The reply was as follows:

Mr. . . . has heard from the commission as a rumour that this was suggested to their horror and nothing has been done as yet. The last estimate they have had to build the pool would be in excess of \$300 000.

Where are these people going to get this extra \$100 000? Only the Government knows, but it is not prepared to commit itself in relation to rehabilitation.

Another matter brought to my attention concerns the alteration of the State Transport Authority bus and rail services. Recently a letter was distributed among a number of unions within the State transport industry in respect to alterations of services. I applaud this, but what I have taken up with the Government is that members of Parliament whose electorates about the services should also

be informed of the intentions of the S.T.A. so that residents and members alike will have the opportunity to comment on these alterations before they are implemented. That would be in accordance with the Government's stated policy of open government, and I would hope that the Government would heed its own statements in respect to the S.T.A.

It was rather interesting to read a comment made by Commissioner Nyland in Melbourne on 24 June 1980 in respect of the dispute concerning passengers standing on buses. The final paragraph is as follows:

This commission is always available to assist the parties in any industrial dispute, and indeed in this case both parties have recorded their satisfaction with the celerity with which the commission acted. However, it is frustrating, to say the least, to have encountered a situation such as that met today in that the applicant authority found itself in some initial difficulty in accepting the recommendation of the commission. I accept responsibility for not ascertaining the attitude of the parties at the commencement of this matter. But I can only say that an applicant in a section 25 dispute, which is not an interstate dispute within the meaning of the Act, who is not prepared to accept whatever recommendation is made by the commission borders on being industrially naive and morally bankrupt.

That should be a matter of concern to the Minister, who should sort out that problem with the S.T.A. We hear so much from members opposite about industrial disputation and the fact that it is always caused by the trade union movement. In situations such as this, where the authority was not prepared to negotiate, we find the scathing remarks of the commissioner himself.

A question was asked in the House yesterday about the cancellation of services on the Peterborough to Gladstone line and the bus services from Riverton to Jamestown and Gladstone to Wilmington and Quorn. It is interesting to reflect on some of the statements made in this House about the intentions of the Australian National Railways Commission. We have seen the gutless display of our State Minister in not taking the Federal Minister to arbitration.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr. HAMILTON: Quite clearly, in my view the intention of this Government is to wait until after the Federal election and then to carve up the country passenger services. If the member for Rocky River would care to do a bit of research himself he would find that this has taken place in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, Western Australia, and Tasmania, which has no passenger services at all, and that has happened under this Federal Government. If the member for Rocky River would like further information he should read the statement from Mr. Reiher, who tells us that the intentions of the A.N.R.C. are as follows:

- Discontinue L.C.L. loading.
- Concentrate on bulk loading.
- Concentrate on intercapital loading.
- Reduce both interstate and intrastate passenger services.
- Reduce train personnel . . .
- Simplify the ticketing system and introduce ticket selling machines and automatic barriers.
- Increase productivity by all means available.
- Economise in every way possible.

I believe that this Government is perpetrating a fraud on the country people of South Australia. As the member for Rocky River said, "We will see"; there is no doubt we will see what is to take place in the future. The honourable member should consider what has happened in the other States in relation to the attitude of the Railways Commissioners of Australia who, for the edification of the honourable member (to use the Deputy Premier's words),

meet regularly to decide what the policies will be. I suggest to him that, for the benefit of his constituents, he should not smile about this, because I consider it to be a serious matter; he should be looking after the interests of his own constituents.

Mr. Lewis: Which I have done and which the Minister of Transport—

Mr. HAMILTON: Time will tell whether you can exert enough pressure on the Minister to protect the interests of the people in that area.

While on the subject of transport, I would like to refer to the three requests I have made to the Minister verbally in this House, and also to a written request on 22 May 1980, part of which states:

As you may recall, I have asked on two previous occasions for the results of the investigations carried out by the working party under the directions of the Management Services Officer of the State Transport Authority in relation to the study into the future gauge requirements for the metropolitan rail system, as per attached copy.

I provided him with that copy because obviously he has either a short memory or he is playing politics and is not prepared to provide this information, as he has obviously done for the member for Semaphore. One would hope in future that the Minister might avail himself of the opportunity to provide me with some of these facts.

Also, I had brought to my attention today a report that I am told appeared on television in the Port Pirie area that Dr. Don Williams of the A.N.R.C. has recommended the closure of the Gladstone line. We will see how strong the Minister of Transport is in relation to taking the Federal Minister to arbitration in accordance with section 9 of Part II of the Act. The Minister has made many excuses for not so doing. In August 1978, the previous Minister made statements about the intention of the A.N.R.C. to carve up the railway network in this State, and he was accused by members on the other side of politicking. I have also been informed that the A.N.R.C. intends to cease the bulk-handling facilities between Robertstown and Eudunda in another carve up of the railway network in this State.

A more serious allegation that was recently handed to me involves the Minister of Agriculture. This is what I was asked to put forward. Is it a fact that the Minister was recently approached and agreed to a request by a deputation of road hauliers that he agree to exert pressure on the A.N.R.C. to discontinue its road freight operations between Mile End and Victor Harbor? I have been informed that, when these carriers learnt that rail freight services between Strathalbyn and Victor Harbor were to be discontinued, they invested \$60 000 each to purchase new trucks to cater for the freight demands.

It was further put to me that should this occur it will mean the Minister's constituents will pay higher freight charges because of the additional costs involved, and finally it has been put to me that the Minister is bowing to the pressure from these carriers and looking after their vested interests and therefore neglecting the needs of other customers in the Strathalbyn and Victor Harbor districts. I would hope that next week the Minister will reply to these allegations because they are serious allegations that should be refuted. I have also been told that the Minister intends to use his position within Cabinet to see that this is agreed to. I would certainly hope to hear a denial of these charges from the Minister.

I was amazed to hear the member for Mawson on Tuesday evening make the following statement:

As a result of three years of responsible action we will see the Fraser Government returned to office later this year. That is a rather amazing statement. One of my colleagues

in the Federal arena has put out a pamphlet in respect of the promises of the Federal Government. It reads:

"I can promise you honesty and integrity in Government", announced Liberal Leader Malcolm Fraser in November 1975. "I'd like to have a Government which people can trust." Perhaps it is only Mr. Fraser's own colleagues who can truthfully vouch for his friendship and integrity. One remembers with pride his public announcement in February 1975, "Bill Snedden has my full support . . . there has been continuing widespread speculation that I or colleagues of mine on my behalf are promoting a challenge to Billy Snedden. That is not so. There is no contest." But Alan Austin affirms the Prime Minister's promises to pay and transfer property from one person to another. Austin writes, "With another Federal election due before the end of the year, Mr. Fraser and his writers will soon have to think about a policy speech. As a favour I've collected the following list of promises, all tried and true and perfectly reusable. Mind you, it's not a complete list yet. Unfulfilled promises made less than 18 months ago have been omitted as these may arguably be 'still under implementation'."

The list reads as follows (the date on which the promise was made is given in parenthesis):

1. I can promise you honesty and integrity in Government. I'd like to have a Government which people can trust. (15 November 1975). This promise was not kept.
2. We will maintain Medibank. (November 27 1975). This was a clear commitment to maintain the universal health insurance scheme. This commitment was not honoured.
3. The Australian Assistance Plan will be maintained. (November 27 1975). It was abolished in 1976.
4. We will maintain present levels of assistance to Aborigines. (November 27 1975). In the first year of office the coalition cut expenditure by \$8 000 000. In two years the reduction in real terms was 24 per cent. The Aboriginal housing programme was cut by 44 per cent in two years. Aboriginal education programmes were reduced by 16 per cent in real terms, health programmes by 13 per cent and Aboriginal legal aid by 19 per cent. In the last Budget, assistance to Aborigines was \$35 000 000 below the 1975 level.
5. We will support wage indexation. (November 27 1975). Less than two months later, the Fraser Government opposed the full flow-on of the C.P.I. rise, seeking half-indexation instead. The Government has consistently opposed full wage indexation at all subsequent hearings.
6. Under a Liberal-National Country Party Government there will be jobs for all who want to work. (November 27 1975). Rather than improving, unemployment has steadily worsened. It rose from 4.8 per cent of the work force at the end of 1975 to 7.1 per cent at the end of 1978. While the published figures since then have shown a slight improvement, these do not take into account the hidden unemployed. In the last Budget, funding for one of the few effective training schemes, the Special Youth Employment Training Programme, was slashed by \$50 000 000.
7. We will be generous to those who can't get a job and want to work. (November 27 1975). Unemployment benefits have declined substantially in real terms.
8. We will fully index personal income tax for inflation over three years. (November 27 1975). In 1976 the tax scale was almost fully indexed (but not quite). In 1978 it was reduced to half-indexation (closer to a third, in reality). Indexation was abandoned altogether in May 1979. One-third indexation is now proposed for July 1980.
9. We will reduce the tax burden. We will put an end to Labor's tax rip-off. (November 27 1975). The tax bite for most taxpayers under Fraser has been much greater than under the Labor Government. Total taxes as a percentage of Gross National Product are well up. Taxes relative to income

levels are up. This has happened, despite tax cuts, through the effects of inflation in the absence of full tax indexation.

10. Our reforms will give back to people money they earn by their own hard work and which Labor has taken away from them. (November 27 1975). Only the very wealthy are now paying less in taxes. The vast majority are paying much more. Under Whitlam, wage and salary earners contributed around 77 per cent of total income taxes. Now they contribute over 81 per cent, despite massive increases in the incomes of the rich non-wage earners.

11. We will ensure that where children are in greater need because of educational disadvantage, they receive extra financial support. (November 27 1975). The actual policy pursued has been precisely the opposite. Contrary to the recommendation of the Schools Commission, \$13 800 000 was cut in just one year, 1977-78, from the allocation to Government schools and given to private schools. Last year, \$38 000 000 of the \$42 000 000 cut in education spending was from the schools sector. Government schools were hardest hit.

12. There will be no international safaris by members of Parliament. Australia does not need a tourist as Prime Minister. (November 27 1975). In the first two-month Parliamentary recess almost \$250 000 was spent on trips by Federal Parliamentarians, their wives and staff. Mr. Fraser's total for his first three years was 13 trips. Mr. Peacock made well over 20. Mr. Whitlam, who was Foreign Minister as well as Prime Minister, made 13 trips in his term of office.

13. A Liberal-National Country Party Government will initiate a new deal for migrants. (November 27 1975). In virtually every major area of migrant welfare there has been a decline in allocations and a consequent run-down of services. Most severely hit have been education services, special migrant welfare services and the office of the Commissioner for Community Relations.

14. Spending on essential education, health and welfare programmes will be protected against inflation. (November 27 1975). Except in a few isolated areas, this promise has not been kept. Expenditure on the hospital development programme was reduced by 63 per cent in real terms in the 1976-77 financial year. The community health programme was reduced by \$15 300 000. The completion of the school dental health scheme was deferred until 1990. Then again, maybe these weren't essential.

15. We will not disrupt essential programmes or programmes for which contracts have been let. (November 27 1975). Contracts cancelled during Fraser's first year of office totalled \$60 000 000. The 1977 Budget cancelled expenditure on the national sewerage programme in every State. The water resources programme was abandoned. Pipeline Authority construction, for which contracts had been let, were cut by 43.4 per cent. Possibly, to Mr Fraser, these also were not essential.

16. The real value of pensions will be preserved. (November 27 1975). The real value of pensions has in fact been significantly reduced. Since Fraser took office there has been no adjustment in rent assistance, dependent child's allowance, orphans' pensions, guardian's allowances or family allowances. As a result, pensioners receiving these allowances are up to \$5 per week worse off than in 1975.

17. We stand by our commitment to abolish the means test on pensions. (November 27 1975). In the 1978 Budget, an income test was reintroduced for pensioners over 70.

Because the time allotted to me is running out, I will now refer only to the most important cases, as follows:

19. We will work positively in co-operation with trade unionists. (November 27 1975). From its handling of numerous industrial disputes, the Government appears rather to have actively confronted and provoked the trade unions. The hasty passage of the Commonwealth Employees

Act and the establishment of the Industrial Relations Bureau—which gives the Government sweeping dictatorial powers over unionists—were not seen as either co-operative or positive.

20. We will abolish the Prices Justification Tribunal . . . during the first session of the new Parliament. (November 27 1975). Nine Parliamentary sessions later, the PJT is still alive.

23. There will be no more jobs for the boys. (November 27 1975). Performance of the Fraser Government in this area has been par for the course. Comfortable jobs have gone to Henry Bland, Nigel Bowen, Stephen Alley, Harry M. Miller, David Fairbairn, Peter Coleman, Petreo Georgio and Robert Cotton, to name a few. John Edwards, in *Life wasn't Meant to be Easy*, states, "A great deal of nonsense conceals the essential fact that Labor's 'boys' are only different from the Liberals' 'people of the highest calibre' in their politics."

30. On my own visits overseas, commercial aircraft will be used as far as possible. The argument that Qantas cannot provide adequate security is a specious argument and false. (March 24 1976). In 1979 Fraser spent \$40 000 000 on two VIP jets for his overseas travels.

32. Unemployment will fall from February (1978) and keep falling. (November 21 1977). The fall predicted from February 1978 in fact occurred. It was the normal seasonal drop after the January peak. Seasonally adjusted, unemployment worsened throughout the year and, taking account of the hidden unemployed, has continued to worsen.

33. We are acting to end the offensive paternalism of past policies towards Aborigines. We will continue to encourage self-management of Aboriginal programmes and make them masters of their own affairs. (November 21 1977). Performance in this area has made a complete mockery of these statements.

Mr. Randall: Where?

Mr. HAMILTON: Funds to the programmes which could have facilitated these ideals have been slashed. I thank the honourable member for the interjection. The document continues:

Aboriginal unemployment has increased alarmingly. In places where there is a real need for assistance towards self-management, such as Aurukun and Mornington Island, all that the Fraser Government has given is more empty promises.

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

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the motion, I briefly refer to some remarks from His Excellency's Speech, paragraph 3 of which states:

My Government continues to attach very great importance to careful planning and control of the State's finances, and in 1979-80 the Revenue and Loan Accounts showed an aggregate surplus of \$37 200 000. That surplus has added to the capacity of the State to fund capital works in the present financial year and thus to provide a secure basis for future industrial expansion and to provide housing and amenities that are so essential for the welfare of the citizens of the State.

Mr. Slater: He juggled the figures.

Mr. BECKER: I would not say that the Premier had juggled the figures. I recall a previous occasion when I accused the previous Premier of juggling the figures, and we had the same sort of answer. The previous Government had difficulty in letting the right hand know what the left hand was doing. We were concerned that the Loan Account was being lumped in with the Revenue Account; that is also coming up as well. Overall, it was an

extremely good result for the few months in which my Government has been in office. Paragraph 3 continues:

My Government is determined to maintain its low taxation policy, initiated with the abolition of succession and gift duties, pay-roll tax and stamp duty concessions, and most recently the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence. Rigorous restraint is essential if that object is to be achieved.

I could not agree more. My Government has demonstrated that we can control the finances of the State. On many occasions over the years in which I have been a member, I have said that, with careful planning and budgeting, I believe that we can obtain value for the taxpayers' dollar and that, if we set a reasonable standard of performance budgeting and general efficiency, we can save about 2½ per cent to 3 per cent off the top of the revenue of the State. That is what we have come out with—just over 2 per cent. I realise, also, that you cannot keep doing that every year; you cannot keep pruning departmental budgets year after year.

As a member of the Public Accounts Committee and one who was involved in the inquiry into hospitals, it was demonstrated to us that a certain sum could be saved in certain areas. It was always evident in my mind that no matter what we did in that area the quality of patient care must be maintained. I believe that it should be maintained, and I am concerned to hear reports and see statements claiming that that is not so. My recent experience is that the quality of patient care in our hospitals is being maintained, but the day must come when I do not think that we can prune much more in that area. I am disturbed that morning and afternoon tea will be discontinued in Government hospitals, that biscuits are no longer available, and that seven handicapped people lost their jobs. I should think that the cost of biscuits and morning and afternoon tea would be minimal indeed, but the greatest tragedy was that seven disabled people lost their jobs.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What about the four-hour wait in casualty?

Mr. BECKER: My experience of visiting casualty departments in hospitals has been that there are some reasons for it, and in other areas it could be reduced.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The reason given to me was insufficient staffing.

Mr. BECKER: Apparently there are high and low peaks in casualty, but outpatient clinics—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time. The honourable member for Hanson should ignore interjections, which are out of order.

Mr. BECKER:—could be rescheduled and reorganised. The bookings for outpatients are at 1.30 or 2 p.m. If you have a 1.30 appointment, and if you get there about noon, you will be seen at 1.30 or 2 p.m. If you are the 2 p.m. appointment, you do not bother to turn up until 4.30 p.m., because that is about when you will be seen. That is a crazy system, but has been perpetuated over many years. It is a tremendous inconvenience to the aged and those who have to sit around in wheelchairs and who are in obvious discomfort, having to wait in those crowded outpatient clinics in Government hospitals. That area should be looked at. The other big bone of contention has been in relation to car-parking facilities. It will cost millions of dollars to solve that problem. Money could well be spent at this stage in improving the quality of patient care in Government hospitals.

The State Government is on the right track, but we must be carefully that we do not create the situation of cutting back too far, thus making the services available to the

community untenable. With proper care and management, we must be getting close to the point where we cannot prune much further. I pointed out a similar situation yesterday in relation to the ground maintenance grants given to primary schools, considering that the sum has not been increased in four years, yet we have had about 38 per cent inflation. That is placing tremendous pressure on the parents of our students. At a school at which almost 50 per cent of the students come from single-parent families, the position is extremely difficult, and it is embarrassing for those children. It should not be that way. Every student should have an equal opportunity, irrespective of which school he or she attends in the State.

Paragraph 6 of the Speech states:

South Australia is now on the threshold of mineral developments which will undoubtedly have a major impact on the economy, employment and development of the State. These developments include recovery of petroleum liquids from the Cooper Basin, a possible petro-chemical complex at Redcliff based upon ethane production from the Cooper Basin and salt from Lake Torrens, uranium mining in the Lake Frome area and mining of copper, uranium and gold at Roxby Downs. Mineral exploration is continuing at an unprecedented level throughout the State. Resurgence of interest in exploration results from marked improvements in metal prices, increasing demands for energy resources, recognition of the potential for discovery of a wide range of minerals in this State, and a deliberate policy on the part of my Government to foster exploration for, and development of, the State's mineral resources.

Undoubtedly, some benefits will come to us in the short term from the Cooper Basin, and that is why we recently saw considerable speculation in South Australian Gas Company shares; it is unfortunate that that has occurred. Also, the Pipelines Authority could be the benefactor of any improvements in that area. Unfortunately, the Stock Exchange is used by some people to manipulate the market, and certain people make considerable money. However, if someone makes money, someone has to lose. The company's shares at present appear to be highly overpriced as regards the dividend component yet, on the value of the company's involvement in the Pipelines Authority and in the Cooper Basin, the shares are undervalued.

Fortunately, the Government has control of the situation and I hope that the problem is resolved quickly so that no-one suffers further financial losses. This is an unfortunate situation. Regarding the future of Roxby Downs, I have not promoted uranium development strongly, because I am yet to be convinced about its safety, although from my recent reading I believe that it is becoming much safer to handle uranium and its enrichment. I also declare that my wife has about 110 shares in Western Mining Corporation which were bought many years ago and which have nothing to do with the future potential of Roxby Downs, which I believe is at least six years in the future, if it comes about.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You are stating it publicly, which is more than another person did in regard to another matter.

Mr. BECKER: The shares were purchased some time ago. Of course, we did not know at that time about the potential of Roxby Downs.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He said he told Cabinet, and therefore it was public.

Mr. BECKER: Fair enough. I am concerned about the price to the consumer of electricity. I was disappointed by the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I believe that he is having two bob each way. I was disappointed that he attacked my colleague, the

member for Newland, because I believe that the honourable member put together a reasoned and considered speech in this debate. I was concerned when the Leader of the Opposition said:

... we are not and never have been opposed to the development of Roxby Downs, whatever might be said. An examination of the *Hansard* record will make the position clear.

The relevant *Hansard* report (of the speech of the member for Eyre) of 4 June 1980 (page 2275) is as follows:

As I said earlier, it is unfortunate that the member for Stuart, the member for Whyalla, their Federal colleague Mr. Wallis, and the Hon. Mr. Blevins are not prepared to support that part of the State by lending encouragement to the development of the Roxby Downs area. I am disappointed that the Leader is not supporting that project, and I hope that he will soon be in a position to make a statement clearly explaining where he stands on the issue. He has been most devious in his attitude, talking in riddles, but not once has he stated that he supports the continuation of that project, that he supports the building of an enrichment plant at Port Pirie.

Mr. Bannon: No.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member says he does not support it.

Mr. Bannon: No.

Mr. GUNN: He is in total opposition to the Mayor and the City Council of Port Pirie?

Mr. Bannon: Yes.

Mr. GUNN: And you do not support the mining and export of uranium from Roxby Downs?

Mr. Bannon: No.

Mr. GUNN: As Premier, you would stop that project?

Mr. Bannon: I am opposed to it.

Mr. GUNN: I take it that, in going to the State at the next election, the Leader will be putting to the people a programme to halt the development of Roxby Downs. I take it that that will be part of his platform for the next election. I am very pleased that the honourable member has clearly explained that he would stop the Roxby Downs project.

Mr. Bannon: I didn't say that.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, you did.

I have repeated that to bring into context the unfortunate comments made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday when he was speaking in this debate and referred to the remarks made by the member for Newland. The Leader continued yesterday:

We are opposed to the development of uranium in the present situation until it is safe to do so. We have expounded that policy clearly and constructively for a long time, and we will continue to do so. We are not opposed to that development, and what is happening at Roxby Downs at present is a result of approvals given directly by the Government of which I was a member last year. The \$50 000 000 exploration expansion programme at Roxby Downs for which the present Government is taking credit was an initiative taken by our Government, so we are on the record as supporting the development and investigation of that great resource in South Australia. We are clearly and firmly opposed to the nuclear industry and uranium mining in the present situation. Let that be clear, and that is on the record.

If one takes the two statements together, one could be excused for believing that the Leader is having two bob each way. It is not clear exactly where he and his Party stand. Following the Premier's announcement in regard to the obtaining of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, the editorial in the *News*—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Mitchell to cease his continual interjections across the Chamber. I

have been fairly tolerant, but my tolerance is coming to an end.

Mr. BECKER: In relation to the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie or Whyalla, the editorial states:

Establishment of an enrichment plant at Port Pirie or Whyalla would be a major fillip for the Spencer Gulf industrial towns.

I understand that the proposal has been supported by the Mayor of Whyalla and the Deputy Mayor of Port Pirie. The editorial further states:

What a pity the Labor Party sought to counter it [the Premier's announcement] with a bit of snide carping. Mr. Payne, as energy spokesman, chose to say that there was nothing new in all this, and the A.L.P. did not like the idea anyway. Its policy on uranium was well known, he said. To the Party chieftains perhaps it is.

That being so Mr. Bannon, as Leader, may care to enlighten us on one specific matter. If the project does go ahead and the agreement and contracts are formally concluded, would he in Government repudiate them?

I believe that that is a fair question, and one which the people of South Australia are entitled to ask and receive an answer to, because the current Government is negotiating a plan for a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, and those who propose to develop and invest in this State are entitled to know exactly where they stand. As I said, I have been waiting for a demonstration of the safety of nuclear energy. I have received a copy of a United Kingdom paper which is printed in the north of England and which is dated August 1979, in which an article, by Edward Taylor, on safe and economic atomic power, states:

"Electricity prices are rising sharply", contended the spokesman [for the Scottish Anti-Nuclear Protest Group] a Mr. McKinnon, "and less well-off consumers are finding it difficult to heat their homes adequately. Yet we are being forced to support a technology which is potentially unsafe, inefficient and unnecessary".

Yet nuclear power is the best way of protecting Mr. McKinnon's "less well-off" from excessive electricity bills. As Mr. Norman Lamont said in answer to a question in the House on May 24: "Generation costs in P/KWh in 1977-78 at G.E.G.B. stations commissioned in the previous 12 years were: nuclear, 0.76p; coal-fired, 1.23p; and oil-fired, 1.42p"—and these figures do not include the latest nuclear stations or the rises in oil and coal prices.

More recently the C.E.G.B. report altered the figures to nuclear 1.02p, coal 1.29p and oil-fired 1.31p, the basis of calculation having been adjusted to include de-commissioning and waste disposal costs.

The article continues:

What about safety? There is a fascinatingly ghoulish statistic quoted by Dr. Peter Beckman in his excellent book *The Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear*. He concludes that per billion megawatt hours of generated electricity, generated by their corresponding fuels, either 1 036 coal miners or 20 uranium miners lose their lives. Nor should we forget the substantial loss of life involved in producing North Sea oil and gas.

The article continues, referring to alternative energies:

To match an average-size nuclear station with wave power would require a giant structure of about 60 miles in length in stormy seas. As for solar power, the latest suggestion is for a 5 000-ton structure to be shot into space with rockets. It would be interesting to see how Lloyds of London would quantify the respective dangers of the transporting of 5 000 tons into space followed by the beaming of rays on to precise points on the earth.

On the transport of fuel the case for nuclear power is again

overwhelming. There have been some appalling accidents in the transport of oil and, so far as coal is concerned, the statistics are readily available. The mere fact that to produce comparable quantities of electric power the choice is between 38 000 trucks of coal or six of nuclear fuel shows just how great is the safety gap.

What about the power stations themselves? Mrs. Thatcher has made the telling point that no lives have been lost in nuclear power stations in consequence of the generation of nuclear power. Dr. Beckman makes the same claim for America (up to 1976).

Despite the fantastic publicity given to all incidents stemming from human error, which in non-nuclear power stations could have been catastrophic, the outcome in nuclear stations has been no loss of life or danger to the public, despite the confident predictions by the protesters.

One of the principal arguments of the anti-nuclear brigade is that nuclear power stations emit radiation and that radiation causes cancer. Yet a fascinating article in *Nuclear Safety* argues that coal-fired stations emit up to 400 times as much radiation as nuclear stations because of the radium and thorium contained in coal. Even those living within a 50-mile radius of a nuclear power plant face much more radiation from their colour television sets than from the power station.

What about the waste from nuclear stations—those infamous “Dumps of Death”? Dr. Magnus Pike and Mr. Keith Johnson performed a valuable service (sadly not widely reported) at the meeting of the British Association on 7 September [1979] when they emphasised that one of the greatest advantages of nuclear power is the small amount of waste it produces by comparison with other forms of energy conversion. One teacupful of high-level waste would remain after a lifetime's nuclear energy had been supplied to one person, while one ton of nuclear waste or 100 000 tons of coal ash would be produced by generating electricity in equal amounts from nuclear fuel or coal.

The problem of nuclear waste disposal is not the absence of suitable techniques but the abundance of them. In America the preference is to bury the waste in salt formations partly because no water will have been there for at least 200 million years. Salt formations are also self-sealing in the event of an earthquake. In Britain, the preference is to seal the waste in fire-proof, waterproof and earthquake-proof glass. What is not yet resolved is whether the best place for it is the ocean bed or in land-based hard rock.

Of course, we know what the previous practice was—to leave it out in the colonies. At least there has been improvement since then. The article continues:

Those who argue that atomic waste can remain active for hundreds if not thousands of years might do well to reflect that uranium 238, which might well have been placed by nature under their very homes, has a half-life of 4.51 billion years! In short, the evidence points to the conclusion that energy conversion through nuclear power stations presents less danger to everyone than any other process. There is also evidence that the public is largely unconvinced of this.

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

A quorum having been formed.

Mr. BECKER: It is disappointing that during this debate there has been continual interference to whomever is speaking because of lack of a quorum. I note that there are now three members on the Opposition side, but there were only two a minute ago. We have become accustomed to the fact that the member for Mitcham is not here again. I notice that he has had his name ticked off yesterday and today, and he is not here.

Mr. Mathwin: And the member for Elizabeth must have been a naughty boy. He used to pull the legs off flies when he was a child.

Mr. BECKER: I notice that since my colleague, the member for Glenelg, has come back from the mother country his sense of humour has improved. While there he had the opportunity to look at the benefits of nuclear energy in England. Perhaps he can tell us how much cheaper electricity accounts are in the mother country. The article further states:

Democrats must not forget that public opinion does matter. There is clearly an obligation on the politicians, the nuclear industry and the power boards to seek to persuade the public of the wisdom of their conclusions, and there could well be room also for an active and enthusiastic pressure group to challenge the anti-nuclear protesters head on. Might the day come when we'll see groups of bearded young men and clergymen carrying banners proclaiming: “Cut pensioners' fuel bills—support nuclear power”; or “Stop the energy slaughter—more nuclear stations NOW!”?

I think it is a great pity that the whole nuclear and uranium debate has got down to the stage of demonstrations, of people parading in the streets, with citizens opposed bitterly to one another in relation to what should be best for the future of this country. I should have thought that, with the hundreds of millions of dollars that we have expended on education of the forthcoming generation, people would learn peacefully to co-exist with their fellow man and accept the obvious, namely, that something must be done in the energy crisis. We must work together and come up with a safe method of handling and disposing of uranium. If people put all their energy into that, instead of parading in the streets, this would be a far better country to live in.

I often wonder whether the people behind these organisations are true Australians or whether they are traitors to their own country. It is time that people were prepared to stand up and declare their loyalty to their country. I am concerned, and I would never put anyone's life at risk for the unholy dollar, but I believe that by the time we are ready to go into nuclear industry in this State and country the safe disposal problems will have been resolved. I think the article from which I just read proves that point. Probably of all the suggestions and all the logic I have heard burying in salt seems to be the most feasible method of disposal, and that could well be the solution to the problem.

I am also concerned about the cost of electricity in South Australia. For some time I have expressed concern that pensioners and disadvantaged people do not have the opportunity to receive concession rates from the Electricity Trust of South Australia as are provided by the South Australian Gas Company. On 14 November 1978 I asked the then Deputy Premier, now the member for Hartley, the following questions:

1. Can the Electricity Trust of South Australia offer reduction in electricity costs to pensioners, in particular invalid pensioners dependent on greater use of heaters to relieve pain and, if not, why not?
2. What financial assistance can the trust offer pensioners to relieve them from increased electricity charges?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran replied as follows:

1. Consideration has been given to concessional rates. However, it would require a \$1 200 000 payment by the Government to E.T.S.A., or \$1 200 000 extra revenue from non-concessional users of electricity. The Government is not able to justify either approach at the present time. In addition, it would not be possible to ensure that electricity supplied at reduced rates would be used only by those eligible.

I find it amazing that the then Government, the A.L.P., was concerned that it would not be possible to ensure that the electricity supply at reduced rates would be used only

by those eligible. What a shocking admission, and yet members of that Party are now demanding that there should be Electricity Trust concessions, but that was the view of the then Deputy Premier. In his reply he also said:

2. E.T.S.A. tariffs are among the lowest in Australia and have increased at a much lower rate than either wages or pensions.

I accept that in 1978, but I have never been prepared to accept the principle that pensioners and disadvantaged people should not receive some concession. During the last State election campaign I made some statements about it, and I made several approaches to my Party to have this included in its policy, but it was not possible because of the financial commitments we had already made.

In the past five years the cost of electricity in South Australia has increased by 55 per cent. On 1 August 1976 electricity charges increased by 12½ per cent, on 1 August 1977 they increased by 10 per cent, on 21 October 1978 they increased by 10 per cent, on 1 September 1979 they increased by 10 per cent, and on 1 July this year there was an increase of 12½ per cent. In 1978 it was estimated that it would cost either the Government or the Electricity Trust \$1 200 000 to provide electricity concessions. After looking at the financial statements of the Electricity Trust to ascertain whether or not it could bear this cost, I argue that it could.

For the financial year ended 30 June 1978 the Electricity Trust of South Australia had a net surplus of \$4 500 000. For the financial year ended 30 June 1979 the Electricity Trust of South Australia had a net surplus of \$879 000; but in 1978 the trust paid the State Government \$8 000 000 as part of the Governments' demand as a statutory contribution to State revenue. Rather than pay taxes or other similar charges to the Government, the Electricity Trust pays a statutory contribution to State revenue. In 1978 it was \$8 000 000, and in 1979 it was \$9 144 000. It is easy to see that either the State Government or the Electricity Trust could provide a concession to pensioners. In two years the Government received \$17 100 000 from the Electricity Trust, and I believe that from 1 January 1971 it has received nearly \$40 000 000. The State Government has done very well from the earnings of the Electricity Trust, and the consumers in general have had to pay this contribution. Therefore, I believe that the State Government should again consider these concessions. On 4 August 1980 I wrote to the Premier as follows:

I wish to bring to your attention again the need for our Government to investigate the possibility of offering reduced electricity charges to persons who are aged and disadvantaged. You are aware that I have been concerned over a long period of time that the Electricity Trust of South Australia has been unable to offer concession to pensioners. I asked the former Government a question in State Parliament on 14 November 1978.

I then quoted the questions I had asked on 14 November 1978 and the replies given by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran. My letter continues:

In a press article in September of last year, I stated that charges had jumped 32.5 per cent and, with the increase of 12½ per cent as from 1 July 1980, pensioners are to be burdened further financially.

I believe approximately 39 000 persons, or 19 per cent of consumers, receive pensioner tariffs with the South Australian Gas Company, and any person who is a holder of a social security health card is eligible.

Pensioners and other disadvantaged persons have a continual hard battle to make ends meet, and this is another area where the Government can offer some form of relief. After all, if the Gas Company can offer concession, why not the Electricity Trust?

That was put to the Premier only a few days ago, and I am eagerly awaiting the Government's consideration on that matter.

Mr. Hemmings: Do you think you are going to be successful?

Mr. BECKER: The Government has received nearly \$40 000 000 in general revenue from the Electricity Trust. I hope I will be successful in the not too distant future, but it may well be that I will have to wait longer. I want to inform the honourable member who has interjected that I have been trying to win this concession for pensioners and disadvantaged persons for many years, long before he came into this Chamber.

In paragraph 23 of his Speech, His Excellency said:

My Government is concerned at the continued long waiting list for individuals and families requiring public housing. It has allocated substantial funds from its own resources to add to those provided by the Commonwealth for rental housing and concessional home purchase.

It is the matter of concessional home purchase that I am greatly concerned about, because a problem that worries me is that it takes about 16 weeks for an application to be dealt with by the State Bank of South Australia. We encourage young people to purchase their own home and to receive the concessions that are available to them, but this situation is causing problems. When they sign a contract to buy a home, no-one tells them that there is a 16-week waiting period at the State Bank before they could settle, or perhaps even before they could get an answer.

Two constituents have complained of this matter in the past six months. It has been embarrassing when they have had to go to temporary finance, because the vendors and the agents pressure them to settle for their property within the terms of the normal contract. They take temporary finance, not knowing whether or not their application to the State Bank will be successful. We can only warn young people that, if they are applying for State Bank finance, they should put on the contract, "Subject to finance being arranged and agreed with the State Bank of South Australia." In that way, the vendor knows that the settlement will take 16 weeks or more.

It has been explained to me by the bank that, if a young couple apply for concessional finance and, because of the amount required and their income, they may have to insure the housing loan through the Housing Loans Insurance Scheme, it takes months to handle that application. I fail to accept that the State Bank should take up to 16 weeks to handle a normal housing loan application. I speak from my own personal experience. I could handle an application and arrange settlement within three days. Sometimes it depends on the availability of finance with the banks, but the normal procedure with the commercial banks was that we could accept an application for a housing loan, process the loan, and be ready to meet settlement within the standard period of one month.

For some reason, for which I am unable to obtain an explanation at this stage from the Premier or from the bank, it takes this long period for the loan to go through, and no-one can tell me why. This is difficult when we try to convince people that the bank is there, receiving funds from the Federal Government and the State Treasury, to assist them, and that we as a Government are doing everything possible to help young people with stamp duty concessions, and so on, and yet they have to spend money on temporary finance. It behoves the Treasury and the State Bank Board to ensure that the procedures are updated so that the normal housing loan application can be processed within 30 days. If that cannot be done, it is only fair that the vendors should be warned that

settlement will take up to four months. The purchaser should not be forced into the temporary finance market. If we are to stimulate the building industry and continue to encourage people to own their own homes, we should, from the lending institution right down the line, make the system work and provide facilities for young people.

I turn now to a problem that has come to my attention in relation to a building company which I believe should not be in operation; certainly, the way in which it handles its finances is an absolute scandal. Reluctant as I am to do so, I think the company should be named, because I am most dissatisfied with its operation, and perhaps other members may have heard of this building company or they may have had constituents complain about it. The more complaints we get, the greater the opportunity to obtain satisfaction.

A constituent of mine worked for this company for two weeks. He was owed about \$700 in wages. He was paid \$100, and the company has refused to pay from there on. There is no dispute about the work. The man attended his job and fulfilled his employment conditions, but apparently this is the *modus operandi* of this company, Gloucester Building Company, 30 Chesser Street, Adelaide, and one of its subsidiaries, Ikos Constructions Pty. Ltd., which I believe could well be in liquidation. The proprietors are John and Sophia Karounos. If other honourable members have any complaints, perhaps they could let me know and we will see what we can do. My constituent has written me the following letter:

You may recall that I visited your office on a recent occasion to discuss a complaint for unpaid wages against the Gloucester Building Company. Since that interview, the South Australian Industrial Court has ordered that the money owed to me should be paid by the company concerned. However, after the eight days which were allowed for payment to be made, I had received neither money nor word from Gloucester.

On approaching the legal aid office, I was told that they could not help me since my claim was "only a minor one". That is a nice indictment. The letter continues:

I could not even get a reduction on the \$16 fee that I will be paying this week for a UJS to be taken out against the company! The UJS may take up to three months (it is now six months since I worked for Gloucester!) to be served, but even then the bailiff can only "request" that the company pay the money owed to me. I cannot afford the legal costs to have the company liquidated, and legal aid cannot assist me because the costs would be too high and the company may not have any assets, anyway.

Upon phoning and personally going into the office of Gloucester (still quite intact and functioning), I was either totally ignored, brushed off or told that all claims for unpaid wages were simply being ignored!

So, a considerable number of people who have worked for the company have not been paid wages, and I believe a considerable number of subcontractors are also involved. The letter continues:

The company's manager, George Karounos, simply turns his back on the law, and he gets away with it. Would this be the case if I were to walk into a local supermarket and commit an offence? Is this fair?

As an unemployed member of your electorate, I wish to point out, as strongly as I can, the weakness of the Industrial Court, the Builders Licensing Act, the legal aid system and the Department of Labour and Industry. I will not be at all surprised to see the manager of the company juggling his assets around in the future, and starting an entirely new company—after having got off quite freely from facing the damage he has done to many subcontractors and workers. Many of these workers, I might add, were and are, like myself, unemployed and "living" on an income \$20 below an

accepted poverty level. Apart from my own desire to receive the money owed to me, I would like to see justice done against this company and others like them, as well as the prevention of further hardship to working people employed by them.

I hope that you can achieve something positive in this regard, and I hope that I have supplied adequate information for you.

My constituent worked for the company 10 months ago, and he has done everything legally possible. He has spent considerable time in chasing up the proprietors of the company to obtain the wages owing to him. He is owed about \$600 and, whilst many people might not consider that very much, to someone who is unemployed it is a considerable sum of money. It is the principle involved—how the principals of this company can get away without paying their workers.

My constituent informed me a few weeks ago that, as he has taken out the unsatisfied judgment summons against the building company, the directors are to appear in court, if the summons can be served, but that is the problem. I understand that, every time a bailiff goes to visit the company's office, the directors hop out through the back window. I gave up trying to contact them by telephone.

Mr. Mathwin: Is it a very large window?

Mr. BECKER: It must be, and the building must have a low back fence, because this seems to be the *modus operandi* for skipping away from the creditors. There must be hundreds of people who have obtained employment with builders of this kind and who are paid small sums. They are laid off, and they have to battle to get their wages. Something must be done to prevent these builders from operating and to ensure that they and/or business people are not allowed to continue or to liquidate a company and start up again. I know of several cases where company after company is formed and the assets are fleeced off. The company goes into liquidation, the people have a round-the-world trip, and they start again.

Mr. Mathwin: Many professional people are involved in that business.

Mr. BECKER: That is right. Far too much of this practice is going on, and it is the poor old worker who cops it in the neck. Another problem is the tax-dodging schemes, which I do not countenance in any circumstances. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I will make only brief mention (because I will mention it more fully in my Address in Reply speech later) of some of the facts I found during my recent overseas study trip.

Mr. Hemmings: What did you study?

Mr. MATHWIN: People similar to the member for Napier. Actually, it was juvenile delinquency, and it fits the honourable member well. My study tour confirmed my assumption that we in Australia certainly live in a lucky country; since my return, I have often wondered whether we deserve it. Some people do not realise how fortunate we are, and that would no doubt be borne out by some members who have travelled overseas recently.

Mr. Becker: I am glad that you referred to it as a "country"; you always used to call it a colony.

Mr. MATHWIN: That was some years before my time. Australians take their country for granted and the fact that you have to work hard. In the countries that are

progressing well, the people work hard and hold their country high in their esteem.

Mr. McRae: How does McNally match up with those places?

Mr. MATHWIN: I will tell the honourable member more about McNally when I speak in the Address in Reply debate. At present, I refer him to India, a place he has probably never visited. If he has not been there, I point out to him that many people there are starving, and many juveniles are taken in by the law for stealing because they are starving. The country, in general, has a large population and many problems. The Community Welfare Department and the Indian Government are doing an excellent job under the conditions in which they are trying to work. They have colossal problems in relation to the population and as regards illiteracy, the different sects, and the different religions. When I visited places there (I was 10 days in Bombay and Delhi), I saw the conditions of some of the people. I was invited to look at Bombay and to be given a tour by the department that would have shown me monuments and the Gate of India, but I said that I wanted to see the people and the conditions under which they were forced to live. They took me around to areas to which one would not normally go. From that experience, I was able to understand the situation as it is and the colossal problems they face, as a Government and as a department in those areas.

Another country I visited (and I believe it has much to teach us in the way of national pride and the way in which the people work hard) was Israel. The people there start work at 8 or 8.15 a.m. They have no lunch break; they eat their lunch at the desk; granted, they finish early in the afternoon, about 3.30 p.m. They do not worry about the amount of time they are there, but are concerned about the amount of work they get through for the sake of their country. Here, again, this country has colossal problems. When the Government of the day budgets it has to split the Budget into three distinct parts. It has to pay one-third for defence, which is imperative. When you see the country, and try to understand its problems, you realise that it must have good defences. Another one-third goes to repay the loans the country has had over the years, and the remaining one-third is left to run the country. That country does it exceedingly well, with the responsibilities and problems it has with its mixed races, such as the Israelis and the Arabs.

I visited the areas of community welfare and studied youth problems, and there, again, I saw some of the astronomical problems that existed. Having studied solar energy in Israel, I believe that the Israelis are far in advance of any other country in the world in that field. They have achieved a break-through in the way in which they store solar energy. I stress that they believe, as a people, that it is their responsibility to work hard for their country. They are proud of their country, and are proud to wear its flag.

I visited two countries behind the Iron Curtain, namely, Rumania and Poland. Rumania has a dual system of farming on small farms. The farmers were once encouraged to work and produce for the Government. Now, the authorities have devised another system whereby the farmers are allowed to grow their own produce and sell it on the open market.

The Government has found that that system is working far better than the other system. It has suddenly been realised that, when people are given incentives and when people take the initiative for profit (and what a horrible word that is), people work harder. The Rumanian Government is now encouraging people to produce and sell on the market instead of their being employed by the

Government. When I was in Warsaw, I admired the way in which the Poles have rebuilt that city after the devastation caused by the Nazis during the Second World War. The city has been built as it was before. The churches have also been rebuilt. That is good news to me, as I hope it is to other members; in Poland more than 86 per cent of people regularly attend church and there is a definite flow back of young people into the church.

I visited another country which believes in hard work and which has a great national pride—Germany. The German people are very proud of their country and are not afraid to say so to anyone. I also visited Canada, which, I believe, is similar to Australia. It is a vast country, and a lot of people live around the edge of the country. Canada is multi-racial and has a problem with its Indians, as Australia has with some of our people. The people are very gracious and friendly, as I am proud to say Australians are. I was amused when I was told that I had a glorious Australian accent. I was told that my Australian accent is “kinda cute”. In most countries throughout the world that are really advancing, people are proud.

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

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I return to the topic of Aussie Pools, about which I spoke last Thursday. The issue came to my attention after a constituent, who won \$500 in the competition, was refused payment on the basis that he put in multiple entries. After considering this further, I found that a lot of the shopkeepers who participated by distributing the coupons were very discontented and many who had dropped out or tried to drop out had been hit by bills from the company for the remainder of the season.

I then discovered that a legal loophole existed based on the fact that it is not the entrant in the competition that pays for the ticket but the shopkeeper who puts down \$89 deposit and pays \$19.50 a week to be a distributor of these free coupons. It is this legal loophole that allows them to operate, making up their own rules as they go along in a scheme which seems to involve very few prize winners, as I will show later. It seems that there is a need for the legislation to be altered so that the organisers, if they repeat their scheme in 1981, are obliged to be licensed and registered.

I stated last week that it had been suggested to me that one of the organisers, Mr. Ernest Van Reesema, is an associate of the well-known Tennyson Turner, currently languishing in Cadell. I have since been contacted by Mr. Tennyson Turner, who informed me that he is not currently in Cadell, is not involved in Aussie Pools and knows nothing about it. He insisted that he is not an associate of Van Reesema and said that he would not wish to be an associate of that gentleman.

Mr. O'Neill: That's a great character reference, isn't it?

Mr. TRAINER: I do not know about a character reference, but he has, it seems, as a lawyer, represented Van Reesema, but I suppose that that does not constitute his being an associate. Since I have no reason to doubt his word on this matter, I accept that he is not associated in any way with Aussie Pools and, although I did not actually say that he was, I retract any implication to that effect.

One would expect that a competition on this scale would be registered and licensed and that the participants would have no reason to have less than full confidence in the organisers. It may well be that the individuals concerned, such as Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Van Reesema, could quite satisfactorily operate such a scheme, even if stringent requirements were laid down by law, requirements such as do not exist at the moment; one would hope so.

The background of those two individuals is rather strange. I must admit that I know very little about Mr. Wheeler, other than that in 1975 he had a problem that arose in relation to the proceeds from a journalist's fishing book which led to some legal action. However, Mr. Van Reesema has had quite a few problems with the old Land Agents Board and the courts, particularly in relation to the firms Maelor Jones and Armorcoatings Limited, as I mentioned last week.

Mr. Hemmings: Is he tied up with the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. TRAINER: I do not know about the Minister of Agriculture. However, if one peruses the law court reports one finds a certain amount of information. For example, the South Australian State Reports include references to him in 1975 in Volume XI, and in 1977 in Volume XVII. The case in Volume XI, (page 322) relates to his losing an appeal for being debarred from taking part in the management of a company, which I believe was Maelor Jones, and on page 329 Justice Zelling has strong words to say about the use of documents to deliberately mislead people. On page 360 of Volume XVII, Justice Walters had some strong words to say about credibility. Incidentally, the address of the gentleman who continued as the other Maelor Jones Director when Van Reesema was unable to do so was listed on Thursday 31 July in a land agents advertisement as being 375 Greenhill Road, the same

premises as Pro-Win, the organiser of Aussie Pools, now gives as its address.

I now turn to the details of the actual competition. I have calculated the odds against someone winning, and they seem to be quite high. If my mathematics are correct, and it is quite a few years since I had much to do with that subject, if 10 teams have to be picked the odds against picking all 10 is factorial 10; in other words, $10 \times 9 \times 8 \times 7 \times 6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1$, which works out at odds of over 3 500 000 to one. In fact, it is 3 628 800 to one against someone placing the 10 teams in order of their scores and winning the jackpot. To even place five teams in order for the consolation prize would be factorial 10 divided by factorial 5, or odds of 30 240 to one. To get six teams in order the odds would be 151 200 to one. It is alleged that my constituent put in 150 coupons, but that is not unusual in the case of free competitions. Even with 150 coupons he would have still had odds of 1 008 to one against his picking six teams in order.

Only three consolation prizes of \$500 have been given away so far. However, substantial sums have been paid in by shopkeepers. To demonstrate that fact, I have prepared a statistical table, which I seek leave to have incorporated into *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that it is purely statistical?

Mr. TRAINER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

"AUSSIE POOLS" AGENCIES AND REVENUE (as at 1/8/80)

Prize Jackpot \$	Week No	Week of Operation	Round No	Advert. Date	For Matches On	Metro Agencies	Rural Agencies	Total Agencies	Increase In Agencies	Decrease In Agencies	Prizes Awarded \$
5 000	1	1	3	Tu 15/4	19/4	99?	—	99	—	—	—
6 000	2	2	4	Tu 22/4	25/4 & 26/4	108	—	108	9	—	—
7 000	3	3	5	M 28/4	3/5	114	—	114	6	—	—
7 500	4	4	6	M 5/5	10/5 & 11/5	117	13	130	16	—	—
8 000	5	5	7	W 14/5	17/5	90	17	107?	—	23	—
8 500	6	6	8	M 19/5	24/5	92	17	109	2	—	*500
9 000	7	7	9	M 26/5?	31/5	86	22	108	—	1	500
9 500	8	8	10	M 2/6	7/6 & 8/6	86	23	109	1	—	—
10 000	9	9	11	M 9/6	16/6	78	21	99	—	10	500
10 500	10	10	12	Tu 17/6	21/6	75	48	123	24	—	—
11 000	11	11	13	M 23/6	28/6	75	48	123	—	—	—
—	12	—	—	—	(VFA vs SA) (No pools games on July 5)	—	—	—	—	—	—
11 500	13	12	14	M 30/6	12/7 & 13/7	76	50	126	3	—	—
12 000	14	13	15	M 14/7	19/7	76	48	124	—	2	—
12 500	15	14	16	M 21/7	26/7	76	48	124	—	—	—
13 000	16	15	17	M 28/7	2/8	76	48	124	—	—	—

* shared by six people.

Deposits paid by the original 99 plus 61 who joined late = 160 @ \$89 = \$14 240.

Presumably, 99 have been in all 15 weeks = 1 485 instalments of \$19.50 = \$28 957.50.

Those who have pulled out**: 23 lasted 5 weeks = 115 instalments

1 lasted 7 weeks = 7 instalments

10 lasted 9 weeks = 90 instalments

2 lasted 14 weeks = 28 instalments

Total: 240 instalments = \$4 680

(** In actual fact most of these 36 would probably be liable for all 20 weeks of the competition = 720 instalments of \$19.50 = \$14 040)

Agencies who joined late: 9 have been in 14 weeks = 126 instalments

6 have been in 13 weeks = 78 instalments

16 have been in 12 weeks = 192 instalments

2 have been in 10 weeks = 20 instalments

1 have been in 8 weeks = 8 instalments

24 have been in 6 weeks = 144 instalments

3 have been in 4 weeks = 12 instalments

Total: 580 instalments = \$11 310

By the end of the 15th week of operation, before any payout is made for the round 18 football matches of 2 August, the revenue collected would be \$14 240 in deposits and \$44 947.50 in instalments, totalling \$59 187.50.

From this, only three \$500 consolation prizes (totalling \$1 500) for rounds 8, 9 and 11 have to be deducted i.e. 2.5 per cent of revenue collected.

Mr. TRAINER: That table lists the number of agents who have participated each week, the apparent number that have been added each week, the apparent number that have withdrawn, and the times when prizes have been awarded, and at the bottom I have indicated the amount of revenue collected and the basis on which I have estimated that amount. By the end of last week—the fifteenth week

of operation—I estimate that nearly \$60 000 had been collected, with only \$1 500 so far having been paid out in prizes. In other words, 2½ per cent of the revenue has been distributed in prize money.

The latest advertisement indicates that people are still trying to withdraw. There are 16 fewer metropolitan agents and 12 fewer rural agents than there were the

preceding week. Once again, the jackpot, which was then \$13 000, was not paid out and no \$500 consolation prize was awarded on the previous round.

By the way, those agents that have pulled out are likely to be hit with bills for the remainder of the season that they have contracted for. As an example, a letter from Aussie Pools to an agent, in part, reads:

It is disappointing to note that you have ceased to operate as an Aussie Pools agent. We understand that the main reason for your loss of interest is that the Aussie pools agency was not having the desired effect of substantially increasing traffic through your premises. Whilst that may be so, it is in our view too early to gauge this.

As a former teacher, I find that spelling of "gauge" rather painful. The letter continues:

Surely a new concept such as Aussie Pools ought to be given at least one season, and preferably, two seasons to become established and known to the public in general.

So presumably, they intend to operate in 1981. The letter concludes:

We look forward to your remittance within seven days. This particular small shopkeeper was then hit with a bill for \$331.50. With all contracts adhered to, there could be up to \$80 000 in the kitty by the end of the season. There is nothing to legally oblige the organising judges to pay out the possible \$15 000 jackpot that could exist in the last round. It has been suggested to me by one shopkeeper that, if there is no winner, the money in the pool should be returned to the shopkeepers. I doubt whether that will happen.

If the organisers did give it to the nearest winner, there would still be a sum of \$60 000 or more that would adequately cover advertising, which would be about \$12 000, and other administrative costs. That \$80 000 turnover is quite large for what is legally able to operate as a type of unlicensed, unregistered lottery able to make up its own rules as it goes along.

The matter of multiple entries first attracted my attention. It has in the past been customary for entrants in free competitions to put in multiple entries; in media coverage the winners often state this was done. By telephone, Mr. Van Reesema claimed to me that the prohibition was introduced on the coupons, and in their advertisements on 5 May and 14 May, and their advertisements do carry a notice to that effect on 5 May and 14 May. However, the prohibition was not mentioned in a *News* feature article on 14 May, nor in any subsequent advertisements, up until three weeks ago, by co-incidence, when Mr. Crawford claimed his prize, and was knocked back. Most of the coupons up until about last week did not have it printed on them, either. Mr. Van Reesema demanded that my constituent should produce the blue customer copy of all his 150 coupons, presumably to prove he did not have the prohibition printed on them. I am curious as to when the design was changed, and at what serial number. Aussie Pools must know, so why does it demand that Crawford produce all his blue sections (the customer copies), since the duplicates kept by the agency and by Aussie Pools have serial numbers on them which would indicate whether Crawford's coupons had carried the stipulation against multiple entries.

Aussie Pools, it seems, is operating legally and the shopkeepers are apparently bound by their contracts. Some of them have suggested that they pool their resources to seek legal representation. My constituent might also have legal representation by now—perhaps he will get some prize money, perhaps not.

The whole operation is within the existing law, and perhaps the scheme's problems are because it is just a bit amateurish and the organisers are men of goodwill making

up rules as they go along so that they can do justice by their participants; or perhaps not.

I feel that justice in this area needs to be seen to be done, and would ask the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate this matter fully. It could well be that the law in this field needs to be tightened to bring this lucrative—

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

Mr. SCHMIDT (Mawson): I refer to the matter of education, particularly the TEASA Report and its effects on the Sturt College of Advanced Education and its effects on the people in the south. Before doing so, I refer to the latest *Teachers Journal* in which we can see yet another example of how the A.L.P. wishes to repeat its performance of the past, namely, the wasting of money by undertaking a duplicate inquiry. Members will recall that on 24 July the Minister of Education issued a press release, which states:

The Education Department has already mounted a very comprehensive inquiry into the operating costs of schools. It was also stated in the *Advertiser*:

According to the Minister's press release, Dr. Hopgood and his A.L.P. committee had attempted to gain political mileage by duplicating an already existing inquiry that has been undertaken by the Education Department. Naturally enough, that is what they would do. It is also interesting to read at the end of the article, which is the most apt place to put it, the following:

We enter this exercise with a bias towards public funding of education.

That indicates the platform from which they are operating. On reading through the article it is interesting to note that the member who is supposed to be the spokesman, the member for Baudin, is trying very hard to justify some of the actions in the past. I refer here to some of the things he has said.

The member for Baudin said (and I was glad to see this comment because I made the same comment yesterday in my Address in Reply speech):

Very few Principals have any background in accountancy and only the larger schools have bursars.

I made the point yesterday that we have people in the education system who are apparently judging others on their managerial and accounting skills when they have little in the way of those skills themselves. Over the past decade the whole system has been short of that type of expertise, yet suddenly it is being used as a weapon against the whole education system, when it is something the Labor Party has done nothing about in the past. The article continues:

It is, however, also reasonable to note that largely we put our money into other areas.

The honourable member was making the excuse there that he, whilst in office, was allocating moneys to other areas and was therefore unable to give full attention to the free book list scheme to which this article mainly addresses itself. What he is saying, in effect, is that now parents are having fund raising at schools it is all the fault of the present Government. If he was a reasonable person he would agree that, since schools have been in existence in this State, they have had fund raising exercises in order to purchase equipment or to extend resources to the community or its children. Then comes the honourable member's prime statement, when he is reported as follows:

One cannot do all one would like to do in a short space of time.

He is trying to justify his past errors by saying that his

Government only had 10 years to do these things, and he is sorry it did not do them. But he then says it should have been done in the one year this Government has been in office. For a man of his rationale and objectivity, I should have thought the honourable member would be a bit more objective than that.

The honourable member did make one comment I give him credit for: that the former Government endeavoured in the 1979 Budget to increase the amount of money available for equipment grants. He is reported as saying that the Liberal Government has restored the equipment grant by some 90 per cent. The previous Government in the past slashed that grant to such an extent that schools found it difficult to get the equipment they required. That is why I referred to this article, because it leads to the reason I feel Sturt College of Advanced Education should remain operative.

Over past years, while Sturt has been in operation, it has provided a service to schools in the south. That service was something not considered by the TEASA committee when it prepared its report. Sturt has provided a resource centre for schools to which they can go to get various audio-visual or other teaching aids. School representatives can go there to get expert advice on various matters. Sturt has also provided a high calibre student to the schools in the south. This service provided to the community is one the community has learnt to respect and wishes to uphold.

Furthermore, it provides a service to all those teachers (and I believe there are more than 400 of them) who are doing after-hours study in order to upgrade their standard. They work in the southern areas and go to Sturt to upgrade their qualification so that they might enhance their opportunities for future promotion. That is something that the TEASA Report took little note of when it conducted its study. Furthermore, it took no notice of the costing of the whole exercise to which it refers. In that respect, its terms of reference were grossly inadequate.

The other thing TEASA has much to answer for at the moment that it did not consider when it brought down this report is the effect that that report is having on the community. Sturt college in the past couple of weeks has had its open day, a day that in the past has attracted up to 600 students who have inspected the premises to ascertain whether they would go to that college or to some other college of advanced education. This year only 200 students passed through the college on that day to see what courses they might want to pursue. This is largely attributed to the fact that many schools and other institutions are saying that Sturt will close and that it is no use enrolling there. This is causing students to go somewhere else.

To that end the report again was shortsighted in its effect on the community, and those sorts of measures

should have been looked at before the report was brought down. It has been heartening to hear that most of the directors of all the C.A.E.'s have got together to examine the situation and have now made a fairly comprehensive submission to the TEASA authority, as have many other people in the south, suggesting why Sturt should remain open and how the whole teacher situation can be rationalised.

I now refer briefly to a couple of schools in my area and indicate the sort of concern that has been expressed about the intended closure of Sturt College. Braeview Primary School is disturbed that Sturt may close, and it states:

The people concerned in making such a decision should take more evidence into account than the recommendation of TEASA. Surely the people concerned at grass roots level must have some claim to consultation.

That is exactly what TEASA was trying to achieve with its report: it was seeking the grass roots reaction, and it obtained that in no uncertain terms. One of the better aspects pointed out in the letter from Braeview Primary School is as follows:

The quality of teacher education at Sturt has been recognised by many principals during the recent decade. The breadth of courses offered, the close monitoring of practical teaching programmes and the engendering of an ability to critically think about educational programmes when at last taking to "the field" are all recognisable features of Sturt graduates.

Sturt must be commended on its field programme, because student teachers can go out and have a good back-up system from the lecturers and the whole Sturt system. Teachers from Sturt seem to be closer to the scene when they graduate than are graduates from some of the other C.A.E.'s.

I refer back to the fact that I find the A.L.P.'s comment in the *Teachers Journal* rather ludicrous, as they are trying to justify some of the actions on the basis that they were not able to do that in the short term. On that basis, it is because of the shortfalls of the previous Administration providing some of those facilities. The member says that we should look at what should be a basic amount of commodity that we provide in the school. Because those basic commodities were not provided to the schools, that is why the schools in the south depended so heavily on the resources of Sturt C.A.E. To that end I would vow and declare that we should stay behind Sturt and give it all the support it requires.

Motion carried.

At 5.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 12 August at 2 p.m.