

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 13 August 1980

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

**PETITION: STURT COLLEGE OF
ADVANCED EDUCATION**

A petition signed by 12 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal which would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location was presented by Mr. Plunkett.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: URANIUM

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: In a question yesterday, the member for Salisbury referred to certain statements made by me in this House last Wednesday relating to the leak of radioactive liquors at the Windscale plant in England. In his question, the honourable member sought to draw certain inferences from my statements which are not justified by any objective reading of those statements. However, the honourable member did not stop there.

He went on to indicate that communication had been made with certain people and authorities in England to the effect that my statements in this House amounted to new evidence that should be placed before the inquiry into the Windscale leak. The honourable member alleged that my statements amounted to an admission by Urenco-Centec that it had been aware, long before the time admitted to the inquiry, of the leak at Windscale. Only a person desperate to distort the facts at any cost would make such an allegation.

The honourable member's question yesterday indicates that at least certain elements within the Opposition have chosen to break new ground in their irresponsible approach to the uranium issue. They have now decided to attempt to interfere in international negotiations being conducted at the highest level, and I refer to the involvement of the Governments of the United Kingdom, Holland, West Germany and Australia, and in particular to the letter recently sent to the Prime Minister of Australia from the British Prime Minister.

Such action flouts all the traditions and conventions of proper Parliamentary opposition and is deserving of the severest censure. Those associated with such action ignore the fact that the Party to which the member for Salisbury belongs, while in Government, held discussions over a considerable period of time with Urenco-Centec and British Nuclear Fuels Limited. Had that Party still been in office, it would have been faced with exactly the same decisions that this Government is now required to make as a logical progression of those discussions initiated by the Labor Government. That fact is also completely overlooked. Instead, some members of the Opposition have chosen to act in this matter in a most dishonest manner.

We all recall the visit to Adelaide last year by representatives of Urenco-Centec when a person broke

into a media conference, behaved in a most improper manner and said he was speaking for the Opposition as well as the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy. Now we have another attempt to impugn the reputation of Urenco-Centec as foreshadowed yesterday by the member for Salisbury. The honourable member was not specific about the person or persons who may have initiated communication with England following my reply to a question in the House last week. At this stage, I invite the Leader of the Opposition to dissociate himself and his Party from any such action which involves interference in international negotiations, which could do severe harm to Australia's reputation in the United Kingdom, Holland and West Germany, if the facts were not made clear.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I point out that my answer last Wednesday indicated that the leak had been occurring at Windscale for some years, and this is borne out by the full report of the matter which I have now received. Prompt action was taken when British Nuclear Fuels Limited became aware of the leak in March 1979. Also, the report states quite clearly that no worker or member of the public has been harmed. I would add only that I am having this statement telexed to England today, along with the relevant *Hansard* clippings by post in due course, to ensure that, if any attempt has been made to misrepresent this matter, the full facts are known to those involved.

QUESTION TIME

S.G.I.C.

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say whether the Government has yet decided to give approval to the State Government Insurance Commission's investment account life policy and, if not, why not? Last November I suggested publicly that pressure was being put by the State Government to restrict the services offered by the S.G.I.C. At that stage the S.G.I.C. had submitted plans to the Premier for an investment account life policy which would guarantee a non-taxable return on investment of 6.5 per cent. This new policy would be similar to that offered, very successfully, by the New South Wales Government Insurance Office, and by a number of private insurance companies.

It was reported that private companies, faced with S.G.I.C.'s successful enterprise in the market place, wanted to restrict the commission's role in life insurance and stop it from offering new services on a competitive basis. Indeed, when in opposition the now Premier vigorously opposed the S.G.I.C.'s entry into life insurance. Last November it was quite clear that the Government, under pressure from the companies, was dragging its feet in giving the investment account policy the go ahead.

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

Mr. BANNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will rephrase that. In reply to my question concerning this matter, the Premier denied the suggestion, and he said that it was a beat-up. He said that no pressure had been put on the Government and that any suggestion that the Government was dragging its feet on giving the S.G.I.C. policy the go ahead was ridiculous. The Premier said that the delay had been caused only by the Chairman's temporary illness at that time. That was nine months ago. The Chairman has been fit and well for some eight of that nine months. Has the Government now given the commission the go ahead?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, Mr. Speaker. I could leave it at that, but I will not, in deference to the Leader of

the Opposition. The whole future operation and expansion of S.G.I.C. is being taken into account at this stage as part of a total review of the operation of the no-fault accident insurance scheme and the compulsory third party scheme. A decision will be made after a decision has been made on those matters.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Dr. BILLARD: Has the Premier noted the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition during the Address in Reply debate regarding the method of electing members of the Legislative Council? Will the Premier indicate the Government's view of the correctness or otherwise of these comments? It has been reported that the Deputy Leader stated:

If the election method is altered it will be the first step in a serious attempt to undermine our hard won democracy in this State. The people of South Australia understood what the Labor Party was about in trying to democratise that place.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, I certainly did notice those remarks. I also noticed the very full report of them in the press this morning. I certainly do know what the Labor Party is about in what it is trying to do at present, and it is a disgusting state of affairs. Let us just examine the present Legislative Council voting system, for which members of the Opposition can take full credit, because they introduced it when in Government. The important thing to remember about the voting system for the Legislative Council as it stands at present is that it does not distribute the preferences of those minor Parties and independents which obtain more than one half but less than one full quota.

In other words, the votes of any number from 4.16 per cent to 8.33 per cent of the population who vote for any one such group on the ballot-paper are not counted as the voter intended. What it means, basically, is that those people are completely disfranchised. Whether or not the Deputy Leader believes that that is a fair and democratic process, I do not know. He certainly says that he believes that that is fair and democratic, but how he can really believe it, I have no idea. That system does not fully count out all preferences that are initially distributed, thereby electing the final decisive candidate on the highest remainder principle rather than according to the express and total wishes of the people. The present system does not even guarantee that a person's vote will be fully counted. Democracy, they say! Yet the Deputy Leader has been in this House espousing a scheme that does not ensure that votes are fully counted. Some 40 000 people did not have their votes taken fully into account at the 1975 election, and some 20 000 people did not have their votes fully counted at the last election.

In 1975, although a majority of votes was cast for the combined right-of-centre Parties, the final and decisive seat went to the Labor Party, because the voting system actually prevented the distribution of all those votes. This is democracy, Labor Party style. The present system actively disadvantages small Parties and Independents, and postively favours the single A.L.P. organisation. The previous Government did nothing whatever to remedy this situation. I can understand the embarrassment of the Opposition. The previous Government did nothing.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: At preselection, one man has 2 000 votes in his pocket—one vote, one value!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am reminded that the Opposition has a curious attitude to what is fair and just, and that is nowhere better exemplified than in the card-

vote system. The Leader, I understand, recently claimed a great victory at the A.L.P. conference, because he got the union vote down to three to one instead of 90 000 to 7 000—a wonderful victory. Democracy, Labor Party style! I can understand the former Premier looking so distressed, and I know how distasteful he must find this whole business. One can obviously see exactly why the Deputy Leader is going off on this tack. He believes that, for some reason or other, a system of electing members of the Upper House which ignores anything between 20 000 and 40 000 votes cast is fair and just. I have news for him: I do not regard that as being fair and just.

The previous Government did nothing whatever to remedy the situation, despite its publicly professed dedication to electoral justice and democracy. It is not difficult to understand why it did nothing or why it has now turned its back on electoral justice. Electoral justice, in this case, would mean the loss of an unfair electoral advantage to the A.L.P. This Government wishes to see justice done to all Parties, and will legislate to remove the unfair advantage that is currently enjoyed (and is presently being defended) by the A.L.P.

S.G.I.C.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Premier is in good form, so I will give him another question to answer. Does the Government have any intention of transferring either the third party motor vehicle insurance functions of the State Government Insurance Commission or any future no-fault scheme that will replace it to any other statutory body or department and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: A decision has not yet been taken.

ST. AGNES BUS SERVICE

Mr. ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Transport explain the move of the State Transport Authority to reduce the number of Volvo buses at the St. Agnes bus depot and replace them with older buses from the Elizabeth depot? I have received numerous inquiries from constituents concerned about what seems to be a downgrading of bus services from St. Agnes depot. This was brought to a head yesterday when services were halted for a union meeting. Many passengers have been given a leaflet by personnel at the depot and by drivers and other union members, stating that the reliable Volvos now servicing the area are to be replaced by older buses suitable for slower inner suburban services that are continually stopping. Does this mean a down-grading of north-eastern bus services to the city?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, it does not. Agreement was reached between the State Transport Authority, the former Government and the executive of the union that buses would be distributed evenly amongst depots. I understand that the action by the drivers at St. Agnes depot is not supported by the executive of the union; in other words, it is an intra-union dispute. The present distribution of buses between depots is as follows: City and Hackney depot has 122 Volvos and 176 Swifts; Port Adelaide depot, 47 Volvos and 57 Swifts; Morphettville, 71 Volvos and 64 Swifts; St. Agnes 56 Volvos, and no other type of bus; and Elizabeth, no Volvos and 61 of the older type of bus. I point out that this latter type of bus has been in service since 1973 and, although they are about seven years old, they are perhaps not as old as some people have made out in the press.

To ease the honourable member's mind, I point out that the buses to be taken from St. Agnes will not come from those runs that have express services to Adelaide. To reassure constituents of the honourable member who may notice that they are travelling on different buses in and around St. Agnes, none of the Swifts are obsolete, as union members would have people believe through the leaflets that they have handed out. All buses in the S.T.A. have come into operation since 1970 and are capable of handling any services operated from the St. Agnes depot.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Water Resources confirm that the Public Accounts Committee report tabled yesterday was correct when it referred to surplus labour within the Engineering and Water Supply Department? The report notes that the Minister's department presently has a surplus beyond requirements of more than 900 workers. The report also notes that the maximum required work force will fall still further when even more Government work is farmed out to private contractors. Published Government accounts show that \$7 000 000 of budgeted work has had no money spent on it, and I understand that this work is essential. The Premier, when replying to a question of the member for Mitchell on 4 June about the double payment problem (that is, payment for Government workers while the work was actually being done by private contractors), maintained that, in the E. & W.S. Department, there was a constant flow of work. The Premier also said that reference in a Government minute about the double payment for surplus labour was theoretical.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The information that the honourable member has given is correct. It was provided to the Public Accounts Committee by the E. & W.S. Department from me. About 950 employees are now in excess of those necessary for the operation of the department to keep going efficiently at this stage. That does not mean to say that the 950 persons are idle. What is happening is that work is being undertaken ahead of time which need not necessarily be undertaken right now.

This position has come about largely through the policies of the previous Government when, in the early 1970's, a great deal of money was available from the Federal Government that was used to build up dramatically the E. & W.S. Department day-labour force. Much work was undertaken in the areas of water reticulation and sewerage, and this work has put South Australia, particularly the metropolitan area, three or four years ahead in this area of where it need necessarily be. As such, the surplus employees have resulted as a result of the down-turn which occurred later in the 1970's, but the Government of the day still had the massive build-up of the E. & W.S. Department.

The present Government is reducing the size of the E. & W.S. Department as quickly as natural attrition and job transfers will enable it to occur. We are continuing with that policy.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The previous Government was doing that, too.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Premier has clearly indicated that the Government does not intend to cause any retrenchments. In reply to the interjection, unfortunately, the previous Government left that move about three years too late. The down-turn had occurred about three years earlier and, had that policy been put into effect at the time, we would not have the number of surplus employees that we have today.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Eighty-twenty.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Yes. The point has been made that, under the previous Government's policy, 80 per cent of all capital works within the department was undertaken by the E. & W.S. Department day-labour force. On that basis there was a substantial build-up, and for a deliberate reason. It was built up to that extent purely as part of the policy of the Government of the day. We do not agree with that policy. In fact, we are having a large percentage of the current capital works programme required by the E. & W.S. Department being undertaken by the private sector on contract. Much of that work is being undertaken on contract prices which are approximately equivalent to 1973 prices, so that there is a dramatic saving to the taxpayer in the area. There is not \$13 000 000-worth of day labour sitting idle, doing nothing. That \$13 000 000 a year for day labour at this moment is being effectively utilised on work, but work that need not necessarily be undertaken at this time. It is being undertaken for the benefit of the people of South Australia who will have the facility of sewerage in an area that would normally not qualify for sewerage for another three or four years.

Mr. GUNN: My question is to the Minister of Water Resources. It is concluded in the sixteenth report of the Public Accounts Committee that the Engineering and Water Supply Department depot rationalisation has not proceeded as recommended in the committee's earlier report of 1974. Had the E. & W.S. Department transferred the facilities of the Kent Town depot to Thebarton by the date previously determined?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: No, the Kent Town depot is still operating in a small way. In fact, the majority of the work force has been transferred to other depots in the metropolitan area, and the final transfers will occur before 31 December 1980. Office space currently being built at the Thebarton depot will house the office staff. Thebarton will become the central operations base for the metropolitan area. When the rationalisation is complete, Thebarton will be the major centre of organisation, with depots at Elizabeth, Ottoway, Marden and Lonsdale.

BUSES FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. PETERSON: Will the Minister of Education say why adult supervisors are not provided on buses that transport mentally retarded children to and from special schools in South Australia? I believe that bus drivers are expected to operate buses containing 15 to 20 retarded children, as well as provide discipline, medical aid and general supervision to the children, whose ages range from five to 15 years. Some of these children are very severely handicapped, since they are deaf, cannot understand a direction or have some other behavioural problem.

Numerous reports have been made about the ease with which bus windows can be opened, and in some cases they have been left open, and several times children have been seen hanging out of bus windows. Despite a letter to the transport section of the Education Department in December last year, nothing has been done about window security. It has been reported that there is a complete lack of discipline on the buses. This is only to be expected, as the driver must concentrate on his driving. Children have been injured and property has been broken.

Despite these children having the difficulties outlined, there are no body restraints on the buses. If a bus is involved in a collision, it is likely that serious injury will be suffered. Some of the children have difficulty in boarding and alighting from buses. There have been instances of

children taken sick. One child is reported to have taken an epileptic fit. A bus driver is not trained to handle such an emergency, nor can he leave the bus to obtain help. Allegations of impropriety have been made against drivers. The presence of another adult on a bus would protect the drivers from false allegations and the children from improper approaches. In Victoria, an additional person, who is called a bus supervisor, travels on a bus. In the Northern Territory, people called bus escorts travel on buses. Some private organisations in this State, for example the Woodville Spastic Centre, provide supervisors on their buses. Many of the drivers on these buses that transport mentally handicapped children have expressed the opinion that an adult supervisor should assist on buses. Why are they not provided?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member has given us the benefit of a fairly wide ranging report on disadvantages associated with buses for the handicapped. I point out that this is the first occasion on which the matter has been brought to my attention in general terms, let alone by specific complaint. If the honourable member can cite specific instances of youngsters being neglected, I shall be pleased to receive them and to give the matter my urgent attention. I also point out that many of the matters raised by the honourable member concern allegations against the school bus service in general in so far as there is no adult supervision on those buses other than the driver. Members should realise that, at present, the cost to the State of the school bus service, including the service to the handicapped, is about \$5 500 000. To increase the amount of staffing generally so that youngsters would be supervised would increase the bill to the State. I am not suggesting that there may not be specific occasions on which assistance could be rendered; however, I question some of the points made by the honourable member.

To the best of my knowledge, the occasions on which as many as 20 handicapped children travel on the one bus would be infrequent. On occasions when a bus carries such a large number, specific attention would be warranted. Generally, buses for the handicapped are of the smaller variety and carry few children. Regarding ventilation, the ready movability of windows creates a problem; however, I point out that, generally, there is minimal movement of school bus windows, so that the chance of a youngster going through the window is not nearly as serious as the honourable member makes it out to be.

Mr. Peterson: That's not true.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I shall be pleased to examine details of specific cases. A point that has been brought to my attention recently is a design problem, in that buses generally are manufactured with access points for relatively tall youngsters—upper primary and secondary school children. If we were to ask the bus manufacturers to consider the provision of an arm rail and probably one lower step, ingress and egress may be made easier for those very small children who travel on school buses. That is one of the few points that I already have in hand. I thank the honourable member for his report, and I will look into the matter for him.

CONTAINER SHIPPING

Mr. OLSEN: In view of the concern of the South Australian Government and industry over the centralisation by Conference Lines of the State's container trade through the Port of Melbourne rather than through the facilities at Port Adelaide, can the Minister of Marine say whether this situation will also apply in other areas of the State's maritime trade?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am happy to advise the honourable member and the House that this is not the case. As I pointed out last week in reply to a question on this matter, negotiations are under way between the State Government, South Australian shippers of goods and the Conference Lines to break the old and highly disadvantageous container centralisation through Melbourne. In other areas of maritime trade, figures now being processed by the Department of Marine and Harbors show a very successful outcome for 1979-80. The department's financial position over all its areas of operation shows a surplus of around \$200 000, which is the best annual result since 1969-70. This compares with a situation in 1978-79, when the overall operations necessitated a contribution of \$3 200 000 from Consolidated Revenue to fully meet the cost of operating the department. Members should keep in mind that the overall result of a \$200 000 surplus for the year was achieved after interest, depreciation and other charges had been fully met from the department's actual gross surplus of \$9 500 000. The excellent result was reflected in operations at all ports.

While it stems largely from the bumper harvest of wheat, barley and other grain crops, it is also true that there has been steady improvement in the trading position in other bulk and general cargo areas in recent years. In regard to the port of Adelaide alone, just over 4 000 000 tonnes of cargo was handled in 1979-80, an increase of 12.3 per cent on the previous year. The total for the major deep-sea outports was 14 100 000 tonnes, an increase of 12.8 per cent. The cargo tonnage for all of the State's ports rose by 12.7 per cent to 18 200 000 tonnes. Given that we soon break the centralisation deadlock for containers, I will be hopeful of giving members even more impressive figures for the current and succeeding fiscal years of trading.

WALLATINA STATION ABORIGINES

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Premier investigate claims made in a front page story in last Saturday's *Advertiser* that 20 Aborigines buried in desert country on the Wallatina Station died after being contaminated by a British atomic bomb test in 1953? If the available evidence suggests that this claim is true, will the Premier recommend that a Royal Commission investigate the contamination of Aborigines and personnel from the tests, or refer the matter to the World Health Organisation, so that claims for compensation can be evaluated?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I did see the report in the *Advertiser*, and I will examine the matter again. The speculation contained in that story has, I understand, already been referred to the Minister of Health here, and to the Department of Health in Canberra. They are undertaking a full study of all of the claims made, and I have no doubt that they will have picked up this allegation.

CLEANERS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Australian Government Workers Association's claim that its members face retrenchment because of the Government's policy of using contract cleaners is true?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, the claim by the union is not true. I am disturbed at the extent to which the union has gone out in this dispute and deliberately spread inaccurate or incorrect statements. Throughout its publicity releases, particularly in a newsletter from the A.G.W.A. published, I think, on 8 August, certain

suggestions are made that the workers, particularly the cleaners in the Government, are likely to be retrenched. That is not true. Since being elected, the Government has said that Government employees will not be sacked, and we have stood by that. I challenge anyone to prove that we have broken that promise.

Mr. Hemmings: At the Elizabeth court house—four cleaners sacked.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is interesting that the newsletter clearly omits large sections of the letter distributed by the Director-General of the Public Buildings Department. It omitted the sections that referred, first, to retrenchments and, secondly, to the agreement with the United Trades and Labor Council. I will quote the type of sentence that was deliberately omitted in the A.G.W.A. newsletter, even through the union quoted extensively from the Director-General's letter. It left out the following sentence which was the only sentence underlined:

It must be stressed that your job security is not affected. Government policy very firmly states that no employees will be retrenched.

There are about 110 Government cleaners, and a number of these were in what I can only describe as small and inefficient teams, and the Government has attempted to consolidate the existing cleaners into larger teams so that they can clean entire buildings. As we have undergone that consolidation, a number of cleaners were transferred from one court building to another Government building in the same vicinity on exactly the same pay rates, and still as employees of the Public Buildings Department. That highlights how petty this dispute is. They have simply moved from one Government building to an adjacent Government building.

Taking up the interjection of the member for Napier, I repeat that no permanent employee to my knowledge has been retrenched by the Government. I even point out to the House the extent to which the Government has gone to uphold that policy. Within the P.B.D. there were, I think, seven temporary cleaners who were being paid a loading of 20 per cent because they were temporary; they have been there for periods between 12 and 24 months. I issued an instruction that those temporary cleaners, who had been paid a loading, who therefore had no job security at all, and who, under the statement by the Government, had no long-term job security, were to be placed on the permanent pay-roll of the P.B.D. in the past week. That was the offer we made to the union, but it did not mention that publicly. We took those temporary employees and made them permanent, because they had been there for between 12 and 24 months. That is the extent to which the Government has bent over backwards to ensure that no one will be retrenched.

The union Secretary failed to mention in his newsletter that any employees transferred will be transferred under the agreement reached between the Government and the United Trades and Labor Council. I point out that he was present for some of those negotiations, yet he deleted from the A.G.W.A. newsletter any reference to that agreement between the Government and the U.T.L.C., even though it was specifically referred to in the letter by the Director-General of the P.B.D. Again, the newsletter was deliberately inaccurate and misleading in leaving out those areas that gave certain assurances to the employees involved.

The other accusation made against the Government is that we failed to indicate to the union that these transfers were taking place, or to inform our employees. The Director-General's letter was sent to all cleaners in the Public Buildings Department.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's an ultimatum; that's not consultation.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: He claimed that the employees had not been informed and that the union itself had not been consulted. I understand the union was consulted verbally on Thursday afternoon; at least, an attempt was made to consult it on Thursday afternoon, and it was given, on Friday morning, a letter written by the Director-General of the P.B.D. Furthermore, it is well known that there were extensive negotiations with the union, along with other unions representing the U.T.L.C., on all the conditions involved.

As part of those negotiations, the agreement was that when cleaners were to be declared in three months that they may be surplus to requirements and therefore eligible for transfer from one Government department to another (something that still has not been done or referred to for these cleaners) the union would be notified by letter. That is exactly what the Government has done: also, we sent a letter to the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council under the conditions agreed to at those negotiations. The Government has stuck absolutely to the conditions agreed to, and I am disgusted at the extent to which the newsletters and statements made publicly have tried to mislead completely the union members as to the correct situation.

TRANSPORT FARES

Mr. HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the official estimate of the percentage loss in public transport patronage to follow the 25 per cent average increase in fares later this month and whether the increased fares will place in jeopardy the recent socially desirable trend towards increased patronage of public transport? The Labor Government froze public transport fares from 1974-1975 onwards, except for some increases on the occasion of the introduction of zone fares, in order to promote public transport usage. Public transport journeys increased by 1 250 000 in 1978-79 over 1977-78. According to State Transport Authority figures processed by the A.B.S., there seems to have been a further 1 750 000 rise in the first 11 months of 1979-80 over the 11 months of the previous year. It has been suggested that higher fares will lead to increased private motor vehicle traffic, more congestion on the roads, slower bus journeys and therefore even lower patronage, and increased consumption of Australia's scarcest energy.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Undoubtedly there will be a drop in public transport use for a few weeks or months, but we expect the accelerating trend of more people moving to public transport will continue. On a cost basis the fare increase was absolutely justified, and I remind the honourable member that, when his Government introduced the new zone fare system, that represented an increase of at least 20 per cent in public transport fares. I will obtain for the honourable member the exact percentage increase that the zone fare system represented. The Government and the Premier gave notice of this increase after the December Premiers' Conference, because the Government has to keep up with inflation.

The cost recovery of the State Transport Authority over the whole of the system is reducing every year. The percentage cost recovery on the basis of fares against cost at one stage in the life of the former Government was more than 40 per cent, but it is now at about 30 per cent, and the Government would not be responsible if it allowed that trend to continue. No Government likes to increase public transport fares. However, this Government

believes that public transport has to be subsidised and does not believe that it should be self-funding. The Government has to take a responsible position, however, to ensure that the cost recovery is within reasonable bounds.

COMMUNITY RADIO

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Environment ask the Minister of Arts what has been the Government's most recent financial contribution to community radio? In the capital city area community radio stations have recently been conducting radiothons for which public support has been most generous. I have been asked what the Government has been doing about this.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The member for Henley Beach was good enough to inform me of the question earlier so I have been able to get some information for him from the Minister of Arts. The Minister of Arts established the Community Radio Advisory Committee in April this year. The member for Henley Beach is a member of that committee, so I know how interested he is in obtaining this information, as are other people, who want to know just what this committee is doing.

I understand from the Minister that the committee invited applications for assistance with community radio projects being undertaken during 1980. The committee received applications from a number of organisations and recommended to the Minister grants totalling \$49 797 to 10 organisations. I am pleased to say that the Minister of Arts has approved that allocation of community radio grants to those organisations. Three of the radio stations to receive grants were Radio University (5UV), which received a grant of \$8 000 as a community service grant; Progressive Music Broadcasters Association (5MMM) received \$12 000, made up of an \$8 000 community service grant and an equipment grant of \$4 000; and Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated received a grant of \$6 000 as a community service grant. The committee is serving an important part in community radio activities, and I am pleased that the Government is associated with the work that the committee is carrying out.

TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say how many employees have been transferred between Government departments and authorities by the Government transfer office, and does he consider the scheme to have been successful?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Frankly, I think this is a breach of Standing Orders, because I think a similar question is on the Notice Paper. I am prepared to indicate, without having exact figures available, that I understand that about 285 employees have been transferred. Those transfers include what we would describe as both internal and external transfers. Internal transfers refer to employees transferred from one major section of a Government department to another section of that same Government Department—for instance, a carpenter transferred from the Construction Division of the Public Buildings Department to the Maintenance Section. I cannot recall the exact break-up of the figures but I think it is about 50/50 or 60/40. I will give the exact break-down when I am replying to the Question on Notice.

I think that so far the scheme has worked extremely well. It is a novel approach. Unfortunately, in the past, if

there was a vacancy in one Government department it would advertise and fill that vacancy even though there may have been a so-called surplus of employees in that same Government department or elsewhere in the Government.

This has meant that we have stopped that. If there is a vacancy of a weekly paid position, a person can approach the transfer office and have that advertised on the weekly newsletter that goes to all Government departments. If there is a so-called declared surplus or a person who may want such a position, that person is eligible to apply for it. In the agreement made with the Trades and Labor Council, we put down the conditions on which any transfer would take place, including the maintenance of income for a certain period, depending on the length of service.

One area that has been particularly successful is the recruitment of bus drivers for the State Transport Authority. I am delighted to say that the feedback I have had from a number of people who have transferred from the Public Buildings Department and the E. & W.S. to the State Transport Authority as bus drivers is that they consider the scheme to be marvellous. It has been said "Why weren't we eligible before?" In most cases there has actually been a wage increase, so there has been no need to examine the wage maintenance proposals.

Mr. Bannon: How many bus drivers?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I cannot cite the exact figures; I do not believe that that information is available. I know that, in some months, four, five or six people have been taken on by the State Transport Authority. One would assume that most of those people were taken on as bus drivers. There is a fairly large demand for bus drivers, as the honourable member knows, as a result of the large number of employees and the large turnover rate because of retirement. In answer to the specific question, the scheme has worked well, and I hope that the number of transfers will increase as people gain confidence in the system. Indications are that that is occurring at present. I think I can say that, in a number of sections of Government departments where there has been a surplus, the attrition rate is now up to 10 per cent. That has been achieved largely by these transfers.

The SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of the House the point made by the honourable Minister in answering the question—that it is not for the Chair to monitor whether questions are identical but for the Chair to adjudicate if attention is drawn to the fact that a question asked in the House is similar to a Question on Notice. A Question on Notice of the member for Ascot Park (No. 193) has some elements of the question asked by the member for Hartley, but no exception was taken to the member for Hartley having raised the point.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Health indicate the likely time table in regard to primary schools (and in particular Flagstaff Hill Primary School) being equipped with school dental clinics? At present, many schools are disadvantaged because there is no provision for a school dental clinic. In my district there are several such schools. However, I have been asked to pursue the point in relation to Flagstaff Hill Primary School, the nearest available clinic to which is located at Blackwood Primary School.

The Blackwood clinic will take appointments for the Flagstaff Hill school children, and the school allows children the necessary time off. However, it is the parents' responsibility to provide transport so that children can

keep these appointments. Unfortunately, because there is no direct public transport link between Flagstaff Hill and Blackwood, and many families who own only one car and who are unable to meet these appointments have asked when they can expect a school dental clinic to be established at Flagstaff Hill Primary School.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Health Commission has informed me that, by the end of this year, it expects that all primary schoolchildren in South Australia will have access to a school dental clinic. Therefore, on that basis I would say that there must be relatively few primary schools in the State that are not presently served by a clinic. I will obtain for the honourable member details about when a clinic will be provided for the Flagstaff Hill school. I imagine that the Principal of that school will not have long to wait before he is informed that the services of a clinic will be available for pupils in the area.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. O'NEILL: Does the Premier intend to follow the actions of the Queensland Treasurer, Dr. Edwards, in using State Government controls over building societies to block rises in building society interest rates and, if not, why will the Government not take this action which should benefit home buyers and the building industry? The Liberal's interest rate spiral is making home ownership an impossible dream for many. Every half per cent increase adds about \$900 to the deposit—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member only to explain the question and not to debate the issue.

Mr. O'NEILL: I thought I was explaining that every half per cent increase in interest rates adds about \$900 to the deposit required for a loan on an average home. Higher interest rates are hitting the building industry, and in May South Australian approvals for new privately constructed houses were down by 6.3 per cent on the figures for May 1979.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The answer to the specific question is "No". I point out to the honourable member, when he makes such claims, that the interest spiral that is occurring that increases the cost of housing and puts home ownership out of the reach of so many people, that, first of all, exemptions have been given for all welfare housing from the interest rate increases that have been forced on the private banks and building societies recently. The State Bank particularly and the Savings Bank have not changed their welfare housing interest rates. That is an extremely important point to make.

I also point out that, in South Australia, there has been a considerable change in the cost of building and in building costs over the past 10 years. The policies of the previous Government led to increases in costs at an annual rate of 2.9 per cent after the former Government took office; within two years, the annual rate of increase in home building costs had risen to 8 per cent, which was considerably higher than the comparable rate in any other capital city. Under the previous Government, the South Australian position was that we enjoyed (or did not enjoy) the rather unenviable distinction of having the highest building costs of any State in the Commonwealth until 1979. From June 1970 to September 1979, the price of home building in Adelaide rose by 187 per cent; this was 20 per cent higher than in New South Wales, 25 per cent higher than in Victoria, 8 per cent higher than in Queensland, 17 per cent higher than in Western Australia, and 17 per cent higher than the national average. The record was very poor up to that time.

I am very happy to say that building costs have taken a

nosedive and have remained relatively static since this Government came to office while costs in other States have gone up. There are also encouraging signs of an upturn in the building industry in regard to the number of approvals and the value of building that is currently being proposed or undertaken. To blame the Liberals, as the honourable member did, for the interest spiral and to say that the Liberals are responsible for, in some way, putting home ownership out of the reach of many people is quite fallacious. In fact, the Liberal Government in this State has done a great deal to put home ownership within the reach of the average person.

Regarding building societies, this would be an appropriate time for me to put on record that, as at 1 August, the three largest permanent building societies (the Co-operative Building Society, the Hindmarsh Building Society, and the Adelaide Building Society) have decided to waive establishment fees on loans for the purchase of new homes by first home buyers. Following a suggestion that I made at an annual dinner, the societies have fallen into line with the Government, which gives stamp duty exemption for the purchase of new homes by first home buyers. The concessions on establishment fees will amount to about \$300, and first home buyers of new homes will save up to \$880 in front end payments, if they take advantage of those offers and the Government concessions. I would say quite positively that the election of a Liberal Government in this State has done a tremendous amount to bring home ownership much more closely within the reach of young people in South Australia.

NATIONAL WAGE INCREASE

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs indicate whether employees under State awards are entitled to a 4.2 per cent wage increase as a flow-on of the recent national wage case?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, legally workers under State awards are not entitled to a flow-on as yet, because, although the application has been lodged in the Industrial Commission, members may recall that the matter is now before the Supreme Court and, whilst the matter is still before the Supreme Court, the hearing before the Industrial Commission is still unresolved. There is no legal obligation on employers to flow on that 4.2 per cent.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Has the Government supported that action in the Supreme Court?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, the Government has not supported the action in the Supreme Court. I believe that the position is that responsible employers will flow on the 4.2 per cent for those employees under the State awards. I am pleased to say that many employers have done so; certainly, the State Government as an employer did so as soon as we saw that the matter had been taken to the Supreme Court and was therefore likely to become a rather protracted hearing. I am pleased to say that apparently most of the employer associations have recommended to their members that they flow on the increase. To answer the question directly: no, there is no legal obligation, but I would certainly encourage employers to flow on the 4.2 per cent, because, irrespective of what happens in the Supreme Court, there is no doubt that when the case is eventually heard in the Industrial Commission any increase will be back-dated, and quite obviously it will be an increase of 4.2 per cent under the national wage case guidelines. That will be back-dated to the date when the application is made, so I think employees might as well be paid the money now.

ABORIGINAL RELICS UNIT

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Premier inform the House under which Minister's control the Government intends to place the Aboriginal Relics Unit—the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Minister of Environment or the Minister of Arts, who, as I understand it, is responsible for museums?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We are awaiting a report on that very matter. Of course, there are arguments to be placed on behalf of each of those Ministries. The office of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs would obviously seem to be a logical place for it, because it is specifically the responsibility of that portfolio. On the other hand, to do that would really keep the whole exercise a very limited affair. The Minister of Arts has put forward the suggestion that perhaps it would be better put into a museum, and therefore under his administration, because many people in the community would feel that they should have access to Aboriginal relics which are properly displayed.

The Department for the Environment still comes into it, because it has a very strong commitment to preserving the heritage, and their's is the responsibility of preserving the heritage of this nation, whether it be the Aboriginal heritage or any other heritage. Many aspects must be taken into account, and I hope that the report that we will be receiving soon will come down with a firm recommendation which Cabinet can accept.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SCHMIDT: Has the Minister of Environment seen a Letter to the Editor in Monday's *Advertiser* suggesting that a nominal fee be charged for entrance into the Belair National Park as a means of providing further revenue for the restoration of vandalism damage and general upkeep of the park? Would the Minister care to comment?

The SPEAKER: I would ask the Minister of Environment only to answer the question.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. I do not intend to comment. I saw the Letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser*: I think that it was under the heading "Parks being spoiled". The article referred particularly to problems we are experiencing, in the Belair park particularly, in regard to the number of cars that are being driven into the park. Right at the outset I might say that I have very mixed views on this matter. One of the things that I have most enjoyed since becoming Minister is having the opportunity to travel around the State and look at the national parks and reserves in South Australia. I suggest that we have some of the greatest parks and reserves in Australia. I think that as South Australians we should be proud of those parks and reserves. I think that we all appreciate the cost of developing and maintaining these parks, and the management costs are of great concern to all of us. In answer to the honourable member's question, the Government certainly has not looked very far into this situation; personally, I have mixed views on the matter, and it is something that I need to look at a lot more closely before I make any announcement.

At 3.6 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 12 August. Page 218.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill follows the form of Supply Bills that are introduced periodically to the House. The provisions that it contains are familiar to us all. The need for it is manifest; therefore, I wish simply to indicate the support of the Opposition to its provisions.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): It is most important, I think, that the attention of the House be directed to a grave situation as far as the resources of this State are concerned. I refer to the way in which the Deputy Premier in his cavalier and fairly contemptuous manner has been dismissing matters of grave importance raised in this House by the Opposition and raised publicly in the press concerning the future of our Cooper Basin resources and their control; the Redcliff project, which will use those resources; affairs relating to Delhi Petroleum; and the continuing unhappy saga of the South Australian Gas Company.

All of these matters of concern can be drawn together, and the allegations that I am making regarding the Deputy Premier (who has had the main carriage of these affairs in terms of answering questions in this House and who has responsibility for them in Government) are that either he is completely ignorant of the major implications of what is happening in terms of control of our energy resources, or he is simply refusing, for whatever purpose he has, to be honest and take the public into his confidence in relation to these matters.

Let me deal with answers that have been given by the Deputy Premier to my Deputy in relation to this matter just over the past week. Last Wednesday 6 August, my Deputy asked the Deputy Premier the following question:

Will the Deputy Premier tell the House what will be the impact of the recent Santos board changes on the State's Cooper Basin resource? Will he assure the House that the Government will act to ensure that South Australians will retain control of production from the Cooper Basin?

My Deputy explained the background to the question. The response from the Deputy Premier (the Minister of Mines and Energy) was nothing short of contemptuous. It indicated a complete ignorance of what had been going on and ignored the explanation given by my Deputy. The Minister's answer, rather than clarifying the matter, made the situation more murky than it had been by the abusive terms in which he responded. The Minister began by telling the House that, as he did not have a crystal ball of the necessary intensity, he could only say "No" to the Deputy Leader's first question, which was as follows:

Will the Deputy Premier tell the House what will be the impact of the recent Santos board changes on the State's Cooper Basin resource?

We have had another example of that approach. The Premier's way of handling economic development in this State is to suggest that, if he had a magic wand, he would be able to do something about it. Now, it appears that the Minister, in terms of the development and control of our natural resources, needs a crystal ball in order to take effective action. I suggest that both those frivolous responses indicate a frame of mind that either does not understand the gravity or the difficulty of the problems we are facing in terms of our economy and natural resources, or simply displays a contempt on the part of the

Government in terms of what the public should know about what is happening.

Indeed, the Minister does not need a crystal ball: he has legislation at his disposal to provide for him the very answers to the questions that were asked. It is a matter not of speculation but of hard fact that the Minister is in a position to obtain. I will deal with that in more detail later. Having airily dismissed the first question as relating to whether or not he would have a crystal ball, the Minister went on to say that it was a stupid question; that phrase was repeated by the Minister a week later, and I will come to that soon. After saying that the question was stupid, the Minister tried to answer it. He said:

... of course the Government will monitor the activities and the interests of the State in that area.

The question demanded something much more substantial than that: it demanded an assurance that the Government would act to ensure that South Australia retained control of the Cooper Basin—not that it would sit back and monitor the activities and interests of the State. If the Minister's approach in this area is one of an idle spectator sitting on the sidelines watching what is going on, heaven help the State's control of those natural resources, because there are many active people in the field who would be interested indeed in getting their hands on those resources, putting them to what use and money-making capacity they could. That was a totally weak and inadequate answer. He could not give an assurance that he was acting in the interests of the community of South Australia; he said he was simply sitting back and monitoring what was going on. He continued by talking about the problems of actual physical reserves rather than about who controls them. He told us things we all knew about, namely, the state of the reserves and the length of the contracts written for the supply of Cooper Basin gas. But the grave question that confronts us at present in this State is not what the actual reserves are but who will control them and how they will be put to the best use of the people of the State and of Australia.

Continuing in his abusive frame, the Minister went on to say that he had inherited an appalling state of affairs from the previous Government. We know his style: he cannot resist a cheap crack at his predecessors. Although this was not very relevant to the question, and certainly his dismissive answer had not grappled with the question at all, he thought he would spend a little time making yet another sideswipe at his predecessor in office and the Government. He told the House he would have thought that the record of the previous Government in relation to the State's needs for gas from the Cooper Basin would be something the Deputy Leader would steer clear of. On the contrary, our administration and development of the Cooper Basin reserve, and the way in which we acted promptly and effectively at all stages in its development, is something of which the previous Government is extremely proud. The leading members of that Government involved in that policy, namely, the Hon. Don Dunstan, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, who, unfortunately, is no longer with us, and the member for Hartley, know full well the sort of problems with which they had to grapple and the way in which they were able to solve them for the good of the State. We were fortunate indeed that we had a Government with leading lights of that kind looking after our interests in that crucial developmental period in the 1970's. If the present Minister, with his spectator attitude and complete ignorance of what is happening, both in the resources area and business world, had been in charge during those years, heaven help us. He misunderstood that aspect of the question.

The Minister made his sideswipe about the contracts

that had been written for the sale of gas from the Cooper Basin. Let it be said again clearly, as it has been said before in the House, without the contracts to sell gas to Sydney, about which the Minister is so contemptuous, there would not be enough throughput of gas to enable a petro-chemical scheme to even be contemplated. A petro-chemical scheme requires ethane, which is obtained only by producing the gas. The Adelaide market alone would not have produced enough gas in order to produce the ethane required for a petro-chemical plant. What the Minister was saying, in relation to this contract for the supply of gas to Sydney, in particular, is that he would not have had a bar of it and would not have been involved in it. By saying that, he is implying that he is not interested in the Redcliff petro-chemical project or any development or use of those resources for petro-chemical purposes. That is an outrageous and disturbing statement from a Minister who is in charge of delicate negotiations currently going on in that area, and it makes one rather depressed about the possible outcome of those negotiations.

It is politically stupid to say what he is saying. He is saying, in effect, that we cannot have a petro-chemical industry. That sale of gas was understood by the Hall Government, and he ought to talk to some of the people involved in that Government. It was certainly understood by our Government. The strategy was to discover more gas, and go further and negotiate with Queensland for its share of the Cooper Basin to come to South Australia in order to maximise the flow and possibility of a petro-chemical plant being economic.

South Australian Oil and Gas was set up by Labor in order to set up the exploration effort to find that extra gas, and the activity going on in the basin at present is the result of that sort of energetic activity of the previous Labor Government. One can only recall that, prior to the last election, \$10 000 000 was allocated for exploration, and it was the present Minister who reannounced it proudly (and got some big headlines about it, because people's memories are short) soon after the election. He claimed it as his own initiative. That, like many of the initiatives claimed by the Tonkin Government, is nonsense. It was undertaken by us, consistent with that policy. The Minister's answer to the Deputy Leader, when analysed as I have just done, clearly shows the ignorance and sterility of understanding of the Minister.

Yesterday, my Deputy Leader again asked him whether he had obtained a report and whether he had been able to find something about which he could tell the House. He asked:

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?

In asking that question, my Deputy pointed out that the very day following the contemptuous shrugging off by the Deputy Premier of the information requested from him, there had been a newspaper headline indicating moves being made by Delhi Petroleum to put its company on the market for take-over.

That underlined the gravity and importance of the situation, but it was dismissed as a matter of no consequence by the Deputy Premier. He was asked again whether he had obtained a report, and he said (and this is amazing):

The Deputy Leader persists with the question which he asked last week. The question has not changed [he is right on that] 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 necessary intensity to look into the future when that future is quite unknown. For that reason, I classed the question as stupid, and I still do.

Two points were made by the Minister in his reply that were accurate. Last week he did tell the Deputy Leader that he did not have a crystal ball, and he also told him that his question was stupid. However, he did not tell him about his conversation with the State Manager of Delhi nor the situation concerning Delhi. In both his statements he was not only misleading with the truth, but an examination of the *Hansard* record will show that it was completely untrue and he was in error when he said, "I told the honourable member last week . . ." He did not tell the honourable member that at all, as an examination of the record will show. Far from being stupid, the question was vital to the future of South Australia's energy resources, and not only did the reply reaffirm his view of its insignificance but also it completely misrepresented the answer he gave on that occasion.

The control and management of our energy reserves and the Government's input is vital for the future of any project such as Redcliff and any development of energy resources in South Australia. It was central to the introduction and passage of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act and therefore subjected to full debate in this House. The Premier has indicated that that Act will not be repealed, even though as an Opposition member he fought hard against it. However, in Government they recognised the value of such a measure. The questions asked by the Deputy Leader are central to understanding the appalling mess that has developed in the South Australian Gas Company, which I will deal with in more detail later.

In the *Advertiser* on 7 August we saw an article suggesting that shares are not being registered in a manoeuvre obviously designed to avoid the requirements of the South Australian Gas Company Act, which limits shareholdings to a maximum of 5 per cent. It was claimed that the South Australian Government is on the brink of announcing further measures to tighten regulations governing the ownership of shares in the South Australian Gas Company. For the Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy to dismiss these questions in such an arrogant and stupid fashion is appalling. Let us try to educate the Minister, who is meant to be responsible (heaven help us!) for this area of Government.

The key to the Santos Act was, first, that our industrial development and therefore the welfare of all South Australians depended on assured sources of gas and electricity and some control over the price paid for them. Secondly, the price of the feedstock from the Cooper Basin which Dow will need for Redcliff is critical. If the price cannot be controlled, Redcliff is simply not on.

Thirdly, Cooper Basin companies will be required to spend large amounts on the Redcliff project, so the financial strength of Santos will be critical to the viability of the petro-chemical scheme. A former Minister, who was a man of competence and eminence in this field (the Hon. Hugh Hudson), put it well, when in dealing with the Santos Bill he said:

Industry in South Australia, and therefore the employment of our people, depends on assured sources of gas and electricity which can be made available at prices comparable with the major industrial markets of Sydney and Melbourne. As honourable members will appreciate, gas from the Cooper Basin is supplied principally to Sagasco and to the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Its cost affects, therefore, the welfare of South Australian consumers and the economic position of the South Australian industry.

The Cooper Basin supplied 34 per cent of South Australia's primary energy requirements in 1978, and Santos's share of those sales was 45-57 per cent. Santos is the operating company in the Cooper Basin, and its financial strength and stability is fundamental to the development of the hydrocarbons of the basin. Any action which destabilises the financial position of Santos, or has the potential so to do, will make serious and harmful impact on the costs of further development in this State and the price that South Australians must pay for natural gas. Furthermore, the development of a petro-chemical scheme is dependent to a significant extent on the financial strength of the Cooper Basin companies and, more particularly, Santos, as the leading company of that group.

The situation was put clearly there, but apparently it is not clear to the Government, and it is not treating it with any seriousness. The reason for the Bill was concern that the Bond Corporation may gain control of Santos and, with its record of significant financial difficulties over a number of years, it would be a totally unsatisfactory and unreliable partner in an enterprise so vital to South Australia. As the former Deputy Premier (Mr. Hudson) told the member for Stuart in this House on 24 May 1979:

One of the greatest concerns of local members of the Santos board is that if Bond gains control of Santos he will use the borrowing power of Santos to get it involved in all sorts of other schemes, many of which will go phut, as is shown if one checks the liquidation rate of Bond Corporation subsidiaries.

It seems that Bond now may be in a position to control Santos unless the Government takes action, because it seems from financial commentators that Bond may be working in concert with the Ansett group. A report in the *Australian Financial Review* of 16 July states:

Sir William Pettingel and the Australian Gaslight Company are now in a stronger position in the Cooper Basin than the South Australian Government.

That is a dangerous and disturbing situation. Why could they say that? The answer could be that they would hold the balance of power. The article continues:

As expected, the Ansett nominations, Sir Kenneth May and Alex Carmichael, got up, finally establishing control of Santos. Alan Bond, Rupert Murdoch and Sir Peter Abeles now have 30 per cent of its capital and five out of 10 board seats.

The article concludes:

Alan Bond and Rupert Murdoch, meanwhile, now have control (Sir William willing) of a very attractive Australian energy stock. The potential for money raising through a company like Santos is enormous.

That is the nub of this situation. Enormous sums can be raised on a company like Santos. The money and prosperity of that company is vital for use not only in

furthering and advancing exploration in that area but also for the development of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant.

The Minister is apparently unaware of his powers under the Act. When he said he was monitoring the activities and interests of the State in relation to what is happening in the Cooper Basin, he was apparently forgetting or choosing to ignore section 3 (1) (c) of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act, which gives him the power to discover whether it is just speculation that Bond and Murdoch constitute a group of associated shareholders who are getting into a position of control. Section 3 (1) (c) provides:

where two or more shareholders are, in the opinion of the Minister, likely to act in concert with a view to taking control of the company, or otherwise against the public interest, those shareholders constitute a group of associated shareholders.

Section 3 (2) provides:

... the Minister, or a director or the secretary of the company, may at any time, by notice in writing served personally or by post upon any shareholder, require him to furnish information specified in the notice... for the purpose of enabling a determination to be made of whether the shareholder is a member of a group of associated shareholders and, if so, the membership of the group.

Taking it out of the legally framed language: the Minister does not need a crystal ball at all; he has clear, specific powers under the Act, powers which should be exercised as a matter of urgency in order to discover whether or not there is truth in the suggestion that the Bond and Murdoch interests are taking control of Santos or to discover just precisely what is going on in that area.

The matter has been complicated further by the Delhi sale. On 5 August Delhi announced that it was exploring the possibility of a sale or merger of its interests—a matter of enormous importance for the development of the Cooper Basin. The *Australian Financial Review* suggested:

The 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.

Just what Delhi is doing is not completely clear from its public statements, and certainly nothing has been clarified for us by the Minister's answers in this House. It appears that it is attempting to get ahead of takeover or merger moves that may be underway through the parent company in the United States, but it is actively assessing the situation through a third party to find out what the market value is and what likely buyers there are. Certainly, the implications of that move by Delhi, the opening up of the question as to whether its Australian interests cannot be acquired, have to be investigated and discussed as a matter of urgency by the Government. The Minister of Mines and Energy has to make quite clear that he is protecting the interests of the broad South Australian community in this matter, and so far that has not been done.

I finish on the sorry saga of the South Australian Gas Company. The dividends which the company can pay are regulated by Statute. It is a company that is certainly listed on the Stock Exchange as a public company, but it is also a public utility and controlled by Act of Parliament. Its 50c shares have had a stable value of around \$1 or so over the years traditionally. For some reason in late May, a reason not yet fully explained, Gas Company shares started leaping in price. Despite firm statements made by the Chairman of the Gas Company and statements made in response to questions from us in this House, statements that the Government should have made of its own volition but had to be prompted into making, and despite an

attempt to kill what was obviously speculation in South Australian Gas Company shares, the trading activity has continued. The shares have peaked at about \$8. Right through June they were oscillating at the \$5 or \$6 mark, and yesterday they closed at \$6.70 after a day when 3.5 per cent of the issued capital of the company was traded on Australian stock exchanges. For months and months this has been going on, and it has been going on in the teeth of statements made by the Gas Company directors and by the Government itself. In July, when a major surge of activity was taking place, the *Advertiser* commented as follows:

Yesterday's activity again prompted speculation on what the South Australian Government's attitude ultimately will be as to how it handles the State's immense assets of hydrocarbons in the Cooper Basin of South Australia.

That is the core of this matter. What is the Government going to do? It is in the Government's hands whether it makes the Gas Company's shares a speculative trading stock or whether it is kept controlled under the statutory provisions as a public utility asset in South Australia. It is scandalous that we are now well into August, and still that speculation is rife.

The Deputy Premier certainly made it quite clear that his Government will not surrender its control of dividends declared by the Gas Company nor its control over the prices; it will not surrender that, and he has said that in this House under question. The Government has also made it clear that the possibility of a dividend in the foreseeable future is very unlikely, and that has been emphasised by the Chairman of the Gas Company. On 10 June I called for the Stock Exchange of Adelaide to take action over the unexplained surge of activities. I suggested that the exchange suspend trading in Gas Company shares until the recent activity could be explained.

Weeks have gone by, and the trading and speculation have continued virtually undiminished. I believe that call must be renewed, and I will do so today. The Gas Company shares must be suspended until we can have a proper inquiry and investigation into what is going on. With that investigation by the Stock Exchange must go a thorough investigation by the Government into the possibility that certain shareholders in the Gas Company are circumventing the provision of the Gas Company Act which limits shareholding to a maximum of 5 per cent. That is quite possible, apparently, according to a report by the *Advertiser's* finance writer on 7 August, and it would appear that the Gas Company does not now know the identity of a large proportion, possibly more than 50 per cent, of the individuals and companies owning its shares. It is facing an unworkable situation with its dividends, because it cannot pay dividends to the holders of unregistered shares. It appears that letters sent out to new shareholders pointing out to them the statutory requirements concerning share ownership are simply being ignored. It is not possible for the Gas Company to discover the beneficial owner of shares and approve whether or not the buyer is acting in concert with others. That situation has to be stopped, and stopped quickly.

A lot of speculation was begun by a newsletter in Sydney that was sent out by a character called Ian Huntley. It is interesting to note that at least one of the companies that has been buying shares (Huntley has a close association with Mr. Ron Brierley, the company raider) is associated with Huntley directly. It appears to have been a major purchaser of Gas Company shares. His inside newsletter has been fuelling speculation.

A New South Wales Corporate Affairs investigation is under way at the moment into that, which is more than is being done by the Government of South Australia, so it is high time that this whole area was not trivialised, that the

Deputy Premier stops using abuse in attempting to score political points, stops looking around for crystal balls and gets down to the hard job of finding out what is going on, whether our resources are being protected and what the future control of those resources will mean in terms of the feasibility of the Redcliff project.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My Leader has chosen the high road of the State's energy resources for his remarks. I will tread the more modest path of a constituency matter which I have raised in this Chamber before but, since there has been no resolution to the problem, I must perforce raise it again. Two fortunate coincidences bolster me in my desire to spend my 10 minutes on this matter. One is that the Minister to whom I wish to direct my remarks is in fact the Minister on the front bench at present, and that encourages me considerably.

Secondly, I discovered only about 20 minutes ago, when I made a phone call to get a bit more background advice on this matter that in fact certain of my constituents had been in contact with the Minister's office but not the Minister personally a day or so ago on this matter.

I can see that the Minister is already able to anticipate practically every word I am going to say. Since the remainder of the House is not in that fortunate position, however I will proceed to say it. There has been some confusion in these days (and there would not have been in previous years) as to what the term "Noarlunga" really means.

People once understood what was meant by the term "Noarlunga". Noarlunga was a township, situated adjacent to the bend of the Onkaparinga River, where the river made a horseshoe bend on the Main South Road. However, there is also the city of Noarlunga, which refers to an area very much more extensive than that township. When, thirdly, the Noarlunga regional centre was set up, it became clear that there would be a good deal of confusion in relation to the use of the name and that some name changes should occur. Therefore, the concept of "Old Noarlunga" was born, and my remarks are directed to the problems faced by people in that area—Old Noarlunga (the old town on the horseshoe bend of the Onkaparinga River, plus the Trim Estate, a little to the south).

This area is isolated from the other housing areas of the city of Noarlunga and has become increasingly isolated from most of the facilities upon which suburban dwellers depend. For example, the diversion of the Main South Road away from Old Noarlunga, and the building of the new bridge (I do not suppose it is new now—eight years ago I recall being at the opening ceremony) meant that, with the high volume of traffic having been shifted out of the town, the commercial centre died. That was a mixed blessing for the local people. On the one hand, they were enthusiastic about not having to put up with the extremely high volumes of traffic moving to the south (to Victor Harbor or Yankalilla), particularly during the summer months, but there was a problem of access to butcher shops, greengrocers, etc., and that problem has continued.

For some time, people have been trying to have action taken to obtain an upgrading of these facilities. For example, an attempt was made through the Noarlunga and Districts Chamber of Commerce and Community Development Inc. I have a letter written by the Secretary of that body to a person at Old Noarlunga on 2 February last year. In the letter, the Secretary of the body that had taken up the cudgels on behalf of that person and other residents, stated:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter drawing attention to the lack of public transport to the Noarlunga railway centre from southern areas. I have contacted the appropriate State transport authorities who have assured me that "the situation is under current review" and that, when their investigations are completed, it is hoped that their proposal will be accepted and commence operating to coincide with the opening of the Colonnades regional shopping centre, which is adjacent to the railway centre.

(Signed) T. C. STRATTON,
Secretary.

I raised the matter in this place when I presented a numerously worded petition from the people of Old Noarlunga which was presented to the House on 19 February of this year and which received a great deal of support and enthusiasm from local people. The Minister and other interested honourable members can read the petition in *Hansard* (page 1037). The petition states that no S.T.A. bus facility services Old Noarlunga, no private bus service enters the town of Old Noarlunga to take residents to Noarlunga Centre railway station, Noarlunga Medical Centre, the Colonnades shopping centre, Beach Road or recreational facilities at Noarlunga Centre. The petition also stated, in the normal verbiage:

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will give due consideration to the request for a regular three-hourly S.T.A. bus service to the Noarlunga Centre railway station and local shopping and business facilities.

About that time, I took a deputation of local people to the Minister. We were received with the normal friendliness and consideration for which the Minister is well known, and we had a conversation from which we believed that something fairly positive would come. The only specific feedback that I have received since that time (and I guess that this was the official answer) was a letter from the Minister. The letter that I have predates the tabling of the petition, so I may have my chronology a little awry.

Nonetheless, apart from the words spoken at that time, there was no other response from the Minister. In that letter, the Minister indicated he had discussed with the State Transport Authority the problems faced by these people and that, in fact, two services were provided, one by Premier Roadlines, which is a service to Victor Harbor, and another run by a company known as Aldinga Beach Hire and Sales, which runs between Aldinga beach and the Noarlunga Centre. Premier Roadlines does not go into the Noarlunga Centre, but the service was regarded as being in walking distance of the centre; the other bus visits the centre twice daily. The times were not given in the letter, but I understand that they are 9 o'clock in the morning and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. That service is basically for schoolchildren and does not run at all during school holiday periods. Therefore, for seven weeks through the summer months this direct access, infrequent though it may be, to the Noarlunga area is simply not available to the people of Old Noarlunga.

The letter also stated that the authority does not extend its services over routes operated by private operators and, therefore, has no plan to provide a service to Old Noarlunga. It seems to me that two options are open to the Minister: one is to overcome the ideological blinkers of his colleagues and to provide an S.T.A. service to the people of Old Noarlunga in view of the continued inadequacy of the private services; the second option is somehow to prop up this existing community bus service (as the locals call it). However, in any event, it seems to be operated by Aldinga Beach Hire and Sales. That suggestion would be ideologically pure as far as the Minister is concerned. It provides some means of support for that company, which would enable a greater frequency of services.

This township is a little different from other places in the

south in that in it reside a much higher percentage of retired people who do not have the capacity to get around on foot. Of course, young people live in the township as well, but it is an older area. I therefore take this opportunity to plead with the Minister to examine this matter again, and I hope that my plea will not fall on deaf ears.

Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach): I would like to elaborate on comments made in my Address in Reply speech, in which I indicated to the House that union magazines are used for political purposes instead of being used as information sources for union members. Today in Question Time the Minister of Industrial Affairs highlighted my comments quite openly, and his remarks need to be reiterated.

The Australian Government Workers Association distributes information to its members via its newsletter; however, the association quoted only part of the Director-General's letter to the association. The newsletter, quite specifically, left out a section stating that no employees would be retrenched. This fact was demonstrated during Question Time today, and I will not reiterate the remarks made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who highlighted the misuse of the opportunity that a union has to inform its members of its affairs. I have no conflict with the union that wants to inform its members; provided that it gives all of the information and presents a balanced apolitical viewpoint, I would be happy about that.

Unfortunately, in this day and age, union newsletters and monthly magazines tend not to do that. I also indicated during my Address in Reply speech that I would take time in this House to answer some of the points made by the Australian Telecom Employees Association in their publication *National News*, which has been circulated to all members in this House. Some points need to be highlighted. I base my comments this afternoon on an article headed "What a giant con job!", which refers to a satellite. The article states:

The Federal Government's proposals for a domestic communications satellite is one of the greatest confidence tricks ever to have been tried on the Australian public. Despite bitter conflict in its own ranks over its satellite proposals, the Government continues to promise benefits a satellite can't and won't provide. The people most hurt by this misleading propaganda are those in country areas—especially remote localities—where there is an urgent need for better communications.

Led by Posts and Telecommunications Minister, Mr. Tony Staley, the Government has claimed that rural areas can be given better telephone services, television, and radio when the satellite, costing hundreds of millions of dollars is launched in the mid 1980's.

Those promises will not be fulfilled and the whole reason for a satellite system is not to help the country dweller, but to help big business and to divide the telephone users of Australia into the "haves" and "have nots." If the Government has its way, the country dweller will remain a "have not", and the satellite will be used to keep them that way.

It is time that this rubbish was put in the place where it should be, although I will not rip up pieces of paper, as you have done in this place, Sir. I will demonstrate to the House some of the things that the Federal Government has done in the past. The Federal Government has taken action to provide the country people of Australia with access to a satellite system for telephone, television and radio services. In relation to the communications satellite, a public document released earlier this year states:

The Minister for Post and Telecommunications in his

announcement of 18 October 1979 advised that it is the Government's wish that private industry be fully involved in the planning activities carried out by the Satellite Project Office, and that in any agreement for the supply of a communications satellite system, the Government expects the maximum practicable participation of Australian industry, particularly with respect to the design, supply, installation and testing of the earth segment.

Again, this clearly illustrates the Government's policy of Australian ownership, and an opportunity for Australian business to participate in the planning, supply, installation, and testing stages of this sort of communication and network. It would be a backward-looking Government that proceeded to maintain our existing communications network.

I believe it is a forward-thinking national Government which is looking towards satellite communication in this day of expanding technology. The ability to use this method of communication is becoming much easier. In the past it has been quite costly and has been an expensive exercise, one that the Government has not looked at too fondly. Because of the integrated circuit and because of the expertise available in Australia it is fast becoming a more positive proposition, at which the Government should look.

Regarding the comment that country people are being left out, let us see what is actually happening. The Government has a policy on the remote area programme for implementation of communication, telephone and television services. It is estimated that the cost to establish and operate the television services scheduled for construction in the first two years by either the videotape replay or the satellite alternative would be of the same order of magnitude. In other words, there are two types: the type which comes via satellite from an earth station or where a remote transmitter is installed and every day videotapes are flown in by news media.

The cost of providing television to the first 56 locations during 1979-80-81, including operational and satellite rental charges for the period, is estimated at about \$8 800 000. Forty-one earth stations will work through INTELSAT; the remaining 15 locations will be provided with a service through translators or from existing Telecom broadband systems. Studies and field surveys for the remaining 20 stations have not yet reached a stage where firm cost estimates can be provided. Thus, 56 locations will have television services.

It was my good fortune the other day to have a look at some of these electronic transmitters and devices which will be installed in remote localities in the Northern Territory. They will be installed in huts, and will be automatically operated. The programme source will come via national networks, via the international satellite and then be retransmitted to people of that area. It is interesting to see that the beneficiaries of this scheme will be country people located in remote areas. They will be country communities of Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory who have long wanted to have the communication systems that others enjoy.

Not only will this INTELSAT satellite communication link provide television services but it will also provide a radio link that we need for radio stations. It will provide an automatic telephone network enabling a person to pick up a phone in these Aboriginal communities and dial anywhere in Australia or the world. So much for the statement that the Government will have its way, and that the system will be used to keep the country dweller a "have not".

In the Mid-North, in the electorate of Grey, it is planned to install satellite operated remote television

links. As members are aware, Leigh Creek has a television station, which is run and which has programme material fed to it each day by a video recorder. What is planned for the areas of Andamooka, Coober Pedy and Marree is earth station links with the INTELSAT satellite so that people in those remote localities can have direct access to the television services that we, as city dwellers, are now fortunate enough to have access to. So much for the sort of statements that we read that the Federal Government is not prepared to do anything for the country dweller. The Federal Government has set in motion a plan, and is using a satellite at the moment. It does not need to build a new one.

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

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I refer to a paper which is a brief summary of the deficiencies of the Myers Report on technological change in Australia and which was delivered by Mr. Barry Jones, M.H.R., Federal member for Lalor at a recent meeting at Port Adelaide. The four-volume report of the Committee of Inquiry into Technological Change in Australia was published in July 1980, and I understand the full cost of this inquiry was well in excess of \$2 000 000. The committee, which was appointed in December 1978, was directed to examine, report, and make recommendations on the process of technological change in Australian industry in order to maximise economic, social and other benefits, and minimise any possible adverse consequences.

The committee also had to review the effectiveness of Government policy and programmes in facilitating the introduction of new technology. So, the outcome of the inquiry and the Government's desires were made clear right from the start. The committee was also directed to identify technological changes and the new technologies that are likely to have an impact, to evaluate their effects, and to examine relevant overseas experience and studies of technical change. The Barry Jones paper states:

There are three general objections to the way in which the Committee of Inquiry into Technological Change in Australia was established and carried out its operations:

1. The terms of reference were far too narrow. The report states that "Australian industry" was assumed to cover "all aspects of endeavours" (as per paragraph 1.14), but there is little evidence of this. There was no basis for examining alternative forms of development, as in the Canadian GAMMA Report, "the selective conserver society". The committee read down its terms of reference and failed to examine relevant overseas studies such as "the computerisation of society" by Simon Nora and Alain Minc (commissioned by the French Government), "the office in 1990" prepared by Siemens A. G. of West Germany, the Canadian GAMMA Report, or the Sleigh Report of the U.K. Department of Productivity.
2. The membership of the committee and its support staff were far too technologically oriented, as was its support staff. There was no sociologist, historian or philosopher to put an alternative point of view.
3. The committee of inquiry's methodology was highly suspect, using a technique which intelligence testers call "backstopping". A particular assumption is made, material which supports this assumption is examined and adopted, "advisers" who are known to share this view are commissioned to provide additional evidence, visits are made to people or institutions which take the same view (I.B.M., Fairchild, Bell, Chase Manhattan, Rand, Nuclear

Power Research of Tokyo, Ministries of Science, Technology and Industry, and West German trade unions) while those who take a contrary view are not visited and their conclusions ignored.

The committee could then say, "All the people we talked to had the same view." Where there are dissenting views they are dismissed without identification or examination. Nowhere does the report say that two views are put on a certain matter.

I will now read extracts from Barry Jones's paper, as follows:

There are a number of specific objections to the conclusions made by CITCA [the committee of enquiry]. Technology is treated as a single entity, monolithic and incapable of being differentiated. There is no suggestion that there are varieties of technologies or that it is possible for nations to choose between them. This is the "cargo cult" view of technology: we wake up one morning to find a computer in the garden; it has arrived impersonally and we must take it or leave it as we find it; we are not permitted to modify it. If we reject it, we will be punished, if we accept it, the prerecorded birds will sing all day, and artificial lighting will abolish night.

The Myers Report makes no attempt to differentiate between varieties of technologies, for example:

- (a) Labor displacing v. labor complementing
- (b) Megatechnics v. polytechnics
- (c) Centralised v. decentralised
- (d) High entropy v. low entropy
- (e) Nuclear energy v. solar energy
- (f) Environmentally harmful v. environmentally benign

There is a fundamental misunderstanding about the impact of technological change of employment. The report states (paragraph 4.57): "The committee . . . does believe that the available historical evidence shows that technological change has in the long term created wealth and employment and that future technological changes will continue to have this effect."

The report is superficial and wrong in its reading of economic history and gives the impression that since the Industrial Revolution full employment has been the norm, and that current high levels of unemployment are a temporary phase due to reduced levels of demand. Since the Industrial Revolution began in Britain in 1780, unstable employment has been the norm. Over 200 years there have been 30 years of full employment, 30 years of war and 140 years of unstable employment (with sharp alterations between high and low levels). In the period 1919-39, when Britain still had a dominant world economic position, the average unemployment was 11 per cent.

Some "new technologies" are identified in the report, but it is difficult to see them as major employment generators. Many are specifically labour displacing. Most new, sophisticated products are very small employers. The report ignores the question whether new products will be in addition to or in substitution for existing ones.

The report aggregates statistics, such as the technological impact on employment, rather than disaggregating them. This conceals the impact of the decline of manufacturing employment in specific regions, particularly where there is a large working class or ethnic component (for example in the seat of Lalor where technological displacement is high, compared to Kooyong where it is low).

The report completely ignores the role of multi-national corporations as the primary agents of technology transfer. Indeed, the term is never used in volume I (and is not obvious elsewhere). The questions "Who owns new technology?" and "Who controls it?" are completely ignored, although they are fundamental to working out appropriate policies for an era of change.

The report fails to recognise or examine those factors in the current period of economic change which indicate discontinuity with past economic history: Miniaturisation—The significance of micro-electronics is that it permits an exponential rise in output together with an exponential fall in total inputs—energy, labour, capital and time. There is no precedent for this in economic history. The first electronic computer ENIAC (1946) cost \$5 000 000 (US) at that time (perhaps \$20 000 000 in today's values) while a modern mini computer costs \$2 000, reduced by a cost factor of 10 000:1, smaller by a factor of 1 500:1, using less power by a factor of 2 800:1, lighter by a factor of 17 000:1, with 400 times the memory capacity and faster by a factor of 40:1. It is difficult to think of an appropriate analogy: it is as if modern aviation began with the jumbo jet and evolved towards something lighter, cheaper, faster and safer than the Wright brothers model at Kittyhawk (1903).

Occasional bursts of candour make CITCA admit to an agnostic position about future work possibilities: Volume 1. Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2: "Most of the concern expressed about technological change related to its effect on employment . . . The argument is not whether jobs will disappear, which is generally conceded, but is about how many and what kinds of jobs will disappear, and to what extent they will be replaced by employment generated elsewhere in the economy."

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

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): Mr. Acting Speaker, I am pleased to see you in the Chair, perhaps on a temporary basis, but I look forward to the day in the near future when you will be occupying that position on a more permanent basis. During the course of my remarks in the debate on the Address in Reply last evening, I referred to the difficulties associated with housing. I said that housing was one of the most pressing needs facing the community. I said that about 16 000 applicants were awaiting rental housing accommodation from the Housing Trust. The immediate prospects of the trust being able to accommodate those on the waiting list has been severely affected by cut-backs by the Commonwealth Government in welfare housing funds.

Consequently, a proposal for the provision of another source of housing finance needs to be seriously considered if the State is going to be able to provide adequate housing for its citizens, many of whom are in urgent need of decent accommodation. The opportunity for low and middle-income earners for home ownership could alleviate pressures on the trust for housing assistance, possibly in the rental sector. One such proposal has been put forward, namely, the Ramsay Trust, and I bring it to the attention of the House.

The aims, the social need, and the outline of the actions proposed are referred to in a draft that I intend to bring to the attention of the House. The aim of the Ramsay Trust is, first, to start a third sector of housing outside the governmental financial system by financing a public interest housing operation from the open market, with its earnings going exclusively to charity; secondly, to see whether money can be raised by capital indexed debentures; and thirdly, to offer access to home ownership by a method of equity renting. Some members may recall the rental purchase housing scheme that was most effective and efficient in enabling members of the community on low incomes to obtain houses: in fact, about 8 000 families were able to obtain them in that way, with long-term loans at low interest. The social need of the Ramsay Trust is stated as follows:

An increasing number of low-income households face unnecessary hardships because they are excluded from home ownership as many families depend on one below-average income and can no longer buy a family house as they could 10 or 20 years ago. This loss of access is serious because over a household life of 40 years home ownership can make a difference to spending resources, after taxing and housing costs. It could be as much as 50 per cent in some cases. The deprivation of not owning a house can continue into old age.

The trust is named after the late General Manager of the Housing Trust, Alec Ramsay. The outline of the action proposed in setting up the Ramsay Trust is as follows:

1. Amy Ramsay has donated \$2 000 to establish the Ramsay Trust.

2. The trust is for the benefit of the Brotherhood of St. Laurence, an old-established independent charitable organisation. The trustee is a public company, empowered to do the business outlined herein, and permitted by the Attorney-General to be named "The Ramsay Trust". It is a benevolent institution whose business income is exempt from company tax. Mrs. Ramsay appointed three initial Trustee/Directors, who serve in their personal capacities, without remuneration. They are W. H. Hayes (lately Lord Mayor of Adelaide; and Chairman of the Electricity Trust of South Australia), H. Stretton (Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust) and R. Wagstaff (lately General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company).

The Brotherhood of St. Laurence may appoint a Trustee/Director and has appointed its own Executive Director, David Scott. The South Australian Council of Social Services may appoint a fifth Trustee/Director. There is provision for a sixth if required.

3. Through the South Australian Development Corporation and the Industrial Development Committee of Parliament, under section 14 of the Industrial Development Act, the Ramsay Trust applies to have its debentures guaranteed by the Treasurer of South Australia.

4. If approved, the Ramsay Trust issues Indexed Housing Debentures, secured by the Ramsay Trust's assets and the Treasurer's guarantee.

Time does not permit me to give all the details in relation to the setting up of the Ramsay Trust and its financial implications, but the idea is that the funds raised will be employed to convey home ownership to households with low incomes. The Ramsay Trust would engage the South Australian Housing Trust to act as its managing agent. The individual home-buyer would go into the market in the ordinary way and find a house he wanted to buy. He would propose the house to the trust office. Subject to appropriate approvals, the Ramsay Trust, using the Housing Trust as agent, would buy the house then let it to the home-buyer on an equity-rental contract. Terms could be varied according to policy, but a basic contract would provide that the rent would be 7 per cent of the purchase price, as indexed annually. The term would be 21 years. The first year's rent would belong to the Ramsay Trust to cover costs of acquisition, etc. Thereafter, the rent would be indexed annually, and each year's rent would be divided according to a calculation of indexation over a period of years.

This proposition was provided to the Government for assessment, but the Premier in his reply to the trustees stated that it did not seem to be a viable proposition, because the institutional investors would not find a zero real return on indexed securities attractive, and that some taxation implications may be involved. According to the summary of arguments against the trust, even at quite moderate levels of inflation, the State Bank home loan arrangements would be more attractive to borrowers.

I do not believe that that is the case. In South Australia

we need as many opportunities as possible for young people to purchase houses, particularly people on low and middle incomes who are able to purchase over a long-term at low interest rates. I am disappointed that the Premier has not given the necessary encouragement at this stage to the Ramsay Trust in order to get the operation off the ground. This is a glorious opportunity outside of State and Commonwealth financial arrangements to provide young people with the opportunity to purchase a house, and I hope the matter will be reconsidered.

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

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate. I wish to express my personal views on child safety, especially in regard to safety on roads. When I was a child, the school I attended believed that children riding bicycles to school should adopt a responsible attitude. In an attempt to bring this message home the Regional Education authority, together with the Police Department, devised a scheme. The simplicity of that scheme should be referred to, especially when one considers the present volume of traffic and the increase in the use of bicycles, a use that will continue to increase because of the high cost of motoring. A school rule provided that if one wished to ride a bicycle one had to pass a proficiency test. In those days this was conducted by the Police Department in conjunction with debates and lectures on road safety and courtesy.

The officer in charge would use the school playground and set up mock crossings, obstacles and side streets, and these props were portable, thus being able to be moved with ease from one school to another. Points were awarded for performance on the bicycle, with a maximum of 100 points obtainable, and a pass standard was set by the authority. Besides testing on normal conditions of road usage, knowledge tests were given on maintenance, cleaning and use of accessories with bicycles. We were also given tests on balance, riding with one hand, and controlling the bicycle at very slow speeds, and avoiding the wobbles.

Thus it was assumed that children who passed this proficiency test and gained a proficiency flag or badge took the more reasonable discipline on the road and to a large degree accidents were minimised. We must all at some stage have felt somewhat sickened or disgusted when confronted with a situation in which a child cyclist has been injured, maimed or even killed because of an action taken, mostly without the child really knowing what he has done.

Not a day goes by when driving along I do not see a child cyclist doing something silly, and risking life and limb, not only his own but sometimes those of the motorist. I believe that, if we introduced a scheme into our society whereby the proficiency of cyclists was tested, I feel positive that it would have an effect on reducing the toll of accidents and the fatalities in which children are involved. I firmly believe that such a scheme should perhaps be compulsory, and that school principals should be empowered to refuse children the right to ride to school unless a proficiency test has been passed. A proficiency badge could also be displayed on the bicycle so that the police could monitor the safety effect of such measures.

After all, if a person is required to pass a test to drive a motorised vehicle, or even a motorised bicycle, then why should not people similarly undergo a test to ride a bicycle on the roads? After all, cyclists use the roads as do drivers of motorised vehicles and, technically, bicycles are a means of transport. Thus, I believe that tests of this nature could possibly be carried out perhaps not by the police but

perhaps by a team of 10 people from the Department of Transport or even from the Road Safety Council. This team could move from area to area conducting the tests over a set period of time. The tests could be regionalised at one point at a central school, and training sessions could be conducted after school hours by a voluntary force of parents and community minded people who are anxious to see that safety standards are reached and who support ways and means of ensuring that a more safety conscious society is achieved amongst young people.

I have witnessed many incidents between my home and schools when I have had to take extra caution when confronted by children on bicycles, especially those who of six or seven years of age, who have wobbled all over the road. Adult supervision or escort has been absent. In these cases I believe that parents cannot see the irresponsibility of their actions in allowing their children to ride bicycles to school, simply because they cannot see them because they are not there. I believe that if they did see some of the actions of their children they would indeed tell the children off, probably grounding the bicycle, or instructing the child more carefully in road usage. I do not wish to label all parents or all children as being irresponsible, but I do believe it may be possible to cut the rate of young people being hurt by using a type of discipline such as this.

There obviously must be arguments against such an idea, such as the difficulty of children who live a distance from a school and whose bicycle is the only means of transport. To preclude some children from riding bikes to school would be to add an hour or so to the journey to and from school. Attending after-school sport may present some difficulties. It would also mean that parents would have to drive their children to school, thus putting a burden back on the parents to ensure the safety of their children. To some of these arguments I must respond by asking at what price we value the safety of our children or even at what price we value our children?

I believe the argument should be seen and coupled with the necessity to provide bicycle tracks and cycle lanes along our major roads. Indeed, I fear that even in my own electorate, which borders Brighton Road, the increase of traffic that will be drawn from the Lonsdale extension will in time create a difficult situation. It is anticipated that the volume of traffic along that road will increase from 20 000 movements a day to over 30 000 movements a day. Along Brighton Road are situated the Seacliff Primary School, Brighton Primary School, Mawson High School, Brighton High School and Sacred Heart College, and just off Brighton Road, further down, there are several other schools. Between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. each schoolday the road is used by hundreds of cyclists who are mainly children. Cars are already parked along the kerb, and this means that these cyclists must weave in and out and sometimes wobble in and out, while some ride two abreast and some ride three abreast. Imagine the scene when the traffic increases by 50 per cent! To block off two lanes for a cycle track might mean some hardship because of the commercial nature of the road, and this may bring some disadvantages to the area.

I believe that, in any new development or wherever possible, we should be encouraging councils to construct bicycle tracks and to see far enough into the future needs to incorporate these tracks into plans. I also believe that the use of protective headgear for cyclists in general should be looked at, because in some cases it has proved to some cyclists to be the difference between life and death, or sometimes at least serious injury. I introduce these arguments as a suggestion to members to think seriously about, bearing in mind the numbers of children today who are on our roads.

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

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): In my 10-minute contribution I would like to point out to Government members opposite their complete ignorance with regard to the safety of nuclear energy. It seems that Government members have become completely mesmerised by the Deputy Premier, who can only measure the dangers of nuclear energy by the number of recorded deaths. It is beyond the Deputy Premier's comprehension to understand the position of those poor unfortunate people who will suffer the awful consequences of a slow and agonising death caused by cancer of one form or another.

Much has been said during the last few days about the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The Deputy Premier is on record as saying (and this has been parroted by Government back-benchers) that what happened there was a major technological achievement; that is, he says that no-one died. He forgets that 50 000 people in the area fled their homes and that there were plans to evacuate further hundreds of thousands of people if the plant blew its top. As long as no-one died (in the words of the Deputy Premier) it became a non-event.

Let us look at the facts which have emerged since that fateful day and which Government members have carefully declined to mention over the past couple of days during the Address in Reply debate. The member for Eyre quoted from (to use his own words) a responsible editorial that appeared in the *Grand Forks Herald*. The editorial claimed that the press had built the Three Mile Island accident into a panic situation.

If an editorial such as that had appeared in, say, the *New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune* or the *Washington Post*, perhaps we could look at it with some credibility, but, honestly, the *Grand Forks Herald*! This newspaper represents a small provincial American city. I know that the member for Eyre has a fixation about being a small town country boy; I also know that he has never really risen above small town comments. However, if the honourable member quotes the *Grand Forks Herald* editorial to prove that the accident at Three Mile Island, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, was an attempt by the press to build the circumstances into a panic situation, I think his credibility has fallen to an all-time low (and I would have thought that it could not have fallen any lower than it has over the past couple of years).

Let us look at the real facts. I will use the Deputy Premier's method of dealing with the number of deaths, accidents and incidents in nuclear power stations. The total number of incidents at nuclear power plants have been as follows: 101 radio-active leaks, including many cases of radiation of workers; 84 documented accidents; 6 204 accidents listed by authoritative sources; 20 failures; 7 cracks in a nuclear reactor; 41 outright deaths; there have been many cases of alarming increases in leukaemia and in the number of cancers around reactor sites among uranium energy workers and uranium miners; 4 cases of missing or stolen uranium; 10 sabotage and terrorist attacks; and 402 accidents in the shipping and transport of uranium.

Let us look at the true situation in regard to Three Mile Island. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* of 10 March 1980, written by a United Kingdom journalist, John Pilger. It was a rather alarming document. It is a pity that the member for Eyre and the Deputy Premier do not have this article in their files. The article concerns a meeting that John Pilger attended at a school in Newberry, Pennsylvania, not far from the Three Mile Island site. The

article stated:

A monitoring device had recorded the level of radiation in the room, where children were taught by day, as many times higher than "safe", and when the people on the fold-up chairs were told about this, they said nothing.

They appeared exhausted, as if fear had been present in their lives for as long as they could remember.

"Since that nuclear reactor went through the roof," said a farmer in bib overalls, "all life has gone from my land, just vanished—no toads, no snail life. No worms, no quail. The earth is dead."

These were heartland Americans, not anti-nuclear zealots. Farmers . . . clerks, teachers, small businessmen and a doctor, patriotic, decent and democratic people who have coped with hurricanes and floods but never with something they cannot see or hear or smell: radiation.

On the morning of the schoolroom meeting, the crippled nuclear reactor at Three Mile Island, in whose shadow they all live, "accidentally" discharged 4 500 litres of radio-active water and krypton gas. The power company and the Government's nuclear commission denied this at first, then confirmed it.

I repeat that comment: in regard to the accident at Three Mile Island, the Government denied and then had to confirm that certain things had actually happened at the nuclear plant. The article continues:

. . . scientists at the Pennsylvania Department of Health revealed that, since the accident, the number of babies born with deformed thyroid glands, near Three Mile Island, had suddenly leapt to six times the national average.

Yet members on the Government side tell us that there is no danger in regard to nuclear energy. In one State close to the reactor, of 17 young couples expecting babies, 12 wives had miscarriages. No-one can pinpoint that to the accident; however, no-one denies that the accident caused the miscarriages.

I now refer to details that I quoted to the House 18 months ago, long before the Three Mile Island accident. I cited figures in regard to leukaemia, miscarriages and malformed babies in areas where nuclear reactors were installed. There was an increase of between 240 per cent and 600 per cent in regard to these medical conditions. Regarding leukaemia, in the area of the nuclear reactor at Garfield, Montana, the death rate from leukaemia increased by 600 per cent from the national average; in Scaix, North Dakota, it increased by 290 per cent; in Mojave, Arizona, it increased by 270 per cent. In regard to miscarriages, in Morten, North Dakota, the death rate increased to 215 per cent above the national average; in Garfield, Montana, 230 per cent above the national average; in Sherman, Oregon, 162 per cent above the national average; and in Massac, Illinois, 240 per cent. In regard to malformed babies, the future generations, in Sherman, Oregon, the death rate was 310 per cent above the national average; in Carroll, Missouri, it was 273 per cent; and in Massac, Illinois, it was 240 per cent above the national average.

Those facts were denied by the United States Government. The lady who researched those figures was given no help by the United States Federal Government, which wanted to keep the facts quiet. Fortunately, Governments in Europe are beginning to accept the facts and are informing the people; however, that is not happening in this State. People in South Australia are being denied the facts. It is up to us on this side to inform the people, because we will get no truth from Government members, who are all hell-bent on providing the mighty dollar for the mining companies. Members on the other side know that the price of uranium will fall, and their idea is to get it out of the ground and sell it as quickly as

possible. However, we will continue to inform the people of this State exactly how uranium mining will affect them.

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

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I will deal with guidelines for public servants and with the scandalous maltreatment of S.G.I.C. by this Government. First, in regard to the guidelines, I understand that, in my absence yesterday on Parliamentary business, the speech that I made on Wednesday night was described as deplorable by the Premier in this place and by the Attorney in another place. Let me assure honourable members that it was not described as deplorable by senior public servants whom I met on Monday, or by a number of other responsible people.

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that there is a notice of motion on the Notice Paper in the name of the honourable member for Mitcham which relates to this subject. A point of order was taken yesterday on this matter, because the Premier was making a statement; I ruled that it was possible for a Government Minister to make a statement relative to a matter, which did not cut across the right of a member to proceed with his motion eventually. However, I suggest to the honourable member for Playford, that he may be coming very close to being out of order in canvassing this matter. I ask him to look to the motion that is on the Notice Paper and to take it from there.

Mr. McRAE: I have done that. The member for Mitcham, in his normal fashion, hitched on to the information that I had obtained and then put that notice of motion on the Notice Paper. The point I want to make is that I challenge the Government to produce the original guidelines that were prepared at the Public Service Board.

I know very well that half of the members of Cabinet were not aware of the contents of the document that was tabled in this House. Furthermore, I am also aware that senior officers of the Public Service Board were not aware and were completely taken by surprise by the document tabled in this House. I challenge the Government to produce the original document which had been discussed with the Public Service Board and with the Public Service Association. By looking at that, they will be able to see who got at that original document. I challenge all Government private members to look at the Federal guidelines on this matter, easily obtainable, under the heading "Personnel Management Series No. 1 of the Public Service Board, Canberra—Guidelines on official conduct of Commonwealth Public Servants, October 1979". That contains none of the dangers and none of the devious aspects which make this document so alarming.

Every member of my Party knows that S.G.I.C. has been an ideological base of the Liberal Party, and, in particular, of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and certain members of the other place, who at all times tried to prevent the creation of S.G.I.C., and then once it was created attempted to destroy it. Certainly, they have done everything in their power since coming into office to do that. I shall point to a number of features to support my proposition. First, S.G.I.C., in common with similar bodies in other States, provided a new investment account life policy late last year. It was something that was highly beneficial to many members of the community. The present Government, on dubious and devious grounds, has prevented its implementation. It has simply done nothing on the matter. It has not refused S.G.I.C. an opportunity to continue, but has just done nothing whatsoever.

The next thing the Government did was in relation to

the S.G.I.C. building, and that was a thoroughly disgraceful thing to do. It had been arranged between the former Government and S.G.I.C. that part of the rooms of the new S.G.I.C. building would be used as civil courts. In order to harass the S.G.I.C., and to satisfy the big life insurance companies, which are the political masters of this Government, anyway, they broke that agreement. What do we find now? Not only has there been this ludicrous investment in Moore's building in an attempt to turn that into courts, against the advice of all practising lawyers and the Law Department, but I have heard today that it is very likely that at huge public expense a large building will be built on the site of the old Supreme Court building, with a tunnel going under Gouger Street. The reason for the tunnel is that there are dangers (sadly, as with the Judge of the Supreme Court in New South Wales who was murdered) in the transportation and custody of very dangerous criminals. We all know that there are dangers to judges when they are moving from their chambers to courts and back again. The point I am making is that all of this seems to have come about simply because of a desperation on the part of this Government to make sure that the S.G.I.C. cannot proceed with its legitimate activities. I am thankful to say that it has leased out those spaces to which I have referred, and, partly as a result of that, the public is now inflicted with this new ludicrous nonsense.

With regard to the third party insurance scheme, it is not proper to comment on what the final result will be, and I will not do so. Everyone knows that there are a number of options available. What everyone knows and what it is proper for me to comment on is that there must be a manager of whatever the eventual third party policy is. Will it be the S.G.I.C., the Treasury, or private industry. I fear very much that it will be private industry. I also fear that this will be a price paid by this Government to its financial backers, particularly in the life insurance industry, who helped secure its return to Government. I know that the Chief Secretary is particularly embarrassed by the incidents down in the law court area.

Mr. Slater: I don't think he knows.

Mr. McRAE: He does know about it and he is worried, and of course he should be concerned. However, there is worse to come regarding S.G.I.C. What will happen is that this vast successful business organisation, which we were told would never get off the ground and which has provided housing for tens of thousands of young South Australians, now stands in a situation where it could be ruined, not because it has not been efficient, successful or productive, but simply because it is against the ideology of certain members of the Liberal Party. By no means do all members of the Liberal Party share this ideology but, unfortunately, it appears that a majority of them may. Certainly, I can say that a majority of those persons in the Upper House do.

Not only do young home owners but also South Australian small businesses stand to lose by this manipulation. It is interesting to note how we always get back to the losers (the consumers, trade unions and small businesses), the winners being big business, life insurance companies, motor vehicle companies, mining companies and multi-nationals. The point I am making is that the \$40 000 000 or so made available by the S.G.I.C. in the time of its existence has largely gone to small business, or to business in desperate need of transitional finance. As I did the other night, I ask those responsible members of the Liberal Party, and in particular the new members (and I know that there are some good ones—they are occupying very dangerous seats and what I am suggesting to them is very much to their advantage), just as they needed to

check those guidelines (which I know shocked them), let them now check with their supervisors concerning the machinations with the S.G.I.C. I think they may get quite a shock.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I will first refer to housing. The person from the Australian Labor Party who sits in Opposition with his Party—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. EVANS: If the honourable member had taken as much interest when his Party was in office in the housing situation as he did in the state of the House a moment ago, many more people would be satisfied with the type of housing and the opportunities that they had to obtain proper and reasonable housing. A claim has been made by the Labor Party that the Liberal Government has not taken any action in the area of housing in an attempt to give the opportunity to people to have housing or to acquire their own house. While the Labor Party was in office in this State, the cost of housing more than doubled.

Mr. Slater: What do you think happened in other States?

Mr. EVANS: It is no good blaming other States. This State had the lowest cost structure of any State when the Labor Party came to power in 1970, whereas at the end of its term in office it was the highest. Do not blame other States for that. The honourable member knows that that is the case. The Labor Party carries that burden, and it is no use saying that we should do something about it. He claimed that 16 000 people were on the waiting list for rental accommodation and that about that number had been there for many years. However, we all know that all those young people would not want housing if they were told tomorrow that housing was available. Many people do the wise thing: they put down their name for an application with the State Bank until their name comes up and, likewise, with the Housing Trust for rental accommodation in case they need it in the future. Often, when those names reach the top of the list, some people are unable to take the rental accommodation or the opportunity to obtain a low-interest State Bank loan through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money. That is a fact.

We also know that, while the Australian Labor Party governed this State, it did not encourage people who were given the opportunity of renting Housing Trust accommodation to buy that accommodation. It is against A.L.P. philosophy to encourage people to acquire trust accommodation. In relation to the person who happened to live in a house for between 20 and 25 years, whose family had grown up, and who was in a position to acquire the property, it is against Labor Party philosophy to say, "That is your home." The A.L.P. did not on a large-scale basis encourage people to acquire a home.

Mr. Keneally: That's rubbish, and you know it!

Mr. EVANS: It is not rubbish. It was done on a low key level, in the hope that people would not be able to buy a home. My Party believes that, where a person wishes to acquire a home and it can be made available by the trust, that person should acquire it. Such people have friends in the community, they are financially able to buy a home, and they are not in need of taxpayer support any longer. We give them the opportunity to acquire a home; thereby, we have greater sums available to be used for building or acquiring houses in other areas.

Also, we introduced the policy of allowing within the inner areas some houses that were in the private sector (admittedly, not large numbers of them) to be made

available to people in the lower-income groups for rental. The Government would pick up the difference between the rent they could afford to pay and the market rent for the property. This is also a step in the right direction, because it does not require large sums of taxpayers' money to build extra accommodation.

We also provided a stamp tax reduction to people who were buying their first home; that amounts to about \$500 that they can save, and that is a considerable saving in anyone's language. It is a straight-out subsidy from the taxpayer to the first-home buyer. The Labor Party would not accept that sort of philosophy. It was not prepared to say to young people who were buying their first home, "We don't believe you should be paying a penalty for buying your first home or for wanting to own your own shelter." The Labor Party would say that everyone should have the right to shelter, but it gives no opportunity or incentive to those who want to buy, thus ignoring the genuine desire of many in the community. It says, "Bad luck. We'll push the cost of housing up by more than double. We'll make your State one of the highest cost States in Australia and you'll have to pay the price if you want to buy a house."

The Labor Party established the Land Commission, which was supposed to make housing cheaper for people in the community, but did it really? It did not. Our housing cost, compared to that of other States, was just as high. Admittedly, land in the inner areas of Sydney and Melbourne, both of which have much larger populations than does Adelaide, was more expensive. The Labor Party cannot claim the credit for doing anything of real benefit for those who wanted to acquire their home in South Australia or for ensuring that sufficient accommodation was available for low-income groups. In Playford's period, there was never the waiting list that there has been under the Labor Party's Administration in its last nine years; that is a fact.

Mr. Keneally: Fifteen years ago, there were not as many kids.

Mr. EVANS: I do not know how many children the honourable member had 15 years ago. I am not interested, and I do not think we need to know that. The Labor Party says that more money should be made available for housing and for education and that more money should be available in other areas, such as health. However, not one Labor Party member has said that he wants to set up a lobby for higher income tax or other taxes across the board and to apply it throughout the community in order to raise the necessary funds. Its attitude of saying, "Spend more and collect less," does not work. What the member for Stuart and every other Labor Party member knows is that, in the past decade, throughout Australia, the national debt has been pushed to the highest figure on record—one to be afraid of. In future, our children will have to pay the debt. I admire the present Federal Government and State Government for taking action to stabilise the situation, and not incurring up massive national and State debts for future generations to pay. We cannot afford to spend more and collect less. When a group starts a campaign by saying "We want to pay more tax so that we can have more benefits," I believe that it will be genuine. However, the A.L.P. will never do that, because it knows that it is politically unappetising.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): The matter about which I will speak this afternoon is one of great importance. I hope that the Government will give serious consideration to what I am about to propose, namely, that a fund should be set up to enable compensation to be paid to persons injured in circumstances beyond their control.

It has been brought to my notice recently that a person suffered serious injury, but there is no way in which she can be compensated or claim against local government for the injuries she received. I believe that some Act should be passed (and I ask the Minister to consider this matter), such as the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, which was introduced in early 1970 and which provides for persons to be able to receive compensation. I suggest that, if a person cannot be proceeded against, the money should be paid out of general revenue. In the case about which I am speaking, the person received permanent injury, through no fault of her own, merely because a footpath in Port Adelaide, as a result of wear and tear, had deteriorated so much that it caused this old lady to fall.

In June last year, she was shopping in Port Adelaide and walking along St. Vincent Street footpath on the southern side near Rohdes old store. These footpaths have been down for many years, and a lot of the stones have lifted, some have cracked and some have broken away. The lady was wearing flat shoes (she can no longer wear them). Outside the store are several uneven stones, with cracks and depressions in them, and she caught her shoe in one of the cracks in the pavement that is a triangular shape of about four inches by four inches and 1½ inches deep. The hole seems to have worn away by natural wear and had left the depression in which the lady caught her foot.

She fractured a kneecap when she fell and has not fully recovered, although having a clearance from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. She has a permanent disability to the knee, cannot walk easily and cannot put pressure on it. She cannot bend down or use her cupboards, so that she cannot perform her normal kitchen duties, as she would like to do. She has difficulty getting into and out of the bath, and has to be helped by her daughter. Before the accident, she could perform all these functions without any problem. She can still walk, but now and again she must lean on something to give her support because the knee has never healed properly. The report I have states that she has difficulty at traffic lights and often finds that the lights have turned against her whilst she is trying to cross the road, as she cannot run. At Port Adelaide some of the light cycles are short, and even a normal person has difficulty in getting across the road.

Mr. Randall: Even you!

Mr. WHITTEN: I invite the honourable member to go to the corner of Nelson Street and St. Vincent Street, and I defy him to get across on the "Walk" sign. He would probably be run over by a bus, as usually happens to politicians. This old lady has to use a taxi because she cannot get into or out of buses because of the steps. It is awkward for her to get out of the middle door because she cannot push the door and bend her knee at the same time to go down the stairs. She has constant pain in her left knee and that affects her sleeping, and she takes tablets to ease the pain. Not only does she suffer physically but she also has social problems because she cannot attend at clubs or other activities in which she previously took part. She is also unable to wear her normal shoes.

This old lady took the case to a lawyer, who advised her that it would be unlikely that she could claim in any way. She wanted to prosecute the Port Adelaide City Council but cannot do that, because the lawyer's opinion is that it was normal deterioration of the footpath and not a hazard placed there by the council that caused the problem. An estimate of the damage she has suffered is up to \$15 000, and she will have to return to the hospital later. I have a report from the hospital. She attended the Queen Elizabeth Hospital complaining of a pain in her left leg, and gave the history that she had fallen whilst shopping that morning. An examination showed that she was very

tender in the region of her left kneecap and lacked the ability to extend the knee over the last 10 degrees, and she could not flex the leg because of bruising. An X-ray showed a fracture of the kneecap. The following are some details from the lawyer's opinion:

We note in your circumstances that you wish to take proceedings against the Port Adelaide City Council for its failure to maintain the footpath. It would appear that, following an inspection of the area, this is a case involving wear and tear of the footpath, and therefore you have no claim. Our advice is that you would not have any grounds on which to allege that the council was liable to pay damages for the injuries you have received.

Under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act there is a way for persons injured through no fault of their own and in circumstances outside their control to proceed through the courts against the person that injured them. If that person is unable to meet any claim, the Attorney-General can pay out of the general revenue. This is the sort of thing I am asking the Government to consider. It should introduce legislation so that persons injured in circumstances beyond their control may be able to get compensation. I feel sorry for this dear old lady, because there is no way that she can ever be right again. She has to pay a person to help her in her home, although she has been completely independent all of her life. She has a daughter who gives some assistance, but I am looking for some monetary assistance by asking the Government to consider introducing this type of legislation.

Mr. SCHMIDT (Mawson): I refer to a letter which has come to my notice and which was written by an honourable gentleman in another place, a Mr. Cornwall. It was written to Mr. Tupper of the South Coast Boatowners Association, in relation to providing a major facility for the association. In part it states:

When I was Minister for the Environment I had discussions with you last August . . . I also had discussions with the Noarlunga City Council. The basis of funding would have been from the \$1 200 000 that is available through the Coast Protection Board each year. Funds could have been made available and should still be available. The money could be made available on a three-year programme by setting aside money in June 1980, July 1980, and July 1981, that is, over three financial years . . . If funds of the order of \$250 000 to \$300 000 had been made available on a three-year basis a major boating facility could have been constructed without unduly interrupting the important functions of the Coast Protection Board.

The fact that he says funds "could" have been made available is very important, because he tries to insinuate that had he been in power this would well be under way. He says:

Although there were some problems such as access roads—

he grossly underplays the problem that this would play in the whole project—

to be resolved, I am confident that had we still been in office arrangements to commence the instructions would now be well in advance.

This man is incredible. He wrote this letter on 13 May this year and he is talking about what he could have done had he been in office. He disregards any evidence of the fact that his Government did not make use of the money when it had it.

The Auditor-General's Report of 1977-78 shows that the Coast Protection Board received \$1 589 539, and it spent \$1 413 289, which gave it a surplus of \$176 250. Yet, to go by his letter, it would appear that money could have been made available over various financial years. There

was a surplus in that financial year, which he could have used towards the whole project of providing a boating facility but he did not do it. He was the Minister but he did not want to direct the money there.

The Auditor-General's Report of 1978-79 shows that the Coast Protection Board received \$1 540 705 and it spent \$1 696 356, giving it a deficit of \$155 651. I do not know where he was going to get the \$250 000 or \$300 000 to start channeling towards this project he is now supporting!

An honourable member: He didn't even think of it.

Mr. SCHMIDT: We could not suggest that; that might be a bit out of order. I think we need to go back and look at the history of this whole project to see why the honourable gentleman did not do something about it earlier. In 1975-76, it was first decided by the Coast Protection Board that there was a need for a policy to define the requirements for such a facility in the south. The definition recognised that the Coast Protection Board would be the most appropriate board to look after that project.

In 1977, the Coast Protection Board commissioned a small boat survey to identify the demand for facilities for the public and who should be responsible for that. The results of that survey were never released.

In 1978 Mr. Kinnane and Mr. Beurenfeldt set up a task force to make a report. It suggested two alternatives: first, that the whole project should be in the hands of the Department of Marine and Harbors, and, secondly, that it should be in the hands of the Coast Protection Division.

In September 1978, the Director-General of Environment and the Department of Marine and Harbors recommended the first alternative, that it should be in the hand of the Department of Marine and Harbors. Unfortunately, as was the case with the previous Administration, there was a certain amount of confusion, it did not know where to put this project, and it did not know how to go about funding it. In order to keep the wolves (or sharks) at bay, it issued a series of newspaper articles over a few years stating that it would do something about it. The first report was in the *Sunday Mail* of 13 August 1978 which stated that Mr. Corcoran said that in 1977 the Coast Protection Board prepared a concept plan to test the feasibility of constructing such facilities at Whitton Bluff or Port Stanvac. This was done to gain some idea of the cost of the whole project. Yet, the honourable gentleman who wrote this letter was not fully aware of what the cost would be. Most people would realise that it would now be well over \$1 000 000, if not \$2 000 000. The Noarlunga council has already contributed \$200 000 towards the project. This man said that his Government could provide \$250 000 or \$300 000 a year over the next three years, that would have been \$900 000 at the most. He did not say from where he would have raised the rest of the money.

In the *Sunday Mail* on 13 August 1978, Mr. Corcoran went on to say that the Coast Protection Board also recognised the need for improved facilities in the southern area. In April, 1978, the *Advertiser* stated that the Director-General of the Coast Protection Board said that there was a great need for facilities in the southern coastal area. That is very commendable. The *Southern Times* (the local district newspaper) on 29 November 1978 contained a warning from the Chairman of the South Coast Boatowners Association on the launching of boats at the dangerous ramps that exist in the southern area. In a response in the *Advertiser* of 6 September 1979 the Minister said that the Government was also investigating the feasibility of providing major launching facilities. The Minister said that in 1979, and yet Mr. Corcoran said in

1978 that the Coast Protection Board was also going to look at the feasibility of the cost of the project in 1977. It took that Government two years to look at the cost factor involved; it certainly could not be pushed; it was doing its best.

Especially during the period leading up to the last election, the boatowners association in the area set up a petition in August 1979 requesting that a boating facility be provided. The then Government said that it would look at the project, and it would have its support. That support came in May of this year, six months after the election. The Opposition now says that if it were in Government it could have provided some funding and this money could have come from the Coast Protection Board. However, it forgot that the Coast Protection Board was running at a deficit and did not have any money.

I really wonder about these gentlemen writing letters in retrospect. One must commend them for their imagination and their inability to conceive how susceptible the public is. I spoke to a public meeting a short while ago, and no one accepted the argument contained in Mr. Cornwall's letter. They could see that it was nothing but hogwash.

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): We are continually being assured by our media proprietors that, while the political news is reported on an even-handed, fair basis, they reserve the right to express their own paper's view in the editorial columns. That is a philosophy with which we do not disagree, although we do not always agree that the political news is reported in a fair, even-handed way. A recent example of editorial bias should not go past without some comment in this House. On 29 July 1980, the editorial of the *News* commenting on the resignation of Mr. Neil Batt, Federal President of the Australian Labor Party and Deputy Premier of the Tasmanian Government, said:

Predictably, Labor Party leaders are buttonholing all who will listen to tell them that Mr. Neil Batt's resignation as national President will not mar the Party's chances in the Federal election.

It goes on to say:

However, the resignation is bound to have some impact . . . it serves as a reminder to the electorate that the A.L.P. is an uneasy coalition.

It further states:

He [Mr. Batt] and his colleagues must now seek to persuade voters that they are also cohesive and unlikely to be as faction ridden in office as they are out of it. That will not be an easy task. In the circumstances, Mr. Batt's personal decision was understandable.

That comment was made about Mr. Batt on 29 July. One week later, Mr. Staley, a Federal Minister, retired from the Ministry. He was not as senior in the Federal Ministry as was Mr. Batt in the Tasmanian Parliament. An editorial in the *News* one week later, stated:

Few people will today be more envied by their peers than Mr. Tony Staley. He has been able to kick that most addictive of habits, politics. . .

Yet he has now chosen—after 18 months of considering retirement—to say goodbye to all that to spend more time with his family. There is no reason whatsoever to doubt that his departure is for any other reason.

There is plenty of reason to doubt that Mr. Batt's resignation was caused by pressures within the Party, but, when Mr. Staley retired, it was stated that it was for family reasons. The fact that Mr. Batt will work for Unesco is of no interest to the writer of the editorial. Members will know, after listening to today's news, that Mr. Staley may

have reasons other than family reasons for retiring. I hope that that is not the case. I admire him for retiring. If he wants to be with his family, I understand that. It is likely that subsequent events will show that Mr. Staley was under a great deal of pressure and that his family involvements might not have been the only reason. The same *News* editorial further stated:

It was anyway a decision that, having done the State some service, he was entitled to make and having done so he is to be respected for it.

I want to know what circumstances differentiate the retirement from politics of two very senior people that would warrant a news editorial that conflicts so dramatically in its attitude towards these retirements.

A good article appeared in Saturday's *Advertiser* under the by-line of Bill Guy, the foreign editor; the article, which was about terrorism, stated:

. . . the Hiroshima bomb and the Bologna bomb do have one essential common denominator—each was employed in an act of terrorism. . . . we ought to re-examine the circumstances in which Hiroshima was sacrificed.

The myth is that Hiroshima had to be destroyed in order to bring World War II to a quick end, that it was necessary to kill 80 000 Japanese civilians in a flash in order to save a million Allied soldiers in a prolonged assault on Japan.

The article goes on to give evidence that that was not the case (as a lot of people have been saying for the past 35 years), and was never the case. The fact is that the bomb was dropped in Hiroshima to teach Stalin and the Russian people a lesson. The Americans had the bomb and they were prepared to drop it if required; they believed that the Russians should be aware of that fact and made afraid by it. Members opposite doubt what I say; I will read what Mr. Guy had to say about that, as follows:

Why, then, in the face of all these reservations among the advisers around him, did President Truman go ahead and drop the bomb? . . . the bomb would be used said Byrnes [Mr. Byrnes was President Truman's Secretary of State] not essentially for its effect on Japan but in order "to make Russia more manageable in Europe".

What is the attitude of members opposite now? For 35 years we have been led to believe that it was necessary to drop the bomb in Japan to stop the war.

I am prepared to say that the same sort of misrepresentation is being practised by our media at present in regard to the uranium issue. Members on the Government side, during the Address in Reply debate, have been trying to convince us that there is no danger whatever in uranium. At least two members opposite, the member for Newland and the member for Todd, tried to suggest that there was no doubt in the scientific and medical world that uranium was not dangerous. However, Professor Ernest Sternglass of the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine had something to say about the Three Mile Island incident. His remarks have not been widely canvassed by such notable U.S. journals as the *Grand Forks Herald*, an article printed in which was used by a Government member to support his argument in regard to uranium. I do not know where Grand Forks is: I have never heard of the *Grand Forks Herald* and I suspect that Professor Sternglass is not concerned about remarks made in that newspaper.

Professor Sternglass was a respected member of the scientific fraternity in the United States that was directing itself to the issue of nuclear energy and the hydrogen bomb until he started to say that there was danger in the nuclear technology. From that moment, Professor Sternglass, as a scientist, was belittled by his colleagues and particularly by the press in the United States. Regarding the Three Mile Island incident, he stated:

In Pennsylvania, infant mortality increased by an unprecedented 92 per cent in the summer months when such deaths are usually at their lowest. . . . In the four months after the accident there were 240 infant deaths more than normal in Pennsylvania, an increase which moved the State from far below the American average to the highest infant death rate in any state east of the Mississippi River.

I would have thought that members on the Government back bench would be responsible enough when promoting the values, as they see them, of the nuclear technology to acknowledge that there are eminent people in the world who do not share their views. I was absolutely appalled to listen to, and read, what the member for Todd had to say. He suggested that there were no problems associated with uranium technology. Who is the member for Todd to tell the House that that technology is safe? He is not, and neither are you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in your position as member for Eyre, an authority on the dangers of that technology.

Mr. Lewis: Are you?

Mr. KENEALLY: I am not an authority; I am merely telling honourable members that some eminent people in the world do not share that view. These people ought to be listened to. If members opposite want to promote the values of nuclear technology, let them satisfactorily convince those eminent scientific people who are opposed to it and who should be listened to that they are wrong. If members opposite cannot do that, they should not bedevil the House with the absolute tripe that they have been going on with; and I suspect that the rest of the Address in Reply debate will be as bad.

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): The Leader of the Opposition has made a number of allegations today regarding the State's natural gas resources. These concerns appear to be prompted by three parallel developments: changes to the board of Santos Limited; speculation in shares of the South Australian Gas Company; and the announcement by Delhi Oil Corporation that it is interested in exploring the possibility of a sale of its assets or a merger. Let me deal with each of these in turn.

With regard to Santos, I, too, have noted that there have been changes to the board. However, the fact that there have been changes to the board does not of itself bring the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act into play. There has to be some evidence that shareholders are acting; in concert or are likely to do so. I am advised that the board of Santos has not yet met since the new Directors were elected but will do so next week. In these circumstances, there is just no basis for the statement that the Bond and Ansett interests are acting in concert and that I should exercise my very drastic powers under the legislation.

I shall be watching the situation closely. In my dealings with this company and other Cooper Basin producers, I have emphasised that the Government expects due regard to be had to the interests of South Australia when they are making their commercial decisions. The Leader in his discussion concerning the South Australian Gas Company, suggested that my comments were made in response to questioning, presumably from him. He should refresh his memory in that regard. On that matter I received no questions whatever. I made two Ministerial statements, one of which dealt at length with the Government's powers and its willingness to use them to preserve the Gas Company's status as a utility serving the interests of all South Australians. If the Leader does not know, he should

know the cause of the speculation—the South Australian Gas Company's shareholding in the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation. I do not question my predecessor's motive in establishing SAOG—it was and is intended to facilitate exploration in the Cooper Basin. SAOG was created as a private company with the Gas Company having a majority of the shares although not of the votes. The value of the share issues was small (approximately \$50 000 in total), and the company gained the finance it required by borrowings and levy payments by gas purchasers from the Pipelines Authority of South Australia. These mechanisms, combined with a surge of share market interest in energy resources, led to attention being directed to Sagasco's interest in SAOG and the speculation to which the leader refers. I simply state that the Gas Company's Act is under review.

Mr. Millhouse: Is what?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Gas Company's Act is under review.

Mr. Millhouse: What is?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Share traders who persist in speculative dealings with Gas Company shares do so at their own risk.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mitcham. If he continues to defy the Chair, I will name him. He has just entered the Chamber and has continued to interject and ignore the rulings of the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I had not opened my mouth until that time. How can you possibly say that?

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I simply stated that the Gas Company's Act has been under review by the Government for some weeks. Share traders who persist in speculative dealings in Gas Company shares do so at their own risk, as I pointed out at the conclusion of my two Ministerial statements to the House not long ago.

I was interested to note that the Leader himself said that "just what Delhi is doing is not completely clear". Precisely. That is my view entirely and the view I expressed when replying to the Deputy Leader. We are watching the situation, and as it develops we will consider what action we will take. I have certain powers as Minister of Mines and Energy with regard to approval of transfer of licences and, if necessary, the State can and will make representations to the Foreign Investment Review Board. FIRB's decisions on the Mitsubishi take-over of Chrysler and the Glaxco takeover bid for Fauldings show that the South Australian Government's views are given close attention by it. The Government is concerning itself with gas supplies from the Cooper Basin in other ways.

Let me remind the House of two initiatives we are pursuing. The Natural Gas Supplies Advisory Committee, which has replaced the former Government's Cooper Basin Development Committee, is due to report within a few months its views regarding the whole question of natural gas supplies for South Australia. As we know, there is no assured supply of natural gas to South Australia from the Cooper Basin after 1987, whatever price we may be prepared to pay. Therefore, I expect that this committee will look at the interstate options for gas supplies to us.

Meanwhile, with a view to facilitating gas supplies from interstate should that be necessary, I have engaged in discussions with the Federal Government, the Northern Territory Government and the Federal Government's Pipeline Authority.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite do get upset when I refer to their questions as "stupid". I will not use the word "stupid" again; I think I will just say "dopey"; I think that sums up the honourable member. He is just plain dopey.

These have explored possibilities as diverse as gas supply from Palm Valley and Mereenie in the Northern Territory to supplies from Bass Strait via Victoria. It may interest the Leader to know that the pipeline to be constructed from Dubbo to Wagga is to be extended on to join up with the Victorian grid, thus enabling Victorian gas to be used, I trust, to reduce Cooper Basin sales to Sydney or to supplement Cooper Basin supplies to South Australia. I use the word "enabling" advisedly. There is obviously going to be a need to negotiate quantities and price as our demand and supply positions become clearer. Suffice to say that the Government is exploring a number of options rather than just relying on control of shareholdings.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It appears from the way the Deputy Premier lost his place a few moments ago that he is reading his speech. I would have thought that was in breach of Standing Orders, and I draw it to your attention.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order, as it is my understanding that the honourable Deputy Premier has adopted the usual practice of using copious notes.

Mr. Keneally: Odious notes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I said "copious notes". I therefore ask the Deputy Premier to continue his remarks.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I am quite sure you have been watching the Minister as closely as I have, and there is no doubt that he is reading the whole thing word for word, and that that is against Standing Orders.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I will get the protection of the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You certainly will.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is reading the whole thing, and, with the utmost respect to your person and office, I say that it is against the Standing Orders. I hope that you will rule that the honourable gentleman is not entitled to read word for word; otherwise, I shall have to move to disagree to your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not for the Chair to say whether the member is reading or not. I note that the honourable member is referring to copious notes; whether he is reading word for word I cannot determine, so I cannot uphold the point of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a further point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In those circumstances, how and when would it ever be possible to uphold that particular Standing Order. If the person in the Chair is unable to make such a judgment, it seems to me with great respect, that it is making a mockery of the whole Standing Orders. Unless the person in the Chair is able to make such a judgment, which I would have thought could well be based soundly in this case, given the way the Deputy Premier has been reading from those notes, in those circumstances it is a clear breach of Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold that point of order, but I point out to the Deputy Premier that he should only use copious notes and that he should not read from the document. Therefore, I ask him to continue but only to refer to copious notes.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not a document; you have ruled quite correctly, Sir, as has been invariably ruled in the past. On no occasion has any member on either side of the House including the member for Mitcham, had cause to refrain from using copious notes. He knows perfectly well that I am only doing what has been done in this place for many years.

There will obviously be a need to negotiate quantities and price as our demands and supply positions become clearer. Suffice to say that the Government is exploring a number of options rather than just relying on control of shareholdings.

Finally, the Leader referred to the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. The Government shares his desire for such a plant, and we recognise the need for it to have ethane. The Government is using its best endeavours to encourage a favourable outcome to the negotiations regarding feedstock prices. We are also using our infra-structure borrowing powers and our ability to influence the Commonwealth with regard to export licences. We are also mindful of the State's interest in this regard and the necessity to ensure our future supplies. The Government's announcement in conjunction with the producers earlier this year with regard to a design and cost study for a liquids line to Redcliff was seen by all parties to the feedstock negotiations as having a very positive impact on their discussions.

I trust that what I have said puts the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in some sort of perspective. He is young and enthusiastic, and I have no qualms about that. However, he is alarmist and less than accurate in what he has said, and I do not hesitate in taking him to task for that. The Leader seemed to base his whole case on a collection of speculative reports in newspapers. He should realise that he has some responsibility, in debating weighty issues such as this, to ensure that what he says or does is not ill advised to the extent that there is distortion of markets and loss of confidence in the community.

I also mention that this is not atypical of the track record of this young and enthusiastic Leader since assuming the mantle of office in the Labor Party, a mantle that does not sit too comfortably on many shoulders these days because of the obvious divisions that exist in the Party. He is so young and enthusiastic that he is advising me to charge in, take Draconian powers to myself, and exercise them in a situation that is far from clear.

Delhi has not disposed of its interests in the Cooper Basin, and no-one has the faintest idea what the consultants will recommend. The Leader knows full well that certain constraints will be put on Delhi, which will be watched by the Federal Government in terms of the Foreign Investment Review Board, and the South Australian Government will be monitoring the situation fairly carefully. For him to suggest that we act now in this Draconian fashion when nothing has happened (I was considering using the word "stupid") illustrates his immaturity.

Likewise, he is trying to suggest that there was some connivance between the new directors of the Santos board and the Bond group, when they have had no board meeting. Here, I am being exhorted to use Draconian powers to annul something that has not happened. If ever there was an immature approach, it is that.

Regarding the Gas Company, he suggests that he has written to the Chairman of the Stock Exchange and suggested that the shares in the Gas Company be frozen. Those shares, as we observed some time ago, were rising, and had risen to a level which indicated to me that there was a degree of speculation in relation to them.

What did we do? We made two Ministerial statements in

the House (we did not answer questions) and pointed out clearly (and if the Leader had read them, he would have seen that I said this clearly) that there was no intention that dividends from the South Australian Oil and Gas—

Mr. Bannon: That was two months ago.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I made it perfectly clear that we were discharging our responsibility in that we were warning people that there was no way in the world that, in the Government's view, dividends would be paid from S.A.O.G. to the Gas Company. What would the Leader do in the case of the Mintaro Slate and Flagstone Company? It appears to me, from statements in the press, that trading could well be going on in relation to the exploration licences that my department had issued. I did what I did in the case of the Gas Company and other companies, and warned the public. I made a Ministerial statement, and acted responsibly. What more could I do? It is not in my power to delist the shares or to take them off the Stock Exchange. The exchange is perfectly well aware of what I said in the House, and the decision is for the exchange. If the public, after due warning, does not heed the Government's warning, I cannot see what the Government can do to protect the public in those circumstances. That point is not directly connected with the other allegations made by the Leader.

He has made great play of the fact that the Government had to enter into contractual arrangements with New South Wales to sell gas until the year 2006 simply to ensure an ethane supply to the Cooper Basin. There would have been a petro-chemical plant, if not in operation, close to operation here at present if it had not been for the intervention of his then Federal colleague, now deceased (former Minister Connor). He sounded the death knell, in the first instance, of the petro-chemical plant at Redcliff. I am also reliably informed that, in relation to the negotiations with regard to the supply of gas to New South Wales and South Australia, the Government had advice to the effect that there should be a saving clause in the contract, but that was ignored. I repeat again what I said last week in answer to a question, namely, I cannot conceive of a Government, even though it wanted to ensure an ethane supply to a petro-chemical plant somewhere on the horizon, ensuring a supply of gas to a Sydney market until the year 2006 and to its own home side until 1987, without a saving clause.

Some of the money we are spending on exploration now will be to find gas to supply to Sydney. It could not claim to be a prudent Government. I made that point last week, and I make it again today. This spurious attack by the Leader on me was made because he is stung by the facts I put before him, indicating his Party's duplicity. They are plainly dishonest in relation to the uranium debate. Their whole record in dealing with the matters for which I have been responsible has been to feed to the public a whole series of blatant falsehoods. How does a responsible Minister combat people who are prepared to resort to their over-full dirty tricks bag, into which they are continually dipping and pulling out falsehoods? The only way I know is to tell the truth and put the facts before the public. I have done that. This Government has had to deal with an Opposition which has been only too happy to play the dirty tricks department to the full in its dealings with us and with the public.

I have recited to the House on numerous occasions the deliberate falsehoods and untruths that have been fed to the public, the dirty tricks in which the Leader and his cohorts have been prepared to engage to try to confuse and strike fear into the hearts of the public quite unnecessarily. I would have hoped that, in coming to Government, we would be dealing with a responsible

Opposition, but that, unfortunately and sadly, is not the case.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In listening to the past five or 10 minutes of the Deputy Premier's speech, Opposition members have been very restrained. I think that, during the past few minutes, particularly in alleging that the Opposition has not been responsible, the Deputy Premier has breached Standing Orders 153 and 154, on which you gave a ruling earlier and which deal with imputations of improper motives, reflections and the like. In the light of your own ruling on that matter earlier, Standing Orders ought to be upheld, and the honourable member ought to be asked to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have been asked a point of order by the honourable member for Elizabeth. Does the honourable Deputy Premier wish to withdraw any word he has used?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am simply outlining to the House the record of the Labor Party. I do not wish to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! I asked the Minister a simple question. The answer is, I take it, in the last words—that he does not desire to withdraw.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is nothing to withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I indicated to the House on an earlier occasion, in relation to Standing Orders 153 and 154, that I recognised the responsibility of the Chair to draw to the attention of any member or to the House any word being expressed by a member which was offensive to the Chair. I also indicated to all members that, if a word offensive to them was used, it was their responsibility to draw that matter to the notice of the Chair. I cannot uphold the point of order which the honourable member for Elizabeth has made, because he has generalised in the question he has put to me. If any member desires to ask for the withdrawal of a particular word or words, I will consider that matter. However, I do not uphold the point of order, because of the generalisation and the manner in which it has been presented to the Chair.

I would, however, make the point again to all members of the House that their own veracity and their own recognition in the community is dependent upon the manner in which they conduct themselves in this House. I believe that it is only fit and proper that all members should act with due decorum regarding the responsibility they have to this place, which is the public arena for political debate.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me remind the House again of certain matters (and I will keep reminding it if members opposite keep coming up with accusations like they did this week when they contacted London with a completely false construction of something I said). We had the structured list of leaks to the press, to mislead the public, with a completely false construction on the reports of Messrs. Dickinson and Wilmshurst. They were reports originally commissioned by the Opposition when in Government. When this was drawn to the newspaper's attention at the last hour, they had to rewrite the whole story. I was asked to comment at 5 o'clock one Friday afternoon, and when we were able to explain what was in those reports that story had to be rewritten. It was a deliberate attempt by the Opposition spokesman—

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No.

Mr. Bannon: That's where the Premier writes letters.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: You must have a closer contact with the Chairman than I have. We had a report on the mining operations at Roxby Downs. The

back page was torn off, and it indicated that the mining operation was impossible without the mining of uranium, because it is finely divided, and the report had a "confidential" stamp on the front. There is no other word than dishonesty to describe that behaviour. We had the stage-managed question in the Upper House by the Hon. Dr. Cornwall and the assertion that Radium Hill was to become an international dumping ground. One of the television stations was contacted to play this up. It was a completely fabricated story—what other word describes that but "dishonest"?

We had the attack on some of the officers of my department by the honourable member for Elizabeth. It was a disgraceful attack on the integrity of officers of the Mines and Energy Department, and a series of assertions was made about cores from Maralinga being stored in the metropolitan area. It was either a complete fabrication or he had been fed inaccurate information. The whole thing was in keeping with the record of the Labor Party of complete irresponsibility in Opposition. To cap it off, we had this week an admission by the member for Salisbury that the Labor Party here had contacted London—someone in the British Government, in Her Majesty's Opposition in London—to try to discredit Urenco-Centec in relation to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If this Opposition had been responsible, it would have sought clarification of what I said. What I said was perfectly clear. The Opposition has deliberately sought to misconstrue what I said last week to cause trouble even in Great Britain. If the Leader of the Opposition read what I said last week, there would be no way that he could say that I suggested that Urenco-Centec knew of this leak years ago. I said that the leak had gone on for a period of years. They did not even bother to check that. I believe members opposite understood what I said, as their intelligence is not that mean. To be completely mischievous and dishonest, they contacted London, and this has serious overtones in relation to the credibility and the standing of Government in this State. This is one of a series of incidents.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is being poorly advised. He raised the matter here, and we know the background of some of his advisers. He has been poorly advised, and for his own credibility he should attempt to keep at least the thrust of his attack on the Government honest and not try to build a fabric of falsehood and try to deceive the public. That is the burden of my complaint. It is documented, and if the Opposition runs true to form we can expect much more of it. We will counter by putting the facts before the public by publicising the authoritative reports, as I have indicated, in relation to the Windscale incident. The official report of the Three Mile Island incident in relation to these matters we are perfectly happy to debate on the basis of the official reports available in relation to these incidents. For the Opposition to continue to try to mislead the public and attack me in the immature way that the Leader of the Opposition did today does it no credit at all.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): It would take at least 30 minutes to reply to the last half hour's abuse that we have heard from the Deputy Premier. However, I do not believe that it was done out of anything but intemperance. It was an outburst the like of which I have never heard previously in this Parliament. However, we have become accustomed to this sort of behaviour from the Deputy Premier, and I do not intend to reply to it because I have only 10 minutes and I have a matter of importance to put in regard to the people of my electorate.

In the past five weeks, at the Elizabeth South factory of a multi-national firm known as Schrader-Scovill, there has been a strike by most of the employees—all of the blue collar employees. It involved about 50 people, most of whom are my constituents.

I want to detail for the benefit of the House the history of this strike, because it seems to me to be an extraordinary series of circumstances which now constitute the issue over which the strike has been caused. About five weeks ago, on 9 July or prior to that, the management called the workers together and told them that either 25 had to be sacked or all of the people in the plant were to take their annual leave and once they returned were to work a four-day week for four day's pay. The workers were particularly unimpressed to hear that, but nonetheless they held a meeting, and without the presence of any full-time union official they decided most reluctantly to accept the proposals put to them by management. The shop stewards went to report back to management only to find that the management was amazed that the workers had actually accepted this obviously poor deal from their, the workers, viewpoint.

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: A situation was created in which the employer had given the workers an ultimatum. The workers had accepted this ultimatum, and, upon that acceptance, the employers withdrew the ultimatum and proceeded to sack six workers (or eight workers if one takes into account that two casuals were put off). As a result of that provocative action by the employers, the employees held a meeting and decided to go on strike immediately, as well they might, given the circumstances. The saga has dragged on. During the past five weeks, there have been a number of meetings between the shop committees of the various unions and the management but on no occasion has the management made any offers to the employees that in any way have taken into account the basis of the dispute.

Following that, last Wednesday, in an endeavour to get some movement, the Secretary of the Storeman and Packers Union, Mr. George Apap, telephoned Mr. Dunn and asked him to meet to try to resolve the dispute (a very reasonable approach, as members will agree). Mr. Dunn, who was apparently the Manager, telephoned on Thursday and stated that he would be prepared to see the union Secretary at about 4 p.m. Mr. Dunn and a Mr. Griffiths arrived at the union office at that time and discussions took place that ended at about 6.15. The discussions concerned such matters as how to keep the employees employed and how to ensure that no-one would be made redundant. The union suggested a nine-day fortnight on a roster basis, with 10 per cent of the work force to be off every day.

As a result, the management agreed that that was a good idea and that it was workable. Mr. Dunn pointed out that one woman was seven months pregnant; there was some discussion about that matter. My information is from the notes of that meeting that Mr. Apap kept as the meeting proceeded. The final upshot of the meeting was that the management agreed to the proposal for a nine-day fortnight. Discussions then took place about redundancy. The Secretary of the union suggested that a redundancy agreement should be introduced, and it was agreed that, where the redundancy had occurred through technological change or shifting of jobs, redundancy pay would be discussed with the union prior to any worker's being sacked.

In relation to what is known in industrial circles as ebb

and flow redundancy, it was agreed that payments would be as follows: up to one year of employment, one week's pay; up to two years of employment, two week's pay; up to four years of employment, three week's pay; up to seven years of employment, 4½ weeks pay; and after seven years of employment, payment of State long service leave according to the appropriate legislation. The basis of the redundancy was to be last on first off. The union claimed pro rata annual leave loading on redundancy. Mr. Dunn, the Manager, stated that he would give this matter further consideration and that he would advise the union Secretary of his decision the following day.

It was agreed that the union Secretary would address the striking workers on the following Monday morning and recommend the package as agreed to the workers. As I said, the meeting finished at 6.15. Mr. Apap then telephoned Mr. Dunn on the following Monday and Tuesday (11 and 12 August) and each time he was told that Mr. Dunn was unavailable. Subsequently, Mr. Apap ascertained that this Managing Director was no longer prepared to seek a settlement of the dispute on those terms.

Therefore, for the third time, there was a situation in which the employer showed no inclination whatsoever to negotiate seriously in an endeavour to resolve the dispute. As I said, the dispute is now in its fifth week. We should look behind the dispute at the motives, and Government members should pay some attention to what I am saying, because it has been clearly indicated that this company, which as I said before is multi-national, operates in many countries. The company has already opened an operation in Hong Kong, and some of the manufacturing that was done at Elizabeth has been transferred to that plant. The old off-shore export of jobs racket is involved. There is serious concern among the workforce that the company may be proposing to set up a factory in New Zealand, where manufacturing is marginally cheaper because of the extraordinarily generous terms granted by the New Zealand Government.

Where does this leave the 50 workers who are my constituents? They are likely to be without jobs and in a situation in which the employer, having made plenty of money out of the monopoly he has had in the Australian market for his products, will march out and leave them. We are seeing more and more of this kind of thing in Australia every day and, unless Governments reverse the trend, it will not be long before we have no manufacturing industry at all. If we allow multi-nationals to continue to simply take over local industries and run rough shod over the local workers and the people in this country, it will be a sorry day for this State and for this nation. I sincerely hope that the Government will consider the situation at Schrader-Scovill.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): Before I deal with the issue that I want to raise in this debate, I draw to the attention of the House the fact that, earlier last evening, I heard the member for Eyre demand that I say where I stand in regard to uranium mining, because the proposal under discussion may affect my district. The member for Eyre (who is now present in the House), Opposition members and Government members all know very well where I stand in regard to uranium mining. I would not have thought that I would need to put my position before the House once again. Both the member for Eyre and the Premier seem to be interested. I was interested in the fact that, when the Minister of Mines and Energy made a public statement to the newspapers to the effect that a

uranium enrichment plant would be built somewhere in my district, the Mayor of Whyalla who, a year or two ago, was very quick to go into print in support of the development of such a project, after the Minister's announcement, was careful in the way in which she phrased her supposed support. She has publicly stated that she would not automatically support such a project, and that she would be concerned about the safety measures involved in uranium mining. I believe that that is a very interesting development.

I refer also to the speech made by the member for Brighton earlier this afternoon. He said that he was concerned about the safety of children travelling to and from school on public transport. I find it very difficult to follow his line of reasoning. Here is a person who comes into this House supposedly concerned about the safety of children travelling to and from school, a concern, I might add, that every member should have, but when it comes to the question of the safety of a project such as uranium mining (and everyone in this House is well aware of the safety issues involved) there is not a word said. In fact, I can only take it that the member for Brighton says to hell with the safety issues of uranium mining—let us get on with it. I only mention that point to clarify the position.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is referring to something I did not say.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. If the honourable member believes he has been misrepresented by anything said, he may take the opportunity at the appropriate time to make a personal explanation.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I am grateful for your protection.

Mr. Gunn: You need a bit of help.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Eyre can be in this, too. The Minister of Fisheries and the shadow Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Agriculture, are both here, and I have had debate after debate with the Minister of Agriculture over the matter that I want to raise, which is the nagging question of B class fishing licences. I refer to this problem because at this time it is causing great concern to professional net fishermen. History shows us that the Liberal Party, while in Opposition, seemed to enjoy criticising the Labor Government concerning this matter. Yet now the Liberal Party is in Government, through its Minister, it has made bungle after bungle in dealing with the problems within the industry. First, with regard to people who currently hold B class fishing licences, I want to make my position quite clear. For the benefit of members of Government who want to create a difference of opinion on this issue between the member for Stuart and me, I simply say that they are indulging in cheapness rather than making a sincere attempt to investigate the needs of the industry.

We all know that B class fishing licences were originally brought into effect to legalise the right of those people taking fish out of the industry, selling the product and not being responsible to the industry. This was at a time when, in the main, people involved in the practice were part-time fishermen supplementing their main income. To my mind, this state of affairs has altered dramatically over the past few years. I think it is true to say that the type of person I have just described has developed into a highly efficient taker-out of the industry, with no reason for supplementary income. In fact, in many cases the income derived from their regular income would be quite astronomical, compared with the income of a professional net fisherman.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Do you believe that all the B class licences should be taken away?

Mr. MAX BROWN: If the Minister is quiet for a while

he will find out what I believe. I think that common ground can be found between the Opposition and the Government as to what should happen to holders of this type of B class licence, but it is a matter that should be given real consideration right now, not at some future time. Unfortunately, the Government, through the Department of Fisheries, has not even remotely looked at this problem. Is it because the major offenders of the take-out-non-put-in exercise are middle-income earners, or is it that the Government might be said to be interfering with the so-called rights of private enterprise?

I do not have much more time at my disposal, but I will leave the Minister with this thought. I believe that his recent effort, by regulation, to close certain areas within the Spencer Gulf fishing ground will deprive good honest people who are endeavouring to make a decent income in a fragmented and rather deprived industry.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We are having discussions with the industry.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Minister says that he is having discussions. The very point I make is that the Minister has gone on record saying that he will do nothing without having dialogue with the industry.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: What's wrong with that?

Mr. MAX BROWN: There is nothing wrong with it. What I am saying is that that dialogue has never eventuated. I am now saying that the Minister has said that he will not do anything until October, until dialogue has been entered into. Yet we find that we are now in August, and I have no doubt that we will be in September with still no dialogue having taken place. I conclude my remarks by asking the Minister, to give some real consideration to the problems of professional net fishermen and have that dialogue take place.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: URANIUM

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I seek leave to make a personal explanation under Standing Order 137.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the opportunity at this time. He has rightly referred to Standing Order 137. I point out that it constrains considerably any honourable member making use of the Standing Order. I ask the honourable member, if given leave, to act within those constraints.

Leave granted.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: In his speech, the member for Whyalla made a statement which misrepresented what I said in my speech. I did not refer to uranium in my speech at all. I did not say that I do not care for the health of people involved in the uranium industry, and I suggest that the member for Whyalla wash his ears out.

Mr. LEWIS (Mallee): I refer to a problem which is of considerable concern to a large number of people in my electorate. I refer particularly to the population of dingoes in and around Ngarkat National Park, and the hinterlands of that park which are across the Victorian border. Members may recall that on 1 November, shortly after 3 a.m., I raised in this place, during a debate on the lines, the problem as I saw it emerging. I asked the Minister of Agriculture what possibility there would be of obtaining additional assistance in the control of these dogs, which were increasing in number. At that time, as I recall, members opposite, who had been filibustering all evening, were very annoyed at my rising to inquire into the possibility of getting those funds, and they were derisive about my remarks.

They took umbrage, and sought to interpret my remarks

as being directed towards themselves. At no time did I intend that that should have been so, but I welcomed their being included in that element.

Mr. Hamilton: You're most unkind.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know whether the honourable member thinks I am being unkind to him or the dingoes. I pointed out that I was genuinely concerned and asked, if the need arose, what likelihood there would be of funds being available for the control of dingoes under the provisions of the Vertebrate Pests Act; I raised the matter on that line in particular. As it transpires, the person who has been employed by the Box Flat Dingo Control Committee has been given fairly minimal reward for his efforts over the years. He has, from the funds given to him, to provide his own vehicle, run it at his own expense, as well as provide whatever baits or ammunition are necessary in the execution of his duties. Whilst he has had a recent rise of about 80 per cent, making the sum he is given each week \$135, I still believe that that is inadequate, and I am sure that any reasonable person would think likewise. It costs about 80 cents a kilometre to run a four-wheel drive vehicle. If he did nothing else but drive, he could do no more than between 160 and 170 kilometres a week, simply to get him from home to the centre of the conservation park and back again. To expect more of him in terms of time and his own provision of ammunition and bait seems unreasonable.

However, he has been doing his job, though not with sufficient effect to bring the dog population under control. It has exploded, over the past three or four years, for two or three reasons. First, no longer are shooters allowed in that area. It is not simply unallocated Crown land, but is now a dedicated national park. Secondly, given the extent to which some resistance to myxomatosis has appeared in the rabbit population, there is now a substantial and continual food base available to bitches and their litters. Thirdly, native animals are also more abundant in that region now that the former practice of shooting them in the unallocated Crown land has also ceased. This applies not only on this side of the border, but also in Victoria. As a consequence, their numbers are higher than they have been since probably early this century.

The dogs are indigenous to the area, and are indeed dingoes. They do not resemble European dogs, except skeletally. Their skulls are consistent with the dimensions of dingo skulls, but their marking and colouring are different. They are black with white and yellow flashes. They are every bit as cunning and intelligent as the northern yellow or orange dingo with which most people are familiar. In recent times, the damage that has been done has escalated enormously. It is estimated by people from all sides of the park, who have not had contact with each other, that in each region over 1 500 sheep have been killed since the beginning of the year, or more than 4 000 in all. At present-day prices, that represents more than \$100 000; so, it is not an insignificant problem. This reduces the capacity of the people adjacent to the area to which I have referred to make their living. My concern is to ensure that, as quickly as possible, two things happen. The district councils and the people who live there should be provided with that additional assistance under the Vertebrate Pests Act, which provides for subsidies to be paid annually to the authority, based on rates collected in the dingo control areas (to quote the Minister, on 31 October 1979). He said:

The provisions that we referred to initially cover scalp bounties, administration overheads, scalp freight charges, and dingo bait programmes.

Thereafter, the vote passed. There needs to be an immediate provision of additional funds, if at all possible.

Furthermore, I hope that management of the Ngarkat National Park, if it can be provided more effectively than it has been in the past, needs to be provided to the extent that the dogs are contained within the park. The fencing of the park at present, since it was only declared and dedicated just before the election last year, is grossly inadequate. I do not deny that the dingoes there are part of the natural eco-system; they were there long before European settlement. However, to leave them there without restricting their access to the livestock on which my constituents depend for their living is unreasonable. If the people of South Australia wish that area to be set aside so that native animals of this kind can live in the way in which they have lived for centuries, my constituents' interests need to be protected.

If any member doubts the veracity of my remarks, I welcome him to come with me one weekend and I will show him not only the damage but also the animals. The population of pups that was there at the time I questioned the Minister last November has now grown into adult dogs; that is why in recent times as many as 400 head have been killed in a night; that represents \$10 000 overnight. If any member opposite could sustain those losses with grins, I would be surprised. Is it any wonder why the people in my district are concerned about the problem that confronts them?

In addition, I bring to the attention of the House what my constituents and the local government bodies in my district believe to be an inequity in the way in which road funds are allocated to roads in rural areas, where roads do not serve the interests and needs of ratepayers but merely provide commuter access through council areas. Yet they are not seen as national highways. They are of considerable significance to the economic welfare and the conservation of fuel, by making short cuts possible between significant centres of population and commerce, such as Geranium and Tintinara. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide these access roads so that people can get from Loxton to Kingston by the shortest possible route. At present, funds for such road construction are not made available adequately according to the formula as has been developed and introduced by the previous Government. In due course, I should like my constituents to know that I trust the Government will find the means by which those funds can be made available to ensure that that kind of commuter access road is made possible not only in its construction expense but also in its maintenance expense.

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

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I must say that the member for Mallee did not thrill me, because I did not understand what he was talking about. I will speak about two Ministers, one being the Minister of Mines and Energy, who, throughout the session thus far, has stuck to the same speech all the time. He has been in a lot of trouble, and he has not convinced any Opposition member in any way as regards uranium.

I am not sure that he has convinced anyone in South Australia, because people know that this is a vexed question. When the next election comes along, this question will still be with us. I am sure the Minister's tactics do not help the situation. After every question is asked in the House he tries to crawl out of the position he has got himself into. During the course of today's debate he made the same comments over and over again, and he admitted it. He referred to Mr. Hawke, of the A.C.T.U., and Mr. Don Dunstan. He is trying to belittle those people.

I am sure members opposite have found that they do not know too much about the uranium issue. They have all utilised what other people have said. I am in the same position, because I do not understand the subject very well, and I could get exactly the same information from people who are against uranium. It is a vexed question, as I have said. I am sure honourable members opposite would not get a line in the paper, but that surprises me, because I have never known so many papers to be so much behind the Liberal Party in this State. They never give the Labor Party a chance. I will have something to say about that in the Address in Reply debate. The Minister of Mines and Energy is always trying to con us, but he is not conning me or the people outside. Members opposite are not doing too well, as the recent polls show.

The member for Todd spoke on uranium, but he was using information from other people. He is entitled to his opinion, but there are two sides to the argument, and he is no authority on it. If he is, let him speak for half an hour and give us his opinion.

The Hon. H. Allison: Your Leader complimented him on his speech.

Mr. LANGLEY: That is one thing we have in our favour: we have a diversity of opinion, and the Leader is entitled to his opinion. The other day, the member for Morphett asked a question in this House relating to someone else's district.

The Hon. H. Allison: The member for Napier did it, too.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Napier is the spokesman for health on this side.

The Hon. H. Allison: I'd never have guessed.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not sure what the Minister is doing about Aboriginal Affairs. The Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Mines and Energy seem to have taken over his portfolio. If the member for Morphett or anyone else wants to ask a question about someone else's district, we can do the same. The member for Morphett got in at the last election because of the swing, but his district had the lowest swing of any. I know the courtesies of this place. A member represents his district, and the member for Price and the spokesman for health had already asked the Minister this question.

Mr. Hemmings: He fell for the three-card trick.

Mr. LANGLEY: He did. He can do it in my district, because I will say the same as the Minister of Mines and Energy says: I will go out undefeated. I have said that four times.

The Hon. H. Allison: When are you coming to Mount Gambier again? You did me a world of good last time.

Mr. LANGLEY: Next time, the Minister might not be going so well. In my district, Mr. McLeay was a candidate out there. When he was defeated he made the greatest speech of all time and ran for help.

When I was at a hospital recently, the nurse asked me if I would like a scone or a jam tart with my cup of tea, but now the Minister of Health says we cannot have a biscuit with a cup of tea at the Adelaide Hospital. I have that in writing. The dietitian says it is not good for our health. It saves the Government \$26 000 over 12 months. You have to decide between two courses: you take it or you damn well leave it. The Minister has gone further. When she wrote a letter to the Editor, even now, she still told an untruth.

Mr. Max Brown: She's protecting her rear.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not want to get involved in that matter. I have not touched her, so I will be in the clear. I do not intend to touch her. Fancy such a frivolous thing to get your name in the paper! We are sinking to a low ebb. The Minister is not game to tell the truth about the matter, but I do not think she should be sacked, because she is a

great help to us, so why get rid of her?

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I congratulate the member for Unley on not being a bum pincher. However, I want to talk about the industrial relations scene in South Australia, or perhaps I should say the lack of industrial relations in South Australia. This afternoon in this House we heard a diatribe from the Minister of Industrial Affairs purporting to put accurately the Government's viewpoint on what has happened in the recent dispute with the A.G.W.A. I listened intently to the Minister and took notes of what he said, then I checked out the facts as he indicated them.

Much to my disgust, I found that the account was not accurate. The Minister of Industrial Affairs stated in this House this afternoon, when he castigated the Australian Government Workers Association and its officials, that the association was breaking an agreement that existed between the Trades and Labor Council and the Government. From minutes of the Trades and Labor Council meeting delivered to me this afternoon, I find that recommendations of the stop work meeting of 26 and 27 November 1979, conveyed to the Minister of Industrial Relations on 29 November, state, in part:

All transfers created by the deliberate run down of Government work shall be opposed.

This decision, as well as others, was made at that stop work meeting (which, incidentally, was caused by this Government—one of only two stop work meetings in South Australia in the past 10 years). When one considers the Government's industrial relations programme, one sees that the Government deliberately provoked two industrial disputes, which caused stoppages for 24 hours on each occasion. What the Minister did not say was that the present dispute between the Australian Government Workers Association and the Public Buildings Department is not in accordance with the decisions reached by the Trades and Labor Council. The Minister tried to indicate to the House, and consequently to the public, that the Australian Government Workers Association had broken the agreement. The facts do not suggest that it has. I have, on good authority from the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, information that the Minister was informed, quite emphatically, of what that agreement was. There is no agreement that surrounds the right of the Government to run down work deliberately and replace employees with contractors.

Let us analyse what will happen. The Trades and Labor Council indicated to the Government that, in a downturn economy (and it is right to take this attitude), it is in agreement that, where there is a surplus of labour, transfers should occur. The secondment of people to private enterprise was refused, and the Government has been told that. It has not agreed in the circumstances that are occurring in regard to the Local Court and the Magistrates Court. The Government is attempting to take from that area three cleaners who have been full-time occupants of a position with the Government for many years. What is the reason for this move? The reason is simple. One needs only to go back to comments I made last week when I asked the Premier about the guidelines and the circumstances in which the Government would let work out to contractors. The Premier said "under all circumstances". He said that, wherever it was possible to let a contract in relation to work being done by Government employees, it would be done. That is a pretty wide answer. I have circulated his answer to the trade unions so that they know exactly what the Government

intends to do. If work can be done by contractors, it will be let out as much as possible.

Let us follow that through to the final conclusion. This Government is on record as saying that there will be no retrenchments; however, it is bringing about retrenchments because of its deliberate policy. It is important that we remember that. The Premier stated that there is 8 per cent to 10 per cent attrition; this will get worse because, if there is no pride in work or security, and if skills of people in, say, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and in other departments are not used, what will happen to the employee? He will say, "I am not satisfied with this occupation; I will search for work outside", and in most circumstances, particularly where the person is skilled, he will find employment in due course. It may take him some time to do so.

What does that do? It runs down the skills of the Government; it gives the Government the opportunity to stay on its no retrenchment policy but at the same time force a deliberate attrition within some departments by forcing work out to private enterprise. This has occurred in relation to railway stations and wherever it has been possible to let out work to private enterprise. This Government should be called not a private enterprise Government but the private enterprise Government. It should be ashamed of its policy.

I now intend to outline the general situation, and I will clear up for the final time the policies agreed to between the Trades and Labor Council and the Government. There is no question in my mind that the council and the Australian Government Workers Association are acting quite properly and in accordance with those agreements made with the Minister. A member of the Australian Government Workers Association expressed some views about the Government which should be recorded. He made up a poem, which is sung to the tune of "Ten Green Bottles".

Mr. Mathwin: It is called a ditty.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Call it what you like. It is significant that voters are thinking about Government policy. The poem is as follows:

Ten loyal cleaners going to the wall.

Due to Liberal policy the axe begins to fall.

And with 20 years service, that didn't count at all—

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask whether it is proper for a member to recite poetry, and whether that recitation conforms to Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: There are plenty of precedents for members to introduce into debate articles that have appeared, whether they be poetry or otherwise. The Chair is quite happy for the Deputy Leader to recite the poem, if that is what it is to be called, as long as he does not sing it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I may be a very good singer, Sir. The last line of the poem is as follows:

Three contract cleaners, came in and grabbed it all.

I will now deal specifically with the conduct of the Public Buildings Department and the Minister in not consulting those three people. Today I challenged the Minister to say whether there had been consultation. The Minister tried to indicate that there was consultation, but I do not believe that there was. In fact, I am quite convinced, after talking to the representatives of the A.G.W.A., that there was no consultation—there was merely an ultimatum. The three people concerned received a letter last Thursday afternoon telling them to report for work at a new location on Monday morning. No officer of the department explained the situation to them. Why? There was no consultation because the P.B.D., via the Minister, was stepping outside the agreement with the Trades and Labor Council. That is crystal clear to me. Irrespective of what

the Minister said this afternoon, I am taking up the cudgels on behalf of all cleaners who will be placed in this situation.

Finally, I indicate that the Trades and Labor Council informed me that, while it had approached the Minister of Water Resources and asked him to place on the line to the Trades and Labor Council, so that it could inform its members, what the future for Engineering and Water Supply Department workers held, it could not get an answer.

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

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): After reading this evening's *News*, I want to highlight some of the points attributed to the Federal Labor Leader, Mr. Hayden. Under the heading "Promises cut in petrol", it is stated:

A Federal Labor Government would offer cheaper health insurance, petrol, and lower sales tax.

One really wonders what else they will reduce. They are at it again. Quite obviously, the Federal Labor Party is not looking at the prospects of winning the Federal election this year; it would not make an undertaking to the people of the nation on that basis, because it knows full well that it would never implement that policy, unless it wants to repeat the 1972-75 Whitlam era, when, instead of producing dollars, it felt that it was just a matter of manufacturing dollars by turning on the printing presses for a few extra days. That 1972-75 period was a disastrous period for the growth of Australia, and there is no doubt that the Australian voting public, with headlines such as I have read, with promises such as those given, will not be caught in the trap of allowing a second period of stagnation by a Federal Labor Government.

It is easy to play politics with petrol prices. Unfortunately the cost is to the future of children in this nation. We do not want our children to be hostage to foreign oil producing nations in future decades because of fuel costs on international markets. The Fraser Government has shown some responsibility in seeing that this does not happen in the Australian society. It is easy to promise something if you do not care about the future of children in Australia, but it is far more difficult, far more responsible, to take the hard course and lay a good foundation for the future of Australia.

The Fraser Government does care, has taken action, and is facing up to the responsibilities of this nation. Its policy to price oil at world prices is a policy for the future, and it is achieving its four key objectives, namely, to conserve fuel; to encourage the use of alternative power sources, other than burning precious oil reserves; to provide incentives to boost the research for new oil and gas fields; and to encourage the production of new fuels. Every cent of the levy goes back to the community, to the taxpayer, to all of us in the community in one form or another.

Obviously, members of the Labor Party do not seem to be able to grasp this point, but without it we would be paying higher taxes today. For the protection of all Australians, I trust that the Federal Labor Party will not be able to implement its policies, which would have a disastrous effect on the economy of this country. The Labor Party would have us burn and use our precious oil reserves now, with nothing to take their place. The cost would be to surrender Australia's independence to foreign oil companies.

One of the four basic aims and objectives of that policy is to conserve known resources of fuel. The current ALP policy does not attempt to grapple with the problem. It

would not place pressure on engine manufacturers to achieve greater efficiency. Let us look at the situation in relation to our self-sufficiency in crude oil and what the estimates of that are over the next few years until the turn of the century. It is assessed that, although we are currently 77 per cent self-sufficient in oil, by 1985 we will be only 50 per cent to 55 per cent self-sufficient, by 1990 only 40 per cent self-sufficient, and by the year 2000 only 10 to 20 per cent self-sufficient. The need to conserve and the need to discover new and alternative fuels is therefore of national urgency.

I refer to some of the achievements in terms of exploration that the Fraser Government has been able to achieve with its fuel pricing policy. I compare figures for the start of the period when it took over Government in 1975 with figures obtainable at the close of 1979. In 1975, 75 exploration wells were drilled; in 1979 there were 25; that had increased to 51 last year.

Development wells, as with exploration wells, have a high capital input, with high risk money in terms of returns for the capital invested. In 1975, there were four development wells, and that had increased to 56 in 1979. The exploration expenditure to achieve those had increased from \$65 000 000 to \$228 000 000. In addition to that, development expenditure had risen from \$85 000 000 to \$145 000 000. Exploration permits (another indication of the direction of finding new oil reserves and resources for the future generations of this country) had increased from 112 to 213, and seismic activity, which in 1975 covered 7 800 kilometres, had reached 43 000 kilometres last year. Quite obviously, the Fraser Government's policy in terms of looking for new resources to supply future decades is working.

I refer to another chart, another set of figures that support the Fraser Government's approach and its fuel pricing policy. It refers to the consumption of petroleum products from 1977 through to the 12 months ended May 1980. It can be seen from that chart that in 1977 we were consuming additional motor spirit at the rate of 4.9 per cent. That had decreased in the last 12 months to minus 9.8 per cent: that is, Australians had become fuel conscious. In relation to automotive distillate, in 1977 there was an increase in consumption of 8.8 per cent. Last year consumption had declined by 7.3 per cent. The average annual growth rate of petroleum consumption over five years to 1979 was 3.9 per cent. Therefore, we have effectively turned the tide in unnecessary consumption of what is a very valuable and very scarce resource in this country.

Much has been said by the Labor Party in relation to taxation levels of the Australian Government. When talking about fuel pricing policies and Federal Government revenue, I think it is well to put in proper perspective what the taxation levels of this country are compared with those of some of our major trading partners overseas. The most recent survey by the O.E.C.D. of relative tax burdens showed that only five of the 23 industrial countries surveyed had a lower taxation burden than Australia. According to that survey, Australia had a percentage rate of 29.7; United States, 30.3; United Kingdom, 36.6; West Germany, 38.2; not to mention Sweden, 53.4.

Also in that news article were one or two other points to which I want to refer. Federal Leader of the Opposition Hayden said:

We have a special relationship with the trade union movement, and I am confident that we can achieve much for the Australian economy.

So much for their special relationship with the trade union movement. Let us look at the index of Australia's

competitive position. Because of its preselection relying on the trade union movement and the dictates of—

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

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I have listened to many of the speeches from members opposite today and during the Address in Reply debate, and I have not heard many comments about job creating schemes and concern for the unemployment in our community. The Government of this State came to power nearly 12 months ago promising thousands of jobs for unemployed people, and particularly young people, in our community. Now we find that in fact 1 000 more people are out of work and joining dole queues than there were when the Liberal Party came to power.

For that reason, I was interested in comments made on radio this morning by the member for Hanson. He alone among his colleagues has come up with a practical suggestion for creating jobs for the unemployed. No doubt there are many men employed in Government departments concerned about the security of their employment, be they permanently employed or be they not permanently employed and meeting the other criteria laid down by the Government. The member for Hanson said this morning that he was surprised that Government departments (and I shall quote) "had not come up with an alternative work programme to use the surplus labour that was in our community". He stated that he thought that there were plenty of areas where work could be found for men within Government.

He then agreed with the radio commentator to whom he was speaking that E. & W.S. workers, for example, could be employed on the visionary Torrens Valley improvement programme—the recently released Hassell report. Members on this side of the House and I could not agree more with the member for Hanson that there is an urgent need in the community for projects such as that to give work to some of the many scores of thousands of people who are unemployed in our community.

I find that clear double standards are being applied by the Government in this area. Just two weeks ago, I attended the opening of the Burnside Rugby Club's new premises in the district of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. He was pleased to open it, and spoke of the workmanship in those buildings built under a SURS grant and said how it had provided work for many men and supported their families, giving them some work, dignity, and ability to hold their heads up in the community. Those who had built it were there on that day and were proud of what they had done. The Minister commented on what a facility it was for the community and how valuable it would be in the years to come. He boasted at the opening that, in addition to the \$64 000 provided by the previous Government for that project, he had found an extra \$13 000 so that the project could be completed to the standards required by the council and by the members of that club. However, he did not mention that he and his colleagues in the Cabinet had been responsible for stopping projects such as that and abandoning the SURS scheme and similar job-creating opportunities within the community.

This is a concept that many Government members have said time and time again is totally opposed to the philosophy of the Party they represent. They believe, as they have said, that these sort of funds ought to be provided to industrial employers so that, when things come good in the economy, when there is an up-turn, there will be greater employment and that, to provide employment by way of unemployment relief programmes, is simply a waste of money.

So, we see that they could provide additional funds for a club such as the Burnside Rugby Club in the Minister's district. I do not disagree with providing the money; it has been well spent. On the other hand, however, the Government is taking legal action and pursuing through the courts a group of young people who were given a grant by the previous Government to prepare a short 25-minute colour film dramatising the causes, nature and effects of unemployment. They have had their money cut off. They are being pursued by the other sponsors, including the Australian Film Corporation, on this project. They worked voluntarily for two years to get up this film; yet, the Government is pursuing this matter through the courts to stop them from making the film. I find such double standards appalling in the Government's approach to the question of unemployment in our community.

The other matter I raise is the widening of Portrush Road and decisions that are being taken by the all-powerful Highways Department. Portrush Road, between Kensington and Magill Roads, passes through a residential area where, predominantly, families live on either side of the road. For some years, there have been proposals to widen that road. Some months ago, I presented a petition in the House from 950 constituents of mine who were opposed to that road-widening project. It was with interest this week that I received notification from the department that public opinion would be sought on an upgrading programme for that section of the road. However, a closer scrutiny shows that it is not an upgrading programme, but a road-widening programme. The department has sought comments from residents; in fact, it has put up four proposals to the community. Unfortunately, these proposals have been put to the public in such a biased and unfair way that they favour a widening of that area of road, a widening that will involve the removal, at worst, of some magnificent plane trees from both sides of that section of Portrush Road.

It will also mean that the facades of some of the historic buildings along that section of the road and some magnificent colonial houses will be very much detracted from. It is disconcerting to see a Government department putting such facts before the public and trying to influence residents in the decision-making process. The first two proposals have been put to the public and underlined, "The Highways Department does not favour this scheme." The schemes that it favours are those which give priority to the motor vehicle, to a thoroughfare for fast traffic, and to widening the roads even further to the disadvantage of those who enjoy the vistas of pleasant trees and pleasant buildings in that area. They are being sacrificed for traffic.

We see the same considerations being applied with respect to the historic Portus House. The Minister of Environment just last week claimed that the Buckingham Arms Hotel intersection was dangerous, whereas statistics show that it is not a dangerous corner. In order to provide a quick left turn on that corner to give priority to traffic coming in and going out of the city, for half an hour or so each way each day, a historic building must go: indeed, it is a home for six people. We, through this department, are giving an enormously high priority to the motor vehicle which, by statistics, is used by 1.8 persons each day in coming in to the city and going out again to the suburbs. The arguments to bolster such massive disruption and dislocation to community life, historic buildings and scenic vistas is to make that traffic move along and stop obstructions. The cost of that to the community can be quite horrific.

That is why I am disturbed to see the Highways Department produce such biased and pre-judgmental material for the community to consider. I am further

concerned that, if this continues, we will see, particularly in the inner suburbs, a massive ribbon development and there will be a further erosion of living units in those suburbs and a decrease in the quality of life in the suburbs.

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

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): In the time allowed me this evening I will comment on the provision of a community health centre at Port Adelaide. In reply to a question asked her on Wednesday 6 August, the Minister of Health referred to the future of the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Centre, by saying:

The Health Commission has before it proposals that the unit shall become a community health unit and that it shall embrace the casualty services which were, prior to the establishment of the occupational health services, working quite satisfactorily in the area. It is envisaged that that should continue.

For the people of the area to be serviced adequately by this facility it needs not only to be continued but it needs to have extended hours to provide for community needs. The Port Adelaide Casualty, as it is referred to in the district, is a wellknown and respected establishment for the treatment of residents and others injured in the area. The need for this extended service is further highlighted in a report that states:

The supply of medical practitioners in the Port Adelaide local government area is slightly better than the metropolitan average. Notably of the 101 who practise in the western districts of Adelaide only 33 reside in the area and this may have an impact on out of hours calls.

It does, and this difficulty in obtaining out-of-hours medical service can be verified by many people in the area. The Minister also stated in her reply:

The House will be well aware that many people in the Port Adelaide area are underprivileged. Also a large proportion of Aboriginal people live in the area. The commission believes, and I agree, that these people would be well served by an extension of community health services.

That there is a large group of underprivileged is not denied, and the sad fact is that this group is increasing as unemployment continues to increase in the ranks of the people of South Australia. But there are other than unemployed requiring these services. In January 1979, of Port Adelaide residents 12.6 per cent were on aged pensions; 2.6 per cent were on invalid pensions; 1.7 per cent were on widows' pensions; 1 per cent were on wives' pensions; 0.7 per cent were on supporting mothers' pensions; 0.03 per cent were on supporting fathers' pensions; 0.4 per cent were on sickness benefits; and 0.07 per cent were on special benefits.

Every classification is higher than the State average. These figures show that although Port Adelaide has only 2.85 per cent of the State's population it has 4.2 per cent of the State's pension or benefits recipients. In fact, 24.1 per cent of the population receives pensions or benefits. If the dependants of these people are added to this figure over one-quarter of the residents rely on fixed incomes.

The need for an expanded health service in Port Adelaide has been recognised for some time, and in March 1978 several health sisters who worked or resided in the district and who were concerned at the services provided, especially in the preventive health field, met to discuss what could be done. It was resolved that they would operate as a sub-committee of the Port Adelaide Community Council for Social Development. The committee also recognised that it needed inputs from as broad a base as possible, and it included in its number representatives from most of the relevant groups in the

district; this also included representatives from the Australian Medical Association. From the day-to-day experiences in their work this committee drew up the following list of needs:

1. There is a need for free health information and referral service. For various reasons many people will not visit a doctor for what seem to them minor matters, or out of fear of escalating financial commitments. These points apply particularly to the poorly educated, migrants and the unemployed.
2. There is a need for basic counselling and an "empathetic" ear that will help to identify the problems, enable suitable advice to be given and arrange any appropriate referral.
3. Obesity is a modern society problem. There is a need for informed advice re diet and exercise.
4. Vision and hearing problems: Simple testing is needed with referral as necessary. This testing can offer an opening for discussing other problems.
5. Simple Screening: On the request of the person seeking advice, e.g. is this cut, mole, speech difficulty in need of medical attention?
6. Physical fitness: There is a well acknowledged need for promotion of physical education in the Australian community.
7. Counselling for the families of the elderly, e.g. nutrition, appropriate physical activities, drug supervision and bereavement.

As the list indicates, there is considerable scope for improving access to preventive health services, and it must also be taken into consideration that access to these services will ultimately reduce the cost of medical services to the individual and the community.

The Minister in her reply said that there is a large proportion of Aboriginal people in the area who would benefit from an extension to community health services. This is true, but only if the centre is set up so that they feel comfortable when using the services. An example of one project that was conducted specifically for the use of Aboriginals and failed was an Aboriginal Health Centre that was set up in a church in Dale Street, Port Adelaide, but recently closed for the want of support.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Who set it up?

Mr. PETERSON: I am not sure; I think it was the Aboriginal Health Service. This indicates that Aboriginal people, recognised as a group having a high level of medical need and assistance in general, will not automatically flock through the doors just because lip service is paid to their needs.

Another section of the community that would greatly benefit from the provision of a centre where they could at the very least find out about medical matters that are of concern to them is the migrant population in Port Adelaide. Some 26 per cent of the residents were born overseas and, while many of these people have fully integrated their lives and their life styles into the Australian way, there are still those who do not fully understand what is available to them and where it is available. A well publicised centre that they can attend when in need of medical attention or advice would undoubtedly be of great benefit to them in alleviating any worry on medical matters and allowing any condition to be treated before needing hospital treatment. These factors would also apply to the lower income and one-parent families who would then be able to obtain medical advice free of charge.

The committee completed its report in May 1979 and I believe that, with minor amendments, this report was submitted to the Health Department earlier this year. The Liberal Party policy on community health centres states:

We support the concept of community health centres where regions are not presently served adequately with social and medical health services.

The Minister, in her reply, acknowledges that there are many underprivileged people in the area, "underprivileged" in this context meaning, I assume, in health services that would recognise their needs. The policy goes on to state:

Our aim with regard to community health centres is to ensure effective services for people in conjunction with established voluntary organisations and those in private practice.

This was supported in the proposal submitted, and the following comments were made in respect of services. Information and referral service to an appropriate agency or practitioner, and they used for examples nutrition, obesity, speech therapy, and so on. They also mention basic counselling, advice on nutrition, behaviour patterns, child growth and development, teenage and youth support, and so on. Another point related to health education, advice on alcohol, drug abuse, family planning, etc. The next point covered screening tests for blood, urine, vision, hearing, and weight. Pregnancy tests with counselling and support were also mentioned, as was the encouragement of better co-ordination of existing facilities and services in the area. That is a brief outline of the submission.

The Minister has stated that the Health Commission has proposals before it, and she has acknowledged the significant need in the area. What is required now is for us to be told exactly what is to be provided and when. It would appear that, in the new scheme of things, there could be some confusion over the roles of organisations already operating in the district. I have, since the Minister gave her reply in this House, briefly discussed the matter with some of the people involved in social and welfare work, and they are extremely interested in the Government's decision on this matter and where they are to fit into that decision as, on the basis of the Minister's reply, it is impossible to define who is to provide what services.

Other queries raised relate to where this community health centre is to be located. Is it to be integrated into the casualty building, or is it to be sited elsewhere? What will be the staffing of the centre? Will it include a community health sister, as suggested in the submission?

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

Mr. OSWALD (Morphett): I rise to speak on what is a specific aspect of probably a parochial and evergreen subject in my electorate, the Adelaide Airport, and I am going to address myself to one specific aspect of the airport, which is by now a familiar subject to most members in this House.

A meeting conducted in late June in the West Torrens council chambers was attended by about 200 people and the subject of airport noise and curfews was canvassed. Speakers from local government and both sides of this House addressed the subject generally. The concensus of opinion expressed by all speakers was that, if an international airport was constructed in South Australia, it should be cited in the Virginia-Two Wells area. There was also a bipartisan agreement of speakers from both sides of the House that land should be purchased in the Two Wells area as a matter of urgency and set aside for this purpose. I supported that resolution.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. OSWALD: The main cause of concern was the noise and the burnt fuel pollution from heavy jets, and there were also persistent rumours that the curfew would be relaxed. Unless members live near the airport, they do not know how deafening is the roar of an after-burner of a 727 as it takes off with a full payload. Some of my constituents have telephoned me because they have crying wives and crying children; they have asked for release from the noise. I have experienced this noise because I live on the edge of the airstrip. When heavy jets pass overhead, you cannot talk on the telephone; the picture on the television rolls off the screen; if you are outside you are forced to go inside quickly or to sit in the car; if washing is left on the line, black specks from burnt kerosene appear on it; if you are asleep in the early hours of the morning, the 6 a.m. flight awakens you; if you are not asleep at that stage, the 4 a.m. flight may have awakened you.

Other serious problems exist in relation to that area because of flights. The value of homes in the area has dropped. House values in Glenelg North have dropped about \$10 000 to \$15 000 per property and, if one asks the agents in the area what this is attributed to, one finds that the reason is the flying times of aircraft. I do not suggest that the Government is not aware of this problem; on numerous occasions the Minister of Transport has reaffirmed the Government's policy, which is not to extend the airport boundary; not to extend the runways, other than the 90 metres in progress at present for safety reasons; not to allow an international airport to be constructed at West Beach; and not to relax the curfew. Bearing in mind this policy, I now call on the Government to expedite negotiations with the Federal Government to go ahead with the purchase of land at Two Wells for Adelaide's future airport requirements.

I also draw to the Government's attention an article in the June 1980 edition of *Aviation News*. The article has caused considerable alarm to those members of my district who are affected by aircraft, which use the airport at night. It should be painfully clear to all Governments that residents who live near the airport will object to any relaxation of curfew hours for any purpose other than an emergency. Cargo carrying at night is a lucrative operation and it is for this reason, rather than for passenger flights, that companies want the curfew lifted. The article in the *Aviation News* states:

One of the main aims of the Department of Transport team, which will go to Toulouse shortly to investigate the Airbus A300-B4, which TAA has ordered, is to assess the noise situation. Both TAA and Ansett state their new airliners will be so silent that the Department of Transport cannot justify the night curfew which is now imposed on jet operation at major airports after 11 p.m. up to 6 a.m.

The Department of Transport team will be an airworthiness group with the Australian certification of the Airbus. A similar team will of course be concerned with Ansett's Boeing 767 and 737. Ansett and TAA have been preparing factual submissions for the Minister for some time. They want the jet curfews at Sydney, Brisbane and Adelaide lifted for the new equipment. They want freedom to operate their new Boeing 737's, 767's and A300's for the complete 24 hours a day. That would allow overnight cargo to be flown on overnight, low-fare passenger services at off-peak times now forbidden.

The cargo situation is particularly important, as more freight is flown by night and the airlines are missing many cargo opportunities through the curfews. Cargo is now moving into the hands of the contributors, the forwarders who assemble small consignments or pieces of cargo into larger consignments that fill pallets or, in future, containers.

For these agents overnight consignments are necessary.

Ansett is very concerned, as it now uses prop-jet electras as all-cargo aircraft to escape the curfew on services. These are orphan, ageing aircraft with a limited future. They are also an airline-within-an-airline, with such nuisance factors as separate pilot lists.

TAA is very concerned because its Airbuses can carry such an enormous cargo load, tonnes more than the Boeing 767, and TAA wants to cash in on the potential traffic offered by this advantage. TAA wants to start that advantage from the moment the first Airbuses go into service in November next year, for Ansett Boeing 767's will be a year later. That advantage in timing is important to TAA.

It appears, then, that TAA chose the Airbus in anticipation of the lifting of the curfew. The demonstration of the A300's to the Department of Transport team in Toulouse will have little relevance to the noise made by the aircraft with a full payload, in the same way that the quiet Concorde demonstrated at Toulouse was subsequently debunked by a fair and equal noise measurement made at the Kennedy Airport in the United States.

If the major airlines are looking for an excuse to put a case to the Federal Minister to abandon the curfew, I suggest they look again. It is because of the concern shown by people in my district that I bring this article to the attention of the Minister. My constituents who live near the airport and I know that any abandonment of the curfew is not on. Let us purchase the land at Two Wells.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): It is with great concern that I note the headlong rush by this Government to kowtow yet again to the multi-nationals and build a uranium enrichment plant without first considering the health and welfare of the workers in this area. This Liberal Government is not interested in providing long-term employment for workers; nor is it interested in the health and safety of those workers. It has repeatedly stated that no danger is involved in the uranium industry, a statement I find quite incredible in view of the problems experienced overseas and in this country.

The Liberals cannot see the light for the dollar signs in front of their eyes. What they forget in their ignorance and greed is that there are organisations in this State which care about the workers and which are appalled at the attitude of this Government. The Australian Labor Party is one organisation whose policy stresses adequate safeguards, and the union movement is another which will fight for adequate safeguards.

Perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy is unaware of the great concern shown overseas. Perhaps he does not know about the enormous rallies which have been held in the United States, the United Kingdom and Europe, protesting about the nuclear issue. My Party is most concerned about people, the Government seems to show scant regard for them. We are concerned about whether this uranium enrichment plant will be cost-effective in that it will provide long-term employment for the many hundreds which the Premier has boasted it will. We are concerned at whether it will be a safe occupation for the workers of this State, and we are concerned about whether this State will ever reap any financial benefits from the plant or whether we will be ripped off yet again by the multi-nationals.

I am particularly critical of the control that multi-nationals have on this country. There are a number of very large diversified conglomerates which dominate the mineral industry. These include Conzinc Rio-Tinto of Australia Limited (a subsidiary of the largest mining company in the world, the British giant Rio-Tinto Zinc Corporation), Consolidated Gold Fields Australia (a

subsidiary of another large British company, Consolidated Gold Fields Ltd.), the Australian owned Western Mining Corporation, and B.H.P. These groups control the majority of large mining companies in Australia and in addition, have controlling interests in many undeveloped deposits. They are major centres of economic, financial and political power. The oil companies are also considerably diversified organisations with interests in many areas of the industry. Apart from their control, they diversify into coal and uranium in particular, and are also actively involved in the development of alternative energy resources.

These companies have tremendous flexibility and generate substantial profits, and they can use profits generated in one part of the corporation to subsidise, or finance, operations in another part. They have the ability to manipulate prices and output, to maximise profits and minimise taxation, and pressure Governments into introducing favourable legislation that best suits the companies' interests. For example, when the issue of the so-called energy crisis is raised, it must be remembered that a small number of trans-national companies control a large proportion of both presently available and future resources, as well as the technology of bringing these new resources into commercial production.

This Government, together with its Federal counterpart in Canberra, would argue that these large companies in the mineral industry contribute a large share of their income to Federal and State Governments through taxation and royalty. This is not an opinion shared by me and my colleagues, nor do the facts demonstrate this view. Since the publication of the Fitzgerald report in 1974, criticism has been particularly severe that they do not, in fact, contribute a large enough share of income through taxation and royalties. This report found that, for the period 1967-73, the Australian Government's assistance to the mineral industry exceeded taxation receipts by \$55 000 000, despite declared pre-tax profits of the principal mineral companies of over two billion dollars. There is no doubt that the mining industry pays a lower rate of tax than many other companies in other industries.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I understand this has been brought up a number of times today, but the honourable member appears to be reading his speech. I believe that is against Standing Orders.

Mr. Hemmings: Get stuffed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member made an unparliamentary remark which I suggest he immediately withdraw.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I did not realise that the word "stuffed" is unparliamentary. If you can provide proof that the term "stuffed" is unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can withdraw his remark (that is in order), but he cannot qualify it. I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark without any qualification.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Is the word "stuffed" unparliamentary?

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I asked the honourable member to withdraw. I did not hear his last comment because of noise on my right. Did the honourable member withdraw without qualification? If he did not, I shall be forced to take action.

Mr. HEMMINGS: No, I had not withdrawn it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but in deference to your authority, I will withdraw. I still say that I did not realise that "get stuffed" was unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid the

honourable member has not complied with my ruling. I ask him for the last time to withdraw without any qualification or I shall have to name him.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I withdraw, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In relation to the point of order, I think the member for Peake stated he was referring to copious notes.

Mr. PLUNKETT: That is correct, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Therefore, I cannot uphold the point of order. I point out to the honourable member that he should just refer to his copious notes.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Sir. I would also advise the member for Glenelg to do the same next time he speaks.

Mr. Becker: He's been here 10 years—

Mr. PLUNKETT: He has been here 10 years, yet some of the actions I have seen him take have amazed me. I shall give an example of the attitude of Liberals. The miners in Queensland are presently out on strike because the Federal Government is trying to take away a benefit in relation to homes supplied by the multi-nationals at a lower rate of rent. It comes out very clearly (even Mr. Howard agrees) that the Liberal Government's attitude is that it considers that the workers should have to pay full rent even though they are isolated at the mines. However, they do not consider that the same treatment should apply to the Prime Minister, who gets his accommodation for nothing. Many members opposite get the same treatment, which workers are not entitled to. Members opposite do not like to hear criticism of their friends, the multi-nationals, which at the last State election virtually won it for them by supplying plenty of money for the advertisements, and people such as the Buicks of Kangaroo Island who were supplied with money by the multi-nationals to fight the election. That is the only way they got in. I tell honourable members that at the next election it will be a different matter, and after the next election a lot of members on the other side of the House will not be here.

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

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I intended to speak about a matter concerning the issue of school bus passes. However, the episode this afternoon whereby the Deputy Premier entertained the House with regard to a statement he made during Question Time deserves some comment. It was indeed a very entertaining spectacle by the Minister, because it indicates a number of lessons that I feel the Deputy Premier should learn about the role of a politician. He spent much time later in the afternoon admonishing members opposite, and in particular the Leader, about the lessons that had to be learnt, speaking as if he was one of the oldest hands at the game, but he seemed to forget some of the fundamental lessons himself in the way he handled this matter.

First, he surely lacked a great deal of political acumen and understanding of the world of politics when he let show quite how much the issue that I raised yesterday has embarrassed him and caused concern to his department, when suddenly he realised that possibly there was a contradiction in the answer he gave. Surely, if he was to show that embarrassment, that unease, he should at least have done it in the way the Premier did the other day when answering a question from the member for Ascot Park in that he turned beetroot red instantly, but it took the Deputy Premier 24 hours to finally get upset and really annoyed about the question that I asked.

If you look at *Hansard*, Sir, and read the answer he gave at the time I asked the question, you will find the answer

totally innocuous and without any real substance or meaning, because he was totally unaware of what was involved in the question. He could not comprehend it. Given the 24 hours and the opportunity to consult with his staff of advisers, he came to the House today full of huff and puff to give the House a lecture (in particular, supposedly to give me a lecture on the way in which I should deal with matters like this). Why did it take him so long? He has only done himself discredit by first pointing out that he did not know what the question was, and secondly by revealing that a sensitive spot had been touched. He ought to learn another lesson from that episode, namely, that he ought to listen to the questions asked in the House and, if he is unable to listen or was not hearing enough to listen to the questions put by us, and by me yesterday, he should read the *Hansard* next morning to make a careful check of what was said.

If he were to go over the question again, he would see that the statement he made to the House was ludicrous. If he looks at what I actually said yesterday, he would realise that what he has been put on record as saying can only embarrass himself, and can be of no embarrassment to me or to the Opposition. First, I referred yesterday to his own words when I quoted him as saying, "I talked to them about it, and they said the incident had been occurring for a long time." They are his words. The words I quoted were his own. It is public knowledge that British Nuclear Fuels Limited had made the statement to the official court of inquiry that it had discovered the leak only in March 1979. We have two statements that seem to represent contradictory information. If the Minister can tie those two statements together and is able to bring one to the other and make them both make sense, and both mean the truth, that would be a useful exposition by the Minister, but that is not what we had. We had instead a verbal tirade by the Minister, which did not link up when the two statements could really come together, if indeed they could. His decision not to tie them together indicates that perhaps they cannot be tied together.

What the explanation of my question did not say was that I had sent a copy of the Minister's statement to the British Prime Minister, the Opposition spokesman or the court of inquiry. It said (and I quote; I do not know whether the Minister is in the building, but I hope he is listening), "I am told that a copy of the Deputy Premier's statement has been sent." At the time of his statement he implied that I was the one or that the Opposition was the party to have sent it. Later, he became more definite about that assertion. Where does he get that? I ask him to look at the *Hansard* report and to listen more carefully to what I said. It does not say "it" in the *Hansard* report, for I did not say that I had sent it or that the Opposition had sent it. He should have listened carefully.

The other thing that is important here is that what I was told had been sent was nothing more than a copy of the Deputy Premier's own statement. That has apparently caused him a great deal of concern, delayed-reaction concern, 24-hours later concern, but, nevertheless, a great deal of concern. Does that indicate that he doubts his own veracity or does not know what he is talking about, and is ashamed to think that the statements he makes go overseas to other audiences and other arenas? I cannot be held responsible for his doubts of his own veracity; that is something for which he must take full responsibility.

The statement which the Deputy Premier made this afternoon during Question Time and which has been read into *Hansard* makes particularly interesting reading. Fortunately, the Deputy Premier has circulated copies of it. Copies went to various areas, and I have been able to obtain one. I am intrigued by certain aspects of it, because

it is titled "Allegations by the member for Salisbury". They were not made by me; I am quoting his statements. At least, it should have been titled "Windscale plant" or "nuclear energy". As it was labelled "allegations", why did he not put "allegations by myself", referring to him? No, he decided to impute them to me.

Later in the document, he goes on to say that such action (of sending comments to England) flouts all traditions and the conventions of proper Parliamentary Opposition, and is deserving of the severest censure. I have said that I did not send that document, nor did the Labor Party or the Opposition. He is suggesting that someone in the Parliament did. Is he suggesting that someone in his own Party sent it? If so, he should start looking in his own camp and not over here. If the reality is that it was someone outside Parliament, what abiding should they give to the traditions of the House which we in the House are expected to abide by and the community should live up to "other standards"? He did not make that point, but talked about Parliamentary traditions and implied clearly by the words "Parliamentary Opposition" that that attack was on us.

One other interesting point is that in the editing of this document, there is a blacked out part of the text. Do we have another Richard Nixon expletive deleted? I decided to look closely through this, because I thought perhaps an interesting word could be found. However, the Deputy Premier was saying no more than that the Opposition was "mischievous". He decided against that, apparently, and crossed it out. Perhaps a thought at the back of his mind made him realise that the opposition was not being as mischievous as he wanted to say previously. Maybe there is a nagging doubt in his mind that there is more truth in the substance we were raising than he was suggesting.

The serious part of this matter which concerns me a great deal is that he has said that he is forwarding a telex to England. He said:

I am having the statement telexed to England today to ensure that, if any attempt has been made or is being made to misrepresent this matter, the full facts are known to those involved.

I would certainly like to see the telex he has sent. If it bears the same amount of inaccuracy and imputation that is incorrect, I would be gravely concerned about what reputation has been given in England to this State. If he is sending over that the member for Salisbury raised this matter in the House and proceeds with an attack on me like he did today, that can do the Parliament no credit in the eyes of those in England who received the telex. I hope that he has the courage to table the telex that he sent so that we can see exactly what has been said and so that the House can be fully informed. I, for one, will challenge him later to do that. I think that that display this afternoon indicates clearly that he is extremely sensitive about this issue and that, when he is feeling sensitive and under pressure, he does not know how to cope.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The Opposition appears to be obsessed by the uranium issue. Now we find the new President of the Labor Party in South Australia writing articles in relation to the nuclear war risk increasing. As we have observed the performance of the Opposition in the House over the past few days, we find that the new madam of the Labor Party certainly has her influence on its members.

Mr. Mathwin: Is she the one who stood against me?

Mr. BECKER: That is the one.

Mr. Mathwin: She got her experience.

Mr. BECKER: The short back and sides is obviously in vogue now, and she has made the Party toe the line. Each and every one seems to be obsessed with uranium, nuclear war threats and so on, to such a degree that many prepared speeches are being handed around the Opposition benches for members to read in the current debate.

The forces in control of the Labor Party (the new President and the press secretaries) are really getting the act together, but when we read some of the garbage printed in the *News* tonight under Barbara Wiese's "View from the back bench", the whole plot unfolds. If you want to score political points, you scare the people, you intimidate them, and you come up with scaremongering tactics such as this:

In Australia, we should be particularly concerned about this "limited nuclear war doctrine" since one of the most logical targets of the Soviets to strike at would be the U.S. bases here—at Pine Gap and Northwest Cape.

The Russians would not be interested in this part of the world at this stage if there were to be a nuclear war. If there were to be one, who would whip it up? It would not be the Yanks, and it would not be us. The report continues:

In this dangerous atmosphere our Government should be urging moderation on the increasingly belligerent Americans. Unfortunately, Mr. Fraser is doing precisely the opposite—encouraging U.S. policies which could lead to World War III and bring nuclear warfare to Australia.

When we read the *A.G.W.A. News* delivered to us today we see that it is about time someone made Mr. Morley, of the A.G.W.A., accountable to the taxpayers, because he will protect something that will produce the greatest ripoff of all time. The story will unfold in the next couple of years. Let us look at a couple of quotes from Mr. Morley, as follows:

Our Government's method of dealing with the highest unemployment in Australia is to use taxpayers' money to prop up their Liberal campaign backers in private enterprise

...
What a load of rubbish! Fancy being allowed to print such a libel. Mr. Morley continues:

... by dismantling Government services and handing over those services to their mates in the private sector.

That is not the truth, but it is under a heading "No retrenchments—another Liberal lie". They should be sued for peddling this stuff.

Mr. Hemmings: Why don't you do it?

Mr. BECKER: Because we have more to do with our time in getting the State going. How can any union secretary worth his salt justify what he is trying to prop up and protect? A nice little racket has been going on in South Australia for the past five or six years. We have had a tremendous surplus of Government workers in certain areas. The Public Accounts Committee report into the hospitals deals with cleaning at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other hospitals. Let us look at the food pilfering and other areas which we were not allowed to touch, because Mr. Morley said we cannot touch his people, and we cannot bring in cost-saving systems to benefit the taxpayers of this State. Charge the taxpayers what you like, and you protect these people who have two or three jobs and some of these cleaning contracts.

Fair is fair. We have heard nothing from Trades Hall or the A.L.P. over the past five years about "one man one job". That was always the principle of the workers' unions in this country. Some cleaners at the Royal Adelaide Hospital have two or three jobs, and some sleep there. At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital we had cleaners cleaning rooms that were never occupied. No union secretary could justify this. No-one can tell me that the A.G.W.A., the

Trades and Labor Council, or any other union will employ anything but contract cleaners. No-one can tell me that any union office in Australia has a surplus of staff. No union employs more people than it requires, so why should the State Government or any Government, industry, or organisation be forced to employ people who are surplus to requirements?

This afternoon, the member for Hartley admitted that systems were put in force eight or nine months ago, before the last State election, to cut back the surplus work force in departments under his control. The former Premier was aware of the situation. We did not hear anything from the A.G.W.A. then when the cutbacks were started in hospitals. They started when the member for Elizabeth was Minister and even before that, but we still heard nothing from the A.G.W.A., yet Mr. Morley still prints garbage like this:

Most people would recognise the main thrust of this Government's policies, and that is to placate their supporters in the private sector by turning over more and more of the public sector to their backers.

I have never served on the executive of the Party, but the member for Rocky River would say that the majority of financial support for my Party comes from the little people, the workers. I have just as many blue collar and white collar workers, campaign helpers, and supporters as members of my Party as has any other organisation.

There is only one policy to adopt in this House, and that is to tell the truth. No companies or organisations that have a contract would be members of a Party, let alone a large financial contributor. Companies do not give large financial contributions to political Parties nowadays. They dare not, because they would soon be found out. The multi-national companies cannot give donations to the two political Parties. When I worked in the bank 17 or 18 years ago, I saw two cheques from a multi-national, one to the Labor Party and one to the Liberal Party, for identical amounts.

The Hon J. D. Wright: What was the name of the company?

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member would be more embarrassed than anyone else would if I named it. It was one of the largest multi-national oil companies in the world, and it gave the same amount to each political Party.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I don't believe you.

Mr. BECKER: When the cheque was shown to me I did not believe it either, but the Commonwealth Bank's stamp was on the Labor Party's cheque, and that is where it banks. We saw the cheque go through. In the Liberal Party, our money does not come from watered sources, which is something the Labor Party cannot say, because there are certain places in this State where money is being filtered through in the most unusual circumstances that I would not be proud to accept.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): I would like to refer to the paranoid attacks to which we have become accustomed in this House by the back-benchers, including the member for Glenelg, on the trade union movement. In particular, I refer to the House of Assembly *Hansard* of 6 August, where the member for Henley Beach is reported to have stated:

A union magazine should deal 100 per cent with union affairs; it should not contain political issues.

What garbage! It is the responsibility of trade unions to be involved in the struggle for improved living standards for their members. It is obvious that, if the Government decides to raise taxes, unions should have the right to protect their members' pay packets as they see fit. Similarly, there are many issues in our complex society

where it is not merely appropriate but in fact essential that unions act in defence of living standards.

Such issues include health costs, superannuation, discrimination, pollution, transport, education and unemployment. The level of union activity on these questions may be determined by the members, but remember that those who have the real power in our society, the corporate heads, and Government Ministers will determine events according to their own interest, unless organised groups in the community, such as unions, can bring their influence to bear. We also heard the member for Fisher say some time ago that two of his sons were required to join the Transport Workers Union. He complained bitterly about the fact that they had to join that union; compulsory unionism is unfair.

Yet we never hear of non-union members refusing to accept salary increases won by the union in an industry. For example, if a teacher union struggles hard and achieves a salary rise, the rise is awarded to all teachers even if they are not in the union. The union members pay the union fees, support the union, even go on strike and forfeit their pay if necessary. But non-union members get the pay rise too—at no cost. Is that fair? Incidentally, the A.C.T.U. has never argued that non-union members should not get the benefits won by the union. Unions generally do not oppose *bona fide* conscientious objectors to unionism, no matter how illogical the conscientious beliefs may be (conscientious objectors accept pay rises won by the union, too). But clearly, it is non-union membership which is unfair. Union members make the sacrifices, but everybody shares the benefits.

Then we had the jack-booted, goose stepping, rabble-rousing outburst of the member for Mawson the other night—the old story of reds under the beds. We on this side are becoming sick and tired of the garbage dragged out of the gutter by the extreme right wing elements within the Liberal Party.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. During the past three minutes, the honourable member has hardly raised his head, which would suggest that he is using more than copious notes and is reading his speech.

The SPEAKER: The point is whether the honourable member is reading his speech or using copious notes.

Mr. Hamilton: I am using copious notes.

The SPEAKER: That is in order within the precedents of the House. I take this opportunity, without wanting to intrude on the honourable member's time, to point out to honourable members from both sides that I will shortly make a statement regarding the practice of using over-copious notes.

Mr. HAMILTON: I find it rather surprising that the member for Mawson dislikes the truth so intensely. His raising that point of order indicates that the truth really hurts. If he is prepared to engage in this sort of tactic, he will find that every dog has its day. In relation to comments that unions are led by communists I refer to the following report in which a statement made by Mr. Justice Ludeke is quoted:

Each union elects its leaders in accordance with procedures determined by legislation. The results reflect the wide variety of attitudes amongst union members to the style of leadership they seek. As you would expect, this wide variety includes many different shades of political opinion. Opponents of the trade union movement are constantly claiming that communist leaders within the trade union movement are conspiring to create industrial chaos.

This is a dangerous misrepresentation. It reflects the refusal of such people to acknowledge that union members do not go on strike, losing pay in the process, unless they have a genuine and deeply felt grievance. Mr. Justice

Ludeke, a Deputy President of Arbitration Commission, said in July 1979, "Many take refuge in the conspiracy theory—that fantasy in which every strike and ban is linked and traced back to a secret cell of industrial bomb throwers. If we permit the ascendancy of the conspiracy theory, we will fail entirely to understand the nature of industrial relations."

I refer to another issue—the garbage that has been heard in regard to secret ballots, and the call by Government members for secret ballots to be held in all stoppages. We have heard many times what members opposite want to do. As I have explained in this House, to conduct a secret ballot of all members in this State would take up to a fortnight. Ballot papers would have to be sent out and it would take another fortnight for the papers to come back. Members may then go on strike. One would expect that a similar situation would occur if members wanted to go back to work. An article in the *Australian* of 13 March 1980, under the heading "Fraser rejects secret ballots on stoppages", stated:

The Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, yesterday ruled out secret ballots as a solution to industrial unrest. He described as "impractical" the use of such ballots to reduce the number of strikes. Mr. Fraser said the Government had carefully examined but had rejected the introduction of secret union ballots.

He said: "It would take days before the results of union ballots were known. Problems such as time taken checking votes and finding out who is eligible to vote make it impractical."

Despite the industrial strife in New South Wales, Mr. Fraser said it would be unwise if his Government adopted a "show-them-who's-boss" attitude. "The cost in terms of hardship would be enormous if the Government had a confrontation with the unions." Mr. Fraser said the public should "wish Sir John Moore all the best".

Those comments should put to rest for all time the garbage that is regurgitated by members opposite. An article in the *National Times* for the week ending 21 July 1979 is relevant in relation to the drivel we have come to expect from members opposite about industrial unrest. It states:

Any industrial dispute (a phrase which is invariably shortened to "strike" in the daily press and the electronic media) is to some extent a matter of public relations, and to that extent the basic issues become lost fairly early in the process . . . And as is usual, the media tended to find its tastiest stories in the Government-promoted line that the country was being held to ransom by a handful of communist union officials . . .

In order to justify what would appear to be a totally one-sided position, the same papers occasionally run editorials along the lines of "We're not against strikes, but . . ." This sounds unconvincing, and it is. If you doubt it, cast your mind back. What was the last industrial dispute properly explained, let alone supported, by the popular media?

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

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

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

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I am feeling somewhat chastened at the fact that I have paid very little attention to the press gallery during the time I have been here. I now understand that this is something to which one should give a great deal of attention. In that context, I will cite a letter which appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* and which stated:

Greg Kelton's column on State politics was less a comment on Parliament than a sad reflection on the standard his

column has reached. The Opposition are "damp squibs" for ignoring "burning political issues" such as "bum-pinching" and concentrating on an "obsession"—unemployment.

I make no comment about the significance of unemployment. The letter further stated:

If, in these parlous times, Mr. Kelton sees Parliament's job as providing free entertainment for the Press gallery, he should apply for the cinema and theatre rounds and leave politics to someone who sees his readers as something more than half-wits.

So that Mr. Kelton will not go away disappointed, I will comment on the recent actions of the Minister of Health.

Our latter-day zealot, the self-appointed Ayatollah in charge of public morals, has, as a former advertising copy writer, come late to the issue of sexism in advertising, and late also to the issue of alleged sexual harassment which she used as a smokescreen when her actions on the former issue proved somewhat embarrassing. Tony Baker of the *News* on 6 August had this to say about her:

In one of the more interesting and potentially significant constitutional developments of recent times, Mrs. Jennifer Adamson appears to have created a portfolio and appointed herself to it. Mrs. Adamson: Minister for Sex (Disapproval). The lady has also managed to redefine that widespread political practice, the cover-up. Already renowned for her vigilance in identifying and disapproving of pornography hard and soft, her writ now runs to the photocopier and the tourist brochure.

I, along with many in the community, have been concerned at the prevalence of sexist advertising, but I cannot recall the Minister expressing any concern about it in the past. On this issue, despite the publicity she received and sought, she would be a Jennie-come-lately. A letter to the *Advertiser* yesterday from the Council to Stop Offensive Advertising stated:

Offensive advertising can be described as that which distresses, disarms and desensitises. Recent reports and correspondence in your paper concerning the status of women in advertising indicate a surprising ignorance of the fact that many thousands of South Australian citizens have been working for the past nine years to overcome this evil.

The advertisement she criticised has been around a long time, as the manager of another 3M dealer other than the one she criticised, commented in the *Advertiser*, as follows:

I believe Mrs. Adamson should have researched the advertising used by 3M copier dealers before making her comments public. The photograph has been used on advertising material of this type for more than five years, and to my knowledge we have never received a complaint of this nature.

I do not criticise the Minister for raising the issue of sexist advertising *per se*; sexist advertising is open to criticism. I do criticise her actions, however, because the firm on which she picked, a 3M agent, Gordon Distributors of Glandore, is in my electorate. Because of this I paid particular attention to her utterances. I believe there are two glaring errors in her actions, although there is some cynicism on my part on account of her coming so late to the issue of sexist advertising.

First, her choice of target was extremely poor. I have a copy of the brochure concerned, and it is a very weak example of sexism in advertising. Her choice of that as a target trivialises a quite important issue. The model appears somewhat demure in the photocopier brochure, and she does not seem to be dressed very differently from most of the female office assistants (the majority of clerical and office staff are female) that you see in the average office. The model is not in a suggestive or lascivious pose, as is so often the case.

My second criticism is of her method of approach to the firm, as reported in the *Advertiser* on 31 July. The Minister of Health wrote to the firm under Ministerial letterhead, and the letter concluded:

I propose to use whatever influence I have with people who may be potential customers for such a photocopier to encourage them to boycott a firm which permits such inappropriate advertising of its product. I would be pleased if you would convey this view to the manufacturer.

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Adamson (Mrs.)

Member for Coles

Minister of Health and Tourism.

This concerned the company greatly. I called to see the Manager, as the firm is in my area. In a statement to the press, the manager repeated basically what he said to me then. The statement is as follows:

The Manager of Gordon Distributors, Mr. J. Hall, said he objected strongly to Mrs. Adamson threatening the boycott action, as a Minister of the State Government.

"If the letter had come to us simply signed by Jenny Adamson, private citizen, I could accept it", he said. "But a letter with the Government crest on it and signed by the Honourable Jennifer Adamson, Minister of Health, that's another matter".

After the rather muffled furore over this wild indiscretion, the Minister got a bit rattled. (Had it been a Labor Minister in a Labor Government who committed a similar impropriety we would still be hearing all about it now.) The Minister was obviously so concerned at the misuse of her Ministerial signature that she forgot to put it on her next letter to me, a letter sent on 4 August regarding an inquiry I had made on another matter. All that appears is the typewritten statement of her name.

Some details about this matter and the subsequent bottom pinching story are rather confused. It is unclear, for example, how the Minister came to be in possession of the brochure concerned. On Wednesday 30 July she told the *Advertiser* it had been "delivered to her electorate premises". I understand that in one or more interviews for the electronic media she said that a constituent had brought it to her attention. That minor point may merit some explanation as to how the Minister first got involved in this saga of silliness.

In an interview in the *Advertiser* on Monday 4 August, the Minister backpedalled on her misuse of Ministerial authority and conceded that she was wrong when she complained to Gordon Distributors. She admitted that she was wrong to have signed as the Minister of Health and Tourism. The article states:

I wrote that letter as a consumer, she said yesterday. I admit it was inappropriate to sign myself as a Minister.

So the Minister apologised and excused herself for her impropriety. Yet the Minister had been very harsh with another person who had used a letterhead to write to her. A letter in the *Advertiser* of 5 August 1980 stated in part:

On June 18 I wrote a letter to Mrs. Adamson, the Minister of Health, urging her to intercede to maintain the environmental mutagen testing facility at the I.M.V.S. and commenting on Dr J. Coulter's situation, which has received publicity of late. I began my letter: "I am writing to you in a private capacity as a scientist whose professional interest is research into the biochemistry of carcinogenesis . . ." I had the letter typed on headed paper from the institution in which I work.

On July 25 I received a reply from the Minister of Health. After stating that she was unable to comment on the substance of my letter as litigation was pending on the matters I had raised, her letter concluded: "I note that whilst you claim to be writing in a private capacity, you are using

the letterhead and, presumably, the stenographic services of (the institution). I am therefore bound to assume that you have the permission of the board to use their facilities in this way." By her own criterion her letter to the distributor of the photocopier must be deemed to have had the approval of the Premier and Cabinet. Either Mrs. Adamson is being inconsistent and thereby abusing her public office or, if she wishes to be consistent, she is hoist by her own petard.

The press let her off fairly lightly, with the exception of a comment from Tony Baker about her indiscretion. The editorial reporting on it in the *Advertiser* merely pointed out that what was surprising was the target that she chose, and that there were far more blatant sexist targets readily available which is something that I mentioned earlier. The editorial stated in part:

Mrs. Adamson was wrong in the case of the photocopier advertisement to protest as Minister with an implied threat. Then the editorial slaps her on the wrist with a feather, saying:

But it did get her message across.

Imagine if it were a Labor Minister concerned who committed an impropriety like that. We would have no-confidence motions, there would be calls in the press for his resignation, and all the rest. However, even that light slap on the wrist was too much for the Minister. The furore, mini-style, was so great that she created a diversion. I understand there is a little lizard called a gecko and, if it is pursued by a bird of prey, it will drop its tail, as a wriggling diversion. The Minister dropped her tail into the act as a diversion away from the issue of Ministerial impropriety.

We all read her titillating story, as related by Bunty Parsons, of the alleged bottom-pinching incident—this odd tale thrown in to side-step the issue of Ministerial impropriety. It seems that the story contained quite a few inaccuracies and distortions which the Minister chose not to refute, until a letter last Friday from a former employee of Parliament House drew attention to those inaccuracies.

The Minister may think that she has got away with an improper use of her office and her skilful manipulation of half-truths and untruths regarding the alleged incident in the Parliamentary bar. But her colleagues will continue to find her more and more of an embarrassment as time goes by, with her strange moralising and her mendacious capacity to weave a web of half-truths. Eventually this will catch up with her.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): First, I refer to a matter that came to my attention in the *News* this evening concerning a statement by the Leader of the Labor Party in this House that the Labor members have placed a ban on bringing their own toilet paper to Parliament House. The article stated that the Opposition Leader asked his colleagues not to break the Parliamentary cleaners' strike by bringing their own loo paper to work. How low can you get! One cannot get much lower than putting one's head in the basin. They are scraping the barrel there.

The situation, as explained by his majesty who sits on the throne, is that they will have a campaign to stop the South Australian Government carrying out its policy of letting out as much Government work as possible to private contractors. The member for Hanson explained that the main area of concern relates to cleaners in hospitals. A recent Parliamentary committee report mentions saving \$1 000 000 of the taxpayers' money. So, this is not rubbish. It is not the Leader's money. He might not be short of a million or two, so perhaps it would not worry him. This is money paid by the little people who have to pay the money to run the State. It is their money, and that is what all the trouble is about.

For the Leader to place a ban on his members makes me wonder how far this matter has been discussed in the Caucus room today at the big Party meeting. Undoubtedly, there was a division on this matter. I am somewhat surprised that the Leader has seen fit to ban his members from bringing their own loo paper into Parliament House. We had an explanation earlier, when we were getting down to the bottom of things, when the member for Unley talked about pinching people, and taking in vain the name of the Minister of Health. I think that this matter is even lower than that. I am surprised that the Leader has seen fit to make such a great thing of the banning of loo paper in the House.

Much has been said tonight about the different unions. I was brought into it by the member for Albert Park, who took my name in vain. He said that I had been on about the trade unions, but I have not said a word about them for at least five months. Perhaps, so as not to disappoint the honourable gentleman, I should say that I was able to procure a book from the library which interested me. As I got it only a few minutes ago, I have not had time to give it much thought. I thought it might interest the House. It is entitled *Inside Australia's Top 100 Trade Unions*, and it is a new edition. It gives some accumulated funds of different unions. It is interesting to see that the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union has accumulated funds of \$7 636 866. Reference is made to multi-nationals with all this money. We have just one trade union with over \$7 500 000. This is great stuff.

This is the capitalist sort of situation, whereby funds are accumulated. Of course, at times the unions give funds away when there is a draw for the Labor Party for a special political fund, or when there is a scream from the Labor Party that it must have a campaign fund to fight an election. Unions give a fair sort of donation. The Australian Workers Union, according to the book, is worth \$5 243 173.

Mr. Trainer interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all very well for the member for Ascot Park to swallow his teeth in that manner, but I ask him to listen carefully.

Mr. Randall: Tell us about the perks the secretaries get.

Mr. MATHWIN: I will, if I have time. The Miscellaneous Workers Union has accumulated funds of \$3 000 000, which is \$2 160 000 up on previous funds. It is really in the system. It has accumulated this dough by getting into its members. Fees are going up all the time; the main thing is to raise money. A number of these unions pay an affiliation fee to the Labor Party. Some union members are not even members of the Labor Party; they do not want to be members of that Party. Many of them are members of the Liberal Party, which they support, yet the trade unions impose a sustentation fee for the Labor Party, and they have to pay it whether or not they like it.

The Bank Employees Union, of which the member for Hanson was once the President, and a good President he was, too (and I have heard that from different sources), has accumulated assets of \$2 917 312, an increase on previous funds of \$2 190 000. Let us look at the situation in the Operative Painters and Decorators Union of Australia, of which I was once a good member. When I joined the union here it thought that I would be a potential shop steward. An official said, "You're the fellow who will really look after us." Last year, that union spent \$45 777 and had a deficit of \$4 590. Perhaps the trouble is that most of its officials are affiliated with and are members of the Labor Party. It has seven members of the Labor Party, and, naturally enough, they could not run a Christmas club.

The Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union has an expenditure of \$7 852 992, and a surplus of \$1 122 446; that is a fair surplus. They are real profiteers. Although it represents the workers of this country, it has made a surplus of over \$1 000 000—not bad stuff, is it? The political fund contributions were \$192 681.

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

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): For the record, let me say that the member for Eyre was completely wrong last night in his wild accusations. However, I want to address my remarks to the statement made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs regarding the attitude of the United Trades and Labor Council to Government transfers. I know my Deputy Leader made some points in relation to this, and I will try not to reiterate them. It is not correct, as the Minister suggested, that the Trades and Labor Council supports what is happening in the P.B.D. cleaning section. The Trades and Labor Council did agree to certain procedures for transfers from one Government department to another, but it also made very clear to the Minister that at all times it would oppose deliberate run-down of Government departments and the deliberate handing over of jobs to the private sector.

The huge mass meetings late last year and earlier this year made clear that Government employees were upset about the general trend of the Government in relation to the area of Government employment. It is easy to understand why the employees in Government departments are upset, even if not merely for the fact that their jobs are being destroyed. They are being totally confused by the multiplicity of statements emanating from Government Ministers. Recently, an open letter went out to all E. & W.S. Department employees over the signature of the Minister, and it said, among other things, that a significant role for weekly paid employees will remain, although this will be primarily in the operation and maintenance areas. It also said, and this is very interesting in view of the attack launched a while ago about Government employees, that the Minister had been impressed by the quality and dedication of the people who made up the E. & W.S. Department. The Minister said:

I assure you that individual employees and trade unions concerned will be consulted fully at all stages, and that your rights and interests will be protected.

In a document that went out over the signature of D. J. Alexander, Acting Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, on 1 July 1980, it is pointed out that the department has about 400 excess water and sewerage construction workers. The letter states:

I know that in some areas of the department morale is not high.

That is a statement of fact. The letter says that there is little likelihood of improvement in the foreseeable future. Later, Mr. Alexander says:

Transfer is voluntary initially, but if the situation of excess employees worsens compulsory relocation may be necessary.

So much for the Minister's undertaking of consultation at all times and protection of rights. It goes further. The Minister assures the employees that there will be a significant role for weekly paid employees in the operations and maintenance areas. In a letter from the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, K. W. Lewis, dated 19 December 1979, long before the Minister gave the assurance of the significant role, the letter states that the private contract component of Government manufacturing and construction activity will be significantly increased. It refers to the request from the Premier for an appraisal, and proposals to be done immediately. The

letter states:

Operations and maintenance activity in Government departments will generally be carried out by day labour, although departments shall explore the possibility of using private resources where the required level of service can be maintained and economies are achievable.

It is doubtful whether the assurance about a significant role for weekly paid employees will be maintained. The problem confronting trade unions and their members is that they cannot believe from one minute to the next what is happening. We heard the Minister of Industrial Affairs try to lead this House into believing that he had the full understanding and co-operation of the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council. After he made that statement this afternoon, I contacted the gentleman to whom he referred, and I was assured categorically that, if that was what the Minister had said, it certainly was not correct.

The problem is quite basic and has to do with the nonsense that we can separate Government from the private economy. We do not have a free enterprise economic system, but the myth that we do dies hard. It leads to the mistaken view that the Government and the economic system are separate organisations, with the Government's being responsible for controlling and regulating the economy in the general interest of the community. But this is impossible, as the Government is itself the most important part of the economy.

Much has been said about the need for efficiency. I notice that the member for Hanson is hedging his bets, claiming that he has done all the hard work and that the Government might have to start spending some money. Much has been said about the need for an efficient system and in terms of producing raw materials and other products cheaply, and I guess slave labour is efficient. It bolstered the German war machine, and Chile is using it now. Goodness knows how far we will proceed in this country.

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: The member for Eyre laughs, because he would quite happily use the birch on trade unionists. An inefficient political system is not necessarily a bad thing. Australia has an inefficient economic system and an inefficient political system, if each is judged in isolation from the other and by some objective criterion of efficiency. An efficient economic system would greatly increase the volume of production, and so the real income per person in the population. But this objective would require stricter working conditions and less absenteeism from the workers; deadheads would have to be removed from management and boards of directors; the Government would have to cut feather bedding in its own departments, and force inefficient firms, especially in wool, textiles, chemicals and engineering, out of existence; it would have to tighten up on tax-dodgers, reduce old age and widows' pensions and force pensioners out to work, and create a "decent" level of unemployment to put the workers on their toes. Adam Smith even suggested that academic efficiency requires payment of lecturers on a voluntary basis by their audiences.

The achievement of economic efficiency by such methods conflicts with other personal and social desires and objectives, and since Australia is already a wealthy country, thanks to its small population and rich resources, and despite its economic inefficiency, Australians can afford the luxury of choosing alternative objectives, and have done so. They forgo a possible increase in material wealth in favour of fairly lax and democratic governmental control; they prefer the security of full employment despite its economic cost; a fair go to all, including the drones and incompetents. These are sensible choices given

the dangers inherent in the alternatives.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity of saying a few words, having had the pleasure of listening for a considerable time to a large number of prepared speeches read to the House by members opposite. I suppose Mr. Muirden is home this evening with writers cramp, because, from the tone of those speeches, it would appear that he has been at his best, writing these articles which many of us became accustomed to when he used to write for *Nation Review*, in his dual capacity as one of the journalists for the Labor Party. The same theme has run through all the speeches we have heard tonight from members of the Labor Party.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he wrote them all?

Mr. GUNN: I believe that he had a hand in most of it. I do not know whether he is still running around the swimming pool loosening up, but in between laps around the swimming pool he must have written most of the speeches. I will not spend any more time talking about Mr. Muirden. I will now comment about the member for Florey, who has now left the Chamber. He said that he was refuting allegations that I made. Last night, I gave the House the benefit of some information as to that gentleman's organising the last State election campaign. If he claims that he was not the author of that campaign, I wonder what role he played. Perhaps they had to promote him into Parliament.

Some of the points raised by members opposite have been interesting. Earlier in the session, the Leader of the Opposition tried to extricate himself from the difficult position in which he found himself, having first clearly admitted, according to *Hansard*, that he was opposed to the Roxby Downs project. He then said "We are not opposed to the mining of copper and gold but we are opposed to uranium mining." He stated that, after he had realised he had made a complete fool of himself. He put himself and his Federal colleagues in a very difficult position, and, having realised that, he is now trying to get out of it. Everyone knows that copper and gold could not be mined at Roxby Downs without mining the uranium. I would like to know from the Leader and his colleagues how it is envisaged that the mine would operate if uranium must be left in the ground. I realise that the Leader has a great many academic qualifications, but I have yet to be told that he has some knowledge as a mining engineer. I understand that it is impossible—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I passed geology.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable gentleman may have passed it. He is not noted as being a practical person. I would like to know from the Leader of the Opposition how Western Mining Company, one of the large companies that the member for Peake and others have shouted about in this Chamber, would be able to operate that mine without removing the uranium. What programme would the Leader suggest?

He may need more than Mr. Muirden to write speeches for him in order to get him out of this situation. We all know that his suggestion is complete and utter nonsense. Perhaps his spokesman in this area, the member for Stuart, can help him. We all know that the member for Stuart is opposed to the mining of uranium and to the views of the Port Pirie Council in relation to the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant there. Perhaps the honourable member can help the Leader by telling him how copper and gold can be mined, while uranium is left in the ground. The question is simple and I look forward, with bated breath, to hearing the answer. I hope that the Leader will explain in the next few weeks how the uranium can be left in the ground. Perhaps he

could also explain in detail how the plant would operate. I admit that I have only limited knowledge of the mining industry, but I have asked a number of questions in relation to it.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: The royalties from the process could be given to the Labor Party, and it would certainly be flush with funds.

Mr. Mathwin: It wouldn't have to dig into the trade union funds, then.

Mr. GUNN: No, it would not have to rely on the political levies. At lunch time today I listened to Mr. Paul Everingham, the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, explain why he believes that it is so important that the railway line between Alice Springs and Darwin be commenced.

Mr. Keneally: Is that the railway line that Whitlam started at Tarcoola?

Mr. GUNN: It is the railway line that runs through my district from Tarcoola to the Northern Territory border and to Alice Springs. The line should proceed and go through to Darwin. I believe that the campaign that has been instigated by Mr. Everingham is not only worthy of support but, if the line were completed, great benefit would result for South Australians. I am pleased that Mr. Everingham was loud in his praise of Premier Tonkin and his Government.

Mr. McRae: What about the Opposition and its support?

Mr. GUNN: I have not heard the Opposition's views on this subject. The Opposition has been too busy reading Mr. Muirden's speeches into *Hansard*. I believe that the cost should be only a minor problem, when we consider that South Australia was promised this project when we handed over the Northern Territory. The Commonwealth has an obligation to complete the project. I know that \$420 000 000 is involved, but the benefits would far outweigh the costs, and the sooner the project is commenced, the better for all concerned.

When the Prime Minister opens the new railway line in October, I hope that he will be in a position to make a positive response to the letter that Mr. Everingham sent to him on 10 June that clearly outlined the aim of the Northern Territory Government and the reasons why the Commonwealth should proceed in this matter.

Mr. Keneally: Sinclair was going to seal the Stuart Highway before that.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member was bellyaching last night about the Stuart Highway. His Government stands condemned for doing virtually nothing about the Stuart Highway. It was given the money, but spent it elsewhere. It used the situation as a political exercise to belt the Commonwealth Government. Two years ago the Labor Government spent nothing on the Stuart Highway. Last year it spent a little over \$3 000 000. The member for Stuart bleated in this House because this Government was spending \$9 100 000 of national highways money. That was why the money was allocated, and the Government is putting it to good effect. The member for Stuart had nothing to say when the national highways money was spent around Port Augusta. He did not complain about that.

If the honourable member had been genuinely concerned about the Stuart Highway, he would have made representations to have that money spent on that highway. The project was held back. However, the member for Stuart wanted to have two bob each way. This Government, to its credit, has been the first Government for a long time to show any concern about the Stuart Highway. It put up the money, and the people of the

North greatly appreciate the view it has taken. It is obvious that the Labor Party, because of the attitude of the member for Stuart, had no intention of spending any money on the Stuart Highway.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 14 August at 2 p.m.