

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 September 1980

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

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

**The SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Grange Primary School Redevelopment,  
Naracoorte Water Storage Tank and Mains.  
Ordered that reports be printed.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AMERICA'S CUP

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I wish to inform members of the House that the following cable has been sent on behalf of the Government and people of South Australia to Jim Hardy, Skipper of the challenger, America's Cup Challenge, Newport, Rhode Island:

Our very best wishes to all associated with challenger. We look forward to the result being a great vintage year.

## CORRECTIONAL SERVICES REPORT

The following paper was laid on the table:  
By the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—  
*By Command—*

Correctional Services, Department of—Report on Correctional Institutions, 1980.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Some sections of the report have been deleted where the tabling would cause a breach of security, and names of officers in references to officers in the Cassidy assessment, which is contained in Appendix B, have been deleted. It also should be noted that some of the recommendations contained in this report have already been acted upon by the Government.

## QUESTION TIME

## DOW COMPANY

**Mr. BANNON:** Can the Premier say what was the precise nature of the invitation from Dow Chemicals for him to fly to the United States to address the board and discuss the proposed petro-chemical plant at Redcliff and, in those discussions, will he ask Dow to ensure that the United States Environmental Protection Agency standards are applied to the Redcliff petro-chemical scheme in order to ensure that environmental protections observed here are of no less a standard than those necessary to be observed in the United States?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** As I said yesterday, I have been in constant contact with Dow Australia and Dow International and, during the course of that contact, as I said yesterday, it was suggested that further discussions between the main board—

**Mr. Bannon:** By whom?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:**—would be beneficial. It was suggested by officers of the South Australian Government, the Chairman of the Redcliff Steering Committee, by Mr. Geoff Norris of Dow Australia and, as a result of that—

*Mr. Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader of the Opposition is very petty. As a result of that and the discussion going on, the President of Dow suggested that he would be willing to meet me in Midland, Michigan, and he has kindly consented to make available all facilities of the company in order to facilitate that meeting, and will do so. As to the United States environmental protection standards, I would say that, whatever the standards are in the United States, I would hope that our standards for environmental protection would be equally as good, if not better. I do not particularly much care what the standards are in the United States, because I am concerned—

*Mr. Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** On some occasions I have heard members opposite denigrate United States standards. In any case, it is much more sensible to insist on our own environmental standards, just as we will, in all matters applying to development, insist on the highest possible standards of environmental protection at all times.

## RADIATION

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Is the Minister of Health aware that a public meeting is being organised by the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy for Thursday 18 September at the guide hall in Christie Downs? Notice of this meeting came to the attention of a local resident this morning when she went to the local primary school to pick up a child. There, she was confronted by a gentleman in the car-parking area with a pamphlet promoting the meeting to be held. The gentleman maintained that he was a democrat candidate but would not give his name, but he said that Dr. Hopgood would be one of the speakers at the public meeting on uranium dangers, particularly in relation to the site of the Western Mining Corporation's storage depot at Lonsdale. The same gentleman is also going around the neighborhood knocking on doors to get people to come to the meeting. He has claimed that he used his own geiger counter and, according to the levels shown, they are three times higher than normal. One would get the impression that they are trying to generate emotional fear—

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

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** He has been doing that for the last five minutes.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will make that decision, not the member for Elizabeth.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** I bring to the Minister's attention that these tactics are being used in order to gain support for this meeting tomorrow evening.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, I am aware of that meeting. I was invited to address it, and the Commission was invited to provide a speaker. However, both invitations were declined because, on past experience, I am convinced that the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy is not interested in any facts that the Health Commission might provide.

It therefore seems rather futile to respond to invitations which are clearly extended with the view to somehow or other incriminating the Government and dredging up facts, so-called, which might give concern to local residents. I refer particularly to the following statement made in the notice of the public meeting:

A test recently completed by the South Australian Health Commission has shown that the level of radiation at the Lonsdale uranium dumping site is three times higher than the normal background level of radiation.

I will quote from a letter which the commission has sent to the Town Clerk of the Noarlunga City Council which puts that statement in context. I am sure that the commission's letter, together with such facts I am able to add, will be of considerable interest to the House. The letter, dated 25 July, states:

The general (natural) background dose rate in the area— I ask members to note "in the area"—

was approximately 8  $\mu$  R/hr. The maximum dose rate measured adjacent to various piles and trays of core samples was 25  $\mu$  R/hr.

Agreed, three times the 8  $\mu$  R/hr in the area. The letter continues:

A survey of dose rates around the boundary found only one place where the dose rate was above background; this was where a pile of samples less than 1 metre from the boundary gave a reading of 12  $\mu$  R/hr. The only other significant dose rate was 35  $\mu$  R/hr measured adjacent to a bin containing slurry resulting from cutting and polishing mineral specimens. This slurry is to be returned to Olympic Dam (Roxby Downs) for disposal.

The following is the important part of the letter:

To put these dose rates in perspective, they could be compared with natural background in other parts of the world. The local background rate of 8  $\mu$  R/hr is typical of most areas of the world, but the background is considerably higher in many parts of the world. The average for East Germany is about 13  $\mu$  R/hr, while 200  $\mu$  R/hr is not uncommon in parts of France. Background also increases at high altitudes; the cosmic ray produced component doubles every 2000 metres.

The Health Commission on 15 September measured the background rate of radiation on the steps of Parliament House. It is interesting to note that the background radiation measured quickly in that area was between 20  $\mu$  R/hr and 22  $\mu$  R/hr. This is due to radioactivity in the granite of the building. That is to say, the steps of Parliament House contain approximately the same amount of background radiation as does the area where the drill hole cores are stored by Western Mining Corporation. If the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy really believes that the steps of Parliament House are a dangerous place to be, then okay, we could go along with that, but I suggest that anyone on the steps of Parliament House is as safe as people who may in the course of their work or residence be exposed to any of the natural background radiation at Lonsdale.

### REDCLIFF PROJECT

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Should Dow Chemical decide to proceed with a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff, will the Deputy Premier assure the House that the consequences of an indenture agreement to be debated in Parliament will be referred to a Select Committee? Although it is normal practice for measures of this nature to be referred to a Select Committee, I have reason to believe that the Government had not, until this moment, made up its mind to take that action. As the Northern Spencer Gulf has a tragic record in relation to indenture agreements, it is absolutely essential that we do not have another disaster.

The Minister is aware of the feeling that has been expressed at Port Augusta and in other centres in South Australia in relation to the environmental implications of

the plant at Redcliff. It is essential that the public has the opportunity to have an input into the discussions that lead up to the ratification of the indenture.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I think it true to say that the Standing Orders will dictate that the Bill will go to a Select Committee; if it is a hybrid Bill, that is what will happen. The only other thing that puzzles me about the question is the reference to "another disaster". I do not know what the honourable member had in mind, but we will see that the Redcliff project is not a disaster, and we will be taking all the environmental steps necessary, as the Premier has outlined in reply to the first question today. My understanding is that Standing Orders will dictate that the Bill will go to a Select Committee, but I will check that matter more thoroughly.

### MURRAY RIVER IRRIGATION

**Mr. OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Water Resources indicate what action the Government intends to take in the light of the refusal by the New South Wales Government to allow the South Australian Government to give evidence before the Land Board inquiry in New South Wales yesterday? What is the moral justification for a State Government opening up further irrigation schemes without giving detailed consideration to the effects of salinity on those at the end of the line? Will the Minister seek Cabinet approval to implement procedures to protect the basic rights of South Australians?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** I expect that the officers who went to New South Wales on Tuesday will be back some time this afternoon. On their arrival, I will get a direct report from them on the reasons that were given as to why South Australia was stopped from presenting its case before the Land Board hearing. I am absolutely amazed at the attitude adopted in relation to water diversions and the reasons given, because not so long ago we opposed a further application for water diversion at Wentworth, in New South Wales. On that occasion our opposition at the hearing was accepted and our objection was upheld. The matter is now before the Supreme Court, where the New South Wales Government is appealing to try to have that decision reversed.

In this instance, the South Australian Government was not permitted to present its case and to give the reasons why it is objecting to further diversions in the Eastern States. In fact, I made representations last November to the Ministers in Victoria, New South Wales, and the Commonwealth, asking for a moratorium to be placed on further irrigation diversions for the Murray River and its tributaries until the amendments to the River Murray Waters Act had been passed by the four Parliaments concerned and powers were given to the River Murray Commission to enable it to study the effects of further irrigation diversions on the quality of water in South Australia.

There is no doubt in my mind that the riparian rights of South Australia are being eroded very quickly by the extended irrigation diversions that are being allowed, especially in New South Wales. It is interesting to note that the applications for additional irrigation diversions on the Darling River and its tributaries, and also on the Barwon River, which is a tributary of the Darling River, total more than 58 000 hectares. The total irrigation in South Australia covers some 42 000 hectares, and we are looking at increased diversion applications for 58 000 hectares over and above the area already existing, purely on the Darling River and its tributaries. When we look at the total applications that can be anticipated, especially in

New South Wales, we are looking at an area in the vicinity of 100 000 hectares as a conservative estimate, which is more than double the total South Australian diversions.

This will have a drastic effect on South Australia, in as much as that every additional acre of diversion that takes place means that much less dilution flow into South Australia. Whilst, under the River Murray Waters Act Agreement, South Australia is allowed 1 850 000 megalitres annually, the quality of that water is paramount for South Australia and while we are on our statutory allocation of water, insufficient water enters South Australia, particularly in the summer months, to allow any dilution flow through the barrages at Goolwa into the sea. We inherit annually millions of tonnes of salt as a result of ground water inflows and irrigation diversions in the Eastern States and this amount of salt remains locked up in the river system in South Australia.

I believe that it is totally unreasonable for the Eastern States to expect South Australia to accept that situation and there is no way in which we can accept it, because, with the increased diversions, South Australia will spend more and more months of each year on its statutory flow. During that period, there would be no dilution flow to the sea, and the situation would become critical indeed. As soon as I have had discussions with the officers on their return from New South Wales, I will have further discussions with the Attorney-General and the Premier prior to making a submission to Cabinet in regard to future action.

#### E.T.S.A. DEPOSITS

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House the policy upon which the Electricity Trust of South Australia basis its demands for the payment of deposits and what is the legal basis for this? The question has been prompted by a constituent who recently received a demand for a deposit of \$80 from the Electricity Trust. My constituent happens to be an independent bus operator who contracts with the Education Department. At the present time he is owed in excess of \$2 000 by that department, plus \$700 by various schools. It is reported to me from other persons, who have had dealings with the Education Department, that that department is a notoriously slow payer of accounts. My constituent is particularly irate that whilst one arm of Government owes him in excess of \$2 700, the same Government insists on his paying a deposit of \$80, presumably to ensure the prompt payment of subsequent electricity accounts. When the Electricity Trust was contacted and told of the situation, the trust officer concerned with such matters explained that the reason for deposits was that the trust feared that people who were tardy in meeting their accounts would one day get into such financial difficulty that they would move house in order to avoid creditors and in these circumstances the trust would be the loser. It is ironic that any problems my constituent has in meeting accounts from the Government or elsewhere are directly related to the tardiness of another arm of Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now transgressing.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Very good, Sir. My constituent is not in the position of demanding a deposit from the Education Department, as he appears to be in a Catch-22 situation. He has reported to me that he believes that this is a case of the Government's left hand not knowing what its right hand is doing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member

continues, he must continue without the type of comment that he has just made.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The comment was not my comment but was reported to me by my constituent.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member is not reading a direct letter from a constituent?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** No, indeed. In those circumstances, I simply ask the Minister what the Government intends to do about this situation.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The sort of problem that the member for Elizabeth has highlighted is nothing new, but that does not make the position less desirable. I well recall, from my own experience when I first came into this place, that I received a letter from the Education Department suggesting that I had been overpaid and demanding a refund. That department owed me a considerable sum by way of accumulated superannuation, and I felt the same sort of frustration as that felt by the honourable member's constituent.

However, we must separate the problems. The rationale of the Electricity Trust's demanding of a deposit must, I think, be separated from the tardiness of some arms of Government in making repayments in circumstances such as those mentioned. This Government is certainly interested in increasing the efficiency of all of our departments and getting a prompt response when the Government is in debt to citizens. We have inherited a fair bit that we believe we can improve on, probably in a whole range of areas. As a result of the specific questions that the member for Elizabeth asked as to the legal basis for the demand, and so on, I shall obtain a report from the Electricity Trust and forward that to him as soon as I can.

#### BLACK HILL

**Mr. BECKER:** Will the Minister of Environment say whether Mr. Kym Lasscock was appointed to the Black Hill Native Flora Park Trust with the specific purpose of winding down its commercial nursery operations and whether the former Chairman of the trust resigned in protest over the Government's actions in relation to the nursery? Yesterday, in another place, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, in asking the Attorney-General a question in relation to the Black Hill native flora nursery, made the following statement:

The Chairman of the trust, Mr. Bruce Mason, has resigned. His resignation is said to be in protest against the Government's actions. But the story gets worse. It has now come to my notice that the Government recently appointed Mr. Ken Lasscock to the trust to advise on the closure of the nursery and disposal of the plant and equipment . . . There is a scandalous conflict of interest in this appointment. Mr. Lasscock is the principal proprietor of Adelaide's largest private nursery enterprise.

The Mr. Lasscock referred to in the question by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall is, in fact, not Ken Lasscock, but Mr. Kym Lasscock, who I understand is employed by his father. He is well qualified to assist in nursery operations.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. BECKER:** Honourable members can laugh: the childish attitude of the Leader—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will come back to the explanation.

**Mr. BECKER:** If members of the Opposition Party in another place wish to make scurrilous and untruthful statements about persons who are involved in commercial enterprises and who accept appointments to boards to assist the Government in the nurseries, I think they should tell the facts. I ask the Minister whether the statements that were made in another place were correct or were they

untrue, and also whether the comments preceding the question were a scurrilous and scandalous attack under Parliamentary privilege of the credibility of Mr. Mason and Mr. Lasscock?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I thank the member for Hanson for that question, because at least it will give me the opportunity to clear up a few matters in relation to the Black Hill nursery.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It would be difficult.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The first thing I want to say for the ears of the Deputy Leader is that no final decision about the future role of the nursery at Black Hill has yet been made. However, I have informed the trust of my concern relating to the commercial side of the nursery; in fact, I have called for a review of the role of the nursery in selling plants to the public, and that review is under way.

**Mr. Bannon:** They have been doing it for 15 years.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I shall come to that in a minute. A final decision regarding the nursery's role in plant selling will not be made without full and proper consultation with the Campbelltown City Council. I believe that the Black Hill Trust is to consider the matter on Friday, and it will make contact with me following that. Let me say that I am completely disgusted at the accusation made yesterday by Dr. Cornwall under Parliamentary privilege in another place.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldworthy:** But you're not surprised?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am not at all surprised; it is becoming something of a normal practice. Dr. Cornwall's politicking, I would suggest, has sunk to a new low ebb through his determination to make political capital and political mileage from attacking the personal integrity of well-respected people in the community.

Many accusations were made yesterday, as the honourable member has suggested today. One suggested that the previous Chairman of the Black Hill Native Flora Trust resigned in protest, following certain Government action in relation to the nursery. On 24 March, many months before anything was said about the Black Hill nursery, I received a letter from Mr. Mason, the former Chairman, which is as follows:

In confirmation of our conversation of several weeks ago I wish to resign from membership of the Black Hill Native Flora Park Trust as from 30 June 1980. I do this with considerable regret as I have enjoyed the work associated with the development, first with Black Hill and lately with Thorndon Park. However, I will be moving to Inman Valley early in June and it would be quite impossible to maintain the necessary close contact with the Executive Officer and the trust from such a distance. May I wish you personally, and the officers of the department, every success in your work in the future.

On that basis, and on that basis alone, I accepted Mr. Mason's resignation, for the reasons he suggested. In speaking to Mr. Mason this morning, I learned that the Hon. Dr. Cornwall did not even have the courtesy to discuss the matter with Mr. Mason before bringing it up in the Council.

Dr. Cornwall also made a disgraceful attack, as mentioned by the honourable member, on the integrity of Mr. Kym Lasscock (as was pointed out by the member for Hanson, Dr. Cornwall could not even get the facts right: it is Mr. Kym Lasscock) by alleging that Mr. Lasscock's appointment as a member of the trust was political patronage. Mr. Lasscock had been appointed to the trust (and I was pleased that he accepted appointment as a member of the trust) because of his depth of experience in his particular field, his detailed knowledge of flora, and his management capabilities.

**An honourable member:** He is a nurseryman.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Yes, he was a nurseryman and I am proud that he is, and a successful one at that. I am confident that Mr. Lasscock will prove to be a very valuable and positive addition to the trust. He is already proving to be just that, along with other new members of the trust whom I have appointed recently. I would suggest (and I think we all recognise this) that Mr. Lasscock is highly respected in his field, and his appointment can only benefit the future management of that particular park. Dr. Cornwall's allegations, particularly as he is a previous Minister of Environment, are untruthful, cowardly and scandalous, and this type of muck-raking at the expense of respected members of the community is typical of his poor performance as Opposition spokesman.

Also yesterday in another place an attack was made on my colleague the Minister of Health. I want to give an assurance that I did not discuss the matter relating to the Black Hill nursery with the Minister before I made any contact with the trust itself. I believe that the Minister knew nothing of this matter until she read it in the media and the scurrilous attack on the Minister yesterday by another member in another place is fairly typical of the tactics of the Opposition on important matters like this.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I seek a ruling from you. Following your statement yesterday about which most of us are relatively clear regarding the reading of speeches, etc., is it proper for the Government to be using Question Time by way of Dorothy Dixers (as one understands them), phrased in the terminology used by the Minister of Environment, especially in that he read most of the abuse of Dr. Cornwall? Is that in order, following your instructions of yesterday?

**The SPEAKER:** I am not going to uphold that point of order. However, I believe that the point raised by the Deputy Leader needs to be clarified, in that no member in this House may refer to a debate in another House, and no person in this House may refer to a member in another House in a discourteous or other way. There were, in the reply, elements that were not in keeping with the decorum and dignity of this House. However, I did notice that the Minister, whilst referring to notes, did not read in total the response to the question asked of him.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of your ruling, Sir, I ask you to rule that the Minister who has just completed his reply should withdraw the remarks that he made that reflected on the Hon. J. Cornwall, a member of the Legislative Council.

**The SPEAKER:** I cannot uphold that point of order. It was not taken at the time when the words were uttered by the Minister.

## RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS

**Mr. LANGLEY:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether radioactive materials, including uranium core samples, are being handled and stored (with the approval of the Government) in the residential area of Mary Street, Unley, and, if so, what safety provisions have been made in terms of environmental radiation and waste disposal? I understand that the Unley council is investigating a complaint that radio-active materials, including uranium core samples, are being analysed and stored at 50 Mary Street, Unley, the premises of A.C.S. Laboratories, McPhar Geophysics, and Geoex Ltd. The Minister will be aware of the ban by the West Torrens council on the storing of uranium core samples in residential Marlestone, and of the criticism made by the Health Commission of lax

safety standards at Amdel's laboratories at Thebarton and Frewville. If the Minister does approve of uranium ore being handled in residential Unley, perhaps he will ask the Health Commission to undertake testing there, also.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member has canvassed a range of matters in his explanation. The short answer to his question is that I am perfectly happy to request any tests that the member requires to be done. I am aware that A.C.S. Laboratories, Geophysics and Geox Ltd. have premises in Unley, because, from memory, I understand that has attracted the attention of the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy, in addition to other premises to which the honourable member has alluded.

I refute his comment that there have been lax safety standards at Amdel. We know of the activities of CANE in trying to stir up public fear in relation to Amdel and in relation to the core storage area that it had closed in one council area. The Minister of Health, earlier today in replying to a question, gave reasons why the Health Commission was not willing to be publicly associated with CANE. I, too, share the grave reservations about the motives of this organisation. It seems that, when confronted with the truth, the organisation goes off at a tangent with another allegation that is completely groundless.

*Mr. Langley interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member referred to Amdel, which was happy to implement all the safety standards asked for by the Health Commission and gave complete co-operation. I do not believe that there has been a health hazard in the past, during the term of the Labor Government, when nothing was done.

Since we have been in Government, we have instituted a very tight surveillance on what happens, and we are buying expensive equipment for the Health Commission so that we can monitor such places as Amdel with absolute certainty (something about which our predecessors were not worried). Suddenly, they have decided to line up with this questionable organisation CANE to try to instil fear in the minds of the people. Recently someone of my acquaintance went to a meeting of the CANE organisation in a country town where there was some proposed possible development in relation to nuclear energy. Among other things, posters were on the wall of the CANE room, and they had youngsters there wearing anti-uranium badges. It was interesting to note that some of the posters displayed by CANE had been produced by the Communist Party of Australia. It is not difficult to understand that an organisation such as CANE would be attracted to the Communist Party of Australia, because we all know well what are the motives of that Party. We know that it has a flourishing nuclear industry in Russia.

I make those comments in relation to the explanation given by the member for Unley. Coming back to the specific question, which he embellished with those other ancillary facts, I shall be pleased to make any necessary inquiry into the safety of the operations of Geophysics and any other mining company processing low-grade ores in the metropolitan area.

#### DRY-LAND FARMING CONGRESS

**Mr. GUNN:** Has the Minister of Agriculture investigated the statements made on 27 August in the House by the member for Ascot Park when asking a question of the Premier in relation to the Dry-land Farming Congress held in Adelaide? During his question, the honourable member alluded to pork being served at a buffet dinner to the embarrassment of Pakastani and Arab delegates, and to

the playing of Jewish music but no Arab tunes. In view of the importance of the congress and of the allegations that have been made by the honourable member reflecting on this Government, can the Minister answer those allegations?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Indeed, I have had an opportunity to investigate the question and the associated statement made by the member for Ascot Park, as referred to by the member for Eyre. In a moment, I will refer to a brief report containing certain facts relating to that subject. In the meantime, I point out that it seems that there is a desperate effort to embarrass the Government. I think that, whilst that might possibly be the interpreted role of the Opposition, it would be fairer if it would stick to the facts when doing so because, in this instance, the member for Ascot Park failed to check his facts before he made certain statements on 27 August. I say that, because Mr. Kevin Earle, General Manager of the Festival Centre, is one person whom the honourable member might have seen fit to contact, because his attacking remarks in this place are indeed a slur on that gentleman.

The position is, as I find after a thorough investigation into this subject, that no pork at all was on the menu and served in catering for the opening of the congress. It may be that the honourable member, or the person who drew his attention to the matters that he raised, confused with pork the pressed turkey that was served on that occasion, but I can assure the House that, from investigations made to the level of the caterers, no pork was served.

Another serious allegation was made by the honourable member. I treat this as a serious subject because, after all, it related to a function involving the presence of delegates from some 40 countries. I think that any such allegation needs to be carefully checked before such utterances are made, especially in places such as this. The other matter raised in relation to this multi-national gathering related to some part of the musical programme. The honourable member claimed that the evening started with a Jewish tune. I have a list of the tunes played on that occasion. The first was *Advance Australia Fair*, which I would have thought most appropriate on such an occasion. Because we had 40 countries represented, the second tune was *Around the World*, which I also believe to be appropriate, as it catered for everyone. The third tune was *Midnight in Moscow*, because we had Russian delegates present. Out of respect to the French delegates, the band played *La Vie en Rose*, and to cater for the American delegates the band played *Yankee Doodle Dandy*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I do not propose to enlarge on the details and to give the reasons for the playing of each of these tunes. The tune *Brazil* was played, undoubtedly for the Brazilian delegation, and the band also played the *Mexican Hat Dance*, *Sukiyaki* for Japan, *La Cumparsita*, *When Irish Eyes are Smiling*, and *Bali Hai* for South Pacific delegates.

*Mr. Trainer interjecting:*

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Obviously, the honourable member has secured a copy of the list. He must have a better photocopy than I have, because I have some difficulty in reading the names of the tunes. The band also played *Caravan*, and *Never on Sunday*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister indicated that, in his opinion, this was a serious matter, and I would hope that the House would treat it as such.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** *Hava Nagila* was played for Israel, there was an Italian tune, and others to cater for

the South Pacific delegates were the *Hawaiian War Chant*, and *Now is the Hour*. The last two tunes were *United We Stand* and *Waltzing Matilda*.

That is the list of tunes provided by the organisers. Incidentally, the organiser was not the Department of Agriculture or any other arm of Government, as has been implied in the remarks made by the member for Ascot Park. The co-ordinating of the whole congress was under the control of an independent person, Mr. Ray Taylor, who, I believe, did a tremendous job. It was the department's intention to assist the organising authority to follow the plan and pattern of events that were laid down by my predecessor when he was in office. The plans and specifications applicable to that programme were not altered by officers of my department or by me, as the honourable member also implied, from what was laid down by his colleague when in office early in 1979.

Our officers' efforts in this exercise are to be commended, from beginning to end. The reports received since have been most favourable. It has been our objective to be friendly and co-operative in assisting those delegates whilst here and, indeed, after their return to their respective countries. We recognise that it costs nothing to be friendly, and we aim to continue in that vein. On a commercial basis, we intend to trade wherever possible with those countries.

The member for Eyre's raising this subject has provided me with the opportunity to clarify a few things that I hope will not be repeated by members of the Opposition. If the Opposition wants to attack me as Minister for the departments I represent, or any other member of the Government, there is no problem, and I certainly do not criticise them for that; however, when they set out to criticise people who are not here to defend themselves, such as officers in the various departments, or outside authorities, as is the case in this instance, I believe that that is quite unfair, and the overall effect can do none of us any good, particularly when we are dealing with countries whose delegates are in South Australia as our guests and who have chosen South Australia, for the first time in the world's history, as a venue for their coming together on this subject. The sort of action to which I have referred casts a slur on those countries and their delegates. I hope that the honourable member has had his little game and that this will be the last occasion on which he will set out to destroy our inter-country relations and our image generally.

#### DOW COMPANY

**Mr. BANNON:** My question to the Premier is supplementary to a question I asked earlier. Will the Premier reconsider and agree to my request that the Leader of the Opposition or his representative be included in the delegation to Dow Chemical Company in Michigan? The House will recall that, yesterday, in response to my request, the Premier replied:

"No"; it would not be proper for the Leader of the Opposition or his nominee to accompany a Government delegation in this matter. This has never been the practice in the past and it would be extremely difficult to countenance any such departure from accepted practice.

Following that response from the Premier, I contacted the Dow Chemical Company, with which we have been in constant contact both in Government and since in Opposition, in pursuit of the bi-partisan approach to this project. I suggested to the company that it may see its way clear to ensuring that a representative of the Leader of the Opposition, or I personally, took part in the deputation in order to preserve that bi-partisan approach. I have just

received communication from the company in response to that request in which the company states that it feels that it cannot suggest my request to the Premier because the trip will be made on the Premier's own initiative and not on an invitation from Dow. Had the trip originated from an invitation from Dow, the situation might have been different. Therefore, I ask the Premier to reconsider his decision.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have a record of the message that was given to the Leader of the Opposition, and I suspect that he is being less than accurate in some of the things that he has just said as emanating from the company. The answer that the company gave to the Leader of the Opposition's staff when the company was contacted to find out exactly whether they could get an invitation to go along, too, was that the company could not issue such an invitation, particularly as the trip was initiated by the Premier. All of the other remarks that were made were not made by the company. I am getting just a little sick of this, because the Leader of the Opposition needs to get this situation quite clearly through his head, and if he were to spend a little more time on the seriousness of this matter, the possible loss of the Redcliff project to South Australia, instead of attempting to score petty points, I suggest that we would possibly have a more accurate and meaningful bi-partisan approach than anything he has tried to achieve. Let me make this quite clear: following the advice that was given to me by officers of the Government and by advisers from outside the Government on the need for further discussions, the possibility of having further discussions was initiated by this Government: there is no question of that. I am at a loss to understand why the Opposition, and the Leader in particular, would not absolutely support such an initiative, because if anything were to go wrong with this project the Leader of the Opposition would be the first to get up in this House and criticise publicly the fact that the Government had done nothing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The possibility of further discussions was certainly initiated by this Government, and it was following that initiation of the possibility of further discussions that the President of Dow himself, Mr. Orrefici, was kind enough to extend an invitation to me and to any of the Government delegation to be the company's guests at Midland, Michigan, for further discussions.

I for one (and I know that the Leader of the Opposition is apparently resentful of this, since he is trying to get on the band wagon, too) am very grateful to Mr. Orrefici that he is prepared to meet with me and with my delegation to discuss these matters. The President of Dow is not somebody who I understand is freely available for discussions of this kind, and I am very pleased indeed that he places such importance on the project here that he is prepared to meet with me and discuss the matter. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to split hairs, he can stay splitting hairs, but as long as he is doing that it is pretty clear to everyone that he is not going to make much progress in what he is attempting to do, and that he is not particularly concerned about the future of the Redcliff project in South Australia.

#### PHYLLOXERA

**Mr. LEWIS:** In view of the report over the weekend of the outbreak of the phylloxera aphid in the Victorian vineyards, will the Minister of Agriculture indicate the

concern of the Government for this important and valuable State industry and the jobs of the people who tend vines, make wines, pack and process the fruit and cart and sell it, by considering stiffening up the plant quarantine procedures and closing the border to inwards goods which represent a risk?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I appreciate the honourable member's raising this subject today. It is true that there has been a report of an outbreak of phylloxera in the Goulburn Valley in Victoria, the two town areas in particular being Mitchelton and Tabilk. First, the recent media report on the outbreak in this area is about two years behind. The outbreak occurred about two years ago.

**Mr. O'Neill:** Will you be taking the six minutes?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Indeed, it is an important subject and I am quite happy to oblige. I can think of plenty of material that is applicable to this subject that could cause me to take up the remaining six minutes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Constant questioning is not assisting Question Time.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** If I may keep it brief and to the point I prefer to do so. I received a report from the department, following the recent announcement of an outbreak, which states that it is important to take advantage of any opportunity to clarify the department's attitude to quarantine, and in relation to what further steps might be taken to protect our own wine grape-growing areas, as was mentioned by the member for Mallee.

Phylloxera is basically soil borne and the greatest risk to our vineyards arises when our soil is cross-infected by contaminated soil transported from Victorian vineyards. In this context, a recent increase in industry traffic moving between interstate vineyards, including trucks, tractors, grape-picking machinery and associated paraphernalia, poses the greatest threat. On the other hand the transportation of vitis material (grape vines) into South Australia is absolutely prohibited. At this stage it is not proposed to establish a border interception point in the South-East, where it has been suggested, as the industry, quarantine and phylloxera authorities do not consider such a move to be warranted at this time.

I think it is fair to say that the matter is under close scrutiny by all those concerned. We have power under the Act, and we will act if the justification is there to do so. In the meantime, the best advice that I can give to the honourable member is for his constituents to be mindful of how the disease is spread, to know the origin of the various pieces of machinery admitted to their properties, and to take steps where necessary to decontaminate that equipment or any items of gear that they might be moving from State to State that could be suspected of carrying infected material.

It is fair to say also that over the years, since the establishment of the Phylloxera Act, the board has been active. The board was in the Goulburn Valley area only recently. My colleague, the Minister of Water Resources, who has been a member of the South Australian Phylloxera Board, has assured me that it does a good job and that it aims to continue its work to protect the industry. Before we consider stopping altogether the traffic of machinery from property to property, much homework will have to be done.

Phylloxera can also be air-borne and whilst it can be air-borne over only relatively short distances, that does not alter the fact that that is another avenue through which we could suffer.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** What sort of growth is it?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** It is a nematode growth.

My colleague is asking another interesting question, but I was encouraged by the Opposition to continue Question Time and I am answering—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** You will regret this before—

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** It came as a request from the other side. I believe I have covered all the salient points. If there is time for another question I shall be happy to let it come forward and conclude on that point.

*At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

#### INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I move:

That in the opinion of the House the Government should, in order to restore the credibility and independence of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, establish a public inquiry into the affairs of the institute with particular reference to—

- (a) the circumstances surrounding the closure of the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit run by Dr. John Coulter and the value of reopening and maintaining such a unit at the institute;
- (b) whether, as an independent statutory body, the I.M.V.S. has always facilitated the free and open flow of information on health hazards to its own employees and to the public of South Australia;
- (c) whether any undue influence has been brought to bear on the I.M.V.S. by chemical and drug companies to have unfavourable reports on their products suppressed or the names of the companies concerned deleted;
- (d) whether reports have been suppressed or names have been withheld by the threat of companies concerned withholding financial assistance to the institute or conversely by providing assistance to prevent unfavourable reports;
- (e) whether pressure from outside organisations, including Government departments, has ever produced a restrictive interpretation of regulations by I.M.V.S. senior management which has led to interference with information on actual or potential health hazards to the public of South Australia; and,
- (f) whether the I.M.V.S. and its senior officers have always served the best health interests of the people of South Australia.

In formulating this motion, I and other members on this side of the House seriously weighed up the use of privileges that members of this House have, particularly in relation to the fact that members can use this place to make accusations under privilege about other people or organisations. We maintain that certain ethics should be maintained at all times. It is only after all other avenues have been explored that we, on this side of the House, use the privileges available to us in this House. We maintain that that course has been followed.

Since it became public knowledge some months ago that the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit run by Dr. John Coulter was to be closed, many requests have been made by organisations and eminent individuals for a public inquiry to be held into the closure of the unit. These organisations and individuals make up an impressive list, including the combined United Trades and Labor Council;



the Doctors Reform Society; the Environmentalists for Full Employment; the Australian Society of Microbiology; and the Women's Electoral Lobby. Obviously more organisations, scientists and doctors have called for an inquiry into the closure of this unit, but the organisations I have listed are the ones of which the Opposition is aware. I am sure that the Minister has received many similar requests.

In newspapers in this and other States there has been a stream of letters, and articles by doctors, scientists, and organisations all springing to the defence of Dr. Coulter and his environmental mutagen-testing laboratory. Both here and outside, the Opposition has repeatedly requested a public inquiry, and on 10 June, in an adjournment debate, I offered the Minister information that, in the opinion of the Opposition, justified a public inquiry. That invitation was ignored. I wrote to the Minister, I think the following day, offering to supply evidence, if there were to be a public inquiry, that could be used, but the Minister said that, as Dr. Coulter had before the Industrial Court a case against I.M.V.S., it would be improper for the Minister to reply. That was correct, but I did not ask for a public inquiry into a dismissal.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Napier would appreciate the fact (and he is now starting to canvass it) that the subject matter of the motion could be *sub judice*. In the way in which the honourable member has approached it so far, I do not believe he has transgressed, although in the last few words he has got close to it. I make the statement to members who may be taking part in this debate later that, because there is now before the Industrial Court an action by Dr. John Coulter for reinstatement to his former Position at I.M.V.S., it is quite important that the House does not try to influence the court in its deliberation by debating the merits or otherwise of his dismissal or canvassing the possible reason for it. Therefore, I rule that any discussion relating to those matters will be considered by me as being *sub judice*. The honourable member who makes such a comment will be warned and, if the warning is not heeded, the consequences are known to all members.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk was very kind to give me your ruling before the House met today, and I appreciate the situation in which you find yourself. However, my letter to the Minister was dealing with a public inquiry: that is past history and has been fairly well canvassed throughout this state and the rest of Australia. My letter was requesting a public inquiry, but it was ignored by the Minister, who said that, as Dr. Coulter had a case before the Industrial Court, she could not reply. I feel that the Minister was dodging the issue. However, the point made by you, Mr. Speaker, perhaps highlights the situation in which I find myself, namely, that being bound, in effect by the rules and Standing Orders of this House need never have occurred. Many people wrote to the Minister giving facts and information on the affairs of I.M.V.S. generally. This Government was so keen to stand up here and elsewhere and extol the virtues of people having the right to be heard (as in the case of ex-Commissioner of Police Mr. Salisbury) but, when we are dealing with another person, this Government chooses to remain silent. It is because of this cavalier attitude of the Minister and Government that we are forced to introduce this matter and to be bound by your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I do not object to that, but the situation need never have arisen. I will try not to transgress your ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member had better not.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** The motion refers not only to the circumstances of the closure of the laboratory but also to

the general situation within I.M.V.S. The Opposition chose carefully before we decided to bring the matter before the House, because of the Minister's attitude in refusing to come to terms with the situation and because the Minister has refused to see certain officers and has chosen to accept the advice of the I.M.V.S. Council and its Director, Dr. Bonnin. We are forced to mention names and to name companies that we say will prove that all is not well with the I.M.V.S.

Also, twice we have offered to give this information to the Government in confidence as long as it agrees to a public inquiry, but twice we have been ignored. Now, we are forced to use the forum of this Chamber to bring those subjects to light. One person who wrote to the Minister was Dr. Brian Martin, of the Australian National University. I am sure that most people will be aware that Dr. Martin has made a study of the suppression of environmental scientists, and it is pertinent to read extracts from his paper *The Power Structure of Science and the Suppression of Environmental Scholarship*. The Minister received a copy of that document. Perhaps the Minister feels now that there is no need to be frightened and that, because we cannot mention certain aspects of this case, the Government can sit pat and hope that it will eventually go away.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member that there is a clear inference in that statement that the honourable member is being gagged by the Chair on a partisan basis. It may not have been the intention of the honourable member to make that assertion, but it was very clear. I ask the honourable member not to canvass that point again. It is not the case, nor will it be, and I will not tolerate any further comment that can be inferred in that way.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but at no time will I suggest that you are partisan. In the summary of his paper, Dr. Martin made the following points:

Political power exercised by leading scientists can be usefully understood as being based on service to powerful groups in Government and industry and on disciplinary exclusiveness maintained by specialisation and isolation of scientific work from the public. This perspective on the power structure of science helps to explain evidence of the suppression of scientists pursuing environmental research and teaching.

He goes on to say:

Is there an underlying reason for suppression in the environmental area? One answer is that the grounds which have been used for dismissal, nonrenewal and the like offered in each case are themselves valid. A detailed assessment of this would require full documentation of each case, hardly possible here.

"Here" refers to the paper. He continues:

Suffice it to say that purely academic or scientific judgments are almost always insufficient as an explanation. In almost every case the research output or teaching performance of the individual under threat was well above average, and in several cases the research or teaching records were outstanding.

Those remarks are pertinent to my motion. Dr. Martin goes on to refer, towards the end, to challenges to the scientific power structure, that group of people who suppress environmental scientists because (a) they do not want to rock the boat or (b) it is against their vested interests to allow people to speak out. He has the following to say:

I have described how the power structure of science is sustained by links with powerful non-scientific groups, by the self-interest of those high in the scientific hierarchy and by the vested interests of the scientific community in specialised,



discipline-based research and teaching. However, by no means all scientists acquiesce in these arrangements. Especially in the past decade or so, there have been increasing challenges to the scientific power structure.

One potent challenge to the links between powerful scientists and powerful non-scientific groups is simply public exposure of these links. Such exposure has occurred especially in controversies over issues such as the supersonic transport aircraft, nuclear power, food additives and pesticides. When the public is made aware of conflicts of interests in the roles of scientists and becomes aware of the existence of value assumptions underlying statements and advice by scientists, the ability of scientific experts to legitimise policies and practices of Government and industry is greatly reduced.

From this paper I think we can safely assume that there is widespread victimisation and suppression of environmental scientists. What was Dr. Martin's view concerning the situation at the environmental mutagen-testing laboratory? I read, in part, a letter that Dr. Martin wrote to the Minister on 2 June 1980. His final paragraph is, I think, very important. He says:

I have made a study of instances of suppression of scientists involved in environmental teaching or research, and can assure you that Dr. Coulter's case is far from unique. Many other examples show that instances of suppression such as this cannot be justified by scientific criteria, but rather are motivated by the influence of vested interests. The best insurance that justice be done in such cases is that all statements by parties on either side of the dispute be subject to full and open scrutiny.

If there is going to be a public inquiry (and I sincerely hope that there will be), I also sincerely hope that my motion will not be dragged out over the next month or so and not brought to a final conclusion. I hope that perhaps my motion will be decided within the next two or three weeks so that the public of South Australia who, I can assure the House are becoming rather perturbed at the general situation at the I.M.V.S., will at least know whether this Government intends to give members of the public a chance to make submissions and be listened to, or whether, as in so many other instances, it will be swept under the carpet and left there.

One particular part of my motion that does not deal with Dr. Coulter (and so I am sure I will be able to canvass it thoroughly) is whether an independent statutory body such as the I.M.V.S. has always facilitated the free and open flow of information on health hazards, especially to its own employees. I will give the history of the situation that existed at the I.M.V.S. some months ago, dealing with the laboratory at Northfield, the specific pathogen-free laboratory that dealt with the feeding of animals in which tests were undertaken by the use of a chemical called ethylene oxide. This chemical is used to clean the feed for the animals, so that they are disease free prior to having tests carried out on them. Ethylene oxide is a potent mutagen and, as such, is likely to be shown to be cancer-causing on humans when they are subjected to sufficiently large amounts.

Mr. Speaker, may I have your ruling on a certain subject dealing with this matter and, perhaps, possible areas I wish to canvass later? The point is that I will be dealing with a particular person involved, Dr. Coulter. One way I could get out of it would be by saying a particular scientist or doctor. I feel that I will not be transgressing your ruling if I use that particular doctor's name. This area covers the free and open flow of information being denied to employees.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member seeks approval for an action ahead of making any assertions, a position which no Presiding Officer could accept. I

indicate to him that he has recognised and is recognising the sensitivity of the area. I believe that, having, in the manner in which he has put the question, identified the person, he can henceforth talk of a medical practitioner or medical researcher and leave it at that. It will not, I suggest (and this then becomes a subjective decision of the Chair, no doubt), cause any loss of value of the contribution, and it will, I believe, not cause any transgression of the very fine line the honourable member knows he is trading.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A medical researcher who at that time was running the mutagen-testing unit at the I.M.V.S. was asked to carry out tests into the situation at the S.P.F. laboratory at Northfield. The officer found that four staff were working permanently at the unit (three females and one male), all of whom were young. Three were married, and none had yet had children.

I am giving that information because the people involved were young and intended to have children at a later date, so any children born to them could suffer from some carcinogenic disease caused by ethylene oxide. I will not go into the technical details of the tests, but the outcome was that a serious hazard existed at the S.P.F. laboratory at Northfield.

Because of the potential health hazard in that area, the medical officer who was running the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit decided that, in the interests of the safety of the four young employees, the report should be issued to them simultaneously with its issue to the Fire and Safety Committee of the I.M.V.S. The officer thought that there should be a free and open flow of information to all people concerned. He believed that, in cases where the general public was concerned, if there was a potential health hazard to the general public it was his duty to inform the public of such a hazard, and this he did. However, he incurred the wrath of I.M.V.S. senior management. I think it is relevant that I should read a letter sent to that officer from the Director, Dr. Bonnin. The letter states:

It was reported to me on Monday 21 April 1980 that you released to Dr. Watts—  
that was the doctor involved with the specific pathogen-free laboratory at Northfield—

and staff of that unit a memorandum addressed to the Fire and Safety Committee, before all members of that committee had received the document. Apart from the fact that the staff concerned received a document which they could not completely understand, therefore becoming unduly frightened and concerned, you were obliged to report your findings to the Fire and Safety Committee, which asked you to investigate the toxicity of ethylene oxide. I consider your conduct in this matter quite reprehensible.

That brings me to a point that I think is quite legitimate. If the officer had not released that report to the staff members at Northfield, we do not know whether or not any action would have been taken by the I.M.V.S. Council or its Director. I would hazard a guess that no action would have been taken. Because the staff members were informed, the Director was forced to make a decision to ban the use of ethylene oxide at Northfield and also a recommendation was made to the South Australian Health Commission that it should be banned in hospitals and other laboratories in this State.

Because of that report by the medical officer a completely different means of cleaning food has been installed at Northfield. A steam machine costing about \$45 000 has been installed, and the Opposition maintains that, if someone had not rocked the boat, those four young people at Northfield still would have been using ethylene

oxide to clean the food prepared for the animals.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** At risk.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** At risk. There is in my motion a paragraph relating to whether any undue influence has been brought to bear on the I.M.V.S. by chemical and drug companies, and another relating to whether there has been any pressure from outside organisations, including Government departments. The Opposition claims that undue influence has been brought to bear on the I.M.V.S. and that there has been pressure from outside organisations, including Government departments.

Matters relating to finance are hard to prove, and the Opposition does not claim that any individual officer or senior management member at I.M.V.S. has received any financial reward from individual drug or chemical companies, but we all know exactly how these things can be done. I refer to a question asked by the member for Mitcham, dealing with just that subject. There were two questions, but I shall deal with only one, because I do not want to steal the thunder of the member for Mitcham. When he enters this debate, no doubt he will have a lot to say. He asked a question dealing with the Deputy Director of I.M.V.S., as follows:

Who is the Deputy Director of I.M.V.S.? How many times has he been abroad in the last 10 years? What proportion of the cost of this travel has been borne by I.M.V.S. and how much by private companies? Which companies have contributed towards the cost of this travel and how much has each contributed?

The answer was that the Deputy Director was Dr. R. G. Edwards, that he had been overseas 17 times in the last 10 years, and that the cost of his travel had been borne as follows: from Dr. R. G. Edwards' personal funds, or by international professional organisations, 70 per cent; by I.M.V.S. funds, 6 per cent; and by private companies, 24 per cent. The companies contributing to the 24 per cent were Pfrimmer, \$1 504; Technicon, \$7 720; and Hoffman-La-Roche, a Swiss firm, \$400.

The Deputy Director had taken 17 trips in 10 years, at a total cost of \$38 000, representing a little more than \$2 000 a trip. One would suggest either that the Deputy Director is a frugal traveller and possibly a future contributor to *See Europe on \$15 a Day*, or that the answer given to the Minister was not correct. I make the point that the Minister received the answers supplied. This is no reflection on the Minister.

However, when one sees that a measly \$9 000-odd was supplied by private companies to the cost of overseas trips or to I.M.V.S., and when one looks at the reports of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (I have gone back through as many reports as possible), one sees very little evidence of grants from private companies to I.M.V.S. The 1977-78 report states in the specific grants accounts that from private companies it received from Tosco Proprietary Limited, for travel, \$200, and from J. Pfrimmer Limited, for research, \$10 803.

One would say that there is very little evidence of any substantial sums of money going to the I.M.V.S., so, therefore, one could ask why we included in our motion that part dealing with chemical companies having undue influence by either providing more funding or threatening to withdraw funding. I will cite the transcript of a case held before the Industrial Court on 19 February 1979. This case dealt with an action taken by Dr. R. G. Edwards, who wanted to carry on private practice as well as being a public servant. Dr. Edwards mentioned an organisation known as the W.H.O., and the transcript states:

Question: W.H.O. being?

Answer: World Health Organization. I will then be attending a meeting in Singapore which is principally to organise a

regional meeting there in October of this year. I will then be taking part in a conference on acute care medicine in Jakarta. I will then return to Australia, in May I will be attending a meeting for a few days in New Zealand which is a meeting of senior executives of colleges of pathologists in America, Canada, Britain, Australia which is being held in New Zealand.

Question: Who's paying the expenses of both those trips?

Answer: Both—the expenses for both of those trips will be met by sources outside of the Government or the institute and the time taken for those will be recreation leave on my part.

Question: Will the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science gain anything from your attending on those conferences?

Answer: Certainly indirectly, possibly directly.

Question: What do you mean by indirectly "certainly indirectly"?

Answer: Well in terms of an awareness of the problems and the needs and how we relate to those. This is information that I would gain. There's always other things that arise from these meetings that ultimately can end as direct benefit, for example in terms of research or other support.

Question: Have the I.M.V.S. in the time you've been in your situation benefited at all from that sort of work?

Answer: Yes. Best illustrated by placing a direct cash value on it of approximately \$400 000.

**His Honour:**

Question: Sorry, who has put the cash value on this?

Answer: That is cash received by the institute in the form of various grants or other direct support from—

Question: Overseas?

Answer: Industry overseas, industry local, other funding bodies.

Question: How do you say that's directly related to your trips overseas?

Answer: It's derived, well I could illustrate it point by point if you wish, but it's been derived much of it from specific conferences that I've held with people overseas. For example, I will be going to Sydney tomorrow to receive \$25 000 which is derived directly from a meeting held in Basle, Switzerland.

Question: Do I draw the inference from that that if someone hadn't gone to that conference in Basle, Switzerland you wouldn't have got the \$25 000?

Answer: That in that instance is absolutely correct, yes, sir. I have a somewhat unusual role, shall we say, in an unusual expertise. I'm not suggesting everybody would do that.

That organisation was called Hoffman La Roche, which is a drug company. We have not been able to find in any reports a reference to \$25 000; nowhere have we been able to find, in past reports, a figure of \$400 000. This is the kind of thing which we want to know and which a public inquiry could bring out, but up to now, the Government and the Minister have chosen not to give any form of answer to our request.

I now refer to the suppression of reports. It is fairly well known that, some time in 1978, I think, a certain medical research officer appeared on a *Four Corners* programme and discussed the problems associated with a household pesticide called Baygon, which is produced by the Bayer group in America. That programme was quite controversial and, as members may recall, the Bayer group put a \$10 000 000 writ on the A.B.C. forbidding it to show that programme at any future date. This action was known in legal terms as a stop writ. The Bayer group have no intention whatsoever of bringing action before the courts, and the A.B.C. knew that, but this action was a means by which Bayer could continue to sell Baygon in Australia without any worry.

The main ingredient in Baygon is a substance called dichloris whose use, in America, under the Federal Drug Administration Act, is banned in restaurants, kitchens or anywhere eating takes place, yet Baygon is being sold in Australia for specific use in kitchens, restaurants and eating places. Because that officer chose to appear on *Four Corners* to warn the people of Australia about the problems, dangers and health hazards associated with Baygon, he was taken to task by Dr. Bonnin, the Director of the I.M.V.S. A letter from Dr. Bonnin to this gentleman stated, in part:

Because of your obvious intent to create exactly the type of situation which has occurred, I must hereby formally instruct you and any staff members for whom you are responsible, not to participate again in these types of programmes, where what you will say and demonstrate cannot be vetted in advance by a responsible officer of the institute.

Before that, the Director had said that he had no objection to discussing the chemical under its proper chemical name. What can the public expect? The public, on the one hand, is being bombarded by individual drug and chemical companies about the pesticides that one can use in the garden or in the home; the public is being assured that this substance is perfectly safe, and, in fact, if one reads the descriptive label on Baygon, it states that Baygon can be sprayed anywhere near food. What can the public expect from that kind of exposure?

The public expects, and in fact demands, that independent laboratories will protect its interests. This was being done, and the Director of the I.M.V.S., whom one would have thought would know his responsibilities in regard to informing the public, chose to use the heavy hand of bureaucracy to stop that officer carrying out the function that he so clearly saw as his responsibility. That is one case.

Another case that is even more damning involves a paper prepared by three gentlemen, two from the I.M.V.S. and Dr. MacPhee from La Trobe University, Melbourne, in July 1977.

These three gentlemen sought to publish a paper in the *Medical Journal of Australia* dealing with a group of drugs called 5-Nitroimidazole, which is a group of drugs in widespread use in medicine and veterinary work. That particular drug was manufactured by an American drug company called Searle, and it came into widespread use throughout the world in the early 1960's. This particular company sought registration of the drug with the United States Food and Drug Administration. In a number of different laboratories and with a number of different test systems, the drug was shown to be mutagenic, and in 1972 it was shown to cause cancer in mice. This finding was published in the *New York Academy of Science* journal. The point I want to make is that that journal is very rarely read by medical practitioners, in particular by medical practitioners in Australia, so there we have a drug that was known to be mutagenic but, because it was not very well known that it was mutagenic, it continued to be prescribed in increasing amounts in this country, despite its potential hazard. For instance, it was prescribed for trivial conditions, sometimes where a proper disease had not even been established.

In 1976 it was revealed in the United States that Searle had been less than honest in presenting the data on metronidazole. This point came out in an English science journal called *Nature*. I shall quote what was said in that journal, as this has a bearing on what I am saying about suppression. The article is as follows:

We have uncovered serious deficiencies in Searle's operations and practices which undermine the basis for reliance on Searle's integrity in conducting high quality

animal research to accurately determine or characterise the toxic potential of its products . . . Searle has not submitted all the facts of experiments to FDA, retaining unto itself the unpermitted option of filtering, interpreting, and not submitting information which we would consider material to the safety evaluation of the product. Some of our findings suggest an attitude of disregard for FDA's mission of protection of the public health by selectively reporting the results of studies in a manner which allays the concerns of and questions of an FDA reviewer.

The three gentlemen concerned wished to make that particular point in the paragraph that I have just read out in their paper to the *Medical Journal of Australia*. The idea was to place in a medical journal rather than a scientific journal the fact that that drug was mutagenic.

On 14 July 1977 Professor Vernon-Roberts, who was, I think, the head of the tissue pathology unit at the I.M.V.S., came into the office to discuss the paper with the two gentlemen from the I.M.V.S. I want to quote what was given to me, because I feel that it is important that we have it down correctly. Professor Vernon-Roberts said he wanted a quotation from *Nature* removed and also any reference to, or use of, the terms "drug company" or "drug firm", and he made a statement as follows:

This institute gets money from drug companies to carry out research.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Was a transcript taken of the conversations?

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Both gentlemen were present when this was said, and I understand that statutory declarations will be forthcoming if required. The purpose of Professor Vernon-Roberts's demand was quite clear. A higher priority was being set on the protection of one of the institute's sources of funds than on the protection of the public by making relevant information more widely available. It was also protecting the interests of the drug companies. The gentlemen concerned became extremely angry over this request and even the morality of such a request. Professor Vernon-Roberts made it perfectly clear that he was acting on instructions from a higher authority, and he stated that he was not going to involve his own ethical standards to disagree with an instruction from a higher authority.

The following week a similar request was made by Dr. R. G. Edwards, then head of the Division of Clinical Chemistry and the Acting Deputy Director. The same reasons were given, namely that the I.M.V.S. received money from drug companies and chemical companies and that a paper such as that proposed could have had adverse effects on that kind of money coming into the organisation. The two gentlemen were forced to delete this passage and any references to drug companies or chemical companies. I maintain that that is direct suppression of information which could be of value to the public and to medical practitioners, and one would have thought that it was the duty of the I.M.V.S. Director and his Deputy Director, and the council, to make sure that that kind of information was forthcoming to the general public, but it was suppressed.

Finally, I turn to the last part of my motion which deals with whether the I.M.V.S. or its senior officers have always served the best interests of the people of South Australia. I think that at the moment, from what one reads in the newspapers and from the information that the Opposition has received (and I might add that it has been received from people who are clearly disturbed and concerned over the situation at the I.M.V.S. and the fact that its credibility as an independent body is in doubt), the indication is such that the health interests of the people of South Australia are not being served. In fact, senior

management and the I.M.V.S. council are treating with contempt not only the people of this State but also members in this Parliament.

I mention again the situation dealing with the Questions on Notice asked by my colleague, the member for Mitcham. I have already quoted one where the answer was completely misleading and in no way compatible with what one reads in the report or what one reads in the transcripts from the Industrial Court last year, or from what one reads from other areas. The member for Mitcham asked the following series of simple questions:

1. Has it been decided to close the environmental mutagen testing laboratory in the I.M.V.S. and if so—
2. Has it been decided to close such laboratory, and if so—
  - (a) who made this decision;
  - (b) why;
  - (c) when will it be closed; and
  - (d) what will happen to Dr. Coulter?

Until that question was asked, all correspondence the Minister had had with interested people, members of the Opposition and no doubt the member for Mitcham was to the effect that the environmental mutagen testing laboratory run by Dr. Coulter was too small, there was a similar laboratory in Sydney, and currently a committee of assessment had been set up by the Federal Government to deal with the whole question of occupational health. Obviously, the Minister had not really delved into the situation.

It is rather funny that we found out in reply to that question that Dr. Bonnin of the the I.M.V.S. had advised the Minister that there was no environmental mutagen testing laboratory at all; it was a figment of everyone's imagination. It had never existed and it would not exist in the future. That is gross contempt of this House, because everyone knows that a testing unit was being run by Dr. Coulter. The Minister agreed on that but either the Minister did not bother to read the reply to that question (and for that I could forgive her, but I could chastise her for being a bit foolhardy in putting her name to answers she had not read) or, having read it, she was more than foolish and showed scant regard for the situation at the I.M.V.S. and the kind of question that was being put forward to try to get to the bottom of what was going on.

The Minister, or Dr. Bonnin or Mr. R. G. Edwards claimed that there was no environmental mutagen testing laboratory and that Dr. Coulter was authorised just to carry out mutagenic testing functions concerning only vitamin C. Bearing in mind that Dr. Coulter was authorised only to use mutagenicity testing to study the effect of large doses of vitamin C, testing had been carried out in that laboratory since 1959. Apart from the first study conducted in 1959, all tests were designed, carried out or researched by Dr. Coulter and were included in reports of the I.M.V.S. which were tabled in this House. During the time at the I.M.V.S. when Dr. Coulter was running his environmental mutagen testing laboratory he published six papers in scientific journals, five of which were on mutagenicity and related hazards, and each of which was approved by the I.M.V.S. A number of tests were conducted on potentially hazardous substances and situations within the I.M.V.S. Each investigation led to a recommendation on which the I.M.V.S. took action. The only person who could have authorised that action would be Dr. Bonnin. The most significant was the situation at the S.P.F. unit at Northfield where, as a result of Dr. Coulter's findings, ethylene oxide was withdrawn and a steam steriliser was replaced at a cost of \$40 000.

Even more astonishing was the fact that it was stated in a letter by Dr. Bonnin that no tests were carried out within the mutagen testing unit run by Dr. Coulter for outside

bodies. However, memos were raised by the accounts department to Dr. Coulter that charges should be made on these bodies and the money from these tests went into the accounts of the I.M.V.S. Yet, suddenly, overnight, the member for Mitcham was told that no such laboratory existed. I have here a photograph of the laboratory with the words "Environmental Mutagen Testing" clearly printed on the door.

That laboratory existed before 1959 and I am sure that, even though it is not functioning at the moment as a laboratory, the sign is still on the door. If the Minister would like a copy of this photograph I would be only too pleased to supply it to her.

**Mr. Keneally:** Was that photograph taken in 1979?

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** The photograph was taken in 1980, but the laboratory existed in 1959. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have strayed from your ruling. I have had to delete reference to the relationship between senior officers and other gentlemen at the I.M.V.S. which I thought would be relevant to this motion. I have had to spend time on matters other than those on which I would have preferred to speak, such as items of correspondence between senior management and subordinates at the I.M.V.S., as I believe that is important.

I could quote them to see how far I could go, but I will not do so. As the debate progresses, my colleagues will have information that will be damaging to the I.M.V.S. We say that, if the Minister had been willing to listen to our requests in June and to the requests from organisations and other scientists here and in other States who have requested a public inquiry, this debate need not have taken place. The Government's attitude is irresponsible. This Government supports the Establishment in the medical and scientific area, and nothing is done to upset people. It continues to brush aside people who have enough conscience to want to expose the hazards and inform the public. My colleagues and the member for Mitcham will give information to this House that may force the Government to have a full and open inquiry into the affairs of I.M.V.S., because all is not right there.

The present Director is to retire soon. If there is not a public inquiry before he retires, we could have the situation in which there is a new Director (and most Opposition members know who aspires to be the new Director) and the situation will be hushed up even more. I have some sympathy for Dr. Bonnin: as he is close to retiring, he may not wish to get involved. However, there are ambitious people in the I.M.V.S. who want to further their careers, and the Minister and this Government have a duty to ensure that when the new Director is appointed the affairs of I.M.V.S. are free from any taint that may come up from accusations and allegations made by all and sundry outside the House. The only answer is a full and public inquiry.

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

#### NORTHERN TERRITORY RAILWAY

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

That this House supports the efforts of the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Mr. Everingham, in his endeavours to have a standard gauge railway line constructed from Alice Springs to Darwin immediately.

This important matter should warrant the attention of all members, because it could affect the people and have lasting benefits for both this State and the Northern Territory. South Australia, with all States, relies on

growth; we must have a strong and growing economy. Unfortunately, during the past few years we have lost the advantage that we used to have with the Northern Territory. One way that we can help to regain this advantage—

**Mr. Keneally:** Is to change the Government in the Northern Territory.

**Mr. GUNN:** That is a ridiculous comment and is irrelevant to this motion. The matter is far too important to be side-tracked by the honourable member, who I hope will wholeheartedly support this motion. In order to prosper, we rely on growth in the economy so that we can obtain the benefits to which we are entitled. Recently, I attended a dinner at the Town Hall at which the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Mr. Everingham, clearly and forthrightly detailed the advantages to this State and to the Northern Territory of his proposal to build this line. This is the correct time to introduce this motion: the line between Tarcoola and Alice Springs will soon be completed and we have available a large and skilled work force that was assembled by efficient private contractors who have proved beyond doubt that they are capable in the construction field.

There will be an official opening soon. Also, there will soon be a Federal election. Both these events are conducive to important announcements being made. The importance of this matter cannot be over-emphasised. South Australia is losing about \$70 000 000 (a conservative estimate) in trade with the Northern Territory, much of which has been lost to Queensland. Unless we act quickly we will not regain that benefit. Historically, South Australia has a right to a standard gauge line between Darwin and Tarcoola because it was promised by the Commonwealth in 1910 but, unfortunately, that obligation has never been honoured. That lack of action deserves strong criticism. I refer to a letter that Mr. Everingham wrote to the Prime Minister on 10 June in which he included his Government's view on the report on this project. He states:

The view of my Government is that the study team's report provides clear and overwhelming support for the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link and fully justifies the earliest possible construction of the line. This follows from the principal conclusions of the report which, I believe, can be stated as follows:

- the growth in freight associated with the growth and development of the Northern Territory would provide justification for the railway on financial grounds within the foreseeable future;
- the construction of the railway will have an enormous economic impact on the Territory and will serve as a major impetus to development;
- the non-economic considerations such as defence, energy and the social impact all point forcefully and unambiguously to the need for the railway.

The document enclosed with the letter contains several interesting statements. Referring to the project as a national asset (which I think it would be), the document states:

Decisions to construct national assets must be based on suitably broad national perspectives. The particular emphasis of these perspectives will, of course, depend on the nature of the asset under consideration. In some cases, defence may be a primary concern. In other circumstances, judgments may need to be based on an assessment of what is appropriate to Australia's present level of maturity and prosperity, or what is consistent with broadly conceived objectives of national development.

The Chairman of the Australian National Railways Commission has pointed out that Australia is one of the few

countries in the world where there are still frontiers to be crossed by large-scale development railways. He suggests that a north-south rail land bridge would be a project which would capture the imagination of, and be supported by, most Australians.

The 1937 report of the Board of Inquiry into Land and Land Industries of the Northern Territory of Australia stated:

... we are apt to forget the great part railways have played in the development of our continent. Few, if any, countries owe their progress to railways as does Australia. In order to develop our natural resources, it has been necessary to construct a greater mileage of railways in relation to population than any other country in the world. Our great exporting industries, which give Australia financial stability, could never have been built up without the co-operative assistance of the railways. Our railways have been, and still are, a great national asset.

I entirely agree with that. One of the great disasters of this country is that the States looked inwardly at the time they constructed their railway systems. One of the amazing things that took place was that in this country we could have three different rail gauges. The member for Stuart would be aware that, in my district, I have one town which has three different rail gauges coming into it, and that has caused problems. The commitment to the railway is also discussed in the documents provided to the Prime Minister, and I quote:

The commitment to construct the Darwin-Alice Springs railway link is long-standing and accepted in Commonwealth legislation. The Northern Territory Acceptance Act (1910-1973) provides that the Commonwealth shall—

Construct or cause to be constructed a railway line from Port Darwin southwards to a point on the northern boundary of South Australia proper (which railway with a railway from a point on the Port Augusta Railway to connect therewith is hereinafter referred to as the Transcontinental Railway).

The document goes on to point out how the South Australian Government was sick and tired of delays, and took the matter to the High Court. It was pointed out there that, unfortunately, no time was indicated in the agreement; therefore, they could always be going to build the railway line one day hence. The guarantee was not as watertight as it should have been. Another interesting point that should be quoted is taken from the A.N.R. annual report, which states:

The proposed Darwin to Alice Springs rail link will be no more costly in terms of the ratio of expenditure to earnings at standard freight rates than the average of all other rail links operated by A.N.R. The consequences of the existing transport deficiency are felt in a number of ways:

The strategic interests of the nation as a whole—including most importantly, defence considerations—are prejudiced;

The opportunities for national development in the interests of all Australians are impeded;

The nationally-accepted policy of closer settlement and the development of rural areas in largely pre-empted.

It has been estimated by the A.N.R. that the construction of this railway line will cost about \$375 000 000, plus an additional \$43 000 000 for rolling stock and communications for freight task of some 500 000 tonnes a year, giving a total cost of \$418 000 000. The annual charges are estimated at \$90 000 000, of which \$42 000 000 is in the nature of interest charged at 10 per cent and a further \$42 000 000 is a return on the investment. Depreciation and amortisation account for \$6 000 000, while direct operating expenses amount to \$21 000 000. They are all in 1979 costs. The direct benefit to South Australia,

particularly the Iron Triangle, should be considered. It has been estimated that it will be necessary to produce about 2 500 000 concrete railway sleepers and about 150 000 pieces or railway line, all of which will most likely be constructed in South Australia, thus creating considerable employment.

If this railway line were constructed, it would open up to South Australia the vast markets in Asia, and Darwin would most likely become a large port dealing with Asia. It would allow us the opportunity to have direct access to a market of at least 150 000 000 people, and this would certainly benefit this State. In addition, there are the vast mineral resources in South Australia and in the Northern Territory, which will be developed. As I have said earlier, our economy relies on growth for its success. If we promote this project, the growth will be generated by the development of our vast mineral resources in South Australia and in the Northern Territory to the benefit of both States. The Alice Springs to Tarcoola railway line goes right through the middle of the coal fields at Lake Philippson, and it is obvious that those particular resources will be developed in the near future because, as the amount of usable oil continues to be depleted, it will be necessary to use more and more coal and uranium. We have these large deposits of coal, which the Northern Territory Government has already indicated it is interested in using for the development of electricity.

I also point out the interest that South Australian firms have in the Northern Territory. Recently, foresighted people got together and decided to hold a trade fair in the Northern Territory, at Alice Springs. About 31 South Australian firms exhibited at the fair. To give an indication of the sorts of industries on display, I cite soft furnishings, chemical detergents, fencing materials, plumbing, hardware, footwear and souvenirs, kitchenware, jewellery, caravans, carpets, domestic and commercial ware, industrial, electrical and engineering products, general hardware, clay bricks, air-conditioning, welding and general merchandise, firearm accessories, solar heaters, bedroom and dining-room furniture, grandfather clocks, bedding, trailer kits, and steel shelving. It was clear from reading information in relation to the proposed trade fair of the great interest shown in South Australia by businessmen from the Northern Territory, who would be eager to take goods there if there were a reliable and sure means of transport.

The Stuart Highway is unreliable, and it will take a considerable time to have it fully constructed to a reasonable standard. I believe that, if this railway line were constructed, it would not only create jobs in South Australia, but it would also assist us in developing those areas of the State that have so much potential. In conclusion, I will quote from the speech that Mr. Everingham made at the town hall.

**Mr. Randall:** It was a good speech.

**Mr. GUNN:** It was a good speech. He said:

By default Australia has drifted into two camps. In one camp are the southern States of New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, and—even though its long-term interests are intrinsically different—South Australia, which has apparently enrolled through no particular conscious choice of its own.

For a long time the other camp consisted only of Queensland and Western Australia, but they are now joined by the Northern Territory, magnetically attracted by common interest and indignant complaint against national policies oriented to South-East Australia. But this need not be the case. There is, since self-Government in the Northern Territory, opportunity for a new relationship—or perhaps I should say, for re-establishing an old relationship.

I am talking about a north-south axis down the centre of Australia, which holds a great deal of promise for your State. If South Australia fails to capitalise now on such a partnership, the Northern Territory will become inextricably linked with her neighbours to the east and west, Queensland and West Australia.

Sir Charles Court, I can assure you, readily appreciates the value of the railway. In a speech to the heavy-haul railway conference in Perth he stated: "Railways are forever—they are an indispensable part of any great economy."

The only nations which have been able to come to grips with their potential have been those that have had the foresight to get good solid railway systems, he told the conference.

Mr. Everingham went on:

He is right. One only has to take a brief look at the developments that have followed the advance of railways across the world. Railway builders have been men of vision.

I agree with those comments. I believe that it is important that this House should carry this motion as soon as possible, so that it can be transmitted to the Prime Minister, the Chief Minister, and all other people involved in making this decision. Although I could quote much more material, I do not think it is necessary. However, I emphasise again that the Government of South Australia is to be commended for its strong and active support of Mr. Everingham in this matter. The Premier especially should be commended, because he has strongly supported Mr. Everingham in his endeavours. Because the motion is in the best interests of every South Australian, I hope that it will have the support of the House.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** In seconding the motion, I support the view of the member for Eyre that this is a matter on which the House should vote as soon as possible—today. It is easy for State Parliaments to make decisions on this matter, because the Commonwealth will be asked to spend the money—and rightly so. In the agreement of 1910, it was part of the deal that the Commonwealth would build a railway line between the northern border of South Australia and Darwin. It is the Commonwealth's obligation and responsibility, but, as a Parliament, we should recognise that it is easy for us to pass such a motion because our financial commitment will not be large.

I support the motion in the strongest terms. In the Eastern States, the majority of people and industries look on South Australia as the dead-end of Australia. This State is the last consideration when decisions are being made. When Mr. Everingham was speaking in Adelaide, he said that, although the use of these terms may be hard, he suggested that for too long South Australia had been content to bask in an atmosphere of assumed intellectual superiority while the rest of Australia left it behind. There is no doubt that that has been true in the past. We have taken the attitude that South Australia will go on at a slow pace, without any real drive or impetus from other sections of Australia.

In the Northern Territory, the view is held that the south-east of Australia is always making decisions which, in many cases if not always, are contrary to the long-term benefit of the Northern Territory. For that reason, a feeling exists in the Territory that the south-eastern States do not necessarily support the Territory to any extent. Queensland and Western Australia have a close affinity with the Territory, more particularly with Darwin, but traditionally South Australia has, until now, had the closest ties with the Territory. However, we are losing those ties, and that has been especially true in recent times. If we continue without a direct rail link and without developing other communications with the Northern

Territory through business and commerce, we will lose those ties.

In the past, members of the teaching profession in the Northern Territory came mainly from South Australia. Many public servants were on transfer from South Australia, and the people in the Department of Works of the Commonwealth Government in the main came from South Australia. Many people who went to work for private enterprise in the Territory came from this State and, because South Australia was the place of their birth or a place where they had spent some considerable time, when they wanted to revisit a major city they came back here.

With more roads being developed connecting Queensland in particular, and Western Australia to a lesser extent, with Darwin, the other States are developing more connections with the Territory than has been the case in the past, and South Australia has missed out. It is unfortunate that, when the Northern Territory has the fastest growth rate of any part of Australia, we in South Australia have suffered a decline in our trade with that area. Fifteen years ago, that would not have happened, because of the close ties that existed at that time.

The member for Eyre has made the point that defence may be a consideration in building this rail link, and I shall comment briefly on what benefit some people see the railway line having for the whole of Australia in the matter of defence. It would provide a direct link for rapid transport of personnel or equipment, and an alternative to the Stuart Highway, even though the two routes will be close when the rail link to Darwin is developed. The benefit of the two links is important for defence, for transshipping equipment or personnel, or for evacuating civilians from the area.

If we talk to people in Darwin, we become conscious of how they view the defence situation. South Australia is the State farthest removed from any danger of initial attack or conflict with any other country, but the Darwin people see the matter differently, speaking of the people of Darwin as distinct from those of other parts of the Territory. They are conscious that Darwin was attacked by air raids on 21 occasions in the Second World War and they are aware of the dangers to the north if any nation were to decide to have a crack at Australia. They realise how close they are to South-East Asia, because they know of the number of refugees who come to Darwin and who are transported to the southern States to take up residence, seek employment, and make a new life.

The rail link is important in terms of defence, but it is important for Australian in other ways, and we must recognise that. The argument that a railway line is one of the major features in developing a new country is as true today as it was in the 1870's and 1880's, when we built the line from Adelaide to Melbourne, or in 1910, when the Commonwealth Government promised to build a railway line but did not say when. Before Western Australia joined the Commonwealth, it argued strongly that it would not join until agreement was reached and a time set for a transcontinental rail link stretching across the continent from the east coast to the west. The legislators in power in Western Australia at that time had the foresight and the common sense not to trust a statement that a line would be built some time. They fought and won the argument, but we in South Australia missed out.

Many of the goods used in Alice Springs come from South Australia, and we send a substantial amount of fruit to that city—perhaps more than is sent from any other State. The situation in Darwin is different. South Australia produces some of the best cement in the world, and it is exported to Europe and to other countries. Strangely,

however, all of the cement that goes into Darwin comes from New Zealand. The rail link must give us that potential, if nothing else. The fuel for Darwin comes from Singapore. A small quantity of vegetables comes from South Australia, but much of the vegetable supply comes from Queensland and Western Australia and, to a lesser extent, from New South Wales.

The same thing applies to building materials. Yet, at this time of so much unemployment in our country (and, this applies to a lesser extent, in Darwin), almost any person who wants to work manually has an opportunity to do so in Darwin. Some people are reluctant to go to Darwin because it seems remote from Adelaide or from other States. A rail link would break down the remoteness and encourage South Australia and Darwin to work as sister States. South Australia is dependent on the Northern Territory to some degree and will be more dependent on the Territory in the future.

The member for Eyre referred to the fact that we have an opportunity to trade with South-East Asian countries; one of the connecting points, either airport or seaport, is Darwin. If South Australia has a connecting link to Darwin, and if we can produce goods at a price that will make them competitive overseas, bringing a small, if not a large, profit, the rail link would be important and must be fought for in the strongest possible way.

The Federal Government now encourages people who produce minerals in this country to process those minerals in Australia. That long-term goal cannot be achieved quickly, but if we reach the point at which people in the Northern Territory, and in South Australia, process minerals that are available for manufacture, there could be a cross-over purpose so that the Northern Territory, or South Australia, could manufacture goods for home consumption or could export goods. The rail link would become important not only in the carting of the materials that have been processed from the raw state to the finished article but in the processing of export goods, which would result in a larger profit for Australia.

In excess of 11 000 000 of the 14 000 000 people in Australia live on the eastern seaboard. Slightly less than 1 400 000 people live in South Australia and 120 000-odd live in the Northern Territory. We must not neglect our opportunity for expansion; we must fight for the railway line, because it is one of our great trading potentials for the future. We know that the Eastern States will not give much consideration to South Australia. Experience over the years shows that, if there is a takeover of a company, it is unlikely to involve a South Australian company taking over a company from the Eastern States. The Eastern State raiders come in and take over, and the headquarters of the company is in the Eastern States. People are employed there and South Australia loses out in economic terms. Therefore, a pioneering area, as one must call the Northern Territory, is important.

By interjection, it was stated earlier that the Government in the Northern Territory is not a good Government. However, considering the economy of the world at present, any Government that can claim the great growth taking place there deserves credit. A \$75 000 000 project is under way at Ayers Rock, involving the development of a tourist village. The Northern Territory's population is barely 120 000, but the Territory has initiated other projects and has built up tourism to the point where three times more people visit the Northern Territory each year than are resident there. No other part of Australia as a total region can make a claim like that. The Northern Territory has progressed, and is doing so rapidly.

One may say that the Territory is progressing so rapidly



that it may not be able to keep progress under control unless it has good communicating links with other States so that goods and services can be taken in as rapidly as they are required. If there is a demand for goods and services and if South Australia can supply those goods and services, it is important that we deliver them in the cheapest and surest way without delay. On present indications, rail must be considered as the likely means of future transport, if one considers the cost of fuel in regard to normal road haulage. Trains can use other forms of fuel and can still prove to be economical, safe, and in line with modern times.

I have felt strongly about this subject since I have been in Parliament, and therefore I am thrilled that it is at a point at which the Parliament is discussing it in South Australia. More particularly, I believe that the Federal Government is conscious of its responsibilities and of the need for this project for defence purposes and for the overall development of Australia. I also believe that the present Federal Government is responsible enough to pick up the challenge, even though it has been in power for only five years, in comparison with the 70-odd years during which the project has been waiting for a Federal authority to take up the challenge.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** They were in there for 23 years at one stage.

**Mr. EVANS:** The present Government has not been. We will win the battle if we fight collectively, and the battle is well under way. I thank the member for Eyre for moving his motion, and I support it in the strongest possible terms.

**Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart):** In the 10 years that I have been here I have not had an opportunity previously to support a motion moved by the member for Eyre, and I am delighted to do so today. I believe that this motion will be supported by all members, and indeed by everyone in South Australia. First, I would like to declare a personal interest in the construction of the rail link between Alice Springs and Darwin. I worked for 20 years for the Australian National Railways both in Port Augusta and Darwin; I have two brothers who worked for the A.N.R. in Port Augusta and Darwin, the officer in charge of the Central Region of the A.N.R., based at Alice Springs, is my brother-in-law; and my son and daughter-in-law live in Darwin. All told, I have quite a close relationship with the Territory.

I was interested to hear the comments made by the member for Fisher, who believes that the close relationship that exists between South Australia and the Territory is lessening. I do not believe that to be the case. We all know that, geographically, Adelaide is the closest capital city in Australia to Darwin and, in terms of trade, the people of the Territory still look to Adelaide as their main commercial base. This situation has weakened somewhat in recent years, mainly because of the difficulties that South Australians have faced, both in relation to the existing rail link between Port Augusta and Alice Springs and because the Stuart Highway has not provided the security of service that the link to Brisbane has provided.

Now that the rail link between Adelaide and Alice Springs has been completed and will be opened within a few weeks, any advantage that Brisbane might have had over South Australia as a direct and reliable supplier of goods to Darwin no longer exists, because South Australia will have a first class, flood-free rail link from Port Augusta through Tarcoola to Alice Springs, and a first class sealed highway from Alice Springs to Darwin. I have been concerned in recent years to see that, in Australia,

particularly in regard to the A.N.R., the emphasis has been away from railways when, throughout the rest of the world, there has been a tendency to move back to railways. This move back to railways has been brought about primarily, at least in recent years, by the fuel crisis that the world faces.

Any reasonable assessment of rail transport as opposed to its competitors would show that, once one goes 200 miles away from the source of the traffic, goods rail traffic becomes cheaper than its competitors. One of the factors that people rarely consider when comparing rail transport costs with those of its competitors is that railways pay for the provision and servicing of the permanent way, the railway track. However, road transport does not pay the cost of providing, sealing and maintaining roads. Also, air transport does not pay for the provision and maintenance of airports, and sea transport does not pay for the provision and maintenance of harbours. The only form of transport that is expected to pay the total cost of its operations is the railways. So, when people try to assess the viability of railways, they should take that factor into consideration.

Because I lived at Darwin and worked in the railways when they existed there (they have since been closed), I am aware of the beneficial effect that the railways can, and indeed will, have for the Territory. I believe that, within a few weeks, when the line between Tarcoola and Alice Springs is declared open by the Prime Minister or Princess Alexandra, the Prime Minister will announce that the construction of the rail link will continue and that it will go through to Darwin. If it is not the Prime Minister's intention to do so, I sincerely exhort him to reconsider that decision.

I am pleased that the South Australian Parliament and Government will be given this opportunity to tell the Prime Minister that we are strong supporters of the continuation of the railway line. However, it should also be made clear that this is a bipartisan view, and that the South Australian Opposition is also very much in favour of the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link being constructed. In my District, which is part of the wider Federal District of Grey, the Federal member for that District (Mr. Laurie Wallis) has been a very strong supporter of this action for many years, indeed ever since he became the Federal member for Grey in 1969. Of course, Mr. Wallis is very much aware that it was a Federal Government commitment in 1910, as a condition of the Northern Territory's being separated from South Australia, that this rail link should be constructed.

It has always appeared strange to me that over that time Governments have never felt justified to honour that commitment. There are a number of reasons why this line should be constructed. One matter which has been neglected over the years but which has been referred to by the two members who have spoken today is the matter of defence. It has always seemed strange to me that, when we have a Federal Government that is loud in its rhetoric about defence in Australia and the need to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on F 111 aircraft and our Navy, we have not felt compelled to construct a quick traffic corridor from the southern States to Darwin, which is in the forefront of Australia's defence.

Any Government that has been prepared to spend money on our Air Force, Navy and Army, and not to spend money on the basic component of defence, involving a corridor to our northern shores, is, seriously, not fair dinkum at all. There would be no purpose at all (and the member for Mitcham, who is very much involved in the defence forces in Australia, would be able to support me on this) of having aeroplanes based at

Amberley and a Navy based in Perth, or whatever, with no way of getting our ground troops from here to Darwin. If we were to be attacked, one would assume that it would happen somewhere on our northern shores and, by the time that our enemies were there and we had got together to transport our ground troops and their support equipment to the northern part of Australia, it would already have been lost.

If, for no other reason, we are to spend thousands of millions of dollars on defence (as we have been told by the Federal Minister of Defence, Mr. Killen, recently), this scheme ought to be a part of that defence payment. It ought not to be left merely to our transport authorities in Australia. It ought to be a defence commitment, and funds should be made available within the defence vote.

If the Federal Government is not prepared to do that, it is not serious about the defence of Australia. This will be a critical issue in the forthcoming election campaign. We have been told that it will be a khaki election. If that is the case, the Prime Minister can make his contribution to the khaki election by announcing at Alice Springs on 8 October or 9 October that the Federal Government will proceed with the construction of this rail link.

**Mr. Becker:** Don't you think that it will happen?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I am sure that it will; everyone knows that it will. It would not surprise me if that is not the reason why this motion is now before the House. Whatever the reason for it, the important thing is that the Opposition supports the motion.

**Mr. Becker:** As long as it doesn't run over any sacred sites.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The member for Hanson has just made a comment that is, I think, being used too often by people on his side of politics. The honourable member said that he supports the motion so long as the new line does not run over any sacred sites.

**Mr. Becker:** Fair enough.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** To me, that is ridiculous, because the Aboriginal people of this country have not been irresponsible at all in the declaration of sacred sites.

**Mr. McRae:** Archbishop Rayner certainly agrees with you.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Certainly he agrees with that point of view. If the member for Hanson and his colleague, the Premier of Western Australia, have no consideration for the rights of the indigenous people of this country, that is for the honourable member to explain. However, I for one, having had a fairly close relationship with Aborigines in the northern part of South Australia, as well as in Darwin, where I lived for some time, do not accept that the claims that Aborigines have made to sacred sites have been irresponsible.

Sometimes, it is difficult, because of the passage of time, for them to justify changing the system now, and the Aborigines will accept that. However, that does not deny the validity of their claims that sacred sites exist in areas where development is sought to take place and in other areas where it is not taking place. The snide remark inherent in the comment made by the member for Hanson is unwarranted, and I do not intend to give much more credence to his remarks.

The cost of the new line, which is, as the member for Eyre said, over \$400 000 000, is not excessive for the benefits that would be achieved. Economically, it can well be justified. The growth in freight that will accrue to South Australia will fully justify the expenditure involved. Indeed, the expenditure on this link will not only serve the purposes of South Australia and the Northern Territory but also it involves a rail link that is of national significance.

The construction of the railway line that has just been completed between Tarcoola and Alice Springs is the largest railway project currently in progress in the world. Of course, if work continues, it will just magnify the significance of that rail construction task. Railways have played a very important role in the development of Australia, and they still have a part to play.

In its new-found support for railways, will the South Australian Government come out very strongly in support of those persons who are attempting to encourage the Australian National Railways not to reduce the rail services that currently exist in South Australia? I believe the member for Rocky River will follow me in this debate and he is very well aware of the situation, because it is right in the middle of his electorate that the A.N.R. is cutting its rail service. Certainly, it is leaving the permanent way there and is not taking up the tracks, because it believes that the service will be renewed sometime in the future. However, I am a rather suspicious character and I believe that once the A.N.R. is allowed to discontinue services, it will be very difficult to encourage it to renew that activity at a future time.

There will be considerable benefit to Port Augusta and Whyalla and industry in those cities if this new rail link proceeds. The millions of concrete sleepers needed to be manufactured could well be manufactured at Port Augusta, and hopefully that will be the case. However, I rather suspect that the A.N.R. will seek to set up a sleeper construction plant at Alice Springs. I am sorry if that will be the case, but there may be some economic factors to support that view, if, in fact, that is the view. Of course, the steel railway lines will be manufactured by B.H.P. and, as I said earlier, that will not be an insignificant order.

For over 70 years, the railway workers of Australia have been seeking the completion of this link with Darwin. By "railway workers", I am referring to those persons who work in the railways; the people who are dedicated to railways; the people who believe that railways are the traffic mode of the future, and, increasingly, the rest of the country is accepting that. I do not need to say anything further, except that the Opposition gives its wholehearted support to the motion. The Opposition hopes that it will be voted on today and that a message will be sent to the Prime Minister and his Minister for Transport who have the authority to make the decision that we so urgently require. I am looking forward to being present at Alice Springs when the Prime Minister makes this announcement. I am absolutely certain that the Federal member for Grey, the Hon. L. G. Wallis, will be delighted to see the many years of effort that he has put into encouraging the Federal Government to make this decision come to fruition. The Opposition supports the motion.

**Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River):** I support the motion moved by the member for Eyre. I concur with the sentiments expressed by the member for Stuart in this bi-partisan approach to what is a very important aspect of national development within Australia. I would like to comment on two points before specifically speaking to the motion. The first point relates to an interjection by the member for Stuart earlier in the debate, and the second point relates to his invitation to respond to some of his comments.

First, in relation to the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Mr. Paul Everingham, I do not believe there is an Australian who has more fiercely supported the establishment of the rail link between Adelaide and Darwin. I believe his endeavours across Australia deserve the greatest commendation. I believe he will be one of the

principal architects in bringing to the attention of the Australian people, and more specifically of the Commonwealth Government, the responsibility that exists to establish and complete this link across Australia.

**An honourable member:** A real nationalist.

**Mr. OLSEN:** He is a real nationalist in the true sense of the word. If his efforts are successful, hopefully culminating with an announcement by the Federal Government of its intention to proceed with this link, he will have achieved something rather significant for national development within Australia. His enthusiasm and drive not only within his own State but through his programme throughout Australia to convince other States of the necessity for this link, have attracted the support of States throughout Australia—and rightly so. I am quite sure that as a result of those efforts he will have the reward that he is seeking at the moment.

The member for Stuart also referred to the deficit of the A.N.R. in country areas and the current suggested programme for reducing some of those services in country areas. Part of my speech today will be devoted to the deficits of the A.N.R. and how one should look at those deficits in a broad context and not in narrow terms. The construction of the rail link between Adelaide and Darwin is a far different situation from that applying to rail services in South Australian settled areas. In some areas, some of which are in my electorate (to which the member for Stuart referred), residents can be better serviced by road transport than currently existing rail transport. Such is the case where people have to get on a feeder bus service in the early hours of the morning and, halfway through their journey to metropolitan Adelaide, have to transfer to a rail service; this is inconvenient and makes for a longer journey.

When the Adelaide to Crystal Brook link has been standardised, those persons will not have the convenience of disembarking at the Adelaide Railway Station; they will have to disembark at the new terminal to be built by the A.N.R. at Keswick. Therefore, passengers on the services referred to by the honourable member will be seriously inconvenienced at the Adelaide end, unless some facility is provided to take them into the city area of Adelaide. I am quite sure that the State Government will take a very responsible attitude in relation to the Federal Government's announcement on those railway lines. In fact, as a result of representations by the Minister of Transport, the matter has been deferred until the end of this year to give the State Transport Authority adequate time in which to assess the alternative transport services available to persons within the affected electorates, principally my electorate, in the northern part of this State. If the State Transport Authority is unable to provide equivalent or better services for those persons to the metropolitan area, I will encourage the Minister of Transport (and I am sure he will do this) to lodge an objection with the Commonwealth Government in relation to any cessation of passenger railway services to those areas. The two matters I have referred to are quite separate from the motion, and I wanted to isolate them in my speech this afternoon. I also wish to refer to the Government's introduction of the Bee-line bus services to service the bus depot operating for the benefit of country people of South Australia.

**Mr. Keneally:** Tying in with the Alice Springs to Darwin line.

**Mr. OLSEN:** Indeed, that is quite right. People travelling to the Adelaide bus depot will now have access to the services of the free Bee-line bus within the city area, a service similar to the service already operating in the metropolitan area.

Thus, country people are getting equivalent services, tying in with bus services, for example, from Alice Springs and areas north, as the member for Stuart rightly points out. I am sure that factor, amongst many others, in servicing people in the northern areas of the State will be the prime consideration of this Government in determining its attitude as to whether it lodges a formal objection or not with the Commonwealth Government in relation to the cessation of passenger rail services.

The 70-year unfilled obligation of the Commonwealth to build a railway line between Darwin and Alice Springs has taken on a new importance and a new dimension. That obligation is indeed a legislative and constitutional requirement originating in an agreement between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments when the Commonwealth assumed responsibility for the Northern Territory. When challenged by the former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, the response was that the Commonwealth had not met its obligation, but that did not necessarily mean that it would not meet it some time. The serious question is—when? Surely 70 years is far too long to wait for the fulfilment of that obligation on behalf of the Commonwealth Government.

It appears that, when we relinquished our rights and obligations in relation to the Northern Territory, the bonus for South Australians at that time was a railway line to Darwin, but the agreement did not contain a completion date. We relied on goodwill: so much for goodwill in that respect. It would be an indictment of our system if that line is not completed, certainly by the bi-centenary year of 1988. It is an objective towards which we ought to strive.

The new importance of the line has resulted from the rapid rise in oil costs, leading to demands for energy resources other than oil. Bad weather can retard the present transport flow, adding unnecessary delays and transport costs for goods and services from southern capitals to Darwin. Hence, close links have been established with Queensland for the supply of those goods and services, to the detriment of South Australian job opportunities and South Australian business concerns. The opening up of opportunities for South Australia will be important for wholesalers and retailers alike. Large and small businesses will be able to expand and open new markets in the Northern Territory, provided we can establish a reliable, effective and efficient transport link. Indeed, the establishment of the rail link between Adelaide and Darwin, I believe, will be the catalyst for opening up those job opportunities that will flow through the system and down the line.

Other compelling factors such as defence and tourism have been referred to by previous speakers. South-East Asia, with its huge population, is no doubt the market of the future for Australian businesses and manufactured products. A port like Darwin, close to that market, with a connected railway line to southern Australia, has enormous potential. While the project will require vast sums, of which previous speakers on both sides have spoken, the benefits that will flow will make that investment appear small.

I think the point we should be making is that the railway does not have to be justified; if any justification is required, it is for the Commonwealth to justify its failure to fulfil its commitment. The advent of self government and the changed constitutional status of the Northern Territory present a completely new aspect to the case for the railway. The emergence of the Northern Territory to a position of partnership in the Commonwealth requires new perspectives about its basic infrastructural needs, and this argument is sufficient on its own to justify the railway line.

Another aspect in relation to support for the development of this line and establishing the link relates to the establishment of national assets in Australia. I quote from a report prepared by the Northern Territory Government in relation to establishing this line, as follows:

Decisions to construct national assets must be based on suitably broad national perspectives. The particular emphasis of these perspectives will, of course, depend on the nature of the asset under consideration. In some cases defence may be a primary concern. In other circumstances judgments may need to be based on an assessment of what is appropriate to Australia's present level of maturity and prosperity, or what is consistent with broadly conceived objectives of national development.

The Chairman of the Australian National Railways Commission has pointed out that Australia is one of the few countries in the world where there are still frontiers to be crossed by large-scale development railways. He suggests that a north-south rail land bridge would be a project which would capture the imagination of, and be supported by, most Australians.

I believe his assessment in that respect is, indeed, accurate. The report continues:

It is perfectly proper to assess when the Darwin to Alice Springs rail link should be built in such terms. To suggest that a decision on the railway must be based on—or must even be strongly influenced by—some concept of a financial cost-benefit fails to give adequate recognition to the scope of the project. National assets cannot be viewed this way.

I hope that the member for Stuart will take account of those comments, which I think are pertinent to his interjection and remarks earlier in the debate. Similarly, judgments about the construction of a new Parliament House in Canberra or a Supreme Court building require a particular blend of considerations that are not primarily financial. Nor would a narrow pre-eminently financial approach to a Darwin to Alice Springs rail link be consistent with decisions taken over the years in Australia to construct the railway network.

The 1937 Report of the Board of Inquiry into Land and Land Industries of the Northern Territory of Australia states:

... we are apt to forget the great part railways have played in the development of our continent. Few, if any, countries owe their progress to railways as does Australia. In order to develop our natural resources, it has been necessary to construct a greater mileage of railways in relation to population than any other country in the world. Our great exporting industries, which give Australia financial stability, could never have been built up without the co-operative assistance of the railways. Our railways have been, and still are, a great national asset.

We should also take into account the impact on the Northern Territory of a rail link. The Territory has become a disadvantaged part of Australia in relation to other States. Its infra-structure deficiencies have left it unable to compete for investment and development projects on an equal basis with other regions better served by those infra-structure costs. There is evidence that the pastoral industry is sensitive to rail transport possibilities, and that certainly applies in the Northern Territory for the transport of cattle to the appropriate markets.

It would be fair to say that it has been pointed out accurately that a large share of the pastoral expansion in southern regions of the Territory can be attributed to the extension of the southern rail link to Alice Springs. That boosted settlement and production in that region. By extending the rail link further to Darwin, we will open up the opportunities for that market, and therefore reduce

the serious impediment that the lack of the rail link through to Darwin has had on the development of the Northern Territory.

Indeed, South Australia is inextricably linked, in those development projects, to expanding markets and to the supply of those markets both to and from the Northern Territory. Therefore, the connecting of the link from Tarcoola through to Darwin will deliver maximum impact, because it will open up the cattle producing country of the Barkly Tablelands and the Victoria River districts to South Australian and other southern State markets. It is clear that the development pattern of the Northern Territory has been adversely affected by the failure to press on with the railway link.

The consequences of that existing transport deficiency can be easily spelled out. The strategic interests of the nation as a whole, including, most importantly, defence considerations, are prejudiced. Despite the mirth that was generated by one or two members earlier in relation to defence requirements, at least I am proud to be part of a Party that has taken its defence responsibilities and requirements nationally, over a number of years, most seriously for the benefit of all Australians, and I trust that it will continue to do so. The opportunities for national development in the interests of all Australians are impeded and the nationally accepted policy of closer settlement and the development of rural areas are largely pre-empted with that development link.

I want to make one or two further remarks in relation to A.N.R. deficits, to which the member for Stuart referred in his speech. In broad terms, many sections of railway in Australia are not presently viable in the narrow financial term. The sizable deficits incurred by the various State Governments to support their railway operations or their bus operations or, for example, in South Australia, the transport authority deficit, are adequate confirmation of that point. Nonetheless, those State transport authorities have continued to operate those railways, and whilst seeking to rationalise them they are clearly committed to their continued operation. Therefore, the view is that they are justified on financial grounds because of the service that they provide to the community. Railways are justified on economic and other grounds, even if it cannot be established that they are financially viable in the narrow sense of the term.

The sizable deficits incurred by A.N.R. suggests that the attitude of the Commonwealth is not so much different from that of the States despite the charter that has been given to A.N.R. over the next eight years, I think, that will remain. State Governments offer subsidies to their railway systems to cover their deficits, and the appropriateness of this is confirmed in the machinery of the Grants Commission applying throughout Australia. The reason for this attitude is quite obvious: economic considerations with respect to railways or any other transport system must reflect the relevance of that transport system to the economic life of the community which it is serving. In other words, a farming community or, indeed, a mining community may be heavily dependent on railway transport to the extent that viability of the industry in that area, and consequently the community itself, will be primarily related to the existence of the transport link. In this context the proper perspective for an economic assessment for the railway line will be the economics of the region of which the railway line is but one aspect. In that, I think the member for Stuart and I are of the same opinion.

The question of viability is therefore not so much a question whether the Darwin to Alice Springs line will be viable, but rather a question of the railways contribution to the viability of the Northern Territory, South Australia,

and other southern States of Australia. The Northern Territory has a narrow productive base and, while development opportunities for the coming year will see some broadening of this base, it will nonetheless remain the case for some years to come that virtually all goods and services required in the top part of Australia will have to be imported. This narrow productive base makes a minimum-cost, reliable and secure transport link to industrial regions in South Australia a necessity. The railway is the only transport mode which satisfactorily meets that requirement to overcome weather conditions and other factors that have significantly impeded the development of the Northern Territory and the subsequent and associated and linked development of South Australia. Therefore, it is my pleasure to support the motion ably moved by the member for Eyre.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** Likewise, with other members this afternoon, I wish to indicate my support for the construction of the rail link from Alice Springs to Darwin. I do not anticipate taking the entire time available to me, because I think it would be worth while to get this matter to a vote before the dinner adjournment. So, unlike the previous speech which was almost as long as the railway line itself, my comments will be somewhat shorter.

This matter has been going on a very long time in Australian history. Indeed, one can look back to the *Hansard* of some years ago, because we are only 22 239 days away from a motion that was passed in this House on 29 October 1919, and it is an interesting one, Sir, and I have no doubt that you are particularly interested in this matter. The motion passed by the House was as follows:

That the Government immediately urge upon the Commonwealth Government the necessity of giving immediate effect to the agreement made on December 7, 1907, between the State of South Australia and the Commonwealth, and contained in the Northern Territory Surrender Act, 1907, providing that the Commonwealth shall construct or cause to be constructed, a railway line from Port Darwin southwards to a point on the northern boundary of South Australia proper.

A very long time ago, Sir, that motion was passed. The word "immediately" seems to have got lost—61 years lost. The fact that now the campaign is being started in various quarters of Australia once more to urge the construction of that line can only be regarded not only as a matter of some urgency but also as a matter surely of some relief. As has been mentioned, it will be a boost to Australia, and it will be a boost to the role that railways play within the transport of passengers, but more particularly the transport of freight within this country.

It has been implied that the construction of such a line would be deemed to be a national act of faith, and inasmuch as it refers to railways that certainly must be so. Rail as a form of transport over the last two decades has suffered increasingly from many allegations about its ability to compete with other forms of transport, about its ability to serve the needs of the Australian community. A decision to construct this line would remind the community just how vital railways are to the development of any nation, and perhaps we might see a return to a more impressive and useful role for railways than has existed over the previous decades, as I have mentioned.

Not only will it be a boost to Australia as a whole, to the national unity of the nation and to the development of the nation as a whole, but also, it will be, as we have had pointed out to us, a boost to South Australia in particular. It will give South Australian industry a much closer access to the South-East Asian market, a market which in the years to come must play a much greater significance for

Australia. The hundreds of millions of people in that region, as they reach higher income levels, will continue to purchase more and more goods that we are able to provide. We must, therefore, be provided with a means of transfer from the producer to the consumer, and this national railway link will help to do that.

We are hoping to increase trade in years to come with South-East Asia. One can look, for example, at market garden produce. It has been suggested that we should stimulate the export of market garden produce to that region. The construction of this railway line will enable perishable goods to be transported much more easily than do the present available modes of transport.

It will make it more cost efficient than air transport and certainly more time efficient than ship transport, which must travel right the way around Australia from Port Adelaide. Furthermore, the construction of this railway line will provide a tremendous employment boost, not only for this State but, indeed, for the communities of the Northern Territory as well. The construction of the line will be a national project of great significance. Perhaps, at this moment, this is what this country is crying out for—employment projects of very great significance. One can perhaps start thinking that maybe other projects could be added to the list, but for the moment we are dealing with this project in particular.

To make the line as useful as it might be, one would hope that the Federal Government, when it accepts the responsibility that it should have accepted 61 years ago to build this line, will realise that there are two other things that will also be needed. The first is the construction of an efficient handling facility at the port of Darwin to enable the easy and efficient trans-shipment of goods that are to go on to the railway, or have come from the railway. If it ends up that the efficiency of that port is not of a high standard, then indeed the railway line itself will be prejudiced.

Likewise, one would hope that there would be efforts to invest in improved trans-shipment facilities somewhere within the Iron Triangle. The Iron Triangle has the possibility of becoming a major centre of goods transfer within this nation. It is already on the central point of the East-West railway line, and now it has the potential to become a major point on the North-South railway line. That will be maximised only if the trans-shipment and transfer facilities for freight are of a very high standard indeed, and the investment that that will call upon will itself be quite a significant figure.

We know that the construction of a railway line will stimulate industrial investment within the Iron Triangle region because, in effective terms, the Iron Triangle will no longer be on the outer perimeter of the South-Eastern boomerang of Australian industrial development stretching from that area right round to Brisbane. It will become more essentially central to a national industrial development pattern involving both the north and the west as well.

Some comments have been made this afternoon about the possibility of passenger transport on that line, and much talk has been made about the efficiency of railways in carrying passengers over long distances. The real benefit, of course, will be not in passenger transport but in freight transport. That is not to say, however, that I hope that railway passenger services would not in fact be a component of the line. It was a pity that the Commonwealth Government cut out the Darwin to Larrimah passenger service in the middle part of this decade. I know that they were making substantial losses, but I believe they had established a pattern that could have been built on in years ahead as fuel costs increased.

I return to the advantages that a railway service has for

freight shipments. One can see that not only can this railway line compete with shipping traffic around Australia, but that it can also compete with the truck traffic in Australia. I mentioned some moments ago that the transport of goods by railway to Darwin from South Australia will mean a great reduction in distance travelled when compared to the distance travelled by ships, which have to travel around Australia from southern ports. Not only will there be a time reduction but also it will result, ultimately, in energy consumption patterns not too far different from those for ships, in total. Therefore, any trade to South-East Asia and Japan can only benefit from those cost reductions.

We already know that the railways are much more energy efficient in transporting freight than are trucks. The truck traffic that presently carries all of the freight north will be able to be replaced by much more cost efficient transport, by the railways. It has been mentioned that South Australia is losing to the tune of \$70 000 000 a year because of the absence of this railway line. In fact, I suggest that that figure will be much higher indeed, because once a railway line is built the freight volume will escalate markedly due to cheaper freight tariffs.

There are one or two other brief comments I wish to make in relation to the line before concluding my remarks. First, one comes back to the question of passenger transport. I think it is a pity that at this point in this debate the A.N.R. intends to build a passenger terminal at Keswick and not to utilise the facilities of the Adelaide central railway station. I do not believe that that will be of benefit to passenger traffic. I believe it will cause inconvenience. Cities overseas that have more than one passenger railway terminal are not efficiently catering for their incoming or outgoing travellers. It is a pity that we are now moving in that direction rather than seeking to have the one passenger terminal, as we have had all these years.

One other thing on the question of passengers is that I hope that the construction of the line will mean that communities in outback South Australia and the Northern Territory can look forward to reasonable passenger services being provided. We have already seen a number of cutbacks by A.N.R. in country passenger services. That has been a sad thing. I do not believe that the A.N.R. has fully appreciated the social value involved in that service that it was providing. I hope that that philosophy will die as the new line is constructed.

One comment made by the member for Rocky River that amazed me was when he was talking about the Bee-line bus, because I wonder, given the debate on which we are presently engaged, whether he was proposing an amendment to the Act so that the Bee-line bus could go from North Terrace to the Northern Territory. I could not quite see the relevance of his remarks to the facilities here. One wondered whether he was going to say a railway was not needed at all and to suggest instead the introduction of an O'Bahn bus system; that would have been the ultimate joke.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I think the honourable member for Salisbury should link his remarks to the motion before the Chair.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. One final point: in the two days of sitting this week it has been very impressive to see that there has been a great deal of consensus on major issues. We had, yesterday, members of the Government realising that our sort of approach to the South Australian Gas Company was, indeed, the correct one. Today, again, we have a great deal of unity in this House about a national railway line linking north and south. Such a consensus and

bipartisanship is a positive and productive thing. I strongly support the construction of this railway line. I call on the Federal Government, as the motion does, likewise to support it. I hope that, in this sense, the urgency of it will become more apparent to the Federal Government and that it will not take another 61 years to answer this motion, as has been the case previously.

Motion carried.

## PUBLIC TRANSPORT SYSTEM

**Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd):** I move:

That this House commends the Government on its decision to immediately proceed with the provision of a modern rapid public transport system utilising all the advantages of conventional and guided bus-ways, to serve the people of the North-Eastern suburbs of Adelaide, and its associated decision to restore and develop the River Torrens in line with the River Torrens Study Report prepared by Hassell and Partners Pty. Ltd.

This afternoon I would like to put forward, first, the aspects which the Government took into account in arriving at its decision to implement a busway system to the north-eastern suburbs, and there is no doubt whatsoever that there are many points in favour of such a busway proposal. Cost, convenience and comfort are just three, and there are many others as we will see. Therefore, I will initially outline the advantages of the decision the Government has made and then, secondly, rebut totally the emotional and inaccurate statements that have been brought forward by members opposite in an attempt to denigrate this Government's decision. Honourable members will see clearly that, when facts alone are considered, the decision was the obviously correct one.

South Australia will no longer be left with a grossly expensive monument to the previous Minister of Transport, but instead will have an extremely economical, rapid and efficient public transport system which will be one of the most modern in the world.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that the Government's decision to implement a busway incorporating all the benefits of both the Mercedes-Benz guideway system and the conventional busway is the only action that could have been taken by any responsible Government.

Unfortunately, members opposite and members of the Labor Party in the north-eastern suburbs have attempted to belittle the decision of the Government. Instead of putting facts before the people of the north-east, they have brought forward a large number of emotional and incorrect statements. Some of the arguments which are presently being put forward in my district are indicative of the fact that the Labor Party realises that the decision that has been made is a good one, that the points which have been put forward by the Minister of Transport, the member for Newland and myself are irrefutable and, as a result, they have resorted to a smear campaign and the tactic of putting forward total untruths.

It is my intention this afternoon to set the record straight. As I stated previously, there are a large number of factors which influenced the Government to make the decision which it did and, far from being a so-called political decision, it is a decision which is extremely responsible, for it provides residents of the north-eastern suburbs with the most modern transport system in the world at a fraction of the cost of any other alternative. This leads me to the first point that is greatly in favour of a busway proposal, that is, cost.

When we look at the comparative costs of this Government's proposal against the previous Govern-

ment's light rail transit system, we see most clearly that the busway comes out far in front.

In 1979 dollars, the cost of the busway proposal is \$39 000 000. Comparing this with the cost of the Labor Party's light rail transit proposal, as put forward to the electors prior to the last election (also in 1979 dollars), it is \$115 000 000. Then, when we look at the final costing at completion in 1986, allowing for a 10 per cent per annum inflation rate, we find the cost of the Government's busway proposal is \$60 000 000, whereas the cost of the previous Government's light rail transit system is \$178 000 000.

Therefore, initially there are huge savings to the people of South Australia, with absolutely no disadvantage whatsoever to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. In fact, as I proceed this afternoon, honourable members will see that the Government's proposals are, in fact, superior, even though cheaper than those espoused by members opposite.

Members opposite have attempted to portray the cost advantage of the busway as short-term only and to say that the short-term cost advantages of the bus proposal disappear in the long-term. Of course this is quite false, and is but one example of the way in which members opposite have deliberately avoided facts. The truth is that in the year 2005, at which time the cost for the Government's busway proposal will be at its greatest disadvantage when compared with a light rail system, we find that the cost, in 1979 dollars, of the busway proposal rises to \$64 000 000. Honourable members should remember that this is at the time when all of the buses will have been replaced.

At the same time, the cost of the light rail transit system, in 1979 dollars, would have risen to \$126 000 000. Therefore, even at the time of greatest disadvantage for the busway, one finds that the cost of the bus proposal of this Government is only one half, 50 per cent, of that of the proposal put forward by the previous Government.

Another point which must be borne in mind at this time and about which I will enlarge later is the fact that, in spite of these huge cost differences, the Government's proposal is one which will provide all residents of all suburbs in the north-eastern area with a rapid transport system, whereas the previous Government was offering a tramway between Tea Tree Plaza and the city only.

I must repeat that there is absolutely no contra argument to the fact that this Government's proposal is far more responsible when considering cost than that put forward by members opposite, and the attempted clouding of the cost issue by using mythical long-term figures is quite fallacious. Both in the short-term and in the long-term, we find that the costs for the busway are always far less than those for the tramway.

In 1986 honourable members will find that the Government will have saved \$118 000 000 over the proposal put forward by the previous Government. This means there is \$118 000 000 left to invest in other public transport systems and public works developments. Honourable members should not forget that the \$118 000 000 saved is double the total cost of the completed north-eastern rapid transport system put forward by this Government.

These figures absolutely condemn members opposite for their desire to proceed with a monument to Mr. Virgo, a monument which this State can ill afford, and one which, fortunately, we will not have to pay for.

**Dr. Billard:** No more Monartos.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** That is for sure. The next major factor which influenced the Government's decision is the far greater convenience offered to the residents of the

north-eastern suburbs. As I have said earlier, in spite of its astronomical cost, the light rail scheme would have serviced only Tea Tree Plaza, whereas the busway proposal services all of the north-eastern suburbs.

Under the light rail scheme, any resident living away from Tea Tree Plaza would have been required to use either private transport or a bus to get to Tea Tree Plaza, and then board the tram. If a person were to use public transport all of the way, say, for example, from his home in Banksia Park to the city, it would have meant boarding a bus in Banksia Park, travelling by that bus to Tea Tree Plaza, where he would have been required to leave the bus and board the tram for the trip to the city. This would be inconvenient, and a number of constituents to whom I have spoken in the north-eastern suburbs have stated quite categorically that, given the choice of a system with no changeover compared with that of a system with a changeover, they would infinitely prefer the former.

This was pointed out to me by one gentleman in particular, who said, "Once I get on the bus, I open the paper, and I do not want to have to put it down until I get to the city."

Members opposite have made all sorts of ridiculous claims that there would have been very little inconvenience or delay in the changeover from a feeder bus to the tram. In fact, one supporter of members opposite has publicly stated that the changeover would only take 10 seconds. Of course, this is utterly ridiculous unless one happens to be the world's fastest runner and could be first off the bus as soon as it pulled up, and could run across and jump on a departing tram.

Other members opposite have put forward times that vary from 30 seconds to two minutes for a changeover. I believe that even the two-minute changeover would occur only under the ideal conditions of pulling in two minutes before a tram was leaving, and that all passengers on the bus could have disembarked and boarded the tram. Let me concede that possibility. Let me say that on some occasions there could be a two-minute changeover. On the majority of occasions, however, it would have to be considerably longer.

Let us consider the homeward journey, for it is on the return journey that we find a tremendous difference in convenience. Trams would have been running frequently from the city to Tea Tree Plaza, but the time of departure for a bus to a particular suburb, of course, will not be every few minutes.

Here, buses could be departing from the plaza for a specific suburb anything from 30 minutes to 60 minutes apart so that our resident from Banksia Park, perhaps in the morning, would have been able to catch a bus and get over on to the tram in two minutes for the journey into the city, but what happens when he comes home on one of the trams departing every two or three minutes from the city and finds that he arrives at the plaza and the next bus is not going for 30 minutes? I am sure we can see that, here, there will be tremendous delays at the interchange.

With the busway proposal, none of these disadvantages need occur. In the morning our resident from Banksia Park will board the bus which then conveys him to the Modbury transport corridor, via Tea Tree Plaza, where it then continues on its journey to the city at 80 km/h. He then arrives at the city to go about his day's work. On the return journey he will know exactly at what time buses to Banksia Park will be departing from the city. He will catch such a bus, travel via the transport corridor to Tea Tree Plaza and then, remaining on that same bus, complete his journey home. There will be no need for interchange at all.

Now let us look at travel times—another plus for the busway. Members opposite have misleadingly stated that



the tramway would provide a quicker trip to the city. This is true only for the section from the Tea Tree Plaza to the city, on which the tram would have been perhaps two or three minutes quicker than a bus travelling along the busway. But for any resident living away from the plaza (as most residents in the north-eastern suburbs do), the total trip by busway will be quicker than would have been the case by feederbus and then tramway.

I have already pointed out that there would have been considerable delays at the changeover point at Tea Tree Plaza if the previous Government's proposal had been proceeded with, whereas, with the busway, there will be no loss of time at that point, and any two or three minutes lost between the plaza and the city is more than made up for by the removal of the necessity for a changeover.

Let us now consider the aspect of buses between Tea Tree Plaza and the outer suburbs. Members opposite again are totally illogical in their arguments in that they have stated that the roadway systems in the suburbs of Tea Tree Gully will not be able to handle the buses. Of course they do not mention, when putting this argument forward, that the light rail proposal of their own required feederbuses to travel over exactly the same roads through exactly the same suburbs to pick up and set down passengers.

So, to state that the Government proposal provides for buses that will not be able to negotiate the roads, or that will cause road damage is of course, ludicrous. We have heard arguments put forward that the articulated buses which will be used will not be able to negotiate the roads of Tea Tree Gully. This is farcical. Articulated buses are able to negotiate exactly the same routes as those buses presently operated by the S.T.A. They are just as manoeuvrable, and their axle loads are no greater; in fact, they are lighter than buses presently in use. Therefore, the system proposed by this Government, with buses operating through to the rapid transport corridor, will be just as viable as the feeder bus system that the previous Government proposed.

Those arguments put forward, particularly by the previous member for Newland on this aspect, show yet again either his total ignorance of the facts or his total inability to put forward truthful statements. When we consider Mr. Klunder's performance on the Modbury Hospital, I think it is probably a combination of both, and it is unfortunate and to be regretted that he in particular, and members opposite in general, are placing before the public total misrepresentations of the facts.

Now let us consider comfort. Under the previous Government's light rail proposal, during peak hour travel trams would have been carrying approximately 170 passengers, of whom 90 would have been standing at the rate of four per square metre. Now this, of course, would be extremely uncomfortable for all concerned. I think they are under the impression that we are all very thin in the north-eastern suburbs. With this Government's bus way proposal for the use of articulated buses, there will be no passengers standing. Even with non-articulated buses, under the proposals put forward and the number of buses that will be in operation, very few passengers, if any, will be required to stand. Therefore, when we look at comfort, we find yet again that the bus way proposal comes out well in front.

Now let us consider another argument put forward by members opposite. They state that the system is unproven, untried, and will not work. I would like to lay that sort of statement to rest by quoting some points that have been put forward by a completely independent expert, Mr. Peter Burden, in an article which he wrote for the *National Times* headed "The Coming Transport Revolution". And,

I might mention, these are just a few of the points put forward by Mr. Burden. Also, I mention that Mr. Burden is used by members of the Australian Electric Traction Association as a source of reference for their own report on the north-eastern transport proposals, to which I shall refer later. So, I doubt that his qualifications will be queried by members opposite.

Mr. Burden, speaking about the Mercedes-Benz guideway systems, states:

Its promise is for low cost, high convenience of service and established standards of comfort. It is the result of almost a decade of planning and hard work.

He then goes on to say:

The advantage of the system is that it is low cost, and the cost of setting up a length of guided track is far below that of new roadmaking and far less again than that of a new rail system.

He continues in that article by stating:

The O'Bahn system has been around for some time and it quite obviously works, and works very well. Its promise for mass transit is enormous, and the things it can do are astounding. The O'Bahn system has already proved itself as a transit system.

He then goes on to say:

One was installed late last year as a feeder in the northern German city of Hamburg. More than 300 000 passengers were successfully carried, and the Kassel test facility has also been important in demonstrating it.

The article then goes on to point out that this month there will be a guided busway system in operation in Essen, and there is another which will be commencing in the West German city of Regensburg, where the system will be operating underground. Other guided busway systems are to be introduced in Bangkok and Heidelberg.

It is most interesting to note that in West Germany a guided busway is replacing a present light rail system, the reason being that it offers the same comfort and convenience as the previous light rail, but it can be established at a fraction of the cost. Mr. Burden then goes on to say that the advantages of a guided busway system are immense when compared to light rail. He states:

A difficult section of an O'Bahn network can be constructed at minimum cost, using materials which are made in basic modules. This means further savings on the cost of construction and—

and I stress the next few words—

better still, less encroachment of the existing environment.

It is here that I will digress from Mr. Burden's article and outline the distinct advantages of the busway proposal in relation to the environment. The section of guided busway will be along the Torrens River. In this area, by using a guided busway, there will be the minimum possible effect on the environment. The guideway offers the narrowest of all possible public transport systems. It is narrower than the corridor required for light rail and therefore will have a lesser visual impact on the environment than would the light rail system. Additionally, initially the buses will be operating on diesel power. This means there will be no unsightly overhead wires at all.

The present buses developed by Mercedes-Benz, which, I am sure members opposite will acknowledge, is one of the leaders in the world in technology, are only a shade noisier than a light rail tram. With the tree screening planned by the Government, there will be no noise differential away from the tracks caused by a busway or a tramway.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** We can encapsulate the diesel engine.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** Yes, thank you, we can encapsulate the diesel engine. also, with pollution control devices, the

buses will have a minimum effect on the atmosphere. The Government's decision again is shown in its strength. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### PORTUS HOUSE

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's resolution:

That in the opinion of this Council any decision by the Government to demolish the property at 1 Park Terrace, Gilberton, known as Portus House, is premature. Portus House is a significant part of the built heritage of South Australia and must be retained while any option exists for alternative transport corridors to meet the needs of the residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

**Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart):** I move:

That the resolution be agreed to.

I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

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

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

It has three main objects. First, it empowers the Attorney-General, with leave of the Full Court, to appeal against a sentence imposed on a person who has been convicted on information. Secondly, it empowers a court, on the application of the Attorney-General, to reserve a question of law, arising in the course of a trial leading to the acquittal of an accused person, for the opinion of the Full Court. These two major reforms both arise from recommendations of the Mitchell Committee, although in the case of reservation of a question of law arising upon trial the terms of the Bill depart to some extent from the recommendations of the committee. Thirdly, the Bill removes the restriction whereby only one consecutive sentence of imprisonment in respect of a felony may be imposed by a court at any one time upon an offender.

The Government believes that it has a duty to ensure, as far as possible, not only that sentences passed upon convicted persons provide an adequate safeguard to the community against criminal conduct, but also that sentences are fairly and uniformly imposed by the courts. As the law stands at the moment, the Crown has no rights of appeal against a sentence imposed upon an accused person who is convicted upon indictment. Thus the Government lacks power to take appropriate action where such a sentence appears manifestly inadequate or anomalous. The proposed amendment should enable the Full Court to formulate more comprehensive and consistent policies on sentencing than are presently possible under a system that allows only for appeals by the convicted person. A further amendment proposed by the

Bill, which is to some extent consequential, provides that a convicted person who appeals against sentence does not thereby expose himself to the possibility that the sentence will be increased. A sentence will in future be increased in severity only on an appeal by the Crown.

The second major amendment allows the Attorney-General to apply for reservation of a question of law, arising in proceedings leading to the acquittal of an accused person, for the opinion of the Full Court. This amendment differs somewhat from the recommendations of the Mitchell Committee. The committee suggested that there should be a right of appeal, and that the Full Court should have a discretion, if the appeal were allowed, as to whether the accused person should be again placed on trial. There are certain practical difficulties inherent in that proposal and, in any event, the Government believes that an accused person, once acquitted by a jury, should not be again placed in jeopardy. The amendment, as proposed by the Bill, will enable the Crown to exercise a responsible role in building up a coherent and consistent body of criminal law, without prejudicing decisions made by juries in favour of accused persons.

The third major amendment empowers the Supreme Court and the District Criminal Courts to impose any number of cumulative sentences of imprisonment upon a convicted person, whether cumulative upon a sentence then being served, or any sentence to be served. At present, the courts are held to have the power to make only one sentence of imprisonment cumulative upon another, where the offences involved are felonies (that is, those crimes considered historically as the most serious and designated as felonies by the law). There is no such restriction in relation to misdemeanours (that is, the less serious crimes). It is absurd, in the Government's view to preserve the archaic distinction between felonies and misdemeanours in this area, and heed has been taken of the long-standing pleas from our Supreme Court to abolish the restriction in relation to felonies. The Hon. Mr. Justice King said, in the judgment of the Full Court recently delivered by him in Spiero's case (22 S.A.S.R. 543):

I invite the attention of the Legislature to the need for an amendment to the law to remove the limit upon the number of cumulative sentences which may be imposed. The limitation in the existing law hinders the courts in framing sentences which are proportionate of the crimes committed, and may encourage criminals to suppose that in some circumstances additional crimes can be committed with impunity. I do not think that the danger that such an amendment might result in crushing aggregate sentences is a real one. A judge should take into account the total period of imprisonment which would result from his sentence and from other current sentences imposed by him or other judges, and an appellate court is clearly entitled to moderate the sentences on the ground that, although each individual sentence can be justified in isolation, the total effect of the sentences is unduly burdensome.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment differs from the Mitchell Committee recommendations on the matter. That committee recommended that the current restriction of only one consecutive sentence in relation to felonies should be preserved, and extended to apply also in relation to misdemeanours. It is proposed that the operation of the amendment will be delayed until a similar amendment to the Justices Act is made in relation to summary offences.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides that the court may make any number of sentences of imprisonment cumulative upon any other sentence of imprisonment being served, or to be served, by a convicted person. Clause 4 removes an obsolete transitional provision.

Clause 5 provides that the Attorney-General may delegate his power to appeal, or to apply for the reservation of a question of law, to any legal practitioner in the service of the Crown. Such a delegation may be proved by certificate of the Solicitor-General, Crown Solicitor or Crown Prosecutor.

Clause 6 provides that the Attorney-General may apply for reservation of a question of law, arising in proceedings leading to an acquittal, for the opinion of the Full Court. Clause 7 provides that the determination of the Full Court shall not disturb an acquittal. It provides also that the accused person is entitled to his taxed costs in any event in such proceedings, or if he does not care to appear, the Attorney-General must himself instruct counsel to submit arguments that might have been advanced on the question by the defendant.

Clause 8 provides that the anonymity of an acquitted person must be preserved in any report on proceedings for the determination of a question of law arising out of his trial. A person who publishes, through any of the media, material which discloses the identity of such an acquitted person, will be guilty of an offence bearing a penalty of \$1 000. Clause 9 provides that the Attorney-General may, with leave of the Full Court, appeal against sentence. Clause 10 provides that the Full Court is not to exercise its powers to increase the severity of a sentence except on an appeal by the Crown.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 27 August. Page 682.)

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** The merits of this Bill are such that the Opposition indicates its support for the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"How fines, etc., to be shown in accounts and dealt with."

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The Opposition has already indicated its support for the Bill. This clause refers to the amount of fines collected by the Gas Company. I do not require the Minister to give any information on that basis now, but I would appreciate obtaining from him in due course a list of fines that can be imposed.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 28 August. Page 773.)

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** Tomorrow, the Premier and his Government will have been in office for exactly 12 months. This is their second Budget, but the first in which we can see their record of economic management alongside their proposals for the next year. However, the Budget, with its accompanying statements, is more than a reconciliation of payments with revenue: it has an importance which is wider than the economic and financial matters with which it principally deals.

The Budget process sets out the Government's social as

well as economic priorities. It lays down the directions of Government policy for the months ahead. It gives financial form to commitments and indicates the steps by which the Government will meet those commitments. The second Tonkin Budget, when considered in this broader context, is a particularly disturbing document which contains enormous problems for the people of this State.

As a statement of future policy, it is in large part a repudiation of the many promises put to the people of South Australia by the Premier and his Party 12 months ago. These promises were made grandiloquently with little sense of responsibility; in fact, made with no prospect of Government and, therefore, no prospect of their having to be honoured. Those promises made so irresponsibly in these circumstances will constantly return to haunt this Government over the next two years. On this occasion, which provides an opportunity to keep those promises, we find that the Budget is largely a record of breaking them.

As a record of economic development in the past year, and as a statement of expected progress, it contains bad news for those out of work and offers little encouragement for young people still at school but expecting to join the work force at the end of this year. As a financial statement it confirms that this Government has seriously weakened our financial base. It spells out the extent to which the Government is turning to State charges (which are a regressive form of tax) as a means of raising revenue and, most disturbingly, it shows that the Government is using the Loan Account, and, in effect, borrowing money to keep its Revenue Account solvent.

And, finally, as an outline of social policy this Budget continues a Liberal attack on community services and public enterprise. Those activities which directly affect people are treated by the Government as having no relevance whatsoever. The community services that a Government is elected to provide, namely, education, health, community welfare, are all cut, and promises made last September in respect of those areas are being ignored and swept under the carpet.

Let us look at the national economic scene, both as described by the Premier and as a matter of reality. He was careful to describe national economic growth during 1979-80 as modest (indeed modest it is). Given that his political colleagues have been in charge of promoting our national policies for the past five years, that was faint praise indeed. It was a recognition of the complete failure of the recipes of five years of Fraserism in this country which has brought so many of our institutions and services to their knees, creating widespread social dislocation and poverty in this country. Modest growth, the Premier describes it, and it is fortunate that he did not delve into it any more deeply than that.

He went on to say that unemployment had "remained virtually constant". This is simply not true. Not only is it an untruth that the Premier is peddling in the form of his Budget documents but also he is saying outside this House, in so-called eyeball to eyeball interviews, and in every other forum when he gets the opportunity, that unemployment has remained constant. What are the facts? In July 1979, according to Commonwealth Employment Service figures, which the Premier discovered the other day as being the only true measure of the unemployment level, 410 000 people were unemployed in Australia. By July 1980, 12 months later, this figure had risen to 424 000, a further 14 000. It is worth noting that this is about 153 000 more than in July 1976, the period in which the ill-fated Fraser Government first began to place its dead hand on the economy of Australia. "Virtually constant", the Premier says, in the face of those figures.

This rising level of unemployment is the huge social cost

of the Fraser Government's policies which is being borne by the majority of Australians, either because their children or their relatives are affected by it, or because they, as taxpayers, are having to shoulder a heavier burden of social services to provide for Fraser's policies. And what benefit does that provide? Inflation is not falling. That is meant to be the key to unemployment, that inflation will be conquered by throwing people out of work, but that is not happening. The consumer price index annual rate to June 1979 was 8.8 per cent, and to June 1980 it had gone to 10.7 per cent. That is what is happening to inflation. The failure of Fraser's inflation policies has meant that interest rates are still being pushed upwards, resulting in a continuing recession in house building, which affects this State particularly adversely.

Who benefits from what modest growth there is? After tax household disposable income grew by a meagre .8 per cent in 1979-80. Clearly, it is not the majority of Australian families who benefit. It is disturbing, therefore, to see in this Budget and in the Premier's statement the same wrong-headed conservatism that has failed at a national level since 1975. The recipes and prescriptions that the Tonkin Government is providing for South Australia are the outdated shibboleths of the early 1970's. They have failed throughout the world. They have failed nationally in Australia under Fraser, and they are failing in South Australia. The fact that they are being applied at this time means that it is even more disastrous for South Australia, which is rapidly getting out of step with the rest of Australia.

We see the same attacks on public enterprise which have characterised the Fraser Government being made by the Tonkin Government in 1980. There is the same rush to shift taxation so that it falls more heavily on lower and middle income earners. That policy is being followed by this Government at the State level by shifting taxes away from progressive taxation into the regressive form of taxation. The same facility for ignoring promises and commitments has been shown by Tonkin once in power.

The Premier's review of the national economy and economic policies of the Federal Government in this document was incomplete and, in the few scanty references made to it, certainly dishonest. He then turned to South Australia, and what followed is something which is becoming very familiar indeed. The Premier wiped his hands of responsibility for the employment situation, and continued his recent tactic of seeking to distance himself from his election promise of a bold initiative (we well recall those words) to create 7 000 new jobs, a figure which was increased in December to 10 000.

His new catch phrase has become "the medium to longer term". No longer are the initiatives bold. No longer is the action instant. We are looking now at the medium to longer term. We are deferring the promise of performance, just as we are deferring the public works programme and everything else that requires Government action. The Government, he said, "does not believe, nor has it ever pretended, that this tragic problem can be solved overnight." Let us go back to September 1979 and look at the advertisement published by the Liberal Party in support of its campaign and this Government, to see whether that tragic problem could or could not be solved overnight. The Premier is rapidly trying to distance himself from those promises and, even worse for a State Premier, from the problem itself.

That is not what he said in his television address in December last year, when he believed that there was "unmistakable proof" that his policies were working. In that address, he claimed that there had been a sudden turnaround in South Australia's fortunes as a direct result

of his Government's policies. He was pleased to see that temporary improvement in figures as something that could be attributed to him and to his Government. The constant and alarming deterioration since then is obviously, he claims, due to factors beyond his control, and is nothing to do with the present Government. In December he was quite definite. Let us remember his words. He said:

On present indications the actual number (of new jobs) over the next three years could be nearer 10 000.

Now, 12 months in, we have lost thousands of jobs in this economy. We now find in the Premier's statement, nine months later, the following:

It should be emphasised, and emphasised strongly, that, although we see certain actions by the Government as necessary to create the climate for economic growth, they are not by themselves sufficient to ensure that growth. Ultimate success will depend on other factors, including decisions taken in the private business sector, consumer confidence, attitudes of employees and their representatives and economic management at the national level.

These are decisions that happen almost anywhere but on the eleventh floor of the Administration Building, where the Premier sits. Everyone else is responsible, and everyone else has the capability of making decisions, except the Premier in 1980.

This section of the Premier's statement is little more than a collection of excuses for his inability to deliver on promises which, by any definition, were central to his Government's programme. But there are also some interesting omissions. Last year in his first Budget the Premier included a list of economic indicators in his review of the South Australian economy. He included a full list of all the indicators, what they meant, and what the predictions on them were. Where are those indicators this year? What has happened since then? Why is the Premier's report in his Budget speech incomplete on this occasion? All we have are scanty references to non-farm product and employment in the national economy. Apart from that, there is not one single piece of hard evidence in this section reviewing the Australian and South Australian economies. It is all assertions and excuses.

I think that it is necessary for me to remedy that for the Premier, to get on record the state of those indicators that he quoted last year and somehow overlooked quoting this year in his Budget statement. I shall bring them up to date. First, let me refer to population. The first three months of the Tonkin Government saw the largest quarterly outflow of population from South Australia ever recorded in the Australian Bureau of Statistics population figures.

**Mr. Becker:** You never admitted it when you were in Government.

**Mr. BANNON:** Almost 2 000 people left the State, more than three times the emigration figure for the same period in 1978. It is all very well to say, as the member for Hanson does, that my Party did not claim responsibility for population outflow when it was in Government. However, the then Opposition claimed that it was directly attributable to the former Government's policies. Now its tune has changed, and it will not say anything about the outflow of population, which is at record levels.

Private sector employment is the next indicator. In September 1979, the private sector work force (and remember it is the private sector on which the Premier concentrated his particular attention) stood at 309 700 jobs. The latest 1980 figures show that it has fallen by 1 000, while every other State in Australia has experienced increases since September last year. So much for the Premier's boasts about helping the private sector and opening South Australia for business again; 1 000 jobs were lost in that sector in South Australia, but in every other State there was an increase.

What about another of the unmentioned indicators—unemployment? I point out that 1 800 more South Australians were out of work in August 1980 than in August 1979. The rate of unemployment has increased, and the number of young persons aged from 15 to 19 years looking for full-time work has also increased, and the Premier has the audacity to say in the press and in this House that the situation in South Australia is improving.

I refer now to job vacancies; yesterday, the Premier referred to the "silver lining" of a recent increase in South Australian job vacancies. Certainly, there was a slight improvement in the job vacancy figures, but look at the Premier's Budget speech of last year. He chose, in commenting on job vacancies, to use as the yardstick South Australia's share of national job vacancies. Our share has now fallen. In September 1979, South Australia's share was 8 per cent, and it now stands at 7.7 per cent. No wonder the Premier did not make much more of that and omitted those facts from his Budget speech.

Regarding finance and instalment credit, the latest figures available, for the May quarter of 1980, compared to the same period last year, show that there has been a 15 per cent fall in new business after allowing for inflation. The Government of business and private enterprise has been installed, and finance and instalment credit has fallen by 15 per cent.

In regard to new dwelling commencements, at the March quarter of 1980, South Australia's share of commencements was 5.9 per cent, which was a fall from the level of 6.2 per cent in the same quarter a year earlier, less new dwellings being undertaken, and this in the face of a Government that said it would stimulate and encourage building, particularly in the private sector.

To that we can also add building approvals. The June quarter 1980 figures for private sector housing are down 5 per cent on the figures for June 1979, another disastrous indicator for this State. Finally, I refer to motor vehicles; South Australia's share of national motor vehicle registrations in the March quarter 1979 was 8.11 per cent. The latest 1980 figures for July show a fall to 7.47 per cent. According to the Government's own submission to the Relativities Review, that is an important indicator of our economic health, but it is not mentioned by the Premier. Of course, it is not mentioned because, like all of the other indicators, it shows the total failure of the Premier's first 12 months in office. He now speaks of the enormity of the task of economic reconstruction, but he forgets to mention that, during 1979, all the economic indicators to which I have referred showed that the South Australian economy was recovering and improving, and it is only since then that we have slumped.

Are those two circumstances to be linked together? Is it something to do with the fact that a new Government, with different policies, whatever its rhetoric, has failed dismally to stimulate and encourage growth and development in South Australia? Clearly, the Premier must say that it is, because he made such a thing about it when Opposition Leader and used it as his platform to gain election, but he is not now willing, in Government, to face up to the failure that he has created. What we need immediately are constructive measures to get us back to 1979 levels of economic activity, those that existed under Dunstan and Corcoran. The Premier has had 12 months in the job and the member for Todd who laughs has about two years left in this House. It is not good enough for the Premier to hide behind excuses or to cite interrelated factors that have nothing to do with the Government, as he puts it, and simply hope that the economy will come good. We need constructive measures and we look to the Budget for them.

What does the Budget reveal? It contains a number of examples of how this Government seems intent on merely coming to terms with its own impotence, and its inability to renew development rather than get on with creating jobs and economic activity. Regardless of the Premier's rhetoric, the evidence in this Budget is uniformly pessimistic. On his own figures, in his own Budget, the Premier indicates a no-growth situation, and the Minister of Education can joke with the back-benchers about that—he is the person who made extravagant promises and he is the one finding that, in the essential areas of works and teacher employment, there have been major cut-backs and major breaking of promises. It is the Minister's head that will roll eventually as a result.

**Mr. Langley:** He is not even the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs now; he has lost that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader does not need any assistance.

**Mr. BANNON:** The State's main sources of revenue depend largely on economic activity. Regarding pay-roll tax, certainly collections will be affected by the move to increase the exemption level from \$72 000 to \$84 000 from 1 January 1981, but it is expected that \$184 000 000 will be collected this year, an increase of 11.5 per cent on last year, below the 12 per cent rise in average wages forecast in the Federal Budget. That is a clear indication that the Government does not expect employment to improve. If employment was to improve, the level of collection on pay-roll tax would be improving by far more than the percentage estimated by the Government. In fact, the Budget refers only to "the possibility of some modest increase in employment".

There is the operative word—"modest", the word that is replacing all the upbeat language and talk of growth and development that we heard in September last year. There will be "some modest increase in employment". All of the figures, statistics and indicators suggest that we will see quite the opposite. The Government's own document concedes that pay-roll tax collection will not go up and, by conceding that, it indicates that the Government does not expect any increase in the level of employment.

Stamp duties constitute another important source of revenue for the State and are also dependent on property and motor vehicle transactions. Again, the Government has forgone some revenue through its decision to abolish stamp duty on the purchase of a first home or housing allotment up to the value of \$30 000. However, the Premier's statement adds the following:

It also anticipates that receipts from property and motor vehicle transactions will increase with inflation rather than through any upturn in the market . . .

That is a clear indication that, for the next 12 months, there will be no upturn in the market and no increase in activity in terms of property sales or motor vehicle transactions. So three important admissions are contained, or hidden, in the Premier's statement.

Let me now refer to an even graver matter—the position of the State's finances. For some time, I have been warning that the State's financial base is being weakened by this Government's policies. Its capacity to give effect to programmes and to provide services is being seriously compromised by the financial mismanagement of the present Government. This Budget confirms that those fears are well founded; it confirms that the State's revenue position has deteriorated seriously. Any Government, when it frames its Budget, must begin with the Revenue Account, and past Labor Governments were no exception. It is a basic rule of finance that there must be sufficient funds to meet recurrent expenditures.

Where possible in any one financial year the Revenue Account must be in balance or in surplus in order to ensure that those recurrent expenditures can be met without having to draw on other sources to bolster them. That is obvious and it is sensible; it is what a business would refer to as its cash flow. The Government, like a business, has weekly or fortnightly calls on it for salaries, rent, payment of accounts for equipment, and so on.

The Loan Account, on the other hand, is concerned with expenditures which, while certainly important, are not so immediate or pressing; they can be deferred or delayed. Communities may have to go without schools or hospitals because of that, but payments from Loan Account can be deferred. In fact, this has been happening and has been happening to a great extent, and I shall go into this in some detail shortly.

The Loan Account, of course, is largely dependent on Loan Fund receipts which are borrowings on which interest is paid, and receipts which come to it from the Revenue Account, any surplus contained in the Revenue Account, which is normal as far as the State Budget is concerned. It is usually the case that a surplus is transferred from the Revenue Account into the Loan Account. In all but one year during the past decade this has been the practice, and the scoffer from Hanson should remember that. He is meant to know something about banking and financing and he can look back through the figures and find that in all but one year in the past decade it has been the practice to have a surplus in our Revenue Account and to transfer that to Loan. Last year in the first Tonkin budget for 1979-80 (this was no exception), \$15 500 000 was transferred from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account.

What do we find in the 1980-81 Budget? We find an extremely alarming turnaround. We find in this Budget that \$16 000 000 is needed to support the Revenue Account because there will not be sufficient funds to meet the State's recurrent expenditure. The revenue funds that provide for wages, materials and equipment will not be sufficient to cover the outlay to the tune of \$16 000 000, and so, an unprecedented unusual transfer must go from Loan to Revenue.

Why do I say the situation is so grave? Remember that the year before, the financial year just ended, a \$15 500 000 transfer came from the Revenue Account, which in this year, 1980-81, will be \$16 000 000 in the red. Therefore, the turnaround in our finances in one year is a staggering \$31 500 000, and that is brought into the books. It is not easy at all to recover deficits in Revenue Accounts. It is the beginning of a serious cash flow problem for this Government which is in fact not just going to affect this Government in its short term of office, but will return to haunt any Government in the future trying to grapple with the parlous financial situation that will be left as a legacy of the Tonkin years—\$16 000 000 of Loan funds on which interest is paid has gone to prop up the Revenue Account. That means we are borrowing to pay our running expenses.

Let me reduce that to terms that members opposite can understand, and often keen on using; we are spending the rent money on groceries. It is an unprecedented turnaround for the worse in the State's books. It is an indictment of the Premier's ability to handle his role as State Treasurer. It is even more astounding in light of the Premier's vociferous campaign when he was in opposition against borrowing on the ground that that increases the public debt. Now we are using \$16 000 000 of borrowed funds to finance our weekly recurrent expenditures. How is it possible that the State's finances have been brought to this parlous situation in first 12 months?

**An honourable member:** Because the Treasurer is an idiot.

**Mr. BANNON:** That is one of the problems, but the Treasurer's competence or not depends on the policies he has and the advice he is prepared to take. We can certainly eliminate the area of Commonwealth payments, which is one that the Premier might readily wish to blame. The increase in funds from the Commonwealth of 10.5 per cent will exceed the growth in Revenue Account expenditure, which is set at 9.1 per cent. Certainly, Fraser's "new federalism" has squeezed the States, but this is not at the root of the Premier's financial problems. He is getting an expected increase in funds in excess of the growth in expenditure which he has planned for, so he is doing all right out of the Commonwealth Government this year. The answer lies in the weakness or revenue receipts due in part to the economic slump which has occurred, particularly under the Tonkin Government, and due also to some very poor arithmetic on the part of the Premier when he costed his election promises. I have already dealt with those revenue sources which are dependent on economic activity. I need only remind members again that 1979 economic activity was improving and since the end of 1979 it has worsened noticeably.

I repeat that in this Budget the Government has neither any hope nor any plans for an improvement in that situation. They do not even look like getting back to the level of economic activity that they inherited.

The other reason concerns the falling revenue collections. During the election campaign the Premier claimed that the total cost of his promises in a full year would be \$19 400 000. If we adjust that figure for the fact that pay-roll tax rebates are an expenditure item, the cost would be, at the most, \$17 800 000; that is using the Premier's election costing document as a basis for calculation. However, in this 1980-81 Budget we find the Premier, now with the benefit of Treasury advice and off the election hustings, saying that the full-year cost of his revenue measures is \$28 000 000. That is a mistake of \$10 200 000 which he must find and which he did not expect to have to find this year. Its effects flow on every succeeding year. That error will be repeated year after year, namely, the error in his costing of his extravagant election promises which willy-nilly handed away State revenue.

I will not shy away from discussing the effect of this miscalculation on the State's revenue, simply because the phrase "tax cuts" is an emotive one and because the Premier has been trying to make much of his promises of tax cuts and how attractive they are. Of course everyone likes tax cuts; of course it is desirable to reduce the level of taxation where we can, but that must be done with due regard to the level of services and the standard and quality of life in this State that people expect. They get money value for their taxes that they pay to the Government. A Government that seeks to throw away its revenue also risks the standard of living of those people it seeks to serve. Those cuts have been financed in part by regressive taxation in the form of increased State charges. Also, they have been financed in part by cuts in the construction of schools, hospitals and other public works, and they have been financed in part as well by borrowings which all South Australians in the future will have to repay with interest eventually. That is the tax hoax that has been perpetrated on the people of South Australia.

I have referred to State charges; the Budget mentions numerous increases in those charges this year. Water and sewerage rates are up 6.4 per cent and 6 per cent respectively; the price of water is up 12½ per cent; irrigation charges are up 12½ per cent; public transport

fares are up 25 per cent; ETSA tariffs are up 12½ per cent, and the contribution by ETSA to the revenue will increase as a result by 18 per cent, and there is a further ETSA increase foreshadowed; the Woods and Forests Department levy is up 50 per cent; port dues are up 5 per cent; pilotage fees are up 30 per cent; and fees under the Justices Act are up 10 per cent.

The Premier has tried to argue that charges are not a tax but that they are merely the user paying for a service. I shall not go into great details on the philosophical error involved in that particular proposition, but in fact it can be demonstrated that the subsidy from the General Revenue of public transport fares more than outweighs the cost that would occur if that transport was not to be subsidised. In fact, the "user pays" principle applied across the board throughout the State would yield enormous problems and hardship in this State. Taxes may go down, but the cost of those services would go up alarmingly under that principle.

That is why we collect progressive taxation. That is why we have general revenue, in order to spread the burden and to make sure that those who have most pay most and those who have least are not bearing the whole burden. That is not the policy or concept of this Government. The Premier has argued that charges are not a tax and that we cannot really talk about the two in the same context. As usual, of course, he is being totally inconsistent with what he said and with the stand he took when in Opposition. To quote one example, on 12 September 1978 he was reported in the *Adelaide News* as attacking a much lower rise that had occurred then in the ETSA tariff. "It is a tax," he said, and we agree that it is. Certainly, users have to make some contribution to the cost of public services, but this Government intends to go further. It intends to use State charges as a source of general revenue. The Premier has not missed an opportunity to suggest that State charges should rise, and rise further.

In December 1979, his first response to the Premiers' Conference outcome was to say that State charges were certain to rise. Later, after the national wage decision, he said again that State charges would go up. There was no reference to general revenue, and he also conveniently forgot that in his own Budget he had made provision for a rise in wages. An amount of \$56 000 000 was set aside specifically for such wage and salary rises. Not wanting to miss an opportunity, the Premier pretended that he would find it necessary to raise State charges because of this wage increase, for which provision had already been made. So, while the Premier says pompously in his Budget statement that his Government will continue to pursue a policy of lower taxation, he has brought about some of the most comprehensive increases in indirect taxes seen in this State in many years.

The Premier's policy is one of taxation, taxation indeed by stealth and regressively, and this has got to be exposed and explained to the people of South Australia, who are the subject of this fraud. Even with these increases, the Premier is still forced to borrow \$16 000 000 to make up the short-fall in his accounts, to cover the turn-around of \$31 000 000 in the State of the Revenue Account. The increase in charges has not accounted for that turn-around. To make that up, in fact, the Premier would have to at least double the increases he has already made, with horrendous results. The increases to date have already seriously eroded our cost advantage and our competitive position vis-a-vis the other States.

If we raise charges such as electricity, water, and so on, we are putting ourselves at a disadvantage, not only as a community, but in terms of attracting the manufacturing and economic development and investment that the

Premier claims he wants to attract. We are destroying any cost advantage that we might have by piling up the charges in the way the Premier is doing. While we need economic activity to stimulate the revenue collections, the Premier is putting that cost advantage in danger.

Let us look at another of the myths perpetrated by the Premier, the myth of waste and mismanagement and his boast that that has been cured or corrected in the course of his Administration. There is no possibility that a campaign against imaginary waste will solve the Premier's financial problems. That is quite apparent from looking at this Budget document. Since coming to office, the Premier has continued his pre-election obsession with this so-called waste and mismanagement. In the Budget statement we find the Premier stating:

Firm and responsible control over all public expenditure represents the single most important element in the financial policies of this Government.

We do not disagree with that statement of importance; of course firm and responsible control is vital; of course public expenditure must be managed efficiently and effectively. And, in office, that is precisely what we did; there is nothing new about that. The Premier continues:

The 1979-80 Budget result bears testimony to that policy. It does nothing of the sort! There is no evidence of any reduction of expenditure through the elimination of waste. In fact, there is no evidence that the Government has found any waste within the administrative apparatus it has inherited from Labor. Cull the documents as you like, you will not find it there. The so-called savings which the Premier identified and which I will list shortly do not mean that some wasteful practice has been identified and eliminated; they mean that vital works and additions to our State's community assets, vital for employment and productivity in the State, will not go ahead this year. Our social capital is being run down and the Premier is hoping that the effects of it will not be noticed before the next election. That is not the elimination of waste and mismanagement; that is deferral and, in the long term, irresponsible behaviour in relation to our capital and infrastructure. If there were any real savings in waste and mismanagement they would have to show up in the Revenue Account. The Premier claims:

Payments were below estimate by \$2 700 000 mainly due to the control exercised over all expenditures and a less than expected call on funds provided for industry incentives. So there is \$2 700 000 identified, and the reason for that saving is twofold: the control exercised over all expenditure, one assumes, and therefore the elimination of this waste and mismanagement, and the less than expected call on funds provided for industry incentives. Payments may have been below estimates by this amount, but this had nothing to do with controls over expenditure, as analysis of the Budget will show.

When this section of the statement is examined closely, far from there being a saving by exercising control over expenditures, we find that there is evidence that the Premier's so-called controls and reviews are, in fact, costing money. I suggest that the Public Account Committee and its watchdog Chairman perhaps turn their attention to this particular facet, and that the procedures initiated by the Tonkin Government, supposedly in the interests of controlling waste and extravagance, have, in fact, created more bureaucratic effort, and involved more expenditure than the amounts of money that they are meant to be saving. It has cost us money, not saved us money. The Opposition has said all along that that would probably be the inevitable result.

How can I say that? It is quite clear from the figures. An amount of \$1 000 000 has been saved on pumping from the



Murray River, due to favourable rainfall (which not even the Premier is claiming credit for). That is recorded on page 101 in the Estimates of Payments from Revenue Account. The Premier has also admitted that his industry incentives were under-spent by \$3 500 000, which is more than 50 per cent. That clearly shows that his much-vaunted bold initiatives have been failures. Over \$6 000 000 was set aside for industry incentives and less than half of it was spent. Clearly, those schemes have been total failures. If we put those two figures together, we have at least \$4 500 000 under-spent, but the Premier in his statement says that an estimated \$2 700 000 has been saved. Where is the rest of that money?

Is he saying that, in fact, he over-spent on Revenue Account by \$1 800 000 and that his rigorous controls actually added \$1 800 000 to payments? Anyone who knows how Public Service departments operate and what happens when departments are shuffled and when all sorts of administration procedures are changed, when people are transferred arbitrarily and abruptly from areas of expertise, knows that that costs money. That is precisely what has been happening throughout 1979-80 and the financial effects of that are showing up in the accounts. The Premier's controls are costing us money.

Yesterday, to top it all off, he announced a Deregulation Bureau, a bureaucracy to de-bureaucratise the bureaucracy. It is like the figure on the packet of Weeties holding a packet of Weeties, holding a packet of Weeties. Where does it ever end? The answer is—never. We will have a permanent head of the Deregulation Bureau, his deputy, assistant directors, a force of field inspectors, more reports from the statutory authorities—the whole thing is an absolute farce and it is costing us money. That shows up for the first time in these accounts.

The Premier's financial position has apparently been saved by the failure of his pay-roll tax incentive scheme, regardless of his explanation. He has not uncovered this massive waste and mismanagement in what was universally recognised as the most efficient Public Service in Australia.

The area of Government cuts, the cut back or deferral of Government programmes or public works is another avenue that the Premier has used in a desperate attempt to overcome the financial problems he created for himself. The member for Rocky River should continue his discussion with the Premier because he will find that his district, and all country areas, are the areas where these cuts will have the most severe and most abrupt impact. The honourable member should look at some of the facilities in his district, for instance, the magnificent sporting facilities provided in the town of Kadina under the previous Government's policies, and then look at the Budget for this year. The honourable member can be thankful that he was able to get—

**Mr. Olsen:** Look how much the Commonwealth provided.

**Mr. BANNON:** True, there was Federal Government assistance, but that facility was a prime example of the way in which the previous Government was able to co-operate with all levels, State, local and Federal, to ensure that the partnership between the Government and the community was preserved. That has been thrown away.

The partnership with the Federal Government is impossible because of Fraser's policies; and the partnership with local government is impossible because this Government is refusing to attend to local government and its needs by providing assistance to it. The member for

Rocky River will find that that town and its facilities will remain static as long as this Government remains in office. I would say that that applies to many other country areas, too.

Regarding the cutting and deferral of Government programmes and public works, we know from a Government document that found its way into the media earlier this year that this is a course that the Government has readily adopted. The Premier said in that minute to his Ministers that he was facing a possible \$40 000 000 deficit in the 1980-81 financial year unless there was a 3 per cent cut in real terms on Revenue Account expenditure.

That 3 per cent target has been met. As I said, the position has been further complicated by the weakening of the receipts requiring the transfer from the Loan Fund. The full brunt of that cut has been borne in the Loan Account. That \$16 000 000 represents 7½ per cent of total Loan Funds and, once that is removed (because it will not now be spent on capital works projects; money made available for capital works is being used to prop up revenue), we can see that the Loan Account compared with last year's expenditure is reduced by \$14 500 000, and that is before allowing for inflation.

Is the Premier really aware of the true nature of his position in this respect? Unlike other Premiers, he has cut Loan Fund expenditure below the restricted levels dictated by the allocation of Commonwealth Loan Funds. That is a disturbing development. It runs against the grain of every other State's management of its finances. It contrasts with the situation in New South Wales, where Premier Wran last week introduced his Loan Budget and was able to increase capital spending by 17 per cent above Commonwealth allocations. This is the only State spending less than the Commonwealth allocation.

The Premier is one of those who went to Canberra as recently as June last year and bleated about the fact that he was not getting enough from the Federal Government. He will be treated with absolute contempt, I suspect, by Prime Minister Hayden in next year's Loan Accounts—absolute contempt—because he has proved that he does not want Loan money to build essential public works and advanced programmes; he wants it to prop up the deficit in his Revenue Account.

If by some unfortunate accident the Prime Minister is still Mr. Fraser, I think the contempt will be equal. Certainly, just as the Premier cut away the case for South Australia's higher share of revenue sharing in December last year, so he has cut away the case for our share of Loan Accounts. What would members think if they were in charge of Federal finances and a Premier came to them saying, "I want more money for my Loan programme and, incidentally, my Loan programme consists of 7½ per cent transfer of Loan funds into my Revenue Account." What sort of reaction would one get in that case?

The problem of the \$40 000 000 deficit predicted for 1980-81 has not really been overcome. The Premier has been able to juggle the figures so that it does not appear on the books, but that deficit is there all right and it is represented by schools planned for this year that are not being funded, by water filtration programmes that are being deferred, by sewerage schemes that are being put back, and by hospital building projects that have been pigeon-holed.

The Premier has the audacity to talk about savings. In a time of extreme economic depression in this State when building and construction need every cent pumped into them, the Premier can talk about savings. How are those savings made up? The following savings cuts have been made:

	\$
Health.....	8 200 000
Water and sewerage .....	10 300 000
Woods and forests.....	2 400 000
Marine and harbors .....	1 900 000
Schools.....	4 000 000
Further education .....	1 300 000
Other (Police, courts, etc.) .....	5 000 000

The net cut shown in the Budget papers is \$29 000 000. Increases have been made in other areas, and the list I have read totals more than that, but the net cut is \$29 000 000. This cut directly affects our building industry. Members can see already that that industry has not prospered under the Tonkin Government. Between September 1979 and April 1980, 1 100 jobs were lost in the building industry in South Australia, and that is little wonder when one looks at those so-called savings promoted by this Government. The money siphoned off the Loan Account to pay for the Premier's mismanagement is now lost to that vital public works programme.

In regard to the future, this is a most regressive Budget. It certainly confirms that the Premier does not understand the inter-relationship of the public and private sectors of our economy, just as he fails to understand the inter-relationships between the various arms of Government. The heavy cuts in public works do not just mean that there will be less public employment and a smaller Government sector: those cuts will flow directly to the private sector and the contractors that tender for Government jobs.

I point out that 80 per cent of the Public Buildings Department work was contracted out under the former Labor Government. Indeed, there could have been a strong case that that was too much, but those are the facts. It was not that we were spawning some vast bureaucratic empire of permanent employment; we had a responsible slice of direct Government employment in the building and construction industry, a window on the industry, and our own skilled work force. And very skilled it has been as its work all over town demonstrates, most notably right next door in the now praised Constitutional Museum, which was so attacked by the Government when it was in Opposition. It is the public sector work force that is being run down and, if that was the only area to suffer, that would be enough, but that flows directly into the private sector as well.

In his Budget statement, the Premier says that he wants to lay to rest the belief that his Government is engaged in an indiscriminate and unrestrained attack on the public sector. He could have kidded us. He is certainly trying to kid the public of South Australia. He will not do that with Budgets which cut public works programmes and which use capital funds to prop up Revenue Account. At page 6 of his statement, the Premier states:

Of course, the public sector provides many essential services, some of which are vital to the economic growth of the State.

What does that mean? Are services not directly connected with development to be starved of funds? Is it believed that unless one can show direct immediate economic benefit then they are not essential services, that they are not vital to economic growth? Education apparently is not vital. The fact that it trains the work force seems to be irrelevant. Are community services not vital? Are health services not vital? Are recreation facilities not vital? Is consumer protection not vital?

Clearly, the Government has a total lack of understanding of the inter-relation between economic growth and private and public sector activity and the social services and infra-structure that bears them up. Without education, community services, health services and adequate recreation, as well as without things such as

consumer protection, we would not have a healthy, vital, skilled work force, and we would have absolutely no economic growth. They are totally inter-related and, until this Government recognises that, the State is headed for disaster. This Budget does not recognise it. The massive turnaround in our finances confirms the inability of the present Government and Treasurer to manage our funds.

As little as three months ago the Premier went along to the Loan Council and threatened, with the other Premiers, to walk out unless he was given more funds, and we got a 5 per cent increase. In South Australia's case that amounted to \$8 000 000. What did the Premier say? His response was:

The additional \$8 000 000 will be applied to job-creating projects by letting works out to tender as soon as possible. These will include housing, sewerage and highway initiatives.

But double that extra allocation has now gone to support the Revenue Account. So, what was he talking about then? We have certainly got a very weak bargaining power at Loan Council meetings, as I have already said.

This is the first major economic statement of the Tonkin Government—its first opportunity to record its achievements and to set out its plans and how it intends to put them into effect. Its first Budget last October was, to a large extent, inherited. The strong financial position of South Australia it definitely inherited. Within 12 months it has undermined that strength and has presented a Budget which shows that we have gone backward since that time and that, as a Government, it has little optimism for our future.

After a year of office of the Government, we have a right to expect a Budget that sets out how the Government intends to honour the promises which it made to the people of South Australia in order to get elected. This Budget makes it clear that those promises have just simply been shunted aside. The central plank of the Liberal Party's platform at the election, the bold initiative to create jobs, the springboard of the job rot campaign, have all failed. The definite promises to create employment have become meek phrases about modest increases and vague statements about medium to long-term development. The Budget shows that the Government's policies are dishonest, and its plans for our financial future are very dangerous indeed. Unfortunately, we are stuck with this Government for another 2½ years. We can ill afford it, but we are going to have somehow to get through it. However, the task of the next Government that replaces it is going to be made very difficult indeed by the course that has been so far set and demonstrated in this Budget.

**Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart):** It has become my lot to speak on the Budget tonight much sooner than I would otherwise have expected—about a week at least. However, we have heard tonight a very good exposition of the failures of the Tonkin Government in South Australia in the 12 months that it has been in the Treasury benches to provide for the needs of the South Australian community. It was a Government that came to power in South Australia on a policy of restoring, as the Government put it, the economic viability of this State. However, what have we seen? We have seen 12 months of stagnation, and the Budget that we are debating is a clear indication of the failure of the Tonkin Government to be able to come to grips with what is a very difficult economic situation facing the State.

The Leader of the Opposition tonight has quite clearly shown, for all those who have the will to listen, what is needed in this State and the failure of those people who have been charged with the responsibility of providing for that need. It is interesting, to me at least, to see the humour of the Minister of Agriculture and one or two of his nondescript back-bench members because of the

comments that I have made. I believe they are perhaps somewhat relieved, after the castigation they have received in the last hour, that the eloquence of the speaker may have deteriorated somewhat. That relief will be short lived, I can assure them, because their economic failure will soon become quite apparent to them as it has been to the Opposition and as it will be to the people in South Australia, who are already rueing the occasion 12 months ago when they elected to the Treasury benches the people who now reside there.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I would have thought that the House would be extremely interested in the well researched contribution that I am making to this evening's debate. I really do not need the inane interjections of the gentleman on the front bench. I am quite able to cope by myself. This is the first opportunity that the Government has had to show South Australia what it proposes to do. It is not so much a record of what it has done, because quite clearly that is nothing, but it is an opportunity for the Government to show to the State the directions in which it believes South Australia should be moving. As our Leader has said, if that is what this Budget is all about, we are in for a very lean time indeed. If the device that we have seen from the Premier in using the Loan Account to bolster the Revenue Account is to be the practice of this Government, we are indeed in a very weak bargaining position with our negotiations with the Federal Government in seeking more financial assistance for this State.

I have been here 10 years, and I can well recall over that period of time the Premier and his colleagues castigating the then Labor Government for complaining that sufficient funds were not being provided by the Federal Government so that it could do the things that the people of South Australia so urgently required. At least, when the Labor Party was in Government the device that the Liberal Party now uses was not in practice. When we went to Loan Council and Premiers' Conferences we were able to show quite clearly to the Federal Treasurer that we were very effective in the spending of the money provided to us, and that that money was used for the needs for which it was sought.

All that has been destroyed by this Government, which has come to power on the pretext of efficient economic management and of providing jobs for South Australian workers. Those jobs are very sorely needed indeed, but what good is a Budget to South Australia when the overwhelming problem that we have is unemployment and when that Budget does not improve the unemployment situation at all? We have the example of the Liberal Party, in its advertising of its achievements in the past 12 months, saying that it has reduced public employment in South Australia and that it has been able to do that without retrenchments or sackings.

It has reduced public employment in South Australia. Fewer jobs are available in South Australia today than were available 12 months ago in the public sector. That is a deliberate policy of the present Government to reduce employment opportunities for the people of South Australia, including the young people who badly need jobs and for people leaving school. There are fewer jobs in the private sector, because the private sector depends largely on the public sector to provide the markets for the produce or for the work done in the private sector. My Leader has explained this inter-relationship between the public and private sectors.

In Port Augusta, which is one of the towns that I represent, more than 70 per cent of the male employment

is Government-generated, so what do we think of a policy that the present Government has? How do we think that affects Port Augusta, where our employment is predominantly Government employment? Here we have a man who proudly says that this Government, as one of its successes, has reduced the amount of employment in the public sector. I believe that that is an absolutely disgraceful statement and, as an achievement, it is one of which the Government ought to be totally ashamed.

If the Government believes that, by reducing employment in the public sector, somehow or other that reduction will be picked up by the private sector, it is living in fantasyland. That position has not occurred anywhere in the world. I challenge Government members to show me an example of where it may happen. I state clearly and categorically that it has never happened anywhere, and it will not happen in South Australia. The Government is tied to a philosophical position that requires it to attack the public sector, for reasons that I am unable to ascertain, except that it is a sop to those who put members opposite into this place as a Government and of whom they have largely become the stooges.

**Mr. Lewis:** Piffle!

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The member for Mallee will be given his opportunity during the course of this debate, if he is prepared to grasp the nettle. Obviously, his colleague the member for Hanson was not prepared to grasp the nettle when he got his opportunity to speak, because he was not in the Chamber when you gave him the call, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing in the Bill relative to nettles.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I bow to your advice, Mr. Speaker. You obviously have had the opportunity to research the Budget documents to a greater extent than some other members may have done. Some of those members are now interjecting. Members opposite recognise the people to whom I am referring, and I appreciate that, because it is not often that my barbs seep home as successfully as they did on that occasion. They are nettle barbs, Mr. Speaker, if you would like me to continue with that analogy.

This year in South Australia we have had a Government which has reduced taxation on those people who are best able to pay and which has replaced that drop in revenue through taxation by increasing charges that often fall on that section of the community that is least able to pay. These much-vaunted reductions in succession duties (and I have said this on several occasions and will say it again tonight) have very little effect, if any, on the people in my district. It is a working-class district, made up largely of middle-class to lower-class wage earners, and also includes many who are not in employment. The reduction in succession duties affects those people not one wit.

There may be 5 per cent to 6 per cent of the people in the District of Stuart who will benefit from the abolition of succession duties, but almost all of my constituents will be affected by the increased charges imposed by this Government. They most certainly will be affected by the reduction in services to the community that has been a result of the election of this Government.

If I had the opportunity, I would provide for the benefit of the House an Editorial written in the local newspaper in Port Augusta. That Editorial asked this Government to get its priorities right and said that the reduction in education and health spending was a disastrous step for the Government to take, yet this is what we have seen it do. It is reducing public spending in those areas that affect the welfare of the average citizens of South Australia. I am not concerned about those people who are well able to look after their own welfare. I am concerned about those who are in such an economic situation that their day-to-

day living is affected largely by decisions of government, such as increased charges for health, education, sewerage and water services, and a whole list of other service charges that this Government has imposed. The reason why it has imposed these charges on the people of this State is that it has reduced taxation on that section best able to meet their fair share of Government charges.

**Mr. Russack:** Would you reintroduce succession duties?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Once a tax has been abolished, the possibility of it being reintroduced is very limited. If it was for me to decide what was a most appropriate tax in South Australia, I would say that succession duties on those able to pay, on the estates that can well afford it, was an area where taxes could be imposed. However, I am realistic enough to appreciate that, once a tax has been lifted from people in any society, it will never be reintroduced. That is because, unfortunately, the working people in South Australia have somehow been convinced that they pay succession duties.

As a result of being a member of Parliament for 10 years and of prior to that being reasonably well paid as an officer of the Australian National Railways Commission, and because I am not a person who wastes my money (I do not gamble, drink or smoke, and am really an honourable person), if I died tomorrow, my estate is such that neither my wife nor my children would have needed to pay succession duties had they still applied.

I will wager that, on any basis of comparison, I am reasonably as affluent as are the overwhelming majority of my constituents. My family would not have to pay succession duties under the old arrangement and neither would my constituents. However, people had been convinced that they would, so when the Government lifted succession duties, those people said, "Good, I will no longer have to pay succession duties." The fact that they would not have to pay them anyway is irrelevant. To answer the member for Goyder, I say that I do not expect that succession duties will be reintroduced but that what we will have to do is replace that amount of about \$20 000 000 that we lost from succession duties with another duty or charge.

If he does not concede that, he has no economic appreciation of how Government is run. I ask the member for Goyder, when he makes his contribution to this debate, to tell me what he will replace succession duties with.

**Mr. Olsen:** Royalties.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The honourable member is going to collect royalties. Will he increase charges? If so, what will those charges be, and on whom will they fall? That is a challenge I throw at the member for Goyder or any of his colleagues who might wish to enter the debate.

**Mr. Russack:** There's such a thing as good house-keeping.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The good housekeeping that this Government has been practising is not to fulfil previous commitments, but to reduce expenditure on buildings in the education and health spheres, and we have these much-vaunted housekeeping benefits. Money set aside for N.E.A.P.T.R. has not been spent. All this money goes back into general revenue. They say, "Aren't we good fellows. We've balanced the Budget," but what they do not say is that they have cut back on building programmes throughout the State. Programmes that were undertaken previously have not been fulfilled by this Government. That is how the Government has been able to balance the Budget: by not fulfilling commitments given and by cutting back on services, increasing charges on those services. So, where is this economic miracle that the Liberal Party has wrought for South Australia?

**Mr. Lewis:** We got rid of the Monarto madness.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** If the member for Mallee was to look at the sum expended on the Monarto programme last year or the year before, he would see, and again, that the level of savings the Government has been able to achieve on Monarto is not significant compared to the overall Budget we are debating. I am concerned that services in my electorate will be reduced as a result of this Budget.

**Mr. Lewis:** You've got no evidence.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** We have in Port Augusta and Port Pirie areas that could shortly be affected by dramatic growth. We have been trying at Port Augusta to get the Minister of Health (and I am pleased that she is in the Chamber now) to give certain commitments about extensions at the Port Augusta Hospital, because undoubtedly our health facilities will be running into a critical situation if the Redcliff project goes ahead. The Minister already knows what is the situation at Port Pirie. In her own words and in the words of the Chairman of Health Commission, the hospital there is inadequate, and needs massive sums spent on it.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** Years of neglect by your Government.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I ask her not to trouble about interjecting on me but to get on with the task of doing the job and providing the money for the Port Pirie Hospital. I am not the slightest interested in the Minister's interjection. The member for Rocky River should be supporting me in trying to achieve for Port Pirie improvements in the hospital, but all he wants to do is score political points. I am trying to better the lot of people whom the member for Rocky River helps to represent, but all he tries to do is score political points. I ask the member for Rocky River to show some concern in this matter.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** He's organised deputations to me.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I have to continually speak over the interjections of the Minister. I do not want to have to continually raise my voice so that I can be heard by those members who have some concern for the needs of South Australians. Obviously the member for Rocky River and his Minister do not have that concern.

**Mr. Russack:** That's not right.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The honourable member, as the member for Mitcham would say, is a jolly nice chap, but Port Pirie and Port Augusta have not figured at all in this Budget.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** And they weren't given a fair deal by your Government either—not the health services.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The Minister of Health says that Port Augusta and Port Pirie did not figure very well under the previous Government.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** You're so right.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I invite the honourable member, if she is prepared to spend a little time in my district, to spend it with the local member, instead of some other members, and to look around and see what has been provided in Port Augusta in the past 10 years by the previous Government, and she will see that Port Augusta has been very well provided for. It is a strange thing that, in Opposition, this was the very point that her Party was prone to make. Now that it is in Government, it is trying to resile from that position. Because Port Augusta was well provided for, does it mean that its future needs will not be considered? Port Augusta is facing a critical stage in its history (a massive developmental impact), and it is because of that impact and because of the continual growth at Port Augusta that I ask the Minister and her

Government to be more conscious of the needs. It is absolutely irrelevant and totally wrong of her to suggest that in past years Port Augusta's needs have not been looked after.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** I am talking about Port Pirie, which was grossly neglected.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Port Pirie suffered in this way. When many other cities in South Australia were growing fast and the Government was providing for the growth needs of those communities, Port Pirie, because it was the oldest and most significant country city in South Australia, already had facilities provided for it; but, over the years, these facilities became inadequate. They certainly deteriorated; this applies to the hospital, particularly to the Department of Further Education and the Department of Community Welfare office, etc.

Commitments were made in regard to the Department of Community Welfare. The previous Minister is present in the Chamber, and will vouch for that. Commitments were made regarding the hospital, as they were for the Department of Further Education, and I am waiting to see this Government honour the commitments given previously, but I very much doubt that that will happen. I have read the Budget documents, and there is no indication that this will take place.

That is what happened to Port Pirie over a period. When I got to Port Pirie, I was immediately horrified at the level of services provided, especially at the facilities in which public servants had to work. It seems strange to me that the people of Port Pirie have become accustomed to facilities that they have grown up with over the past 40 or 50 years. Having previously represented Whyalla and Port Augusta, I am familiar with the facilities provided in growth centres. I believe that Port Pirie is equally entitled to that level of facility as are the other Spencer Gulf cities. Immediately I represented Port Pirie I made strong representations to see that that took place. If the Minister wants to know why representations were made in regard to the hospital, technical college and other facilities at Port Pirie, she need not rely on what the local Mayor has told her. She should talk to the local member, who initiated the action in that city to get these things done. The member for Rocky River knows that what I am saying is absolutely true, and would agree with everything I say.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I have absolutely no need for the constant interjection by the person on the front bench. It is bad enough to have to listen to the honourable woman when she has the call of the Chair, but it is entirely insufferable to have to do so when she does not have the call of the Chair.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** It's spinning the time out nicely, isn't it?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I am pleased that the Minister of Health is prepared to accept that I am doing a remarkably good job. Obviously, she is embarrassed because I am bringing home to her and to her colleagues who are still in the House the very poor state of facilities. There are other issues that I could raise on the Budget, and I shall be very keen to do so—

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Not again! I shall be very keen, if the Minister does me the courtesy of allowing me to finish my remarks, to participate in the Estimates Committees. This, I notice, is one of the achievements of the Liberal Party in Government, along with the magnificent achievement of reducing the registration costs to South Australians who drive electric vehicles. The advertisement in the press, which must have cost the Liberal Party thousands of

dollars, informed members of the public of its achievements, but it was so bereft of achievement that it had to include a statement to the effect that the Liberal Government would be reducing the registration costs for those people who drove electric vehicles. The constituents of Stuart are absolutely delighted with that! They do not drive electric vehicles, and have no prospect of doing so for a long time, but they are certainly impressed with the achievement that this Government has been able to effect.

That, along with the remarkable achievement of being able to reduce jobs in the public sector, on which my constituents largely depend, is not guaranteed to win the Liberal Government a great number of votes in Stuart, but it does not expect to win votes in Stuart. I do not blame it for that expectation. If it had any concern about working class people, of whom my electorate is largely made up, the Government would have brought down a Budget to benefit the average citizen of South Australia, and not a Budget to benefit those people to whom it is beholden, the people who control the purses in South Australia.

It is no good for the member for Goyder to want to interject, because he knows that what I am saying is true. To his embarrassment, he is there as a shock trooper for the capitalist system and the big money interests in South Australia. This Budget is designed entirely to repay the debts, nothing more, and in that regard it is successful. It will repay the debts, but it will do absolutely nothing to better the lot of the average citizen of South Australia, and that ought to be what this Government is concerned about. It certainly is what the Opposition is concerned about, and it seems to me that we will have to wait for 2½ years before the workers of South Australia can expect that their interests will be paramount again in the discussions in this Parliament, and will be paramount in the Budgets that will be brought down. I had hoped for a better Budget, and I look forward to further debate on the allocations.

**Mr. McRAE (Playford):** I reject this Budget as a disgrace. I note that, within a week or so, the Federal and South Australian Treasurers introduced their respective Budgets. In a Federal system, of course, the two are inextricably interlocked, so we need to give some consideration to the Federal as well as to the State Budget. They have a similarity, because each is based on the same philosophy, the philosophy of Milton Freidman. The philosophy of Milton Freidman is simply explained. That incredible economist has produced a theory that, by reducing taxation, and at the same time reducing public sector expenditure, one can reduce inflation and, so he claims, employment opportunities will be increased; in other words, the private sector will come into the vacuum which has been created.

Nowhere in the world has it worked. Mrs. Thatcher came to office in Britain on exactly that policy. Immediately on coming to office she made the most massive tax cuts known in Britain, I would say, ever, and at the same time she made massive cuts in the public sector area. What was the result? Did the benefits follow? The benefits are, according to Freidman, that inflation will come down and employment will go up. Did either of those things come to pass? They did not. Inflation is worse now in Britain than ever before. Unemployment is also worse now in Britain than ever before.

This philosophy of Milton Freidman has been inflicted on the Australian people, first by Malcolm Fraser, and now by the State Liberal Government. The two are linked together. Prior to this, I must admit, the Fraser Government did have one success in its electoral bag. It did manage to reduce inflation from a notional 16 per cent

or 17 per cent, which is argued vehemently about by economists (but let us assume that there was 16 per cent or 17 per cent inflation before Fraser came to office), to about the 8 per cent mark.

The costs were terrible, because unemployment rose to unprecedented levels, social security reached abysmal lows after what Whitlam had been able to do, and the whole economy is in stagnation. But now we are finding that inflation, even on the Federal Government's own estimates (and I have taken the trouble to read the Federal as well as the State Budget papers), is likely to reach 12 per cent or 13 per cent in the next year. This is most regrettable. It shows that the philosophy on which this Government is working and on which Malcolm Fraser is working simply does not work; it does not get the results. On the Federal scene, I think the Labor Party has some excellent policies. Obviously, economists throughout the world agree that there is—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. McRAE:** I thought that the member for Stuart was afflicted by the braying Minister of Health, and now I am afflicted by the scoffing and laughing Ministers of Water Resources and Health and the two back-benchers who are here. However, I shall tolerate that burden, as did my colleague. The Federal Labor Party has some excellent suggestions in this area.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much audible comment.

**Mr. McRAE:** It agrees with economists throughout the world that there is not one school of economic thought that can any longer be relied upon to produce a sound philosophical basis. I have spoken to academics in Adelaide and interstate, and increasingly economists themselves agree with that proposition. The Keynesian theories upon which we were brought up as almost gospel have been thrown out the window. Milton Freidman has been discredited, but no-one else has come forward with a basic philosophy which will overcome the problem.

**Mr. Lewis:** Not even Bill Hayden.

**Mr. McRAE:** Not Mr. Hayden, not Mr. Fraser, and certainly not Mr. Tonkin, I agree. I am sure the member for Mallee would be forced, from his own reading, to agree with my basic proposition. However, one or two things can be said. First, a mild stimulus to the Federal economy would not be out of order, and there is one area in which I can suggest a basis for that mild stimulus. I refer to the oil levy. The Minister of Water Resources should not be shaking his head at my proposal, because the oil levy is one of the greatest con tricks ever perpetrated on the Australian taxpayer and the Australian States. I hope that the Premier of this State, on behalf of the people of South Australia, has told Malcolm Fraser, loudly and clearly, of the crooked trick that he has perpetrated.

We all know that some sacrifices must be made in the search for oil, but there are certain things that follow from this. First, I think that the levy that Fraser has imposed is far too high and the price that he has permitted is far too high. I believe that, by freezing petrol prices at their current level and reducing them by 3c in the litre, it would cost about \$500 000 000 and produce a domestic deficit of about \$2 000 000 000. That is a figure, by the way, that two years ago even the Freidmanites were prepared to accept as reasonable, and I see no harm in that.

There would be another result: there would be tremendous benefit for all Australian citizens. A small tax cut is really insignificant. A tax cut of about \$2 a week would cost possibly \$500 000 000 a year, yet it would be an illusion. The pressure would be upon any Government, as it was upon the Fraser Government, to give the benefit

one year and take it away the next. By being committed to a strict policy, something could be achieved.

Also, if the States are to remain as viable propositions, they must work out an acceptable agreement with the Commonwealth Government, and there is no question in my mind that the Premiers could demand that the moneys received by the Commonwealth from the oil levy be included in the tax-sharing arrangements that have been in operation for the past 50 years, and this is the right time to do that—immediately before a Federal election. I cannot understand why the Minister of Water Resources is so much in disagreement with my proposition: I would have thought that my proposition was very simple.

**The Hon. P. B. Arnold:** I was not even listening to what you were saying.

**Mr. McRAE:** I am sorry; I thought that the Minister was disagreeing. I hope that the one remaining Minister who is in the House may be taking some notice and, if she becomes aware that her Leader is making a move along these lines, I also hope that she will let us know. I intended to deal with other matters, in particular, in regard to technical arrangements that lie in issue between the Commonwealth and the States, which was the subject of my study tour, but I see that I am running short of time, so I now refer to matters in which South Australia has been abysmally let down by the Commonwealth Government. Another way of stimulating the economy mildly is by a building construction programme. Let me make one or two suggestions in that direction.

First, I believe that it is high time (and I will refer to this matter on a State level as well) that South Australia had decent Supreme Court facilities. It is noticeable that, in Sydney, there is a joint Commonwealth-State court building, which is an excellent and beautiful building of 25 or 30 storeys facing Hyde Park in Sydney, in which the Commonwealth takes half the space and the State takes the remainder of the space. There are library and other facilities at the midway point of the building. Such a venture could work here. Auditors-General of the States and the Commonwealth agree that it is bad business practice for Governments to lease their own premises, but we know very well that the Commonwealth Law Courts in South Australia work from leased premises, so there is every basis for the Commonwealth to expend money and yet stay within the strict standards of the Auditor-General.

The other point that I raise is in relation to the very miserable deal that South Australia has had from the Commonwealth over the years in relation to Government buildings generally. With the exception of the Taxation Department building and some other smaller buildings, very little has been done in Adelaide, yet South Australian Senators, both Liberal and Labor, have been demanding for years that something be done. There is every justification for a complex of three or four buildings of 15 or 20 storeys to house Commonwealth departments in this city, and this complex would give a most desirable impetus to the building industry in this State.

The next matter to which I refer in terms of Commonwealth expenditure is Adelaide Airport, which is an absolute disgrace. I am appalled as a South Australian when I see people from interstate and overseas coming to our lovely city and State and entering into that atmosphere. Adelaide is redolent of a hick town; one could not even call it a city. One steps off the plane either on to the burning tarmac or into the pouring rain and, once inside, the building is either almost totally deserted or jam packed with people milling in all directions. The car park and most of the facilities are totally inadequate and second-rate, and it is about time that something was done.

**Mr. Becker:** Shift it.

**Mr. McRAE:** I agree with the member for Hanson, as I often do. It should be replaced with a proper international airport and linked with the facilities of the international hotel, provided the international hotel is properly looked after, and I will refer to that matter in regard to the State Budget. As I said, the airport and the hotel are linked together, and I hope that members will not overlook that fact. As I said, I intended to deal with tax sharing arrangements and the Loan Council, but I will not bother about that.

I now refer specifically to the Budget as presented by the Premier, and I need to quote only two comments made by the Premier to demonstrate that we are dealing with another disciple of that infamous economist, Milton Friedman. Contrary to every experiment that I mentioned elsewhere, the Premier still maintains the following:

Essential for sustained economic growth are lower levels of taxation and firm control over public sector expenditure.

That just will not work; it has not worked anywhere. I would like to deal with this in more detail but, as sufficient time is not available, I will limit myself to two headings, because of my belief that this Government was elected because of its promises of better employment levels and its indirect promises relating to law and order.

Everyone will remember the infamous campaign conducted by the Chamber of Manufactures and the Retail Traders Association on behalf of the Liberal Party. By the way, I suppose Mr. John Rundle will shortly be going down to West Beach Airport, making his way to London, having been paid back for his part in that infamous campaign.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** That is a dreadful allegation.

**Mr. McRAE:** Everyone knows that John Rundle, on his own admission, organised that campaign and helped get this Government into office, with disgraceful promises that could not be carried out. The Minister knows that. She, being part of the Cabinet, would also know that John Rundle was paid off for his part, as others have been paid off and as others will continue to be paid off. She knows that as well as everyone else.

I will never forget, and I will not let the Liberal members in the north-eastern suburbs forget, the disgraceful campaign that was run in Playford, Todd and Newland. The newspapers are letting the Liberal Party get away with the point that all it promised was another 7 000 jobs. Let me say that that was not the case in Playford, Todd or Newland—it was not 7 000, not 10 000, but 17 000 jobs. Again, the Liberal organisations in the area know about it. It is a fairly tightly knit community. I know many members of the Liberal Party in that area, and they know very well that the promise was made by the business people. In Playford, business men who came out to man the polling booths brought with them many dewey-eyed youngsters. I obtained the figures. As one would expect, I went around in my district during the polling day and spoke to these young people because I could see the disgraceful advertisements outside the polling booths. I did not complain about them.

**Mr. Becker:** You were campaigning on election day.

**Mr. McRAE:** I was not campaigning; I was visiting the workers, as I was perfectly entitled to do. That was certainly not campaigning. Disgraceful advertisements were placed on motor vehicles outside polling booths.

**Mr. Becker:** You were campaigning!

**Mr. McRAE:** Could the member for Hanson lower his voice? I do not want to shout.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hanson has given the member for Playford all the assistance that he needs.

**Mr. McRAE:** These disgraceful advertisements were of two types. One of them said "Vote Labor and we will all lose our jobs", and the other said "Vote Liberal and we promise 17 000 jobs". During an interview I saw recently in which the Premier was being questioned on his economic performance I was amazed when I heard an explanation, and later I heard Mr. Sinclair say something similar. The logic they put forward was this: the interviewer said, "Surely you would have to agree that in the relevant period the number of unemployed persons has increased?" The reply was "Yes", but it was said that that was not the relevant point—employment had increased. However, the interviewer was somewhat puzzled by this, and well he might be. I shall now explain the explanation, which goes something like this: if you look at the total number of people in employment, then from one period to another you will find that there are more people in employment but, equally, if you look at the total number of persons unemployed, that is, seeking employment, you will find that that figure has gone up.

The Liberal promise of 17 000 jobs in this State was very definitely clear—at least it was in my electorate. Mr. Rundle was rich on the polling day, and so were very many of the businessmen who were out there in Playford whom I had never seen before, and I probably will not see them again. I think they would have come from Tusmore and St. Georges, and places like that which I do not visit very often. They promised 17 000 jobs. Those people have not produced the 17 000 jobs, yet at the moment the newspapers are allowing the Liberal Government to get away with it, and they are simply ignoring it. I do not intend to let them get away with it. Even in the Budget speech the Premier had this to say (and what an understatement):

Unemployment in this State remains at an unacceptably high level.

He says that it is of concern to his Government, and I certainly hope that it would be. The Premier went on to say:

It is a situation which results from an accumulation of factors operating over a number of years, and my Government does not believe, nor has it ever pretended—and I stress these remarks—

that this tragic problem can be solved overnight.

The Liberal Party did pretend just that to the very people who worked on the polling booths in the electorates of Playford, Todd, and Newland; not that 17 000 jobs were coming in five, 10 or 20 years time, but that those young people who worked there were going to get jobs within six months. That was the promise made to those people. The wealthy Mr. Rundle who financed those advertisements is even wealthier today, plus he has his job in London, and also a very nice house at Wimbledon at great expense to the taxpayer. However, the young people who worked on those booths have not got jobs, I am very sorry to say. They were defrauded, and I am very sorry about that. Furthermore, the Budget makes it quite clear that this situation is going to get worse; it is not going to get better, because it is further stated in the Budget that employment in the Public Service will be reduced. In a moment I shall turn to the matter of the Police Force and tie that up with the promises that were made on law and order. Not only is the Public Service generally going to be reduced, but I find that the Police Force is also to be reduced—an appalling situation. I turn now to this question of law and order. Another one of the disgraceful Liberal Party beat-ups at the time of the election was the disgraceful advertisement of the hoodlum as part of their law and order campaign. This was the advertisement which was paid for under cover of darkness by that wellknown business man, Adrian Brien of Adrian Brien Ford fame.



**Mr. Becker:** How do you know?

**Mr. McRAE:** I have a photo-copy of the receipt. I have definite proof of it; quite clearly it was paid for by Adrian Brien Ford under cover of darkness and authorised by one Mr. Buick who comes from the Minister of Agriculture's electorate. This was the infamous advertisement of the hooded bandit, suggesting that the Labor Party was responsible in some way for the crime wave in South Australia and that the Liberals would do better. What have they done? I will not be as irresponsible as the Liberal Party members and suggest that the continuation of the crime wave is their fault; it is not. Without having a long and hard think, no Government can do anything in this complex area. I am very concerned when I look at the Budget allocation for the police and find statements such as this:

Expenditure by the Police Department is expected to increase from \$70 900 000 to \$72 700 000 in 1980-81.

Reference is also made to the replacement of police officers with court orderlies. I applaud this, but what I am saying is that in the totality of effective police work that increase is a nothing. In fact, in real terms it is a reduction. On my calculation, just to keep pace with inflation, \$78 000 000 is required. Either one of two things will happen. Either the Police Force manning scale will drop—not increase, as it needs to. It will have to drop, or other services will have to be pruned back. The Chief Secretary has been given this dreadful job by his Government; that gentleman is a very nice man, but this Government has loaded upon him the dreadful task of trying to honour this scurrilous promise that it has made. That is the first thing. The Government stands condemned for that, but if it stands condemned for that, it stands condemned five times over for its attitude towards the criminal justice system.

I urge any member who has not recently been down to the Supreme Court to take a stroll down there. I suggest that this is what he will find: first he will find the graceful old Victorian edifice fronting Victoria Square, a beautiful building, rather crowded inside, but a lovely building. Fronting along King William Road he will find the graceful reasonably graceful Local Court building. In the hollow square, as it were, the L-shape formed by that configuration, he will find the five-storey monstrosity which Sir Thomas Playford put up. So far so good. Now let me get to the bad part. He will then find the Supreme Court Hotel, which was acquired by the Labor Government some years ago with the intention of erecting a new Supreme Court block. Remarkably enough, that building is still standing, although it looks as though it is rotting away from salt damp. But even that is not as bad as the rest of it. Behind that is a wood and iron humpy in which court officers are working, and behind that again is a row of what appear to me to look like tenement houses which the Government seems to have acquired in which court reporters are working.

If any members should disbelieve me I please ask them to take a stroll down there, and I want to connect this with a few other remarks. First, on anybody's estimation the existing premises are a mess. Across the road, members will know the Moore's building—at the moment quite a pleasant building, although I do not particularly go for it in architectural terms, but a lot of people do. Certainly the interior is lovely, with its marble. At the moment it is simply a gutted building. Next door to that is the international hotel, and as the immortal bard once said, "There's the rub". You cannot have it both ways, or all ways. I am demanding an international airport for Adelaide, and I hope the Liberal Party is doing the same.

We demanded, as did the Liberals, an international hotel, and I am pleased to see that they got it.

However, next to that international hotel, which I can see will be a lovely building that will link up beautifully with the S.G.I.C. building and other buildings, will be the criminal courts. Our international visitors, until we get an international airport, will get off their planes at West Beach and think what a hick town this is; they will get to their hotel and think what a lovely hotel it is; but when they wake up in the morning to get on their beautiful S.T.A. bus they will find a line of sheriff's buses behind them to deal with the criminals. What do members think will go into those law courts? I hope members opposite do not laugh about this. I invite them to check what I have said. This is still a democratic society. The civil service may have been muzzled by the Government but members can still speak about this matter to judges, the sheriff, police officers and other people involved. If they do not want to do that they can look for themselves; what I am saying is self evident.

What dim-witted fool could ever have thought that there would be any value in putting up this magnificent international hotel and then putting next door to it a place where infamous criminals will be brought? These people will see a line of black marias, and in front of them a line of tourist buses. I know what I would do if I was an international tourist; I would start judging the risks.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** Some might get in the wrong one.

**Mr. McRAE:** That is possible, with some of the tourists we have had go through Australia. I will not go into that too deeply. Surely any fool could have recognised this situation. The latest preposterous thing I have heard, on good authority, involves the poor wretched Chief Secretary. I do not blame him, but somebody in Cabinet ought to be good enough to take that job because it is too much of a burden for Mr. Rodda. Apparently, he is not listening to reason and to what everybody else is suggesting—and I am sure the member for Hanson would agree—about tearing down those humpies. The Government should get together with the Commonwealth and put up a decent building. It should sell off Moore's to be used for any number of purposes, for instance, as a convention centre. Some people have recommended it be used as a casino, but I disagree with that. There are any number of purposes for which it could be used, but it should not be used for courts of criminal justice; that is just too ludicrous. I think that this burden must be removed from Mr. Rodda. Somebody has to try to tackle this job and to introduce some common sense into this matter; otherwise, international tourists will regard us as a laughing stock.

These people who will deal with law and order are also accountable for the prison system. At the moment, our prison system is a laughing stock. That was highlighted, I think, when criminals actually broke into the Yatala Labor Prison to spring one of their colleagues. Again, I do not blame the Chief Secretary for that; one cannot improve things overnight. What I am criticising are the preposterous, fraudulent promises made that were never based on any scientific reasoning at all. Both of those promises were fraudulent and never had any scientific background. This will catch up with the Liberal Party. I reject all this nonsense.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I support the Budget, unlike the previous speaker who said he could not support the document. I have news for the honourable gentleman: he has no option but to support the document in the same way as my Party did when in Opposition. The honourable member can question and query this document—

**Mr. McRae:** I didn't say I would vote against it; I just said that I rejected it.

**Mr. BECKER:** The honourable member can try as hard as he likes, but he will find that he is stuck with it, which is exactly what my Party found when in Opposition.

I want to put the record straight regarding some of the wild allegations made by the Leader tonight when he criticised the document and, of course, criticised the Premier as Treasurer. In one of his allegations, he was critical of the Government's proposing to transfer \$16 000 000 from Loan Account to Revenue Account this financial year. Unfortunately, the Leader has not been in Parliament very long and does not know of the sleight of hand practices of previous Treasurers in his Party when that Party was in Government. In the final year ending 1979-80, \$15 542 583 was transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account to supplement capital programmes. We did not hear anything from the Opposition then, and we did not hear anything from the Leader in relation to that transfer. If one wants to balance the books, we can say that in this financial year we are getting back from Loan Account what was put into it during the previous financial year. The argument put forward by the Leader was absolute nonsense in that respect.

Let us go back a couple more years because, after all, we realise the Leader has not been in Parliament all that long, and we will have to educate him about what his own Party did when it was in office. I may as well quote actual figures. For the financial year ending 30 June 1980, as I mentioned, \$15 542 583 was transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account. In 1979, the Auditor-General informed us in his report that \$5 662 433 was transferred from Loan Account to Revenue Account, and that was under a Labor Government. For the financial year ending 30 June 1978, the Government transferred to Loan Account from Revenue Account, \$3 400 000. That statistic appears on page 37 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1978. For 1977, we find that the Government transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account, \$24 053 933. We can take it that over the past four-year period \$43 000 000 was transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account.

For this financial year and the earlier occasion \$21 600 000 was transferred from Loan Account to Revenue Account. It is normal practice that when there is a swapping of funds they eventually even themselves out. When one looks at the track record of the previous Government and its handling of the Revenue Account funds (and I think that the Leader ought to bear this in mind), for the financial year 1970-71 there was a deficit of \$4 500 000 in Revenue Account; for the financial year 1971-72, there was a \$5 600 000 deficit; for 1972-73, there was a \$2 000 000 deficit and, in 1973-74, there was a \$500 000 deficit. In 1974-75, because of the unusual circumstances of recurring grants from the Federal Government, there was a surplus of \$22 700 000 in Revenue Account. In 1975-76, that surplus was \$18 400 000; 1977-78, there was a surplus of \$6 400 000; and, in 1978-79 and 1979-80 the Revenue Account balanced.

We find that, in all that time, there has been this give and take within the Revenue Account. During the term of the Dunstan Administration we had the combination of the Loan Account and Revenue Account. I have always favoured dealing with both accounts as separate items, even though they can be consolidated so far as the total fund situation is concerned. These facts give the lie to the statement made by the Leader. There is nothing dishonest and nothing untoward in relation to transferring moneys

from Loan Account to Revenue Account, or vice versa. Let us get that situation clarified. It is obvious that whoever is advising the Leader on economic matters should go back to school and start simple book-keeping procedures again. It would not surprise me if the adviser was the Labor Party Senate candidate, Mr. Maguire. I hope that that gentleman can do better than that if he hopes to aspire to the Federal Parliament and to make any worth while contribution there. If that is the sort of advice he is giving the Leader, no-one in Canberra has much to be worried about.

Another point that I want to clarify concerns the allegation made by the Leader that the Government would be setting up a deregulation unit, which will be another expensive bureaucratic organisation. It has been made clear that the deregulation unit will consist of two officers. Who can believe anything that the Leader says when he goes on about a multi-purpose deregulation department? Two officers will operate that department. There will be no bureaucracy within the department. There will be no permanent head of the department. It will be simply a two-man operation. The Leader's facts have proved to be erroneous in those allegations.

The Leader then attacked the Government in a way that we have come to accept from him with his continual denigration of anything that the Government does, in a typical knocking fashion. We have heard this over time, with everyone knocking everyone and of course the State suffers. If the Opposition is to make any worthwhile contribution in relation to the Budget, I would have expected it to have read and studied the Budget documents and to have given an honest overview of what has been presented. There is no doubt that the attempt by the Government to present a responsible document is proved in the Budget. It is a responsible and well worked out Budget. It is a Budget that will benefit the State partly in the short term, and certainly in the long term.

The ability of the Treasury officials that we have in South Australia, Ron Barnes and his staff, is recognised throughout the Commonwealth, and has been recognised by previous Labor Premiers of South Australia. We are fortunate to have people of such high capability. That is why we have a responsible document. When someone in the position of the Leader of the Opposition condemns what the Treasury has advised the Government it can do, then the credibility of such a person is in doubt.

The Leader went on about the airy-fairy threat of broken promises. Let me remind him that during the 1979 election campaign the Liberal Party spelt out clearly that the economic policies would be spread over a three-year period. We had in mind that it would take at least three years for the new Government to be able to correct the wrongs of the previous Government and set the economic records straight. Thus, this very haphazard attempt by the Leader has been destroyed.

Of course, he is also on record publicly as sounding off in relation to our allocations in education areas. I refute the pathetic assessment that he has made of what we are doing in relation to education. The allocation has been increased by 14.5 per cent, or approximately 1 per cent in real terms. When members bear in mind that there are some new initiatives to be implemented and other additional programmes to be maintained and improved, I think that the Minister of Education has done an excellent job. It will be proved in the next 12 months, and certainly in the remainder of this financial year, that the basis of improved education, the quality of education and the financial control of education in this State in the years to come will benefit from the initiatives that are taken now.

It is easy for the Teachers Institute and all these other

little groups that dance around on the lunatic fringe of politics to protest and object to anything and everything that ever catches their fancy at the time. They have no argument at this stage, and they have plenty to answer for regarding the handling of the dollars in education in this State. Certainly they will have the opportunity to comment on future documents in that respect. There has not been any cut in education in real terms or in any other terms. In fact, I believe that they are doing well, indeed; they can be fortunate to have the level of funding they have. The performance that I have seen, certainly during the investigation that we had of the Teacher Housing Authority, indicated that they are spoilt, if anything.

**Mr. Ashenden:** Would you say they went off half-cocked over there?

**Mr. BECKER:** They did go off half-cocked. The Opposition was trying to dredge something out of the Budget to hang its hat on with its supposed acclaimed supporters and, as the honourable member has said, the Opposition was desperate and it has failed. Certainly, the Opposition has destroyed any credibility that it ever had. In the health area, in real terms, there is a slight drop of 1 per cent.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. BECKER:** It is not only healthier; if one has sound financial management there is no point in throwing money away. No-one says anything or even remembers that just two years ago the former Minister of Health (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield) announced cuts of 8½ per cent across the board in hospital funding, and this was followed by further cuts under the previous Labor Minister of Health, the member for Elizabeth.

In its term of office the Labor Party implemented heavy cuts in this area. The present Minister of Health came into an organisation that was undergoing financial management changes and the tightening of controls, and she was also faced with the financial fiasco that was created by the previous Government in slashing budgets and trying to cover up this cost cutting. The Minister of Health has had to take the brunt of the accusations, that it is she who has been responsible for the cuts in health, when in fact they were implemented about two years ago. She has had to take the savage criticism that it is she who cut out the biscuits at Royal Adelaide Hospital. In fact, it had nothing to do with the Minister of Health. Sir Norman Young, Chairman of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Board, was the person who announced that decision to the staff. He and the board made that decision.

Therefore, I wish the Opposition would do something to build up its credibility and tell this House the full facts or at least investigate these matters before making the allegations that they have made. Of course, the Government has come to accept that certain members of the Opposition (fortunately, not all of them), whether it be here or in Canberra, seem to take personalities of the Government of the day and set out to try to destroy their credibility. They have tried to do this to the Ministers of my Government and, fortunately, they have failed dismally. From what I can see of the efforts that the Ministers have displayed so far, we have nothing to fear about the ability of our Ministers to carry out their duties and to withstand that level of attack.

This situation points up the weaknesses of the Opposition, which has to resort to personal attacks on Ministers to try to destroy the excellent performance of people who are working under extremely difficult conditions. It is incredible to think that some of our new Ministers, when they came into office, had as much as nine months backlog of work to clear up before they could commence setting about implementing our own policies.

It is absolutely disgraceful to think that people who were elected to Parliament under the banner of the Labor Party and who were appointed as Ministers by the former Premiers Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Corcoran, allowed their work to slip, leaving dockets up to nine months in arrears.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Some dockets date back several years.

**Mr. BECKER:** In the Minister's department we found some dockets dating back several years. He and I know that there was a problem involving a person of foreign nationality in relation to a real estate licence. The handling of that person's application by the previous Minister was pathetic. It went on for months with the gentleman believing that he had the qualifications when, in fact, he did not. There were matters going back several years, and we are now starting to find, through the resurgence of the quality of education campaign through our schools, that requests for minor facilities at some of our schools which were fed into the system years ago have been brushed aside. It is now up to our Government to review established priorities within the constraints that must be placed on the economy in this country. There is no doubt that it is a Budget that will fulfil the wishes of the Government and the people of South Australia. It is a Budget that is designed for future planning and development.

One other allegation that the Leader tried to make in his remarks was that the Government was endeavouring to obtain taxes through Government charges. As the Premier said yesterday, the water rate increase in 30 July represented an aggregate increase of about 8 per cent for water and sewerage charges. This is less than last year's increase, and it is less than the current rate of inflation. He also went on to answer criticism from the Leader in relation to Housing Trust rentals. The Premier explained that the increase of between \$3 and \$4 became effective in March because the Housing Trust is required, under the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, to review rentals annually in relation to rental movements in the open market. The Leader did not say this, of course, nor did he say that 47 per cent of the trust's tenants were unaffected by the increases because they are pensioners or tenants receiving rental rebates. So much for the very hollow attack that the Leader made again tonight on the Premier in this regard. He also paid very scant attention to the economy of the country, and blamed anybody and everybody.

Five years ago Australia was clearly living beyond its means under the megalomaniac policies of the Whitlam Government. These economic policies were brought down into the Federal Parliament by the man who now leads the Federal Labor Party and wants to aspire once again to hold very high office in Canberra. The people of this country would be extremely short-sighted if they turned around and supported that person at the forthcoming Federal election. Nobody can be sure that the economic policies of the Labor Party federally or in this State will not lead to the disastrous situation we experienced in the past decade.

The Public Accounts Committee, of which I am Chairman, has proved that there are many areas where huge amounts of money can be saved. I hope that within the next 12 to 18 months we will be able to quantify the savings that have been made in many departments. I remind the Leader that the two reports that we have presented to Parliament so far, one in relation to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the other in relation to the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority, have not been refuted. The Engineering and Water Supply Department report has been supported by

the Minister. This demonstrates the benefit of the Public Accounts Committee—a committee of the Parliament which reports to the Parliament the facts and figures. If the Government of the day uses those reports as they are designed, for the benefit of the State and to correct the anomalies, and accepts the advice of the committee, the Government of the day will then be far better off. Certainly, it is a far cheaper operation to use the Public Accounts Committee comprising members of Parliament rather than employing numerous public servants and using modern technical aids to come up with the same result.

The Labor Party should not be fearful of the Public Accounts Committee, as it was in years gone by. Mr. Dunstan established the Public Accounts Committee and supported it, but no doubt there was a move to abolish the committee a few years ago following the hospitals report. Irrespective of the feelings of the Labor Party itself in relation to the hospitals report, one must commend the former Chairman (Mr. Charlie Wells, the member for Florey) for steering that committee into the situation where it was able to report. The Labor Party did accept many of its recommendations, and it did implement cuts in the hospitals area.

The total expenditure of our Budget for this financial year is \$1.5 billion. It is the first time that we have reached that magical figure. We can compare that with our expenditure last financial year of \$1.384 billion. Let us hope that we do not always look for huge increases in the Budget expenditure or revenue figures. Let us hope that we keep looking for a sane and balanced document.

I now turn to the Auditor-General's Report and some of the matters that have been raised by the Auditor-General before the financial year ending on 30 June 1980. When we look at page 1, we find a fair statement as follows:

In response to various requests, seven experienced officers were seconded for indefinite periods to assist the Public Accounts Committee and other departments. It is expected that the services of one officer will be made available to the Public Accounts Committee on a regular basis.

I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** I wish to bring a couple of matters to the attention of the House tonight; one concerns a Minister in another place, and a memorandum that was issued by the Director-General of his department. I refer to the Minister of Community Welfare. Sometime ago, in April of this year, the Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare issued a memorandum to all branch heads titled "Parliamentary back-bench committee access to the department". That memorandum went on to inform the branch heads that there were five members of Parliament who desired access to various Department for Community Welfare offices around the State. It said that this committee supported or advised the Minister of Community Welfare on matters of community welfare, and he felt that it was important that these members should have full access to and understanding of the way services were provided within the department itself. It actually read in part:

The committee is a policy advising committee to Government and it certainly will be more interested in broad issues rather than detailed management. However, where management practice appears to cause some concern, then

the member of Parliament will discuss this with the district officer.

I am sure that all members of this House feel that it would be very important for all members of Parliament to become better informed and more educated about what is happening in the offices of government around the State, and I think it would be commended that access be offered to members of Parliament who are interested in the appropriate areas to have access to those Government offices that fall within the ambit of committees of which they are members. However, there are a number of important implications to the memorandum, first, in the memorandum itself and, secondly, as a result of an answer that the Minister gave to a member of another place a few weeks ago.

The first concern I have is that the memorandum clearly does not state that it is a Liberal Party back-bench committee. It gives the indication that it is merely a back-bench committee made up of Parliamentary members, and, without district officers going to the trouble of finding out what districts these members represent, they may be under the delusion that this is a bipartisan committee, but that was not the case.

The members of the committee identified are the members for Brighton, Mawson, Newland, and Glenelg, and one member in another place. I am not objecting to the Parliamentary Liberal Party having a committee on community welfare and having the right of access to offices in the Department for Community Welfare throughout the State, but I will come in a moment to the principal point of objection that I have to the way in which this memorandum has been framed.

An interesting point should be mentioned in looking at the memorandum because, as I have said, the member for Brighton is indeed the member for Brighton, but the memorandum suggests that he was going to look at the Port Adelaide office of the Department for Community Welfare. The member for Mawson was going to go to the Woodville office. The member for Newland was busily occupying himself at the Elizabeth office, in the heart of the District of Elizabeth, and the member for Glenelg was going south to Christies Beach.

If those members were reasonably and honestly interested in community welfare issues, why did they not ask to go to offices in their districts, especially given the fact that the memorandum said that these members were interested in the management practices and, where concerns involved individual cases, they would discuss the matter with district officers? That seems to be an invitation to involve themselves in constituent matters outside their districts. We know how sensitive members opposite are, particularly the member for Glenelg. In the first session of this Parliament, that member was beside himself when another member of this House was helping constituents in the District of Glenelg, and now here is the member for Glenelg in Christies Beach!

The aspect of members involving themselves in Government departments and in trying to find out more about how they work is an understandable one, albeit that members opposite do not seem to know where their own constituencies are and seem to be wandering all over the State. In another place, the Hon. Norm Foster asked the Minister, first, whether the Minister would acknowledge that this was a Parliamentary Liberal Party back-bench committee, whether he would identify that to district officers of the department, and then whether the same access would be afforded to the Opposition Parliamentary Labor Party committee on community welfare.

The Minister started his reply by saying that he felt it quite obvious that the district heads would realise it was

the Parliamentary Liberal Party committee and members named in this memorandum are so obviously not very able that one would guess them to be members of the Liberal Party, but that is making an assumption, and I do not think it fair to have the district officers have to make that assumption. The Minister went on to say (and this is more important and more dangerous), in answer to the second part of the question, that he would not allow access to the Opposition Labor Party committee on community welfare. What is the Minister of Community Welfare aiming to do? Is he operating within a one-Party State mentality that it is okay for some people to have access to information and to what is done but it is not okay for members of the loyal Opposition to have the same access to try to find out what is going on? That means that, for example, the member for Newland is entitled to access to what is going on in the Elizabeth district office of the department and that he is quite entitled to see what is happening in the handling of constituents from the Districts of Elizabeth and Napier, but should the members for those districts be on the P.L.P. committee on community welfare, they would not have access to the office in their own areas.

Surely that is not within the realms of democratic tradition that this State tries to uphold. I mentioned this about a month ago in an article in the *Sunday Mail*. This question in the Upper House has been in *Hansard* for well over a month waiting for some response from the Minister of Community Welfare himself to at least acknowledge, in decency, a retraction of the answer he gave or, indeed, awaiting a response from the Premier. What have we had? We have had absolute silence. I believe that this shows clearly that this Government is committed to a one-Party State mentality. It is not interested in true access to information or in Parliamentary representatives (representing as they do the electorate as a whole) informing themselves better on behalf of their constituents and of this State. I do not think that that will do them any credit, and I know that that type of mentality and attitude will do them no credit at the next election.

**Mr. Abbott:** I'm all right Jack!

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** That is precisely what it is. It means that perhaps the member for Brighton, the member for Newland, and the member for Mawson, who are decidedly "oncers" in this Parliament, who are in marginal electorates, are trying to scout around for other seats.

**Mr. LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**Mr. LEWIS:** I draw your attention to Standing Order 153, which states:

No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.

The member for Salisbury called the member for Mawson and other colleagues of mine "oncers".

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member takes offence at the word that has been used by the honourable member for Salisbury. Will the honourable member for Salisbury withdraw the word referred to?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am afraid that I cannot see the offence in the term "oncer".

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member has been asked whether he wished to withdraw. He does not look on it as offensive. It is not one of the words which have been deemed to be unparliamentary and, unless the honourable member for Mallee wishes to take the matter further, I will call on the member for Salisbury.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Thank you, Sir. Indeed, the very principle I am coming down to is that the tradition under which we operate in Parliamentary democracy is surely

one of all sides operating on the best information they can have on how Government departments operate and having access to that information, and an attempt by any Government to close that off, in the sense of this memorandum issued by the Director-General and not retracted by the Minister of Community Welfare, is not in the best interests of this State. I believe that, indeed, when they consider this matter and realise its full implications, both the Minister and the Premier will try to find some way in which to backtrack and reach some sort of commonsense attitude.

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

**Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd):** I take this opportunity tonight to correct some of the misconceptions and inaccuracies put forward last evening by the member for Playford. This is necessary, because if it were not rebutted, unfortunately, some people might think that what he said was true. His speech was full of emotionalism and stepped far away from the true facts in relation to the north-east transport situation.

First, he stated on three occasions that the Opposition had sought an opportunity to debate in the Parliament the decision of the Government in relation to north-east transport, and said it was blocked by not providing the necessary time. Later in his speech he went on to say that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs were being robbed; that the Leader had moved a motion; that the Government was not going to give any time for this matter to be discussed; that it was a kangaroo court; that the debate was gagged immediately, and all this sort of thing.

**Mr. Lewis:** Misleading statements.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** Completely misleading. If the member for Playford were to look at the Notice Paper for today, he would see that Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 6 states, "Mr. Bannon to move—That Government time be made available," etc.

In other words, the Leader's motion is still before the House; he will have the opportunity for debating it, and, as for saying that the Government was not allowing debate on this matter, I point out that Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 4 on the Notice Paper states:

Mr. Ashenden to move—That this House commends the Government on its decision to immediately proceed with the provision of a modern rapid public transport system to the north-eastern suburbs . . .

Of course, this naturally will open the whole area for debate. When I have completed that speech, no doubt members opposite, as well as other members on this side, will take the opportunity to put forward various points. So, the honourable member was totally misleading, as the entire Labor Party has been on all the issues in relation to north-eastern transport. For any member to say these things when his Leader's motion is still before the House, which he knew full well, and when he knew full well that there was a motion on the Notice Paper for today which will be debated for months yet on this very matter, indicates that the last thing the Labor Party is interested in relating to north-east transport is the truth.

Let us look at other points made by the member for Playford in his speech last night. He said that the busway will cause great concern to anyone who is interested in the impact on the environment of the Torrens Valley. This point was answered very well earlier today. Mr. Burden, an expert who has been used by members opposite in pushing their barrow in relation to transport, has said that such a proposal as the Government's will have the least effect on the environment of any public transport system.

We have said that the O'Bahn guideway will be

narrower than would the l.r.t. track, and there will be no unsightly overhead wires, so his statement on that matter was another untruth.

The member for Playford said that the system is not going to work and that only one other city in the world, Essen, has a similar system. That is totally incorrect. In Hamburg, Germany, such a system has operated and has carried more than 300 000 public fare-paying passengers. One is going into Essen, and others are to operate in other countries. For the honourable member to deny that again is totally untrue. It would be a good idea if members opposite did their homework before they started making the inaccurate statements they are making on this matter.

The member for Playford went on to say that it is strongly suggested by transport experts that hidden extras could take the total cost of the Government's proposal to \$70 000 000. Of course, we are not told who those experts are or where the information came from. Anyone can make these statements, without any foundation of fact or any support on a factual basis.

The honourable member went on to say that the members for Newland and Todd will have to be brought to account for what the Government is doing. I should like him to go ahead and tell my constituents, as he says he is going to do, what I am doing. I am certain that we have on the Government side an issue which is very well accepted in Todd and, from discussions with my colleague, also in Newland. We are being seen to provide at a reasonable cost a form of public transport with which most of the people in the north-eastern suburbs are delighted. I would be extremely happy to go into the next election with this as an issue that the Government has taken steps in. I know—and the member for Mallee took this up—that members opposite have included me as one of the so-called oncres in this Parliament. We have heard of two members, the members for Mount Gambier and Coles, who were subjected to the same type of denigration in the last Parliament, yet they are both here now as Ministers. I also look forward to coming back in a further Liberal Government after the next election.

The honourable member went on to talk about saving six minutes if we use a busway system, but saving 15 or 20 minutes by using a tram. That is utter rubbish. I recommend to the member for Playford that he read the report prepared by officers of the S.T.A. which shows that this statement is totally untrue.

As I pointed out earlier, except for those residents who live at the plaza (and I know of none), those who need to come in from outer suburbs will have a quicker trip by bus than by tram.

**Mr. McRae:** That is not right, and you know it.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** Of course it is right, for the simple reason that there will be no changeover. Some people could be waiting for half an hour at the Tea Tree Plaza to get their tramway connection. The tram is quicker by about two or three minutes than the bus between the plaza and the city, but that time is more than picked up by the removal of the necessity for interchange with the tramway.

The honourable member said that the Government's decision is blatantly political; he said this not once but twice. I can only say that the Government has conducted an extremely good decision analysis. The Government considered the cost, the convenience, the area to be served, comfort, and the effect on the environment, and considering all of those issues, the busway proposal comes out way in front. How that is a political decision I do not know.

How is the Government's proposal, which will save twice what it will cost (in other words, it is one-third of the cost of the l.r.t. proposed by the previous Government,

which means that this Government can implement another two systems and pay only what the previous Government intended to spend on a tram from Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza), a political decision? If this is not a decision based on good common sense and the use of good financial reasoning, I do not know what is.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They promised a south coast electrified railway in 1973.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** The public is starting to see the members of the Opposition for what they really are. The public knows that the Government has made a first class decision, and that fact cannot be disputed. We are seeing a smear campaign and emotionalism at its worst. The ex-member for Newland, and that is what he will remain, has not learnt any lessons either. As I said earlier today, whether he cannot understand what is going on or whether he wants to mislead deliberately, or perhaps a combination of the two, I do not know. His handling of the Government's busway proposal and of the Modbury Hospital issue shows that he is not in the least concerned about the truth. Other members opposite seem to be falling for the same thing, unfortunately.

I come now to comments made by the Australian Electric Traction Association. Let us assume that that association is not politically aligned, but only wishes to push its own barrow. The association obviously believes that electric traction is the answer, and it will do everything it can to try to convince the public that it is right. Unfortunately, the association is wrong, for reasons that I have already stated; it is falling into the same trap as members opposite are falling into—it is arguing emotionally instead of with facts, and it is talking about delays in the city streets where, it is claimed, buses will be forced to compete with city traffic.

**Mr. McRae:** Quite correct.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** That is not correct; the honourable member opposite never learns and if he considered the facts, he would know that the buses will use a bus-only lane for 24 hours a day, traffic light systems will be operated by those buses, the lights will always go on to green and the buses will be able to move quickly into the city and out again.

**Mr. McRae:** What about Hackney Road?

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** This includes Hackney Road. For goodness sake, the member opposite must be really thick. What else does he say—that Tea Tree Plaza is envisaged as a major bus transfer station. That is totally untrue.

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

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** Before I proceed with the subject matter of my address, I refer to the deliberate misuse or abuse of Question Time this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture. During Question Time, the Minister answered two questions asked by members from his side; it took him 14 minutes to answer a question regarding a reception of some nature that was held recently.

**Mr. Evans:** Are you suggesting he was out of tune?

**Mr. SLATER:** Not in the way he answered the question but in the way he deliberately wasted the time of the House. He buffooned his way through the first question and took 14 minutes.

**Mr. Mathwin:** What about Hugh Hudson, the previous Minister of Mines? He used to go on for a long time.

**Mr. SLATER:** I am not supporting Mr. Hudson; I do not care what he did. I am talking about the present.

The clock showed about seven or eight minutes to go when the second question was directed to him. He deliberately filibustered when replying to the question. In both cases he just rambled on; it was a fairly uninteresting

reply as usual, anyway. The point I am making is that he deliberately flouted the decency of the House in respect to his blatant display of arrogance and stupidity in deliberately stopping persons from both sides having a reasonable opportunity to ask questions.

As I understand it, the purpose of Question Time is for members to seek information from Ministers of the Crown for the benefit of the community generally. I am therefore concerned about the display of the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon. I appreciate the fact that you, Mr. Speaker, have not the power to direct any Minister regarding the way he may answer a question. This applies not only to the Minister's performance today; quite definitely what is needed is that the Standing Orders Committee should consider very carefully the question of imposing a limit on the time which a Minister may have to answer a question.

**Mr. Mathwin:** We used to have two hours.

**Mr. SLATER:** That would benefit everybody in this House, including the member for Glenelg. I believe the Standing Orders Committee should look very seriously at this particular question that I have put this evening, namely, that there should be a time limit on the replies to questions by Ministers.

The other matter I wish to refer to briefly concerns the Ministerial statement made by the Premier this afternoon. He said that his Government had sent a telegram of good wishes to Mr. Jim Hardy of the Australian group in the American yachting fiasco, or whatever it might be called.

**Mr. Randall:** It's a race.

**Mr. SLATER:** That may be so. The point I am making is that this just shows how inconsistent the Premier and his Government can be, because he did not give any support or send any telegram to the Australian athletes at the Olympic Games. Just the opposite occurred; he pulled out of the South Australian Olympic Council. The Australian team was not recognised, but the athletes were selected to represent Australia. However, the America's Cup is a private venture; it is run by the Hardy's and the Alan Bond's. They are not sportsmen, but millionaires who are just using the people's money that they have gained from them over a period of years, yet the Premier has the audacity to send a telegram at taxpayers' expense, and he would not have the bloody decency—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member not to use that term and to withdraw it.

**Mr. SLATER:** I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. It is commonly-used Australian vernacular and it just slipped out. It is true that the Australian people are not particularly interested in yachting events in America anyway.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. SLATER:** It may appear so; the media may present it that way, but I am not personally interested and I believe that the Australian community thinks the same as I do. They look upon it as a millionaire's sport and we might say that taxpayers' money was wasted in sending a telegram to Mr. Hardy. I point out just how hypocritical the Government can be when it did not pay the same courtesy to the people who were definitely representing this country, young amateur sportsmen, not millionaire sportsmen.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They got leave with pay from the Education Department.

**Mr. SLATER:** How generous can you be! That happened before many times; that is only an entitlement, and you would do it for anyone else.

I will now get to the subject matter, because I have only four minutes left. Members opposite have wasted all my time with stupid interjections.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr. SLATER:** I read with interest a few days ago that the Minister for Home Affairs, the part-time Minister for sport and recreation, had made some major Federal policy announcement, including details of the sports development programme budget allocation, at the Confederation of Australian Sports Seminar in Perth. He said that the \$1 000 000 allocation for overseas competition would assist Australian athletes to upgrade their standards, and that a total of \$8 100 000 would be allocated by the Government to sport this year. That is a bit of an improvement on what has been allocated before, because in the past the present Government has only allocated some \$3 500 000 to sport. In this instance the Government will increase that amount to \$8 100 000.

It is fairly significant that this is a Federal election year and that the Government wants to put itself back on side with sporting organisations around Australia because of its efforts in the past. Members will remember Mr. Ellicott as the hatchet-man for Mr. Fraser during one of his many absences overseas, and Mr. Ellicott's "heavying" the Australian Olympic Federation to change its mind about sending persons to compete in the Olympic Games. I do not think he acted very correctly with regard to sport and recreation in this country. Now the Federal Government is offering sportsmen \$8 100 000 to get the Government off the hook with the sports people of Australia. I do not have much time in which to refer to the Labor Party's policy on sport and recreation.

**Mr. Randall:** Do you support the Magarey Medal?

**Mr. SLATER:** Yes, I do. The honourable member would never win one; he would not be able to play football because it is a man's game. The basic policy of the Labor Party federally is, first, to improve the standard of health and physical fitness of all Australians, secondly, to provide access for all Australians to first-class sport and recreation facilities so that they may enjoy and benefit from increased leisure time; and, thirdly, to enable talented sports people to have access to international standard coaching and competition that will enable them to fulfil themselves to the best of their ability. I believe that that is a rational, sensible and attainable policy. I believe that the Australian people will support that policy at the Federal election on 18 October.

**Mr. Randall:** How much money would you allocate?

**Mr. SLATER:** The amount mentioned to be allocated to Sport and Recreation in the policy of the Federal Australian Labor Party is \$11 000 000 a year, that amount to be gradually increased over a period of three to four years.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 18 September at 2 p.m.