

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 August 1980

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1981.

PETITION: WEEKEND BAKING

A petition signed by 298 residents of South Australia praying that the House pass legislation to allow the baking of fresh bread on weekends in the metropolitan area was presented by Mr. Crafter.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 9, 14, 23, 24, 37, 42, 45, 51, 54, 57, 62, 63, 67, 70, 82, 98, 100, 102-104, 155, 156, 160, 167, 181, 201, 205-209, 217.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC SERVANTS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Last week the Government tabled in both Houses of Parliament a set of guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees. The preparation of these guidelines was based upon the Government's awareness of several pertinent matters.

First, it is traditional that public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees are asked questions of fact and are not expected to express political opinions or to deal with political criticisms. This professionally apolitical approach is one of the major strengths of our Public Service system and must, at the risk of compromising the Westminster form of government, be maintained at all times.

Secondly, it is the Government's policy to strengthen the Parliamentary committee structure and to open committees where appropriate. The Government recognises, however, that open committees present a real danger that public servants may be drawn into political controversy, in conflict with their professional status. Thirdly, the Government acknowledges Parliament's ultimate authority to determine its own procedures.

The object in drafting the guidelines has therefore been to balance the rights of Parliament with the Government's desire for an extension of open committees and with the absolute need to maintain the political neutrality of the Public Service. For these reasons the document tabled last week is nothing more than its title suggests; namely, a set of guidelines. It does not purport to usurp the powers of the Parliament or of the committees of the Parliament.

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

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: Mr. Speaker, the Premier seems to be anticipating business on the Notice Paper. I have a notice of motion on this very matter for 27 August. As I understand it, not even a Minister is entitled to anticipate business on the Notice Paper—

Mr. **Hemmings**: Let alone the Premier.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: —let alone the Premier, as the member for Napier says. I therefore suggest that what the Premier is now saying would be more appropriately said when we come to the debate on 27 August; that is, unless he is going to withdraw those guidelines altogether.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is going far beyond the point of order he first raised. I do not uphold the point of order. It is a tradition of this House that a Minister, by leave, may make a Ministerial statement relative to a matter that is important to this Parliament. The honourable Premier has sought that leave and is providing a statement. He has not pre-empted the honourable member from proceeding with his motion in due course. The honourable Premier.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The document does not, and cannot, restrict members in the nature and range of questions they may properly ask of public servants. As the introduction to the guidelines indicates, they aim to facilitate Parliamentary scrutiny and investigation while preserving the traditional principle of the political impartiality of the public servant and the need to maintain the necessary confidences of Government.

With this sole object in mind, the Government entered into extensive discussions with the Public Service Board, which in turn consulted members of the Public Service Association. The intention of all parties has been to safeguard the political impartiality of the Public Service without compromising the Government's commitment to strengthen the Parliamentary committee system, or the right of the Parliament to control that system.

Since the guidelines were tabled last week, it has been asserted that they are both obnoxious and unjustifiable. The **Hon. Mr. Sumner** said, in another place;

There is no evidence to suggest that the protection of public servants has been necessary in the past under previous Governments.

May I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to remind the **Hon. Mr. Sumner**, and all other members, of the regrettable incident two years ago during the Public Accounts Committee's investigation into the Hospitals Department. If the guidelines now proposed had been in operation at that time, then a senior public servant may have been spared the indignity of being criticised by the committee after having been led to comment on matters beyond his knowledge and level of responsibility. Indeed, the member for Elizabeth, who was then Minister of Health, was moved to write to the committee, protesting the embarrassment caused to the public servant concerned, and recommending the committee apologise for its unwarranted criticisms.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, the deplorable accusations which the member for Playford levelled at the members and officers of the Public Service Board only served to reinforce the need for public servants to be protected. For the member in question to characterise these people as "K.G.B. agents and fascists" was a reprehensible illustration of the lengths to which some members will go under Parliamentary privilege.

I cite these instances, which have caused much concern to the Public Service Board and its officers, to emphasise that public servants clearly need some form of protection whilst discharging their duties in what may become a

charged political atmosphere. The form of protection proposed in the guidelines is that public servants giving evidence before committees shall be accompanied by an officer of the Public Service Board who is well versed in Parliamentary procedures and who is able to advise upon matters that should be reserved for a Minister's personal attention.

This proposal has been criticised, again by the Hon. Mr. Sumner, for the stated reasons that the attendance of an adviser reflects upon the competence of public servants, and because committee proceedings will be inordinately delayed. With regard to the first claim, let me make it clear that the Government has every confidence in the competency of the Public Service and dismisses any allegation to the contrary as nonsense. However, the Government believes that public servants, no less than other citizens, are entitled to advice in circumstances which might conceivably compromise their professional positions. The Government maintains the view that advisers should be admitted whenever such requests are made by the officers who are called to appear.

The guidelines are intended to provide a codification of procedures so that all parties are aware of their respective responsibilities. The Government will be pleased to have balanced and reasonable responses to the proposals, and these will be given every consideration.

As to the suggestion that the presence of advisers may delay committee hearings, it should not be necessary for me to say that the Chairman and members of committees have complete control over the granting of adjournments. A committee may proceed with other issues while the appropriate person or information is fetched.

This Government has consistently supported the strengthening of Parliament and the provision to Parliament of that information to which it is properly entitled. Nothing in the guidelines is intended to conflict with that policy, or to inhibit the legitimate inquiries of Parliamentary committees. On the contrary, the guidelines assert the right of public servants to protection, without derogating from the rights of the Parliament.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ABORIGINAL LANDS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In response to a series of questions asked of me in the House last Thursday, I now wish to report further. Members will recall that the member for Eyre sought information regarding the allocation of Aboriginal Lands Trust lands, in which the Yalata people are directly interested, in the Maralinga area.

My reply referred to lands that might ultimately be allotted to the Yalata people. Let me make it clear that there is no doubt at all that land in the Maralinga area will be allocated to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. A matter that has not yet been resolved is the precise area involved. The member for Stuart asked me to investigate claims by the Yalata Aborigines that the Superintendent of Yalata, Mr. Barrie Lindner, attempted to prevent delegates from attending land rights meetings earlier this year at Victoria Park Racecourse by phoning the bus company's headquarters, in Perth, and telling the proprietor not to pick up the Aborigines concerned.

Understandably so, Mr. Lindner has taken strong exception to the allegations. I am advised that the Yalata men did not choose delegates to go to the meeting, as the owners of the traditional lands had determined long before

to allow residents of the Pitjantjatjara lands in the North to negotiate with the Government regarding those lands. Mr. Lindner was in Adelaide from 6 February 1980 to 14 February 1980, and states that he did not contact the bus company as alleged by the member for Stuart.

However, on 11 February 1980, he was telephoned by his deputy, who advised him that a demand had been made for money for fares and clothing to allow a small group of Yalata residents to attend the Adelaide meeting. The group insisted on going to Adelaide, despite the fact that the matter had not been discussed with the old men.

Mr. Lindner phoned the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, in Adelaide, to discuss the matter of fares, and then phoned the Land Rights Support Group, in Adelaide, seeking funds for the Yalata party to travel to the meeting. He was told that the fares were to be provided by the people attending. Mr. Lindner subsequently learned that four seats had been booked on the Greyhound bus by an unknown person and that five men went to Adelaide on the bus, one of them stating that he had been talked into it at the last minute. The Yalata school headmaster had directed the exercise, organised the purchase of clothing, attended to fare payments, and saw the party off. The five had been provided with Pitjantjatjara T-shirts before boarding the bus. Mr. Lindner was subsequently advised that the money for the trip had been provided by Action for World Development. I am satisfied that Mr. Lindner has acted at all times in the best interests of the Yalata community and that the allegations against him are quite unjustified.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (The Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Industrial Affairs and Employment, Department of—Report, 1979.

By the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Dried Fruits Act, 1934-1972—Regulations—Moisture Content.
- ii. Vertebrate Pests Control Authority—Report, 1978-79.

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. District Council of Mannum—By-law No. 15—Caravans.

By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1980—Regulations—Surface Films.

QUESTION TIME

STATE TAXES

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier make a clear statement to the House regarding the imposition of some form of sales tax and whether his Government is actively considering such a tax? In January this year, I wrote to the Prime Minister, calling for a national conference to look at the problems caused by the imposition of pay-roll tax and its possible replacement. The Prime Minister rejected such

a discussion. At that time, the Premier did not see fit to join me in the call; in fact, the Acting Premier suggested that there was absolutely no point in my suggestion. However, in the context of that debate, a report appeared in a newspaper suggesting that the Government was actively considering the imposition of some form of sales tax. The response of the then Acting Premier was that this was "just a figment of the imagination of the Leader of the Opposition". In April, the matter was again raised publicly in the press; the Premier scoffed (to use the newspaper's expression) at any idea that he planned to introduce a new sales tax. Yet, last Friday the Premier was quoted as saying, "It is possible the States could introduce a broadly based turnover tax or even a sales tax."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition will have to do better than that, I am afraid. I believe that this is about the fourth occasion that I can remember on which he has brought up this subject. I suppose I could say "Yes, I will make a statement; no, the Government is not either actively considering or pursuing the imposition of a sales tax in South Australia." I could, thereupon, sit down and leave the Leader to stew in his own juice. However, I believe that it is worth going further than that because if the Leader, apart from his attempts to make some political capital about the imposition of a turnover tax or, as he persists in calling it, a sales tax, were to leave the constant suggestions that this Government was actively considering a new tax, a tax to be imposed over and above all other taxes, he would get on a lot better.

We are not actively considering such a move at this stage, but we are and have been for a considerable time (long before the Leader of the Opposition became the Leader) considering an alternative to pay-roll tax. That tax is iniquitous. As I have frequently said (and I believe that all members would agree with me), it is a tax on employment, something that is totally inappropriate in these times. We have had discussions with various Treasurers and Premiers of other States because the tax is State imposed. We would unanimously like to find an alternative to the tax, and that alternative (and I emphasise the word "alternative") could well be some form of broadly based consumer or turnover tax.

I am not prepared to go any further than that because the State Treasury has not done any particular work on that subject in that context. Treasury officers from all States are united in their efforts between now and 12 September, when all Premiers will meet in Adelaide to consider the matter further, to produce a report that may suggest what that alternative tax may be. The Leader has spoilt his case in the past by attempting to suggest that the people of South Australia will be slugged (and I believe that he used that term before) with an additional sales tax over and above pay-roll tax.

I would like to assure the Leader at this stage that any move to introduce a turnover tax that may arise from the meeting of Premiers in Adelaide on 12 September will be designed to replace one form of taxation—a tax that we all agree is inappropriate—with another. I do not suppose I need go any further by saying that it is impossible to abolish pay-roll tax, which as the Leader knows is our major source of State tax income, without finding an alternative source of revenue. It is really a question of finding what alternative is the most appropriate.

BELAIR GOLF COURSE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment outline what plans he has regarding the management and control

of the golf course that has been established in the Belair Recreation Park? For some years I have communicated with the Minister's predecessor and I have also written to the Minister about the park. I have pointed out that 350 people belong to a club that plays on the course, in addition to the many members of the community who use it for their form of recreation. Also, I have been informed that the grass that has been used to turf the course is of a type that takes large quantities of water to keep it in good condition during the summer months, and that it is an inappropriate type of grass for that area.

I have had complaints from members of the community nearby who have a decreased water pressure when the Belair park is using water to irrigate the fairways and putting greens. I have communicated to both Ministers the problem of car parking near the present pro shop established near the course. I have also asked whether consideration can be given to golf club members establishing their own club. Because of a recent newspaper article, I am concerned about the future of the course.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I presume the member for Fisher is referring to a media release yesterday. I know of the interest he has shown in the Belair park, and in particular, the golf course, and I am very pleased to be able to inform him that the future of the Belair golf course is not under a cloud; it is not in the balance. The finance for the course has not been stopped; the proposed watering scheme has not been shelved; and the suggestion that a proposal to revert the golf course to public parks has been overridden is not true.

I want to bring to the notice of the House the real facts in regard to this golf course. When I became Minister one of the first things that I did was to look at the areas under my responsibility to see whether any of those areas could be better managed by the private sector or by a local government authority. I made a request to the Department for the Environment to follow up this matter, and in reply the National Parks and Wildlife Service was able to come forward with various activities, including the Belair golf course, which the service considered could conceivably be undertaken by either the private sector or local government. It was felt that this was the case because most golf courses, as members would appreciate, operate according to normal business practices.

I agree that the Belair golf course should be considered for transfer from Government management, but I make quite clear that investigations have only just started on the ways and means of transferring the management of this area to an area other than Government, that is, either to private enterprise or to local government. I want to stress that internal funding for at least six months has been made available to the golf course pending its successful transfer from Government management. Obviously, if this transfer cannot be effected in that time, funding will have to be provided to continue the present standard of management.

In reviewing the alternatives for the transfer, it must be stressed that any move to close the operation of the golf course could not be considered, because of the capitalised cost, the amount of money that has already gone into the course, and also because it would mean the loss of a sporting asset which will become more popular and of greater value to the community as the population of the area increases. I repeat that the future of the Belair golf course is not in the balance. The Government is looking at possible alternatives regarding the management of that area. The two areas at which the Government is looking involve possible leasing to private enterprise or to a local government authority.

COOPER BASIN

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Has the Deputy Premier obtained a report on recent and proposed changes in the ownership of the Cooper Basin, and will he inform the House of the potential impact of these changes on this important South Australian resource? Last Wednesday, the Deputy Premier was asked whether interests associated with Mr. Alan Bond could control Cooper Basin liquids production. The Deputy Premier clearly was not briefed on this matter and tried to ignore the question by claiming that it was a stupid one. The very next day, a report in the Australian *Financial Review*, under the headline, "Delhi sells out of South Australian gas", stated:

Cooper Basin assets will be a strong attraction for interests associated with Alan Bond and the News Limited-TNT controlled Ansett group, which have been seeking control of the gas and liquids fields.

The *Financial Review* added that Delhi's proposed sale offers the Bond interests the opportunity to boost their holding in the Cooper Basin to 63 per cent.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Leader persists with the question which he asked last week. The question has not changed, nor has the answer. I told the honourable member last week that the State Manager of Delhi had telephoned me to tell me that his company had engaged a consultant to advise it on its interest in the Cooper Basin and the possible disposal of that interest. This was in a very preliminary stage, he did not expect anything to happen for some time, and there was nothing further to report. I saw the headline in the *Financial Review*, which seemed to overstate the situation. No firm decision has been made by Delhi. I think I indicated to the Deputy Leader that we would appraise the position when a firm proposal was mooted. It is impossible, as I said, to have a crystal ball of the intensity necessary to look into the future when that future is quite unknown. For that reason, I classed the question as stupid, and I still do.

IMMUNISATION

Mr. OSWALD: Can the Minister of Health say whether a serious polio or diphtheria threat exists amongst school children in South Australia? The *Advertiser*, on Saturday last, reported, on page 3, that a major study of immunisation amongst Sydney school children had found that more than half were not fully protected against polio, and up to 24 per cent had no protection against diphtheria. The report states:

The researchers, who made the study for the Children's Medical Research Foundation, say the Sydney findings are likely to apply to all States. The research team, which was based at the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children, has called for a "mopping-up" programme of immunisation as an urgent health measure.

The head of the research team, Dr. Margaret Burgess, said that, under present immigration laws, symptomless carriers of the diseases could enter Australia without being detected.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I, too, saw that newspaper report and immediately asked for a report from the Health Commission as to the situation in South Australia. I am assured that 80 per cent of South Australian children have been immunised against poliomyelitis and that about one-third of the South Australian community has been immunised. However, that immunisation does not indicate the extent of immunity in the entire community because further

immunity is gained from contact with the disease from contact with those who have been immunised, and from the large-scale Salk vaccine programme which operated in the mid 1950's and 1960's under which probably most members of this House would have received immunity.

The situation to which the honourable member referred in Sydney is certainly a serious one. The fact that about 20 per cent of children in South Australia have not been immunised, according to the I.M.V.S. survey conducted in 1978 that indicated that 80 per cent were immune, shows that we need to be extremely diligent. I would say that the higher rate in South Australia is due to the extremely good co-operation between general practitioners, local boards of health, and child organisations, such as kindergartens which periodically organise immunisation drives, and to the efforts of the Mothers and Babies' Association in conjunction with the South Australian Health Commission. Nevertheless, it should be emphasised in relation to poliomyelitis and diphtheria, where again the rate of immunisation amongst children is about 80 per cent but where there is a lapse in the booster injections, that constant vigilance is required. I have asked the Commission to report to me on ways and means by which campaigns can be stepped up for all infectious diseases, particularly poliomyelitis, diphtheria, measles and rubella, and also a greater programme undertaken with regard to awareness in the community of the need for tetanus injections.

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. TRAINER: Can the Premier explain to the House how he managed to suggest that the Public Service Association was among those consulted while the Government was drawing up its notorious guidelines for the conduct of public servants called before Parliamentary committees, when the association has explained that the document it saw bore no relation to that tabled in this House?

The Premier has said that the eight guidelines that have been tabled were devised for the protection of public servants. One of the guidelines, and possibly the most objectionable, refers to the necessity for any civil servant appearing before, say, the Public Accounts Committee, to have alongside him or her a friendly KGB agent—sorry, Sir, in view of the Premier's sensitivity, I should have said—to have alongside him an adviser from the Public Service Board. It would be interesting to discover whether this Kafka-like proposition was ever put to the Public Service Association and, if it was, what was its response to such a proposition with such a close similarity to protective custody.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is not a question of the sensitivity of the Premier in this matter when insulting and scurrilous remarks are made across the Chamber—it is a question of the sensitivity of those members of the Public Service that the honourable member is denigrating, criticising and abusing, using the privilege of this House. It is absolutely unthinkable that such a thing should have happened. I give the honourable member perhaps some benefit of the doubt; he has not been here very long. However, there is a rule in this House (and there has been as long as I have been here) that one does not attack in such a fashion members of the Public Service who are not able to use the same rights to answer an honourable member. Let us get this quite clear. I said in my statement today that the Government entered into extensive discussions with the Public Service Board which in turn

consulted members of the Public Service Association, and that is exactly what happened. For the honourable member to use this piffling excuse for a further attack on members of the Public Service is absolutely despicable.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Deputy Premier say at whose expense the loading facilities will be constructed (either the South Australian Government or Dow Chemical) should a petro-chemical works be constructed at Redcliff Point? Is it envisaged that provision will be made, in the design of such a facility, to handle grain, coal, mineral and/or stock exports?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The arrangement first entered into for the provision of infrastructure by my predecessor, and later confirmed by this Government, was that the Government would undertake to build those facilities with Loan funds for which approval has been sought. There has been some consideration of making that facility of such dimensions as would enable other products to be exported from Redcliff Point, although no firm decision has been taken on the nature of what those exports would be. There have been some preliminary discussions about using the jetty and wharf facilities for other exports. I think the honourable member would agree that that would be prudent planning on the part of any sensible Government. No firm decision has yet been taken about this matter.

BELAIR GOLF COURSE

Mr. SLATER: My question is supplementary to that asked by the member for Fisher. How does the Minister of Environment justify the proposed transfer from the Government of the public golf course at Belair Recreation Park, when this has been a well patronised community recreation asset, catering for about 43 000 playing members in the year ended 30 June? I would like to know why such a well patronised venture is to join the growing list of community assets being sold out by the Government to private enterprise.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am pleased to inform the House that this matter has been given much thought. The Government is not selling out the golf course at all.

Mr. Slater: You're giving it away.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: We are not giving it away, either. This Government believes this is a matter that does not necessarily have to be managed by the Government.

Mr. Slater: Why?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Because when this Government first came to office it made the point very clearly that it believed in a smaller Government and a more efficient Government. We still believe that, and always will believe it while we are in Government. That being the case, the Government does not believe that it should be involved in areas that can be just as well looked after (perhaps better look after) by people outside of government. It is not a matter of being able to justify anything. We want to give the club the opportunity of managing this golf course. It may be that the local government authority will be interested in managing the course. The Government will give these people the opportunity to take responsibility for this golf course because it believes there are people outside of government who are quite capable of accepting this responsibility.

SCHOOL MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Health explain why provision of school medical services which used to cover children in years 1, 4 and 7 is now maintained at years 1 and 8, respectively? Can consideration be given to primary schools having a school support nurse (as do high schools), particularly when enrolments are of 800 to 1 100 students?

This cut could create a deplorable situation and is seen as a retrograde step. It has been said to me that many learning problems can be associated with medical difficulties. Moreover, in large primary schools of 800 to 1 100 students some medical conditions can be transmitted from student to student because of poor hygiene, etc., contagious viruses and health problems can be passed on. These problems could possibly be solved by increased surveillance, particularly by having a school support nurse or at least one further medical check in year 4.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I appreciate the honourable member's concern, which has also been expressed to me by the principals and school councils of various schools. I have informed them that the change in the routine screening has been brought about by a Health Commission decision to allocate resources in a more effective fashion than had been possible in the past. I acknowledge that, in the past and at present, the resources for school health have not been and are not as generous as we would like them to be. Certainly, we inherited a situation where school health nurses were hard pressed indeed because they had to cover an extremely large number of students; in some cases, it has been an almost impossible load.

In order to ensure that those scarce resources are put to best effect and that trained personnel are concentrating their efforts on the children who most need care, there has been a reallocation of resources so that the screening now takes place at the levels of grade 1 and grade 8. There is also a system of referral whereby teachers, parents or doctors can refer students to the school health nurse so that problems can be identified and treated in a multi-disciplinary fashion within the school by those teachers and health nurses working together. We believe that the time saved by routine screening, as happened in the past, can be put to better use.

As for the question of what the honourable member describes as a deplorable situation, the reallocation of these resources will prove to be of benefit to the children. The school health nurses were provided under a School Commission's funding programme and were allocated to only 10 high schools in South Australia. Since then, the nursing services have been extended to the primary feeder schools of those high schools, but there is no possibility at present of providing a nurse for every school, which the honourable member has said is thought desirable.

It is the Government's policy to provide health screening in schools and far better preventive services for children. I have already announced that I have instructed the commission to allocate a greater proportion of its resources in the forthcoming Budget to this very purpose, and I hope that some of these strains and stresses experienced in the School Health Service will be relieved by the additional resources that will come under the programme of the child-family health services in which school, health, mothers and babies and child and adolescent family services will be amalgamated this year under the one programme.

PAYMENTS TO JOURNALISTS

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Agriculture, who last Thursday in the House denied that he had offered financial inducements to Adelaide journalists Ryan and McEwen to continue their investigations in an attempt to smear Don Dunstan, truthfully tell the House today what was the purpose and nature of his communications to the journalists in early February 1978 and what was the role of the member for Fisher in these communications?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Last week I was asked a question regarding the funds I offered or gave to some journalists to encourage the publication of a book, and I gave the answer then. I was also asked at that time whether I would name colleagues of my Party who were involved, and I answered that question. The answers I gave on that occasion were the truth. The two journalists named are Mr. McEwen and Mr. Ryan. I know Mr. McEwen from my association, during 1977, in what was then described as the hospitals issue.

It may be incidental to the question but, having been given the opportunity, I would like to say that I had certain admiration for that journalist at that time. He was one of the few in the profession who was able to embarrass the ex-Premier, Mr. Dunstan.

Mr. Whitten: Was it the pork chops that you gave him?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: You can refer to the pork chops issue if you like, but it became a sizzling public barbecue. Certainly, during that episode, that journalist demonstrated that he could embarrass the Premier of the day. I would not know Mr. Ryan, the other journalist mentioned, if I fell over him. I repeat that at no time have I ever been in association with those gentlemen—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's too wide.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It is not: it is true. Nor have I been involved in, or a party to, an offer of money for the purpose alleged, or for any other purpose.

STREET CLEANLINESS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Environment say what action his department is taking to approach the City Council to have the city streets cleaned? Walking back from the Public Accounts Committee office in the I.M.F.C. building this afternoon, I was disturbed to see the condition of the city streets, particularly the cigarette butts and matches that were in the gutters and, more importantly, the weeds. I believe that it is time that someone gave a little more consideration to keeping our city streets clean. Will the Minister say what is the KESAB programme for this financial year?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will investigate the matter. One could almost suggest that the member for Hanson had no question ready. I am very pleased at the cleanliness of this State. We do not have many problems in that regard. The honourable member's question provides me with an opportunity to congratulate KESAB for the way in which it accepts its responsibility to keep South Australia beautiful. As a voluntary organisation, KESAB is to be commended for the work it does. I do not often have the opportunity to walk down King William Street and to observe the weeds that are growing there (I am not sure where they are growing), but I am sure that the member for Hanson will agree that KESAB is doing a great deal to keep South Australia beautiful. I know that that organisation accepts its responsibility and will continue to do so.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. PLUNKETT: Will the Premier indicate how much of the \$2 000 000 allocated for youth employment pay-roll tax rebates in the 1979 Budget was actually spent?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will obtain detailed information for the honourable member. The result has been particularly pleasing to this stage, although it seems that further measures will be necessary. About 1 687 additional youth workers have been granted the benefit of pay-roll tax exemption until the end of May. I am afraid that I cannot give more detail as to the exact sum involved, but I shall be very pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member.

The pay-roll tax exemption scheme was designed purely and simply because pay-roll tax, as I said earlier in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, is a tax on employment. It is a tax which is passed on to the consumer in the costs of construction and manufacture. While it may appear that people in the community are not burdened with pay-roll tax, and that it is a tax on manufacturers only, that is not so. The tax is passed on to every consumer in the community and, obviously, I think it is in the interests of all of us to see that a different form of tax, if it is at all possible (a different source of income for State revenue), can be found. Nevertheless, I shall obtain for the honourable member the exact figure and let him have it forthwith.

COUGH ELIXIR

Mr. SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Health have investigated the effects of Tusselix Forte with a view to having that cough elixir listed for use by prescription only. It has been brought to my notice that many young people, notably the unemployed, are turning to this form of drug use to get their highs because they cannot afford to pay for either the pusher type drugs or other types of drugs. There is therefore a greater usage of elixirs which are based on anti-histamines and which are used as a substitute drug as a provider of high trips. Therefore, a problem is arising in the pharmacy world in relation to how to supply these elixirs. Only through the astuteness of pharmacists is the problem being kept at the present level. It would be worth while if we could do something to support pharmacists in their endeavour to prevent the use of this elixir for this purpose.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I appreciate the honourable member's question, and I, too, have had representations from the pharmacists, who, as the honourable member has said, have tried to use their good offices where they have deemed it appropriate to persuade people not to buy this preparation, or to use it strictly in accordance with the directions. Tusselix Forte is a cough elixir on schedule 2 of the poisons schedule, and it is available over the counter. It is one of a series of substances which contain anti-histamines in order to increase effectiveness and which have been subject to abuse by people who are wanting highs, as the honourable member has said.

The Health Commission is concerned about it and there is a proposal to introduce stricter legal controls. The matter will be referred to the National Health and Medical Research Council for advice, but I emphasise to the honourable member, and indeed to the House, that from time to time stricter legal controls are urged for various substances sold in pharmacies, the controls are brought in, the substance becomes more difficult to obtain, and

therefore people automatically move to the abuse of some other substance. Also, there can be a risk of break-ins when people are determined to get a substance, whether it is legally available or not.

To sum up, the answer to the abuse of drugs lies in better community education and in an awareness of the needs of young people which can and should be met in a human way rather than through resorting to chemicals and drugs. We need to tackle the problem on several fronts. As drugs such as Tusselix Forte become abused, legal controls will certainly be tightened. However, people should be aware that it is a vicious circle, and that we need to rely not strictly on the law but on a whole range of measures in the community in order to overcome this very serious problem.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Can the Deputy Premier explain how he can claim in this House that British Nuclear Fuels Limited had been well aware for years of the latest major radio-active leak in building B701 at Windscale, when senior executives of that same corporation, under oath, told the official court of inquiry that they had discovered the leak only in March 1979, and had it plugged in May when they informed the Government?

The Deputy Premier said last Wednesday that senior officials from Urenco-Centec, the consortium which is a third owned by British Nuclear Fuels, said they were aware of this leak, which had been occurring for years. The Deputy Premier said:

I talked to them about it, and they said that the incident had been occurring for a long time.

Later, the Deputy Premier said:

There is nothing new in what the Opposition is trying to stir up. This has been going on for years.

It has been put to me that, if the Deputy Premier is correct, British Nuclear Fuels Limited lied to the court of inquiry and to the British Government. I am told that a copy of the Deputy Premier's statement has been sent to the British Minister for Energy, the Opposition spokesman on energy (Mr. Benn), the convener of the court of inquiry, Urenco-Centec, and British Nuclear Fuels Limited, who no doubt will be much interested in the Deputy Premier's new evidence.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: What I said was quite correct. The Urenco-Centec people made a statement to me that this had been occurring for a long time, and indeed it had. What is the honourable member quibbling about? When they were approached to comment initially, in circumstances the details of which are not known to me, they thought that some new leak had occurred and that they were being asked to comment on it. In fact, they simply said to me that this leak had been occurring for a long time, as indeed it had. There is no untruth in that, and no conflict. The conflict and confusion appear to be in the mind of the honourable member.

URANIUM

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Deputy Premier seen the statement attributed to the Federal Leader of the Opposition, Mr. William Hayden, that no contracts had been signed during the past five years for the export of Australian uranium, and that the world market for uranium was collapsing? Also, can the Minister say whether these statements are correct?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I read the recent comments made by the Federal Leader of the Opposition

when he was visiting Port Pirie. I have long passed the stage where I am surprised by anything said by Opposition members, either here or federally, because they have built up a long tradition of dealing in less than the facts in relation to the whole uranium question. The Leader of the Opposition was merely following the path well trodden by members of the Opposition in this State in dealing in less than the facts. I do not know whether I am allowed to use the word "lies" in relation to someone who is not in this place.

The SPEAKER: That word is unparliamentary in this Parliament.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Sir; I thought that might be the case, even though I was referring to someone who is not in this place. Mr. Hayden was dealing with less than the truth. We have a long track record of Opposition members dealing in less than the truth in relation to uranium. Either he had been primed up by advisers to the Opposition in this place, true to form, or he had been misinformed by some other informant, or he was deliberately dealing in untruths.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Or he was right.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He was not right. Let me place the facts before the House, as I have sought to do on every occasion when the Opposition has dealt in less than the truth. Two major sales of uranium have occurred in the past 12 months. Contracts have been announced for the sale of uranium to South Korea and the United States. The sales to South Korea are by Peko and E.Z., the Ranger partners, and are reflected in industrial contracts for 2 500 tonnes of U₃O₈ over the period 1982 to 1991.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I suppose that's contracts.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, the bald fact was recited by Opposition Leader Hayden that no contract had been entered into by Australia in the past five years. Twelve months falls within the past five years. I would have thought that, by a very elementary mental process, it was abundantly clear to everyone in this House, including members opposite, that he was telling less than the truth. The contracts for the sale to the United States are by Peko and E.Z., and are subject to ratification by the Australian Government. The purchaser in the United States is American Electric Power Incorporated which owns the Indiana and Michigan Electric Company.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What is that—the *Women's Weekly*?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Leader's attempt at humour seems to have fallen particularly flat. I assume the comment was meant to be amusing. Opposition members complain about time being wasted in Question Time, yet they persist in making asinine interjections. These and future sales are subject to Australia's requirements regarding safeguards, as reflected in the bilateral safeguards agreements negotiated between Australia and customer countries under the auspices of the non-proliferation treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency. As I have pointed out to the House many times, the indications are clear that there will be an essential need for an increasing nuclear capacity until the turn of this century if we are to avoid a massive depression in the Western world. The communist world has long realised this, of course. A recent report which was entitled the *International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation* and which covered 56 countries the interest of which in the nuclear energy question varies considerably estimates that the demand for nuclear electricity will increase from 125 000 megawatts by installed capacity at present to between 850 000 and 1 200 000 megawatts by the turn of the century, and between 1 800 000 and 3 900 000

megawatts or more by the year 2025.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Where are you quoting from?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is also quoted—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I know I have no right to be asking questions across the floor, but I have asked two or three times what documents are being quoted and the Minister has refused to answer. Would I be in order in asking the Deputy Premier to table that document?

The SPEAKER: The position is quite clear: if the honourable Minister is quoting from an official document he can be required to table it, but if the honourable Minister is quoting from notes or personal papers he may not be required to table the document, unless of his own volition. I will ask the honourable Minister what is the paper he is quoting from, but I make the point to the honourable Deputy Leader that he is seeking by the ruse of taking a point of order to ask a further question.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am quoting from notes which I have had prepared in relation to the figures for electricity requirements until the year 2025. I do have an extract from a report which is readily available, I would have thought, to the Deputy Leader if he had sought it out. On the question of uranium sales, it is agreed that the market will not be buoyant until probably the end of this decade. Professor DeBruin wrote a letter to the paper about 10 days ago quoting the Atomic Energy Agency Report, but I have had a look at the graph relating to the matter, and it is considered that there will be a big upsurge in the demand for enriched uranium in the late 1980's or early 1990's.

Unfortunately, we have again from the Federal Leader of the Opposition another in a series of events which I believe are deliberately designed to mislead the public. We had the two doctored reports that came from the Opposition in an attempt to mislead the public, we had the scare tactics in relation to Radium Hill becoming an international dump, we had the scurrilous attempts by the member for Elizabeth to frighten the people of metropolitan Adelaide by falsely claiming that radioactive cores from Maralinga were being dumped in parts of the State, and we had the announcement in, I think, every electorate in the metropolitan area that a uranium enrichment plant would be built, an announcement made, I believe, by a spokesman from the Labor Party. They were all part of scare tactics designed to frighten and mislead the people of this State. Fortunately, we know perfectly well that there are saner elements in the Labor Party. We know that one of the prominent members of the Federal Labor Party who is getting close to Mr. Hayden in more ways than one, namely, Mr. Hawke, is a strong supporter of getting on with the business of mining and exporting uranium. At least he had had his eyes open when he has been overseas. He knows that we live in a real world, not in a dream world, and that we do have a responsibility to countries overseas that have no other option for increasing electricity generation than nuclear power. Mr. Hawke has said the following:

Reality demands that we come to terms with the fact that mining has occurred and will continue at Ranger, Mary Kathleen and Nabarlek. Do you think that we will do the union movement a service by creating a national monument to the futility of a moral decision which you can do bugger-all about?

I do not use that sort of language, as honourable members will know, but the point is well taken. Earlier, at Monash University, Mr. Hawke made it abundantly clear that the argument that is mounted by some of his confreres (I suppose "comrades" is the word in relation to the Labor

Party) that we should not mine uranium could equally be applied to the mining of steel, which is turned into guns. He quoted that in his address to Monash University.

Former Premier Dunstan is on record in relation to uranium enrichment which was described last week by the new member for Norwood, his successor of whom he would not be proud, as being a hazardous industry. I used to hang on the former Premier's every word, but I do not remember them all so members opposite will forgive me if I quote. The State owes him a great debt for setting up the Uranium Enrichment Committee in 1974. It is one of the few of his acts which will bear fruit. Mr. Dunstan said:

The gas centrifuge system of proving has a great many advantages for Australia, and involves far fewer questions of danger—

Mr. Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If you listened, friend—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

An honourable member: He is not a friend; he is a member of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If I was on that side of the House, he would be a comrade, but we do not use those terms. If the honourable member listens, he will learn. I wish he would try to learn. Mr. Dunstan said:

The gas centrifuge system of proving has a great many advantages for Australia, and involves far fewer questions of danger of pollution of any kind than does the gaseous diffusion process. If the gas centrifuge system is used, South Australia has few problems at all in relation to it. There are no problems with regard to thermal pollution, waste or water. What is more, it would be within the possibilities of the future development of power in South Australia that this system of uranium enrichment could be used here.

Very encouraging words, I thought. To conclude this answer, let me indicate that, because of his attitude, obviously Mr. Hawke, who is entering the Federal Labor ranks, has fallen into disfavour with the member for Elizabeth, the former Attorney-General, who waxed fairly eloquent in *Nation Review*, which I read with a great deal of interest when I was in Queensland recently. This article indicates the division of opinion which now obtains in the Labor Party. In the article written by the Hon. Peter Duncan about Mr. Hawke entering Federal politics there are many memorable comments, but let me settle for two. The Hon. Peter Duncan said:

Nowhere can I find any real evidence of a desire on Hawke's part to fundamentally change the substance [of society]. Nowhere can I find evidence of Hawke seeking meaningful change in the power of the Australian Government to deal with the almost insurmountable challenge confronting it—the power of the trans-nationals [which received a mention on the second last page].

The honourable member winds up the whole shooting match with this summation:

On the other hand, the writers of essays could well study Mr. Hawke's Boyer lectures to see the divergent path upon which this prospective leader would seek to take the Labor movement.

In view of the attitude on uranium, the enlightenment of Hawke and the abysmal darkness of members opposite, I really did not find that article hard to understand.

ABORIGINAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether Aboriginal members of the Yalata community who are currently involved in negotiations

with mining companies over exploration licences for areas north of Lake Dydy and Lake Norris have been entitled to proper legal representation in those negotiations and, if not, why not? Why has the Pitjantjatjara Council not been invited to participate in this matter, even though that council was promised it would be involved in all negotiations over lands in which it has some interest?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not sure whether the Yalata people have even been seeking legal representation. I think we will find that the Yalata people, along with the Aboriginal Lands Trust seem to be more trusting of negotiations that they have set in train with responsible companies interested in mineral investigations across the territories in which they have an interest. I have not heard that there has, in fact, been any dispute between the Yalata people and the Aboriginal Lands Trust. They have been negotiating for a considerable time without dispute. I think this latter point is the one which is creating more annoyance to the honourable member than the fact that those people have not been openly seeking legal representation.

Turning to the second part of the question, whether the Pitjantjatjara people have been invited to take part in these negotiations, I assume that the answer is "No". Here again, the earlier statement I made in the House referred to the fact that there are two distinct groups of people who claim kinship through being related through the Pitjantjatjara language. I point out that the Pitjantjatjara peoples are the people who speak the Pitjantjatjara language; there are a number of tribes. The northern-most areas are the ones which have affiliations not only with South Australia but also with the Northern Territory and Western Australia, and their affairs are currently being negotiated by solicitors based in Alice Springs and a Queen's Counsel in Melbourne. They have sought legal representation and are negotiating the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill.

The Aboriginal Lands Trust, which holds the rest of the land in South Australia under its care, has not sought similar legal representation. It does, in fact, have a separate Act, the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, which deals with matters of negotiation between companies and with the allocation of royalties. That Act, of course, was negotiated by the previous Government of South Australia and, as such, I assume is beyond reproach. The honourable member is, in fact, criticising his own Party's legislation. Whether the Yalata people will ultimately need legal representation remains to be seen. I have stated quite clearly that we will be negotiating with the Aboriginal Lands Trust for the allocation of lands to the south of the Pitjantjatjara area, commonly referred to as the "Maralinga lands". That will take place soon, so that two pieces of legislation can be introduced into Parliament during this present session.

CIGARETTE SMOKING

Mr. RANDALL: Has the Minister of Health seen the report in today's *Advertiser* claiming that cigarette manufacturers are reducing the tar and nicotine content in cigarettes? Does the Minister believe that this may be a positive indication of their awareness of the reasonably well established link between cigarette smoking and lung cancer?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have seen the report. Certainly, I believe it is an indication that tobacco companies are now acknowledging the well demonstrated and scientifically proven link between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. I think it is a pleasing straw in the wind.

At the conference of Ministers of Health in Sydney in May, I asked that the question of labelling of cigarette packets with the tar and nicotine content be referred to the Ministers' working party. I hope to receive recommendations advising that that is a desirable move.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of the general revenue the further sum of \$350 000 000 to the Public Service for the year ending 30 June 1981. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for a further \$350 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will note that the amount represents a considerable increase on the first Supply Bill for this year (\$220 000 000) and the second Supply Bill last year (\$270 000 000). The reason for this increase is that two innovations, designed to give Parliament the opportunity for a more meaningful discussion of the Budget Estimates, could result in the passage of the Appropriation Bill taking longer than has been customary.

In accordance with undertakings given prior to the State Election in September last year, the Government has initiated work to supplement the Budget documents with a presentation in programme form, and to establish Estimates Committees of the House to consider the Budget. The Government is in no doubt that, over a period of time, the operation of the Estimates Committees will interact with the gradual process of change in presentation to produce a more effective and efficient approach to consideration of the Budget. However, in this first year of new initiatives, the Government expects that there will be a certain amount of "feeling the way" and, for that reason, assent to the Appropriation Bill could possibly be received somewhat later than usual. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 174.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Since last Thursday afternoon, I have been contacted by a person who claims to be an organiser with the Musicians Union. He supported the statements and allegations I made about the Gloucester

Building Company and the proprietor of that company, who also own a motel in Port Lincoln. Apparently, these people are carrying on the practice of not paying the musicians who provide the entertainment at that motel. This scandalous practice must not be allowed to continue; yet, legally, little can be done except to go through the process of the law to make the proprietors of this company pay their bills. I only hope that somewhere along the line action will be taken by the Minister responsible to ensure that this company is not allowed to continue to trade in the way in which it is trading.

Last Thursday afternoon, I also said that I did not countenance tax-dodging schemes. I am pleased to note that the Federal Treasurer is now acting to ensure that certain tax-dodging schemes will be outlawed and that the retrospectivity provision will go back 18 months or more. I hope that the Federal Parliament will pass legislation to abolish such schemes. I fear that, when any legislation is prepared to prevent tax dodging, some people in the community will work harder to try to find other loopholes. I believe that, if tax-dodging schemes were eliminated, the average Australian taxpayer would pay considerably less income tax than he does now.

I will not go into details of the various schemes operating now but, as the founder of the Epilepsy Association, I point out that we were contacted two years ago to be a participant in one of these schemes. We were told that there was nothing to worry about and that large and reputable organisations had been the recipients of moneys in this way. We considered the credibility of our organisation, and I believe that most organisations and charities would not have any part of these schemes.

Certainly, other organisations depend on grants and assistance from the community, but they are not beholden to accept these schemes. I believe that we have only to look at some of our learned institutions; even some of their money has probably come to them by such means. I hope that those sources of income will be eliminated and that the proper taxes will be paid in future.

Those remarks bring me to consider the terminology of "charity". "Charity" has not been adequately defined over the years by Governments, whether State or Federal, nor have the rules and regulations concerning charities. These organisations should be made accountable to the public, the same as any other instrumentality, particularly Government departments. If that were done, the public would be entitled to know whence the income came for these charities and how the money was spent. I would like to see the strengthening of our own State laws in defining "charity". I believe that charities should be categorised as to whether they are educational, health or welfare. The term "charity" is often incorrectly used. I believe that most organisations that deal with the disabled, together with the voluntary organisations, should not be referred to purely as charities. Whilst they must approach the public for their moneys, and accept what moneys are available, their credibility is clouded by other organisations that are looking after certain self interests rather than helping people in general. Too much confusion exists between what is a charity and what is a voluntary organisation that looks after education, health and welfare of the disabled.

That remark brings me to mention an important event to be celebrated next year. The United Nations has declared 1981 to be the International Year of the Disabled. Our Government is involved in preparations for this event and, from what I can gather from various overseas organisations that I have contacted, we are far more advanced than is any other stable country of which I am aware. A few days ago, a newspaper called *Link* was launched by the Attorney-General, at the Silver City

Restaurant, Glenelg. The newspaper is for the handicapped, their parents, and the community at large. If the newspaper continues in the way it presented its initial issue, I believe that it will become a most successful vehicle of education for people in general within the community. *Link* has been made possible as a result of support from the Attorney-General's Committee on the International Year of the Disabled, and it has received considerable support from top Adelaide journalists, artists, photographers, etc.

It has also been supported and encouraged by the mothers of disabled children who attended the National Women's Advisory Committee conference in Brisbane earlier this year. When the mothers returned to Adelaide, they held several meetings and discussed the need for some form of communication for other people with handicaps within the community so that there could be general discussion and so that experiences they had had could be related to one another. It is a self-help method of communicating with and educating the public. This is a most valuable scheme that needs and deserves the support of the Government and the Parliament.

In total, 4 000 copies of *Link* were sold within the first few weeks, and I understand that another 1 000 are being printed. If demand continues, I believe that even more copies will have to be printed. *Link* will fill a gap that should have been filled many generations ago. Those unfortunates who are disabled need understanding and assistance, and to be shown the proper direction. It is up to the Parliament and the Government to ensure that this direction is given.

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

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I am sorry that only one Minister is occupying the front bench. In my contribution to the debate, I hope that I will not upset the member for Henley Beach, who complained that Opposition speakers last year went along the back bench and then along the middle bench and that one member showed some initiative and went along the front bench. I thought that I would show initiative this year and go along the front bench, just for starters.

In saying that, I point out that, as stated in the handsome little brochure that is distributed to visitors to Parliament House, the responsibility of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition is to expose as well as oppose, to test, to probe and to criticise the Government's policies. Therefore, I trust that the member for Henley Beach and his colleagues will be able to contain themselves while I carry out my duty—to comment on the performance of the Government over the past 10 or 11 months and to refer to what I consider to be valid areas of criticism.

It has been said that the first casualty in any war is truth, and that was most forcibly demonstrated in 1979, when the Liberal Party and the media declared war on the former Government. Only now are we beginning to learn of some of the nefarious activities of some who sit opposite. Both in State and Federal politics, the Liberals have shown that truth is expendable in the pursuit of their aims, namely, the maximisation of profit. My Leader has already demonstrated in considerable detail the Premier's propensity for, as he so kindly put it, "bending the facts". In other forums, more forceful terms may be used to describe the Premier: for example, "unmitigated liar". However, that term is unparliamentary, and I certainly have no intention of using it in this House.

It is quite obvious to South Australians now that the Premier is achieving a reputation for being a breaker of promises. He is not in the same league as the Prime

Minister, of course. The national Leader of the Liberal Party is known throughout the land as the greatest breaker of political promises this country has even seen. So disliked has he become that we note from the ever faithful press that the Premier is retiring behind the electronic media because "If the right radio and television appearances are made and handled shrewdly, you really are able to speak direct to your audience with the minimum of interference", and, as the press further says, the Fraser Government has taken the easy way out in its present Federal election campaign by staying away from the press and concentrating on radio and television.

I do not propose to catalogue the Premier's broken promises; that has been, and will be, done by other members during this debate. I have other points to make. Before doing so, let me say, in fairness to the Premier, that, although he has broken promises to taxpayers, to school-leavers, the unemployed, pensioners and the sick, he has kept promises to some groups and some individuals: those with large estates to pass on, those who wish to make large gifts of assets to their families, and property owners with large holdings. The Premier has kept faith with those people at a cost of Government jobs and Government services, charges for which have been increased to make up the shortfall in revenue. This is consistent with the Liberal policy of making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

The Premier has also kept his promise to the No. 1 press hatchet man who cast off the robe of ethics and did a political job on the former Government through his privileged position as a political journalist. History shows that, partly because of this, the *Adelaide News* was so compromised by the findings of the Australian Press Council that the company withdrew from the council—an interesting commentary on self regulation. However, the Premier kept his promise to Mr. Journalistic Integrity by making him the Premier's press secretary.

The Premier also clearly kept his promise to that concerned citizen, Mr. John Louie Rundle, for his part in the now totally discredited "Stop the job rot" campaign by making him (Mr. Rundle) Agent-General in London. Incidentally, one may say with considerable justification to the Premier "stop this rot about jobs", because he has certainly not kept his promise to the unemployed of South Australia. Nor has the Premier kept his promise to small business people in South Australia, in particular to Mr. Graham Black, who, honourable members may recall, was the founder of that notorious committee formed before the last election. Some time ago, Mr. Black was even heard to mutter threats against the Premier for the way in which the retail industry has suffered under the Liberals.

I refer now to the building industry and Mr. Mills, who lent his name to the untruthful campaign; he also remains unfulfilled, as the building industry sinks further into the mire of *laissez faire* economics, as interpreted by the Premier. However, the recent commitment of \$6 000 000 of taxpayer's money injected into welfare housing, most of which will end up in the pockets of the members of Mr. Mills' organisation, may, to some extent, stem the disillusionment of the master builders in regard to the present Government. However, I have said enough about promises kept and broken.

I must refer to another important development concerning the Premier—the cracks that are now developing in the facade of respectability that the South Australian Liberal Party strives so hard to maintain. The authors of that scurrilous document that tried to destroy a former Premier have now, it would appear, turned on their masters. We have learned from our worthy Premier that he took part in a clandestine meeting in a car on

Greenhill Road one night not to talk of defamation, nor scandal, nor conspiracy, but peanuts, the good Premier said.

Mr. Randall: Tell us what last Thursday's answer contained.

Mr. O'NEILL: The Premier said recently that he believed that this matter should not be raised again; it is past and should remain buried. I bet he does not want to raise the matter again, because it is becoming obvious that he and members of his Party know a lot more than they are saying. Perhaps the member for Henley Beach knows something about it; he has a lot to say. Allegations are now being put, with some foundation, that members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party might have been involved in a conspiracy to defame a prominent and honoured South Australian. For a Party that claims to uphold the precepts of law and order, moral values and family life, the Liberal Party is treating us to some interesting revelations that must undoubtedly come as a shock to some of the more politically naive backbenchers on the Government side who tend to believe the glowing agency copy about their glorious leaders. The member for Henley Beach is obviously a case in point.

However, I do not want to spend all of my time talking about the Premier, because he is not the only member whose credibility is rapidly waning. The Deputy Premier strode on to the stage of Government last year like a veritable colossus, the strong man of the Party, who would put some steel into the backbone of his nice guy Leader, metaphorically speaking, of course. I would not want honourable members to think I was suggesting that the Deputy Premier had intentions of knifing his Leader in the back, although that has been known to happen in the Liberal Party before today.

The Deputy Premier has also demonstrated a cavalier disregard for the truth, particularly in his handling of the uranium question. All of the talk of thousands of jobs is quite clearly compromised because of his recent reference to a multiplier effect of only four, when earlier we were treated to reports of multiplier effects of 20 or more. Honourable members will recall the Deputy Premier's infamous gaffe about agreement with the Pitjantjatjara people, Getty Oil and the Government, and his subsequent cowardly attempt to blame a public servant, which was, in fairness, too much even for his Cabinet friends.

Unfortunately for all public servants, this action by the Deputy Premier is probably largely the reason for the promotion by the Government of the Big Brother guidelines for public servants which were introduced during this session. The sad thing about what the Deputy Premier is doing, of course, is that thousands of people are now dependent on him and his colleagues, as the Government of this State, for their very livelihood, and they are being betrayed by him and his colleagues, not only by the handing over of the State's natural resources to private interests but also by committing taxpayers' money to uneconomical ventures such as uranium treatment plants to allow private entrepreneurs to profit from what would otherwise be very high risk areas of capital investment where they may lose money. By making the people of this State pay for the infra-structure, they are following in the footsteps of the National Country Party, and in earlier days it was said that that Party was very adept at capitalising its gains and socialising its losses. Recently, a commentator in the *National Times*, I think it was, said—

Mr. Keneally: There is no Minister in the House.

Mr. O'NEILL: Are you drawing my attention to the state of the House? I think you should draw that to the

Speaker's attention. They are probably ashamed to come in here, because of the revelations I am making. The great pie-in-the-sky uranium boom will benefit few, as I have already said during a speech earlier this year. The Beverley and Honeymoon deposits are the real reason for the indecent rush in the uranium field. Mr. Bjelke-Peterson and a few like him will make a quick killing, and no long-term benefits will accrue to South Australians generally. If we want an example of this, let us look at Nabarlek, where as I understand it all the ore body has now been removed, the hole has been filled in, and covered with concrete. The ore has been stockpiled and secured against the wind by being covered with a concrete and ferrous mixture, and a few caretakers are now employed to guard the stockpile. So much for the benefits and the jobs for Australians.

The Deputy Premier may well get his reward later from the real beneficiaries of his current actions, perhaps a job for the boy for doing what his master desires in selling out his State and his countrymen to the multi-nationals. The Deputy Premier is the member for Kavel. If I might be permitted to use a homonym thereof, may I say that the name of the member's district is appropriate, because cavil means to raise fallacious points, to be prone to taking exception to and trying to catch people in their words, which is a succinct description of the Parliamentary behaviour of this honourable gentleman. Incidentally, it is the way he behaved when he was discussing important matters with the Pitjantjatjara people.

Mr. Randall: Are you denigrating people in his electorate?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House, and to the fact that there has not been a Minister in this House for the last five minutes, which I believe—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has a perfect right to draw my attention to the state of the House, and I will count the House. The Chair has no authority to require that a Minister of the Government be in charge of the House, even though that is the traditional role that the Government normally plays. There being insufficient members for a quorum, ring the bells.

While the bells were ringing:

Mr. KENEALLY: In the 10 years I have been here, there has never been an instance when there has not been a Minister in the House.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Glenelg, who has interjected when out of his place and who has used an unparliamentary term, to withdraw that comment immediately.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the statement that the honourable member is telling a lie. He is just telling an untruth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to withdraw unconditionally.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. O'NEILL: I shall now make some observations about the performance of the great white hope of the Liberal Party, the man they may send to Canberra to improve the sad image of this State's Liberal representation in that forum. I refer to no less a person than the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has learned a little about his portfolio in recent times. Since his return from an overseas tour he has announced to the press some very important discoveries. First, he (and I shall quote) "believes the time has come for action to resolve the inconsistency between unemployment and the shortages of

skilled tradesmen". Bravo! However, the Minister should know that the answer to this dilemma has been known for many years by those who do the work in this society. It is only those of the Minister's ilk who have difficulty in understanding the problem, which basically is that employers are too lousy to pay a rate for the skill required sufficient to keep tradesmen and other skilled persons in industry.

The other brilliant observation, which presumably resulted from the old adage that travel broadens the mind, is the Minister's statement in the *Advertiser* of 27 July 1980, namely, that South Australia has a (and I shall quote) "unique industrial relations environment, this State having the fourth lowest incidence of industrial disputes in the world from 1971 until 1979". What apparently escapes the Minister is that he and his colleagues, since they came to Government last September, have done that unique industrial environment almost irreparable harm. Their industrial vandalism has set back the proud achievements of the former Government to the detriment of all workers in private and Government enterprises in this State to the extent that it will take years of Labor Administration to repair the damage. If one wants an example of the situation one has only to look at the way in which the Minister's equivocation and evasion in respect of Government cleaners has precipitated the latest industrial trouble, reported in the newspapers of yesterday and today.

Many of the measures introduced by the former Government were so basically commonsense that, despite all this Government's pre-election propaganda about industrial turmoil, compulsory unionism, and other things, it has been forced to retain them. Of course, one of those measures is the practice of encouraging Government employees to be members of an appropriate union. That is the policy of this Government, and I have documents from Ministers to prove it: the Government has not deviated one iota from the policy of the former Government. So much for all the rubbish about compulsory unionism. Members opposite know that we never had compulsory unionism in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: That is an obvious indication of the absolute and abysmal ignorance of members opposite. Despite the irresponsible rhetoric of election campaigns, both State and Federal, the Minister and members of his Party know (and the Minister at least is beginning to concede) that the policies of the former Government were in the forefront of world industrial relations.

What the Minister apparently overlooks is that the basic premise of the philosophy of his Party is anathema to free and democratic trade unions and to free and democratic society. The Minister of Education, another one who is not present in the House, evokes in me some sympathy, because I think he is quite a gentle person who tries hard to perform but obviously is not much of an achiever. It is well known amongst teachers that the eloquent rhetoric of the President of the S.A.I.T. rather than the performance of the then shadow Minister conned many teachers into voting for the Liberal Party at the last election. It is equally well known that the Minister is held in low esteem (I do not use the word "contempt") by teachers, parents and students as a result of the deceitful manner in which this Government has set about cutting the State education system to ribbons.

Mr. Randall: That's your biased interpretation.

Mr. O'NEILL: If the honourable member was on the front bench, I would deal with him, too, but he is only on the back bench, so I do not want to be bothered. The Minister can bleat all he likes—

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: —in statistical terms to justify the cuts. The people know that the Liberal Government is costing parents more and more for less and less education.

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: I thank you, Sir, for your protection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. O'NEILL: No, Sir. I was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the honourable member that in future he should not make such references to the Chair, or I shall deal with him, because I regard them as a reflection on the Chair. I point out to honourable members on my right that there are far too many interjections, and I ask that the honourable member for Florey be heard in silence.

Mr. O'NEILL: Thank you, Sir. It may have been my poor eyesight, but I thought that I noticed you glowering at members on the Government side, and I was most appreciative of your support. The people know that the Liberal Government is costing parents more and more for less and less education. The Minister's attempts at political and financial legerdemain fool nobody. However, one magical trick which would please many associated with education would be for him to do a disappearing act. Whilst his performance in education is bad enough, his performance in the field of Aboriginal affairs is even less impressive. However, it is fair to say that in this area he is more of a puppet than a Minister, a puppet whose strings are manipulated separately and conjointly from time to time by the Premier and the Deputy Premier. Between them, they have been able to bring total confusion to the portfolio of Aboriginal Affairs. Our Aboriginal citizens must be commended for the patience and decorum with which they have tolerated the clumsy and, in some cases, downright cruel manner in which this Government's Ministers have misled them.

I am sure that all fair-minded citizens of South Australia will understand and sympathise with the black people if they lose patience with these errand boys of the multinational companies. The poor Minister must at times regret his fateful excursion down the burrow and into the strange world of the Liberal Parliamentary Party, which might be truly termed, "Allison wonderland". Why, Sir, on the front bench we can see from time to time the Cheshire cat grinning and disappearing, grinning and disappearing, and the Mad Hatter leaping and shouting and glowing green in the half-light, and many others. It will be a relief to all South Australians when, after the next election, the State returns to the real world, and a Labor Government can get on with the job of repairing the damage that these fictional characters have done.

Now I turn to that venerable gentleman who is not in the House, Mr. Nice Guy, the Chief Secretary. Unlike King Midas, everything this Minister touches turns to disaster. The Minister was charged with the maintenance of law and order in this State. What a record! I know only too well, because, since this Minister took over escaped prisoners, with almost monotonous regularity, have been running all over my electorate.

Mr. Slater: They don't call at your office, do they?

Mr. O'NEILL: No, they do not. I have written to the Minister on numerous occasions and have been assured that he will control the situation. I am not the only one who is critical of this Minister. He has managed to upset the prison officers, the firemen, the fishermen, and the public, to name a few. It must be of some concern to the Government, given its oft ventilated concern for law and order, that this situation be rapidly improved, unless the Government is totally cynical about its policy. In fairness

to the Minister, whilst confidence might not be his strong point, he is loyal to the Premier, who has paid his debt, but at what a cost to the South Australian community.

A few other things have been drawn to my attention, not least of which is the problem in relation to the Fire Brigade. The Minister made a statement to this House; the firemen said that he was wrong; the Chief of the Fire Brigade said that he was right; and the Secretary of the Fire Fighters Association—not the officers—said that firemen's lives were at risk because, despite what happened at Centrepoint some years ago when a man died because he went into a fire without a lifeline, this Government allowed firemen to go into Gays Arcade without lifelines attached, putting their lives at risk. Perhaps members opposite would like to laugh about that. The problem we have is one of an incompetent Minister, and obviously mathematics is not his strong point (nor is it mine). There were questions about the number of firemen, about matters related to the fishing industry, and so on, but I think the classic case was last week in this House when he informed us that 17 prisoners had escaped from Yatala and 18 had been recaptured. Who is the poor unfortunate in Yatala who should not be there? I hope he is not one of my constituents. He has not written to me. No doubt we will soon see more monumental blunders from this quarter.

I turn now to the Minister of Transport, who is also not here at present. He is another aspirant for the title of the political juggler of the year. We remember how, before the last election, he extolled the virtues of the O'Bahn system and his merciless criticism of what he said was the expensive l.r.t. system. He has taken his time in producing the promised assessment of O'Bahn. If he were truthful, he would put that to sleep by admitting that it never was a goer. Even the material that he so assiduously peddled last year, supplied by the Daimler-Benz Corporation, referred at all times to O'Bahn as a concept; never did it claim to have it as an operational system. It was a concept, a figment of the imagination. That is not the impression conveyed by Liberal advertising prior to the election. We find the Minister taking refuge behind the obtuse verbiage he used at the time; he now uses qualifications which at that time were glossed over and underplayed to grossly mislead the Adelaide public.

Let him now come forth and tell the people of his electorate where the Government intends to put the eight-metre wide concrete gutter running with old sump oil and spilt diesel fuel. Where will those ghastly eyesores, the concrete pipe bus stops, be and where will we see the concrete flyovers, from which waste oil leaked from the buses will drip on to those below? Where in the Walkerville village will those monstrosities go?

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: The inane member for Glenelg can laugh, but perhaps he knows how, with the electronic control problems at intersections admitted to by the Minister, the Minister (not the member for Glenelg, who could not guarantee anything) will guarantee safety to the public.

Can the Minister guarantee that, for instance, should a small radio transmitter be turned on near an intersection, an electronically-guided O'Bahn juggernaut will not deviate from its intended course and crash through the local fish and chip shop or the local kindergarten? I do not think he can in good faith guarantee that. The O'Bahn was never on in Adelaide and the Minister knows it, even if the member for Henley Beach does not. If the Liberal Government introduces such a system, given all the unresolved questions still extant, it would be guilty of providing South Australia with its own F111 fiasco, a

bottomless financial pit. The Minister will not introduce O'Bahn. He will almost certainly introduce more articulated buses as his solution to the transport problems of the north-eastern suburbs, either on the existing routes or on the Modbury corridor and then through the streets of Walkerville. This will ensure the destruction of Portus House and probably necessitate the resumption of residences to provide more roads for the lumbering giants, and not only for the lumbering giants, but also for the private cars that will be squeezed over and need more room on the road, because people will not get out of their cars to ride on those things.

The introduction of articulated buses will also create problems for passengers in the city where, because of the greater size of the buses, there will be fewer pick up and set down points in the city (and I have evidence from the Minister that indicates that this matter is now being considered by the S.T.A.). Consequently, passengers will either have to use Bee-line buses or walk much farther to get to their S.T.A. transport, and they will have to work more because of the increase in fares.

While on this subject, I give credit where it is due. In extending the Bee-line service and allowing more free travel on other routes in some restricted circumstances, I think the Minister is heading in the right direction.

An honourable member: Why didn't your Government—

Mr. O'NEILL: It did a damn lot more than your Government has done; it did not put the fares up, for one thing. It is my opinion that before long any modern city which wishes to survive will have to seriously consider the operation of a completely free or nominal fee system, as an economical alternative to existing methods of public transport. I hope the Minister will be big enough to admit to the false arguments drummed up against the l.r.t. by his Party in its desire to get Government and accept that such a system—even if more costly now because of his procrastination and only because of his procrastination—is really the only sensible proposition for Adelaide if we are to retain our image of being one of the cleanest and most pleasantly livable cities in the world, and no credit to this Government for that.

Mr. Keneally: There are no Ministers in the House again.

Mr. O'NEILL: I can only assume that they are too frightened to come in here because of the devastating revelations that are coming from my speech. I now turn to another disaster area—health. It is with some temerity, I must admit, that I presume to cast a critical eye over this Minister's performance, having observed recently the extremely aggressive, if somewhat irresponsible, manner in which that Minister responds to criticism. However, I will not shirk my bounden duty. I hope the Minister will not hurl any wild charges of impropriety in my general direction, or cry "sexist exploiter" in another attempt to cover her own shortcomings. In the recent much publicised debate regarding the alleged assault on the Minister's posterior (and I use the term "posterior" as an acceptable synonym for the slightly more commonly used term applied by the member for Hartley recently, my authority for this being that reliable and reputable source Roget's *Thesaurus*), whilst some reporters waxed lyrical pro and con on the subject of the Minister's posterior, I think there is some evidence that the Minister was less than truthful.

One journalist referred to the Minister's "inimitable forthright manner". We all know that forthright is synonymous with "truthful", yet it would appear from the evidence that veracity is lacking in the Minister's allegation. Indeed, once again, we find truth a casualty at

the hands of a Liberal Minister. We were told earlier by the member for Stuart that at the time of the alleged assault the Minister was not dining in the royal blue, richly appointed members' dining room, as the press would have it, but that, rather, she was drinking with male members in the members' bar.

Mr. Keneally: Boozing in the bar, at 1.30 in the morning.

Mr. O'NEILL: As the honourable member says. The truth of the member for Stuart's statement is attested by a correspondent to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, a lady who claims to have been an eye-witness to the alleged incident, and one who places an entirely different construction on the incident than does the Minister; and according to this witness's statement the Minister was not drinking *aqua pura*, either. As one who has supported the emancipation of women, as a trade union officer and in the political movement, and as one who is opposed to sexual or any other harassment, particularly in employment situations, I think the Minister's action in publicising the alleged occurrence in the way she has is at least open to suspicion in relation to her real motives.

If she felt so strongly about the matter, why did she not in her own "inimitable and forthright manner" make it public at that time, instead of waiting until much later and then quite unscrupulously casting aspersions on the integrity of at least 15 members of this place who are now retired and in no position to defend themselves against the Minister's charge?

I believe the real reason for this somewhat belated display of umbrage is that the Minister made another of her now quite common blunders, this time attacking a well-known copying machine company and, when called to account, in a desperate attempt at self-justification, she resurrected this "unutterably humiliating" incident from her memoirs.

Mr. Hemmings: I heard she liked it.

Mr. O'NEILL: You may be a better authority on that subject than I. The most important information I gleaned from the newspaper reports was the fact that prior to her marriage this Minister had been an advertising copywriter, and herein I believe lies the answer to much of what this Minister has and has not done in the areas of health and tourism. Copywriters, of course, must have a rather vivid imagination and are more prone than is the average person to engage in flamboyant language and extravagant claims, for this is the service they must provide to their clients. This would account for the statements which issue from the Minister from time to time proclaiming that all is well, as the health system of this State disintegrates at an increasingly rapid rate each day.

It may also be the case, given the Minister's predilection (one might almost say her addiction) to appearing on television that, deep in the bosom of our healthy bouncing lady Minister, there lurks a tiny frustrated desire to be a model, like the ones she met in the advertising world when, by the nature of her work, all she could do was write the copy for others and not act out the fantasy.

Mr. Hemmings: Do you think she is a female Walter Mitty?

Mr. O'NEILL: She may well be. While this Minister plays Miss Personality on the box the health of South Australians is allowed to suffer. Trained staff are becoming increasingly more frustrated and are leaving the service. The false economics being perpetrated by this Minister will soon result in some catastrophe, and the blame for this will rest squarely on the Minister, her Cabinet colleagues and the back-benchers who sit opposite holding the fort and laughing.

I learnt from a constituent recently that newly arrived

Vietnamese refugees who were supposed to be in quarantine in the Morris Ward at Northfield were wandering the streets of my electorate.

Mr. Slater: And mine, too.

Mr. O'NEILL: And the streets of the electorate of the member for Gilles, as well. The Minister used a quite deceitful ploy to mislead the media and to kill a story of potential danger visited on some of my constituents and some of the constituents of the member for Gilles, because of the penny-pinching policies of this Government. The media did not take much killing about this matter.

I must be fair and say that some of the blame must rest with the Fraser Government, which is unscrupulously landing refugees here and leaving the State Government to meet the cost of health checks and other services. Nevertheless, the continuing run-down of health services and personnel is creating an untenable situation in which the remaining staff cannot keep up services. It is totally unfair to expect them to do so. The sooner this Minister realises that she is responsible for the health of the people of this State and no longer writing copy to sell chocolate bars, cigarettes or bikinis, the better. I know there are other Ministers on the front bench—

Mr. Keneally: We haven't noticed them.

Mr. O'NEILL: I am becoming rather disappointed that, after all my efforts to constructively point out where Ministers should lift their game and do a little better for the people of South Australia, they have not bothered to come into the House. I do not know where they are; they may be hiding.

Mr. Randall: What a waste of time!

Mr. O'NEILL: The other day the honourable member referred to chloropicrin, or tear gas. The people of Henley Beach are probably crying because they made the terrible mistake of electing the present member for that district. He would be worse than tear gas, if one had to listen to him for very long.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the honourable members should choose his words more carefully when referring to other honourable members.

Mr. O'NEILL: I shall try, Sir. The other night, during this debate, we were treated to a remarkable display. I must say that I had a feeling of *deja vu* because I thought it was something from the past being revisited. I thought I was watching a film of a youth leader from the Hitler *Jugend* when I heard the contribution of the member for Mawson. He reeled off a number of propositions which he purported to be ways in which one could recognise a communist. I think there were 39 of them. They were apparently the work of a former officer of that now thoroughly discredited organisation in the United States, the F.B.I.

Mr. Keneally: About 35 of them would have described Christ.

Mr. O'NEILL: At least three of the examples would describe Malcolm Fraser, and I would not put him in the same category. The amazing thing was that he claimed that two sure-fire methods of recognising a communist were that he, first, supported the United Nations and, secondly, recognised Red China. I wonder when the honourable member will resign from his Party which, according to his own criteria, is quite clearly led by an arch-communist. That is not a new phrase, because I can remember leaders of his Party in earlier days applying it to a Papal Knight, namely, Arthur Calwell, which shows how paranoid some people can get.

I think there is method in the honourable member's madness (and I am not saying that the honourable member is mad; I am saying that there is method in his madness, although the proposition may be open to debate). It is now

quite clear that the Prime Minister of this country was completely out of touch with the situation, in his abysmal efforts this year in trying to get the Australian people on side, regarding the Olympic Games boycott. His attitude has been thoroughly discredited by a prominent legal gentleman from this State who attended the games as manager of a team.

What the Prime Minister has decided on is what all cowards (and I was going to say traitors, but I will not do so because the word is probably unparliamentary) resort to: it is what is sometimes referred to as the last refuge of scoundrels—patriotism. What he is trying to do now is drum up as terrible the threat of a Russian base in Kampuchea. Unable to solve other problems, and realising that he has almost destroyed the Australian way of life, the Prime Minister has resorted to saying that there is an external threat. This is a ploy that has been used since time immemorial; when there is trouble at home, start a war abroad. I think the people of South Australia have woken up to that ploy, and I am amazed that members of the Liberal Party still have the gall to perpetrate the filthy lie.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member is not implying that honourable members opposite are telling lies.

Mr. O'NEILL: Certainly not. What the member for Mawson was doing (and in fairness I do not think that he believed all that rubbish he was speaking) was using that topic as a political ploy, as a lead up to the election campaign, which will obviously have a basis similar to that used by the State Liberal Party last year, a basis of innuendo, proven libel and smear tactics. The State Liberal Party fell foul of it. Admittedly, it was not enough to cost it office, but if those members have a conscience they must feel badly about it.

What the honourable member was doing was setting the pace for the election in South Australia (and goodness knows why the Liberal Party chose him to lead off), and opening the Federal campaign for the Prime Minister in South Australia. As I mentioned earlier, it is clear now that the Prime Minister does not intend to confront the people. He intends to hide behind the electronic media. This has been stated by the press, which was somewhat upset that, despite all the service it has rendered to him, he has now thrown in his lot with the electronic media. It may be enough to get him out of trouble, and it may not.

We all know the problems that accrue from control of the electronic media. We all know the dastardly things that have occurred relating to control of the electronic media. We may find out later that the reason for the Hon. Mr. Staley's resignation is allied to this problem. It would not surprise me to find at some later stage that Mr. Staley was a Director of, say, "Satellites International", when the Liberal Party has destroyed Telecom and hands over control of communications in this country to private enterprise.

Mr. Randall: Tell us—

Mr. O'NEILL: The time for my speech is running out, and I cannot be bothered answering the interjections of the member for Henley Beach, who rabbits on. I would like to deal with more valid points of criticism, but time does not allow. Therefore, in conclusion, I say that this Government, together with its Federal counterpart, stands guilty of wilfully eroding the standard of living of the majority of South Australians to the extent that, from a position on the world table of living standards in the top three, we have fallen to fifteenth or sixteenth position. That is attributable directly to the philosophy of Malcolm Fraser and his running dogs in the States.

Perhaps the State Ministers are not as cynical as their

Federal colleagues. It may be that in the State, gross incompetence contributes largely to their propensity for wreaking havoc but, as I have demonstrated, some Cabinet members have knowingly handled the truth carelessly. From a Government that pledged to reduce taxes, we have now seen increases in electricity charges of 12½ per cent; public transport charges 25 per cent; and water rates 12½ per cent.

The Government's removal of price control has resulted in Adelaide's having the highest cost of living of any capital city from the period when these people assumed Government. Bread prices have risen as a result of Government bungling over retail practices, and the Ministers refuse to admit their blunders. Beer prices have rocketed, interest rates are up, yet this Government claims that it is doing a good job. I do not know whether that is cynicism, or whether the Government really does not understand. Perhaps the Government believes that it is doing a good job and, if it so believes, God help South Australia.

The industrial relations scene has deteriorated from the high level it enjoyed under the previous Government to the stage where not only the so-called blue-collar workers, but also the white-collar workers, are taking direct action. This was the Government that was going to get rid of strikes—what an achievement for a Party that claims to represent white-collar workers, as is the old song of the member for Henley Beach. This Government and the Fraser Government have brought about a situation where Commonwealth and State public servants, bank officers, insurance officers, school teachers, nurses, salaried doctors, prison officers, and airline pilots are all taking direct action—what a record for a Party that claims to represent the white-collar workers. What white-collar workers are discovering is that conservative Governments represent no workers.

In the past, because a stable content work force was required in some areas of administration and management, the system would accord minor privileges to workers to ensure the stability of the system. With the arrival of computers and advanced cybernetics, the human component is no longer necessary. So, white-collar workers are getting the same treatment that has been accorded blue-collar workers for years. History dictates that white-collar workers will either fight against the treatment they are receiving, or they will be cast on the ever-growing social junk heap. All the rhetoric in the world from Ministers, both State and Federal, will not stop this.

I am sure that many white-collar workers are now able to see through the cynicism of the Prime Minister and his Treasurer in their conflict with the Queensland miners. Instead of taxing at a realistic level the huge multinationals, they go back on their 1978 promise, reiterated in 1979 (and that does not concern the Government, because, unlike the Opposition, it does not see anything wrong with breaking promises), that they would not tax the housing subsidies in remote areas. This tax would collect about \$1 500 000 a year.

To date, because of the irresponsible attitudes of the Prime Minister and Treasurer Howard, \$2 000 000 000 has been lost in coal exports, and the Japanese contracts have been placed in jeopardy.

Why? Because these Ministers want to run a reds-under-the-bed election. Having fallen so far from public credibility over the Olympic boycott fiasco, having reduced to poverty large sections of the Australian work force, having destroyed the health system, and having done more damage to Australia, they are reduced to the filthiest type of electioneering—smear, war scares, downright robbery through their fuel-pricing policy to

finance their elections, and many other such tactics.

An honourable member: And forgery.

Mr. O'NEILL: I take the honourable member's word for it. I hope that, for the sake of all Australians, after so many disclosures of improprieties and untruthful statements and so much ruthless taxation of those who are least able to afford it, the people of Australia will remove from office before the end of this year these people who claim that they are acting on behalf of the people of Australia. As I have demonstrated, they are acting on behalf of people who do not reside in Australia and who have no interest in Australia, other than wanting to make money out of it.

I have now completed my remarks in respect of the rather dismal performances of some of the Government members on the front bench; I did not refer to some of them. I did not want to refer to the Minister of Agriculture, because I appreciate that he is in enough trouble already. I am not going to say that he misled the House. We will wait and see what happens in respect of the allegations about possible charges of conspiracy with the so-called authors of a publication. The Minister of Environment is in enough bother without my picking on him. The poor Minister of Water Resources has just returned from overseas, and does not know what is going on. In contrast to a number of his comrades on the other side, at least he disclosed some of his shareholdings in the House. I do not know why they are so reticent about making known whence they get their money: we might get a few surprises if we found out.

Mr. Lewis: Which union do you belong to?

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take your point that one should not answer interjections, but the honourable member has been most persistent. He obviously cannot read, because it was well publicised before the last election that I am a former officer of the A.M.W.S.U., and I am proud of it. I know that much of the rubbish spoken by the honourable member's colleagues is untrue. I do not know of which union he would be a member, but from the way in which he carries on from time to time I can readily believe that the shooting in the bush might not have been accidental. If he treats his constituents as he treats members of this House, it is possible that someone might have taken severe umbrage to him.

Mr. Slater: The duckshooters' union.

Mr. O'NEILL: I do not know. I have sympathy for the freckled ducks, because I wish that they had someone more responsible than is the honourable member to represent them. I want to draw attention to the fact that this Government came to power on a campaign that was based on libel, and that is a record of the Supreme Court. This Government has not delivered. It intends to cringe behind a three-year term and stretch out its term for as long as it can, because it knows very well that, after Fraser is destroyed at the next election, there will be little chance of this Government's getting back. Probably the member who is luckier than most is the Minister of Transport, who has at least had the decency to come into the House and who, as a pharmacist, will be able to supply himself with all the compound analgesics he needs to get rid of his headaches when the O'Bahn system crashes down around his ears in the near future.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Newland and seconded by the member for Mawson. I add my condolences to those of other members to the family of the late Mr. Parish. Naturally enough, I did not know him but, needless to say, since he was a member, we would have had some things in

common.

It was with interest that I listened to the Opening of Parliament by His Excellency. Having read through eight pages of the Opening Speech, I was somewhat concerned that the only real mention made of primary industries was in paragraph 7, which states:

Opening rains in the latter half of April following an extremely dry period have provided the best commencement to the season for many years. Consolidating rains in June and July have contributed to the estimated record sowings of 2 700 000 hectares of cereal crops in South Australia. The early rains have resulted in good pasture growth with a high legume content thus ensuring favourable conditions for livestock production. The general prospect for agricultural production in the present financial year appears to be very good.

Whilst I fully support that statement, it does not give anything of the Government's commitment to primary industry for the forthcoming session. In fact, I looked at His Excellency's Speech closely so that I might find any associations with non-urban areas and I was pleased to find that some other departments have given consideration to this matter. They include the Department of Lands, the Water Resources Branch, and one or two others. I have been most grateful for the assistance of the respective Ministers during that time.

The issue that has caused me the greatest concern, and the subject to which I will direct the majority of the time allotted to me on this occasion, is the mention of the possible petro-chemical complex at Redcliff, based on ethane production from the Cooper Basin and salt from Lake Torrens. Honourable members will appreciate that this proposal has been of sincere and serious concern to me. I first raised the matter in the House on 3 October 1973, almost seven years ago. At that time I was a relatively new member and it was a new session of Parliament. It was a new experience for members to have a State Government proposal of such magnitude placed before them. Because I represent a fishing district, where people are vitally concerned with the likely impact on the Gulf of such a proposal, I became very interested in the concern and the welfare of my constituents and on many occasions I have had discussions with the leaders of the Department of Fisheries, with many fishermen in the area, many scientists, and other persons who actively have been involved in the upper reaches of Spencer Gulf. Every person I contact makes my fear for the future of the Gulf grow should a petro-chemical plant be established at Redcliff Point.

I would like to say right from the outset that I am not against a petro-chemical works for South Australia, but I am opposed to the proposed site. I can say quite unequivocally that, if a more appropriate site could be found, I would support it fully and I am sure that it would have the full support of the fishing industry. When Dow Chemical Company recently released a draft environmental effects statement, I purchased a copy and spent a considerable time analysing the contents. I must say that, whilst I was looking for answers to many of the questions that had been raised with me, I find that the draft environmental effects statement raised more questions than it answered. I, for one, was most critical of the report, because it was a glossy publication designed to gloss over many of the real issues involved.

I was contacted by members of the South Australian branch of the Australian Fishing Industry Council, who advised me of the report that the council had submitted to the Dow Chemical Company. I have been most concerned that, whilst that report has been in the hands of the State press since 26 June this year, very little, if any, mention

has been made by the South Australian media of the concern of South Australians for the fishing industry. It is very worrying that the main body of the total fishing industry has prepared a comprehensive document, which has not been used by the State media; it almost looks as though there is a reason for the information not being published.

The only reference that has been made to the AFIC report is in a small section concerning the fact that the council referred to the Dow Chemical environmental effects statement actually raising more questions than it answered. That was the only reference raised in the State media in regard to this proposal, and for that reason I am even more concerned. Why should South Australia's press and media play down, if not suppress, the views of the fishing industry?

When AFIC forwarded its report to me, there was an accompanying letter, which, I believe, was sent to all political Parties, the Department of Fisheries, and anyone who had shown any concern for the fishing industry in previous times. The letter, signed by the President of AFIC (Mr. Michael Thomas), stated, in part:

I should point out that, as loyal South Australians, the members of the fishing industry support the concept of providing economic benefits to the State by the establishment of a petro-chemical complex designed with adequate safeguards and located on an acceptable site. However, we are gravely concerned that the Dow E.E.S. does not satisfy those conditions, and at the same time political statements have been made indicating acceptance of the Dow proposal by the South Australian Government—this we find unacceptable.

In considering views such as this and actions taken by the Government at the same time as the draft environmental effects statement came out, I became concerned. I believe that the Australian Fishing Industry Council is fully justified in expressing its views in this way.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Without going to the Minister, or as a result of going to the Minister?

Mr. BLACKER: The Minister of Agriculture has raised a question as to whether this should go to the Minister.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BLACKER: The Minister of Agriculture has been trying to find out the process that was undertaken by the Australian Fishing Industry Council when it released this material to the media. It is my understanding that the document was forwarded to Dow Chemical Company and, after some time (I am not sure how long), it was released to the media. At the same time, copies were given to Ministerial departments and to other political Parties, including the Government. That is all I know and can undertake to explain at present.

The fact that this particular report has not received wide publicity is of concern. However, I believe that I have a right, on behalf of the fishing industry, to explain to the House many of the aspects contained in that report. The report is a 20-page document, with appendices, and explains in detail the fishing industry's concern about many aspects raised in the draft environmental effects statement that was prepared by the Dow Chemical Company. The report contains material under the following headings:

Commercial fishing: the effects on marine environment of the use of seawater for cooling at Redcliff; the effects of pollutants on the immediate environment at Redcliff; the effects of shipping movement in the upper Spencer Gulf; water exchange between the upper, middle and lower Spencer Gulf and currents in the regions; tides; permeability

of the soils and stability of the area of the Redcliff site; responsibilities in the event of the disposal or an accidental spill or disposal of chemical or other substances at or from the Redcliff plant and the consequent pollution of the environment and/or contamination of marine life; concerns regarding the E.E.S., the proposed environmental impact statement, and the proposed Redcliff indenture with the State of South Australia; and other concerns about the inaccuracy and inadequacy of the data in the E.E.S.

As I have already explained, the Dow report is a detailed draft environmental effects statement, a document which is about 1½ centimetres thick and which has some very pretty maps, diagrams, charts, and so-called explanations of the area. A matter of grave concern is the section related to commercial fishing. Chapter 6.2.4, paragraph 1 states:

The commercial fishing industry will not be affected by the establishment of the proposed plant at Redcliff, since no continuous ecological load will be imposed on the gulf during normal operations.

That very statement itself could raise a dozen questions. First, what is meant by "continuous ecological load"? What is meant by "during normal operations"? Let us face it: I think we would all accept that under normal operations we would hope that there would be absolutely no contamination. We know that there will be: there will be temperature effects to the sea, there will be air pollution, there will no doubt be leaching of soils and the permeability of the soils surrounding the area. Nobody knows what the likely effects of an earthquake would be, bearing in mind that it is right on a fault line. These sorts of questions are the ones that have not been answered. In response to the Dow E.E.S., the report of the Australian Fishing Industry Council (South Australian Branch) Incorporated, states:

The various potential items which could affect the fishing industry have been identified and all the preventative measures to be adopted during engineering design for this project have been described. Spencer Gulf is the breeding ground for the 1 837 tonnes of prawns caught in the gulf in 1978-79 and is the basis of an Australian and overseas market with an estimated annual value of \$20 000 000. The Jones Report (February 1979) into the commercial scale fishing industry of South Australia pinpointed the upper Spencer Gulf as the breeding ground for the major proportion of the most popular commercial fish caught in the gulf which move as far afield as Thevenard on the West Coast of South Australia and which are ultimately processed and then sold in both South Australia and interstate. The Jones Report also detailed the dependence of the young fish and prawns on the seagrass banks and the mangrove tidal outlets around Redcliff.

And so the report continues. There has never been any statement by the Government in response to that report, and members of the fishing industry are starting to believe that they have been abandoned in their request for support for their industry. The question has been raised: "Is the fishing industry expendable?" Many people and leaders in the fishing industry are starting to ask whether the Government has given consideration to this question. Fishermen were holding those views when the former Government was in office and were hoping for a relief from those views. However, the questions are still raised. That is troublesome to every member of the community, and more particularly to the citizens of Port Lincoln. I say that because a large percentage of the prawns caught in the upper reaches of Spencer Gulf are processed at Port Lincoln, and quite a considerable proportion of the scale fish are processed there. Without doubt, if there is a spillage or if environmental damage is done to the upper

Spencer Gulf region, the economic effects it will have on Port Lincoln will be absolutely disastrous. There are no ifs and no buts about that. For that reason I was prompted to write to the General Manager of Dow Chemical (Australia) Limited.

The letter is as follows:

Representing a State electorate which has considerable fishing interest, I feel I must offer some response to your draft environmental effects statement recently released relating to the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical project. My prime concern relates to the effects that such a complex could have on the fishing industry as we now know it in South Australia. I point out from the outset that I am not opposed to the development of a petro-chemical works in South Australia and fully support the likely impact it could have on the State economy and employment in South Australia. I am, however, rather critical of the site proposed for the establishment of such a project. The site is in the upper reaches of Spencer Gulf situated in a mangrove swamp area which is a widely recognised breeding ground and nursery ground for prawns and other fish species.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Where do you think the site should be?

Mr. BLACKER: I will come to that. The letter continues:

The very nature of Spencer Gulf is such that it is a unique ecological environment enabling prawns to breed and grow in the most southern latitude in the southern hemisphere. The nature of the gulf is such that there is very little water movement and the only movement appears to be in a north-south direction with each tide. There is no evidence that the effect of flushing of the gulf could enhance the disbursement of any accidental spilling. Furthermore, there is strong evidence that the contrary is the case, because temperature tests and salinity tests taken at intervals indicate that the further north one goes, the higher the temperature and the higher the salinity of the water. This confirms the view that there is a minimum of interchange of waters in the upper reaches of the gulf. Your environmental effects statement makes reference to the effects on the marine environment of cooling waters from the proposed plant. Whilst I see this as a problem, I can appreciate that action can be taken to further cool the water before it is released into the gulf.

One would only be guessing at the many millions of dollars that would be required to reduce the temperature of outflow water by just one degree. It has been stated in the environmental effects statement that water will be released at between 30° and 32° Celsius. That is too hot, and it will seriously affect the fish life, the eggs and the larvae and so forth in the sea. That aspect has been recognised, and it has been admitted that that would happen. The letter continues:

I am somewhat concerned that the location of the proposed complex is at the most northern extreme of the gulf that large shipping can navigate and as such the last few kilometres of the gulf, shipping would proceed along a very narrow channel with a minimum of water beneath the keel. The effect of propellor turbulence alone would have a significant impact on sea growth along that shipping channel. This would be almost the same effect that dredging could have and as such a vast change in the local underwater environment would be made.

Without doubt, the greatest concern is the likely effects an accidental spillage either in the sea or on land would have on the marine ecology. With a minimum of water circulation, any such spillage would remain in the area for long periods of time and would continue to contaminate sea and fish life until such time as it was removed. As already stated in your environmental effects statement, there are no facilities available in South Australia which could cater for such a

spillage. Furthermore, your document gives no indication of what actions your company would be prepared to take for providing such facilities for clean up operations. An employee of Dow Chemicals in the U.S.A. is reported to have stated in the *Advertiser* of 25 June that no significant killing of fish would occur in the northern Spencer Gulf from a ten-tonne spillage of ethylene dichloride.

I wish to take up that matter at a later time. The letter continues:

A statement such as this does little to back up your draft environmental effects statement, because it raises more questions than it answers. What is not known, and your statement does not indicate, is what would be the effects on plant life in the area and whether your company would undertake any restitution or whether your company would be prepared to provide compensation for the loss of catches of fish should that occur, and also what evidence there is that any accidental spillage would not contaminate marine life and thereby continue through the feed chain to either directly or indirectly effect the health of humans. It is questions like these and many more that have not been answered and are of grave concern to me.

I also want to follow up that point at a later time. The letter continues:

Your draft statement makes reference to the fact that it would be highly unlikely that a shipping accident would occur in the upper Spencer Gulf region. This is hard to accept, because, of the reported accidents that have occurred with spillages, more than half have been accidents which have occurred at or alongside the berth, thereby indicating that the Redcliff site would be just as prone to accidental spillage as would any other area throughout the world.

I regret to say that I find your draft environmental effects document to be one which fails to grasp the practical probabilities of likely effects on the marine environment and does as such fail to give the answers which so many people involved in the fishing industry have been looking for.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Peter D. Blacker
Member for Flinders

That concern is amplified time and time again, especially in the local media. The *Port Lincoln Times*, the Chamber of Commerce, the Mayor of Port Lincoln, and the industries have all expressed concern at what could happen and at the economic effects that could accrue.

I turn now to some aspects raised in one of the appendices of the document presented by the Australian Fishing Industry Council. They relate to the dispersion of an accidental spillage. I refer to section 8 of the appendix, and the comment by Professor H. S. Green, Department of Mathematical Physics, University of Adelaide, in response to the proposed petro-chemical plant at Redcliff, draft environmental effects study. This raises great concern for the fishing industry, as well as the people living in the area. The report states:

8. Environmental and Social Consequences of Accidental Spills: Certain highly undesirable consequences of a spill of E.D.C. into gulf waters near the Redcliff site appear not to have been considered by the authors of the E.E.S. It has been pointed out by Dr. J. Hails, Director of the Centre for Environmental Studies of the University of Adelaide, that some of the E.D.C. would be absorbed by the clays—

that is, the sedimentary clays of the gulf—

which constitute much of the sea bed, and then be released slowly into the marine environment, to endanger all forms of marine life. The remainder of the E.D.C. would dissolve rather rapidly into the layer of sea water in contact with the pools formed by the liquid. From a knowledge of the tidal motion and the vertical eddy coefficient of diffusion (8 cm²/second) it can be calculated that E.D.C. would diffuse

upwards from the sea bed at a rate in excess of 36 kg per day per square metre of E.D.C. surface. During the time (3-4 days) required for the E.D.C. to reach the surface, it would be carried by persistent currents to the neighbourhood of Snapper Point, and thence into Port Augusta on the next tide. During the same time, in view of the known horizontal eddy coefficient of diffusion (5.5 m²/second) it would spread over an area not exceeding 10 km². A spill of 10 m³ of E.D.C. would therefore result in the evaporation of about 100 kg per day within the Port Augusta area, and almost certainly require the evacuation of the town. Even smaller spills, evaporating within the town, or carried there by sea breezes from the sea surface to the south, would constitute a serious hazard to the health of the residents, especially over an extended period of time.

When we talk about the evacuation of towns, we must become concerned. I am going beyond the interests of the fishing industry. Surely, I must take into account the interests of the residents in the area. One would like to think that such a statement could be dispelled as fear tactics but, although it is in writing for all to see, there has never been a word said about whether or not it is right. I am not in a position to question the comments of Professor Green.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What about the preferred location of that site?

Mr. BLACKER: I will get back to that. I want to refer to one aspect mentioned in the appendices.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: My remark was not a rude interjection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BLACKER: To satisfy the Minister, my prime concern is the site, so any move further south, in an area where water has a greater exchange, is acceptable to me. If it was on the Bight areas where there is obviously a marked exchange of water, I would be prepared to tolerate the possible effects of a spillage, even though all precautions had been taken. However, the upper reaches of the gulf are the most unique area in the Southern Hemisphere, if not in the world. The fish life that occurs in the region, and the prawns, are at a low latitude; nowhere else in the Southern Hemisphere can similar fish life be found at a comparable latitude. There is no doubt that it is unique. Many other things are involved, but I think the point has been made.

About two months ago a film entitled *Shadows on the Gulf* was shown on Channel 7, and about a week ago it was shown on Channel 4. That film has generated a great deal of interest. The contents of it revolved around information from the Chinamans Creek research station; that has not yet been challenged. I understand that business houses in the iron triangle are most concerned about the implications of the report and the possible damaging effects it could have on the development of an industry in the area which might bring an added work force. In making an assessment of this, we must get our priorities right. Do we want to ruin a gulf which supports a work force of 700 for some project which could be shifted, even though it would be a costly exercise to shift it at this stage, or do we go ahead regardless, ruin the fishing industry in total, and possibly have other dangerous side effects in relation to the residents of this area? When *Shadows on the Gulf* was being screened, I tried to make notes. They were rather sketchy, because it is difficult to watch and write at the same time. However, a few things did come out of it.

It was said that it has taken 1 500 years to ruin the Mediterranean, but that it will take only one-tenth of that time to ruin the gulf. In 150 years, on the present rate of destruction of the environment of the gulf, without the

installation of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant, the ecological balance of the gulf will be ruined. That statement has never been challenged. Deformed fish have been found in the area, hump-backed garfish, well known to fishermen, and they are a direct result of pollutants. Already we have deformed marine life, and that must be of concern. We have the unique situation that very little fresh water enters the gulf, with little or no interchange of water, obviously going on for several years. There is at present an abundance of marine life and sea grasses, and the tagged fish migrate out of the upper reaches of the gulf into southern waters. Whiting, tagged off Redcliff Point or Chinamans Creek, in five years swam down to Coffin Bay. Other fish species have gone as far afield as Thevenard. We know that it is a breeding ground and a nursery ground. The mangrove swamp areas were shown in the film, and the mangroves themselves contribute significantly to the marine ecology.

It is known that every acre of mangroves contributes five tonnes of plant nutrient to the area, and that is the feeding ground for the nursery fish, for the prawns, etc. There are 50 miles of hidden waterways in that area, all of which are subject to damage or being wiped out. One significant thing that is happening at the present time is that when rotting vegetable matter lodges on the sea-bed from the mangroves it sets up a chemical reaction of hydrogen sulphide, and that chemical reaction traps and holds metal wastes from the present industry, so that we are getting an accumulation of heavy metals in our prime nursery ground areas. It is just a matter of how soon someone will take remedial action.

One aspect of the report that worried me is that we have not heard much about the Chinaman Creek Environment Research Station, which is 25 kilometres south of Port Augusta. It is right at the heart of where this petro-chemical plant would be. I understand it is being used by 18 university departments, 20 research departments, the colleges of advanced education, numerous schools, the C.S.I.R.O. and three overseas universities for research purposes, and yet the Government, Dow Chemical and the previous Government have never used any of the research material that must be available to anyone who wants to use it as supporting evidence to justify the establishment of a petro-chemical plant in that unique environmental situation. There is research, but what has happened to it? I strongly suspect that much of that research has been gagged and hidden in cupboards. It has not been brought out because it does not support what the former Government or the present Government would like to occur.

We know that there have been problems with industrial waste in the iron triangle. There has been a fall-out of iron oxide. A few years ago, we had a scare about a cyanide contamination in the gulf. There has been the cooling water, and the heavy metals. We know there is cadmium, mercury, zinc and lead in the sands of that area, and yet we still seem to be proceeding headlong into an area of no return, and that must be a concern to all. Dow Chemical has admitted that insufficient information is available; it admits that there is nothing in South Australia that would help it clean up; it admits that the least possible time for any help to come to it would be from Whyalla, which is three hours steaming time away, even if that city had something, which it does not have at present. It admits that it does not have information on the temperature inversion of the air, and that is of concern.

There are plans to build a new power station at Port Augusta, the smoke stack of which will be twice as high as the present smoke stack at the Thomas Playford Power Station at Port Augusta. There is a unique environmental

situation because of the range of hills on either side of the gulf creating a channel in which the air-borne pollutants lie, and they are feeding into the gulf. This is another matter of concern. The Government and the Electricity Trust admit that, by now trying to put up a chimney stack at least twice as high as the present one.

The water temperature is another aspect. It is admitted that no-one knows what effect this will have on marine and fish life. No-one knows what will be the effect on Yalata Harbor. Not a word has been said about the natural food chain, or of the likely effect of fish from that area being eaten by humans. I have already told the House about the deformed fish that are being caught in that area: hump-backed garfish, and so on. I do not know what the effect will be. There may well be no effect, but I would like to know whether it would be harmful to humans.

The next problem relates to the effect of heat and turbulence, particularly the turbulence caused by shipping. It is all very well to say that there will be no dredging to get up the gulf. I think we all know that a 100 000 tonne ship with a propeller churning away will cause turbulence. No marine life would be able to stay in that sort of environment. Naturally enough there will be a denuding of the shipping channel and, further more, no-one knows whether the shipping channel will silt up. All of these questions have been raised but none of them have been answered.

I asked the Minister today whether other commodities would be shipped out through that particular port, because the indication to this stage is that there will be only a skeleton jetty going out 3.3 km, bearing in mind that that is two-thirds of the way across the gulf. One wonders why we are not starting on the other side of the gulf, because then the jetty would not have to be so long. Having gone two-thirds of the way across the gulf, and having established another record for one of the longest jetties in the world, we are now starting to talk about shipping other commodities.

The Department of Marine and Harbors and the State Government would then be required to finance, if it proposed shipping grain through that outlet, a massive loading gantry. We have spent \$11 000 000 at Port Lincoln erecting a loading gantry, and one could only hazard a guess at what it might cost to put it on a structure suitable for carrying such a loading gantry across the 3 km. of swamp. These are additional costs, and no-one knows how high they will be. It was admitted by the Minister today that it was a possibility, but the questions have not been answered.

Dr. John Hails gave a number of reports in which he raised the question of the movement of the sands in the area. It was his opinion that massive dredging would be required to maintain or shift the shipping channels, but worse would be the possible effect of an earthquake at the petro-chemical plant. The proposed complex is to be located on a fault line. It is known with present trends that there will be at least one sizable tremor during the expected life of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. Whatever project goes there will have to be of such a magnitude as to withstand at least one sizable earthquake tremor. I do not know the attitude of the Departments of Agriculture and Fisheries to this particular problem. We do not know the attitude of the Department of Marine and Harbors or that of the University of Adelaide. I asked the Minister of Fisheries the other day whether his department had submitted a report to the Dow Chemical Company. His answer was that it had submitted a report, but he was unable to tell me the contents of that report. We could ask each Government department just where it stands in this regard.

I think I have made my point fairly clear, but what concerns me now is that this project will almost certainly go ahead with the blessing of the present Government and of the previous Government. I maintain that this House must insist on stringent penalty and compensation provisions for any industry seriously affected as a result of this project. If the Government is not prepared to do that, one can question the validity of the statements it has made and the validity of the assurances it has been giving to the fishing industry, for without backing of those verbal assurances, by strong penalty provisions that not only protect the fishing industry but also protect the South Australian taxpayer from the cost of massive clean-up operations, we can only regard the whole project with some considerable doubt.

I turn now to other matters, although I have no doubt that the matter of the petro-chemical project will be raised again. I was looking at His Excellency's Speech in an attempt to find a way of raising during this debate the fuel problem presently confronting this State. I was pleased the other day when the member for Mallee not only took it on himself to blast the Country Party and me but also raised the question of fuel, statements made by various Ministers, and so on. That gave me the best opportunity I have had to raise this subject. Our recent State conference was about the effect certain Government actions will have upon the people of South Australia. The member for Mallee, during his grievance speech, quoted extracts from a speech I made at our annual State conference. I wish to quote those extracts to the House because they have some relevance to what I will say later. The first quote was as follows:

Country South Australia is being given second place by our new Government. This is because the Government Party room is dominated by metropolitan members.

Now follows the key paragraph, which stated:

The refusal by the Government to commit itself to doing anything within State jurisdiction about petrol franchising during the last session is a case in point.

The member for Mallee raised that issue and then set about denigrating my Federal colleagues. He quoted the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Anthony, and Mr. Nixon. He went on to talk about dishonesty in the local Country Party, deceit and of those sorts of things in connection with the fuel pricing policy. I believe all his quotes were accurate. What concerns me is that never during our conference did we deny that our Ministers had made those statements. We expressed concern about what effect those statements were having on the rural industry.

The member for Mallee went on to say, when referring to a resolution that came out of our conference (that one-third of additional moneys being recouped by the Federal Government as a result of its world parity pricing scheme should be returned to capital improvements of the road system), the following:

They say, further, that the money that has been collected (I do not know what money they are referring to in that instance) in the course of using that policy as a contribution to Federal revenue should be spent on the building and development of country roads.

That statement gives me the opportunity to give a brief outline of where that money came from and how the Federal Government came to have that money at its disposal.

I think it was in 1972 that the McMahon Government was defeated. At that time 53 rigs were drilling for oil in Australia. Within 18 months of the Whitlam Government coming to office that 53 had dwindled to three oil rigs operating in Australia. When the present Government was returned to office it faced the challenge of trying to get

additional oil exploration undertaken in Australia. In order to do that, it had either to fund the exploration itself or offer sufficient incentives so that outside industry would take on that oil exploration.

At that time the price of a barrel of Australian crude oil was \$6. The world parity price was \$14 a barrel. It is only common sense that nobody was going to come and explore for oil in Australia if they were only to get \$6 a barrel for it, when they knew that if they explored in other countries they would get \$14 a barrel for any oil found. The Government opted for raising the price of Australian crude oil to world parity price. That meant that for every barrel of oil found in Australia the explorer would get a world parity equivalent, which was then \$14 a barrel. That move had the effect of creating a massive increase in fuel prices to the Australian consumer, but the Government was faced with the problem of whether to give the difference in price received for oil already being produced and world parity to the oil producers or to the taxpayer. The Government decided that, rather than give the money to the oil companies, which had already covered their costs in producing the oil at \$6 a barrel (any extra money would have been a windfall for them), it would give it to the taxpayer. Therefore, that money was returned to the Australian Treasury, and this meant that the Government got this \$2 300 000 000 (and that figure has varied from \$2 300 000 000 to \$3 500 000 000—I do not think anybody knows the exact figure involved). One thing we do know is that the difference between the original price of production of \$6 a barrel and world parity price only applies to oil coming from wells established prior to 1975, so it only applies to old oil.

Any new oil found by exploration, as a result of the 1975 decision, does not result in a further return to the Treasury. That money goes to the oil companies who find the oil, so the amount of money going into Federal coffers is on a diminishing scale. Already, only 85 per cent of Australian oil production is from old oil, so we already have a 15 per cent input of new oil. We know that, over the next four or five years, that 85 per cent figure will markedly reduce to about 15 per cent, where it will stabilise for another 10 or 12 years. It will eventually diminish further. There may be isolated wells that go on beyond that point. The point I am making is that the income or so-called windfall that the Federal Government is getting now will not apply for much longer. That is the tenor of discussions that took place at the Country Party conference. For the member for Mallee to talk about dishonesty and disrepute—

Mr. Lewis: Would you put up taxes to finance the resulting deficit?

Mr. BLACKER: The honourable member is way off the track again.

Mr. Lewis: How would you finance that debt?

Mr. BLACKER: If the member for Mallee had been at the annual meeting of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association he would have heard the Prime Minister clearly set out the Federal Government's policy on fuel, and that would have answered his questions. Up until now, nobody has ever committed the funds that the Federal Government has recouped from fuel prices because of the reasoning that the Government should not place strings on money received, otherwise, the tobacco industry, for example, would receive massive amounts of money if all the income from that industry was returned to it. Likewise, the wine industry and other alcohol-related industries would be in a similar situation. The Government has always maintained an open book about this type of thing.

The point that the Country Party conference wished to

make (and I believe it did make it, because it got through to the honourable member for Mallee) is that one-third of that additional money should be spent on capital works of a non-recurring kind. In other words, it should be spent on highways and works of that kind that do not come up a second time. It is for that reason we set down guidelines for our policy, which was passed at that conference with the full support of Federal members who were present.

The other issue that arose at that conference as a result of the fuel debate was a recommendation that there be a removal of excise from all distillate, and that the third stage of the fuel freight subsidy equalisation scheme and to remove the 0.44c a litre differential should be implemented. There should be compensation to any agricultural export industry disadvantaged by a competitor industry in another country that does not have import parity, for example, as regards wheat in Canada. In no way can the Australian wheat producer compete with his Canadian counterpart because Canada does not have world parity on the pricing of oil. We are at a distinct disadvantage. We should be competitive on a world basis. There should be priorities for agriculture as regards the storage of distillate. When strikes occur, the available storage facilities should give priority to the seasonal conditions of the crops. There should be international commodity agreements to retrieve the higher cost of fuel in international deals. What came out was the fuel-pricing policy and the wholesale prices.

What the member for Mallee said, in his indignant statement about the National Country Party, and my remarks, all stems back to a motion moved in the House on 11 June 1980. The motion, which was moved by the Minister of Transport, stated:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Federal Government should as soon as possible enact legislation to give effect to the provisions of the "Fife package" in relation to petrol reselling; and that the Premier be asked to convey the substance of this resolution to the Prime Minister.

Not one honourable member was opposed to the basic concept, but the Leader of the Opposition decided that it was time to play Party politics. So, he introduced an amendment. I should not be critical of him, because this is done by both sides, no matter which Party is in power. The Leader's amendment was as follows:

That this House deplores the inaction of the Tonkin Government in relation to the problems faced by small business people engaged in petrol reselling, particularly in view of the joint statement by the Ministers of Industrial Affairs and Consumer Affairs in January of this year, and urges the Federal Government to heed the call of the Federal Labor Opposition to enact legislation as soon as possible to give effect to the provisions of the Fife package in relation to petrol reselling; and that the Premier be asked to convey the substance of this resolution to the Prime Minister.

Basically, that was the same motion, except that it praised the Federal Opposition and at the same time it was giving a backhander to the present Government. However, as the debate progressed, the member for Mitcham also moved an amendment. It was to add the following at the end of the original motion:

and that, if no undertaking to enact such legislation has been given by the Prime Minister by 31 July then legislation should be introduced into this Parliament during the next session to give effect, to the extent possible in South Australia, to the said provisions of the Fife package.

As I said at that time, all that the House was being asked to do was, if the Federal Government would not act by a certain time, introduce legislation in an attempt to do whatever was possible within the jurisdiction of the State Government to carry out the provisions of the Fife

package. To me, that was a totally clear and concise way of putting it, that we were prepared to do something. In no way was I prepared to go home and say that I would support the Government, because it was not prepared to tie itself down to do anything about the legislation. That was the reason for my speech. If one studies the voting on the motion, one will see that the member for Mallee was not prepared to commit the House to doing anything about implementing the Fife package within the State jurisdiction. The voting clearly shows that every Liberal Party member was not prepared to put his head on the block and do something in the time specified. That is the crux of the whole matter.

What I said was said sincerely, and I hope that members will take up this matter from there, and hopefully change their view. I notice that the Premier has come forward with a statement in the meantime. We can make press statements and statements in the House as much as we like, but it is the votes that count. The Government's vote against committing itself to doing anything within the State jurisdiction is the only thing we can take notice of. It was not prepared to commit itself.

I will now raise another matter, namely, the jetty at Dutton Bay. Jetties are a prime concern to both the former and present Governments. At Dutton Bay, we have a long jetty which shared, in the initial stages, ketch operations and the removal of grain. It is in a fairly good state of repair. However, it has been closed because of vandalism. Some vandals decided to have a barbecue half-way along the jetty. They lit a fire in the middle of the jetty, and we all know what might happen. Naturally enough, the jetty was alight. A constituent of mine came along at the time, saw the fire in the middle of the jetty, and extinguished it. A couple of days later, a local resident of the area saw that a plank had been burnt; he decided he would test it out by jumping on it. It gave way and, as a result, he suffered injuries to his leg, and he has claimed compensation from the Department of Marine and Harbors Department or the Coast Protection Board.

The department, without questioning, took some panels out of the jetty, saying that it was under repair, whereas all the locals thought that the jetty was under repair because of the burnt plank. What was in the department's mind was that, if the community did not complain about the partial closure of the jetty, perhaps it could dismantle the whole jetty. This is the whole exercise we have been going through.

As the sign stated "Jetty under repair", no-one took any notice, because they all know that Government departments are slow to act. The reality was that the jetty was closed. Just in the past few weeks, they have sawn out the two main bearers, and put up the sign "Jetty closed". Fortunately, some of the locals actually saw this action taking place. I hope that the responsible Minister does something about this, because the jetty was closed not because of its disrepair, but because of vandalism. When we see two or three other jetties being held in abeyance, pending the outcome of this cat-and-mouse game, one gets concerned. I trust that the Minister responsible for this operation will ensure that the people of that area get what is rightfully and properly theirs.

Mr. Lewis: You've taken your time to get around to saying it.

Mr. BLACKER: The member for Mallee is concerned at what I might say. I will take him up another time as regards the Electoral Act.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I support the

motion and, before moving onto some of the more important things I want to say, I will make a couple of complaints. First, I refer to the Liberal Party's neglect of keeping the front bench occupied. I know that the Minister of Agriculture is present at the moment, but on two occasions today there has been no Minister on the front bench in charge of the House. For the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture, I am not referring to his remarks to the Speaker; I am talking about two separate incidents which, to me, appear to mean that the Parliament or the Opposition is being treated with contempt. It is one of the other, or both. The other incident occurred last week. I know that mistakes can be made, but for three mistakes to be made over a period of two sitting days is absolute neglect.

On many occasions when we slipped (and we did slip—I do not say that we were perfect) it was always drawn to our attention and we took some pride in keeping a Minister in charge of the House. I put to whoever is in charge of the House (and I understand that it is the Deputy Premier) that he should speak to his Ministers to ensure that one of them is here.

Mr. Keneally: He was the offender.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If he was the offender, I do not know who was in charge of the House at that time. I do know that the member for Stuart had to draw the Speaker's attention to this matter, and that is not good enough.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: We apologise for that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister has apologised, and I am always prepared to put out the hand of friendship in those circumstances. However, I do not want to see the same thing happen again. It is important that the traditions of this place, particularly in that area, are followed.

I congratulate the member for Flinders, because I heard him complaining about the attacks (if that is the right word) that the member for Mallee made on him; the member for Flinders handled the situation extremely well in replying to the member for Mallee. I believe that, if the member for Mallee did not hear all that was said in reply to him and if he reads it, that will probably be the last occasion on which he bothers to pick on the member for Flinders in this House.

My third complaint relates to the mover and seconder of the motion; however, I do not intend to say a lot about this subject, because I do not want to spend much time on it. While I do not agree with all aspects of the mover's speech, I believe that he did a lot of work in considering his material; he delivered his speech well and made some forecasts that may, in time, prove to be correct. Nevertheless, that is all I want to say about that subject. The seconder, the member for Mawson, probably dug right back to the fifteenth century.

Mr. Randall: A lot of research.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not know there was research for that far back. I can see no significance or importance in a member in 1980 making speeches of that nature that do not enhance the quality of debate in this place or give us anything to go on. I hope that the member for Mawson continues to make that sort of contribution, particularly from now on and for the next two years, because, if we hear that kind of utterance from him, he will not be the member for Mawson for much longer. I expect that that situation will come about in any case. The member for Mawson's speech reminded me of one of the first speeches that I heard in this place, which was made by a member of the Liberal Party in Opposition; I thought at that time that the speech was of sixteenth century or seventeenth century vintage. However, the member for Mawson went back even beyond that time.

I will deal with four or five different subjects, including unemployment, the youth employment scheme instigated by the Government, technological change, and the Myers Report, which has just been tabled for the people of Australia. I will raise the question of transport fares for the unemployed, because I have received a letter in regard to that subject, and I will also refer to small business. However, first, I would like to comment on press reports that the Government intends, during its three-year term, to introduce legislation to alter the method by which Legislative Councillors are elected. I am concerned that, if this happens, it will be the first step in a serious attempt to undermine our hard won democracy in this State, a democracy that our opponents opposite fought so hard, for so long, to prevent. Irrespective of the fight and the tenacity shown in those days by the Liberal Party to maintain its present system, the people of South Australia understood what the Labor Party was about in trying to democratise that place. We are now living under that system. I would like to place on record today our warning that the Labor movement will battle tooth and nail to prevent any attempt to bring back the gerrymander in this State. Members on this side of the House remember with bitterness the dark days when a Labor Government, in 1968, was defeated.

Mr. Schmidt: I thought your policy was a gerrymander.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Mawson, by interjection, states that that is what we did as a gerrymander. If he listens for the next few minutes, he will hear where the gerrymander was.

Mr. Schmidt: If you listen to any political theorist, he will tell you that your Upper House system was that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The only professed political theorist whom I ever heard say it was a gerrymander was Ren DeGaris.

Mr. Schmidt: You go to the university and ask the political theorists what they think of the Upper House system. It must be revised.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member listens, he may learn something. It was a dark day in 1968 when a Labor Government was defeated despite its gaining 52 per cent of the popular vote (for the member for Mawson's information) whilst its opponents were able to take the Treasury benches with only 43.8 per cent. I put to the member for Mawson that even he would have to agree that that was a gerrymander of the worst type.

South Australia's hard won Constitutional changes placed this State in the forefront of democratic reform in the 1970's. Indeed, it is somewhat ironic that the new Constitutional Museum, in its multi-visual programme, chronicles that the present Government was the first that was fully democratically elected in the State. Fearful of political retribution, the museum sadly neglected to say why that was so and who was responsible for it. Of course, the public of South Australia knows full well that the Labor Party was responsible for the democratisation of the voting system in this State.

Before changes brought about by the Dunstan Government, our Legislative Council was a most undemocratic House of Parliament. As an institution purporting to represent the people, it was a sham, and everyone in South Australia, and Australia for that matter, knew it. The current Legislative Council voting system has been in operation only for the 1975 and 1979 elections, and now, for the first time, the whole of the Upper House has been democratically elected. Yet the Premier now appears to be planning to scrap that system. Democracy apparently leaves a bad taste. But it is not hard to see why the Liberals do not like the present system. At the 1979 elections, there were less informal

votes for the Legislative Council than for the House of Assembly. That record takes a lot of beating. That result is almost unprecedented in Australian political history.

The present Legislative Council voting system effectively enfranchises the largest proportion of voters by cutting down on vote wastage. That is the argument about the Senate now—there are not as many informal votes. That is the simple reason. The informal votes cast for the Senate are astronomical when compared to those for the Legislative Council; the difference is completely out of all context.

We have been told, in press reports, that the Premier wants to model Legislative Council voting on the Senate system. If he does, he will be doing so with the deliberate intention of removing the democratic rights of thousands of South Australians. The Senate system, as the Premier well knows, is so unnecessarily complex that it disfranchises many voters. Many thousands of voters in my district at the last Senate election were disfranchised. The fact that they voted wrongly or incorrently disfranchised them.

Dr. Billard: That happened at the State election.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Listen and I will tell you. Let us look at the facts. At the 1977 Federal elections, over 80 000 South Australian Senate votes were informal; that was more than one person in every 10 who voted.

In some areas of Adelaide, particularly where there are large numbers of people who may have language difficulties, one in five senate votes are informal. In my view, that is a tragedy for democracy. In contrast, the simple and more straight-forward method of voting for the State Upper House reduced informal voting in South Australia to 33 000, less than half the number of votes that are wasted in Senate elections. That is why the Liberals do not like it. Instead of calling on the Prime Minister to reform the Senate, which I believe is the sensible thing to do, and base it on the South Australian system of voting, the Premier chooses to welcome a system where he believes a higher level of informal voting will help his Party's chances. It is as cynical and shabby as that.

Mr. Schmidt interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Mawson should remain seated and keep his speeches for his district, because I can assure him that he will need to get down to his district very soon.

I would now like to comment on another issue which some press commentators find boring but which is seriously affecting the life chances of a generation of young Australians. Last week, in a bizarre dialogue between the member for Glenelg and the Premier, it was again demonstrated that the Government knows as little about unemployment trends as it knows about job creation. The Premier, forgetting to seasonally adjust the figures, said he was somewhat reassured about the result for July and spoke about the evidence of a trend back towards a better rate. These are not my words, Mr. Speaker; they are the words of the Premier in this House last week. But this time he was careful not to say there was "unmistakable proof" of the employment benefits of his policies (which was as credible as the captain of the *Titanic* trying to sell return trip tickets in a lifeboat). Instead, the Premier spoke about there being every prospect of reversing high unemployment because of the measures he had taken to provide for industrial development and expansion. That is a long and devastating retreat from what the Premier was saying some months ago.

Tedious though it may be to some journalists, whose newspapers seem unconcerned about the plight of at least 46 000 South Australians, let us again look at the facts. Last Wednesday, *The Australian Financial Review's*

economic survey indicated that the New South Wales economy is beginning to move ahead strongly, whilst Victoria and especially South Australia, are lagging behind. That is the situation this Government is getting us into. Indeed, the survey indicated that whilst New South Wales and Queensland were in the lead in creating private sector jobs, Tasmania and Victoria were barely moving forward in that area, whilst "South Australia is sliding at a poor rate". These are not my words, but comments which were published in the *Financial Review*. Despite the theology from Canberra, the survey indicates that public employment continues to move ahead in all States, except South Australia. We know what is happening here; nobody is being employed, unless they are press secretaries or somebody close to the Government. I understand that the number of press secretaries is back to 14. One of the promises made by the Government was that there would be only seven. I am not criticising the number's being 14; I think that is right and the Ministers need secretaries, but I wish the Government would stick to what it says.

Let us analyse the figures which apparently reassure the Premier. When you seasonally adjust the figures (and I would be happy to explain that process to the Premier and his speechwriter because it seems to me that they do not know very much about it) South Australia's unemployment rose by 6.4 per cent between the December quarter of 1979 and the June quarter of 1980, in just six months. Those figures are correct, and have been checked and double checked. South Australia is not only lagging behind the other States but its position is worsening at an accelerating rate. The figures for the last 12 months show that there has been a 4 300 fall in private sector jobs alone. Instead of showing an improvement, the Australian Bureau of Statistics unemployment figures for July, released last Thursday, show that there were 5 400 more unemployed this July compared with the position in July 1979, when Labor was in power. That is not grounds for reassurance, and that July comparison is worse than the June 1979 to June 1980 comparison, which showed a 3 600 rise in unemployment over 12 months.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Do you think New South Wales and Tasmania, with Labor Governments, reflect the best scenes in Australia?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The position I think the Minister ought to be cognisant of is the attitude taken and expressed by the Premier in telling us what is happening in South Australia, and what will happen in South Australia, and about how many jobs were to be created instantly. The jobs are not being created. This is why I want to clearly establish what the actual facts are. I am not able to say what is happening in Tasmania and New South Wales, nor is the Minister, but I am able to analyse what is happening in this State, and tell the Government about it. I hope that it has some effect, and that the Government changes its course, and changes its policy in relation to how it will go about correcting the unemployment position. However, I doubt that all the things that the Premier has been talking about will work. Even if they do it will take a long time to get them off the ground, and it will take a long time to get people back into employment.

It is now quite clear from all the official statistics—A.B.S. and C.E.S.—that unemployment was falling during the term of the Corcoran Government and began to worsen late last year. It is also quite clear from our appalling figures for youth unemployment that the Government's much trumpeted pay-roll tax concession plan for youth employment has been a dismal failure and should be scrapped and replaced with a direct job creation scheme.

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, youth unemployment in this State has risen by over 1 000 since June 1979 to a record level of 17 000. A shocking 27 per cent of South Australian young people are unemployed, the highest level in Australia by a long way. The pay-roll tax concessions are not working. Even the Premier, on the first day of this session, admitted that studies that have been done show that the people who have been taken on under the scheme would have been taken on anyway, without the incentives.

That is the very thing that I warned the Government about when the legislation was brought into this House last year. At certain times of the year there is always an upsurge in the retail industry, and in the manufacturing industry. I do not believe that conclusive evidence can be given for any more than 25 per cent of these young people having been employed because of the introduction of this scheme. I believe that 75 per cent of the total 1 600 people, or whatever the figure is, would have been employed in spite of the scheme. There is little question about that. I would like to call on the Premier today to release the studies to which he referred to the media so that the people of South Australia can judge for themselves whether or not public money is being wasted for no good purpose.

Let us also take a look at the level of activity in the building and construction industry. Earlier this year the Premier flew to Britain to tell the London Chamber of Commerce that South Australia was "open for business again" and that already growth in the building and construction industry was "beginning to chart ascending curves". The truth, of course, is quite the opposite. Employment in our building industry fell by 1 200 jobs, from 31 300 to 30 100 between the end of September 1979 and April this year, the latest month for which Australian Bureau of Statistics figures are available. The reasons for this fall-off are quite simple, yet there has been a hamfisted attempt to disguise them by the Government.

We have heard a lot about the Premier's so-called Budget surplus. The major part of that \$37 000 000 surplus has been concocted through the Government's drastic cuts in public works expenditure. In the 1978-79 financial year, when Labor was in Government, our public works expenditure totalled \$232 000 000. In 1979-80, following the Premier's first Budget, South Australia's public works expenditure was cut to \$202 000 000, \$30 000 000 less than that afforded by the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments. But even that \$30 000 000 cut is not an accurate picture, when we take into account inflation and rising materials costs.

To maintain Labor's level of activity, our public works expenditure last financial year should have been somewhere between \$250 000 000 and \$260 000 000, at least \$50 000 000 more than the Premier provided for the people of this State. Obviously, that level of cutback in public works programmes has had a major effect on the level of activity in the building and construction industry.

For the Premier to now claim that his \$37 000 000 surplus is a demonstration of sound management, or some kind of economic wizardry, is like refusing to pay your mortgage and pretending your reduced expenditure is some kind of financial miracle—at least until the bank's bailiff arrives. In effect, the Premier's deferral of public works programmes in order to conjure up a Budget surplus this year amounts to not building hospitals in the hope that there will not be any patients to put in them. If that is financial wizardry, then it is the magic of a sorcerer's apprentice, in my view.

The Premier shows the same kind of "logic" as does the Deputy Premier in talking about the bonanza that mining

will bring to South Australia compared to the alleged stagnation of the past. South Australia, our opponents claimed, was the peasant State under Labor. Yet, in the 1978-79 financial year, during the period spanned by the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments, per capita income in South Australia was exceeded by only two other States and was well ahead of the so-called mining boom States of Western Australia and Queensland. Perhaps that is not surprising when a third of Australian profits is siphoned off overseas.

The other area I wanted to talk about today is technological change. Last week, the Myers Report underlined the enormous structural and industrial relations changes that will be needed during the next decade, and raised issues with enormous implications for South Australian industry and employment.

Obviously, today I can hope to cover only a few of the report's arguments and only touch upon the implications of its 30 major recommendations.

I want to place on record that I do not criticise the whole of the Myers Report. I believe that there are some excellent recommendations in it, some of which I am quite surprised to see there. I want that on the record. At the same time, I have some reservations about what actions it did not take to overcome the obstacles as I see them. The Myers Report is, however, in many ways disappointing, and reflects the shallowness of much of the Australian debate over technological change. Its comments and recommendations are often vaguely worded, and its arguments often circular. The committee was also selective in both its choice of issues to be examined and in the evidence chosen to justify its conclusions. For instance, the committee's recommendations on union amalgamations have been seen as "naive" by both employers and unions alike. The committee, it seems, apparently ignored the industrial reality in which many unions would not seek amalgamation on industry lines, even if it were offered to them, and it ignored the cynical political reasons why such legislative obstacles to amalgamation were introduced by conservative Governments in the first place.

In the areas of training and retraining, which I believe are vital areas, the Myers Report is hopelessly inadequate. The committee suggests only minor changes to existing provisions and facilities for training and retraining, and therefore does not address itself squarely to the very real crisis confronting industry. Instead, the report declares itself largely satisfied with existing training and retraining provisions, thereby ignoring the concern expressed by unions, employers and Governments.

There are a number of other key issues, however, that were either completely ignored by the Myers committee, or only briefly skirted over. For instance, after identifying "vulnerable" groups, such as women, migrants, older workers, and youth—the people most likely to be affected by technological changes—the report then provides no recommendations or strategies for either job creation or the specific protection of these groups.

The report makes no real attempt to make predictions on levels of employment or unemployment due to technological change in industry, and there are no detailed strategies on how to reduce wage inequalities between groups in the work force because of technological divisions. There is also no analysis of the role and distribution of profits in the economy, or any analysis of how international technology transfer affects Australian industry and employment, and the role of multi-national corporations in such a transfer.

Obviously, there is a great deal of work yet to be done. Yet, at the State level, the present Government—despite

an initial fanfare of concern and promised action by the Minister—has, to the best of my knowledge, paid only lip service to the problems posed by technological change. It is quite clear that neither the Minister nor the Premier has grasped the implications of technological change to South Australian industry, let alone been capable of formulating strategies to ensure that changes result in the minimum of hardship to all concerned.

So far all the Government has done is to appoint one officer with expertise in this area. If there has been any change to that, I have not been able to pick it up. Last time I checked this out, there was only one officer looking after this problem. When an election is called and—as all the opinion polls indicate—a Labor Government is returned again in South Australia, we will take immediate steps to come to grips with the problems posed to industry and employment by new technologies.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: I can assure you there will not be an election for a while.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I can well understand that, on the polls at the moment. If the Minister has finished, let me proceed. We will create a technological change unit to assist industry. Let me just explain what such a unit could and will do. First of all, it will be charged with the task of assessing the impact of technological changes upon employment opportunities and upon the general structure of South Australian industry. At the request of the Minister, the unit will provide technological change impact statements and maintain close links with those sections of the department responsible for manpower planning and forecasting. The unit will be asked to recommend changes necessary in job design, job training and retraining provisions and programmes, and provide advice to the Industry Training and Development Council.

It will also examine the industrial relations implications of technological change and recommend appropriate steps to be taken to ensure that co-operative efforts are made by both management and unions to settle resultant problems with a minimum of industrial disputation or hardship to parties involved, particularly employees.

The unit will monitor developments relating to technological change in South Australia, in other States, and overseas, and research the means which might be employed to minimise the adverse effects on sections of the community considered especially vulnerable. The unit will also establish a library of reference material and maintain an information service available to both the private and public sectors. Such a unit could be quite small and could also incorporate officers from the old Training and Development Branch of the Department of Labour and Industry.

This is what we will do in Government, but the immediate issues posed by technological changes will need a positive and sensible response from the present Government, and I hope it will push partisanship aside to consider the recommendations I have made today, as it did when it appointed the present officer following my public recommendations on the need for specialist expertise to advise the Government.

Dr. Billard: Are you suggesting it will be similar to the democracy unit?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It would be a unit on its own. That is the only way to do it, in my view.

I want to say something about the Constitutional Museum. I had the pleasure of being invited—and I accepted the invitation—to go along to inspect the museum one night last week, by the Minister, the Hon. Mr. Hill, from the Upper House, along with other Parliamentarians and their wives. I thank the Minister for the opportunity to visit the museum. I had not been there

previously, because I did not want to see it half or three-quarters finished. I wanted to see the project finished, when the work was completed, because I was Minister of Public Works in the period and had taken an intense interest in it earlier.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was talking before dinner about the Constitutional Museum. The craftsmanship that went into the reconstruction of that old building to give us the magnificent sight that we can now behold from North Terrace was excellent. I want to place on record my thanks and gratitude to the craftsmen employed at the Constitutional Museum over a lengthy period. It was not an easy job, but I believe it is now one of the great traditional and historical buildings in South Australia.

One has only to go inside to see the absolute craftsmanship in the regenerated building, craftsmanship that has restored it to what it was when it was first built, to realise what calibre of man is employed by the Public Buildings Department. I am not now jumping on the bandwagon, because I have said before that there are good craftsmen in this area. It was no surprise to me that they were able to do such a fine job on that building.

There are many thousands of people in South Australia who are going to derive a tremendous amount of pleasure from this building and its inside components. I was also impressed by the display that the staff has been able to gather to make the building extremely attractive inside. I was also impressed by the films shown. The whole procedure is first class and one that I would recommend not only to my own constituents but to all the people of South Australia—that they go along and see this magnificent museum.

However, there are some detractions from the building. I recall that, some three or four years ago when the then Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) made the announcement about investing money in the Constitutional Museum for South Australia, many members of the Liberal Party condemned the Government of the day for wasting taxpayers' money on that project. I do not believe that that building has been a waste of money: I believe it is a monument to our history. When I signed the visitor's book I made clear that historically the museum was a great asset and a great lesson in our history. Some of the films I saw whilst at the museum taught me things about the history of South Australia I did not know. I am sure that many other people in the House who have not bothered to find out something about our history (except those learned historians amongst us) learnt something as well.

I can recall the Minister of Industrial Affairs, when shadow Minister, condemning the workers on that site in this House and criticising them for drunkenness, inactivity, standard of work, and so forth. That occurred some time last year. Those criticisms emanated from the Liberal Party whilst it was in Opposition. It is interesting to note that now the Liberal Party, in Government, is taking an extreme interest in this building. The mug shots of the whole of the Ministry at the end of a film shown are blatantly political. There can be no other description. With the record on which the Liberal Party went into that museum, members opposite ought to be ashamed for allowing the whole of the Ministry to be filmed in such a way. When I say "allowing" the members of the Ministry probably forced themselves in and did not "allow" the films to be made and used. I will bet there was an instruction from the Minister about that, because I do not believe that there is any political bias in the administration of the Constitutional Museum. I believe that the people

there are doing, and will continue to do, an excellent job.

I make no criticism of those people who have been or are now running the museum, because I believe it is a great thing for South Australia. The fact is that the Liberals have forced themselves on to the screen, without there being any mention of Don Dunstan, the creator of that concept. Whether the Liberals now like to admit it or not, that is the fact of the situation. There is no mention anywhere in the scripts of Don Dunstan being the initiator of that project, nor of the criticism directed at him by people then on this side of the House for commencing that project. Yet, there is a great scramble now by Ministers opposite to get their mug shots on the screen so that the faces of Cabinet members are seen by all South Australians seeing that film. I do not think that is good enough. In fact, I think it is hypocritical on the part of the Liberal Party. I want to go on record as calling members opposite a bunch of hypocrites in relation to the museum.

An honourable member: *Sour grapes.*

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There are no sour grapes about me. Members opposite are now in Government, but, if they were consistent with what they said when in Opposition, no photographs or mug shots would have been taken to appear in the museum, because almost to a man members opposite criticised, condemned and castigated Don Dunstan when he made the announcement. The present Minister of Industrial Affairs criticised, condemned and castigated the whole work force working on the museum only last year. I congratulate those people who made that concept possible and those people who are running the museum, but I do not in any way support the taking of mug shots of the Liberal Cabinet to advertise those members on the screen for South Australian people to see.

I think it was last week that the Minister of Transport announced that changes were to be made regarding free transport for the unemployed. I think all people in South Australia would agree that that was a commendable action, provided it was going to work. I received today from the Secretary of the Unemployed Workers Union a letter that I want to get into the *Hansard* record. It states:

Dear Mr. Wright,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Unemployed Workers Union in regard to the changes to transport fare structure.

The Minister for Transport, Mr. Wilson, announced to the papers that he will be introducing free travel to unemployed people. This is partly true but overall the new scheme will be more costly to unemployed and will discourage us from finding work. The scheme as announced will provide free travel only between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. Most unemployed people, however, travel to workplaces earlier than 9 a.m. to apply for interviews. The cost of this fare before 9 a.m. will now be 20 cents instead of 10 cents which it presently is. Also, unemployed people attend interviews in the afternoon after 4 p.m. The extra cost for this travel will prevent unemployed seeking jobs.

The attitude of the Liberal Government remains one believing that there are jobs for people to apply for and that unemployed people are unemployed for relatively short periods of time. The average period of unemployment is now nearly 40 weeks. It is not just a matter of providing free transport for unemployed to look for work but also to carry on some form of social life. In reality what this new change will mean is a curfew on unemployed people between 4 o'clock in the afternoon and 9 the next morning.

The new fare structure not only affects unemployed but also aged, widowed, invalid pensioners and single parents who will have to pay twice as much. We hope that you will investigate this further and make appropriate complaint about this new structure.

I am raising this matter in the best place for it to be raised, namely, in the Parliament. I do not condemn the Minister. He may not have consulted the people who will be directly affected by his administrative decision, but I believe that he should have. In good faith, he has probably erred in his effort to try to solve this problem.

It is clear, from what Mr. David Arkins, the Secretary, says to me in that correspondence that the unemployed will be not better off, but worse off, because they will have to pay double the fare that now applies before 9 a.m. One would not have to be Einstein to realise that, if you are wanting employment, you must be up reading the paper early in the morning. Certainly, most of them would not have cars, if they were not working. The only form of transport available to them would be public transport.

It to me seems essential that, in order to afford these people the opportunity to which I think they are entitled (it is not a privilege, so far as I am concerned), every access should be made available to them to get to job opportunities as quickly as possible for interviews. Members know that hundreds and hundreds of people apply for one or two jobs at a time; it is therefore essential that these people be given the opportunity to get to their appointments seeking work as quickly as possible.

I ask the Minister and his staff to reconsider this matter and, further, I believe that the Minister should consult with the unemployed, who are recognised bodies. The Unemployed Workers Union is an accepted association in the community. It is comprised of reasonable and sensible people with whom to discuss. I have had many discussions with them. The Minister ought to discuss this matter with the union's representatives and then make the administrative changes they seek and desire in order to help themselves. That seems to be the proper solution to the problem.

The Minister may be doing his best so far as he is concerned. Obviously, he wants to do something for the unemployed, and that is why I do not criticise his actions. I bring to his attention the basic fact that these people, who are genuinely looking for employment, are saying to me and to the Parliament that the change that has been brought about by the Minister is not the correct one. I ask that the Minister has his staff arrange for discussions with a deputation of these people. That procedure has not been asked for: I have merely been asked to bring the matter to the Government's attention, but I make this firm suggestion to the Minister that these people be given the opportunity to put up their own case about the timing of free public transport.

In the last session of Parliament, members will recall, I moved a motion in the House which stated, in effect, that, in the opinion of this House, the Government should, as a matter of urgency, establish a Select Committee to inquire into the pricing structure and pricing practices within the retail industry of this State, with particular references to four matters that I thought were significant and needed inquiry about. Unfortunately, the Government, whose attitude was expressed by the member for Fisher, did not see fit to vote on the motion. However, I serve warning that it will have to vote on it the next time, because I will be reintroducing it.

The member for Fisher made the point, (which at the time I thought was valid) that perhaps I had beaten the gun, because the Minister of Consumer Affairs was having all these matters examined by his inspectors and staff. I thought that if that was the case, that was good, the matter would be cleaned up and there would be no need for my motion for a Select Committee to be carried. How far from the truth I was! I was nowhere near the mark when I contemplated that that was what the member for Fisher

was talking about. Since then, I have received correspondence, dated 23 June and signed by Mr. Ronald E. J. Paddick, the Executive Director of the South Australian Mixed Business Association. Mr. Paddick begins his letter by thanking me for my assistance in arranging discussions, which eventuated. I directed to his attention the speech the member for Fisher made in the House, and asked him whether he would check the details and find out whether the situation as set out by the member for Fisher applied within the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. I quote from Mr. Paddick's letter, as follows:

Recently I spoke with the member for Fisher (Mr. Stan Evans) regarding his statements in the House opposing an inquiry by a Select Committee of Inquiry which is currently under way. It appears this has been initiated by the Minister of Consumer Affairs and is only investigating the operations and conditions of Associated Co-operative Wholesalers self-service warehouses and how their policies affect the viability of small business.

As you know we are looking for a far wider inquiry into the entire food industry and to how co-operative advertising payments are being used to cut prices in the chain stores, half-case warehouses, etc., at the expense of goods being supplied to smaller outlets.

My Executive greatly appreciates your efforts on our behalf, especially in that at last A.C.W. have agreed to price the goods in S.S.W.'s albeit as usual they have not kept their word to the commencement date they set themselves.

I am sure you appreciate our task in dealing with the A.C.W. people as it is very difficult to accept whether they are being truthful or not. Despite what the Managing Director and his Secretary told us at our recent meeting it is obvious their deliveries of \$400 at any one time is so much rubbish. Apparently by design most business in this area is either conducted by phone or by word of mouth of company representatives who they claim do not solicit membership in the co-operative.

Mr. Paddick goes on by telling me that, although the situation in this industry improved slightly because of actions I took in setting up and chairing meetings for both sides to come together and reach some sort of reasonable agreement for the small businesses to get deliveries, price tags, etc., the crux of the matter is that the motion I moved in the House earlier this year should have been acceptable to the Government. There is no other solution. I am told by the Executive Officer of the association that small business people are only asking for a fair deal in South Australia. They are only asking for comparable conditions to those applying in other States. Some of the conditions applying in Victoria are reasonable and would be acceptable to the association here, if they could be implemented in this State.

It is apparent to me from my discussions and negotiations on their behalf that other organisations (which shall remain nameless for the moment) would not grant such conditions voluntarily. The only solution to the problem is for the Government to accept the propositions that I put up in the last Parliament. I serve notice on the Government tonight that, early next week, I will be moving the same motion in the House, because I have been told by small business that this is the only possible solution to the problem. I ask that the Minister of Consumer Affairs, other Ministers, and back-benchers take cognisance and read what I said in moving my motion, so that they can judge whether they are properly looking after small business. I make the allegation, which may be a strange one from this side of the fence, that the small business people in this State are being neglected in droves.

This occurs not only in the field about which I am speaking but in other areas as well. If this is a private enterprise Government, as it says it is, it should not continually gloat about these things, but get off its backside and do something for small business because, if it does not, small business will go out of business. That is what I am concerned about.

There is no question but that throughout the country, although more so in South Australia, more takeovers are occurring day by day. Small business is being shot at by the big supermarkets, the big monopolies and multi-nationals, and this situation is allowed to continue. I have taken an interest in this area (it is not within my portfolio) only over the past few months because people have come to me explaining their position as I know they have done with members of the Government. I believe (and I make this allegation quite strongly) that the Government is looking after big business and is prepared to neglect small business, and that, with that philosophy, the Government will rue the day that it took no notice of what I tried to do last April.

I sincerely ask back-benchers on the Liberal side to examine the situation more closely on this occasion. I do not know who made the decision on the last occasion to avoid sending the matter to a vote, but the Liberals would not even vote on it; the matter was hustled out of the place without a vote being taken, and that is not good enough. I believe that there should have been a full-scale debate on this proposition, with more than one speaker from the Government side. We had only the one speaker, who identified quite clearly the Government's stand on this matter. There should be a full-scale debate so that we can ascertain the Government's attitude and record its vote. Only then will small business realise exactly whom the Government is looking after.

Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd): I rise with pleasure to support the motion. I wish to address my remarks to three major topics, two of which are of vital importance to this State and one of which is of vital importance to my district: uranium mining (with specific reference to the development of Roxby Downs); education; and north-east transport. Unfortunately, there is one common thread running through all three topics: they have been subject to emotional, biased and misleading statements from members opposite. I take this opportunity to dispel some of the myths that have been created, and I will put forward the true position in relation to each matter.

Before raising the uranium issue, I make the point that I have long been an advocate of uranium mining in South Australia and Australia. During the years preceding my election to the seat of Todd, I made abundantly clear, in press statements and in other forums, where I stood on this issue. There is no doubt that Roxby Downs offers South Australia one of the greatest potential developments that this State has ever faced. If allowed to proceed (and certainly this Government is very much behind the project), a town will develop that will be even bigger than Broken Hill or Mount Isa. The money coming in not only from mineral royalties but from support industries, and so on, will be measured in thousands of millions of dollars. A great number of jobs will become available—at least 5 000. Just think of the jobs that will become available in developing the town and, once the town is developed, the jobs that will be created in ensuring that the town is able to provide all the services needed for such a large development.

I have emphasised this issue for years, and I believe that the points I am about to make show that the risks in not allowing uranium mining and the development of Roxby

Downs are far greater than any risks that honourable members opposite can put forward in support of a ban on uranium. First, I indicate that I strongly support the points already made by my colleagues in regard to the mining of uranium and the development of Roxby Downs. During my time in Parliament, I have been absolutely staggered at the emotional and misleading statements about uranium that have been made by members opposite in the House and in the media. I have been utterly confused by the Leader of the Opposition, who does not seem to know whether or not he supports such developments as Roxby Downs. In the first session of this Parliament, he left us in no doubt that he was opposed to Roxby Downs going ahead. Then, in his Address in Reply speech this session, within less than a minute of commencing, he said he supported this issue; then he said he did not; then he said he did; and then he said he did not. Talk about pandering to both the left and the right of the A.L.P. The Leader stated:

I want to put on record, firmly and clearly, that we are not and never have been opposed to the development of Roxby Downs.

Then he stated:

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.

He then said:

We are not opposed to that development.

Finally, he stated:

We are clearly and firmly opposed to the nuclear industry and uranium mining in the present situation.

One thing about it—the Leader can use sections of his speech for any group in the community that he talks to, but he had better make sure he uses the right quote at the right time. However, his colleagues are not nearly so equivocal; they have left us in no doubt that they do not want a uranium industry in this State, and that includes its mining at Roxby Downs. Such an outlook is appalling for the future of both South Australia and the industrial world. I intend to show why it is essential that this State not only allows but also encourages the uranium industry.

First, there is tremendous wealth in South Australia that is ours for the picking. Current estimates available to the Government suggest that South Australia has potential commercial resources of about 500 000 tonnes of uranium oxide. The importance of these discoveries is best illustrated by reference to the world situation. There is every reason to believe that Australia's potential uranium resources will exceed 1 000 000 tonnes of uranium oxide, which represents 20 per cent to 25 per cent of commercial uranium reserves in the Western world. Therefore, we in South Australia know that our potential reserves amount to about 10 per cent of presently known world reserves. Can we afford to reject these reserves? Experience overseas suggests that orderly, controlled development of uranium resources can greatly enhance local economies.

Thus, to take two examples: Saskatchewan in Canada is seeing major improvements in housing, schools, universities and hospitals, as well as an overall improvement in living standards as a result of uranium and other mining developments; similarly Niger, which currently produces 5 per cent of the world's uranium, is undergoing a transformation. It is against this background that South Australian uranium is seen as having an important role to play.

In reaching its decision about whether to allow development to continue, the Government has had regard not only to market and economic factors but also to the real and pressing need in many countries for an additional

energy source. Both the present industrial countries of the world and those countries known as the Third World will need greatly increased quantities of power in the short and long term. If sources of energy are to be available that will enable technology and industry to develop, and if the world's standard of living is to improve, it is essential that energy, other than that from fossil fuels, becomes available, and at present the only source that can make a major contribution to the world's energy demands between now and the end of the century is nuclear fission.

The vastly increased price of oil over the past few years has caused a tremendous shock to the industrial world. It has drawn attention to the fact that the supply of oil is presently very much under the control of what can only be regarded as unstable suppliers, and as a result it is essential that we turn to other fuels to overcome the difficulties that are presently being experienced. Countries must take measures to ensure that they become less dependent on oil, particularly imported oil, while there is still time.

Even the world's leading industrial nation, the United States, is having tremendous problems in overcoming the difficulties presently being experienced because of unstable oil supplies. At present, more than 15 per cent of that country's energy is in the form of imported oil, and the only steps that it can take to protect itself are the same as those that other industrial countries and future industrial countries will have to take—and that is to move into providing nuclear power.

Even more concerned than the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, and so on, is Japan. At least the former have some forms of energy available within their own shores. However, in Japan the energy issue is not just critical but one of survival. If energy is not made available from nuclear fission, there will be increasing pressure on oil supplies throughout the world, and this will drive prices even higher, and the world market will become even more unstable than it is at present. There is no doubt that the Governments of countries such as Japan will not stand idly by and see their competitiveness eroded by other industrial nations. Also, the ultimate bankruptcy of Japan and the Third World countries would make it impossible for the world as we know it to survive.

Members opposite tend to use figures from the Fox/Ranger report when they feel that it suits their case. However, the A.A.E.C. produces annual estimates for the demand for uranium, and these tend to conflict with the Fox Report and the figures quoted on the other side of the House purporting to show that the demand for uranium will die. A fact that the Opposition conveniently overlooks is that the most recent reports on energy supply for the period 1985 to 2020 show quite clearly that to survive all of Europe, North America and Japan will have no alternative but to use nuclear power. These countries may use less than was expected 10 years ago, but the demands will still be huge.

Another important thing to be borne in mind is that uranium mining companies are prepared to put up hundreds of millions of dollars to develop additional sources. Such companies would certainly not be doing this unless they were confident that the ore they were developing could be sold. Before any company committed funds for development it would have completed studies indicating that such investment would return a profit; otherwise it would leave it well alone. One aspect of the profit motive is that it causes very serious thinking before investments are made. The fact that companies are prepared to develop further mines obviously shows that such companies feel that there will be a large and continuing demand in the future.

At the moment in Australia we are approximately 70

per cent self-sufficient with its own oil supplies. Unless new discoveries are made, the amount that we are able to produce will diminish, and as this occurs we will be more and more energy dependent on other sources. If Australia does not go on with nuclear development, it can, like the rest of the world, only become more and more reliant either upon imported oil or upon coal. Certainly, in Australia we have large reserves of coal, but coal cannot do everything, and the mining and burning of coal has very serious adverse consequences. Without a doubt, Australia will need another fuel source, and the only source that is now sufficiently developed to play any major role is nuclear fission. The only other alternative non-fossil source of power is solar power. There is no doubt that solar power is technically feasible, but its economic feasibility is another matter altogether, and a clear distinction must be made between the two distinct uses of solar power; partial heating of and for the home, and the production of all-purpose power on a large scale.

Partial solar heating for home use may become widespread, and solar air-conditioning is also becoming quite feasible. However, at this stage it is just not economically feasible for solar power to be used as a large power source, and it will be a long time, if ever, before such technology becomes cost-effective. In fact, the most generous cost estimate that I have been able to find for the present production of solar power on a large scale would be something in the order of \$3 500 per installed kilowatt. On the same basis, nuclear fission reactors cost approximately one-fifth of that amount. Much more development is required before solar power on a large scale becomes a reality and, certainly, until the turn of the century nuclear fission will be the only major power source that Australia and the rest of the world can rely on.

I now turn to some of the objections that have been raised about nuclear power. First, concern has been expressed that nuclear reactors, in routine operation, release radioactivity through out-flowing liquids. The American Atomic Energy Commission and other nuclear regulatory commissions have set guidelines, and at this stage there has been no example of release of liquids which has come anywhere near the allowances set by these commissions. An even more wide-spread fear, mainly generated through scare tactics, is that a reactor accident would release catastrophic amounts of radioactivity.

Let us look at the facts. First, a reactor is not a bomb. In particular, light water reactors, which make up the bulk of present reactors, use uranium fuel with a readily fissionable uranium 235 content of only 3 per cent. No matter how large an amount of such a material is present, it can never explode in any circumstances. It is possible that a reactor could lose its core water, melt and release radioactive fission products. Such an event is extremely unlikely and has never occurred, and there are at least three barriers to prevent such a release.

The radioactive fission products are enclosed in fuel pellets. And those pellets have to melt before any radioactivity is released. No such meltdown has occurred in over 3 000 reactor years of operation involving commercial and military light water reactors. Moreover, even if there were to be a meltdown, the release of radioactivity would be retarded by the very strong reactor vessel which, typically, has walls 6in. to 12in. thick. Finally, once this reactor vessel melts through, the radioactive material would still be inside the containment building which is equipped with many devices to precipitate the volatile radioactive elements (mainly iodine, caesium and strontium) and prevent them from escaping to the outside. Only if very high pressure were to build up inside the reactor building could the building vent

and release major amounts of radioactivity. The chance of that happening is extremely small, even in the event of a meltdown.

I believe it is fair to ask just what is the likelihood of such a reactor accident. This is, of course, very difficult to estimate, as it has never occurred, and fortunately most of the conceivable failures in a reactor do not lead to an accident. Reactors are designed so that in case of any single failure, even of a major part of the reactor, the reactor can still be safely shut down. Only when two or more essential elements in the reactor fail simultaneously will an accident occur. This makes a probabilistic study possible. An estimate is made of the probability of failure of one important reactor element, and it is then assumed that failures of two different elements are independent, so that the probability of simultaneous failure of the two is the product of the individual probabilities, although this is not always the case. There can be common mode failures, where one event triggers two or three failures of essential elements of the reactor. In that case the probability is the same as that of the triggering event and does not get any benefit from the multiplication of small probability numbers, and it is this probability of common mode failure that is the most difficult to estimate.

Working on the basis of these principles, a reactor safety study commissioned some five years ago by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission estimated the probability of various types of reactor accident. These results were published in the Rasmussen Report and the same methods as applied in the Rasmussen Report have also been used in Britain for many years to predict the probability of industrial accidents. Experience from this area has shown predictions usually give a frequency of accidents higher than the actual frequency.

The basic prediction of the Rasmussen Report is that the probability of a major release of radioactivity is about once in 100 000 reactor years. Such an accident would involve the release of about half the volatile fission products contained in the reactor. A release of that scale would have to be preceded by a meltdown of the fuel in the reactor, an event for which the report gives a probability of once in 17 000 reactor years. Finally, the report predicts that water coolant from a reactor will be lost once in 2 000 reactor years, but that in most cases a meltdown will be prevented by the emergency core coolant system. If the Rasmussen estimates were wrong by even a factor of 20, which would bring the probability of a meltdown to being once in 850 reactor years, then at least three meltdowns should have occurred by now, but they have not.

What would be the consequences in the extremely improbable event of a major release of radioactivity? The immediate effects depend primarily on the population density near the reactor and on wind direction and other features of the weather. For a fairly serious accident, one for example that might take place in 1 000 000 reactor years, Rasmussen estimates less than one early fatality, but 300 cases of early radiation sickness. He also predicts that there would be 170 fatalities a year from latent cancers, a death rate that might continue for 30 years giving a total of some 5 000 cancer fatalities. The number of latent cancers that would occur if a major release of radioactivity under average weather and population conditions (and this has a probability of one in 100 000 reactor years) would be about 1 000, but it would not result in any cases of early radiation sickness.

Now it is agreed that 5 000 cancer deaths would be a tragic toll but, to put it in perspective, we should remember that there are about a million deaths each year from cancers due to other causes throughout the world,

and when we consider these figures we should weigh them against the present industrial accidents already occurring and the very large number of deaths and injuries resulting from the mining of coal, the transport of coal, and the processes involved in obtaining petroleum, all of which have disastrous records. Additionally, the nuclear industry is being subject to far more research and money being spent on the improvement of safety than any other form of energy, and the U.S. alone is spending in excess of \$100 000 000 per year in improving reactor safety.

Taking into account all types of reactor accidents, it is estimated that the average risk for the world population is something less than 10 fatalities per year from latent cancer and, when this is compared with other accident risks that our society accepts, the risk from nuclear reactors is extremely small indeed.

Members of the Opposition have also been very emotional in relation to environmental statements relating to the development of mining in South Australia, particularly at Roxby Downs. The control in this area is quite simple. Every mining licence already contains conditions that operators must meet, and it is very easy to insert enough specific conditions in such future licences to protect the environment. If these conditions are not being met, then the operation can be forced to shut down. However, before this would be necessitated there are many stages of pressure that can be placed on a company. Besides, Western Mining has shown its willingness elsewhere in Australia to go to extreme measures in protection schemes (for example, Yeelirrie) and so why would it act any differently at Roxby Downs?

Members opposite have raised the very old and hoary issue of radon gas emitted when uranium ore is being mined. Certainly back in the fifties this was a very real concern. However, the Canadians have developed first-class technology in this area, and any requirements can now be made for protection from radon gas, and these are accepted world wide by medical authorities. There are no intrinsic engineering difficulties at Roxby Downs that would prevent the developments from Canada being applied.

Also, members opposite have stated that we should be developing the use of coal as a source of energy rather than uranium. What is not pointed out by them is that most coals have radium in them, and radon gas is released when the coal is burnt. Because of the huge amounts used each year (about 5 000 000 to 6 000 000 tonnes for a 2 000 megawatt plant), the amount of radioactivity released is much greater than from a nuclear plant. And also members opposite fail to mention the deaths that occur in coal mining and in the transportation of coal, or the environmental damage which occurs from the disposal of 300 000 tonnes of flyash each year. Other members opposite have also attempted to instil emotional fear at other forms of radiation during the mining process, and Nabarlek was used as an example. The ore grade at Roxby Downs is nowhere near as high as that of Nabarlek, and therefore potential effects of gamma radiation will be nowhere near as great.

The member for Baudin in the last session attempted to paint the breeder reactor as an evil which produces more fuel than it consumes. It is true that fuel is produced, but he conveniently overlooks the point that it takes about 20 years to double the fuel supply through such reactors, and so just the normal increase in power demands (for example through new generating stations) is more than enough to use up this excess. Breeder reactors would be a major commercial user of plutonium, and there would not be a surplus in the foreseeable future, but rather extreme pressure on the reprocessing of spent fuel from existing

reactors to recover the plutonium to make available enough of it to support even a modest development rate of breeders. Use of the two types of reactor will therefore be complementary over the next 30 to 40 years.

I now turn to what is probably the major problem in the obtaining of nuclear energy—the disposal of nuclear waste. It has been alleged that such wastes poison the atmosphere and the ground forever. It is true that the level of radioactivity in the standard 1 000 megawatt reactor is very high; that is, about 10 000 milli Curies half an hour after the reactor is shut down. But the radioactivity then decays very quickly, and the resultant heat dissipates also very quickly. When the spent nuclear fuel is unloaded from a reactor, it goes through a number of stages. First, the highly radioactive material, still in its original form, is dropped into a tank of water, where it is left for a period ranging from a few months to more than a year. The water absorbs the heat from radioactive decay and at the same time shields the surroundings from the radiation.

After the cooling period, fuel will be shipped in specially protected containers to a reprocessing plant. In this plant the fuel rods will be cut open, still under water, and the fuel pellets dissolved. The uranium and the plutonium will be separated from each other and from the radioactive fission products. The uranium and plutonium can be re-used as reactor fuel and hence will be refabricated into fuel elements. The remaining fission products are the wastes. These substances are first stored in a water solution for an additional period to allow the radioactivity to decay even further. Special tanks with double walls are being used for that purpose in order to ensure against leakage of the solution. After five years the wastes are converted to solids, and after another five years shipped to a repository.

Presently, three different methods have been developed for solidifying wastes, and these wastes can then be fused with glass and fabricated into solid rods. These rods can then be placed in sturdy steel containers which are closed at both ends. It is difficult to see how any of the radioactive material could get out into the environment after such treatment, provided that the material is adequately cooled to prevent melting. As I have already said, the materials can then be disposed of in one of two main ways: either by burying within salt domes or within granitic batholiths. At this stage scientists are quite certain that suitable permanent storage sites are available, and there is no doubt that world technology has now reached the stage where there will be a completely safe means of disposal for highly active nuclear waste.

France is, in fact, completing the first major plant to handle such disposal on a commercial basis right now, and this plant will be in operation soon. The United Kingdom already has a reprocessing plant and can produce limited batches of encapsulated waste. The United States of America is presently conducting intensive experiments to develop the necessary technology. In the U.S. the Government has an active programme of seeking out and proving sites for deep disposal of radioactive waste once they have been fixed into vitreous material. They are investigating the use of salt domes due to their long-term geological stability and granitic batholiths, which are much more promising as they are even more stable than salt domes and are not permeable or subject to melting. Additionally, Sweden, West Germany and Japan all have the technology that will enable long-term disposal.

Some persons have stated that the radioactivity from such burying could come back to the surface. I believe that this fear is grossly exaggerated. Recently it was discovered that, in the Gabon Republic in Africa, there existed some 1 800 million years ago a natural nuclear reactor, a metal ore in that area being extremely rich in uranium, ranging

from 10 per cent to 60 per cent. Whereas the present concentration of uranium 235 in natural uranium is 0.72 per cent, the concentration 1 800 million years ago was about the same as it is in present-day, light-water reactors; that is, about 3 per cent. The ore also contained about 15 per cent water, thus making conditions similar to those in a light-water reactor, except for the cooling mechanism.

In the natural nuclear reactor, plutonium 239 was formed, which subsequently decayed by emitting alpha radiation to form uranium 235. The interesting point is that the plutonium did not move as much as a millimetre during its 25 000 year life time. Moreover, the fission products, except the volatile ones, have stayed close to the uranium even after nearly 2 000 million years.

Assuming that plutonium is made in appreciable amounts, it must be kept from anyone who might put it to destructive use. However, contrary to widespread theory, there is little danger that plutonium could be stolen from a working nuclear reactor. The reactor fuel is extremely radioactive and even if an unauthorised person could succeed in unloading some fuel elements, which is a difficult and lengthy operation, he could not carry them away without dying in the attempt. The same is true of the used fuel cooling in storage tanks. The places from which plutonium may in principle, be stolen are from the chemical reprocessing plant, after the radioactive fission products have been removed, the fuel fabrication plant, or the transportation system between the plants and the reactor where the refabricated fuel elements are to be installed.

Of these, transportation seems to be the most vulnerable. In this area, much study has been done to ensure the secure and safe transportation of these products.

Members of the Opposition have been most misleading in their statements in relation to international control. To control materials flow, it is not necessary for the sensitive parts of nuclear plants to be inspected. Physical technology can be kept secret, as inspectors have no need to look at this aspect of a plant's operations. They can still readily determine the apparent efficiency of the plant without such inspections. Provided that the licences to operate a plant include very strict workable quality control to keep track of all materials, complete protection will result. It is only necessary that good quality control be demanded as a prerequisite for the initial supply and the continuing supply of uranium.

Members opposite have expressed concern about the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Even if most countries were to stop producing nuclear power, others, such as Japan and some of the Western nations, not only need nuclear power more than does the United States or Australia, but they also have the technology to apply it, and there is no doubt that, because of their heavy energy demands, they would continue to produce nuclear power themselves. We have a resource which other countries need, and only two things can occur if we refuse to develop it: either those countries will obtain their requirements elsewhere, and therefore South Australia and Australia will miss out on the huge amount of income to be derived, or we run a serious risk of being forcibly occupied by countries less fortunate than ourselves purely and simply to get at our energy resources. We cannot bury our heads in the sand and refuse to provide the one fuel that will enable Japan, Third World countries, and countries without or with very small supplies of their own fuel, to survive.

I believe that, in weighing the overall health hazard presented by nuclear reactors, it is most appropriate to compare nuclear plants with coal burning power plants

and, remember, members opposite are putting forward coal as the major alternative to supply large amounts of power. Recent findings indicate that, even if scrubbers or any other technology could reduce the estimated health effects from coal burning by a factor of 10, the hazard from coal would still exceed that from nuclear fuel by an order of magnitude.

We in Australia just do not appreciate the already severe environmental effects in the north-eastern United States and north-western Europe from too much coal burning. Acid rain is now a severe economic problem in those areas, and, even with highly efficient scrubbing of sulphur gases from the emissions, there is little room for the further expansion of the use of coal as an energy source in those areas. And these effects are on top of those I mentioned earlier!

These comparisons are not intended as an argument against coal. We clearly need to burn more coal in power plants, but I am using this comparison to point out the relative safety of nuclear reactors.

So, in summation, nuclear power does involve some risks, notably the risk of reactor accident or the risk of facilitating the proliferation of nuclear weapons. There is difficulty in the proliferation of nuclear material but, as I have already pointed out, this could occur and would occur anyway, and, as far as the risks of nuclear power are concerned, they are statistically small compared with other risks that our society accepts.

It is also important not to consider nuclear power in isolation. This country needs power to keep its economy going, as does the rest of the world. Too little power will mean too little industry, which will mean unemployment and recession, if not worse.

I would now like to turn my attention to public transport for the north-eastern suburbs. I believe the reports earlier prepared by this Government offer only two alternatives that can be realistically entertained. They show quite clearly that the Modbury transport corridor is admirably suited for either a conventional two-lane bus-only road (called a conventional bus-way) or a Mercedes-Benz guided bus-way system. Similar operating concepts apply to each and cost differences would be only marginal. It cannot be stressed enough that it is in the area of cost that both of these systems come out far in front of the previously considered l.r.t. proposal, making a new public transport system for the north-eastern suburbs an economic reality at last.

Even the most expensive diesel powered bus proposal, whether bus-way or guide-way, is costed in 1979 dollars at \$39 000 000 at commencement of operation. The l.r.t. proposal, which the previous Minister of Transport was attempting to force on the public of South Australia, is generously estimated to cost \$115 000 000 at the same stage. By the year 2005, costs are anticipated at \$64 000 000 for either bus-way but \$126 000 000 for l.r.t. The huge costs for l.r.t. make it totally unviable, as no Government could, in my opinion, consider that amount of money to be well spent when there are much cheaper proposals that will do the same job. Similarly, the State, in my opinion, just cannot afford l.r.t.—and I believe that the previous Government realised this, too. The only way that l.r.t. could have proceeded would have been through vastly increased taxation or Government charges. Fortunately, the present Government is exhibiting a high degree of responsibility, and we can now have alternatives to consider which are viable and which this State can afford.

Additionally, either bus system alternative has another very great advantage: passengers can board a bus in any of the north-eastern suburbs and then travel via the bus-way

on that bus all the way to the city. Under the l.r.t. proposal, intending passengers would have either to use private transport to Tea Tree Plaza or to catch a feeder bus to the plaza and then board the l.r.t. This would have been both time consuming and inconvenient. There is no doubt that these factors would have deterred potential users of l.r.t., and the two bus systems remove the disadvantage of interchange completely—a point I will enlarge on shortly.

The reports also show many other advantages of the bus systems: they are highly dependable; they will provide a much quicker trip to the city over present times; they will result in lower increases in the deficit of the operating authority; they have a much better benefit-cost ratio; they offer greater flexibility of use; they will enable earlier use of advanced vehicle technology in the future (once bought, l.r.t. vehicles would have to be operated for 35 years to obtain maximum dollar value, whereas buses can be changed after 15 years); various power sources can be utilised for the buses (diesel, electricity, batteries, l.p.g., l.n.g., methanol, or various combinations of these in dual modes), thus enabling the use of the most economical form of energy, with diesel power being most economically superior at the present time.

Additionally, it is important to note that, in the reports, it is stated quite clearly that, if the l.r.t. option were put in, more than half of the passengers would be standing, and these would be standing at the rate of four persons per square metre—extremely cramped conditions, as I am sure all honourable members would agree. On the other hand, the reports show that virtually all passengers on the bus-way would be seated, and I have already mentioned the added aspect of convenience. Passengers can choose whether to “park and ride”, or to catch a bus from their home to go to work, if the bus option is chosen, whereas with the l.r.t. there is no choice. If you want to use it, and you do not live near it, then you must either use a bus to get to the l.r.t. or take a car and “park and ride”. With the bus system, however, the buses will service all of the north-eastern suburbs and persons will be able to board a bus and travel all of the way to the city without the disadvantage of an interchange.

I think I should point out here, too, that the report states that the interchange from bus to l.r.t. vehicle is two minutes. I cannot accept that timing at all. This, I believe, would be the absolute minimum if a bus happened to pull up just before an l.r.t. vehicle was leaving. Then it could be done. But what happens if the bus pulls in just after the l.r.t. vehicle has left, and also what about the all important homeward journey? It is all very fine to say that the bus could bring passengers to the transit point for the inward journey, where there would be vehicles running at frequent intervals, with a quick passage from the transit point expected. However, it is most unlikely that, except in exceptional cases, the l.r.t. vehicle would arrive on the homeward journey from the city at the same time as a bus was leaving to go to a particular outer suburb, and I can see quite long delays occurring from the time that an l.r.t. vehicle arrives, for example, at Tea Tree Plaza, to the time when a bus could be leaving to take passengers to Banksia Park. Here I can see very real and long delays for intending passengers, and so once again the superior convenience of a bus system is clearly shown.

There is also no doubt in my mind that a bus-way would provide greater flexibility. With the changing patterns in the development of land use and occupancy in Tea Tree Gully, a system which can cater for the many changes is required. As the previous Government admitted, it had no intention whatsoever of expanding the l.r.t. service beyond the Tea Tree Plaza. A bus-way system provides

the opportunity for servicing all outlying areas in the north-eastern suburbs, including those yet to be developed.

I believe that the Government has provided two truly viable options for us to consider. Either the bus-way or the Mercedes-Benz guide-way can be provided at a price we can afford, and each offers rapid transport to and from the city without any need for interchange. We have proposals which are both practical and realistically priced, which really do provide the opportunity for world-class public transport for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs and which, unlike l.r.t., are economically realistic. I am looking forward to the release of the Government's decision on this matter soon.

I now turn my attention to education. Members opposite have, I believe, played a major role in attempting to have the community look at education emotionally rather than factually. It is obvious that they are trying to foment trouble in South Australia with the misguided aim of embarrassing the Government. However, in spite of an extremely active campaign from the Opposition and from the South Australian Institute of Teachers within my electorate, I believe that parents are getting the message that this Government is doing a lot, in fact far more than the previous Government did, in education.

We have seen the spurious arguments being brought forward about the supposed 3 per cent cuts and others which are also purely surmised by members opposite. But, let us have a look at the true facts. This Government has shown, in its very short term in office, that it is totally dedicated to ensuring that South Australia has the best possible education system.

First, the Budget allocation for 1979-80 that was developed by the previous Government prior to September 1979 was not only adopted by this Government but also increased. We have seen the equipment grants, which the previous Government cut in halves, restored to their previous level. We have seen class sizes reduced in South Australia, and it is anticipated that they will be reduced further again in 1981.

This Government, in spite of the declining school enrolments, has taken initiatives in many issues. There has been no reduction of staff as alleged. In fact, there has been an increase in staff numbers in the primary school area. More funds have been made available for temporary relieving staff and ancillary staff. There have been substantial increases in school foundation grants and free scholarship allowances. There has been a doubling in grants to ethnic groups teaching languages to students. The sum of \$1 500 000 has been made available to employ relieving staff, and there is a commitment of \$2 500 000 already given for this purpose for the next financial year.

Totally ridiculous claims have also been made about the number of unemployed teachers, but the point is that this Government has, during this year, increased greatly the number of teachers employed and reduced substantially the number of teachers unemployed. I think at this stage we should point out that the previous Government did little, if anything, to try to overcome the present problem being faced because of the number of unemployed teachers. The previous Minister should have known and been given figures which showed quite clearly that the number of teachers required was going to diminish. But, what did he or his Government do about that? It did absolutely nothing.

This Government has also taken initiatives in the area of Aboriginal education. Remote children's and isolated children's allowances have been increased. The free book allowance has been substantially increased. Funding in the field of further education is up by \$2 600 000 and schools

recognised as under-privileged and needing priority have been increased from 10 to over 30.

The present Government has recognised and will continue to recognise the importance of education to all South Australians. It has increased overall spending. However, I would like to take up a point which was so well expressed by my colleague, the member for Rocky River, earlier this year when he pointed out that the standard of education is not necessarily based on the amount of money devoted to it. Frankly, I am very suspicious of the South Australian Institute of Teachers' desire to get more money in the education Budget. It has placed a log of claims to have a 12 per cent increase in the salary of teachers, and it is interesting to note that at a recent meeting held by the Acting President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, with the Minister of Education for over an hour, she spent the entire time talking about the proposed pay rises for teachers and did not mention any other matters pertaining to education.

I think it is quite easy to see where the institute's interests lie, and I might point out that I have had many discussions with many teachers about the proposed salary increase. I can state that, without any shadow of fear of contradiction, only a handful of the teachers to whom I have spoken are in agreement with the present salary demands being put forward by their institute. We therefore have yet another example of a union pushing its own barrow and totally ignoring the needs and wants of the people whom it supposedly represents.

Of the teachers to whom I have spoken, many are embarrassed by the claim presently being put forward by their institute, and have stated that they wish to dissociate themselves completely from what is going on. They are genuinely concerned about the education of the State's children, and they do not agree that increased salaries is the way to get this done. They are also very conscious of the fact that their salary increase will probably mean that fewer numbers can be employed in future years. Let us face it: a classroom teacher can now earn in excess of \$18 000 per year, a figure which I do not believe to be an unreasonable amount. It is way above the average wage, and it certainly is in the region of middle levels of management in industry. This is a figure which, having spoken with teachers, is acceptable to them as being adequate.

While I am discussing S.A.I.T., the *Teachers Journal* certainly does not provide much interesting reading these days. Very little of it is devoted to professional development. It is, unfortunately, more and more becoming a piece of biased political journalism, and it is supposedly a professional journal.

I have also taken particular care to speak with a number of parents on the issue of education spending, and again far and away the majority of these parents appreciate the fact that more money does not necessarily mean better education.

This Government was elected with one of its major platforms being to ensure that Government money is well spent. I have been given by many teachers a lot of information which indicates that there are areas within the department where money is being wasted through duplication and in other ways. Many teachers are also expressing concern at the large amount of time that is being spent by them outside the classroom. In many cases the privilege of attending conferences (and I agree that conferences are necessary to keep professional levels up) is being abused, for undoubtedly some teachers are attending conferences purely and simply to get out of the classroom situation. And these statements are being made by teachers themselves.

Many teachers are concerned about a number of areas, and I am most pleased that this Government has instigated the Keeves committee in order that far-reaching recommendations can be brought down to ensure that good education with optimum use of the dollar is obtained. I am sure no-one will confuse this committee with the pathetic piece of politicking set up by the Opposition.

Teachers have also expressed concern to me that there are in their ranks, unfortunately, a number who are not accepting their professional responsibilities. There are teachers who are taking high salaries and giving nothing in return. The good, conscientious teacher is naturally concerned about this, because it increases the work load for him or her, and also makes the job within a school, of providing education, much more difficult. Teachers have spoken to me of the necessity to develop a form of assessment for appraisal to ensure that those good teachers who are presently unemployed (and I believe there are many, many young people who are very keen to be teachers,) who would make very good teachers, and who presently cannot get a position within the department because too many spots are being held down by the unprofessional teacher.

I believe that teachers themselves should be looking very seriously at what sort of appraisal system should be developed to ensure that good teachers can get a job and that those teachers who do not wish to, or who are not capable of performing their duties well, can be removed from the classroom. One must remember that teachers have the education of young children in their hands, and I think that it is very wrong indeed to have incompetent or irresponsible persons presently doing the harm that is being done within schools.

I stress that the number of these teachers is small, but they are there, and they should not be there. Teachers should also be looking very closely at other uses of an appraisal system within their profession. There is, without doubt, a lot of dissatisfaction at the moment, as many teachers can see little, if any, opportunity for promotion over the next 10 to 15 years.

Promotion tends presently to be based on seniority. Again, should it not be that the most able teachers be the ones that move on within the department? A system of appraisal would determine who the good teachers were, who the good administrators were, and therefore those who were worthy of promotion. As in private enterprise, a system based on performance, not on seniority, should be seriously considered.

Also, I believe that a teacher should be appraised as far as his monetary worth is concerned outside of the promotion system. A teacher obtaining a good appraisal should be eligible for a merit increase. Teachers who do not get such reports should not get any increase. In this way one of the major problems that teachers are putting to me, that is, the lack of opportunity to move on, would at least be partially overcome. Unfortunately, there is not the opportunity to reward all of the good teachers with promotion but, if they can see that they are being rewarded through a merit system of payment, at least that would provide a tangible way for them to sense that what they are doing is being recognised.

I realise that many of the points that I have made will be complete anathema to some within the Education Department, but teachers with whom I have spoken are genuinely concerned about the future, and are looking to bring about the best education system possible. They believe that the old system, where there can be virtually no dismissal, little control of the irresponsible teacher, no determination of promotion except by seniority, and no

method of financial reward for performance, offers too much protection for the wrong person. A system overcoming these retarding influences would bring about a major change that would be of benefit to the State's education system.

I personally see no reason why any teacher, or for that matter any public servant, should have a guarantee of employment. If he does not merit his employment, if he is not capable of his employment, if he does not want to perform as he should, then why should this State pay out money that could be much better spent by employing persons who do want to do a good job and who would do a good job? Again, we should, remember that teachers are dealing with the education of our children, one of the most vital things any person can possibly be involved in.

I would like to conclude by taking up some of the points which members of the Opposition have stated in relation to the development of industry within South Australia. Many fatuous remarks have been made, but any unbiased person must admit that there is now far more activity industrially than occurred under the previous Government. We can see quite clearly, from many examples, how industry is being attracted back to South Australia.

We have heard many bitter comments made by the Opposition about the General Motors-Holden's plastics plant. There may not be an actual increase in the number of jobs in South Australia immediately from that development, but had we not obtained that development in South Australia, first, the jobs that will be created within that plant would have been lost to this State permanently and, additionally, as is seen in the case of vehicles overseas, plastics are going to play a more and more vital role in a car's development, predominantly owing to the fact that it is much lighter than steel. If we can get lighter vehicles, they will be more fuel efficient and, as plastics development occurs, South Australia will be in the box seat to get the additional employment from that development.

We have seen the industrial firm of Shearers, which moved to Queensland during the period of Labor rule, now returning to South Australia and consolidating all of its manufacturing within this State, even though the equipment that is to be manufactured, because of the transfer from Queensland, will be much further from the markets for which that equipment is intended than it would have been had Shearers remained in Queensland.

We have also seen that the confectionery maker Rowntree Hoadley will be expanding its operations in Adelaide. Again, it is bad news for "Nifty" Neville Wran, in that the company's Sydney factory is going to close at the end of the year. But the Adelaide plant will be expanded to cater for that closure, and the Sydney plant presently employs 150 persons.

It is quite obvious that with that move and also with the closure of the General Motors-Holden's Pagewood plant (and the corresponding expansion at Elizabeth), many companies now see this State as infinitely preferable to the Labor State of New South Wales. They can now see that there is a Government in South Australia that will protect, encourage and nurture private enterprise and, over the next few years, I am sure the public of South Australia will see only too clearly the major differentiation between that which was occurring prior to September 1979 and that which has occurred subsequently.

Again, as my colleague the member for Rocky River pointed out recently, figures now released by the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce indicate that South Australia's development prospects are certainly being renewed. Major manufacturing investment is occurring, mining projects are developing, and all of these

will result in many more job opportunities and much more income for this State.

The survey by the Department of Industry and Commerce shows in excess of a 1 000 per cent rise in combined manufacturing and mining investment in South Australia from October last year to May this year, and this massive increase in development must augur well for South Australia's future. The nearest any other State gets to this is approximately one-fifth of the percentage development that has been experienced in South Australia.

In manufacturing industry, investment was increased from \$110 000 000 to \$140 000 000 in that period, and in mining, from \$190 000 000 to \$3 270 000 000. And this only supports how important it is that this State encourages the development of areas such as Roxby Downs.

This State must retain its present Government. We just cannot afford a return to the socialist 70's, to a Government which would be anti-enterprise and which would immediately, on its own admission, close down a huge mining prospect, and the industry that would go with it. And that would be just the tip of the iceberg.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion because it is accepted Parliamentary practice, and I do so in due deference and respect to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House, and note that there are only two members of the Opposition present in the Chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not supposed to comment in raising a point of order.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. SLATER: The contents of the Governor's Speech and some of the legislative proposals contained therein can best be described as a recipe for disaster for the residents of South Australia. In the opening paragraphs of the Governor's Speech it was stated that the Government continues to attach great importance to careful planning and control of the State finances, and that the Revenue and Loan Accounts show a surplus of \$37 200 000. It is essential to examine carefully the surplus.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Would you like one or two of us to come over and keep you company?

Mr. SLATER: No, I am perfectly able to look after this side of the House. It has always been the accepted fact that one Labor member is worth about 15 Liberals, so we are about square at the moment. I was suggesting that we ought to examine carefully the surplus.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation on my right.

Mr. SLATER: We should examine carefully the surplus indicated in the Governor's Speech of \$37 200 000 to see whether the surplus is real or imaginary, and why some of this money cannot be allocated to some of the real and pressing needs of the community.

Why is it that water, electricity, and transport costs, Housing Trust rents and other State charges have substantially increased in the past 10 months? Some claim (and the claim has been made specifically by the Premier), in respect to the abolition of succession and gift duties, pay-roll tax, stamp duty concessions, land tax abolition on the principal place of residence, that these taxes substantially assist the more affluent members of our society and do little or nothing to assist the ordinary members of our community.

Recent figures for South Australia show that the

increase in the consumer price index for Adelaide was 8.8 per cent during the past nine months so it has had the largest rise of any capital city. This can best be described as Tonkin-induced inflation. The greatest contributing factor in this regard has been the removal of effective price control. Many goods that were previously under price control have consequently increased in price. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture has a special interest in one of them, and that is increased beer prices. Food, footwear, children's clothing and other essentials important to the family man have increased quite substantially and have further promoted the inflationary spiral. It is obvious that the Government is concerned with the more affluent sections of the community, and its declared policy regarding private enterprise supports this contention.

A surplus in accounts has been attained by many cut-backs in community services of the sort which the public are entitled to receive and which are essential to the general welfare of the community. Because of these cut-backs, the morale of the Public Service and many of the essential services is at an all-time low. Despite the remarks of the member for Todd, the morale of the teaching profession is at an all-time low. The Police Force, fire fighting services, nurses and hospital staff have all been affected by reductions in staff or by insufficient remuneration. Morale has been seriously affected, and services to the community have consequently been impaired. If this continuing philosophy of the Premier and the policy of his Government continues, it will indeed be a recipe for disaster. Legislation outlined in the Governor's Speech designed to assist private enterprise friends of the Government—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You support the private enterprise sector of the community.

Mr. SLATER: If the Minister will listen to why I support private enterprise but not monopoly capital, he will learn the difference. He will have his opportunity to speak later in the debate. I refer to the Governor's Speech in respect to community welfare and the nature of the services which will be restricted or curtailed. The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs will be disadvantaged by legislative changes to assist the interests of commerce and industry, and the replacement of the Land Commission, which has served the South Australian community well, with an urban land trust which will have revised functions and reduced powers will disadvantage the consumer.

Mr. Lewis interjecting:

Mr. SLATER: If the member for Mallee wants to know how the Land Commission has served the people of Adelaide, let him look at the price of land in any other capital city in Australia and he will find that land in Adelaide is cheaper than comparable land in any other capital city. That is how the commission has helped South Australia.

The Premier has, over recent times, made great play (as we have just heard from the member for Todd) about industrial expansion in South Australia and the creation of employment. The Governor, in his Speech, cited a number of firms that expect to expand. However, he has conveniently disregarded the fact that a number of companies have reduced staff or ceased operations during his Government's term of office in this State. Perhaps for the record it might be important to indicate some of those firms. Charles Moore's retail group closed its four South Australian stores. On 30 July 1980 Leyland ceased truck retailing in South Australia. This affected the jobs of 40 to 50 people. In July 1980, 40 jobs were lost at a cement plant. South Australia's biggest concrete plant, Pioneer Concrete retrenched 40 employees in the contracting

division. On 8 August, 12 tip-truck drivers were retrenched from Quarry Industries. In May 1980 a plumbing supply firm, Donson Industries Proprietary Limited, announced that it was transferring its manufacturing operations to its Melbourne plant. The work force of about 113 in October was to be reduced to about 10. On 7 June Hallett Bricks announced that it would close its Golden Grove plant, putting 54 employees out of work.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Why do you keep on knocking all the time?

Mr. SLATER: If I were a knocker, I would say that I learnt a lesson from the Premier, who in Opposition did his best to knock everything and all in South Australia. I am not knocking; I am stating facts. A number of companies that have closed do not receive a mention from members opposite in regard to loss of industry in this State during their term of office. Ansett closed its South Australian air hostess base with a loss of 66 jobs. Comalco closed its aluminium extrusion plant at Mile End. There are others—a substantial list of industries and commercial enterprises that have closed in the past 10 months, and that does not indicate that the Government is assisting the employment situation in this State. This fact is proved by figures.

The Commonwealth unemployment statistics for June 1980 show that 46 200 South Australians were registered as unemployed. That is almost 3 000 more than in June of last year. Do members opposite deny that? In July the A.B.S. figures showed that the South Australian unemployment rate of 7.5 per cent was the highest of any State in Australia. Do members opposite deny that? The national average is 5.8 per cent. How can the Premier or the member for Rocky River, or anyone else on the other side, tell us that they have improved the situation in regard to unemployment in the past 10 months? Despite what they say about their promises of giving jobs to people in South Australia, it has not happened. I am not interested in statistics—I am interested in people.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is interjecting when he is out of his seat.

Mr. SLATER: It is all right if one is not a statistic. Many people in my electorate are unemployed, and they are desperate to receive jobs. They need more than just financial assistance, as they have lost their morale. Some persons in this position whom I know are in their early fifties and have families. Their prospects for finding employment are almost nil. Many young people are unemployed.

Members interjecting:

Mr. SLATER: I am saying that they have no opportunity to obtain work. Prior to the election, the Government Party promised them jobs, but it has not done it, nor is it likely to do it. It might also be significant to note the number of South Australian business firms and commercial interests that have merged or been taken over by interstate companies or multi-nationals in the past 10 months. This trend has been significantly pronounced during the Tonkin Government's term of office.

Let us look at a few of these companies. The Bank of Adelaide went by the wayside. Kelvinator was taken over by an interstate or overseas firm, Email.

Mr. Olsen: With no jobs lost.

Mr. SLATER: We are not sure about that. I have not seen statistics for employment at Kelvinator, but if you let me get to the point I will tell you what has been lost. Golden Breed has been handed over to private enterprise (and I think we gave them South Australian Development Corporation shares). T. O'Connor Holdings is another

example. Let me quote from an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 22 July 1980 under the heading "O'Connor in share switch", as follows:

The O'Connor family is cutting its shareholding in South Australian-based T. O'Connor Holdings Ltd. from 65.62 per cent to 43.75 per cent.

Adelaide-based investments group, Consortium Property & Investments Pty. Ltd. (CPI) is to emerge as O'Connor's second largest shareholder with an 18.75 per cent stake.

CPI is owned equally by Mr. Ron Brierley's—the share raider—

Industrial Equity Ltd., Southern Farmers Holdings Ltd., Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd.—

and so on. There is a list of Industrial Equity's ownership in various companies in this State. What I am suggesting is that there are plenty of South Australian companies—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. SLATER: Quite a number of companies have merged in the past 10 months, or been taken over by interstate or overseas interests. The mystery continues about the upsurge in the sale of John Martin and Company Limited shares. There is the Uniroyal situation where, amid continuing heavy rationalisation of the Australian tyre industry, there is persistent buying of the shares of Adelaide-based Uniroyal Holdings. All of these matters point to one thing, that the decisions which affect the lives and work opportunities of South Australians are now being made not in Adelaide but in the boardrooms of Melbourne, Sydney, New York, Tokyo, Paris, and so on, with little or no regard to decisions that might affect the lives of people living in this State. The Tonkin Government condones—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Tonkin.

Mr. SLATER: The Tonkin Government, and I use that term without any disrespect (he used to be called Dr. Tonkin and changed that to Mr. Tonkin, so anybody could become confused), condones all of this in the name of what it describes as "free enterprise". If members opposite studied history they might realise that free enterprise died in about 1890 and that the other aspect of enterprise, which is not free but monopoly enterprise, entered the field and, as a consequence, is extending its tentacles into South Australia.

This Government, being private-enterprise orientated, has scant regard for the welfare of the ordinary citizen and has done nothing to arrest the situation of South Australia's assets being sold off, raided by share raiders, and, of course, the situation of remote control of all the important aspects of commerce and industry in this State. My view is shared by Mr. John Bonython, who is reported in the press as saying—

Mr. Keneally: He's a socialist.

Mr. SLATER: I am not sure that he is a socialist, but he is a director of a number of companies in South Australia, although I think he is now retired from active participation. He was reported in a press report titled "Why all the takeovers?", as follows:

South Australian firms have been exceptionally prone to takeovers during the past few years, causing grave concern among business leaders.

Mr. Bonython highlighted that one of the reasons for this happening is the payment of small dividends to shareholders. He continued in that report, as follows:

We have been carrying that to such an extreme in South Australia that it is half our trouble.

He went on to explain about company A and its profit-making situation. He concluded as follows:

The danger is that any small town winds up with smallish

people running smallish businesses and otherwise just having agents for big companies. Adelaide could one day have only a few agents or representatives of big manufacturers. The big decisions will be made wherever the big companies have their head offices.

Mr. Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think the member for Mallee has been given a fair bit of licence with his interjecting.

Mr. SLATER: Mr. Bonython supports my contention that the present Government, rather than assisting them, has acted more like a conspirator in relation to multi-national interests, mining companies and the large commercial industrial and retailing interests. It believes that by doing this it is doing the people of South Australia a favour. There may be some peripheral employment opportunities created in the short term, but in the long term, of course, the multi-nationals are interested only in squashing small business activity with a subsequent overall loss of employment opportunity. We have been told recently, in various television, radio and press commercials, that "It is our State, mate". Let me assure members that it is not our State, mate. In almost every sphere of industrial, commercial and retailing activity, the real wealth of this State is siphoned off by large combines. The public of South Australia is being taken for a ride. I do not blame some of the members opposite, because perhaps they do not understand what is happening, but we are being sold off, we are being ripped off by large international organisations. It is a pity that the Government is aiding and abetting those interests. What is even worse, it is shifting the burden of taxes from the wealthy section of the community to the lower and middle-income earners.

Mr. Mathwin: You know that this is the best country in the world. You have travelled around the world.

Mr. SLATER: I recall that it was the best country in the world, but now one doubts that, with the sorts of things that are happening in the community.

Members interjecting:

Mr. SLATER: The philosophy of members opposite is the philosophy of the Fraser Government and your Federal counterparts, who have been following economic policies which are proving disastrous for the welfare of the ordinary people in the community. Let me give members an example of a handout to big business which is proposed by the Government and referred to in the Governor's Speech.

I refer to the proposed introduction of soccer pools in South Australia. The pools will be conducted by an organisation named Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited, and the principals, I understand, are Mr. Rupert Murdoch and the United Kingdom-based Vernon organisation, which is principally controlled by Mr. Sangster, of racehorse infamy.

Mr. Mathwin: Sangster is Vernon pools.

Mr. SLATER: Of course he is. What effect will the introduction of soccer pools in this State have on other forms of gambling revenue?

Mr. Lewis: What does it matter?

Mr. SLATER: It matters a lot and, if the honourable member will just listen, I will explain why. In particular, I am concerned about the effect soccer pools will have on the South Australian Lotteries Commission, which was set up in 1966 under an Act of this Parliament to conduct the form of lottery operations in this State. The commission has proven competent and effective, and it has conducted its lotteries most successfully, namely, cross lotto, lotteries, etc. Soccer pools are only a variation of the numbers game. I believe that soccer pools will be

introduced as a pay-off to the Government's private enterprise friends to the detriment of the successful Lotteries Commission operation, and this will affect the commission's operations considerably.

It is interesting to note the comparison of the break-up of the investor's dollar in respect of the commission and the soccer pools proposal. Soccer pools pay 37 per cent in prize money to the investor, whereas the Lotteries Commission pays 61 per cent. From soccer pools, the Government obtains 30 per cent, whereas from the Lotteries Commission it obtains 32.8 per cent. Soccer pool operation expenses amount to 15½ per cent, whereas the Lotteries Commission's operation expenses amount to 6.2 per cent. Agents' commission is 12½ per cent for soccer pools, and nil for the Lotteries Commission, because the 8.5 per cent is paid by the client who purchases the ticket. The promoter's fee is 5 per cent for soccer pools and nil for the Lotteries Commission. One can see that soccer pools are a rip-off for the investor.

Mr. Hemmings: Good, old private enterprise.

Mr. SLATER: Yes. The experience in some of the other States where soccer pools operate has shown that there has been a decline in other aspects of gambling revenue, and T.A.B. is an interesting example. South Australia already is one of the lowest States in this form of investment, and racing, trotting and dog-racing clubs rely to a great extent on the return from T.A.B. Here again, this operation could be seriously jeopardised by the introduction of soccer pools.

Another aspect is the effect soccer pools will have on small lotteries operation, because many sporting and social clubs raise considerable revenue by means of small lotteries such as instant bingo, bingo, etc. As there is in the community a limited sum to be invested in various forms of gambling, one form has an effect on the other.

No doubt it will be argued that Government revenue from soccer pools will be provided for sport and recreation. However, if a soccer pool operation takes away revenue from the Lotteries Commission, it will be taking away money from the Hospitals Fund, which provides substantial sums for hospitals in South Australia. Soccer pools appear to me to be another example of the Government's desire to assist large entrepreneurs, to the detriment of community enterprise. For this reason, the Opposition will be strongly opposing the legislation to introduce soccer pools in this State if they are to be run by Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd.

I turn now to another matter which, I believe, is of extreme importance to the people of this State. I believe that, next to unemployment, the most pressing problem facing the community is housing. The housing industry has suffered a severe and sustained downturn, and it is becoming increasingly difficult for young couples to purchase a home, despite the biased statements by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Hill), the Premier, and his remissions of stamp duty on the purchase of a first home.

The continuing escalation of costs and high interest rates are the main causes of the problem. Many people are unable to purchase a home, owing to the economic circumstances, and many of these are on the waiting list for Housing Trust rental accommodation. This, together with the number of people living in substandard accommodation, indicates the magnitude of the problem, particularly in regard to welfare housing. The trust, along with State housing instrumentalities in other States, has been severely affected by Federal Government cutbacks in funds for welfare housing. Consequently, the trust is finding it difficult to provide accommodation for all of its applicants.

In addition, because of the cutbacks in Federal funds,

one casualty has been the rental-purchase scheme, a most successful scheme that provided the opportunity for middle and low-income groups to purchase a home over a long period at low interest rates. Over 8 000 people participated in the scheme. Unfortunately the scheme was torpedoed by the Federal Government's cutbacks in funds.

It may be interesting to note that the trust has also been one of the instrumentalities on which the hand of this Government has fallen. I mention, without making any criticism of the person involved, that it was a case of a job for the boys (perhaps the girls) because, in December 1979, the Government replaced four members of the trust board. Perhaps the best way I can express that situation is by means of a press report, which gives an indication of the persons who were appointed to the board at that time. A press report dated 21 December 1979, under the heading "Four replaced on board of Housing Trust", states:

The State Government has replaced four of the seven members of the South Australian Housing Trust board, including the Chairman, Mr. M. L. Liberman. Mr. R. F. Paley will be the board's new Chairman . . . The other new members of the Housing Trust board will be Mr. R. J. Emmett, Chairman and Managing Director of the building firm Emmett Pty. Ltd., Mr. P. T. Pirone, a city solicitor with accounting and land broking qualifications, and Mrs. E. A. von Schramek, an interior design expert who lectures part-time at the South Australian Institute of Technology.

The Chairman of the board is Mr. Paley. I do not know him, but I understand that he is the founder of Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd. It is further interesting to note that he is also a director of the Co-operative Building Society. One would be pleased to believe that Mr. Paley could act in regard to a public instrumentality and share this with his interests in the Co-operative Building Society, which is a private organisation.

It was most interesting to note that the persons who were replaced all had community interest regarding the trust instead of having specific business interests.

Mrs. von Schramek's comment, on being appointed as a member of the board, was reported in the press. She said that she admitted that she knew little about the Housing Trust but said that she was impressed by a new trust unit block in Rundle Street, Kent Town. She hoped to bring a woman's perspective to trust interiors, something that traditionally had been lacking in Australian housing. She would like to see the trust use participation housing (whatever that is) in which tenants would be offered a house without interior walls. I do not want to be too critical of the lady; she is an interior designer. Instead of having walls, perhaps the trust could hang up some wallpaper as a gesture to the tenants.

Without being too critical of the situation, it seems to me that these were jobs for the boys and girls. I also believe that the Government and the Minister have not justified the replacement of the former Chairman and other members of the board. Who knows? Perhaps they were replaced because the present board members are good card-carrying members of the Liberal Party, or are private enterprise orientated and this could have some effect in ensuring that the trust played a less substantial role in public housing, which would assist the private housing sector.

I was interested in a recent announcement by the Minister of Housing in May this year that long-term trust tenants who rent semi-detached or double units would have the option to purchase these homes. This policy should be closely examined to determine the long-term effects that this policy will have on the operations of the trust. I noted that no special favours would be given to

tenants in regard to finance; tenants would have to obtain finance from the normal lending sources. It is my opinion that the purchase would not be beneficial to the overwhelming majority of tenants. Trust valuations are considerably higher than the amount offered as a loan on the property by lending institutions, and I can cite examples of this.

It may be that sales will lead to the depletion in Housing Trust rental stock. I say this with no degree of authority, but I believe that it is a possibility. I understand, at present, the trust has more than 16 000 applicants who are waiting for housing. The policy of selling rental dwellings could have two major consequences. First, because the purchasing tenants will be disproportionately drawn from among the higher income earners, the proportion of tenants on rental rebates is likely to increase, and this will put additional strain on the trust's operations.

From the trust's 1979 annual report, it can be seen that over 30 per cent of trust tenants received a rental rebate; 14 per cent received a rebate in 1976 and 7 per cent received a rebate in 1971. The rebate is provided from trust resources, and the trust and those tenants who do not receive rebates subsidise the tenants who receive rebates, who in turn subsidise the inadequate social benefits and pensions paid by the Commonwealth Government.

The second consequence of depleting the housing stock could be that trust rental applicants would have to wait a longer period to obtain trust accommodation. The number of applicants waiting for housing could be considerably extended. In addition, the sale of stock of older dwellings on which the debt load is lighter than that on new dwellings could mean that the average debt burden per dwelling will increase, with the result that trust rents must be considerably higher. Over the years, the South Australian Housing Trust has differed considerably from housing authorities in other States. The most important difference is that it has provided rental housing to a much broader section of the community. It has owned a higher proportion of housing stock than authorities in other States and the public and private rental sectors in South Australia have been almost equal in proportion. That is in sharp contrast to the Eastern States, where the average private rental sector has been four times the size of the public rental sector. Consequently, this policy of the trust to retain possession of housing stock has, in the past, had a major impact on rental levels.

If the policies of the trust change, this effective difference will be destroyed and, as a consequence, the levels of rent for existing tenants will be considerably higher. Because of this, the sale of trust rental housing must be considered carefully to ensure that rent levels remain within the means of the tenants and that the trust, as much as possible, does what it can to provide housing to those people in the community on lower and middle income levels and to those in receipt of pensions, who are unable to afford the levels of rent in the private sector.

As well as the 16 000 or so trust rental applicants pending, a considerable number of families in Adelaide live in substandard accommodation. I noted on a recent television programme that it was claimed that about 700 or more squatters occupy premises in Adelaide; these people are unable to obtain other accommodation. I know many young couples who reside with their parents because they cannot find other accommodation. Many other people are forced to reside in caravans, and some people live in tents.

I received a letter today from an organisation that is holding a public meeting this evening in Adelaide; that group calls itself the South Australian Tenants Association. The letter indicates the difficulties that these people encounter in obtaining private rental accommodation for

low-income persons. The letter states, in part:

We are a group of people affected by and concerned with the disappearance of low-income housing in the inner suburban area of Adelaide. The present economic climate in South Australia in which more people daily find themselves in positions of economic hardship, combined with the phenomenal increase in the cost of inner-city housing, is resulting in the continual erosion of this type of housing. The people affected are those in society who are least able to defend their right to live close to the city—single supporting parents, unemployed people, students, Aboriginals and other fixed and low income earners.

The meeting has been called and that indicates the problem that exists in the community in relation to people obtaining suitable accommodation.

As I said in my opening remarks, next to unemployment housing is probably the most pressing need of people in the community.

Mr. Lewis: Food is, Jack.

Mr. SLATER: Well, you may be right. There has been a substantial increase in the price of food during the past 10 months, and Adelaide had the highest increase of any other State, mainly because this Government knocked off effective price control.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I call your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. SLATER: I believe the most pressing necessity in South Australia, apart from unemployment, is that for adequate housing. I am afraid that the policies of the present Government, and perhaps those of the new Housing Trust board, will destroy the excellent work that the Housing Trust has undertaken during the past 40 years in providing accommodation for thousands of families. It must be realised that the downturn in the private housing sector has been mainly influenced by the higher interest rates and mortgages repayments associated with continuing inflation. Consequently, this is excluding many middle and low income earners from purchasing a home. It is almost necessary to rely on two incomes for young couples to purchase their home and be able to repay housing loans. I accept that the State Bank of South Australia does provide concessional home loans, but there are many who do not meet the eligibility conditions, which I realise, need to be applied.

Only a few days ago, on 6 August, I noticed in the press that these eligibility conditions were indicated by the State Bank. It is interesting to note that the loan limit has been considerably extended in the past because of inflation. It happened when the Labor Party was in Government and it has happened with the present Government. I do not decry that but, of course, that makes it increasingly difficult for people to meet the loan requirements, as they must provide 85 per cent of valuation and the concessional interest rates commence at 5.75 per cent depending on the income situation, and rise to 7.5 per cent, where the continuing household income is higher than but does not exceed 90 per cent of average wages with a present limit of \$225.90 a week.

The point I am making is that many young couples do not qualify for these concessional home loans because of their income situations, and so on. They are precluded from obtaining a loan, and would have difficulty in meeting the other commitments that go with purchasing a home, obtaining the necessary finance, etc. I believe it is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure that sufficiently low interest money is available to State Governments for home purchase. Unfortunately, the reverse has applied, and cut-backs in Federal funding to State Government instrumentalities have placed them

in an impossible situation in regard to providing sufficient funds for housing. This places both the private sector and the public sector of the housing industry in extreme jeopardy.

I turn now to another matter in which I have a specific interest. I note that there is a brief reference to tourism in the Governor's Speech. If I remember rightly, it uses one of those rather worn clichés and describes tourism as one of the growth industries, etc. I do not deny that, but the tourist industry in South Australia, despite promises from the Minister, has not shown any significant improvement under her Ministerial direction. Earlier this year we had a revision of tourism which turned out to be a bit of a giant fizzer. The report criticised the former Government quite unjustifiably; indeed, the review was hastily conducted and arrived at the wrong conclusions. We have heard of another review being undertaken at present by the Public Service Board. It is interesting to note that a Queensland firm has been appointed to review the operations of the Department of Tourism. The firm is Rob Tonge and Associates of Maroochydore, Queensland, which will form a committee to undertake the review, for which 23 consultants tendered. I am at a loss to understand why a firm from Queensland should be so expert on tourism in South Australia. The final paragraph of the press report I read makes me wonder a little about the real intention of the review. It states:

It will also look at the functions and operations of all units in the department in order to identify any deficiencies.

Could it be that the purpose of the review is to actually cut back or curtail the operations of the Department of Tourism and to reduce its allocation of funds? Perhaps many of its operations will be farmed out to private enterprise, as in the instance of the golf course at Belair Recreation Park. It must be accepted that Governments do have varying priorities, and perhaps, in the past, tourism has not received the priority that it should have received. Also, it must be accepted that a greater allocation should be made in the future than was made in the past. The real issue involved in attracting people from interstate or overseas, as well as encouraging people to travel within the State, goes a little deeper than just advertising and promotion. There are a number of factors that need to be considered, one of which is the effect of increased fuel prices on the cost of travel. People who travel like to think that they are not being ripped off. Many of us who travel interstate and, on occasions, overseas are ripped off, and I believe that, from both a public and a private entrepreneurial point of view, we ought to ensure that anybody who comes to South Australia receives our hospitality and that they are not ripped off.

I believe a co-operative effort is required between the Government and private entrepreneurs, and it should be seen as a co-operative effort. Initiatives are needed in various forms of travel, so that visitors from interstate and overseas will make South Australia part of their itinerary. I will be particularly interested in the Minister's report on the review of the Department of Tourism. As I have said, it is my guess that that report will be another fizzer and that, if anything, it will reduce the department's effectiveness, its staff and the allocation of funds. The public of South Australia can be assured that a future Labor Government will give greater priority to tourism. As time passes, the Labor Party will announce policies in that regard that will indicate our positive approach for the benefit of industry in this State.

I was rather amused the other night when the member for Henley Beach, in the opening remarks of his contribution, spoke of Divine providence. He implied that

the hand of God was guiding the Liberal Party. I do not agree with that suggestion, and events may prove that that is not the case. Perhaps the hand of the devil is doing the guiding. However, public perception of the Government's performance is of a more critical nature, as indicated in a recent public opinion poll. If the recent *Bulletin* poll is correct, and no doubt it is, the members for Henley Beach, Todd, Newland, Brighton, and Mawson—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: They will be here a lot longer than you.

Mr. SLATER: Maybe, but the recent opinion poll indicates that that may not be the case. Those members will be going back to, in the case of the member for Brighton, a travel agency.

Mr. Becker: What about Semaphore?

Mr. SLATER: We will worry about the electorate of Semaphore in due course.

Mr. Gunn: What about Mr. Apap?

Mr. SLATER: I do not know whether Mr. Apap will be our candidate next time. We were seriously thinking of making an approach to the member for Eyre to stand for us down there. Perhaps we could issue a challenge to the member for Eyre to stand for the Liberal Party in the seat of Semaphore. If the poll is correct, no doubt many members opposite will need the guidance of Divine providence. It is becoming increasingly obvious that the policy of the Government is in every way to shackle any community or public enterprise. I cannot understand the mistaken belief that free enterprise will, in its *laissez faire* fashion, provide economic recovery for this State. Nothing can be further from the truth, because the public sector is just as important as the private sector, and both are dependent upon each other. I have given several examples of where the Government is unfortunately making every endeavour to torpedo the Public Service and community enterprises. There is nothing wrong with community enterprises: they belong to the community in general, and I was amazed today—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That's why they're community enterprises.

Mr. SLATER: That is true; you can play on words. As I said in my initial remarks, if members opposite do not accept my advice, their legislative programme will no doubt turn out to be a recipe for disaster for the majority of citizens in this State.

Mr. OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday you had reason to warn me about my behaviour during Question Time. For that I now apologise, as I did then.

The reason for my outburst was the contemptible way in which the Minister of Health had used Question Time on that day to denigrate the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service, and in particular the Acting Director, Dr. Richie Gun, who is also the Labor Party candidate for the Federal seat of Kingston.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HEMMINGS: It is obvious that members opposite fully condone the way in which the Minister acted on that day; they would not know any better. On Tuesday 25 March, the member for Semaphore asked the Minister of Health a question concerning the future of the Port

Adelaide Occupational Health Service. The reply was that no decision had been made. I had talked to people at Port Adelaide and to the member for Price, and we had heard things to the contrary of what the Minister had said.

On 8 April of this year I wrote to the Minister, saying that I had been given to understand that the Director of Occupational Health had informed the service on 18 March that there were three options available to the centre: the first was for funding to be taken over by those employers then using the centre; the second was for the centre to be absorbed by the industrial industries clinic, which was privately owned; the third was for the trade union movement to provide funding. All of those three options carried with them the employment of an occupational health nurse.

I also stated in the letter that I understood that the committee was told that the Government favoured the second option, and that the Minister was not prepared to allow the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service to continue in its present form. If any of those options were taken up by the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service it would result in Commonwealth funding for the casualty section being withdrawn. The reply I received from the Minister was that the future of the service was at that time under detailed review by officers of the South Australian Health Commission, and discussions were taking place between the commission and the management committee of the service with regard to its future role.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, no discussions have taken place with the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service. One would have thought, since the member for Semaphore had raised the question in this House, and since I, as Opposition spokesman for health, had written to the Minister concerning the future of the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service, that the Minister would have acted in a responsible way and replied to the member for Semaphore, possibly to the member for Price, and to me, regarding the future of the service. However, that was not so. The Minister was aided and abetted by the member for Morphett, who has no interest in the Port Adelaide District, who has no interest in the health service being provided for the people of Port Adelaide, but who is so obviously bewitched by the Minister that he, like other Government back-benchers, is only too keen to do the Minister's bidding and to stand up and ask crude Dorothy Dixier questions, so that the Minister can enhance her reputation in this House and through the media.

The member for Morphett was only too keen to say his little piece. He is too stupid to realise exactly what he has done. The Minister came out in her true colours, and it did not concern her whether or not the people of Port Adelaide got a decent medical service. Her hatred for the Labor Party clouded any decency that she might have had, and the Minister distorted the situation just to be able to denigrate the professional standing of Dr. Richie Gun and his staff at the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service. The Minister used this coward's castle, as so many other Government members have used this place, to denigrate members of the public, who cannot reply in any way whatsoever.

Members know that the Director of the privately owned Port Adelaide Industrial Clinic, Dr. Wyatt, visited the Minister or one of her senior officers soon after the election last September and put a case to the Minister and to this Government that private enterprise should take over the industrial clinic at Port Adelaide.

Mr. Becker: Hear, hear!

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is right: hear, hear! Dr. Wyatt had obviously put up a fairly good case, as the Port

Adelaide Occupational Health Service was doomed from then on. Dr. Wyatt objected that workers in the Port Adelaide area had an independent clinic to which they could go when they had accidents at their work place. He objected also that disadvantaged people and Aboriginals, who were being denied treatment by local doctors (who demanded fees before service) and who were being refused bulk billing were being forced to go to the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service. Dr. Wyatt and his A. M. A. cronies at Port Adelaide objected to that, and obviously the Minister agreed with that. Of course, treating people as human beings and with dignity was not in keeping with the political philosophy of the Minister of Health.

Now, the Minister of Health has achieved what she set out to achieve. The Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service will close. The people of Port Adelaide will be made to suffer the consequences of this Government's policy over handing over Government subsidised clinics to private enterprise. The Minister at no time has been willing even to release the Health Commission's findings. Just lately, the Minister of Health has gone to great lengths to promote herself as the high priestess of purity and morality, and she has become the darling of the blue rinse dowager set in this city.

Members have fairly long memories, and know that the Minister, as a back-bencher and Minister, has broken every convention of which I know in this House. We always remember the speeches that the Minister made when she was a back-bencher, when she referred to the member for Elizabeth when he was Attorney-General, to the then Premier (Hon. D. Dunstan) and to the then Deputy Premier (Hon. J. D. Corcoran).

In closing, the Minister's claim to fame in this House will not be through her Ministry. She is more concerned about her backside than with the health care of people in this State.

Mr. Becker: How low can you get?

Mr. HEMMINGS: Not too low—we all know where the backside is. Any Minister in this Government who uses Question Time and Dorothy Dixers to try to blacken the names of people outside this House deserves the kind of criticism that she is receiving now. The Minister will be remembered for one thing in this House: she will be remembered for bringing the art of gutter politics to an all-time low.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to make a slight response to the member for Napier. The House should note that the Labor Party is so interested in the proceedings of this House that the normally sleepy member for Gilles has been in the Chamber and the member for Napier has also been present so that he can get his name recorded in every second page of *Hansard*. That has been the sole contribution from members of the Labor Party tonight. There has been no-one else present. On one occasion the member for Elizabeth came in for a couple of moments. The member for Napier is now going to leave the Chamber, because he is good at handing it out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has the floor.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Napier is good at handing out some strong medicine but it does not appear that he likes to receive it. I was going to remind the honourable member that perhaps, in some of the spare time he has, he go through *Hansard* and examined some of the Dorothy Dixier questions that the member for Elizabeth had asked of him when he was Attorney-General and sought to

attack in a quite scurrilous manner people whom he alleged were members of the Liberal Party. Before the honourable member starts throwing those comments out he should look at the record of his own Party.

In the few minutes available to me I want to make some comment in relation to what would appear to be the difficult position that the Leader of the Opposition finds himself in. In June he made interjections when I was making a speech. Although interjections are out of order, fortunately they were recorded in *Hansard* at page 2275. The Leader of the Opposition said he was opposed to Roxby Downs. In the course of his Address in Reply speech he obviously realised that he was in trouble. He set out to say that the Labor Party was happy to see Roxby Downs proceed but—

Mr. Slater: That's different.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, there is a difference. The Leader of the Opposition stated:

We are opposed to the development of uranium in the present situation until it is safe to do so.

He went on a bit further, and said:

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.

He has made that clear. I think he is having some difficulty because he probably realises the great benefits that will flow to South Australia, and in recent days we have seen the return to South Australia of the real power broker in the Labor Party, the member for Elizabeth, who is the leader of the anti-uranium movement in this State. He is dictating the terms, and the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to delude the people of this State with the comments that he is making.

When discussing the member for Elizabeth, honourable members should be clear of what are his motives. I was fortunate last week to have put in to my possession a report that appeared in *News Weekly* of 23 July 1980 under the heading, "Who's who in pro-Moscow Australian Peace Committee". I paid more than a passing glance to this document, and I will go on to examine it because the public will be interested to know about it. The report states:

The Australian Peace Committee, Australian affiliate of the Soviet-led World Peace Council, has established a branch in South Australia, with prominent Labor movement leaders, including the controversial former South Australian Health Minister and Attorney-General, Peter Duncan. According to a brochure issued by the Australian Peace Committee, announcing the formation of the South Australian branch, the Covenying Committee consists of:

Peter Duncan, Member, House of Assembly and Vice-President, Australian Peace Committee.

Mr. Duncan, a former student radical at Adelaide University, has been prominent in the anti-uranium movement, opponent of the Festival of Light, and supporter of the Marxist-led Australian Union of students.

He is the gentleman who is really making the policies. The report went on to name one or two other people on the committee, Ruby Hammond and one or two others. I am sure that my colleagues would like to read the rest of the document into *Hansard* at some time. Thus, one can see what a difficult situation the Leader of the Opposition is in.

Members opposite have been critical of the current Federal Government, and we are going to have an election before Christmas. This Government is committed to the development of Roxby Downs, and will be explaining to the people of this State the great benefits that will flow not only to this State but also to the people of Australia. In view of these facts, the people of this State, particularly

the people of Grey, are entitled to know where Mr. Wallis (the Federal Labor member for Grey) stands on this issue. The people of this State are entitled to know whether Mr. Wallis supports that project and whether he supports the Mayor of Port Pirie in his endeavours to have a uranium enrichment plant built in that city. The people of Grey want to know where he stands and will also want to know where the member for Stuart, Mr. Blevins and the member for Whyalla stand. The member for Whyalla has not been in the House for a couple of days; I understand he is sick and I am sorry about that. He may have a chance to write another travelogue during his convalescence.

Mr. O'Neill: His wife is ill in hospital.

Mr. GUNN: I am sorry about that. Where do these people stand? I would like to know where the vocal member for Florey stands on the Roxby Downs issue.

Mr. O'Neill: I was standing on your neck earlier, but you weren't in here.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Florey is at his delightful complimentary best. He displayed to the House this evening that sort of hatred in a manner which is quite contrary to the manner of the average Australian. He displayed the venom that will keep him and his colleagues in Opposition for many years to come. It was a deplorable attack on members of this side of the House and it was uncalled for. What he cannot understand is that people exercising their democratic right would turn the Labor Party out of office. As the General Secretary at that time, he cannot understand how the people would fail to accept his leadership and guidance.

He was the architect of the campaign to re-elect the Corcoran Government and he was the one who messed up the whole campaign—no wonder he is bitter. He has no future except that of a backbencher in Opposition. He is a sore loser. He planned the strategy and was in the top team of Labor Party advisers—the head of the organisational wing of the Party. He was one of those who helped then Premier Corcoran make the decision to hold the election. He was one of those who turned with such venom on the former Premier when the people of this State rejected the Labor Party. Of course, he comes in here and displays that vindictive attitude towards members on this side of the House.

I hope he continues in that vein, because as long as we have people like him sitting on the Opposition benches their numbers will grow fewer at every election, because the people will never accept the sort of arrogant attitude that he has displayed today. I am pleased to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House—

Mr. O'Neill interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: I missed the compliment paid by the honourable member for Florey passing across the House. Would he care to repeat it?

Mr. O'Neill: You were trying to knock the Chief Secretary off to get the gun laws put down.

Mr. GUNN: Goodness me! I suggest to the honourable member that he see Bill King so that his humorous comments can appear in next week's edition of the *Sunday Mail*.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): I will try to inject a little sanity back into this House. I would like to voice my protest about a situation that exists in the District of Semaphore. That is, the lack of action about the Glanville-Semaphore railway line by two successive State Governments. The regular railway service on this line ceased on 29 October 1978. It had been in operation since Monday 7 January 1878. That period represents 100 years of service.

As far back as July 1972, the Public Works Committee

indicated that the line should be closed because it was costing taxpayers a large sum and it was thought that the community would be advantaged by removal of the line. In October 1974 it was decided that the rail service should be discontinued and replaced by a feeder bus service. The principal reasons for this decision were the high cost of urgent repairs on the line (estimated at that time at \$30 000), the high cost of operating the line of \$73 000 per annum, and the poor patronisation by the public, which averaged 6.2 passengers per trip.

An Act for removal of the line was passed in this Parliament and was assented to on 7 December 1978. The debate on that Bill was remarkable for the amount of co-operation between the major political Parties, whose roles in Parliament were reversed at that time. The only dissenter was the well-known member for Mitcham, and his protest was only at the speed at which the Bill was processed; I do not think he objected to the principle of the Bill, just to the speed of its progress. The *Hansard* record clearly spells out how the Parties stood on the Bill, so I will quote from *Hansard* of that time. The then Minister of Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo), in his explanation of the Bill, was reported as follows:

It is proposed to remove the railway track from the roadway so that the roadway may be completely rebitumenised, including a better car parking arrangement for the centre at Semaphore. To enable the railway track to be removed it is necessary for legislation to be enacted. This Bill provides for the removal and disposal of the track.

The member for Alexandra, then a member of the Opposition, is reported as follows:

We support the Government in its proposal to take up the railway line between Semaphore and Glanville. From the inquiries I have made, I understand it will allow the area to be upgraded and enhanced in the public interest. The Minister has the labour to do the work and I see no reason to retain the existing trainline.

The Bill was also fully supported in the other place by the now Government, and the words that appeared in *Hansard* at that time were:

The obvious thing to do is to remove the rails and reconstruct the road.

The Port Adelaide council also supported removal of the line with its vote in February 1979. The member for Semaphore at that time, Mr. Jack Olson, said during debate that only one person had approached him about retaining the line.

However, in September 1978 a group calling itself the Semaphore Consumers Organisation Railway Emergency was formed to protest at the removal of the line, urging its retention on historic and future economic grounds and for the tourist appeal that it would give the area if it were to be developed correctly. This organisation worked hard at its protest and arranged "weed ins" and clean up parties to keep the line in reasonable appearance. However, work was commenced by the State Transport Authority to dismantle the service. All signal equipment was removed, fences along the line were taken away, and the Exeter railway station was demolished and completely removed. I believe that workmen were on the site ready to lift the rails when the Australian Railways Union officials placed a ban on the removal of the line on 23 March 1979.

From that day the people of Semaphore have been waiting for a decision from the Government. The State has now had both Labor and Liberal Governments looking at this problem, and we are no nearer a solution. This leaves the community of Semaphore in a situation where they are the victims of a test of strength between the union and the State Government of the day. They are hostages, in that they as individuals or a community cannot resolve the

issue, and all the time the line is deteriorating the area around it becomes more shabby and the whole of Semaphore Road, which a few years ago was a bright, vibrant thoroughfare, and a commercial and shopping centre for the area, has been degraded to a pitiful state.

There were comments earlier today about Kesab and how clean our State is: you want to have a look at Semaphore Road! Many of the residents near Semaphore Road are elderly; because of the decrepit state of the northern roadway and footpath, they are forced to risk a fall and injury when even crossing the street, and, as all of the bus stops are in the centre of the divided road, to catch a bus they have to cross a horror strip of roadway.

While no firm decision is forthcoming from the Government on the rail line, no other work can be done on the roadway. All levels required for work are dependent on whether the line remains or goes. While no work is undertaken on the road, kerbs, gutters and footpaths, there is absolutely no chance to have the traffic and pedestrian lights so badly needed at the Military Road intersection and also the Swan Terrace and Woolnough Road intersection.

What then is the situation today, some 21 months after the passing of the Act by this Parliament and some 17 months after the placing of the ban by the A.R.U.? The Port Adelaide council has taken out a loan twice to try to get this job done. Inflation will naturally add to the cost, which must be met by the people in the Port Adelaide district.

SCORE, the protest group, wants the line retained, or alternatively a light rail system installed. If the Government will not make a decision, it could at least conduct a feasibility study into this suggestion. The A.R.U. maintains its ban, although it has apparently changed the reasons for its actions. Initially, the stated reasons were as follows (and I quote from the edition of the *Messenger* of 10 October 1979). The A.R.U. Secretary said:

The majority of Semaphore residents and a good number of traders wished the line to be upgraded and the passenger services recommenced to again serve the district. With the fuel crisis we are faced with, the reintroduction of these services is a real necessity.

I was later informed that the A.R.U. would lift the ban on the Semaphore line if the Hendon line was extended to West Lakes, but it seems that only the A.R.U. knows the real reason for the ban.

Several petitions have been circulated in the district asking whether the line should be retained or removed. The latest that I have seen was raised by the Semaphore District Traders Association, and it asked the question, "Are you in favour of the removal of the railway lines connecting Semaphore and Glanville Stations?" The response along Semaphore Road was an 85 per cent "Yes" reply.

Within the past few weeks a new organisation has been formed in the district. It is named the Semaphore Progress Association and this group as yet has not committed itself to a policy on the Semaphore rail line, but it also will be pressing for action soon. I believe that Semaphore Road has the potential to provide a commercial and shopping centre for the entire LeFevre Peninsula. It is an extremely wide roadway that could be a pleasant seaside boulevard, with many buildings dating back to the last century and modern shops along its length.

Semaphore Road is in a unique position, in that it is not possible to get on to or off the LeFevre Peninsula without crossing it. It runs from the foreshore park at the beach to the wharfs on the river on the other side of the peninsula. All of the major banks have offices on this road. Not one

of them has an office north of Semaphore. The only picture theatre still operating in the entire Port Adelaide area is on Semaphore Road. There are three hotels on this road; even in its current state it provides the largest collection of shops on the peninsula. At the beach end of the road stands the Old Customs House, purchased and renovated in 1976 by the Coast Protection Board at a cost of \$103 000, and still standing empty. No doubt the uncertain future of Semaphore Road has affected the ability of those in power to make a decision as to the most suitable use for this building.

In the area adjacent to the old Semaphore railway station it has been suggested that a mall could be constructed with an old railway engine for added historical interest to the existing items in this area such as the time ball tower. We have this road, with all of the assets that I have mentioned, which has the potential to provide the community and the people with much better facilities than are available to them in the area. We have this road that is creating great difficulty to many older people who are forced to walk along and across it, thus creating personal danger to them and all others who have to cross because of the lack of traffic and pedestrian lights.

We have this road on which are many historical buildings that could enhance our heritage and the appeal of the district; we have the traders on the road, some of them just hanging on waiting for the improvements to the road; and we have the residents and organisations who are just about desperate, all waiting upon the decision of the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Transport can (and if he was here I would tell him) reinstate the service, install a light rail service, remove the line, or leave the line and seal the road and construct kerbs, gutters and footpaths, but he must not leave it the way it is. The matter has been going on for too long. The money is available to do the job, and there are plans drawn up that would be suitable, whatever the decision. Semaphore can cope with any option. I want to know where we stand and I want to know our future. It is up to the Minister to decide.

Mr. Randall: And the union.

Mr. PETERSON: Not the union; the Minister must make a decision and let us know.

Motion carried.

At 10.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 13 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 August 1980

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FIRE BRIGADE

9. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: When does the Chief Secretary propose to reply to the member of Mitcham's letter of 25 March about a new headquarters for the South Australian Fire Brigade, and why has a full reply not been made before now?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: A reply was forwarded to you on 22 July 1980.

MINISTERIAL CARS

14. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Do the Premier and the Deputy Premier continue to have a permanent motor car and a permanent driver at their disposal at all times and, if so, why?

2. Do all other Ministers continue to have a permanent car and a permanent driver at their disposal at all times and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. As I advised the honourable member by letter on 16 July 1980, the Premier and Deputy Premier continue to have a permanent car and a permanent driver at their disposal at all times because of the work load borne by the Premier and the fact that the Deputy Premier continually represents the Premier at functions.

2. Other Ministers do not have a permanent car and a permanent driver at their disposal beyond 8 p.m. when Parliament is sitting, except at my discretion, in cases of unusual circumstances. This procedure has been introduced to reduce the overtime costs of chauffeurs.

NAUTICAL MUSEUM

23. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What progress has been made to enable the establishment of the nautical museum at Cruikshank Corner, Port Adelaide?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The final report on the South Australian Museum by Mr. Robert Edwards will contain comprehensive recommendations for a Government policy on the co-ordination of and support for local, regional and specialised museums. The Government is awaiting the outcome of the final report, due October 1980, before consolidating its policy towards such museums, and any request for assistance with the establishment of a proposed nautical museum at Cruikshank Corner, Port Adelaide, will be examined in the light of the final report's recommendations at that time.

SALTIA CREEK

24. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Highways Department intend to carry out any further improvements to the Saltia Creek, where the creek crosses the Quorn to Port Augusta road and, if so, when and what is the estimated total cost?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The floodways have been provided to carry Saltia Creek over the Quorn to Port Augusta Road. No further works are proposed at the present time.

HOUSEHOLD INSURANCE

37. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What action has been taken to advise householders in the Torrens flood plain area that their household insurance coverage for storm and tempest damage does not extend to flood damage?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The likely extent of inundation of the Torrens River flood plain under floods of various risk levels is being determined as part of the current study to identify and recommend means of mitigating and managing Torrens River floods. This study was approved by Cabinet in February 1980. Insurance will be one of the matters addressed as part of that study. Householders and others affected by this aspect will be informed of the options available early in 1981, following completion of the study.

HARTLEY COLLEGE

42. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it intended that the Kingston campus of the Hartley College of Advanced Education be sold?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No decision has been made, and the matter remains under serious consideration.

SCHOOLS CAPITAL WORKS ASSISTANCE SCHEME

45. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How much money was provided to schools under the Schools Capital Works Assistance Scheme during each of the years 1978-79 and 1979-80?

2. Which particular schools benefited, how much money did each receive and for which projects?

3. What modifications, if any, are to be made to the scheme?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Schools Capital Works Assistance Scheme was not functioning during the 1978-79 financial year as the amendment to the Education Act did not become operative until 1 July 1979. During 1979-80 only one project, at Salisbury East High School, reached the stage where the school council settled its loan of \$12 000 to be serviced by the Education Department. A sum of only \$89 interest repayment was provided by the Education Department to the school during 1979-80 because under existing banking policy only half year payments are required, with the first full payment of principal and interest on the loan not due until the end of October 1980.

2. Apart from Salisbury East High School (hall extensions) another 20 projects, with a total estimated value of \$2 100 000, were at various stages of processing but none of the schools involved actually received money during 1979-80.

3. A review of the scheme, which will include a conference involving all Regional Capital Assistance Committees, has been commenced. No modifications of the scheme are to be made at this time until the results of the review are shown.

"T.A.F.E. STREAM 6"

51. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many schools are currently providing courses which could come under the designation "T.A.F.E. Stream 6"; which schools are they, what is the nature of the courses provided and how are they funded?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is not possible to state the number of schools which are being used by the community to conduct courses which could be seen to be similar to T.A.F.E. Stream 6 courses. It is part of Education Department policy to encourage, wherever practicable, joint school/community use of school facilities. Such arrangements are a matter of negotiation between community groups, the principal and the school council.

Some activities conducted by community groups in this way may be seen to be similar in nature to the T.A.F.E. Stream 6 courses in that they provide enrichment in subjects such as woodwork and have some supervision by a specialist in woodwork. Funding for such activities is negotiated at the local level between the people concerned, namely, the school principal, the school council and the participating community members.

FOUR-TEACHER UNIT TRANSFER

54. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the matter of a transfer of a four-teacher unit from Whyalla to Ceduna been resolved and, if so, how and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The four-teacher unit will remain at Whyalla Stuart High School. Ceduna's accommodation problems will be resolved in the short term by the transfer of metal transportable rooms from the redeveloped Crafers Primary School, and, in the longer term, by relocating Demac accommodation from Leigh Creek Area School.

MOANA KINDERGARTEN

55. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the Government supply the requested additional staff person to the Moana Kindergarten and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes. The additional staff person commenced at the Moana Kindergarten on 18 June 1980.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION INQUIRY

56. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the present position of the Ministerial inquiry into physical education and sport?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is anticipated that a draft report of the Ministerial inquiry into physical education and sport will be completed by the end of August 1980.

SPEECH PATHOLOGIST

57. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it intended to provide the Murray Lands Region with a full-time speech pathologist this year and, if so, when and if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: During 1980, Murray Lands will be provided with a speech pathologist service from outside the Region. Arrangements to this end have been

made with Regional officers. Earlier intentions to appoint a speech pathologist full-time in the Region could not be met following resignations in the speech pathology service. Of the two Regions currently without a speech pathology appointment, only Murray Lands can be offered a viable service from outside the Region. Eyre Region has a somewhat larger school enrolment and is more remote from the city than Murray Lands. In July, seven speech pathologists graduated from the Sturt College of Advanced Education. Following a six-weeks induction programme they will begin work in schools. One of these will take up an appointment in the Eyre Region.

ROAD SAFETY

62. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister satisfied that road safety was the prime factor taken into account when the Road Traffic Board agreed in April 1980 to the request of the Burnside Council to remove various road closures in the Rose Park/Toorak Gardens area and, if so, will the Minister make available to the House the road accident statistics used by the board in arriving at the decision?

2. Will the Minister give an assurance that, if the statistical accident rate increases substantially in the Dulwich/Rose Park/Toorak Gardens area following the implementation on 2 June 1980 of the alternative traffic control scheme, he will use his influence to have this unsatisfactory situation corrected?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Road safety was the prime factor in the report tabled before the board at its 17 March 1980 meeting when the decision was taken to allow the removal of the street closures in Burnside.

2. Accidents in the Dulwich/Rose Park/Toorak Gardens area will be closely monitored by the Road Traffic Board and any increase in the accident rate thoroughly investigated.

63. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that on the recommendation of the Road Traffic Board, the longstanding road safety scheme installed in the Rose Park/Toorak Gardens ward in May/June 1976 is now to be removed and replaced by a scheme substantially the same as that which the board previously rejected in March 1978 on the basis that it would double the casualty accident rate in the ward?

2. Will the Minister institute an inquiry to determine the reason why the board has now approved an alternative scheme, which as stated in a letter to the Burnside council dated 1 March 1978, "is expected will increase accidents"?

3. Will the Minister supply the reasons why the board has now approved the implementation of the same scheme, which it described in that letter as acting "in contravention of the board's charter, i.e. of reducing accidents"?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The scheme which is now replacing the eight closure scheme includes two roundabouts additional to the five which constitute the proposal rejected by the Road Traffic Board in February 1980. The additional two are at the intersections of Hewitt Avenue/Close Street and Grant Avenue/Webb Street and both were installed in October 1978 to coincide with the change from the 12-closure to the eight-closure scheme.

2. No.

3. The Board has approved the new scheme (which is expected to retain a reduced accident rate at the request of the Burnside Council.

BOAT LAUNCHING

67. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What is the present position with regard to the Coast Protection Board's plans to build a sheltered boat launching facility along the central southern coast?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: As a consequence of policy determined recently by the Government in regard to recreational boating, the responsibility for continued negotiations for the provision of facilities in the south coast area in the form of a sheltered ramp for the safe launching and retrieval of trailer boats, now rests with Department of Marine and Harbors. Currently, action is being taken to engage consultants who will be required to report on a suitable site or sites, the availability of adjoining land, estimated costs, environmental effects, and so on.

MYPONGA WATER

70. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Is Myponga water currently being reticulated to the Christies-Hackham area and, if so, when will the area revert, for the time being, to a purely Happy Valley supply and, if not, when was the Myponga tap turned off?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Myponga reservoir water is currently serving through to Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga, but not the Hackham area. This is a normal operation when there is a plentiful supply of water in that reservoir, which is the case at the present time. It is not known at this stage when the supply will revert to the Happy Valley source. The valve separating the two supplies was closed on 16 April 1980.

GOVERNMENT CARS

82. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What has been—

(a) the cost to the Government (and how is that cost made up); and

(b) the consumption of petrol, oil and lubricants, of running the Government motor cars provided for the use of Ministers and other members of Parliament in each of the last five years, including this financial year to date?

2. In each of those years—

(a) what has been the assessed capital value of those motor cars; and

(b) how many of such cars have there been?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The cost of running the Government Motor Garage has been:

	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Salaries and wages	542 000	694 000	801 000	835 000	937 000
Operating expenses	63 000	105 000	115 000	159 000	198 000
Purchase of motor vehicles	59 000	31 000	54 000	41 000	51 000
Purchase of equipment	4 000	1 000	8 000	5 000	2 000

However, the above figures take into account the cost of running cars other than those used by Ministers and other members of Parliament (e.g. vehicles used by inspectors of the Central Inspection Agency). To extract the specific information requested would be an extremely time-consuming and costly exercise.

(b) The cost and consumption of all fuel dispensed at the Government Motor Garage has been:

	Petrol (litres)	\$	Oil (litres)	\$
1975-76	132 845	16 403	790	288
1976-77	151 153	20 012	812	235
1977-78	156 424	24 470	803	230
1978-79	154 287	29 286	793	248
1979-80	169 391	44 767	1 102	509

These figures include fuel used by all Government Motor Garage and Central Inspection Agency vehicles and do not include fuel purchased of necessity anywhere else other than the Government Motor Garage. Again, to extract precise figures relating to Ministers and members of Parliament would be an extremely time-consuming and costly exercise.

2. (a)

	\$
1975-76	170 300
1976-77	137 200
1977-78	177 300
1978-79	132 400
1979-80	162 700

(b)

1975-76	21
1976-77	23
1977-78	25
1978-79	25
1979-80	26

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES

98. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many resident tenants have accepted the South Australian Housing Trust offer to purchase following an announcement by the Minister of Housing that this option would be available?

2. Are the types of housing available for purchase single units, double units or semi-detached and what are the numbers in each category that have been purchased?

3. What financial considerations in respect to rental paid and the value of improvements have been given to tenants in the purchase?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There have been 450 applications indicating interest in the purchase of double units since the Minister's statement. In order to assist those interested in purchasing to determine whether or not to proceed with their inquiry, cost estimates must be obtained of the work required to obtain separate title; this includes estimates for new sewer runs both within and outside of the property boundary, separate electrical connections, separate stormwater drains, possible extension of party walls, re-surveying, possible realignment of fencing, valuation of property, etc. This work has been completed in 40 cases and letters of offer with all the necessary details have been sent to these prospective purchasers, who have been given three months to take up the offer to buy. These letters have been despatched recently and there have been no acceptances to buy to date.

2. All types of housing either are or will be available for sale. Single units have always been available for sale and 148 were sold in the 12 months ending 30 June 1980. As

stated in 1 above, no double units (i.e. semi-detached units) have been sold to date.

3. Under the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, sales of rental housing are at market value or replacement cost on the basis of a cash transaction. The value of improvements is not included in the sale price of the house as the improvements were made at the expense of the tenant and not of the trust. Double units are thus offered for sale at market value less the value of improvements and there is no financial consideration in respect to rental paid.

WALKERVILLE TERRACE STUDY

100. Mr. SLATER (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What was the purpose of the traffic survey conducted at Walkerville Terrace on the afternoon of 24 June 1980 and who authorised and conducted it?

2. Was part of the survey conducted at any other location or on any other occasion at Walkerville Terrace?

3. What were the findings of the survey resulting from questions to motorists regarding point of departure, destination and reason for travelling?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The survey was conducted to determine the origins and destination of vehicles using Walkerville Terrace, as one of the means of evaluating options for major transport improvements in the North-East Corridor. It was authorised by the Minister of Transport and conducted by the Highways Department.

2. No similar survey has been conducted elsewhere or on another occasion for this purpose. Automatic meter counts and intersection turning counts of a standard nature were conducted to assist in data analysis.

3. The principal findings were as follows:—

Origin of trips

	per cent
Walkerville	33.8
Eastern suburbs	26.0
North-East suburbs	20.4
Northern suburbs	14.8
Other areas	5.0

Destination of trips

City of Adelaide	56.2
North-Western and Western suburbs	22.6
Walkerville	6.1
Other areas	15.1

Reason for travelling

Work	59.3
Personal business	20.1
Recreation/social	7.5
School	5.1
Shopping	4.3
Serve passenger	3.7

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

102. Mr. SLATER (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Why was it necessary to substantially alter the courtyard at the Adelaide College of Arts and Education?

2. Was the work carried out by private contractors and, if so, who were they?

3. What was the final cost of the alterations to the courtyard?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. A leaking fire main caused the earth fill in the courtyard to subside leaving the existing concrete paving slabs broken and uneven. The courtyard is used by students and the public, including patrons to the Scott Theatre, and the uneven surface was dangerous.

Because so many paving slabs were broken and had to be replaced and because it was uneconomical to clean the mortar from the backs of the concrete slab, the court was paved in brickwork. At the same time a section of the court was raised to provide a level access way for the handicapped between Hartley and Schultz buildings.

2. Yes. Hansen & Yuncken (S.A) Pty. Ltd.

3. \$42 788.

S.A.H.T. MOTOR VEHICLES

103. Mr. SLATER (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the number of motor vehicles currently owned by the South Australian Housing Trust?

2. Is it envisaged that the number of vehicles will be reduced and what cost savings will result if vehicles are disposed of without replacement?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. As at 30 June 1980, the South Australian Housing Trust owned 319 motor vehicles (including passenger vehicles, utilities, transit vans and one-tonne trucks).

2. In the financial year ended 30 June 1980, 35 motor vehicles were disposed of without replacement. During the financial year ending 30 June 1981, it is anticipated that at least a further 45 vehicles will be disposed of without replacement.

It is estimated the disposal of 80 vehicles without replacement will release about \$300 000 of the trust's capital which will be applied to its housing programme.

HOUSING TRUST LEASES

104. Mr. SLATER (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment—

1. What progress has been made in the proposal by the South Australian Housing Trust to lease houses from private owners and to sublet the houses to tenants on low incomes?

2. How many houses have been leased and sublet to tenants under the scheme?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The leased housing scheme is a pilot project which requires 100 houses to be leased by 30 June 1981. After an initial slow beginning, houses are now being offered for leasing at a better rate and the trust is hopeful of maintaining the desired two or three houses each week to achieve the objective.

2. As at 4 August 1980, eight houses have been leased and sublet to tenants, one house has been leased but will not be available for occupation until October, eight houses are approved for leasing and are in the process of documentation, and 10 houses are currently being investigated or are being negotiated for leasing.

FARES

155. Mr. WHITTEN (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport—Will increased fares be charged during peak loading periods for travel on State Transport Authority services?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The fare increase which takes effect on 17 August 1980 includes free travel for pensioners and the unemployed in off-peak periods. Standard adult, child, pensioner, and other concession fares apply for all users during peak times.

BUS COMPETITION

156. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the Government's intention to allow private bus operators to compete with the State Transport Authority services during peak loading periods?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No.

EMISSION CONTROLS

160. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Government aware that emission controls on motor vehicles are frequently removed?

2. Does the Government condone such removal and, if not, what action, if any, does it propose to take to prevent such removal?

3. What is the policy of the Government on emission controls on motor vehicles?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is aware that emission controls on some motor vehicles have been removed.

2. The Government does not condone such removal and where detected prosecution would follow.

3. The current policy on emission controls is as follows:

(a) The Government has agreed to the deferment of the implementation of the third stage of ADR 27A for a period of two years from 1 January 1981.

(b) In the meantime, the Government is awaiting an evaluation of a report prepared by an *ad hoc* committee of the ATAC on future emission control strategies which should be adopted on an Australia-wide basis. An inter-departmental committee in South Australia is currently examining this report and it is hoped that the Government will shortly be in a position to determine its policy prior to the next meeting of the ATAC which is to be held in Melbourne in February 1981.

I.M.V.S.

167. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Who is the Deputy Director of the I.M.V.S.?

2. How many times has he been abroad in the last 10 years?

3. What proportion of the cost of this travel has been borne by the I.M.V.S. and how much by private companies?

4. Which companies have contributed towards the cost of this travel, and how much has each contributed?

5. What equipment, if any, has been bought by the I.M.V.S. during these last 10 years from each of these companies; why has it been bought; and how much has it cost?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Dr. R. G. Edwards.

2. Seventeen.

3. The cost of this travel has been borne as follows:

	Per cent
Dr. Edwards' personal funds or by international professional organisations	70
I.M.V.S. funds	6
Private companies	24
4.	\$
Pfrimmer	1 504
Technicon	7 720
Hoffman-La-Roche	400

5. All equipment purchased from 1/7/71 to 30/6/80 was for routine diagnostic use.

Equipment Purchased from Technicon	Purchase Date	Cost \$
Single Channel (Dept. of Agric.)	1971	25 000
18/60 S.M.A.	1971-72	120 000
Digester System (Kjeldahl)	1971	3 710
Sampler II	1972-73	1 800
Proportioning Pump	1972-73	2 259
Fluorescence Spectrophotometer	1972-73	10 000
Dual Pen Recorder	1972-73	2 819
Proportioning Pump	1973	2 301
Colorimeter	1973	2 813
Sampler IV	1974	2 467
Colorimeter Model SC	1974	3 232
Transformer	1974	278
Digital Printer	1975	18 000
Fluoronephelometer		
SMAC System	1975	230 000
AA 11 Dual ABS	1975	20 096
Dual Pen Recorder	1975	3 411
AA 1 Dual ABS	1975	20 096
Proportioning Pump Model 3	1975	2 500
Statlyte	1977	25 652
Haemalog 8	1978	91 345
Haemalog D	1978	142 000
11, Ultra Issue Processors	Various dates	82 500
Equipment Purchased from Roche		
Centrifichem 400	1978	55 000
Centria Pipettor	1978	16 000
Centria Incubator/Separator	1978	12 000

In general, the I.M.V.S. has become recognised as an organisation with international respect for its expertise in evaluating scientific equipment. Its publications in this field influence national and international purchasing. It has to evaluate equipment for its own use prior to purchase. Industry needs the assistance and expertise of the I.M.V.S., and *vice versa*. Japanese universities have a similar relationship with equipment manufacturers and so do organisations in several other countries. The Institute particularly tries to assist South Australian industry with considerable success. It gives this assistance at cost. The council is adamant that research grants must have no strings attached and the institute must not become beholden in any way to any manufacturer. Dr. Edwards, because of his undoubted expertise, has played a significant part in this work.

LAW DEPARTMENT

181. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government propose to change the name of the Law Department back to Crown Law Department and, if so, when and why has it not been done already and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

WESTERN AREA TRANSPORT STUDY

201. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What stage has been reached with the Western Area Transport Study?

2. Have the form, extent and nature of the review of the North-South Transportation Corridor been determined and has the composition of the investigating team for the review been decided?

3. Have any recommendations yet been formulated concerning the construction of a North-South Freeway similar to that envisaged in the M.A.T.S. Plan?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1 and 2. I am awaiting reports from the Highways Department on Government policy concerning certain roads in the southern and western metropolitan suburbs before determining the extent of the review and its composition.

3. No.

S.A. FILM CORPORATION

205. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many companies carry out video copying for the South Australian Film Corporation, how much has been done and at what cost?

2. What types of material have been copied and how has this material been marketed?

3. Has any problem existed with 'pirate' video-cassettes?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. One company at present. In 1979-80, the company made 1" video master tapes of 45 corporation productions and 14 video films produced by the Department of Further Education by arrangement with the corporation.

It also made 183 ¾" video cassette copies for the corporation.

Total expenditure on video copying in 1979-80 was \$9 893.

2. See answer 1. The films copied covered a wide range of subjects. Copies have been marketed through mailing of promotional literature and personal visits on clients by the corporation's marketing manager (documentary films).

3. Video copies of films and video programmes can be made quite easily because of wide availability of video equipment. It is difficult to eliminate this risk and much dependence has to be placed upon the honesty and sense of responsibility of film users. Appropriate warnings are published concerning the legal penalties for such pirating but finally it is the integrity of film users that governs the incidence of piracy.

PUBLICITY AND DESIGN SECTION

206. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Have any decisions been made as to the reallocation of equipment from the Publicity and Design Section of the Premier's Department?

2. Has any decision been made as to which P.D.S. staff will remain in the department and, if so, who are they and what are their salaries?

3. Has any decision been made as to which P.D.S. staff will be redeployed in other departments and, if so, who are they and what are their salaries?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. A major portion of the equipment from the Publicity and Design Services branch of the Premier's Department has been reallocated to a variety of departments and in most cases reallocated to serve the requirements of former P.D.S. staff who have moved into other areas. The majority of the darkroom equipment remains to be allocated.

2. A nucleus of former Publicity and Design Services staff has been formed into the present Publicity Section of the Premier's Department. They are:—

	\$
Mr. J. Parkes	28 133
Mr. O. Laukirbe	17 437
Mr. D. Rogers	15 977
Mrs. R. Barnes	10 797
Miss E. Randell	11 111
Mr. K. Hope	14 707

In addition, Miss S. Green (\$7 643) and Mrs. K. Arthurson (\$9 851 per annum, \$3 940 part-time salary) have been employed by the Premier's Department in another area.

3. The following P.D.S. staff have been redeployed in other departments:—

	\$
Mr. J. Correll (Environment)	20 670
Miss J. Cranwell (Tourism)	11 111
Mr. M. Carbins (Tourism)	14 434
Mr. N. Winter (Tourism)	11 759
Mr. J. Mitchell (Lands)	20 884
Mr. R. Trowbridge (on secondment to the office of the Attorney-General)	17 820
Miss E. Murphy (Marine and Harbors)	12 972
Mr. B. Gardner (Ombudsman)	13 261
Mr. C. Bell (E. & W.S.) (+ \$500 allowance)	20 884
Miss R. Paddick (E. & W.S.)	9 539
Miss A. Coleman (Constitutional Museum)	10 764
Mr. G. Moore (Constitutional Museum)	14 707
Mr. P. Smerasuta (S.A. Museum)	13 455
Mr. O. Wills (Black Hill Flora Park)	15 405
Mr. V. de Gouw (National Capital Development Com.)	11 162

O'BAHN SYSTEM

207. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What stage has been reached with the Government's assessment of the O'Bahn system and, in particular, what assessments have been made of the impact on inner suburbs if such a system is implemented?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I expect to make a public announcement with regard to this matter within the next month.

ASCOT PARK HOUSING UNITS

208. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What is the present stock of housing units owned by the South Australian Housing Trust in the electorate of Ascot Park that is being rented or is available for rental?

2. How many of these units are:

(a) two or three bedroom semi-detached;

(b) two or three bedroom detached;

(c) single person cottage flats;

(d) two person cottage flats; and

(e) other types,

and what are the dates of applications the trust is presently considering for the area in each category?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. As at 30 June 1980—1 271 (excluding the remaining 20 units in the group of 35 at Plympton Park which were handed over in early July 1980).
2. (a) 1 043;
(b) twelve;
(c) 36 (+14 at Plympton Park handed over 8 July 1980);
(d) 108 (+6 at Plympton Park handed over 8 July 1980);
(e) (i) 52 (flats), (ii) 20 (Special Rental Houses);
1 271 (+20 at Plympton Park handed over 8 July 1980).

Waiting times:

- (a) December 1976 applicants being housed;
- (b) December 1976 applicants being housed;
- (c) March 1975 applicants being housed;
- (d) March 1978 applicants being housed;
- (e) (i) Very infrequent vacancies, (ii) As early as 1974.

ASCOT PARK HOUSING UNITS

209. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What construction of South Australian Housing Trust rental units has taken place in the last two years in the Ascot Park electorate?
2. What construction, if any, is proposed for the next two years?
3. When will the new Trust units on Park Terrace, Plympton Park be declared open and what impact will these units have on the waiting time for applications in this area?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. As at 30 June 1980, 15 cottage flats in a group of 35 on a site bounded by Hawker and Aldridge Avenues and Park Terrace, Plympton Park, had been completed and handed over to the Trust's letting section for allocation. The remaining 20 units in this group were handed over in early July 1980. There was no construction in the 1978-79 financial year in this electorate.

2. Planning has commenced for the construction of six cottage flats in Jervois Street, South Plympton to be started on 16 February 1981 with anticipated completion in early 1982.

3. See 1. Regrettably, the waiting time for pensioner accommodation in all parts of the metropolitan area is very heavy and this particularly applies in the southern suburbs. Allocation of the units in new developments is planned before completion of construction to ensure early occupation. Many of the units in the group at Park Terrace, Plympton Park have been offered to elderly Trust tenants who have been occupying family-type accommodation in the area. These family houses have been relet to families with children.

FREEHOLD LAND

217. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How much leasehold land has been converted to freehold to 30 June 1980 and what payment did the Government receive for this conversion?
2. How many applications for freeholding have been received to 30 June 1980, how many applications are still pending and what is the value of the conversions still pending?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: It is assumed that this question relates to the Government's policy on the freeholding of perpetual leases, announced in February 1980. The information sought to 30 June 1980 is not available and would involve a considerable amount of research. However, statistics to 24 July 1980 have recently been compiled and are:

Applications received.....	661
Applications approved and applicants notified of purchase prices.....	563
Offers accepted.....	75
Total purchase moneys involved in accepted offers.....	\$536 553
Total statutory fees (other than application fees).....	\$5 250
Total area involved in accepted offers	19 303 ha approx.