

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 September 1980

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

PETITION: EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 59 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide full details of proposed education funding was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: ENVIRONMENTAL UNIT

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to re-establish the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science was presented by Mr. Hemmings.

Petition received.

PETITION: TOWING INDUSTRY

A petition signed by 156 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to legislate urgently so as to regulate the motor vehicle towing industry was presented by Dr. Billard.

Petition received.

PETITION: RETAIL MEAT SALES

A petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose any changes to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat was presented by Dr. Billard.

Petition received.

PETITION: NET FISHING

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ban the use of nets, except for tuna baiting, from Port Sir Isaac to Frenchman and from Port Bolingbroke to Port Donnington was presented by Mr. Blacker.

Petition received.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER**: I have received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition, as follows:

I wish to advise that when the House meets today, Wednesday 24 September 1980, I shall move that the House at its rising adjourn to 2 p.m. on Friday 26 September for the purpose of debating the following matter of urgency, namely, the Government's cynical use of the office of Attorney-General for blatant Party political purposes as shown by the Attorney-General's Report purporting to deal with the dismissal of Mr. H. H. Salisbury.

I call on those honourable members who support the Leader's request to stand.

Members having risen:

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until 2 p.m. on Friday 26 September,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, the Government's cynical use of the office of Attorney-General for blatant Party political purposes as shown by the Attorney-General's Report purporting to deal with the dismissal of Mr. H. H. Salisbury.

Yesterday, we saw what might have been the last act or perhaps a further round in one of the most shabby and cynical political exercises that this Government has undertaken during its term of office. It is a continuing saga that culminated yesterday in the Chief Law Officer of the Crown, the Leader of the Bar in South Australia, under his own hand and under Parliamentary privilege, presenting and tabling a report of the most scurrilous nature containing unsubstantiated allegations, circumstantial inferences, and generally aimed at not only discrediting a former Premier of this State and distorting a particular period of our history but also with the purpose of it being used for cynical contemporary political election purposes.

Those charges are grave ones, but the evidence is extremely clear indeed. This whole shabby political exercise has been continued probably since early 1979 when the first discussion of a book that was being prepared purporting to expose the previous Premier and the record of his Government was first foreshadowed by some Adelaide journalists. Such is the sense of shame I suggest on the part of the Government that it is not even prepared to come out with the report and table it and publicise it without attempting to find some pretext or setting in which to present it, that setting or pretext being the only reason the Government is reluctantly doing it and climbing down into the gutter with this report is that the Opposition has called on the Government to do so. No doubt we will hear more about this from the Acting Premier who will make considerable statements about it.

The facts are that the report, commissioned at the height of an election campaign that the Government looked in grave danger of losing and did lose, has re-emerged after months of delay precisely at the time that a further Federal election has been called in which one of the candidates is personally related to the chief subject matter of this scurrilous report. So, they had to devise a pretext for it. When it was first mooted the Premier on reading or hearing of a statement, an unsworn uncorroborated statement by a completely untrustworthy and discredited person, called for a report on the allegations made by that person and commissioned it from his Attorney-General. I remind members of what the *Advertiser* stated at the time:

The Government should establish Mr. Ceruto's meaning, and quickly. Failing some new and very solid material, it would be grossly improper to do anything but let the matter rest.

Let the matter rest! There is no way in which the Government wanted this matter rested or dealt with quickly. All the remarks made by the Opposition, and particularly by my colleague in another place, the Hon. C. J. Sumner, have been directed at ensuring that the Government says one way or the other whether it is commissioning a report; what it is going to do about it; and what recommendations and what action will follow the report. At no time has he said plainly and specifically that we demand the tabling of the report, certainly not in the sense of at a particular time or session. Certainly, there may be some such inferences drawn, but that is a shabby device, a sideline, which the Government has used to

somehow ensure that it is covering itself for the discreditable exercise on which it is engaged.

The air has not been cleared for seven months. The Government has fostered speculation about this matter, culminating most shamefully last week when rumours were deliberately circulated among the press to the effect that this report was to be released by the Attorney-General and tabled in Parliament. Naturally, the media's curiosity was whetted and, naturally, they waited with anticipation on the day the tabling was meant to take place. It did not take place, and that prompted, because the speculation and announcements were made known to everyone, my colleague in another place to ask specific questions about the failure of the report to be presented on that day.

It was seized on with glee by the Attorney-General, who, by means of the media and by the press rumours he had circulated, had deliberately set up the Opposition. The Attorney-General said, "You have demanded the report. Therefore, I will release it." Let us be clear. If there had been no calls, and if the set-up whereby the media was shamefully used by the Government (and I hope that they will remember this in the future), if that device had not succeeded, there is no doubt that the opportunity would have been taken this week to release that report, come what may, because it is a political exercise, in the context of the Federal election.

It is interesting that this week is the time, the last possible opportunity before the Federal election, and the time when the Premier himself could be away overseas, and not called to account personally for the shabby report that has been produced and for the way in which it has been used. It is just as well that he can play Mr. Clean somewhere else, and no doubt that was all part of the planning and strategy of the Liberal Party. The Government and the Liberal Party have connived closely in organising this event. The election and maximum damage to the Labor Party at election time obviously was one of their aims, and it was coloured by the continuing ferocity of their pursuit of former Premier Dunstan. They will not rest until he is totally discredited in his grave. Why? Because they know that his leadership and achievements in this State kept them out of office. The heritage of that will ensure that the Government goes out of office quickly, having destroyed those achievements, at the next election. The Government must destroy him and everything he stands for.

This is where the hypocrisy is most apparent. Only last week, at the same time as this job was being prepared on the former Premier, the Minister of Tourism was unveiling a package selling the advantages and merits of South Australia for tourism that has as its feature every single thing Premier Dunstan had promoted and stood for: our quality of life, our arts, our festival, and our transport—all those things that make South Australia and Adelaide the place it is, all of them heritage of the Dunstan years and the Dunstan spirit in the community. There, bold as brass, are the members who carped and attacked him, using that for their \$1 000 000 promotion campaign for the State. It is outrageous hypocrisy, and it will be noted by the people and public of South Australia.

What is the nature of this report? It is a prosecutor's brief prepared by a politician. Certainly, it has no merit as a legal document. If the Attorney-General was a lawyer in private practice, and had dared to publish a report such as this one, he would have not only been sued in the courts of this land but also been taken instantly to the Law Society on grounds of unethical conduct. It is totally unethical.

It is interesting that the entire report hinges at its base on eight pages of statements by a certain Mr. Ceruto. It is

an unsworn statement, and what irony do we hear today? The Government is to introduce in this very House this very day legislation that will abolish unsworn statements from the courts. That issue is being dealt with and discussed in this Parliament. Yet, here is an unsworn statement made for the purposes of promoting a scurrilous book, made for sensational purposes, and made for commercial purposes. No cross-examination is afforded, no proof is adduced, and there is no credibility in respect of the person making the statement. Yet, that is the hinge and basis of a 33-page report, not from some journalist in the community, someone without legal training or understanding, but from the Attorney-General himself, the Chief Law Officer of the Crown, sanctioned by the Government.

There is nothing new in this report, and nothing new in what Ceruto says. One thing must be remembered. There was an occasion and an opportunity for Ceruto, his statements, and his credibility as a witness to be questioned in a proper legal process, and that was before the Royal Commission. He was there; he sat throughout that Commission. He talked to the Liberal Party's lawyers and he was available to be called if they had wished to adduce evidence of this sort. They did not, because they knew it would not stand up to the normal legal scrutiny. So, they waited until they had it dealt with in this manner, and they have produced it in this form, in this report—scandalous behaviour by anyone, whether legally trained or not.

Let us briefly analyse the report. The first seven pages consist of a total verbatim transcript of the scurrilous statements made by Ceruto, probably prepared by Ryan and McEwen, who had written the book which he was trying to promote and sell—simply stated verbatim statements. The usual thing in reports such as this, particularly dealing with such a statement, would be at the least to summarise or extract from the report those parts which are relevant and to append the full statement. Of course, the report would look thin indeed and would certainly be far less sensational if, instead of reading for seven pages the libelous utterances of this man, it had to be turned to in an appendix. That is typical of the whole dishonest construction of this report, of which the author should be totally ashamed.

There are seven pages of those scurrilous statements, and then a number of pages purporting to summarise what this statement says, but presenting it in such a way as to indicate that these are factual statements. For instance, the first point dealt with by the Attorney-General is that Ceruto and Dunstan had a personal relationship which fitted the concept of a security risk. He goes on to quote from Lord Denning and discusses the general situation of security risks, all of which was intended to convey the impression that what Ceruto said was true, that the facts of his statement were not in dispute.

On page 10 of the report—and this is where it is made quite clear—he says that the facts raised in paragraphs 1 to 4 appear not to be the subject of dispute; he refers to "the facts" mentioned on page 5. They are not facts; they never have been. They have not been tested, corroborated or proved. It is absolute nonsense to describe them as such, but that is what the Attorney-General says: they are facts, facts that have been raised. The report proceeds on that basis. It is a scandalous document.

After going through a tedious recitation of circumstantial evidence by which it may have been that the Government or Mr. Dunstan knew about the existence of a Special Branch and its precise nature, a circumstantial analysis, nearly all of which was available to the Royal Commission and which was dealt with quite solidly there,

we come at page 25 to the Attorney-General's projection of the consequences of Ceruto's statement. The Attorney-General says:

It may be projected that the disclosure to the Royal Commission may have had the following effect.

And he lists a number of points, saying that it may have affected this or that conclusion—absolute conjecture and absolute nonsense if one returns to the actual findings and reports of the Royal Commission.

Let me make a comment on that. What that Royal Commission was dealing with was not the Premier of this State or his behaviour, or allegations by people such as Ceruto. It was to do with the decision that the Government of South Australia made in relation to the misleading information provided by the Police Commissioner at that time. That is what the Royal Commission was about, and that clearly was what the evidence was adduced on and what the findings were made on. There is nothing in this report that would in any way affect or alter those findings. At paragraph 89, Justice Mitchell said:

I have no doubt that the answers which Mr. Salisbury gave to the Government were intentionally incomplete, and being incomplete they were in some instances untrue and misleading.

At paragraph 108, Justice Mitchell said:

My conclusion from all of the evidence is that the Government was misled by the communications of Mr. Salisbury as to the nature and extent of the activities of Special Branch and that, relying upon such communications, it misled others.

At paragraph 147, she said:

It seems to me that there is no cause to find that he [Mr. Salisbury] was denied natural justice.

At paragraph 141, she found that, before his resignation was called for, Mr. Salisbury had ample time to put before the Government any information he wished to give in order to show that the factual findings of Justice White were not true or were misleading. Those were the findings of the Commission, and those matters were thoroughly explored. There is nothing in this document that in any way could alter those findings or have an effect on the matter. It is a scandalous exercise.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):

The Leader of the Opposition has in fairly florid language referred to what he has described as a shabby political exercise, a scurrilous report, distorting history for cynical contemporary election purposes. Opposition members tried to shake off the fact that they, as an Opposition, have called for the release of reports, and in particular this report. Let me refer the Leader's memory to the debate initiated by him in this House on 2 April, when he castigated the Government for not making reports available to the public and to the House, and when he was supported quite ably by his Deputy, who specifically referred to the Salisbury Report, to this report the Government was commissioning. The Deputy Leader, in this House, asked for its release.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader was heard in silence. As this is a matter of extreme sensitivity, I trust that all other speakers in the debate will also be heard in silence by members on both sides of the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There have been repeated public pleas from the Leader of the Opposition in another place in relation to this report. Let me briefly quote the statement published in the *News* on 30 June this year. The Leader of the Opposition in another place was quoted as saying that the Government should cease its delay and dithering (his words) in completing the report,

and that the Government was being either dishonest or incompetent (his words) in not having completed the report.

It is significant that the Leader's statement was made after the Premier had stated publicly that the report was unlikely to be made public and, in those circumstances, it must be conceded that implicit in the Opposition statement was a demand that the report be made public. The Leader of the Opposition conveniently forgets those facts, that over a long period of time the Opposition, both in this House and in another place and publicly, has been asking for the report and the information that is not available.

Let me disabuse the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the timing of this report. He may care not to believe us—that is his prerogative—but it is a statement of fact that this report first became available for Ministerial scrutiny last week. It was scrutinised by all Ministers. Some preliminary discussions took place on Thursday, and the final decision to release this report was made in Cabinet on Monday, when the Premier was not present. So much for the cheap reference to the Premier's being conveniently out of this State. When the final decision was made, on Monday this week, to table this report, the Premier was not present.

Opposition members cannot have it both ways. They want to castigate the Government for keeping the information to itself; they call for the release of the report's findings; yet when we release a report at the earliest opportunity, when it is specifically requested, they complain. If Opposition members believe this is an election gimmick, let them explain to this House how information which would seek to clear the name of Salisbury, or at least bring new information to light in relation to clearing of the name of Salisbury, is significant in this election campaign. The fact is that the Opposition has not gone into the substance of this report. The Leader of the Opposition has followed the tack taken elsewhere in relation to this report, and has talked about Mr. Ceruto, but in fact has not talked about the substance of this report. I intend to refer to one or two of those matters.

What is the substance of this report? I believe that one of the pertinent factors that comes to light in this report is in relation to the previous Government's knowledge and the former Premier's knowledge of the existence of Special Branch and Special Branch activities. To me, that seems to be a key element in this report. I can cite what the former Premier said and if, in this exercise, the veracity of some of the evidence of the former Premier is called into doubt in an attempt to do justice to Salisbury, so be it. On 24 January 1978 (as repeated in evidence at the Royal Commission), the former Premier stated:

Prior to 1970, I was not even aware that there was a Special Branch of the South Australian Police Force. I believed that all security matters were dealt with by ASIO.

That statement was repeated at the Royal Commission and was fundamental to the acceptance by Her Honour of evidence at that Commission. The report gives ample evidence on this matter, and I believe that this has been acknowledged this morning. If one reads carefully what the former Premier said on page 1 of the *Advertiser*, one sees that there is a clear shift of ground in relation to the former Premier's prior knowledge of Special Branch. The implication is clear that the former Premier did know about Special Branch. This report deals with the evidence of the existence of Special Branch that was available to the former Premier and to the previous Government prior to 1970. I believe that the conclusion drawn in this report, to which I will refer shortly, is clear.

In the light of the evidence adduced in this report, it

would be completely incredible to suggest, let alone to believe, that the former Premier and his colleagues were not aware of the existence of Special Branch prior to 1970. The former Premier and elements in the Labor Party had shown an intense interest, I might say, during this period in the activities of the Police Force. The report quotes factually what is in the reports of Commissioners of Police to the Parliament and to the public in relation to Special Branch (and I indicate that the Premier, until 1970, thought that all security matters were dealt with by ASIO). Under the heading "Special Branch", it is stated:

The close liaison established between the Special Branch and the various Commonwealth departments has continued. I have been assured that the valuable assistance given to several Commonwealth departments in the matter of general security is very much appreciated.

That statement comes from the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police as far back as 1952, yet the former Premier stated that he did not know that the Special Branch existed until 1970. This is what this report brings to light. Under the heading "Special Branch" (which they claim they did not know existed) in the following year, it is stated:

The work of this branch was carried out in a satisfactory manner. Close liaison with Commonwealth and State Government departments was continued and work of national importance accomplished.

So the quotes go on. In the following year, under the heading "Special Branch" (and from a member of Parliament who showed a keen interest in Special Branch—and the unions as well, from time to time, as relevant newspaper commentaries indicate, showed a great interest in Special Branch, and there is reference to communist infiltration and the like if one peruses the relevant report), it is stated:

Inquiries and patrols by members of this branch were satisfactorily carried out, and work of additional importance accomplished.

Year in and year out in the Police Commissioner's Annual Report there is reference to Special Branch and yet, as I quoted, we have a clear declaration by the former Premier that he did not know Special Branch existed before 1970.

If the integrity of the former Premier is called into question in an attempt to see that justice is done to Salisbury, who was peremptorily sacked, so be it, say I and the members of this Party. Relating to the information to which I have referred, the conclusion of the report, at which members opposite take such extreme umbrage, states:

Because of all the information referred to earlier it is impossible to accept that Mr. Dunstan was unaware of the existence of Special Branch before the date he indicated to the Royal Commission or that he could have been misled to the extent he has claimed or at all by findings of the White inquiry. In fact, his inaction, given the information about police activities which was available was entirely inconsistent with the views of Mr. Dunstan about civil liberties, privacy and security.

It was not a difficult or unreasonable conclusion to reach, I would submit, for anyone of even the meanest intelligence in response to the claim by the former Premier that he did not even know of the existence of Special Branch.

Who did this sorry affair really damage? We have a spirited defence of a former colleague by members of the Opposition, which is entirely understandable. I would submit that this sorry affair damaged the reputation of former Commissioner Salisbury.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: And so it should have.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: And so it should have says our friend opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Sorry, I withdraw the word "friend"; I should have said the member for Elizabeth. The peremptory dismissal of a Police Commissioner on grounds which are now called into question is one of the sorriest chapters in the history of South Australia, and so it will be recorded.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the truth is damaging to those who have given evidence and made public statements, some of which I have quoted, in the interests of seeing that justice is done and that the truth is uncovered, I am perfectly content, and the member opposite can use all the florid phrases he likes to call this a dirty, cheap, political exercise. Let members opposite get around that fact which is central to this report. Who was really damaged in this sorry exercise, and who has more to gain or lose by the search for truth in this exercise? I submit again that it is Salisbury. A statement made about him by someone who knew him well, Sir Mark Oliphant, was quoted in the *Advertiser* on 19 January 1978. He described Salisbury as "one of the few people of absolute integrity whom I have known". In the book written by Cockburn, Sir Mark is quoted as saying—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: When it suits the purposes of members opposite, he is the greatest Governor this State has ever had, but when the man is entirely consistent in his forthright statements of fact as he knows them, it does not suit them. In relation to Salisbury, Sir Mark said:

I felt he even had a touch of greatness in him. He was out of the top drawer . . . He was personally incorruptible.

In its farewell speech to its sacked boss the Police Association said:

Your innovative actions for the betterment of the force earned the respect and loyalty of members. Your high moral standard and integrity has been an example to those under your command.

If the truth hurts certain individuals when another man of the calibre of Salisbury has been damned, I do not apologise for any action which leads to that circumstance: in no way do I apologise. On this side of the House, we are prepared to let the report and the information which has subsequently emerged as a result of this research speak for itself.

I refute entirely the argument of the Leader of the Opposition who has suggested that this is a cheap political exercise. He has sought to advance his argument by an emotional spirited defence of his former Leader, and he has hinged the whole of his argument around John Ceruto. There is no denying that I have left Ceruto out of it, because that is not central to the points that I have made in relation to the public documents concerning the Special Branch. It is an acknowledged fact that there was a close association between the former Premier and Ceruto.

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

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): One reason why I am here today is because the people of this State have judged the cynical and blatantly political activities of members opposite in respect to this matter. They are sick and tired of the politicking that has gone on, and the shallow arguments from the Deputy Premier have strengthened that view. His excuse is that Cabinet has just received the document, and that the Premier has not seen it. Why then did it have to come out today, and how does he explain the

comments of the Attorney-General when, on 3 June 1980, he said, in response to a question:

I am almost in a position to be able to present a report to the Premier on that matter.

Why has it taken him three months to do so? Has he waited for the opportunity to do so, and now it has arisen with the Federal election weeks away? The publication of this report, signed by the Attorney-General and approved by Cabinet, at this time, some seven months after it was ordered by the Premier in the midst of a heated by-election, raises one of the most fundamental and serious breaches of abuse of public office ever known in this State. Parliament has before it a document prepared allegedly personally by the Attorney-General, although it seems to have throughout it some strange reasoning for an Attorney-General, it almost looks like the document of a police officer. This report is no more than gossip. The factual basis of the substance of the report is so flimsy or at times non-existent that it would be thrown out of any court of law, let alone be described as "jury questions".

The Attorney spends the first seven pages of this report (and the Deputy Premier has just cast that aside; he did not want to refer to it because it was insignificant and irrelevant) on a statement by John Lang Ceruto. His opening words were, "I do not propose to give any interviews or answer questions at the conclusion of my statement." It was not signed by Ceruto or sworn before a justice. We are not even told how the Attorney got the statement and how he checked it for accuracy, if he bothered to do so.

In other words, it was an unsworn statement and, as the Leader said today, there is a Bill before Parliament, introduced by the same Attorney-General, to abolish unsworn statements, because they pervert the course of justice in this State. In other words, they give accused persons the opportunity to lie before the jury and, in this instance, the Attorney-General embraces this alleged abuse of criminal procedure and uses it as a basis for this report. He elevates the unsworn statement not to just a possible statement of fact; he does not question it and does not call for corroborating evidence other than that that was before the Royal Commission. If he has carried out any inquiries, the Attorney has suppressed them from Parliament and the public. If he did not seek further evidence he has denied natural justice to those he has accused.

His report is baseless and worthless. It is a disgrace to any lawyer, let alone the Attorney-General and Leader of the Bar in this State to write or attach his name to this report. He is the first adviser to the Government on legal matters, and it is common knowledge that he spends much of his time with the Premier. His work is so far behind in his office that he uses that as an excuse to tell people why his work is behind.

Yet, he has lost his objectivity. He has sunk into blatant Party politics. He has been used and, further and more importantly, he has allowed his office to be used for this shameful purpose of Party-political politics, of point-scoring, and of continuing this ruthless inhumane vendetta against one person, Don Dunstan, who is the greatest politician that this State has known or will know.

Regarding the history of this series of circumstances surrounding Mr. Ceruto and the publication of the booklet *It's Grossly Improper*, the Opposition would like to know who paid for the publication of that booklet prior to the September general election last year. It was used in the September election last year from door to door. In my own electorate, people told me that Liberal Party canvassers came to their door with the booklet in their hand and quoted from it to scare them in the electorate. The book

was first released prior to that election. It has been said that it was released again prior to the by-election in Norwood. That was its second, third, or fourth release made; I think it was called its national release. It was used as a political weapon in an electorate that had been held by Don Dunstan for over 25 years. The booklet and the circumstances surrounding Mr. Ceruto and his comments with respect to the former Premier's knowledge of the activities of Special Branch were front-page news in the *Sunday Mail* just prior to the last Norwood by-election.

We have seen since that time the Premier go to London to talk to Mr. Salisbury. Why are these matters as well not included in this report of the Attorney-General? They are omitted. Just this one unsworn statement of Mr. Ceruto is considered. Now, we have a Federal election on our doorstep and another Dunstan is involved opposing the Liberal Party. So, once again, by coincidence, this matter is raised to headlines again. This is surely the most worthless and most frustrated attempt by any political Party ever to denigrate the name of Dunstan in South Australia. It is shameful, to say the least.

The Attorney-General has not even attempted in his report to piece together all the facts, as I have said. He chose not to refer to the Premier's visit to London and the discussions he had with the former Police Commissioner, although he received great publicity for them here. The matters raised in questions from the Opposition to the Premier about his meeting with the journalists who wrote that book and the meeting he had with them by his own admission raised very serious questions in relation to the propriety of the Premier's action. Why were they not referred to by the Attorney-General as well? Why are they not answered? Why does the public not know the true facts there? The interjections of the Minister of Agriculture speak for themselves. He has denied his activities rather hollowly in this House when being questioned.

I have shown the shallowness of the fraudulent nature of this report presented at this time. Further, this report, even if one accepted the statements of Mr. Ceruto, is absolutely biased. Even in very simple ways, in the latter pages of this report the former Premier is referred to simply as Dunstan, whereas the former Police Commissioner is referred to as Mr. Harold Salisbury. Clearly, there is an intention throughout the report and through all the other activities of the Government to get Dunstan and the Dunstan name. On page 28 of the Attorney-General's report appears the following:

The question must now arise as to whether Dunstan had already made a decision on 10 January 1978 to dismiss Mr. Salisbury and whether the subsequent interviews with Salisbury were window dressing.

That overlooks the fact that no single man or Premier made that decision alone. It was made by Cabinet after consultation with the Parliamentary Labor Party. It was not a single decision on the spur of the moment. It was considered after advice had been obtained from the Solicitor-General of the State, and after there had been a thorough discussion of these issues. But the Attorney-General is not concerned with the facts and with the information that came out in the full and thorough Royal Commission on this matter, at which the Liberal Party was represented. They overlook that. They overlook the real facts in this issue so that they can get the former Premier, and this is clear proof of that.

The report contains some covert criticism of the Liberal Party's case and, as the Leader has said, Mr. Ceruto was at the Royal Commission hearing. I was there, and I saw him in conversation, on numerous occasions, with Liberal Party officials and counsel. They could have called him if

they had wished, but they chose not to do so. They chose to wait for some other occasion to bring out this sordid story, this shabby series of events which they have clung on to and waded around for the public to see, hoping that some of their nastiness would rub off and work against the interests of the Party I represent and of the right interests of the people of South Australia. The Liberal Party is not prepared to accept the decision of any Royal Commission or to listen to the facts as they have been brought out by proper evidence, proper cross-examination, by some of the most experienced counsel in this State. They seek to achieve their ends by these little tricks, these techniques of releasing reports such as this. As I said, the Liberal Party was represented at the Royal Commission hearing, the solicitor for the Liberal Party being none other than the Attorney-General himself. Not only has he chosen to change tunes on the matter of unsworn statements when it suits him, but he criticises his own performance.

What of this man, Mr. Ceruto, with whom obviously the Deputy Premier does not want to associate? When he made this statement, Mr. Ceruto was out of prison on bail. Why not tell the public about that? He is a man who, after that time, was admitted to Glenside Hospital. This is the evidence on which members opposite are denigrating one of the greatest political leaders of this State. They have used it actively in election after election, and I know, because I have been involved in them. I have had to confront people who have been accosted at the door by supporters of members opposite, peddling this utter rubbish. So, we can see that this is just another political ploy. It is worth another run. It has been a good servant in the past, so why would it not be a good servant again?

We must, at least on this side, return to the real facts of this issue. Mr. Salisbury was sacked as Police Commissioner, despite, as everyone on this side would agree, his good record in office; he was a man of outstanding character. He was sacked because he lied to Parliament, and no person can do that. On his own evidence to the Royal Commission, he was found to have lied. He was condemned on his own evidence. It did not require any extra proof to do that. He was a man who told the Royal Commission that he owed no allegiance to this State Government in security matters. He simply did not know the law, and he must pay the penalty.

I must say that the conclusion of this report speaks for itself. It is recommended that no further action be taken, and rightly so. I worked in the Attorney-General's Department from 1972 to 1978, and I have never seen such a disgraceful use of that office as I have seen on this occasion. I assisted, in the Royal Commission, the counsel for the then Government, now Mr. Justice Cox, and Mr. Tony Bishop. I am convinced that the case was presented thoroughly, accurately, and honestly, and any covert criticism that there has been of the findings, of the judicial officers, or of counsel is unwarranted in its entirety. This matter has been thoroughly and publicly canvassed, scrutinised, and debated, and now it is time for it to be left to rest. Members opposite and those whom they have called to come to the aid of their Party at election time should be ashamed of themselves for the way in which they have used and abused this Parliament and the great offices of the State for their own shabby purposes.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): For the whole of this Parliamentary session we have been sitting back waiting for the great onslaught from the Opposition. Much to the disappointment of Government members and depressing, no doubt, to the public of this State who want good Government and good Opposition, that just has not come. Today we see members opposite make what, in their minds at least, they

think is probably a significant move. Today, with a great deal of bluster from the Leader of the Opposition and a great deal of fumbling from the member for Norwood, the Opposition launched what was apparently supposed to be an attack on the Government. Let us just analyse what, in fact, Opposition members are trying to raise this afternoon.

The Opposition has put forward a matter of urgency, not a matter of a vote of no confidence in the Government. Let us start with a clear indication in the minds of members opposite as to the sort of rating that they are giving to this issue just as a matter of urgency, simply because it was brought up yesterday in the Upper House and in this House. What exactly is the Opposition accusing the Attorney-General or the Government of doing? Not improper behaviour, improper use of his office, or anything else—simply cynical use of the office of the Attorney-General. That is how meek and mild the wording of the actual motion is, yet just match that up with the bold statements (which could not be substantiated, incidentally) made by the Leader of the Opposition, where he accused the Attorney-General of coming out with unsubstantiated facts, distorting history, abuse of the position of the Attorney-General, and said (I use his exact words), "These charges are grave ones." Yet look at the motion that has been served up to the House today. The motion does not even criticise or reprimand the Government: it simply refers as a matter of fact, drawing no conclusions, to the Government's cynical use of the office of the Attorney-General. I might add that it goes on to say—

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Well, I would not have thought that it was a very grave accusation to make against any Attorney-General simply to accuse him of cynical use of his office. When one thinks back over the whole history of the Salisbury affair, one could justifiably understand anyone with any sense of justice whatsoever being rather cynical in the way in which the Government of the day and the Premier of the day dealt with that Police Commissioner.

Mr. O'Neill: And you said—

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

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am extremely cynical of the way Dunstan, the Ministers involved and the Government of the day dealt with Harold Salisbury, so what is wrong with claiming that the Attorney-General was also equally cynical? I am sure the whole of South Australia is damned cynical, and that is exactly why we had a change of Government last year. The public was sick of the way in which the Government had dealt with Harold Salisbury and the whole matter of the dismissal of the Police Commissioner.

Let us go on and look at the substance of what has been brought forward by the Opposition this afternoon. The main attack throughout the entire debate has been that the Attorney-General in his report printed the entire statement made by John Ceruto. When one opens up at page 1 of the report (which apparently members of the Opposition have not read through carefully) and looks at the commission given to the Attorney-General (which I will read out to the House)—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: By whom?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: By the Premier. The commission is as follows:

To the honourable the Premier. Dismissal of Mr. H. H. Salisbury, the Commissioner of Police. You have asked me to report to you following public statements by one John James Lang Ceruto on 4 February 1980 on the occasion of the

national launching of the book *It's Grossly Improper* by two journalists, Des Ryan and Mike McEwen.

In other words, the Premier asked the Attorney-General to report to him on the public statements of John Ceruto. If that report by the Attorney-General did not contain John Ceruto's entire statement, I am sure we would all be absolutely disgusted that certain parts of his statement had been selected, and not others. How in the world, as the main line of attack, can the Opposition's two junior lawyers, who have nowhere near the legal qualifications of the Attorney-General and who have hardly had a chance to get out in the world and practice, make such an incredible claim as the basis of what is apparently a matter of urgency this afternoon?

It is also interesting to note the type of statement made by the member for Norwood. He obviously does not understand what were the facts. Despite the fact that he had a very well prepared speech and extremely comprehensive notes, substantial parts of his statement were grossly incorrect. For instance, he claimed that the Liberals, before the 1979 State election, ran around the District of Norwood with copies of the book *It's Grossly Improper*. I wonder whether the honourable member realises that that book was not even published until after the 1979 State election. That is the sort of substantial fact upon which the Opposition has relied to bring forward this motion: that is the sort of case on which the Opposition bases this matter of urgency. I see that one honourable member is yawning and I understand why. The motion has been a complete and utter non-event.

The member for Norwood, as part of his substantial case, as a junior lawyer, claimed that Trevor Griffin was counsel before the Royal Commission; he asked why the Attorney did not make these facts known during his counselling. The fact is that Trevor Griffin was not counselled before the Royal Commission; counsel for the Liberal Party was Mr. Williams, Q.C., and his assistant counsel was Tony Russell, Q.C., now Justice Russell.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He did not say that. And who was the solicitor?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is interesting to see the way in which honourable members are trying to interject across the House in order to prop up a case that has obviously collapsed around their ears. Other claims made this afternoon are also interesting. I point out that the Attorney-General had the specific task of taking John Ceruto's statement, going through it, and looking at new evidence in the light of that statement that would suggest whether or not Mr. Dunstan had misled the Royal Commission. The Attorney-General (and I have read the report in great detail) brought up, with great respect, all of the substantial evidence that was available to him. It has been claimed that he dealt with John Ceruto's statement only. Again, that would suggest that some honourable members have not even bothered to pick up the appendix to the report, because that appendix contains quotes by the Attorney-General of excerpts from *Hansard*, various Annual Reports of the Police Commissioner, newspaper cuttings and other things. The claim that the Attorney-General has merely taken John Ceruto's statement, printed it in full, made an accusation, and printed it in the report is entirely false.

If one took John Ceruto's statement, added it to the excerpts from the Police Commissioner's reports over a number of years, the various newspaper reports as far back as 1970, and Mr. Dunstan's statements before the Royal Commission, it would be quite clear that Mr. Dunstan misled the Royal Commission, and honourable members opposite ignored this fact because it suited their

case and, in fact, they are now embarrassed. That fact is almost substantiated again by the statement made by Mr. Dunstan in the *Advertiser* this morning. In the *Australian* of 24 January 1978, Mr. Dunstan stated:

Prior to 1970, I was not even aware that there was a Special Branch in the South Australian Police Force. I believed that all security matters were dealt with by ASIO.

Think clearly of that statement and its implications—prior to 1970 the former Premier was not aware of the Special Branch of the Police Department—and then look at the following statement made in the *Advertiser* this morning:

There was nothing in any of the police reports which could lead us to conclude that the activities of the Special Branch were other than what the police said they were.

That is Mr. Dunstan showing his stand in relation to the Special Branch before 1970. In other words, in a statement in the *Advertiser* this morning Mr. Dunstan is saying that he understood that the Special Branch activities in the Police Department were of a certain nature, yet his statement to the Royal Commission and to the *Australian* was that he did not know of the existence of the Special Branch before 1970.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Get around that!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has had his call.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That is a gross inconsistency, which is highlighted not just by those two quotations I have given to the House this afternoon but also by many other statements given to the House which are included in the report which has been tabled by the Attorney-General.

In reading through the report, I was amazed to find that at least two Police Commissioners' annual reports to this Parliament well before 1970 (in fact, going back to the late 1950's) specifically referred to the Special Branch. I also know that in 1950 a very irate angry young man who was the new member for Norwood in this Parliament used to stand up consistently and question the then Premier, the Hon. Tom Playford, about the activities of the police. On reading the report of the Attorney-General, I find it absolutely staggering that this young, energetic and intelligent member of Parliament, who was so keen to drag the police down on what he considered were their improper actions, had apparently not bothered to read any of the annual reports of the Police Commissioners. I would find it staggering if he had not read them, but if he had he would have seen and read about the activities of the Special Branch—not much about it, but it was mentioned. His statement to the Royal Commission was that he did not know of the existence of Special Branch prior to 1970. I urge all members of this House, and particularly members opposite, as they obviously have not been bothered to do so, to read the report, because I believe that if they read the report presented by the Attorney-General they will come to the same conclusion as the Attorney-General has reached.

The final point is that the Opposition this afternoon is apparently disgusted that the Attorney-General has seen fit to table such a report before this Parliament. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recall how, over the last six months, the Opposition in this House has consistently asked for the Government to table various reports, one of which is this report. Not only have such requests been made in this House but also public statements have been made about it, and statements have been made in the Upper House about it. I have just read the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House in which he attacks the Government and the Attorney-General because the Attorney-General had failed to table that report in Parliament. Now, when that report is tabled,

and they have found that the contents of the report are not what they wanted, members opposite have become irate and annoyed, and have come forward with what is unfortunately a half-baked lame-duck motion in which they do not even criticise the Government but say that the report is obviously written by a cynical Attorney-General.

I believe the Attorney-General's report is fair, just and reasonable. It does absolute credit to the evidence that he had. I believe the Attorney-General of this State to be a man of great intellectual capacity, integrity and honesty, who places this State over and above any political responsibility that he might have. The Attorney-General has done the right thing in that report; he has done the right thing in making sure that the report was tabled before Parliament after it was consistently asked for by members of the Opposition. I think, frankly, the Opposition ought to be ashamed of its inconsistency—

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): Pardon me if my voice is a bit scratchy but I believe it is fashionable to lose one's voice at the moment. After hearing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, it is obvious that from here on in the Opposition will be able to call on the Government to table a document and, because we persist, the document will be tabled whether it suits the Government or not. What utter rubbish, and the Minister knows that it is rubbish. The Government tabled this document because it suited its political purposes, and for no other reason. If members in this House and in another place had not asked for it to be tabled, it would still have been tabled when it suited the Government to do so. There happens to be a Federal election in progress, and it suits the Government's purpose to raise this saga again for political purposes. The Government knows it and we know it, and it is no use it's saying anything else.

Let us get back to the basics of this issue, because after listening to the Deputy Premier and to the Minister of Industrial Affairs one could be forgiven for believing that the only reason why Mr. Salisbury's services were terminated was Mr. Dunstan's knowledge, prior to or after 1970, of the Special Branch. What utter rubbish. I will prove that to the House shortly. We all know the reason for Mr. Salisbury's services being terminated was that he refused to give to the democratically elected Government of South Australia information to which it was entitled. Mr. Salisbury said that out of his own mouth to all the media of this State and probably of Australia. He said not only that he refused to give it, or pulled the answers, but that he would continue to do so. I ask you, Sir, what responsible Government could accept a situation like that? Mr. Salisbury gave the Government no alternative but to take the step that it took.

It is a funny thing that, every time we hear Mr. Salisbury mentioned, we hear Mr. Dunstan mentioned. No-one would think that anyone else was involved. The events that led to the dismissal of Commissioner Salisbury in the first place and to the Royal Commission were put in train by me. They were put in train because the member for Mitcham, for example, persisted in directing questions on notice and without notice in this House about the activities of Special Branch. They are the facts. Some of my own members certainly were concerned as well, and it was because of this pressure and the public pressure that built up as a result of that that I decided to make a recommendation to Cabinet, while I was Acting Premier, and then to Caucus to set up a judicial inquiry into the Special Branch, which was done. It was I who decided, after consultation with the then Attorney-General and

Chief Secretary, on the terms of reference, and I decided who the judge would be, after consultation with the then Attorney-General. Dunstan knew about the decision after it was taken. He had no input whatsoever into that decision, and it was the result of that inquiry that led to the dismissal of Mr. Salisbury. Subsequently, because of public outcry and interest, a Royal Commission was established to see whether or not the Government was justified in doing what it did.

Everyone knows the document that Mr. Justice White produced, and everyone knows that no-one, apart from those people actively involved in the Special Branch and possibly the Commissioner himself, could possibly have known the sort of activities that were going on in Special Branch.

What I suggest to the House is that the matter of whether Dunstan knew anything about Special Branch is absolutely and utterly irrelevant to a final decision on the termination of the services of Commissioner Salisbury. I do not think that any fair-minded person could be critical of the terms of reference or of the judge appointed to conduct the Royal Commission. Surely, that Royal Commission should have put to rest all questions outstanding—all the important and relevant questions—and to my mind it did. However, the Liberal Party saw the opportunity to carry the thing on and gain political mileage. That Party did it in the recent State election, in the Norwood by-election, and now it is being done in the Federal election. I wonder what will happen at the next State election: will it come up again? It will be attempted, but surely the people of South Australia cannot be hoodwinked any further than they have been on this issue.

We have been condemned because we treated this as a low-key exercise. The Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House today wanted to move a vote of no confidence in the Attorney-General, but permission was not granted, and members there had to revert to a censure motion similar to this one. So much for the attitude expressed by the Minister of Industrial Affairs: he should check with his colleagues. We believe that a motion of no confidence should have been moved in the Upper House so that we could get at the person responsible for that document. It is no more a legal document than I am: it is a political document, and the Minister knows it. The Opposition considers this a serious matter, because it is aimed at one man. Let us go back to the decision taken in Cabinet: it was not Don Dunstan on his own who decided that Salisbury's services would be terminated; every member of Cabinet made that decision.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Shame on you!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is what the Minister says. He would have carried on with a Police Commissioner who would tell him what the Commissioner wanted him to know, and nothing else. The Commissioner would answer to the Queen only. That would suit the Minister; he would like to have his own private army, and I can understand that he would agree to that. So concerned was I about the isolation of Dunstan in this scene that a week after Salisbury was sacked I said publicly that had he not been sacked I would have resigned from Cabinet, and every other member of Cabinet would have done the same thing. Dunstan does not stand alone on this issue: he never has and never will.

If we have done anything in this House today, at least we have demonstrated that we are prepared to stand by our colleagues whether they are in this place or out of it. Dunstan does not deserve to be treated in the way he has been treated by the Liberal Party or by Salisbury sympathisers or by anyone else, especially at an election time, which always seems to be a convenient time for this

sort of thing to happen. I impress on the House that I, with my Leader, the member for Norwood, and every other member who was in this House when Dunstan was here, is here now, and will be here in future, will stand by the decision that the Government took on that occasion, and we will stand by Dunstan's integrity and statesmanship.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung, the motion was withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I move, for the second year running:

That, in the opinion of the House, victims of crime suffering personal injuries should be compensated by a publicly funded insurance scheme similar to the Workers Compensation Act and should be otherwise assisted and rehabilitated if necessary on the basis that public money expended be recovered where possible from those at fault; and further that a Select Committee be appointed to report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result and also to examine and report on property loss suffered by victims of crime.

I think that this area of the criminal justice scheme is a sacred one, and every attempt must be made by political Parties to get politics out of the arena. It does none of us any good to make the criminal justice system a political football. I was amazed last year when, on moving this motion, I was advised by the Chief Secretary, who is in the House now, that his Government would not agree to any part of it, not even that part dealing with the Select Committee, because I am the first to concede that this type of motion can never be perfect. However, the kind of philosophies that lie behind it seem to get at the root of a grave problem in the community. This matter was always high among my order of priorities, and it was drawn to my attention during the last election, when in the seats of Playford, Todd, and Newland there were disgraceful and disgusting campaign posters put up by the Liberal Party that sought to connect the then Government with the escalation of crime in this State. At the time, I indicated that that escalation was something that was not isolated to this State: the crime rate had escalated throughout Australia and the whole western world.

I am amazed that the Chief Secretary is no longer present in the House: such is the importance that the Chief Secretary in this Government places on Parliament and on a member's sincere endeavour to get something done that he vacates the House when a matter that specifically relates to his portfolio is being discussed. I note that with utter disgust, especially when his Party, as I indicated, at the last election and especially in marginal seats, made a great furore over this matter. There was the disgusting hoodlum advertisement which was inserted in the *News* to which I have referred before. It was the one paid for under cover of darkness by Adrian Brien Ford, a man who did not have sufficient courage of his convictions to sign his own advertisement. He paid for it but had someone else authorise it.

There was more than that. A statement was made by an advertisement that I should quote verbatim. It admonished the then Premier, now the member for Hartley. Digressing for a moment, I congratulate him on his effort this afternoon. Although he had a scratchy voice, it was certainly a powerful speech. I wonder what it would have been like if his voice had not been scratchy. This advertisement attempted to admonish him as being part of

this crime wave. It commenced by saying "Shame! Don't blame Mr. Fraser for that," and then continued:

Why does Parliament provide sentences which are so lenient as in some cases to be laughable? And why are so many early paroles given to serious offenders? Some of your own justices of the peace have complained, so has your Police Force. Your Government sacked the former Police Commissioner (Mr. Harold Salisbury), and you said, "I would have resigned if he hadn't." Are people who stand for family values and law and order expendable because of your Government's radical, libertarian views?

Anyone who read that (and certainly in the north-east suburbs there was not much opportunity to do anything else but read it because it was plastered around, along with the other gimmicks on employment) would have been quite justified, if they placed any credibility in the Liberal Party, in saying that here was a libertarian radical Party that cared nothing for the escalation of the crime wave.

What disgraceful nonsense indeed. I am the first to admit (and I will begin on this note) that I am still ashamed to think that, on a matter like this, the Chief Secretary is not even present in the Chamber. That shows the contempt with which this Government regards the Parliament, particularly when I have asked for a Select Committee. He is not even here paying any attention at all.

I am not associating all Liberal Party members with the Adrian Brien Ford advertisement. I know, from many members of the Liberal Party, that they were as shocked and disgusted as I was. I might guess at your own reaction, Sir, but I will not reflect on you. I would not have placed you in the camp of those who supported such tactics.

Mr. Becker: What's this to do with your motion?

Mr. McRAE: That disgusting advertisement has plenty to do with my motion. The very point I am putting to the House, in the absence of the Minister who is supposed to be responsible for this area, is that the Opposition has all along been prepared to co-operate in an objective dispassionate manner on a Parliamentary Select Committee. The member for Hanson (through you, Mr. Speaker) would do well to remember that the now Government went to the election offering to the people of this State a system whereby there would be open scrutiny through Parliamentary committees. I believe (and no doubt you will correct me immediately, Sir, if I am wrong, you having been in the Chair all the time) that, in the whole of last year, there has been no Select Committee in the House of Assembly. I may be wrong; there may have been a small committee over a hybrid Bill, or something of that sort.

Mr. Becker: The Prostitution Bill went to a Select Committee.

Mr. McRAE: Yes; it was a carry-over, but it was a purely formal matter. Even if I am wrong in my categorical statement, certainly no Select Committee of this Chamber has been established on any serious matter during the life of this Parliament. It draws in the entire law-and-order area. One cannot help but think that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was right the other day when he said that there ought to be no Ministers in the Upper House. I firmly believe that the whole matter of law and order rests between the Attorney-General and the Chief Secretary of the day, and both officers ought to be in this House. There ought not to be any Ministers in the other place. The Government is using the other place to railroad its legislation through, attempting to use this Chamber as a rubber stamp.

Regarding the policies that the Liberal Party had at the last election to deal with the escalating crime rate and the difficulties that it saw being imposed by that libertarian and radical Government, I quote the following statement:

1. The Liberal Party will legislate to protect the Police Commissioner from arbitrary dismissal.

What that means, I do not know. I have not seen a Bill introduced. I thought that the legislation had already been put through to do precisely that. I have seen no other legislation (we heard of a report this afternoon, but I will not canvass that matter).

Mr. Keneally: Perhaps it was a political gambit.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, or a stupid mistake on the part of those who draw up the policy. The next one I commented on last year as being strange; this year I can comment on it with even greater force. Item 2 states:

Strengthen the Police Force.

I challenge any member to look at the Chief Secretary's Budget lines and see what has happened to the allocation to the Police Force. In real terms, that allocation has dropped by about \$12 000 000. The total increase in the force for this year to cope with an escalation in the crime rate of 8 per cent is four men. I assume that part of that accomplishment (if you can call it that) has come about because officers who formerly acted as court orderlies are now being replaced by Sheriff's officers.

The next point involved sentencing courts in the parole system. In contrast, I say that that is not a bad idea. I would support that. The next point was establishing an independent advisory council on parole. Quite what that means, I am not sure. If it means conducting from time to time some systematic research into the area of the criminal justice scene, I am all in favour of it, but I am not sure that it means that. My motion is in the context of trying to tackle what is a very real problem, and I suggest that many things have to be done. I will preface my remarks as to what has to be done by being the first to admit that neither Labor Parties nor Liberal Parties in the past 30 years, or ever, have given the criminal justice system any priority at all: it is always last on the list.

The gaols have always been a disgrace, and the courts have always been a disgrace, not in terms of personnel but in terms of buildings and facilities. The first thing that needs to be done, I suggest, as in all cases, is to get some proper research done. Has any such move been taken by this Liberal Government? No, with one exception, to which I will come later. The next thing that needs to be done is to look very clearly and very closely at reinforcing the Police Force in order to make its job easier. We need more and better-trained police officers; the reason should be obvious, namely, the more criminals you catch, the more successful you are going to be in reducing the crime rate.

The next thing, I suggest, that we need is a totally new system of personnel training in the corrective institutions. I am amazed that the Chief Secretary is still not present; his absence shows the contempt he has for the Parliament.

Mr. Becker: You used to have only one Minister on the front bench at any time.

Mr. McRAE: The honourable member displays the same contempt and attitude.

Mr. Becker: You lot used to do the same.

Mr. Gunn: All you are doing is alienating the people who might support you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: I am very disappointed that the Minister is not present. I certainly need support from members opposite, particularly from the member for Eyre, who is a senior member of his Party, and from the member for Hanson, too, in trying to get something done. We need a new system of training for those persons employed in our corrective institutions.

Mr. Gunn: What is your logic?

Mr. McRAE: I will give an example of logic. One of the

problems we have in prisons is that we have no proper system of training for prison officers. I suggest that, gradually, over a period, no distinction should be drawn between police officers and corrective services personnel, and I say that for good reasons. First, under Australian conditions, if a man is employed as a prison officer, no matter how good a man he is, how good a job he does, or how humanely he does it, he is referred to by his neighbours as a screw.

His wife is referred to by her friends and associates as a screw's wife. That is the truth of the matter. We need a system whereby we can provide proper and adequate training, and—and I know the Police Force will not particularly like this suggestion—some system by which there could be a constant changeover of personnel, at least at the lower levels. As I understand it, many of the difficulties we have now, in the Department of Correctional Services, are caused by people being kept in one establishment for far too long.

The situation in relation to the victims of crime is outrageous. The one thing that this Government has done in relation to its pre-election campaign is to by-pass this Parliament completely, and appoint a departmental committee to investigate the problems of victims of crime. I was pleased, with the co-operation of the Chief Secretary, to be able to speak to Dr. Grabosky, of that gentleman's department, who kindly supplied me with the terms of reference. He asked me the views of the Labor Party, and I told him that they were substantially in accord with the motion before the House. I asked how many people he was circularising to give evidence. I cannot be completely precise: although I think the number was 205, certainly it was more than 200. I would not like to be kept to absolute precision on that. I asked whether, to enable the Opposition to reconsider its position if the Government was adamant about this matter of refusing a Select Committee, we might be able at least to put a submission before the departmental committee. I asked a sensible and reasonable question, which he treated as sensible and reasonable. I asked whether the Labor Party could have access to the submissions made by persons appearing before the departmental committee. I refined it by saying that I did not expect that we necessarily would get access to the 205 submissions, if they were made, but that we would want to see the submissions made, for instance, by the Supreme Court judges, the department itself, the Law Society, and various other important bodies which should, and presumably will, formulate views.

I reduced that to writing, and I received a letter back from Dr. Grabosky, saying that we would not be able to have access to that information. In those circumstances, the situation is quite impossible. We have a Minister and a Government which refuse a Select Committee. When we try to get before a departmental inquiry we are not permitted access to the information.

Mr. Mathwin: You could give evidence if you want to.

Mr. McRAE: Certainly.

Mr. Mathwin: You refused me that position when you were in Government on a number of occasions. It's the same thing.

Mr. McRAE: The fact that such things were done does not make them right. I have never backed away from saying that, and I have said it this afternoon. I have not protected my Party on its record while in Government in relation to the matter now before the House. I have not endeavoured to do that. The fact that someone has done wrong does not justify others copying them. Surely, we can put in a submission, but we cannot make a meaningful input, in my view, to such an inquiry unless we have access to the other documentation.

It may well be that the judges of the Supreme Court, the department, or any number of other bodies could have useful suggestions on which our Party would like to comment, but it will be impossible under the conditions now laid down. A Government that went to an election specifically offering greater freedom of information, greater access to information, and specifically, I recall, more Select Committees, greater involvement of Parliament, and less power in the Executive, has now, on one occasion, blocked a motion which I am quite happy to restrict to the Select Committee part of it. It has already blocked that.

When we have tried to get before the departmental inquiry, that can be done only on conditions that, frankly, would not be workable. I condemn the Government for its actions to date, and I call upon it to rethink its position, doing so on what, I am sure, would be a clear understanding from the Opposition that, if a Select Committee of the Parliament were called together, as I have asked, we would deal with it in a totally dispassionate and objective way. It would be to everyone's advantage. You may recall, Sir, as I do, that the member for Glenelg, when my Party was in Government, asked questions almost every week on McNally Training Centre. It is noticeable that, since the roles have changed and he is a member of the Government Party, he has not asked one question. The problems are still there.

Mr. Mathwin: I deal directly with the Minister, and that gives you more opportunities for questions.

Mr. McRAE: I see. I am interested in that, because it demonstrates the point I am making. The politicisation of this question leads to the problems. McNally Training Centre, I am sure, has not changed greatly in the past year or so. The problems have not suddenly gone down. However, for years before September 1979 the member for Glenelg, who was known in a fond sort of way as the Minister for McNally, plagued the Government week by week with questions concerning the state of affairs out there. Now his Party is in Government not one question has been asked, he says because he can get access to the Minister. I say two things. The first is that the reason for his not asking the questions is that he does not want to embarrass his own Government, whereas he was only too happy to embarrass the Labor Government. Taking it further, if he has information such as he used to put to the House, he should still put it before the House, provided that the questions are responsible and based on fact.

Let me deal specifically now, because the Chief Secretary still is not here, with the question of the victims of crime. If there is any one group in the whole criminal justice system that has been totally overlooked throughout its history, it is the victims. When we look at the personnel making up any police inquiry, we find that the police are there, as professionals paid in the performance of their duty; there is a prison service there, with people paid as professionals to run it; there is a court system with an incredibly intricate system of judges, sheriffs, barristers, solicitors, and various other persons, all of whom are paid for their services. We have trials carefully worked out over the centuries.

But what happens to the victim? With the rare exception of the aid they get at the Rape Crisis Centre or from other independent bodies, there is no monetary compensation whatever for them, except if the existing terms of the workers compensation legislation come into existence, or compensation subject to the limit provided by the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. My Party deserves credit for the introduction of that Act, but the limit of \$10 000 obviously is nowhere near high enough.

If we are serious in trying to help victims of crime, I

suggest that we could provide for them a system of compensation similar to that provided in the Workers Compensation Act. The philosophy is similar. We provide compensation to workers whether or not there has been negligence on the part of the employer—in many cases there is not—and that is simply because they are victims of a lottery. It may have been anyone who was involved in a specific accident; just so with the victims of crime. How unlucky can one be? Just by walking down a street or falling into conversation with a person, one can receive violent and lasting injuries. Such a scheme could be funded by a very small levy on the taxpayers of this State, and my own view is that the levy could be as little as 10c a week from every wage earner.

If that were properly invested, we could provide the capital funds which would give adequate compensation for victims of crime. Apart from that, we would be in a position to set up an authority (expand the concept of the Rape Crisis Centre) so that victims of crime other than those involved in rape attacks could also be assisted for the emotional stress and the mental stress that goes with the crime itself. None of the suggestions that I have put forward are radical or libertarian. To me they are all very soundly and reasonably based. There is every reason for this Government to support the motion, and I certainly call on private members to support it.

Mr. Evans: What about people out on parole or escaped prisoners doing damage to people's property? Surely that is just as much the Crown's responsibility as is personal injury? Why don't you take up that point?

Mr. McRAE: I provided for that specifically by saying "and further, that a Select Committee be appointed to report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result [that is, personal injuries] and also to examine and report on property loss suffered by victims of crime." Indeed, that is a matter which should be investigated.

Mr. Keneally: You would welcome his support.

Mr. McRAE: I do welcome the honourable member's support, and I hope that I do get some support from somebody.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You've got the numbers now.

Mr. McRAE: I am not certain that have. I certainly do not have the Chief Secretary, which I find quite alarming in these circumstances. I do not want to prolong the matter. With those few words, I urge support for the motion.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIREARMS

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I move:

That in the opinion of the House in view of the increase of firearms in crimes of violence, the Government should urgently implement and enforce the new regulations on obtaining and keeping guns, and further that the existing guidelines should be much strengthened.

I am very pleased to recount that I was, at least to a large extent, instrumental in persuading the former Government to do something about this vexing question of the prevalence of firearms in the community. I did so because of a number of cases in which I had been involved over the years in which, but for the presence of firearms, I had been quite confident that the persons I represented would at the very worst have inflicted minor injuries but, because they had firearms at their disposal, they used them in the heat and the anger of the moment and caused death and very serious bodily injuries. As I understand it, the regulations have been put into effect, at least partially.

Again, the Chief Secretary is not here; I was going to rely upon him to help the House out with some factual information.

Mr. Evans: He has a deputation.

Mr. McRAE: Well, I ask the Chief Secretary, if he ever gets around to reading this, to bring the House up to date on the current registration system. When last I heard, the staggering figure of 150 000 weapons had been registered under the regulations with the Police Department—150 000 weapons in a State that has a population of less than 1 200 000. That is quite remarkable. One can imagine the number of weapons that are not registered. That appals me. What I am asking, while reserving my right of reply as much as anything, is that the Chief Secretary, when on some occasion he is not troubled with a deputation and can manage to be here, will report to the House on the way in which the regulations are working, and inform us about what problems are being run into and also about the areas in which the existing guidelines should be strengthened. I know very well that the former Chief Secretary, the Hon. Mr. Simmons, regarded the whole exercise very seriously, and he took the first step as a cautious first step, leaving a great deal of leeway for the regulations to be strengthened should the occasion demand. I commend this motion to the House.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INCOME TAX

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, a Select Committee should be appointed to consider and report on the various methods, either in use or proposed for consideration, of apportioning income tax between the Commonwealth and the States and in particular this State and to advise the Government on the various effects which may be induced by the "New Federalism".

On this occasion I hope that I will have the support of the whole back bench of the Government Party, because this motion can in no way be considered a political one. I do not want to take up the time of the House. Anybody who has studied the constitutional developments and financial developments over the last few years will know the extreme complexities of the tax sharing arrangements. Anybody who has noted at all the changes that have come about because of the oil levy being used as a tax collection mechanism instead of for other purposes will know that the States have been disadvantaged, or at least potentially disadvantaged. Furthermore, all honourable members will know of the substantial changes which are proposed in the New Federalism policy that was announced by the Federal Liberal Party some years ago. Also, those who have been following recent events will know that on a number of occasions the various Premiers have met to discuss the matter, as have the Treasury officers.

This is an occasion on which the Parliament can play a constructive role by having a Select Committee on a topic which is extremely complex. My overseas study tour report (when I finally get around to completing it) deals in large part with many of the problems that are raised, and I found great assistance in places like Bonn and Washington on this sort of problem which we are finding in this country now and which those cities have had before them over a large number of years. I commend this motion to the House.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That this House—

- (a) commends the Government for its efforts to develop the copper/uranium/gold deposits at Roxby Downs;
- (b) calls upon all members of the South Australian Parliament to give their support to the development of Roxby Downs; and
- (c) supports the building of a uranium enrichment plant in the Iron Triangle area in South Australia, and calls upon the Federal member for Grey, Mr. Wallis, to give his unqualified support to both projects which are vital to South Australia.

This motion will allow all members of the South Australian House of Assembly to indicate clearly to the people of this State where they stand in regard to the development of this project, which is vital to the future economic development and welfare of the people of this State, and in particular to the people living in the northern parts of South Australia, who will be interested to see what members representing those districts have to say. This project must go ahead if South Australia is to achieve the type of development that is essential for the betterment and future welfare of the people of this State. This motion provides an opportunity for the major Parties to put on record where they stand in regard to these two vital projects. The motion will allow the people to see which Party or Parties stand for development.

This State depends on growth to achieve the goals that I believe all members want to achieve for their constituents. Those members who are trying to avoid the issue can no longer hide behind the arguments of the type that have been advanced in recent times. The time has now arrived for members to make a decision, particularly as another decision will have to be made on 18 October, when the people should have before them the clear views, comments and statements of the representatives of the people of this State.

We all know that the Labor Party in this State has done a somersault over the past few years in relation to this vital project. Most overseas countries would be more than pleased to be in South Australia's position. This State has the potential to develop a mining industry based on uranium, copper and gold extraction. A treatment plant in the Iron Triangle will not only create directly thousands of jobs but will have side effects, creating other forms of employment. It is important that we understand clearly the type of project about which we are talking. It was interesting to read in the *Sunday Mail* of 14 September this year, in the business section under the heading "Our uranium mine will top the world", the following report:

South Australia will have a \$3 000 000 000 to \$4 000 000 000 uranium mine at Roxby Downs north of Woomera in about 20 years. Take all uranium in Australia and add two, and Roxby Downs is still bigger, Mr. Carroll said. He said there would be a \$30 000 000 to \$40 000 000 mine operating in about three years, but this would just scratch the surface, mainly in copper and gold, but you need to mine uranium to make it work. It will probably not be operating fully for a number of years.

That is a clear indication of the type of project we are talking about. It is completely impossible to mine copper and gold without mining uranium, and the nonsense put forward by the Leader and other members, that copper could be mined while leaving the uranium in the ground, is a figment of their imagination. Let us talk about the somersault that has taken place. In the *News* of 24 October 1970, it was stated:

The Premier will press for the establishment of a plant in South Australia if we have the conditions required. There is some concern about being able to supply enough water.

In the *News* of 4 November 1974, it was stated:

Talks between the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, and the Japanese Prime Minister are believed to have enhanced the State's chances of getting the project. State Minister, Mr. Hopgood, said today he was more confident than ever that South Australia would get the massive plant.

In the *News* of 13 May 1974, it was stated:

Mr. Connor announced a feasibility study into the possibility of establishing a major uranium enrichment plant in the northern Spencer Gulf region of South Australia.

On 27 September 1974, it was stated:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today he did not think the Federal Government's decision to establish a uranium smelting plant in the Northern Territory would rule out the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant being built in South Australia.

On 17 October 1974, it was stated:

The Premier said yesterday that overseas interests had been told they could achieve significant economics in establishing a plant in South Australia.

In the *Advertiser* of 5 November 1974, Mr. Hopgood, presiding member for Baudin, stated:

Mr. Connor is awfully keen on letting us have Redcliff as well. He has made that pretty clear to most people I have talked to.

These statements were made during the Labor Party's term in Government, and I can give other examples. It is clear that many members opposite, from comments generated by them and their Federal colleagues, are endeavouring to make life difficult for this Government and for the current Federal Government. Surely realistic members of the Labor Party realise the great benefits that will accrue to this State and to this country. Members opposite must be aware that we have a responsibility, as a reasonably stable country, politically, to supply scarce resources to nations that unfortunately do not have the energy resources that Australia has.

Surely members opposite realise that, if we deny adequate supplies of energy to those countries in Europe and in Asia, such as Japan and Taiwan, we will be the cause of a down-turn in the economy of those countries that will have a drastic effect on South Australia's industries. The result will be unemployment. The first to be affected in the event of a down-turn in the economy of any country are the underprivileged: surely members opposite are aware of that. I want to quote what Mr. Hawke stated in regard to this matter.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member can say what he likes: he will have an opportunity to put on record where he stands so that the people of South Australia, especially those who live in the Iron Triangle, will know where the Labor Party stands—whether it will support them or let them down. The member for Stuart will be able to show the Mayor of Port Pirie and other people where he stands on this issue, once and for all. He will not be able to hide behind a cloud.

Mr. Keneally: What do you think—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre has the call.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir. On 1 July, during the Perth conference of the Labor Party, Mr. Hawke stated:

I am not convinced as a matter of intellectual integrity of the arguments for leaving uranium in the ground. If we leave it in the ground we have done nothing about the dangers of disposal of nuclear waste, about terrorists acquiring weapons, nothing about people occupied in generating plants

in West Germany, Japan and the United States. We have done nothing about that except make it more expensive, and in the process it seems to me that what we have done is to forgo the opportunity that Australians have to have a voice in safeguarding the world in the processing and utilisation of uranium.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: Of course it is a Liberal Party document, and a very good one at that; I recommend it to all members opposite. The document clearly indicates to all who read it the hypocrisy of the Labor Party. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PORTUS HOUSE

Consideration 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.

(Continued from 17 September. Page 894.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): That motion was fully debated in the other place to such an extent that members voted in favour of it and asked that it be sent to this place for our concurrence. The Legislative Council would not have lightly passed a resolution of this nature. It would have given it the consideration that our opponents in this place believe that that Chamber gives on all matters coming before it. After all, for many years we have been told that it is the House of Review and that review is its purpose. The Legislative Council has well and truly reviewed the motion moved in the Council by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall and has seen fit to agree to it. I am asking members of this House also to agree to that resolution.

The resolution hopes to convince the Government that it ought to hold up any action it contemplates to destroy Portus House so that every possible available transport option can be fully considered. It is the view of my colleague in another place that these options have not as yet been fully considered, and that it is not beyond the wit of our transport engineers in South Australia to be able to devise a corridor that serves the north-eastern residents of Adelaide, so that they can have ready access to the city. That is really the bind in which the present Government finds itself; it wants to be able to provide a rapid transit corridor for people from the north-eastern suburbs, and it also has to consider the relative importance of a historical house, Portus House. I describe this house as being historical because of the grading that has been put on to that building by the Heritage Unit of the Department for the Environment. The Heritage Unit report, which was prepared in 1979, states:

The relationship of Portus House to the surrounding environment is significant. With regard to the immediate streetscape, that is, its position on the intersection of Robe Terrace, Northcote Terrace, Walkerville Terrace, and Park Terrace, and particularly with regard to the latter two terraces, it can be seen that the residence as a whole acts as a key visual element within this intersection and on this corner. In this position it provides a strong visual stop, both to the corner and to the intersection, making the distinction between the residential areas, roadway and park lands positively and clearly. Moreover, this position is typical of locations used by large houses and mansions within

Walkerville and surrounding suburbs—it is situated both on a prominent corner and facing into the parklands. This characteristic siting of large imposing dwellings in Walkerville and Medindie should be recognised and protected. Portus House also has an important landmark status, both locally and city-wide. Being a large imposing building situated on what is the inner-city ring route and the main north-east arterial road into the city it is natural that it has become an established landmark to both local residents and residents of Adelaide who use these particular roads. It is desirable that the psychological importance of maintaining key visual elements in the urban and suburban cityscape is recognised and such landmarks retained and maintained.

The Heritage Unit recommended as follows:

The Heritage Unit considers that Portus House is an item of significant heritage value and should be retained and protected by being included on the Register of State Heritage Items. The unit considers Portus House to be:

Primarily

a contributing item within an admirable landscape, townscape and group;

a typical and representative structure in a class of structures which has some architectural or building significance;

and also

a structure admirable in itself, considered independent of context.

This item will be put to the register subcommittee for it to be recommended for inclusion on the register. Portus House is a significant part of the heritage of both Walkerville and South Australia. It would be unfortunate if this residence were to be substantially altered or even demolished.

The problem we are facing here is that there is a considerable traffic problem at that corner, as everyone recognises. The problem might not be quite as bad as the Attorney-General, when speaking in another place, maintains, but we have seen plenty of the Attorney-General in recent days. He is a man who purports to be the protector of public morality, and yet refuses to set even a minimum standard for his own public behaviour. That Minister, when speaking in this debate, did not argue the value of the issue but wanted to argue the personalities involved and attack the spokesman for the environment in that place over his contribution.

It is recognised that a traffic problem exists and that the people in the north-eastern suburbs find at times that their passage into and out of the city is hampered by the build-up of vehicles at that corner. However, that in itself does not justify the destruction of a building that has significance to South Australia's heritage, a significance that has been acknowledged by the Heritage Unit, a body of experts established primarily for the purpose of identifying and protecting places of importance.

It has been said by a member elsewhere that this building was purchased by the Highways Department during the term of the previous Government, and that is true, but the Attorney-General then suggested that because that was the case we ought to go ahead with the plans to demolish Portus House. He suggests that what has occurred in the meantime cannot alter the original circumstances. It seems strange that when this Government wishes to do so it is prepared to support strongly actions taken previously to justify what it is doing, but on other occasions it wants to put itself as far away as possible from actions taken previously. A double standard exists here; the Government cannot have it both ways. The real issue is whether this Government is prepared to demolish Portus House. The issue is not what the previous Government would have wished to do. The ball is in the court of the Minister of Environment and the Minister of

Transport, who is the local member vitally concerned with the location being discussed.

This Parliament can now pass a motion calling on the Government (represented by the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Transport) to find options that will enable Portus House to remain an integral part of the Walkerville city landscape. In the debate in another place a previous Mayor of Walkerville City Council supported the motion. He has an intimate knowledge of the area and had the responsibility as Mayor for that area, and his vote in support of the motion meant that the council passed it, too. Perhaps that could have some bearing on the decision that we reach here.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I doubt it.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Minister gives an example of the blind adherence to a political philosophy that his Government holds, that is, that nothing can stand in the way of what this Government determines is progress.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: The Minister has not heard my contribution to this debate, but suggests by interjection that the Government will not accept the motion. That is an example of the blind and arrogant attitude that this Government displays towards debates in this House.

Mr. Lewis: Piffle.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is another example of the attitude of Government members towards the most important forum in this State—the Parliament. I hope that the honourable member's electors will get to know more about him, because he is here on false pretences. He has utter contempt for this House, but sets himself up for his electors as being a person that they should have representing them in this Parliament. He cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the honourable member for Stuart needs the assistance of the honourable member for Mallee. I ask the honourable member for Stuart not to reply to interjections.

Mr. KENEALLY: I will try to follow that sound advice. No doubt there will be many times when the conflict that now exists will occur. We know that, in the drive to provide more adequate facilities for the motor car, pressure is applied to Governments to provide the best possible corridors into the city and parking for vehicles in the city. We have a vicious circle, because gradually the city will become choked with motor vehicles. Whilst we have a Government that accedes to every demand placed on it by the motor car, we can only look forward to the annihilation of city areas and of corridors and streets that provide services to the city. I do not look forward to that prospect with any joy.

We could say on this occasion to our traffic engineers that all must not be given to the motor vehicle, and that there are other priorities available to society. One priority is to retain buildings that are valuable to our culture and to our society. I support the Heritage Unit statement that Portus House is one of those buildings and should not be demolished without serious consideration, becoming a victim of the motor vehicle.

This Government gives little credence to what the Heritage Unit considers valuable. We hear much rhetoric from the Minister, who goes around the State telling people that his Government has a great concern for the historical values of this State and wishes to retain many historical buildings. However, when the Government is put to the test it crumbles, probably because the Minister of Transport carries more punch in Cabinet than does the Minister of Environment. This time one would have thought that the local member (who is the Minister of

Transport) and should be concerned about Portus House, could have required his officers to consider alternative routes for north-eastern commuters. Obviously, he has not done so. In his blind drive to satisfy the commuters, he has to sacrifice this building.

This resolution asks that all options that could exist should be investigated. It states that any decision by the Government to demolish the property would be premature while any option exists for alternative transport corridors. I hope that the Minister of Transport will clearly point out the other options that have been investigated and whether or not they are viable. It was said in another place that Portus House is an old home, and has no importance whatever. If the Government considered it to be an old home why did it take the trouble to investigate other alternatives and conclude that one would have cost at least \$500 000 and that amount could not be paid? Either the building is important so that alternatives can be considered, or it is not important and no alternatives would be warranted. By considering alternatives the Government has indicated that it considers this to be an important building. The argument is concerned with the relative importance of this building *vis-a-vis* transport corridors to service north-eastern suburbs.

The House should consider whether all the alternative routes to the suburbs have been considered and this is the only viable one, or whether that is not the case. The survival of Portus House depends on that decision. I am asking that further evidence be given to Parliament to substantiate the decision that this Government is about to make. It is not sufficient for it to say that this house was bought by the previous Government, probably so that it could be demolished, and that therefore this present Government can demolish it. The report of the Heritage Unit was not available at the time the Highways Department purchased the house, and a rating has been placed on Portus House subsequent to that purchase.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: In any case, this information was not available to me as a private member, but it is now available to me and I am making my stand on this issue.

I would have been prepared to make such a stand, if that issue had come before Caucus when the previous Government was in office. Those arguments are irrelevant. Obviously, there is considerable concern that this building should not be demolished. A meeting, held at Walkerville, was attended by many hundreds of people. I was not present at the meeting. I am not too sure of the number, but it was said to be about 1 000 people. If the number is wrong, it is wrong, and I stand to be corrected. The meeting was described by the Hon. Martin Cameron as a Labor Party meeting. That is the sort of cynical approach that the members of the Party supporting the Government have towards public participation. We, as politicians, rhetorically applaud public participation. Obviously, when we have public participation, some Liberal Party members do not wish to accept any decisions arrived at by that public participation. Here again, this is double standards; for the third time in this short debate, I have been able to point that out.

I ask the House to support the resolution. It will not mean that, inevitably, Portus House is saved, although one would wish that that would happen. By supporting the resolution, the House would be asking that the Government not precipitate demolition action on Portus House until every possible alternative option had been considered. The Parliament ought to have those options available to it, because the Parliament should have a concern for the State's heritage. If the Parliament does not indicate such concern, the heritage and history of the State

would be in parlous hands indeed. The Parliament ought to be acknowledged as a forum of which the Government should take heed. I ask the Parliament to indicate such concern and for the Government to heed that concern. I ask the House to support the resolution.

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I second the motion with pleasure. This is an important matter, not just to the residents of Portus House, to the nearby residents, to those people who use the nearby roads in this area, but to all South Australians. The fundamental issue here is that a house is to be demolished, and it matters not whether it is a house of the humblest proportions or a stately mansion, as this one is. It is a house in which people live, and no house should be demolished by any authority without the matter having been carefully considered in the light of all the available facts. The tragedy of this situation is that not all of the available facts have been considered fully in reaching the decision the Government has taken.

I attended the meeting to which the member for Stuart has referred. I, too, was disappointed that the Minister or his nominee was not available to talk to the residents present at the meeting. It was not a meeting of a political nature, but of a fact-finding nature. The officers of the Highways Department who were present tried, to the best of their ability, to explain to those present the reasons why it was necessary to demolish the house. Those officers could not delve into the political considerations, and did not attempt to do so: that is the Government's job, and it is also the Government's duty to go into the community and explain why it has taken such decisions. It is certainly unfair to criticise members of the Opposition for attending such a meeting and then to try, by some sort of smear, to write off the effectiveness of that meeting.

About 200 people attended the meeting, and they were very much representative of people from the Walkerville district and from the wider community who are genuinely concerned about the preservation of that house. As I said earlier, the fundamental issue is that it is a house in which people live, and it should not be destroyed lightly. Like hanging, demolition is permanent destruction and cannot be reversed later, if new facts come to light. This resolution, supported in another place, calls simply for a further think on this issue in the light of further facts; that is only a fair and reasonable request to make of the Government.

There was not just the meeting to which the member for Stuart has referred, but also an open day at Portus House. There was an incredible spontaneous reaction to the invitation issued by the committee that is trying to preserve the house. Between 700 and 800 people went through the house. I understand that almost every visitor was prepared to sign a petition to request that the house be retained. One must ask why there is this haste to have the building removed. This was the view of a number of people who attended the meeting.

This proposal has been on the drawing boards since the early 1970's. If the fundamental data on which the decision has been based have not been constantly upgraded, it may be that the decision has been taken on false premises.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: How many years have we been looking at this matter?

Mr. CRAFTER: For many years. As I have said, the data should be updated, particularly in the light of the Government's recent proposal to provide a public transport system for the residents of the north-east suburbs. When I asked Highways Department officers what effect an O'Bahn or l.r.t. scheme would have on traffic flow through that intersection, they said that there would be no effect. I find that a very difficult conclusion to

believe. I wonder whether any consideration was taken of the O'Bahn proposal and what it would mean to traffic flow not only in the immediate future but in 10 to 15 years time. I guess that no consideration at all has been taken by the planners of that recent Government decision. I think it should have been considered. If the Government cannot delay this proposal until there has been a thorough analysis of the effect of the O'Bahn proposal on traffic flow in nearby streets and on the major arterial roads, I believe that this decision has been taken in haste. It is a difficult task to balance the interests of the people who live in a house and the nearby residents who naturally want the house to be retained to maintain the character of the amenity of the Walkerville area (which is undoubtedly one of great heritage value to South Australia) and the interests of the wider community, such as those who use the roads, those who have cause to go into and come out from the city each day. What are those priorities, when one looks at them? There appears to be a bank-up of about two light sequences in the peak-hour periods in the morning and afternoon going into and coming out of the city through the Buckingham Arms intersection. It appears that the delay averages between three and four minutes.

We are saying that, for the convenience of the people who drive motor vehicles along that section of the road, Portus House should be removed so that people can gain an extra three or four minutes each way on their journeys. We must remember, too, that statistics show that 1.8 persons travel in each motor vehicle to and from the city each day in peak hour periods. Can we justify the destruction of a building of this nature for those reasons? This must be considered.

Mr. Lewis: What would the alternatives cost?

Mr. CRAFTER: Perhaps we should look at the alternatives. The official view is that a grove of olive trees adjacent to Portus House is of greater historic and heritage value to the community than is Portus House. I find that hard to believe. They are not native to Australia. At least some of the trees would be preserved if the road were widened to take away some of the olive grove. If it is desired to leave the olive grove, there is a block of shops on the other corner of the intersection. Apparently those shops are not of great heritage value, and, as I understand it, this is not a shopping zone. However, perhaps they are of greater value than is Portus House or are the olive trees, or the Buckingham Arms Hotel, which is on the other point of the intersection. Portus House has been seen as the easiest option, and I think that the Government would be well advised to consider alternatives other than the demolition of this fine old house.

Mr. Lewis: What will they cost?

Mr. CRAFTER: I think it would cost the taxpayer much less to chop down some of the olive trees than it would to acquire such a house and have it demolished, losing in social costs the value of that house and the community value that it has, which is difficult if not impossible to estimate. Certainly, that form of built heritage would be of much more value to the community than would the olive trees in the parklands.

The Adelaide City Council seems to be in some doubt about the wisdom of the proposals to flow traffic in different directions in the Mann Terrace area and to absorb some of the parklands into the traffic flow proposal. No assessment seems to have been made in this proposal of the effect of the O'Bahn buses streaming into the city off the guided busway at Park Terrace. Surely, this must affect the proposals which incorporate the left-turn slipway, which is the justification for the demolition of Portus House. All of these reasons add up to a hasty

decision on the part of the Government and a failure to consider all the relevant facts, available to it, I would think, quite easily.

In the long term, not just in relation to the O'Bahn proposal, there is, I believe, a strong shift within the community to the use of public transport to and from the city. The price of petrol and other considerations mean that more people find the use of public transport more attractive. What will this mean for our current road system? It may be that, in 10 or 15 years time, we will find that there is no justification for the massive intersection and road widening programmes envisaged to bring the traffic in and out of the city more smoothly than is the need at the moment. We do not know this.

I have put a question on notice to the Minister of Environment about a statement he made, I think on a radio programme, that there was a high accident rate at this corner. Although I have no proof that there is not, many people have said that they have lived in the area for a long time and have seen few accidents on the corner. Information of that sort should be made available to the public. The Minister has seen fit not to answer my question, although it has been on the Notice Paper for almost two months.

I also asked the Minister a question about submissions that the Government intended to make to the Heritage Commission. I find great difficulty in interpreting the reply I received from the Minister, but I understand that a submission was made to the commission from his department.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You mean the Heritage Committee.

Mr. CRAFTER: Yes, the Heritage Committee. I understand that it was the submission of an individual officer, and not a submission that had the approval of the Minister or of senior officers of his department. I find it difficult to understand how such a submission got to the committee, and it is difficult to know why the Minister has not answered my question about whether or not he will make it public.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I'll tell you all about that next week.

Mr. CRAFTER: I would have found it of some assistance, in a debate such as this, to have had available a report that seems to have been rejected by the Minister and his senior officers, and by the Heritage Committee. Obviously, it recommended that the building was of such a nature that it should have been listed by the committee.

One must not fall for the trap that the decision of that committee is the go-ahead to demolish buildings of historic value in the community. If that were so, the committee would have no alternative but to declare many more buildings than it does. However, the declaration of that committee attaches very stringent restrictions to the future use of the building, and restricts its use by its owner, in this case the Highways Department. The decision is not taken lightly, and a decision not to list the building should not be seen as the go-ahead to have it demolished. There are countless buildings of our built heritage, without dispute, but very few of them are listed by the committee.

It is encouraging to see so many people in the community—people who have expertise or knowledge in certain areas, architects, town planners and others—coming to the aid of Portus House, coming forward when an issue such as this is raised, arguing strongly and cogently for retention of the building. If we were to rely solely on the decision of the Heritage Committee, as the Minister has done, that would not be a sufficient reason to justify the action that the Government proposes. As the member for Stuart has said, this is a problem common to all inner

suburban areas. Many important old buildings provide a valuable community service in accommodating young people, particularly students, and people who would otherwise find it difficult to get proper accommodation, have access to hospitals, education institutions, and other important community services. Those buildings are very much under threat, many of them from road widening proposals.

It is important that the Government should be sensitive to the needs of those people, irrespective of the historic value of the buildings concerned—just to the needs of the people. Where will they live if they cannot live in buildings of that nature? There is in my district a building, similarly owned by the Highways Department, of historic value. It is a home for homeless youths. I would be very much opposed to its demolition, and I am sure the community as a whole would be opposed to it. We must use every means available to us to find alternative solutions to the vexing public transport problems existing in the community today, without causing the disruption and destruction to the community that a decision of this type inevitably will cause.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hemmings:

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.

(Continued from 17 September. Page 882.)

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I am aware of the advice given by the Chair on the occasion when my colleague, the member for Napier, spoke, and advise that I will likewise be aware of that and take note of it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the honourable

member will, because I shall be listening very intently to what the honourable member has to say.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you always listen intently to all that is said at all times. I appreciate that point. The call for a public inquiry into the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science is, indeed, a very important one. There has been a substantial amount of evidence in various areas over the year, and indeed prior to that, that suggests all may not be well and that an inquiry is perfectly in order to try to analyse some of the problems that are starting to appear and to ascertain what solutions might be arrived at to restructure the institute with a view to making sure that they do not happen again.

My task today is to outline some of those problems, to look at the impact of them, and to suggest, perhaps, ways in which they might have been avoided if certain procedures had not taken place. In the making of this listing and going through it, I have been particularly concerned to receive information regarding the funding of the institute and to hear about the level of grants or the fact that grants are received from outside organisations by that institute. I believe that an institute which is purporting to maintain functions of a community nature relating to community health fields should not be receiving levels of public funding from private companies unless it can be absolutely guaranteed to us that those funds are in no way influencing the operations of the institute. For that to be the case, it would be vitally important that we know first of all what levels of funding have been achieved from outside organisations and companies and, secondly, to analyse in what potential ways there might have been conflict of interest, and in what potential ways those particular funds may have altered decisions or actions of officers or of the institute itself.

We know that the institute has been receiving money from outside organisations. My colleague, the member for Napier, referred to that in this House last week when he quoted from evidence given by Dr. R. G. Edwards, the then Acting Deputy Director of the institute, who referred to some \$400 000-worth of funds being received by the institute. He gave as sources of those funds not only local industry but, indeed, overseas industry as well.

Referring to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science's annual report for the year ended June 1978, I was interested to see that there is no reference to funds itemised in the general financial statement. The general financial statement for the year ended 30 June 1978 refers to donations totalling \$64, but that figure is somewhat different from \$400 000.

On another page in the financial statement is a listing called Specific Grants Account, which refers to income from grants for specific purposes. It makes reference to two companies that gave money to the institute: \$200 from Tosco Pty. Ltd., and \$10 803 from J. Pfrimmer Limited for research purposes. In addition to that, there were grants from various other Government or semi-government authorities or corporations. Again, we are still a long way from the figure of \$400 000 referred to by Dr. Edwards in the evidence which he gave earlier this year. This statement of the financial affairs for 1978 had, attached to the accounts from the auditor, a fairly standard reference indicating the authority and the extent to which the accounts truly represented the position of the company. It states:

The company's financial statement is properly drawn up so as to give a true and fair view of the financial position as at 30 June 1978 and of the transactions for the year ended on that date. Proper accounting records have been kept and all information and explanations required have been obtained. It is signed by the Auditor-General. Without in any way

wishing to impugn the Auditor-General and the way in which he went through the accounts presented to him by the institute, I do not in fact believe that the figures given in that annual report clearly indicate the true situation. I would say that we can accept, on Dr. Edwards' own evidence, that it does not indicate the true situation. Therefore, it is important that the institute not be expected to adhere merely to the standard company accounting procedures that we accept in the ordinary commercial world, but instead have another set of procedures especially laid down to indicate clearly what funds it is receiving, itemising those funds, naming the companies from which the funds have been received, and trying to analyse the way in which that may be affecting the operations of the institute in other ways.

If it is being suggested that that is casting unfair doubt upon the way in which the officers of the institute or the institute itself may operate, I would say that it is not my intention to cast doubt on a great many of the officers who work there. However, it does seem to me that some officers in particular are leaving themselves open to very reasonable conjecture and doubt about what is happening. Earlier this year, in a Question on Notice, the member for Mitcham asked, for example, what equipment was bought from companies that had given grants or funds to the institute. The answer to that question (No. 167) was given on 12 August by the Minister of Health. There have been substantial purchases of equipment from companies that have given money to the institute. I do not propose to read all the figures out here, because they are available on page 409 of *Hansard*, but very sizable sums are involved.

It is mentioned, for example, that a Haemalog D machine was purchased in 1978 for the sum of \$142 000, and an S.M.A.C. system was purchased in 1975 for \$230 000. It goes on—there are a great many more than that. I am not a technical expert. I do not know what these machines do, but I have been informed that in fact some of these machines do not do very much, that they have been sitting at the institute for substantial periods of time in some cases without being used at all, or at least without being used until questions were raised in this place earlier this year. Suddenly, I am informed, some of these machines got their first usage to try to justify the purchase of that equipment. I think that a public inquiry could very usefully find out not only the relationship of the purchase of these items of equipment with donations to the institute but also whether that equipment was necessary to the operations of the institute. That could be done by simply analysing the usage to which those particular instruments were put—for example, what usage the two Haemalog machines, costing \$91 345 and \$142 000, have had. How can that be analysed in cost per use, for example? Unless we were to have a public inquiry, I do not believe that that information would become readily available to the public of South Australia or to this Parliament.

It has also been suggested to me that, in relation to the purchase of equipment, some irregularities have been practised. We know that Government departments have very strict and rigid standards and procedures by which equipment is purchased. If an item is wanted the matter has to go through various procedures, and various officers within any department to prove, in fact, that a particular piece of equipment is needed, and then indeed, when the equipment is finally purchased, various procedures must be followed to prove that it meets the bill, that it meets the requirements, and that it is in fact what was wanted in the first place.

I have been informed that that has not always been the case at the institute and that some of the machinery that has been purchased over the past few years has bypassed

some of the usual procedures that the institute set down as being essential. I have been informed that certain of the necessary signatures have not been obtained for certain pieces of equipment, and, interestingly enough, those pieces of equipment in relation to which the procedures were not followed came from those companies that gave funds to the I.M.V.S. on other occasions.

There are, too, possibilities of malpractice being assumed, and the only way in which these questions can be seriously analysed, investigated and cleared up to the satisfaction of not only this House but also the community as a whole is by public inquiry to ascertain whether the procedures that were followed in the purchase of these items were regular and whether it can be proven by cartnotes or documentation that the purchasing of these items went through the proper procedures laid down by the institute. If this cannot be proved, questions can be asked in such a forum as to why that did not happen and why other methods beyond the methods set down by the institute were followed in that case.

One could ask why we think it important that favouritism for certain companies be questioned. We are dealing with an institute that supplies information about the value of many chemical products used in our community today. Ample evidence is available in overseas countries and in Australia of the ways in which manufacturers and suppliers of a great many chemical products have chosen to use their position or influence to alter the ways in which certain of these chemical products are controlled or distributed, and I believe that that is the crux of the issue that a public inquiry would aim to analyse. That has been set out in the motion moved by the member for Napier. If we doubt that pressure is applied by companies, we should look at many situations overseas in countries such as America, Britain and Germany, over many years.

The situation also exists in this country and, without wishing to name the institution involved, I cite an example of another South Australian Government institution that was possibly involved in analysing the effects of a chemical, and the institution's reaction to its assessment of the role of certain manufacturing companies in investigations that Government institutions may undertake. This information is freely available to the general public and was cited in the *Canberra Times* of 3 August 1980 in an article by Professor Clyde Manwell. Honourable members will know that Professor Manwell is Professor of Zoology at Adelaide University and was the victim of attacks in regard to the way in which he performed his duties and the way in which he tried to make an issue of the use of a certain chemical some years ago. The article is about toxic substances and the way in which investigations about these substances can sometimes be circumvented. The article stated, in part:

Several years ago a farmer asked me about possible adverse effects from 2,4,5-T, which had been sprayed adjacent to his property by a South Australian Government department. The farmer and his daughter had both become ill and they suspected herbicide drift. In particular, he wanted to have samples of his drinking water and blood checked for 2,4,5-T.

When this approach was made to Professor Manwell, he indicated that he did not have the equipment available and that it would be better for another institution to do the analysis. To protect that institution, I will not name it on this occasion. Professor Manwell contacted a person, to whom he referred as a distinguished organic chemist. It is interesting that that person replied to Professor Manwell as follows:

I appreciate your views that it would be desirable to have

independent tests on water and plants in the area to see if residues of 2,4,5-T are present. Regretfully, however, I feel that I should not at any price undertake such tests, or indeed direct anyone in the department . . . to conduct such tests. My reasons for this stem from my complete lack of faith in certain Government people who, in conjunction with their confraternity in the commercial sphere, tried very hard in a thoroughly despicable way last year to bring discredit upon me, following my criticisms of spraying activities in South Australia with 2,4,5-T and with amitrole. If any tests conducted by me or anyone in my department yielded positive results of an embarrassing nature to the same people, I fear that another smear campaign would be implemented and that rumours would be concomitantly circulated to the effect that we had "cooked" our findings.

. . . I trust that you will understand my point of view.

That is a very disturbing opinion coming from someone within a South Australian institution. The relevance of that matter to this episode is that information is available from correspondents relating to the institute that indicates that a similar circumstance may have occurred within the I.M.V.S. in 1979 that may implicate certain companies in trying to ensure that certain information was not passed on to authorities that could make good use of it. On 26 April 1979, the institute received from the Health Commissioner of the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee a request which stated:

I am writing on behalf of the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee to seek your assistance to collect information relating to studies being carried out in South Australia on adverse effects on human health of chemicals used for agricultural, horticultural, or domestic purposes . . . the committee is interested in specific chemicals which have been in use for some time and for which there may have accumulated some evidence to suggest that a review of control requirements for those specific chemicals may be necessary.

It would be of great assistance to the committee to have knowledge of any particular studies being carried out relating to adverse health effects resulting from exposure to pesticides, including weedicides, or domestic chemicals . . .

The letter worked its way through the I.M.V.S., and an officer of the institute gave a lengthy reply which was to be forwarded to the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee and in which he described the way in which the institute analysed chemical products. Particular reference was also made to two chemicals, dichlorvos and captan. Those references constituted only one-quarter of the letter but, when he forwarded that to the Acting Deputy Director for forwarding from the department, he received a letter that stated that his letter was not appropriate to the questions raised and therefore would not be sent on. It further stated:

Referring to dichlorvos and captan, your case on these should be made at some other time, as the inquiry was a request for information on the facilities the I.M.V.S. has, not to make recommendations.

That is, quite clearly, contradictory to the letter which the I.M.V.S. received and which I have quoted. It asked specifically for case programmes and case studies. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROXBY DOWNS

Adjourned debate, (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1084.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Earlier, I was referring to some

comments made by prominent members of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party, and I want to refer to a few more. A present Shadow Minister, Mr. Keating, said on 2 June 1975:

Since we have taken over the administration of the policy in this area, particularly in respect of uranium, we have said that we intended to export as much of it as we can.

The A.L.P. Shadow Treasurer (although I think he has been demoted since then) said on 14 April 1972:

Uranium exports, in whatever form, could be highly profitable for this country. With the proper taxation policies there could be enormous economic benefits for everyone who lives here.

In his famous comments made in February 1975, Mr. Whitlam said:

In Brussels, London, The Hague, Paris, Rome and Bonn, as well as in Moscow, I consistently asserted Australia's wish to develop her own enrichment capabilities so that as much uranium as possible should be exported in an enriched form.

In December 1973, Mr. Connor said:

We seek to remove any fears which Japan may have that supplies would be arbitrarily reduced or terminated from Australia to them. Australia at all times honours its trading contracts and will never, under any circumstances, refuse assistance to its friends.

That was an interesting comment which should be kept in mind when listening to the comments coming from members opposite and from those irresponsible spokesmen such as Mr. Uren who have threatened, if this country were ever unfortunate enough to be burdened with another Labor Federal Government, to arbitrarily cancel any contracts not negotiated by them.

I believe the electors of Grey should know clearly where their Federal member, Mr. Wallis, stands. Does he support Mr. Uren or does he support a project which will benefit all citizens in his electorate? Does he support the development of Roxby Downs? Does he support the development of an enrichment plant in the Iron Triangle area? Members on this side of the House support such development, as do members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and the Liberal Party candidates at this coming election. Where does the Labor Party stand on this issue? There has been silence from Opposition members, and in particular the Federal member, Mr. Wallis. The people of this State and those in the District of Grey are entitled to know where their member stands on this issue, and on the other matters I have canvassed today. I issue a challenge to the member for Stuart, the Hon. Mr. Blevins in another place, the member for Whyalla, and Mr. Wallis to state publicly where they stand on these issues.

I want to support my view on this matter by reading an interesting letter which appeared in the *Bulletin* on 2 September 1980, under the heading "The need to go nuclear" and which states:

The National Energy Research Association, a Latrobe Valley-based group of which I am secretary, would like to thank Dr. R. Birrell, of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Monash University, for pointing out to the public of Victoria the immense dangers associated with the large-scale plans by the State Electricity Commission to base all its power stations on Latrobe Valley coal in the next 50 years.

For almost 20 years our association has been campaigning for Governments to plan beyond the next election in relation to vital energy supplies. With Dr. Birrell we are concerned that the carbon dioxide levels will double by the year 2030. We are also concerned that the Latrobe Valley will end up resembling a moonscape of black holes with a cobweb of high voltage power lines extending to Melbourne and beyond.

Whether intended or not, Dr. Birrell has highlighted the

need for Victoria to develop nuclear power stations. Because nuclear fuel is compact and easy to transport, nuclear power stations can be built wherever they are required and thus dispersed around the State. Unfortunately, the very phrase nuclear power tends to stir people's emotions to the extent where logic is shrouded by emotive thoughts of mutations and radioactive clouds wafting through the atmosphere.

This impression is far from the truth. The fact is that unlike coal-fired power stations, nuclear powered plants emit neither carbon dioxide nor sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere. Furthermore, the amount of radioactive discharge from nuclear plants is actually less than that of coal-operated stations of similar generating capacity.

The Treasurer of the British Labor Party, Mr. Norman Atkinson, even went so far as to say: "Nuclear power is environmentalism at its best . . . it makes possible the conservation of our natural resources to a level undreamed of a few years ago." Antagonists of nuclear power will point to the breakdown of the Three Mile Island Plant to validate their arguments.

However this breakdown, which was the worst to date, did not result in one single death or injury, nor did the radioactive emissions to the atmosphere reach dangerous levels. It is clear that environmentally, strategically and commercially, nuclear power is the answer to our power needs and should be actively pursued by the Government.

I entirely endorse the sentiments expressed in that letter. I have gathered interesting comments on this subject from around the world, one of which I picked up when I was overseas, which states that Arab Ministers warn that the West must cut its oil imports. The *Australian* has included a report quoting a leading professor as saying, "No more oil in 30 years." An article which appeared in the *Bulletin* of 12 December 1978—

Mr. Keneally: You are a widely read gentleman.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart will have an opportunity in due course to make his contribution.

Mr. GUNN: Under the heading "Ignore eco-freaks, says leading British unionist", the article states:

Australian trade unions continue to receive conflicting advice from overseas on the attitude they should adopt to uranium mining. The advice is being weighed seriously. In fact the A.C.T.U. at its recent executive meeting, resolved to send a delegation overseas to further investigate world trade union attitudes on the question. In particular the A.C.T.U. delegation will be looking at West Germany where the once strongly pro-nuclear union movement has started expressing reservations about nuclear energy. Bob Hawke regards the shift against nuclear power in the German unions as "unbelievably significant".

But last week a leading British unionist returned home after saying, on the nuclear issue, "You in the Labor movement here in Australia are being taken for a ride."

The unionist is Frank Chapple, secretary of the 420 000-member Electrical, Electronic, Telecommunications and Plumbing Union. But he is also spokesman for the British Trade Union Congress (the British equivalent of the A.C.T.U.) on fuel and power. He said, therefore, that he was speaking on behalf not only of his own union but "of the entire British labour movement".

Chapple told a meeting of union delegates in Sydney: "About uranium mining we in Britain simply don't understand your attitude in Australia. In fact I'll go so far as to say we don't even believe it's right. We think someone's telling you a fairy story, a bit like Pommy shop stewards causing all your trouble."

I could go on and read many other documents. I could speak until 6 o'clock, but my colleague wants to say a few words, and I know the member for Stuart is bursting to tell

the people of this State where he stands on the issue. He wants to tell the Port Pirie City Council that he will support it in its endeavours to have an enrichment plant built in its district. I know that, so I will give him that opportunity.

On 26 August 1980 an article appeared in the *Advertiser*, under the heading, "U-deal for \$2 000m". The article stated:

Energy Resources of Australia Limited yesterday signed contracts worth more than \$2 000 000 000 for the sale of about 31 000 tonnes of Ranger uranium oxide to West German and Japanese customers.

I mention that because we have had this nonsense put forward that there is no demand for uranium. Anyone who has made a study of the subject will know that there is a considerable demand that will remain for a long time in the future. An article, which appeared in the *News* on 19 August 1980 under the heading "Only five years before oil crunch", stated:

The crunch comes in 1985. That is the year when we finally slip past the point of no return for the oil on which we are utterly dependent for so much of our daily lives.

Bearing in mind what is happening between Iran and Iraq, that may well occur sooner than we expect.

Members should bear in mind that Sir John Hill, Chairman of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority said, in April 1979, "Britain's future lies in nuclear power". I also refer to two reports made by officers who accompanied Premier Dunstan on his 1979 overseas tour, Mr. Dickenson and Mr. Wilmshurst, who clearly indicated that it was in the interests of this State to proceed with uranium mining, that it was safe to do so, and that there was a demand for uranium.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member has a twisted sense of humour, and twisted outlook, otherwise he would not comment as he does. He should seriously consider his attitude and show some responsibility, instead of peddling nonsense in this House and making statements which he has not researched or which cannot be substantiated. He should not try to interfere with Government members when they are acting purely in the best interests of the people of this State. For the benefit of the honourable member, 5.8 per cent of the world's total electricity is generated by nuclear power; 21 countries produce electricity from nuclear reactors; 227 reactors are in operation and 209 are under construction. Countries producing electricity using nuclear reactors include Belgium, Finland, and Sweden, 25 per cent each; Switzerland, 20 per cent; France and the United States of America, 13 per cent each; Germany and the United Kingdom, 12 per cent each; Japan, 10 per cent; and Spain, 8 per cent. Russia has 21 operating reactors and 21 under construction. Already many countries have a combination of coal and uranium to meet the base load of electricity needs. The use of coal alone is neither practicable nor desirable, compared with 1 000 megawatt stations operating at 75 per cent capacity. Such a station would use 2 300 000 tonnes of coal, compared to 30 tonnes of uranium.

Mr. Keneally: Where did that postcard come from?

Mr. GUNN: It came from the Uranium Information Centre. Does the honourable member doubt that information? I suggest that, if members opposite do so, they should say it but they had better put forward information that clearly explains why they doubt it. This is a reputable organisation providing interesting information to the people of this State, and I think they should have it. In the United States, 68 reactors have operating licences, 89 reactors have construction permits, and there are 21

reactors on order, a total of 178 reactors. Almost 10 per cent of oil used in America is used to generate electricity. The 68 operating reactors in the United States saved 500 000 000 barrels of oil in 1978. Nuclear reactors cannot explode like atomic bombs because their fuel is not the same. This motion is worthy of support, and members will have the opportunity also to support South Australia. I urge every member to support the motion and commend it to the House.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the motion, which commends the Government on its efforts to develop the Roxby Downs site. Associated with that will come the development of the resources of this State that will provide job opportunities and investment for associated services and industry within the State. I call on those that represent most directly the areas that are likely to benefit from the development of such a plant to indicate their support for the project and development. With South Australia, thankfully, because of the Tonkin Government, moving towards uranium mining and, hopefully with the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant, it is appropriate to analyse the risks compared to others applying in the community.

Unfortunately, those opposed to the development of uranium deliberately cloud the issue by over-emphasising the risks. No-one would disagree that there are some risks, but the risks apply to every facet of our lives. The anti-mining and anti-enrichment campaign tends to develop a climate that becomes emotional rather than rational. The fear of uranium mining and the subsequent radiation possibility must be put in proper perspective. We have always been subject to natural radiation from the sun, materials in the earth, the buildings we inhabit, and the food and water we consume.

A recent reply to a question drew to the attention of members the level of radiation applying to the precincts of Parliament House. In addition to natural radiation we are exposed to other forms of radiation such as X-rays, in relation to which we take protective measures where necessary. The uranium and nuclear industries cause such a small increment relative to the level of natural and man-made ionising radiation from other sources as to be of little significance in terms of occupational and public health effects.

This fact has been confirmed by every formal inquiry and properly accredited investigation study that has examined the matter. The natural background radiation exposure of individuals is known to vary in amount which is commonly hundreds of times greater than the small increment arising from the uranium and nuclear industries. Caution has pervaded the development of uranium resources and nuclear electricity generation. Controls and precautions have been imposed. The nuclear industry is unique, in that safety has been the dominant factor in design since inception rather than an evolutionary process, as for most other technologies. I refer to coal and other power generation industries. Therefore, effects in terms of occupational and public health, accidental injuries, fatalities, and environment are superior in that area to other means of large-scale energy production. Economic advantages have been demonstrated. The nuclear electricity generation is no longer an option. To many developing countries, especially in the Asian region, it has become an important component of supply and will be an ever-increasing important component of supply. Increasing commitment to nuclear power generation will be made, as other fuels become costly and less accessible.

If ever we needed an example of that, the unfortunate news that has reached Australia recently in relation to the worsening situation in the Middle East countries supports that contention. Expanded mining capacity must meet the increased world demand for uranium; but whether we mine it or not, that demand will be met somewhere in the world. The slower rate of growth of world electricity consumption following the economic recession of oil price escalation of 1973-74 indeed reinforces that point.

Another factor that should be put into proper context is that the amount of waste produced is relatively small; annually, the volume is equivalent to a medium size dining table. The production of the same amount of electricity from coal would produce several hundred thousand tonnes of solid waste in the form of ash and several million tonnes of carbon dioxide. Waste can be disposed of without undue risk to mankind and the environment. We have only to look at the advances that have been made in France in that regard. The cost of energy will be a critically important factor in the survival of those developing countries to which I referred earlier. Without nuclear power, growth expansion will be difficult for them, if not impossible. Changes have to be accepted, despite the period of resistance which we have faced. A degree of disaffection with material progress, enlarged bureaucratic powers and concern for the environment have motivated individuals and groups into activism. Emotional reaction, rather than balanced evidence and judgment and rational debate, has been to the fore.

Because of that, opinions have been formed on limited or distorted information which exaggerates the fear of uranium development and mining. Fears are being generated by misinterpretation of new knowledge and new technologies. It is possible to identify dangers in any normally accepted human activity. Nuclear energy is no exception to that. For example, let us consider the impact of the motor car. I wonder whether, if we went back decades ago and considered the dangers associated with motor vehicles, we would have prohibited them from going on to the roads because of the millions that have been killed or maimed as a result of accidents involving motor cars. We tackled that problem realistically. We took the problems associated with the advantages offered to the community at large in their proper perspective.

Indeed, that applies to such other projects as Redcliff, as the member for Stuart would readily agree, I am sure. The public debate that has been allowed to run on for over a decade now means that the project will go ahead with some risk recognised. Safety precautions have been taken and new technology has been incorporated in the design of the plant and will be placed into the indenture to protect the environment and the people within the locale. Therefore, those risks have been reduced to a minimum, compared to the significant advantages it will offer the people. The member for Stuart would readily understand that his constituents will appreciate the advantages that will be obtained in any such development in the Iron Triangle area. I am sure that, if one relates the same set of circumstances to Roxby Downs, he would recognise the significant advantage to the Iron Triangle, in providing job opportunities, not only directly at Roxby Downs but in the associated service industries servicing that area.

We must recognise that nuclear electricity is and will continue to be an increasingly important and acceptable component of energy supply, although reports stress the need for a vigilant and positive attitude to maintain and improve the existing high standards imposed on the industry. Indeed, those high standards have emanated,

because of an understanding even back in 1897 of the deleterious effects of radioactive substances. Since that time, study has been undertaken and new technology has been developed to ensure that adequate safeguards are imposed on the industry to enable it to go ahead, providing the benefits it brings to the community and to the economy of the State as a whole, not to mention the people of the Iron Triangle, particularly the constituents of the member for Stuart.

Let us look at some of the other areas in which we receive radiation exposure to put it into its proper context this fear syndrome that has been promoted in relation to the development of uranium resources of this country, not the least of which is Roxby Downs. A radiation dose for individuals is expressed in millirem, and I am sure that, if the member for Stuart likes to do even scant research in relation to the uranium process and development, he will understand the meaning of these terms to which I am referring in support of the motion. Some 30 millirem a year is received by individuals from cosmic radiation. At an altitude of 1 500 metres, that level rises to about 89 millirem. Radiation from ground and buildings, for example, varies greatly, depending on the substances in the areas, between 16 and 91 millirem a year. At Armidale, New South Wales, readings of up to 250 millirem are common from rocks in that area. The Perth metropolitan area reading averages about 60 millirem a year, ranging from 25 to 84 millirem a year. So, one can go on citing examples of the radiation dosage received from the natural background. Brazil, for example, is up to 17 500 millirem a year from natural dosages of radiation.

Let us now move on to exposure from radiation in the medical field. In the United States of America, it has been measured that, between 1963 and 1970, because of medical exposure to radiation, the human level has increased on average from 83 to 103 millirem a year. For the treatment of invasive and malignant diseases, radiation doses of up to 7 000 000 millirem are given to localised tumours to protect the individual's life. Cardiac pacemakers are also radiation sources. The pacemaker carrier may receive up to 5 000 millirems a year from the implant. So much for the exaggerated concern, so much for that which, I believe, puts in proper perspective uranium irradiation.

We get radon in ground water and in natural gas—an estimated exposure of 4 000 millirem per year per person, and an estimated 160 fatal lung cancers for every 1 000 000 people exposed. That information was contained in the United States Environmental Protection Report of 1977. Unvented kitchen ranges and space heaters provide a maximum annual dose to the lung of 1 125 and 4 250 millirems respectively, once again putting into proper perspective the fear of radiation.

These examples indicate what individuals are experiencing year in and year out, having done so for long periods of time, yet when we have the great debates, so called, in relation to Roxby Downs and its development, and the development of uranium, we lose sight of the advantages that we have day by day from the technology, from uranium development, and from the electricity that it provides.

The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation in its 1977 report estimated the global radiation dose commitment from the nuclear fuel cycle to be less than .2 per cent of the global dose commitment from natural background. That is one five-hundredth, and it puts the radiation levels in proper perspective, starting to put rational debate back into the argument.

In relation to nuclear power, it is interesting to note that the population living within a 50-mile radius of a nuclear

plant receives approximately 2 000 person-rem. I use Three Mile Island as an example, a situation that created and attracted much media publicity throughout Australia. The annual collective dose of natural background radiation is 240 000 person-rem, and the incremental radiation dose within a 50-mile radius resulted in an accident rate of less than 1 per cent of annual natural background levels, while at five miles the figure is 10 per cent of annual background levels. The maximum estimated radiation in the accident that attracted enormous publicity, the Three Mile Island situation, was 70 millirem, or 70 per cent of the annual background level. The incremental radiation received was less than the dosage received by a reasonably regular jet air traveller, and a fraction of the occupational dose of a jet air crew.

Coal-fired power plants also discharge radioactivity, as I am sure honourable members opposite who have done their homework will have established. There is no known case of radioactive material in nuclear power stations greater than the permissible concentration throughout the world. A dose of 50 000 to 100 000 millirem is required before radiation sickness becomes clinically observable. Referring to an over-view of the risk from ionising radiation, zero risk is impossible to achieve in any human activity to which I have referred. One of the aspects of the controversy concerning uranium and the nuclear industry is that public discussion of its risks of radiation exposure, which is less than medical exposure, serves to highlight a danger and induces a demand for complete safety—a fallacious argument, and a fallacious concept.

Rather than seeking zero risk for the uranium nuclear industry, it is more appropriate to view it in comparison with other risks to which I have referred. The amount of natural background radiation received by all people is hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of times higher than is any additional exposure received by people as a result of living near any existing nuclear power installations. A perspective on this matter is available from the United Kingdom data on radiation exposure. Britain generates 14 per cent of its electricity by nuclear means. The National Radiation Protection Board has recently compiled data on the exposure of the United Kingdom population to radiation from all sources, which is summarised as follows:

	Annual effective average individual dose mrem
Natural background	110
Medical irradiation	50
Fallout	1
Miscellaneous sources	0.8
Occupational exposure	0.8
Disposal of radioactive waste	0.2

Further data in reports released shows that, of the miscellaneous sources, air travel accounted for more than 75 per cent, while the nuclear industry accounted for only 15 per cent of occupational exposure.

I turn now to Roxby Downs. Having regard to the relatively low grade of the ore and its intimate intermixture of copper and uranium minerals, and the cost of expected mining and separation necessary to produce copper of acceptable purity, it is certain that the project can be developed only on the basis of producing and selling both copper and uranium. I have yet to hear an argument put forward that it is technically possible for

Roxby Downs to proceed, separating uranium and copper, on a practical basis, because it is not available.

Mr. Keneally: You haven't got time.

Mr. OLSEN: It has been drawn to my attention by the member for Stuart that I have not got time available to me, in the nine minutes I have left, to explain how that cannot be done. I would put it on the shoulders of those who say it can be done to explain, to the House and to the people, how it can be done.

Dr. Billard: Flying in the face of the experts.

Mr. OLSEN: They are, as the member for Newland says, flying in the face of reality and of the professional bodies throughout the world. It is a practical impossibility to achieve, and they know it.

The member for Eyre referred to the application of nuclear energy throughout the world and to the number of nuclear plants either operating or to be built in the near future. In total, about 513 nuclear reactors are in operation, under construction, or on firm order. All methods of generating electricity involve risk, and, on the basis of actual performance so far, the nuclear electricity industry has a far better record in respect of its effects on the health and safety of its workers and the community at large than most, if not all, other means of electricity generation can show. We should not lose sight of that fact.

Looking at a report in the Australian *Financial Review* last year, we see that, in the 11 months to November 1979, in oil tanker accidents throughout the world some 257 lives were lost and 600 000 tonnes of oil was spilt into the world's oceans. By contrast, in the Three Mile Island accident there were no reported casualties and there was no mass evacuation. I think it is fair to say that most damage in the Three Mile Island incident was the psychological stress placed on the people of the region at the time—psychological stress because of the media publicity in relation to the situation rather than actual irradiation dosages measured during that period, which I have referred to earlier in my speech.

I would like to make a number of other comments in supporting the measure, but I think the factors I have quoted today have put in proper context uranium development in this State, in this country and throughout the world. South Australia must participate in that development for the wellbeing of the economy and the citizens of the State.

Mr. Keneally: Would you like to have a plant at Wallaroo?

Mr. OLSEN: I have been waiting for about 24 minutes for the member for Stuart to interject; I wondered why it took him so long.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. OLSEN: In relation to the development of a uranium enrichment plant at Wallaroo, I would be delighted to have it there, but in sharing the city of Port Pirie with the member for Stuart and knowing the very anxious way in which Mayor Bill Jones, the council and a number of constituents of that area want a uranium enrichment plant, I would be prepared to support them in their endeavours; they have taken up the cudgels in support of a uranium enrichment plant in the area. But, should they not want it, I would have no hesitation in supporting that development within my district, particularly at Wallaroo. I wanted to put that on record. I will not jeopardise the development of the city of Port Pirie, as has been put to me so anxiously by some people. I would be more than prepared to assist and to support the member for Stuart in any development projects that can be undertaken in that region of South Australia, as he well knows. I support the motion; I believe that it should be commended to the House and, more particularly, to those members whose constituents live in that area.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

O'BAHN SYSTEM

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Government time be made available to debate the Government's decision to proceed with the bus freeway and O'Bahn option for transport to the north-eastern suburbs. This motion is essentially procedural; it requests the Government to ensure that a full and adequate debate take place on this important issue, in Government time, and that a vote be taken at the end of that debate. I do not believe that there is any major disagreement as to the importance of the issue. We are not dealing only with the question of transport to the north-eastern suburbs; obviously, this area is expanding and developing and is of interest to a number of honourable members, because they directly represent districts in this area. The system involves major implications for the city of Adelaide, in that it affects the general transport planning and future of Adelaide, and the State as a whole, as it will result in major public expenditure because of the size and scope of the project.

I am sure that no honourable member would disagree that this is an issue of great importance and urgency, because of the long history of development of this project and the clear and patent need for fast and adequate access to and from the city and the north-eastern suburbs. One would have thought that a motion involving the debating and voting on a matter such as this would be quite unnecessary, because, in the normal course of events, the Government would have made time available. However, that is not the case, unfortunately.

This motion was placed on the Notice Paper at a time when the Government's options had been published and it became clear that no general debate was to take place. I stress that this debate should take place as a matter of urgency and the issue should be resolved because, if we allow too much time to elapse, the die will be cast, work will have commenced on the project, and we will be committed to a system that it would be very difficult for a future Government, or even the present Government if it has a change of heart, to alter. Therefore, a clear debate of the options should take place.

Let us remember that the north-eastern suburbs transportation issue has been under consideration for many years and, because of the size of the problem, the scope of the project and the cost that will need to be incurred to overcome that problem, great planning and care are obviously needed. It is significant that what is known as the North-Eastern Public Transport Study has, over the years in which it has been conducted, involved enormous public participation. The procedure adopted was that people who would be affected by the scheme would have a direct input into the system that would be introduced.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Leader's attention to the terms of the motion that is in his name, which specifically involves an argument that Government time be made available to debate the Government decision to proceed with a certain project. The project itself is not under debate; we are tied, by procedural requirements, to a case being established for the reason for Government time being allowed.

Mr. BANNON: I understand that I should not canvass the system and the option chosen, and I am attempting to avoid those issues, although it would be appreciated that there is a difficult line between the reasons why

Government time should be made available and the decision which the Government has made and on which this motion hangs. In talking about the process whereby an option was decided on, I was not canvassing that option but talking about the method in which public debate and discussion had taken place, and I believe that this is relevant to the motion. This motion is moved in the context of long-term public discussion, the distribution of leaflets throughout the area, the conduct of surveys, and a study team that worked full-time to investigate this matter. Enormous public interest and discussion was generated.

In regard to any issue that involves public interest and discussion, members of this House should have the opportunity for full debate and to be able to make a clear decision. Therefore, it is extremely relevant to consider the processes by which options were decided. That process had been completed prior to the last election and, regrettably, the whole issue was thrown into the melting pot. Further reports were issued, there was a rather vain chasing after alternative options and, even more regrettably, the Government finally came to a decision which is totally unworkable, which will be costly and which is a step backwards in terms of modern public transportation. We will find that out to our cost, but I hope not to a great cost. I will not canvass that area, because that is a matter for public debate.

At the time I put the motion on the Notice Paper, I wrote to the Premier, because, as I said a few minutes ago, I believed that, irrespective of the result of voting on a particular motion, the Government should see its way clear to allowing such a debate to take place.

I wrote to the Premier saying that I had placed this motion on the Notice Paper in order to allow the House to debate the Government's decision fully. I went on to explain why I requested that Government time be available. I stated:

The Opposition believes that the project is of such importance and has such widespread implications that a full-scale debate is called for.

In my letter (dated 27 August) I continued:

The Government's decision to build a busway in part of the Modbury corridor is a matter of grave concern, particularly as it opens up the possibility of future widening to create a general motorised freeway. As far as the O'Bahn section of the route is concerned, we believe that it is irresponsible for the Government to experiment with an untested and technically suspect mode of transport. The comparative cost figures presented are, in our view, totally misleading and structured to present the busway/O'Bahn option as being cheaper by ignoring the long-term cost savings of a light rail transport system. There are many other arguments that can be produced which require full debate and consideration by the House.

Such a debate would centre on a motion moved by the Government supporting its particular scheme or alternatively could be initiated by an Opposition motion. I would envisage that the debate could occupy a whole afternoon with a vote being taken.

There are the parameters of my request to the Premier as embodied in the motion: Government time, an afternoon's debate, with questions pro and con, and with a vote being taken at the end in which all those issues to which I have referred could be fully canvassed. I would have thought that was a pretty reasonable request, and one for which I would have expected some support at least from those members who are directly affected by the issue.

True, we have on the Notice Paper a motion moved by the member for Todd dealing with this issue. I refer to that in the context of the reply that I received from the Premier to my letter of 27 August. In replying on 16

September—unfortunately he did not treat the matter with a great deal of urgency—the Premier stated:

With reference to your letter of 27 August I must decline your proposal for a Parliamentary debate, during Government time, on the Government's plans to improve public transport services to the north-eastern suburbs.

Although you claim that the Opposition regards the matter of sufficient importance to warrant the use of Government time, the Opposition's use of Question Time has done little to support this claim. In any case, private members time is available, and the matter you refer to can be fully ventilated during debate on the motion which stands in the name of Mr. Ashenden.

First, to suggest that Question Time is an adequate place to pursue the technical issues that are raised by this transport proposal is quite ludicrous. Of course one can ask questions, but the questions must be brief; regrettably, many of the answers that we get are not brief but, in any case, the opportunity in Question Time, with so many issues before the House, particularly in recent weeks, when we are getting as few as four questions on some occasions in the course of Question Time because of the extraordinary long answers by Ministers, means that it is quite a ludicrous option.

If what we are asking for is a full and rational debate on a large and technical issue, then to talk about Question Time being an opportunity to ventilate it is quite ludicrous, in my view. Secondly, let me deal with a more substantive point, that is, that the House has an opportunity to deal with the matter through the private member's motion supporting the O'Bahn system moved by the member for Todd. I pointed out in my reply to the Premier, the day I received his letter, the following:

Private members' time does not provide the opportunity you suggest, as the debate must be carried on over a period of many weeks without the immediacy or urgency the situation requires.

The important aspect about that is that we are in the situation where, for instance, the member for Todd makes a speech on the motion; a week later the matter might come again to the top of the Notice Paper on private members' day and another member might speak, and so the weeks go on. We deal with it in that desultory fashion without the cut and thrust of debate and without the ability to hear on-the-spot contemporary questions and answers being dealt with in this House. It is high time that this House had the opportunity to debate major issues of the day, not in an urgency motion situation where no vote is taken and where few speakers take part; not in a motion of no confidence, because in such a situation I do not believe we are looking at a question of confidence as much as at a question of what is the right and correct method to apply to this complex issue. That can be evolved only by debate. Therefore, I do not think that any of the forms of the House, as suggested by the Premier, have any relevance or provide the ability for the sort of debate that I am seeking in my motion.

As I replied to the Premier, the private members' opportunity was simply no option at all. I might add in this context that the motion moved by the member for Todd could certainly be a vehicle for such a debate. It seems to me that it would be appropriate for the Government to have a substantive motion of this kind, probably more appropriately being moved by the Minister of Transport but, if not, the member for Todd could lead the debate, as he seems totally committed and totally dedicated to this scheme. We could then proceed to that debate and a vote; that is the second point I make about private members' time.

We could be in the situation where this desultory debate

carries on in an intermittent manner over a series of weeks and, at the end, we get absolutely no result: the House has no opportunity to vote on it. Honourable members should look at the situation that arose over the Prostitution Bill sponsored by the member for Mitcham. In fact, he attempted to put into effect the findings of a Select Committee comprised of members from both sides of this House. That debate, too, was carried on intermittently, as private members' time allowed, and at the end, when the session finished, no vote was taken on it—it simply lapsed and vanished from the Notice Paper.

That could well be the fate of the member for Todd's motion, which means that the House will have not had the opportunity to express any sort of opinion. I put that to the Premier, and I thought that at least he would give those arguments some consideration. His response was written just before he left on his junket overseas (I am sorry, his trip overseas), and he referred to my letter asking him to reconsider the decision in the light of the matters put to him. The Premier stated:

As previously indicated to you, I believe that ample opportunity will be given to honourable members to fully ventilate their views in private members' time during debate on the motion standing in the name of the honourable member for Todd. I look forward to the Opposition's support of that motion.

Obviously, the Premier is treating this as a sort of joke. He knows that we do not support the O'Bahn system and that, in fact, we have a contrary and extremely well founded view in opposition to it. We are not going to be supporting the member for Todd's motion, but we would certainly appreciate the opportunity to debate it, amend it and vote on it. That opportunity is being denied us.

If I am to take the Premier at face value on his letter, perhaps he is saying to us that private members' time will be extended to the extent necessary to allow members to ventilate their views and ultimately vote on this matter. If that is so, while that is an unsatisfactory way of dealing with the issue, perhaps that is what we will have to be content with. I intend to pursue that matter with him but, at this stage, I still believe he has not answered the points made in support of allowing Government time, and an afternoon set aside for a full, free, technical and detailed debate on this issue, which then can be voted on, so we all know precisely where this Parliament stands.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I second the motion, and I hope that the member for Newland and the member for Todd will support it, too. It is absolutely disgraceful that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs have been robbed of the tramway system without a hearing because that is what has occurred because of the way in which the Premier has acted—quite irresponsibly and disgracefully. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council

requesting that the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin), the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill) and the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence to the Estimates Committees of the House on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) and the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

Motion carried.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pipelines Authority Act, 1967-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The recent nine-minute interruption in the supply of natural gas to the Torrens Island Power Station and the consequent widespread power failure on 30 June 1980, point up the fact that the Pipelines Authority could possibly find itself exposed to huge damages claims resulting from even quite minor interruptions to the supply of natural gas. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the authority's insurers have now declined to extend cover to the authority against risks of this kind, and the authority has been unable, despite a world-wide search, to find an insurer who is prepared to undertake the risk.

Many public authorities are protected in one way or another against liabilities of this kind. For example, the Electricity Trust protects itself by the conditions governing supply. The Electricity Commission of New South Wales is statutorily protected from claims should the supply of electricity fail for any reason. The Government believes that a form of statutory protection is appropriate for the Pipelines Authority. Hence the purpose of the present Bill is to provide that the Pipelines Authority will incur no penalty and no liability in damages in consequence of an interruption of or failure in the supply of petroleum.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 of the Bill enacts new section 20 of the principal Act. The purpose of the new section is to provide the kind of statutory protection against penalties and claims in damages that I have outlined above.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this measure. As the Deputy Premier has pointed out, there is precedent for such a provision in the case of authorities of this kind. Of course, the immediate point that comes to mind is that what we are doing is providing a statutory protection which, in fact, overrides common law rights to damages which people would normally accept. Therefore, it is not something that should be done lightly or without some form of consideration. That is why I think I should make one or two brief comments about it.

The greatest strength in support of the Bill and the Deputy Premier's second reading explanation is the fact that it has been found necessary to provide such statutory protection.

The normal way in which an authority, individual or company protects itself from this sort of eventuality is by means of insurance, but if appropriate insurance coverage is not obtainable or, as in some cases, obtainable only at enormous cost, then clearly it is incumbent on the State to provide some sort of protection for that authority. The only qualification I make to my support of this measure is that members should recognise that there may well be cases where, quite properly, the authority has, in terms of

simple natural justice, some responsibility to redress damages or to assist an individual.

For instance, there have been cases concerning the Electricity Trust where damage has been incurred. The ordinary protections of the law are not available and therefore the person has no redress except by way of some sort of *ex gratia* consideration by the authority or the Government of the day. I think those cases must obviously be looked at in a humane and sympathetic way. We should not see these provisions as being an excuse for a statutory authority to hide behind its protection and thus override the normal standards of care. By providing this statutory protection, in a sense a far greater responsibility is imposed on the authority concerned to ensure that it is conducting itself properly, and minimising the danger of the incidents referred to. The qualification with which one supports a measure such as this is that any Government, or indeed an authority itself, should be prepared to look at a situation which arises whereby this protection is sought and provide some sort of redress by an *ex gratia* payment, or whatever. That responsibility, I think, should be clearly pointed out to the authority on any occasion when a measure such as this comes before the House. With those remarks, I indicate the Opposition's support of the Bill.

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

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act, 1946-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to enlarge the membership of the Electricity Trust from five to seven members and to shorten the term of office of members from five years to three years. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The Electricity Trust faces quite momentous decisions which must be made in the near future in relation to fuel supplies, generating capacity and a variety of other matters. The Government believes that the trust would be better equipped to make the difficult decisions that presently confront it if its membership were widened to include additional experts with skills in planning and managing major industrial enterprises and in energy management. The expansion of the present membership coupled with a reduction in the term of office of members will, it is hoped, enhance the expertise of the trust and ensure that its composition and the range of skills of its members are appropriate to the needs of a rapidly developing society. I should point out that the amendments will not affect the term of office of present members who will remain in office until the conclusion of their present five-year terms. The Bill also removes restrictions which prevent employees of the trust being appointed as members of the trust.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 expands the membership of the trust from five to seven and removes the restriction against employees of the trust being appointed as members of the trust. Clause 4 shortens the

term of office of members from five years to three years but preserves in operation the present five-year terms of existing members. Clause 5 is consequential upon the removal of the prohibition against employees being appointed as members of the trust. Clause 6 increases the quorum of the trust from three to four.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 7, lines 25 to 27 (Clause 3)—Leave out paragraphs (a) and (b) and insert paragraphs as follows:

“(a) 4 950 000 shall be Class A shares; and
(b) 50 000 shall be Class B shares.”

No. 2. Page 19, Clause 3—Leave out paragraphs (a) and (b) and insert paragraphs as follows:

“(a) 4 950 000 are Class A shares;
(b) 50 000 are Class B shares.”

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. Members will recall that this part of clause 3 refers to the authorised share capital of the company and the division of shares. In all, there were to be 5 000 000 shares. Originally, as the Bill left this House, there were to be 4 980 000 class A shares and 20 000 class B shares. At present, 1 952 780 class A shares have been issued. The purpose of the amendment is to allow for a further issue by the company.

If there is a further issue of class A shares by the company at some future time, the capacity will exist to increase the number of class B shares issued and still retain control of the company by way of each class B shares having 100 votes attached to it. Really, the amendment seeks to overcome the necessity for our having to come back and pass an amendment if the company decided to issue more class A shares in terms of its authorised capital and share issue. It will save our having to come back and increase the 20 000 class B shares to a higher figure, which move would be necessary if control was to remain where the Bill seeks to put it.

This is a simple amendment, which deserves support. It does not alter, in essence, the purpose of the Bill but simply allows for the control to remain where this House has dictated that it should remain without having to return to make a further amendment if more class A shares are issued in terms of the authorised capital.

Mr. BANNON: The Opposition supports the Legislative Council's amendments. However, I reiterate the points that have been made in relation to this provision both in Committee in this place and in another place. It is interesting that the Government has returned with this amendment. Certainly, I understand the reasons behind it. In fact I adverted to this matter in my second reading speech and in Committee when the matter was before the House on 16 September. I said then that, although the issued capital of class A ordinary Gas Company shares totalled 1 900 000, and the Government's device of issuing a limited number of class B shares with an artificial value would gain control of the Gas Company, there was a considerable number of unissued shares that obviously could be issued by the directors of the company, thus defeating the whole exercise in relation to control.

The Opposition has indicated clearly that it supports the Government in its move to ensure that the Government, and through it the community, has total control of those

resources. Therefore, any measure that improves the Bill in order to ensure that control has the Opposition's support. However, I suggest that the need for this amendment to be made in another place and the fact that it has come back to this House for approval indicates that the Government did not look as carefully as it should have looked at the device that it has used to provide this control.

As I said in my earlier speeches, the device of directing the State Government Insurance Commission to purchase a special class B share with an inflated number of votes attached to it was a clumsy device. Although there were financial reasons for so doing, it was essentially simply a means of getting around the matter that might have been achieved somewhat more directly. More direct legislation could have ensured control in the way that the Government wanted by a simple 51 per cent take-over. However, the Government chose not to use that device.

Secondly, the S.G.I.C. surely is not the appropriate vehicle for this move. It would have made much more sense if we could have had an exchange of shares between South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation and the Gas Company, thus securing the Cooper Basin resources, securing both those bodies from take-over and, as well, securing Government control. In my view, that would have been far more appropriate. However, the S.G.I.C. has been used as the device whereby this control can be acquired.

That brings us to the next point. When this measure was last before the House, those involved were being required to buy 20 000 class B shares at the value obtaining on the day on which the Government introduced the legislation. That was an inflated value in the market place and, indeed, was a speculative value of shares. That meant an outlay of about \$140 000. The effect of these amendments is not only to increase the number of shares that S.G.I.C. must hold but also to increase the amount that it must pay. In fact, that sum has increased from \$140 000 to about \$350 000. That makes even more telling the point that the Opposition made about the value of the shares as required by this Act.

We are not arguing about the general price of the shares or what happens in the market place, where the trading in class A shares will take place, as listed on the Stock Exchange in the normal way. We are arguing about a statutory corporation being used by the Government as a means of control to acquire shares. There is no question that it is a good or bad investment for S.G.I.C.

In fact, on the return they will get, which is a return fixed by law at a rate below the general inflation rate, they are not getting very good value for their money. As far as the policy-holders of S.G.I.C. are concerned, to have to pay for these shares at that outrageous price is in fact taking money out of S.G.I.C. that could well be left in there for their benefit. It is an inflated price and an unreal price and, in fact, that market price is the very reason that the Government was forced to enter the market place and take control of these shares. So, S.G.I.C. is being required to outlay its policy-holders' money to that much greater extent by this amendment. Why should it do that, because the shares it is being issued with are quite different in quality? They hold a different number of votes, they cannot be traded in the normal way, because they have been purchased by Government requirement, and they can be sold only if the Government permits them to be sold.

So, it is not as though S.G.I.C. has a trading asset. It has a low-yield, undervalued asset which it cannot do anything with. So, why are we requiring S.G.I.C. to pay that market value on the day? It seems quite extraordinary.

Both in this Chamber and in another place the Opposition moved an amendment that it be required simply to pay the par value for those shares. It is a reasonable proposition and, in fact, I think the Deputy Premier himself conceded that there was considerable strength in our argument, although at that stage he was not prepared to accede to it. I am very surprised that this measure comes back to us with an amendment which increases the required shareholding of S.G.I.C. but which does not also take into account the inflated price that it is being forced to pay.

We are simply putting S.G.I.C. money down the drain for no reason. I believe that it would probably be tedious and would certainly be futile for us to try to move that amendment again. However, I would ask the Deputy Premier, even at this late stage, to earnestly consider also taking the opportunity to change that part of the legislation which fixes the price at the price at which those shares were sold or offered for sale on the Stock Exchange on 27 August. It is imposing an unnecessary financial burden on the State Government Insurance Commission.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY I did allude to some of the matters raised by the Leader in the second reading debate, and I will briefly reiterate the argument, certainly in relation to the last point that he raises. All I can say in connection with the first few points that he made is that the Government does not see this as a clumsy move in getting S.G.I.C. to take up these shares, in essence, on behalf of the Government. This type of approach has been used quite frequently in other places around Australia as a device for giving Government control, or, in some instances, not even control but a significant stake in commercial-type enterprises where the Government believed there were strong grounds for intrusion.

The details of the Leader's proposition in relation to an exchange of S.A.O.G. shares are not perfectly clear to me. There is no fear of a take-over of the Gas Company if this Bill passes, nor is there any fear of a possible take-over of South Australian Oil and Gas, in view of the shareholding in South Australian Oil and Gas. The Pipelines Authority (which is Government-controlled) has 49 per cent of the shares and now the South Australian Gas Company (which will be Government-controlled) holds the other 51 per cent of the shares. There is no fear at all, if this Bill passes into law (as we are all quite confident it will)—

Mr. Bannon: You could have tidied it up nicely by keeping that money and those resources within that group.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The detail of what sort of a stake that would give the Gas Company in South Australian Oil and Gas is not clear to me. I do not believe that the shareholders of the Gas Company have any real determinate claim to the assets and any possible future dividends of South Australian Oil and Gas because, as I have pointed out, literally tens of millions of dollars have gone into South Australian Oil and Gas, whereas the South Australian Gas Company's contribution is \$25 500. That is where it began and ended. I do not wish to persist with that argument because the detail is far from clear and I do not believe that the fears that the Leader expresses in relation to take-overs are there. The Government controls both instrumentalities.

I canvassed at some length the reasons for the Government settling on the price of Gas Company shares on the day on which I introduced the legislation without notice, because we wanted to have the minimum impact on the share market. As I indicated then, I had had some discussions with the Chairman of S.G.I.C., and he was not disturbed at the initial investment required, because S.G.I.C. has large sums invested by way of loans in the Gas Company and does very good business by

underwriting the activities of the Gas Company. So, there is no complaint; although the amount of money has more than doubled, in relation to the other investments in the business which S.G.I.C. writes with the Gas Company it is not an overly significant sum of money. It would be foolish to say that any sum was not significant but the sum is not overly significant when one considers the large sums of money that S.G.I.C. has invested in the Gas Company.

The other matter of the price of the shares is that it would be unconscionable in my view to have placed the value on those shares below at least the asset backing of the shares, which is about \$2. That would be deliberately downgrading the value of the Gas Company shares. There could well be an argument for valuing the shares at about \$2, which is the asset backing value.

Mr. Bannon: You could base it—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have denied that argument because we have shown that there is no validity in that argument but there is validity in recognising the asset backing value of Gas Company shares at present, and this Bill will not affect that. The fact is that the asset backing value is \$2. So, if the Government had contemplated going below \$2 and had acceded to the Leader's amendment, we would have been open to severe criticism legitimately. I canvassed these arguments earlier.

In view of the amount of money involved and the desire of the Government to have the minimum impact initially on the share market, the fairest price was the price of Gas Company shares on the day on which this Bill was introduced to Parliament. I thank the Leader for his support of the amendments. I do not apologise for the fact that we accept the amendments, because a good deal of legislation is improved in this kind of way. Rarely do major Bills of this nature not have amendments moved to them.

This Bill was a matter of considerable discussion over a long period, and this provision was one over which there was a great deal of discussion, as the Leader can well imagine. It was only after a good many options were considered by the Government that we finally decided on this way of doing it. I thank the Leader for his support of the amendments which has been given quite openly, and I commend them to the House.

Motion carried.

COMPANY TAKE-OVERS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September. Page 1050.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The Opposition supports this measure. I should say that it supports it because of the history set out in the Minister's second reading explanation and, obviously, in general terms the evils to which he has referred do exist. When my Party was in office, we were involved in the transactions between the Commonwealth and the several States. I do not want the brevity of my remarks or the procedure that I will suggest to indicate a lightness of approach by the Opposition in this matter. We certainly do not approach it lightly.

We have looked at the question carefully and are prepared to support the Bill. We recognise it as an interim measure pending introduction of the package of Bills currently in the other place and I must, in all honesty, foreshadow that, when that package of Bills hits the deck here, there will be a number of points of disputation and, I should think, a large number of amendments. I say that because of the submissions that have been made to me. I support the Bill and now, if there are no other speakers, I

invite the Minister to move the clauses *en bloc* in Committee.

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

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September. Page 1045.)

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I rise to voice my opposition to the passage of these measures, in that they are divisive, oppressive and a serious departure from the fundamental responsibility of government, namely, to maintain peace, order, and good government in our community. This second Budget that the present Government has introduced is indeed a bland and unimaginative document. When one reads of the Budgets of other Australian States and compares them to that which we have before us now, one can only be reinforced in those comments about this Budget.

We are in a period of severe financial restraint from the Federal sphere. There are, as I have mentioned in previous debates this session and as other members on this side also have said, massive cut-backs in essential services for this community, particularly in the health, education and welfare areas. This places an even further burden on the State and a consequential greater responsibility to maintain those services that have been established and to extend them so that those people who must look to the Government to maintain a life with basic requirements, to live with dignity and in peace, are provided with those basic essentials. Unfortunately, this Budget does not provide those basics for those in most need.

In considering just a few of the cut-backs that we had a month or so ago in the Federal Budget, in the grant for the school dental scheme, an essential scheme, there was a real cut. The grant for pre-schools has been cut. The grant for welfare housing, as I have said in earlier debates, has been cut by a massive amount in the past five years and, in the year ahead, those 20 000 people who are waiting for welfare housing in South Australia will find that the list will extend further and that the number of houses will decrease further.

Home care services, which are fundamental services provided in the community, have suffered a real cut. There has been a very large cut in the funds from the Federal Government for senior citizens centres. Children's services (not including pre-schools) also have suffered a cut, as has Aboriginal advancement. One could go on but I give those as examples of where less money is coming to this State from the taxes that the people pay.

We have seen in the Budget before us that there are similar cuts. It has been described as more of the same Fraserism that we are experiencing in this programme of expenditure for the Government in the year ahead. We have seen similar cuts in health, education and welfare spending, and I will refer to them briefly later. I want to compare some aspects of our Budget to the Victorian Budget that was handed down last week. In Victoria there is another conservative Government that has been in office for many years, but clearly it appears that that Government has a different set of priorities regarding its responsibility to the people of that State.

That Government provided a good deal of incentive to the small business community, a community that I believe is suffering at the hands of the present South Australian Government. That section is very disappointed at the fact

that it has been spurned by the policies of this present Government and deserted in favour of big business. That is so, particularly in relation to the shopkeepers, who feel that they have been sold out to the supermarkets. However, the pay-roll tax concession scheme, which the Premier described to this House some weeks ago as being the basis for his promises that he would provide 7 000 jobs for young people in South Australia in the life of this Government, has been shown very clearly, in these documents, not to have worked.

The money has not been expended for that purpose. We do not have accurate figures on the number of young people employed under this scheme, but it would seem that it is certainly well below expectations that the people of this State were promised. We find, further to this, that the Victorian Government has increased the pay-roll tax exemption level. So, the incentive for businesses to operate and to increase their staff is now much greater in Victoria than it is here. As a result, we are losing some cost advantage for employers in this State.

It has been the proposition of previous Governments in this State to maintain parity on pay-roll tax exemption levels with Victoria for precisely that reason, but now Victoria has a much more attractive scheme than ours. One would have thought that this would be considered by the Government prior to introducing the Budget and that there would have been some consultation on that important matter. In Victoria 5 000 businesses will have reduced pay-roll tax bills, and 1 000 small businesses will pay no pay-roll tax at all. That is indeed a big fillip for the small business sector. Another aspect of the Victorian Budget which I find imaginative is the tax incentive for manufacturers of low-alcohol-level beer and wine. I would have thought that this was a sound and wise proposal, and it is one way in which the Budget can be used in the community interest. We have heard of the road toll and the great tragedy that is being experienced in this country through road accidents, and every effort that can be made to reduce this toll and to reduce the cost to the community, both in monetary terms and in social terms, should be considered. One can only hope that the Victorian proposals will soon be followed in other States; at least, they will be watched with interest to see what inroads they can make into this great social problem.

Further, the Victorian Government has reduced stamp duty on the purchase of new motor vehicles; that is particularly appropriate to this State, where a great deal of our employment rests on the manufacture of motor vehicles. There has been a number of suggestions that this scheme be introduced in South Australia. This is another area which I would have thought would be considered more seriously by the Government and would give a boost to local motor vehicle manufacturers and some incentive to buy motor vehicles, providing a reason to smash those piggy-banks with the hammers which Government members have been suggesting people should do. The Victorian Government's capital works programmes are up by \$213 000 000, or 12.1 per cent, a figure in excess of the inflation rate. No doubt this is a priority because it will provide employment for Victorians, yet we find in this State that every possible opportunity is being taken to slash public programmes that will provide employment, and huge numbers of people in Government departments are in excess of requirements, but that is not the philosophy of the Victorian Liberal Government.

Health expenditure is up by a massive 14 per cent. In hospital services alone, \$54 000 000 extra has been provided out of a total budget of \$440 000 000. It is obvious that the Victorian Government is making a valiant attempt to maintain health care standards in the

community and to make up for the short-fall coming from the Federal sphere. Education is up by 10.5 per cent, which is the estimated inflation rate, and which provides for 34 per cent of the total Victorian Budget (a figure in excess of education expenditure in this State). Housing, which is falling into dire straits in this State, receives a 22 per cent increase in funds in Victoria, and welfare receives 15 per cent more; but what happens in this State? Our welfare budget has gone down by 10 per cent.

There have been suggestions that there will not be a cut in welfare services in this State but, inevitably, there must be, and the Opposition will be looking carefully to see where and when those cuts will come and who it is in the community who will suffer as a result of this miserly approach by the Government to a fundamental responsibility of Government: the provision of welfare services. In the health area, we find that there is a 12 per cent cut in this State, and it is not just a matter of biscuits with the tea, but right across the board. We can see in public debate in the newspapers and wherever we move in the community that this is hurting the people who are sick and others who are in need of health services, yet this matter receives a low priority in this Government's estimation.

The Premier has said that money is tucked away for increases in salaries and wages during the year. However, he does not see fit to provide for that in the health estimates, and it is much more difficult to assess what priority the Government really is giving health, when such provisions are made in the Budget to tuck money away in case of contingencies.

We find that, in the past financial year, \$8 200 000 was not spent on capital works in the health area. The Premier calls that savings, but no doubt the community calls it cuts. They, clearly, are the priorities that exist for the people of this State, who compare them with the Budget of a like Government in another State. Witnessing, in addition, savage cuts made in similar areas by the Federal Government, the people of this State are in for a very bleak year ahead. We find this coming at a time when there is a massive increase in poverty in Australia. Figures released in recent weeks indicate that 2 500 000 people in Australia are living below or on the fringe of the poverty line. They show also that the richest 2 000 people in Australia own as much as the poorest 2 500 000: this is an intolerable situation.

Who are these poor people? They are people who, in the main, depend on pensions and benefits that fall below the poverty line. They include Aborigines, recently arrived migrants, refugees, invalid pensioners, single parents, unemployed workers, and some age pensioners. We find that the Federal Government's attitude to pensions and benefits is indeed a very mean and inhumane one. Each year, these benefits are falling further and further below the poverty line. Average weekly earnings have not kept up with price increases in the past three years, and family allowances have not increased since 1976. Allowances for children, pensioners and beneficiaries were increased by \$2 in the last Budget when they should have gone up to at least twice that.

The unemployment benefit for a single person went up by \$2 in the Budget, and for the first time in three years to \$53.45 a week. On calculations carried out by the Victorian Council of Social Services, this is \$22 below the poverty line, which is indeed an indictment on the Government's attitude to these people. How many of them are there? In this State alone, we know that an incredible number of young people are looking for work. It has been estimated that about 25 per cent of young people between the ages of 15 and 19 years are on the dole queues at present.

We know that the number of vacancies available for young people is small, and becoming even smaller. Since the Tonkin Government took office, the number of young people looking for work has increased markedly. Not only are the people I have mentioned coming into the category of the poor in Australia, but another group of people is joining them. I refer to the surplus, dismissed, or unwanted white-collar workers in our community, and small business people. More and more of these people are suffering as a result of the economic policies being followed blindly by this Government and its Federal colleagues. More and more people in our community, especially the shopkeepers, are disillusioned with this Government's policies, and bankruptcies are increasing at an alarming rate.

Let me refer to some of the Government's policies that have attacked the shopkeepers in our community. We have heard the comments in this House of the Minister of Planning. Fortunately, some amendments were made to legislation he introduced, but he tried to deregulate or to move the State Government's responsibility out of the area of planning for supermarkets. There is a surplus of supermarkets in the community. That is true of my electorate, and I know the fears of long-established business people when they see another massive supermarket being erected nearby. The Government has said clearly that it does not want to be involved in the planning for supermarkets, that that is a local government responsibility.

The Minister of Environment attended a public meeting at Norwood earlier this year, at which he said that local government had enough power to control this area. He said he would provide a blueprint for local government to bring down its own moratoriums. That paper has not appeared, and it cannot be done, because the Minister knows that local government does not have that power. He is providing priority for supermarkets. He and his Government favour the development of supermarkets, to the detriment of small business.

This was apparent when the Minister of Industrial Affairs introduced legislation to extend shop trading hours, a direct attack on small business people and a great boon and advantage for the supermarket proprietors. That move was not successful. It was deferred for the time being, and then we found almost a take-over of the bakery enterprises in this State. Bread-making businesses were being swamped and outbid by the supermarket chains. Some amazing figures have been brought to my attention, showing that the supermarkets were demanding up to 35c discount on the price of a loaf of bread, insisting that the manufacturers deliver it and put it on the shelves, thus involving less expenditure on supermarket staff. We read in last Saturday's paper of a Balaklava bakery employing nine people which is going out of business because of the activities of a supermarket. The Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Minister of Industrial Affairs are in collusion in this area, and they are not providing the protection required to save the jobs of bread carters and small business people, especially bakeries.

Mr. Lewis: Give us the facts about it.

Mr. CRAFTER: I suggest that the honourable member should ask his Ministers.

Mr. Lewis: That's a pathetic answer.

Mr. CRAFTER: I have given the honourable member some facts. It is for him to read them in the paper. He should walk around his electorate and talk to some of the small business people.

Mr. Lewis: You're blaming the Government for that, I suppose?

Mr. CRAFTER: I am blaming the Government for not

stepping in and providing some fairness in relation to the massive taking over of small business in this State by supermarkets which contribute so little to long-established community patterns and community life, whereas the small business people are often the backbone of the local community.

Now there is a move to provide that supermarkets can extend trading hours for the sale of red meat. I have talked to the butchers in my area. Once again, we see favouritism for the supermarkets. The butchers say that this will be the death knell for a number of their businesses.

The Minister has made public statements about moving the State Government out of general planning controls and providing for local government to exercise those controls, so we will find a piecemeal system of planning where vested interests will win, because local government has not the resources, the legislative power, the authority, or the staff to resist massive enterprises such as the large supermarket chains. The Small Business Advisory Service, which is designed to help small business people, hardly spent a fraction of the funds allocated to it for the past 12 months. During the course of the Estimates Committees, I shall be interested to find why it is so.

Many tragic stories will be told throughout the South Australian community in the next 12 months as a result of this Budget, which favours vested interests and big business against small business, those who are healthy against those who are ill, and those who are in jobs against those who are not in jobs. It is an appalling document, and I oppose it.

Mr. LEWIS (Mallee): The member for Norwood implored me to walk around my electorate.

Mr. Slater: It's a fair walk.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member is not wrong. Let me make a comparison here and now between walking around my electorate as an exercise and what the member for Norwood would have to do as an exercise in walking around the Norwood District. The Norwood District covers between 10 and 11 square kilometres but the Mallee District covers between 34 000 and 35 000 square kilometres. Does the member for Norwood really believe that the people in Mallee are as fairly represented as are the people in Norwood? He can walk around his electorate every day before morning tea, but there is no way that I could walk around mine; it would be once a month, if I kept walking. I have to drive more than 2 000 kilometres a week, and I have driven more than 100 000 kilometres since the last State election in order to represent my district.

Mr. Hemmings: How many people did you shoot in the meantime?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Napier should not make such interjections across the Chamber.

Mr. LEWIS: I have a piece of paper on which I have written some matters that need explanation, as mentioned by the member for Norwood, and one topic refers to housing. Whilst he bleats about the amount of money that is or is not being spent by the South Australian Government, he said earlier today that it was fair enough for us to spend another \$500 000 on the retention and restoration of Portus House, using money that might be better spent in the provision of welfare housing. I find that incredible. If he considers himself capable of representing the best interests of the underprivileged in our community, he should not be advocating such policies.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. LEWIS: I am amazed that the gentleman to whom I was addressing my remarks, that person who regards himself as more than adequate to represent the interests of those electors in Norwood, has left the Chamber. He does not want to hear that the money that he advocated should be spent may be better spent in providing welfare housing for more than 100 people who would benefit if the money was spent in this way, rather than to retain a relic. The costs in regard to vehicle damage that would result from collisions because of congestion at the intersection which is to be modified would probably be more.

Furthermore, while the honourable member cited figures for Victoria, he did not cite figures for South Australia. One may presume, least of all me, that Victoria, as a liberally-governed State, is better off than South Australia, which is equally well governed. I do not know why the honourable member omitted to say that; perhaps he cannot calculate the percentage figures. I will give him the benefit of the doubt and assume that that is the case.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. LEWIS: No-one ascribes to the honourable member the necessity to have imagination. He says that we are inadequate in our provision for welfare and that poverty is one of those things that we on this side do not understand.

Mr. Hemmings: You wouldn't know what it was about.

Mr. LEWIS: Some people known to me came to this country with nothing more than the clothes in which they stood, quite unlike my forebears who came four generations ago; however, within the past two decades, these people, as a result of their personal efforts, have amassed several hundred thousand dollars. Does the honourable member say that those people have been guilty of some crime? Would he be prepared, or would any other member opposite be prepared, to say that anyone who has prospered in spite of the previous Government's attitude to private business, as a consequence of their personal efforts and their family's efforts, has been guilty of some dishonesty, some theft, or some stealth in economic terms? Let them stand where they are and say so. I have not heard it.

Mr. Slater: There would be some.

Mr. LEWIS: As I am reminded, the member for Napier would, I am sure, be prepared to take unto himself the odium of proclaiming that such people who have so prospered by their own efforts were guilty of a misdemeanor, and he would say that they should have been taxed to the extent that they would not now be so wealthy.

Mr. Hemmings: Look how many people were caught last year.

Mr. LEWIS: As far as I am aware, no-one starves to death in this country, and I remind members opposite, including the member for Norwood, that, if that is the case, the system in which they are privileged to live could not be too bad, because, as it happens, people in other places in the world, greater numbers than live in the whole of Australia, let alone in this State, are starving to death annually. This country and this State is governed not by authoritarian Governments or by Governments that believe in centralist control but by Governments of my political persuasion—the Liberal persuasion. The member for Norwood and his colleagues talk about unemployment and the lack of jobs. No-one denies that presently the number of people seeking work from an employer exceeds the number of opportunities for employment offered by employers.

Those people who see themselves constrained by the

notion that they will be for ever (for the rest of their lives, from the day that they are born) employees are, regrettably, not encouraged, by people like the member for Norwood, to see the greater opportunity that this country offers. The honourable member should speak in terms of those people who cannot find the means of obtaining a living rather than of those who are unemployed, because any individual who is inclined to earn a living can do so, as opposed to what is otherwise available in terms of jobs offered by employers. One can be self-employed and, when unemployment is debated, we must not ignore the prospect of a person becoming self-employed. This Government, of which I am proud to be a member, offers and encourages self-employment, and we want to ensure the creation of permanent jobs, not pretend jobs, such as would be available under the kind of scheme advocated by members opposite in general and by the member for Norwood in particular.

Let us make no bones about the fact that, as the economy halts its down-turn in South Australia and as the number of jobs as well as the number of self-employment opportunities increases from this point forward, there will be a rapid increase in prices, especially in the building industry, because our tradesmen have gone interstate seeking better opportunities for their self-employed income earning capacity and better opportunities for their families. They have gone interstate for no other reason than the fact that the previous Government dried up the prospects of employment in this State. That Government had a policy of providing all Government construction work to Government agencies; no work was let to contractors or subcontractors. That was the deliberate and conscious policy of the previous Government, and I will have more to say about that in the grievance debate following this debate.

Nonetheless, when we are faced with the realisation that our skilled tradesmen went off-shore, if you like, through the State borders to greener pastures prior to this Government's coming to office, to obtain a better income and a better life for their families (and that is understandable and appropriate in a country like Australia), we must also realise that costs will increase at such a rate that one can hear now the bleats of members opposite, who will then say that we are presiding over the most rapidly increasing building costs in Australia, for no other reason other than that the tradesmen, who would have supplied these services to the market demand that will emerge as a result of economic recovery that is coming to South Australia, have evaporated. They are not here. I hear fellows like John Scott saying, "We don't need any more tradesmen in this country or in this State".

Mr. Mathwin: Who is John Scott? The flying Scotsman from Thebarton?

Mr. LEWIS: I will have more to say about him later. This State's education system presently provides for the best student-teacher ratio of any State in the Commonwealth of Australia, as can be seen if one looks at the Budget expenditure on education with a view to examining it in a critical context, and that is not a bad thing. This Government improved on what the previous Government offered not only this year but last year. The student-teacher ratio continues to improve.

The honourable member opposite would do well to do his homework on that score before interjecting to the contrary and regrettably (this is in other people's terms and not mine, as they have described him to me) making a fool of himself.

Regrettably (and this is in no way related to partisan politics) I have to observe in the context of this speech and my remarks the fact that economists and econometricians

(they are the people who fiddle around with formulae) find it impossible to bring to account in the way they give advice to Governments the value of the voluntary work not only within households but also within the community.

When they overlook the value of voluntary work, they do a disservice to rural communities more particularly than they do to the entire community. It is a gross disservice to the community overall. Their prognostications and opinions do not take account of the value of the work that mum or dad does at home. They do not take account of the value of the work that is done voluntarily to provide recreational facilities at no labour cost to the community in which they live in rural circumstances, and that goes in some part to a greater measure per capita beyond what anyone in urban Australia is prepared to make as an input to the welfare of their sport or the community in which they live.

To that extent we get a distorted impression and distorted advice. More than anything else, I think that is responsible for the kind of inadequacy that presently pervades the sorts of decisions that Governments then make in economic terms, and the sort of pretend jobs that are projected by members opposite as realistic and viable as part of Government-sponsored unemployment schemes, and are therefore removed in the opinion of the majority of people as being their responsibility as citizens. How unfortunate, because by that mechanism they destroy the feelings which all of us have as Australians to provide for ourselves the sort of facilities that we believe we should enjoy in our communities.

This Government has introduced, quite unlike the previous Government which never contemplated it, family impact statements. They take account of the consequences of any legislative move on family structures. I believe it should go further than that, but let me again make the distinction between this Government and the previous Government: we are concerned to ensure the survival of families, while the former Government was concerned to ensure the proliferation of the State as against the survival of the family. I believe that sociologically it would be more desirable if all Government measures were to be assessed on the basis of the sociological implications, not only for the family but the wider implications for the community at large, before any attempt is made by Governments to take over what has been provided to the community by the community previously.

Wherever Government takes unto itself such responsibility as may be seen to be desirable and necessary, I think in any such instance there needs to be a sunset clause, so that the entire community at large can focus its attention every five years on the performance of that Government instrumentality in providing the services that it has been charged to provide. Then we could all focus our attention on the desirability of doing so or otherwise. Sunset legislation is a notion that is not well understood. Too many people see it as an inevitable cut-off, when what it really means is that publicly we will assess the value and the function of the Government instrumentality before we decide whether or not it should continue, and we will all do that together and in concert.

I should like to give some examples of the difficulties with which Governments are confronted when they examine matters in isolation, according to the way in which departments are constructed, and divide up the responsibilities that Governments have. How unfortunate it is that we do not have, for example, the mechanisms within the departments dealing with, say, tourism, engineering and water supply, energy, and the environment to enable this State to develop the tourist potential of the off-shore islands in the Great Australian Bight near

the west coast and in the gulf waters and, in so doing, examine the viability of handling human waste through dry disposal instead of wet disposal (using the Clivus lavatory instead of the flush lavatory), generating electricity using the Darvas generator rather than burning oil or coal and, in so doing, not polluting coastal waters adjacent to those islands or, alternatively, wasting unnecessarily large numbers of kilojoules per week's accommodation available. How unfortunate it is that that is not possible. I believe there should be greater opportunity for that integrated effort.

Turning to another area, in agriculture we have extension officers providing farmers with the most up-to-date information about farming technology. I believe that within the fisheries area we might possibly provide extension officers to give fish farmers the most up-to-date technology on how to grow not just a few but thousands of kilograms if not hundreds of tonnes of fish in a farming context rather than winning them from the natural environment. It is cheaper, and that is demonstrated around the world. The reason we do not do it now is traditional, and for no other reason. It is economically viable. There is a market, and we could export the product. Presently, there is no provision for the development of that additional area within this State's economy to enable a greater number of people to be employed in that way. We traditionally eat meat, which was grown on the farm, on the settlement, and we only eat fish which are caught from the water rather than fish protein which is produced by farming.

In conclusion, I refer to another area that illustrates the inadequacy of dividing things up as we have done traditionally into departments for which Ministers alone are responsible. The amount of water at the disposal of this State is left to the responsibility of the Minister who traditionally, since the time that concern for this matter was accepted at State level, has allocated it according to the conventional wisdom of the day. It is only in recent times that water made available for irrigation purposes has been measured in quantity terms and not in terms of the area to be irrigated.

That is a step in the right direction, and a definite improvement because, with a given quantity of water, it has been demonstrated, not only within this State or this country but also overseas in such countries as Israel, that more kilograms of marketable produce can be obtained from a given volume of water depending on the technology used and the system used to distribute it to the crop over which it is applied, and the economics of using water and the market value of each litre or kilolitre, or whatever other measurement of water volume that we want to use, needs to be more exactly and more precisely examined. Greater incentive needs to be provided to people who get more from each volume of water rather than simply using it per unit of land (per square yard or per hectare).

Many of the things about which I have been speaking never entered the minds of members of the previous Government, but they have certainly entered the minds of the Ministers in this Government. There has been already, within 12 months, a demonstrated improvement to the welfare of South Australians and Australians at large as a result of the awareness shown. I commend this Government and its Budget to the House.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): The member for Mallee has just made a fool of himself. He has gone against arrangements with the Leader of the House, the Government Whip and the Opposition Whip.

Mr. Randall: How do you know?

Mr. HAMILTON: I have just been informed that he

has. I will refer to two major issues. I am glad to see the Minister of Health in the House tonight, because on looking through the Estimates I could not find the amount of money to be allocated for medical research in South Australia. It is a tragedy, in my view, that not enough money is allocated to medical research in this country.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr. HAMILTON: I will refer, if the Minister can contain herself, to an article that appeared in the *Australian* on Tuesday 21 May 1979, that shows the tragedy of our medical research programme.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. HAMILTON: If the Minister of Agriculture will shut his mouth for a few moments—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member does not refer to any member in the terms he has just used.

Mr. HAMILTON: I bow to your wisdom, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That article states:

The dole is the only reward awaiting many young researchers in medicine because of the severe shortage of funds, says an associate Professor from the University of New South Wales' school of biochemistry. Professor J. Adams said many grants were made for only short periods and some researchers had few prospects after their grants lapsed. He said: "The result is that the really brilliant PhDs go overseas and the benefit of all their training goes to some other country."

"The others have to take jobs well below their capabilities—if they are fortunate enough to get a position at all—and again we are not getting the benefit. The general lack of support for researchers at the post-doctoral level is very worrying."

Professor Adams said he did not blame the National Health and Medical Research Council, the body in charge of allocating medical research grants. "They do not get enough money to support all the research projects. In general terms we just are not pulling our weight as far as research is concerned," he said.

The federally-financed council gave \$12 800 000 for medical research this financial year. This is about 90c for each person in Australia—one of the lowest contributions to medical research by any developed nation. The \$12 800 000 paid for only 279 projects out of the 640 research applications submitted to the council this year.

Some of the projects might have been too ambitious and others may not have merited the outlay. But the paucity of funds is creating great bitterness among research workers. Many are afraid to discuss the situation publicly for fear they might be victimised and lose what little money they are receiving. Allocation of the new grants comes up shortly. But one of their real concerns is the drift away from financing basic biological research, which must eventually hold the key to diseases such as cancer.

We heard the contribution of the member for Mallee, who talked about people travelling interstate and overseas to try to get jobs, yet we find, because of this Government and its Federal colleagues, that there is a lack of money for health research in this country. This leads me to refer to a number of questions I have put on notice, Nos. 508 and 509, one of which referred to the drug Debendox and its use in Australia, and the other to the question of lead levels in schoolchildren. I would like to refer now to a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 18 January 1980, as follows:

The General Assembly,

Aware that the exportation of banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products could have serious and adverse effects on the health of peoples in the importing countries,

Recognising the urgent need to take concrete measures to prevent the adverse effects on health on a world-wide basis and, to that end, mindful of the importance of objective information about banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products,

1. Urges member States to exchange information on hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products that have been banned in their territories and to discourage, in consultation with importing countries, the exportation of such processes to other countries;

2. Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the United Nations agencies and bodies concerned, especially the World Health Organization, to assist Governments in exchanging information and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, through the Economic and Social Council, about the experience of member States and the United Nations agencies and bodies concerned.

That resolution was made at the 106th plenary meeting on 17 December 1979.

Over a period of months I have raised the question of Debendox with the Minister of Health on numerous occasions. It was interesting to reflect on the Minister's reply to question 664, which I put on notice, as follows:

Has the Minister investigated the medical use of the drug "Debendox" and its use by pregnant women and, if so, what were the results and, if not, will the Minister have the necessary investigations into the use of this drug carried out and the reply, why not?

The reply I received from the Minister on 25 March 1980 was as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The Australian Drug Evaluation Committee has repeatedly reviewed all available data on Debendox to establish whether any birth defect link exists. It has examined data submitted to the committee by an Australian expert in the field of drug induced birth defects, and has also kept abreast of the latest information available from the U.S. Food & Drug Administration. The use of the drug is also monitored in South Australia seeking evidence of any associated birth defects. The results of these investigations overseas and at Commonwealth and State level have not produced any conclusive evidence that Debendox produces birth defects. The health authorities will continue to keep the situation under review.

On 30 May, having written to the Minister on 9 April, I received the following letter, in relation to the question of Debendox, which stated in part:

Debendox was not withdrawn from sale in the U.S.A. although the formulation of the drug was changed in 1977 at the request of the Food and Drug Administration. The F.D.A.'s request was made after statistical studies revealed that one of the constituents of the drug (Dicyclomine Hydrochloride) did not apparently increase its therapeutic value and could be removed from the drug without significantly reducing its effectiveness. The reformulation was not made for medical or safety reasons and only applies to Debendox manufactured for use in the U.S.A.

The most important question is in relation to the doubt that has arisen over the use of this drug. We have such esteemed persons in the medical field as Dr. William McBride. All members would know of that gentleman's research into the drug thalidomide. In the 10 February issue of the *Sydney Sun Herald*, Dr. McBride is referred to as the man who warned the world about thalidomide and who has now blamed another drug for causing deformities in at least 25 babies born in New South Wales. That report states:

The drug, called Debendox, is sometimes taken by pregnant women to relieve morning sickness.

Giving evidence in an American court last week. Dr. McBride said the drug could damage the baby if taken at a particular stage of pregnancy.

Dr. McBride said the Australian cases of deformity were brought to his attention by a Sydney-based group called the Amputee Children's Society. The President and Secretary of the society both have children who, they claim, were affected by Debendox.

In the same paper on the same date, another report headed "Popular drug may cause deformity" states:

At least 25 children in New South Wales have been born with deformities because their mothers took the drug, Debendox, according to Dr. William McBride, the obstetrician who first warned the world about Thalidomide. Dr. McBride revealed the Australian cases while giving evidence last week in an American court.

I referred to that in the previous report. One of the women, a Mrs. Baldwin, said that her seven-year-old son Aaron was born without a right arm. The report continues:

"I started taking Debendox between the fifth and sixth week of pregnancy which is the vital time," Mrs. Howe said. Both mothers said the crucial factor was when the drug was taken during pregnancy.

"It was the same with Thalidomide," Howe said. "Not all women who took Thalidomide had deformed children. It just depends at which stage of the pregnancy you take it."

Dr. McBride discussed the effects of Debendox in Florida last week, where he is giving evidence on behalf of a mother who is suing the multi-national pharmaceutical corporation, Richardson-Merrell, of Ohio for \$US10 000 000.

Similarly, a report which refers to England and which is headed "Tragedy mothers sue drug company" in the 17 June issue of the *Advertiser* states:

A hundred heart-broken mothers have launched a \$300 000 000 court action over their tragically deformed babies.

The women all took the drug Debendox on doctors' orders to prevent morning sickness and they claim Debendox ruined their children's lives.

One of the mothers, Valerie Alexander, 39, said yesterday: "The damage this drug has done is worse than the scandal of Thalidomide."

Mrs. Alexander, of Ickham, Kent, has a 14-month-old son whose arms end at the elbows. She is leading the group in their fight against the drug's American makers.

Mrs. Alexander said, "One woman contemplated killing herself when her three-year-old son had his legs amputated because he had flippers instead of feet."

Meanwhile, Debendox remains available in Britain. Government experts say there is no evidence that it is dangerous.

That is the same situation that applies in this State and in this country. What is the Government prepared to do? One would think that, because of future generations and because of the children who are to be born, this drug should, because of the element of doubt that exists worldwide in relation to its use, be withdrawn from the market. However, that is not the case. We find the drug company itself acting like many other multi-national companies have acted in the past. I refer, for instance, to the likes of Ralph Nader, who wrote the book, "Unsafe at any speed" in relation to the General Motors-Holden's car in America. A similar situation exists in this respect, and certain persons are looking into the past of Dr. William McBride.

I refer also to a report which comes from Sydney and which appeared in last night's *News*. Entitled "Drug firm checks doctor", the report states:

An American drug company has hired a private detective

to investigate Dr. William McBride, who discovered a link between thalidomide and deformities in babies.

Dr. McBride appeared as a witness against the company in an American court case earlier this year. The company, Richardson Merrell, is responsible for the manufacture of the drug Debendox, used by pregnant women. Dr. McBride testified for the parents of a child who was born with a badly deformed chest and right hand.

Before he left to testify Dr. McBride said he believed Debendox caused birth defects. A federal jury awarded \$20 000 to the child in March. Richardson Merrell has challenged the verdict.

The former commander of the Australian fleet, Rear Admiral G. J. Crabb, said he had been approached by a private investigator working for Richardson Merrell and was "looking into" Dr. McBride's background.

Quite clearly, these multi-national companies and big pharmaceutical companies are prepared to go to any lengths. They care not for the unborn children, about the effects on those children after they are born, or about the trauma with which the parents and children concerned must contend. I plead with the Minister to reconsider the matter and to take the matter before Cabinet in order to have the drug withdrawn from the South Australian market. The element of doubt exists. It has existed with thalidomide, and people of Dr. McBride's esteem must surely cast some doubts in the Minister's mind in relation to the use of this drug.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There aren't any other scientists supporting Dr. McBride on this issue, you know.

Mr. HAMILTON: But did they support Dr. McBride on thalidomide? However, he was proved to be correct.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr. HAMILTON: The point is that doubt exists and, therefore, the drug should be withdrawn. I now refer to another matter. I do not have much time and should like to pursue it without interjection.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You haven't done much so far. You've been reading a few press reports and articles of correspondence, but have done little else so far.

Mr. HAMILTON: Time will tell whether or not I am correct. The question that I raise relates to elevated lead levels in schoolchildren. I was interested to read a report headed "Blood lead levels safe" in today's *News*. It states:

Lead pollution from petrol is not a serious danger to the health of children, according to a Victorian Health Commission survey. The study, compiled by the industrial hygiene section of the commission, found blood-lead levels of Victorian children examined in three separate surveys were "within acceptable limits".

The report later continues:

The National Health and Medical Research Council has set 30 micrograms as the level of concern, while specialists at Sydney University have set a level of 25.

A spokesman for the Australian Institute of Petroleum Ltd. said the study and another yet to be released in New South Wales "strongly suggest there is no need for health reasons to introduce unleaded petrol".

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: We can read newspapers too, you know.

Mr. HAMILTON: The Minister does not do a bad job when he makes Ministerial statements. The report continues:

"When you consider that only 10 to 20 per cent of the tiny amounts of lead people absorb comes from the air, and that children's blood-lead levels, when measured accurately as in the Victorian survey, are so far below the conservatively-fixed level of concern, the argument for banning lead in petrol on health grounds just disappears," he said.

It is interesting for one to see the studies that have been

conducted in America and Japan, where they have lead-free petrol. I now refer to a report which was sent to me by the Natural Resources Defence Council in Washington and which, in relation to atmospheric lead, states:

There have been large-scale increases of lead in the general environment in the past 40 years In the past, lead was widely used in pesticides.

I am quoting the report in part. It further states:

At present, motor vehicles represent the major source of airborne lead, contributing approximately 90 per cent of airborne lead emissions, or an estimated 500 000 000 pounds of lead each year in the U.S. . . . High atmospheric concentrations of lead have been found near lead smelters and near city roads where traffic density is high.

The question I raised with the Minister was in relation to what studies had been carried out in South Australia and, in particular, I am very much concerned about the lead levels in children particularly where they go to schools adjacent to main roads within my electorate. I have quoted that in question No. 509 that I put to the Minister—

Mr. Randall: Which schools?

Mr. HAMILTON: There are quite a number in my electorate—Hendon, Seaton, Woodville, Findon, Seaton North, West Lakes High and Siena College.

Mr. Randall: On main roads?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes. You can go down there and have a bo-peep. It is outside your district. The report continues:

Studies in New England and New York City show that ambient lead from automobile exhaust is a substantial contributor to the high blood lead levels being found in many children. In addition to being directly inhaled, small particles of lead from mobile and stationary sources may coagulate into larger particles to "fall out" as dust. Lead in dustfall is a health problem in urban areas especially affecting children who play near city streets and roadways.

It has been noted that, within a given geographical area, urban residents show higher lead levels than their suburban counterparts. Sustained blood levels in the range of 30-50 micrograms per 100 millilitres are now being found in many urban children without pica (that is, who have not taken in lead in paint chips). It has been estimated that in this country [the United States of America] between 250 000 and 600 000 children, one to six years old, have blood levels over 40 µg/100 ml. EPA—

which is the Environment Protection Association in that country—

has recognised that adverse effects of lead have been observed at blood lead levels of 15 µg/100 ml. and lower.

That is in direct contrast to the article that I read from today's *News*. The report continues:

As with cadmium, inhaled lead is absorbed into the body to a greater degree than lead which is ingested. According to several reports, in adults, 40-50 per cent of lead particles deposited in the lung is absorbed into the blood, whereas efficiency for absorption of lead from food is only 5-10 per cent (18 per cent for children). Furthermore, children retain more lead through inhalation than adults when exposed to the same concentration of airborne lead.

Acute effects of lead as a cumulative poison affecting the central nervous system have been well documented and include mental retardation, recurrent seizures, cerebral palsy, optic atrophy, kidney damage, anaemia, and death. However, the subtle, long-term effects of lead are likely to go unrecognised. These may include diminished intelligence, nervousness, impairment of co-ordination and mechanical dexterity, and general fatigue. There is growing evidence that long-term chronic lead exposure may cause minimal brain damage, behavioural problems, and neurological impairment

in children exposed to lead both *in utero* and during early childhood. Research into the toxicologic effects of lead has indicated that lead may reduce the resistance of animals to infection. Lead is also a carcinogen in rats and mice; however, in 425 workers exposed to lead occupationally, no increase in cancer incidence was noted. On the other hand, an increase in cerebrovascular incidents was observed.

There is recent evidence of chromosomal aberrations in people occupationally exposed to lead. Three separate studies have found evidence of chromosomal abnormalities in workers exposed to lead and in individuals living near smelters.

I note that the member for Stuart is very concerned with this question as he represents people living in Port Pirie. It will be interesting to see what sort of studies have been done in the past. The report continues:

As a result of a suit filed against the Environmental Protection Agency in 1974, a final National Air Quality Standard for lead will be promulgated in 1978.

We have heard a great deal of criticism by the Minister of Transport in South Australia in respect of a decision by the New South Wales Government to legislate for the introduction of lead-free petrol. However, it is rather surprising that we find that countries such as Japan and America have already carried it out. Another question that certainly concerns me in relation to chemicals, and one that has certainly been in the minds of many people in this country, is the use of 245T. I refer to an article of 1 July 1978 in the *National Times* under the heading "The danger chemicals Australia won't ban". The article states:

The Australian National Health and Medical Research Council declared last week that it could find "no substantiated scientific evidence of a causal link between the use of 245T and human birth defects." Yet the herbicide is banned in the United States for agricultural use, a major source of the chemical.

The controversial herbicide 245T is just one of eight such chemicals used in Australia but either banned or severely restricted for use on food crops in the United States.

The other chemicals, either herbicides or pesticides, are 24D, aldrin, DDT, toxaphene, heptachlor, lindane and endrin.

Many of these can already be purchased in this State. The article continues:

The main reason for the United States clampdown is the possible link—

and I emphasise "possible link"—
between them and cancer.

It is not the proven link but the possible link. That is the question, and the use of Debendox is the same issue. There is a possible link between that and deformities. Yet, we see that the Minister is not prepared to take action but is prepared to allow mothers, particularly pregnant mothers, to consume this drug with the chance of having deformed children, which is a very real chance. It amazes me to see, despite the fact that people such as Dr. William McBride have repeatedly called for the banning of this drug in this country, that it is yet to be banned in Australia and in South Australia. I once again make the plea that the Minister reconsider the banning of the use of Debendox in South Australia.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): I have reservations when I read the Budget. During the Budget speech the Premier, on page 8, comments about the need to vigorously support responsible wage restraints in the National Wage Case. When Malcolm Fraser campaigned in 1975 for the Federal election he promised full wage indexation for workers in Australia. How long did he take before instructing his Government advocates at the national wage hearing to

argue for no increase in wages or for partial indexation?

We now have in South Australia a Liberal Government that is prepared to echo Fraser's call for wage restraint. The Premier, in his Budget speech, urges wage restraint as a key to controlling inflation and solving unemployment. This Government would have the workers of South Australia bear the full brunt of combating inflation. Mr. Fraser's record on inflation speaks for itself: inflation has come down marginally at the enormous cost of doubling unemployment. The present Government of South Australia exposes itself quite clearly in the Budget by its comments on wage restraint and its intention to fight increases for public servants.

The Fraser Government has cut the living standards of all wage earners in Australia and bolstered company profits, which would please the Liberal Government. The Fraser Government is transferring income that should be going into the pay packet of wage earners to the profits in company balance-sheets. Profits are booming in Australia, while the living standards of the workers and their families are falling.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense!

Mr. PLUNKETT: That shows how much the member is in touch with things. If he got away from the pet dogs that are killing a few sheep instead of blaming the dingoes, he may be able to stand up and speak sensibly, but he thinks more about getting a few bob for killing a few pets than he does about the unemployed and people who are living below the breadline. This Government intends to act in a puppet-like way and continue the savage onslaught against workers and their families.

Every member of this House knows that Australia's increased rate of inflation has been brought about by Fraser's savage petrol tax, not by wage indexation. The wage earners are having to make a sacrifice in Fraser's attempt to contain inflation, and the wage earners are finding it impossible to get employment. The standard of living of the workers has decreased and one reason for that is the high amount that comes out of the worker's pocket to pay for transport to his work since the Liberal Government has brought the price of petrol up in such a way that there has been an increase from \$8 to \$12 a week in the cost of driving a car to work. This is a thing that people on the other side should consider.

Also, interest rates are forcing people, especially young people who are trying to buy homes, into a position where it is impossible for them to borrow money. The other thing is that the money that workers' families were able to save while there was a Labor Government in office has now been eroded. They have to use their savings because of the attitude of the Liberal Government in South Australia over the past 12 months.

Further, children about to leave school are not able to say that when they leave they will be able to get a job, help their mother and father, and probably later start their own family. Most school-leavers have not even the incentive to be able to get a job. They are also disillusioned because they find that many of their parents, especially since the Liberal Government has been in office in South Australia, have been retrenched from Government jobs that they thought they would have for life. I can state plenty of cases of that. Members opposite must walk around with their eyes shut.

The same thing applies as far as young people without a job are concerned. They are disillusioned. Sometimes they are forced into crime. We have already heard about the state of our gaols here and about what the children are subjected to when they are put into gaol for committing a crime into which they have been forced by the Liberal Government. Another facet of the State Government's

policy is to phase out permanent Government employees and introduce private contractors.

Mr. Lewis: Is that bad?

Mr. PLUNKETT: If the honourable member listens, he will hear about people who have been forced out of their jobs since the Liberal Government has been in office in South Australia. I listened to the member without interrupting, and I should like him to accord me the same privilege. I will explain the position about the people who have been forced out of jobs. It is no secret to South Australians that private contractors contributed financially to the Liberal Party in the State election campaign, on the basis that, if the Liberals won Government, they would look after the contractors. Within weeks of the September 1979 election, the Government started advocating the syphoning of Government employees to private contractors, which resulted in mass meetings of about 10 000 State Government employees deciding to hold 24-hour stoppages and totally rejecting the Government's proposal. As a follow-up, the Minister of Local Government forwarded a letter to all councils, urging them to introduce contract labour. In the letter, he said:

It is the firm policy of the Government that in its own operations it should employ the private sector as far as possible. This has the advantage of helping to develop a healthy private sector in the South Australian community, while at the same time ensuring that the contractor is professionally responsible and accountable for the standard of work that is done.

As a development from this policy, not only do I urge councils to avoid becoming involved in private works that are outside of their specific powers, but also themselves consider using private contractors for council work. The same advantages which the State Government believes are accruing in its own operations through the use of private contractors still hold true for local government as well. It seems that the adoption of such a policy would permit councils to review the need to purchase some of the very large and expensive equipment now on the market, and enable risk and the overheads to be shared by the private sector.

In order to be consistent in the application of its own policy, the Government has decided that its own departments and agencies should no longer employ local councils to carry out work on their behalf. An instruction will be issued to all departments and statutory bodies that they should seek tenders from private contractors to do site and other works for them.

Let me tell the House a little about the people who have been forced out of their jobs. They are people who have worked for councils for many years. The member for Flinders has looked up. He would most certainly agree that, in a lot of cases, in councils away from the city, those councils have agreed to do grading work for a farmer, squatter, grazier, or other local person at a minimum cost. The member for Mallee is laughing. That shows how much he knows about the country. It beats me how he represents the district that he is in, because what I have referred to has been happening ever since local government has been in operation. Councils have done work for all the graziers. They grade a road occasionally at a minimum rate. They will also rip up a fire break.

He knows nothing about the country, and he has just proved it. I see the member for Eyre looking up. He understands the situation, because he lives in the country and understands what I am talking about. He knows that many of his constituents are angry about the letter written by the Minister of Local Government. There is no way in the world that these graziers and other local people can afford to bring in a private contractor with big machines

who does the job at an exorbitant price. The member for Mallee probably does not even know that private contractors have worked for councils, the Highways Department, and other Government departments; this is the small private owner with perhaps one machine.

Private contractors are being shown preference by this Government, because they put the Liberal Party in office, and these are the big people who made donations towards the Liberals winning the election. It is a pity that some Ministers are not present in the Chamber and that the member for Henley Beach has left the Chamber. One letter I have received is from one of his own constituents who, as a truck owner, worked with local government for 15 years. As soon as the Liberal Party came to office, he received a letter of about five lines saying, in effect, "I am afraid that we are reducing our staff and, from now on, can no longer employ private contractors such as owner-drivers like yourself."

Metropolitan councils, the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, etc., bring in the private contractors, who are merely looking to make a dollar from the job. Unlike council and highway gangs previously employed, these contractors are not interested in maintenance of the job, or anything like that. They come in and do a quick shoddy job, and I have had experience of this over the past 10 years. They lay the bitumen on an incorrectly prepared surface, and what happens? It is there for six months, but then it falls to pieces. The member for Mallee would not know about that; all he knows about is pet dogs. To whom is it left to repair the roads? The council, the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department bring in their permanent hands, who have to dig the road out and do the job all over again at a higher cost than the original contract. These few Government members who know anything about these private contractors rarely mention this matter, whereas their colleagues who do not know what they are talking about make asses of themselves. That is what the member for Mallee does; all he can talk about is dingoes.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What has this to do with private contractors?

Mr. PLUNKETT: The Minister would know plenty about private contractors; he was one himself and he robbed and stole from a lot of people in his time. Many of these contractors take the tender at a cheap rate in order to get the contract. Take the case of 20 cleaners who cleaned everything in the place every night but who, because of the Government's stupidity (it would not accept this), were replaced by a private company comprising three people, who were called "Quick clean". They were "Quick clean" all right! They walked in and, if there were a few papers lying around, they would pick them up, and do nothing else, and the premises in question get filthy.

It would serve Government members right if half its cleaners did the same thing, the Government having advocated doing away with people who do a terrific job. I could not expect the member for Mallee to understand what I am saying, but I could expect the member for Eyre and the member for Flinders to understand; they know what I am talking about, and they are not stupid enough to criticise a person who knows what he is talking about. I advise the member for Mallee to get out in his area and ask his constituents what private contractors have done for them. The farmers will tell him who helps them—it is the council. Many farmers work on the council and in the Highways Department, but the member for Mallee is too stupid to understand that.

Mr. Speaker, I apologise, but it upsets me to see

stupidity, but it is sitting in the back row. I respect my colleague to the extent that he has asked me to shorten my speech, and I will do so, but the next time I am speaking, I will have more to say about private contractors.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have only sufficient time in which to reply to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, whose financial criticisms of the Budget can be divided into five broad sections, namely, the claim that, in order to finance tax cuts, the Government is using Loan funds to subsidise the Revenue Account; the consequential claim that the Government is not, therefore, spending enough money on capital works; the claim that increases in State charges are being used to subsidise tax cuts; the claim that the Government's controls over financial waste are in fact costing more than the waste itself; and the claim that all community services have been cut and that election promises have been ignored.

The first obvious feature of the Leader's speech is that it failed to repeat the absurdities uttered by him on the day the Budget was tabled. On that earlier occasion, the Leader claimed that health had been cut by 12 per cent in real terms, and that education had been cut by 4 per cent in real terms. But nowhere in the Leader's subsequent speech were these ridiculous estimates repeated. In fact, nowhere did he quantify any changes to community service appropriations, because it since has become apparent to the Leader that his earlier claims were wrong and that there is no substance in any allegations of wholesale cuts.

The facts are that the health budget, so far from being cut by 12 per cent in real terms, has been increased in money terms by 9.6 per cent. Likewise, the total education budget has not been cut by 4 per cent in real terms but has received a 14.5 per cent cash increase. No doubt the Leader is fully aware of his error because, as I say, he has not repeated these ridiculous allegations in the same terms. But nevertheless, to save face, he has included the one throw-away line in his speech that "The community services that a Government is elected to provide, namely, education, health and community welfare, are all cut, and promises made last September in respect of those areas are being ignored and swept under the carpet." Well, what cuts have been made? What services have been reduced? What promises have been ignored? The Leader's speech does not offer one example of a specific cut or reduced service. Nor he can point to one, or to one retrenchment. If he could, then they would be itemised one by one in his Budget speech. But when it comes to supporting evidence to back up his sweeping claims there is not one word to be found in the Leader's speech.

So, before proceeding with my comments, let me put the Leader's contribution to this debate in its proper perspective. It begins with a concession that his own earlier comments were wrong, and it fails to elucidate one example to support his basic allegation that services have been cut.

The second major claim by the Leader is that the Budget proposal to transfer funds from Loan Account to Revenue Account is intrinsically wrong (he says it is using the rent money to pay for the groceries, and that statement has had a fair bit of currency in the media) and, further, that this transfer is being used to subsidise the Government's tax cuts.

As to the first point, I should point out for the Leader's benefit that his notion of a strict division between Revenue and Loan Accounts is anachronistic. In fact, it was the Labor Government of which he was a member which, in 1978, first introduced the Revenue and Loan Budgets

simultaneously, so that they could be considered together by Parliament in the same interdependent way that they are treated for the purposes of overall financial management. His view will be even more anachronistic when, later in this session, the Public Finance Act Amendment Bill will formally combine revenue and loan into one account. The fact is that Loan funds have often been used by Labor Governments to do precisely what the Leader now deplors.

If he refers to page 8 of the most recent Auditor-General's Report, he will find that for the first four years in office the Dunstan Government ran the Revenue Account in deficit and held balances in Loan Account to cover those deficits. That is, the Dunstan Government deliberately chose not to spend some of its Loan funds on public works, but rather to use the rent money to pay for the groceries. Again, in 1978-79, the Labor Government made an actual transfer of almost \$6 000 000 from Loan to Revenue, because it had overspent on groceries and needed to use rent money for that purpose. So, in view of the Labor Government's own record, and the practical interdependence of the two accounts, which the Leader seems not to understand, it is clear that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with this accounting device.

Another relevant fact, which seems plain to everyone except the Leader, is that this year's proposed transfer from Loan to Revenue must be assessed correctly against last year's transfer from Revenue to Loan. Let me explain. As the Leader no doubt knows, the Government transferred some \$15 500 000 from Revenue to Loan on last year's accounts. This amount, together with the surplus already in Loan Account of approximately \$21 000 000, produced a Loan surplus in 1979-80 of approximately \$36 000 000 for appropriation to housing, Redcliff development, and north-eastern transport development. This year, in order to balance the Revenue Account, \$16 000 000 is to be transferred back from Loan to Revenue, which for all practical purposes cancels, not doubles, the earlier transfer.

The overall result would have been the same, of course, if the Government had not transferred \$15 500 000 from Revenue to Loan at the end of the last financial year. If that transfer had not been effected, \$15 500 000 would have been carried into this year as surplus in Revenue Account and a transfer from Loan to Revenue would not be needed now. The result of that strategy would have been an extra \$16 000 000 in Loan Account this year, instead of the extra \$16 000 000 that was transferred to Loan Account last year.

This simple point, which has been completely misunderstood by the Leader, involves nothing more than choosing the right time, whether one side or the other of 30 June, on which to boost Loan Account. As it happened, the Government chose to inject additional funds into Loan Account last year, and is now transferring them back without making any substantial alterations to the overall state of the combined accounts.

I must say, therefore, that the great bulk of the Leader's speech, which sought to explain the alleged conspiracy behind robbing Loan to pay Revenue, and the alleged turn-around of \$31 500 000 is based entirely on the Leader's inability to read the accounts correctly, and on his inability to distinguish between book entries and actual appropriations.

Then we come to the Leader's astounding claim that the Government "has cut Loan Fund expenditure below the restricted levels dictated by the allocation of Commonwealth Loan funds". They are the actual words used by the Leader, who emphasised them by adding that South Australia was the only State to have cut its Federal Loan

allocation. Surely, this is one area where we could have expected the Leader and his advisers to get something correct. All they had to do was turn to page 5 of the Loan Estimates to see that this Budget plans to spend on capital works almost \$15 000 000 more than the total Commonwealth allocation for 1980-81. The figures are there in black and white, as plain as day. They are:

	\$
Proposed payments by the State Government excluding the special transfers	211 500 000
Commonwealth funds, both from Loan Council and specific purpose funds...	196 600 000
The balance—to be made up from State sources	14 900 000

This simple arithmetic was completely ignored by the Leader, who, having invented his sums, went on to make the additional point that this Budget will have an adverse impact on the building and construction industry in this year. Let us look at the additional facts which the Leader chose to ignore.

First, he conveniently forgot that last year's actual payments from Loan Account included \$36 500 000 which was set aside for spending over several years, including this year. Indeed, the Government's contribution to the Housing Trust and the State Bank, including moneys from the semi-government programme, is \$19 000 000 higher this year than last. Secondly, the Leader has conveniently forgotten the entire construction programme of the independent statutory authorities, which, although not included in the Budget documents, are no less a part of the total works programme.

If he had bothered to check those figures he would have found that the Electricity Trust's capital works programme—that is, the money which pays the building and construction industry—has been increased by a massive 69 per cent, from \$76 000 000 to \$129 000 000, and the Housing Trust's programme is up by 27 per cent, from \$70 000 000 to \$89 000 000. To them must be added the building and construction programmes of both S.G.I.C. and the Superannuation Investment Trust, all of which, combined, demonstrate a clear commitment to spend every available public dollar on capital works.

The Leader's repeated claims that State charges are being used to subsidise tax cuts are given another airing in his Budget speech, and are so patently absurd as to hardly deserve yet another reply. Indeed, only last week, the Premier revealed the nonsense of the Leader's claims in this regard. For the record, however, let me briefly repeat that the latest increase in charges by ETSA and the State Transport Authority are in line with other annual increases since 1975-76, and in both cases are related solely to inflation and the cost of service—not to State revenues. They have no impact on State revenues. They are internal charges and in line with the increase in charges within the authority.

In the case of the Engineering and Water Supply Department charges for water and sewers, the new increases are in fact less than inflation, less than the actual cost of pumping, and reticulation, and less than the average of previous years under the Labor Administration. The Leader's suggestion that public transport fares could possibly be used to offset shortfalls in general revenue when the S.T.A. deficit is actually increasing, is, as I say, palpable nonsense.

The Leader's last major point was that "far from being a saving by exercising control over expenditures, we find there is evidence that the Premier's so-called controls and reviews are, in fact, costing money". This point, he claims, is easily proven by examining the Budget papers. There it

will be found that \$1 000 000 was saved on water pumping costs, and another \$3 500 000 of the allocation for industry incentives was unspent, thus producing a total unspent appropriation from last year's estimates of \$4 500 000, according to the Leader's sums. Yet, says the Leader, the payments on Revenue Account were only \$2 700 000 under estimate, which leaves a balance of \$1 800 000 unexplained and presumably "wasted on waste-cutting exercises".

Once again, the Leader demonstrates an appalling ignorance, not only of financial management but also of the relatively simple task of reading and understanding a Budget. He completely overlooks, for example, that \$3 500 000 was set aside from last year's accounts, even though it was not included in last year's Estimates, for meeting the pay-out figure of \$5 000 000 on Monarto. Similarly, he completely ignores that another \$3 000 000, not included in last year's Estimates but nevertheless paid out of last year's accounts, was spent on natural disaster relief. In other words, those two items alone account for an over-run of \$2 000 000 in last year's Revenue Budget, and yet the savings on estimated expenditure amounted to \$2 700 000.

So, where did the difference of \$4 700 000 come from? I will tell the Leader. It came principally from tighter controls over expenditures, without, as I have said, and as the Leader is unable to demonstrate, reducing the level of services to the community or retrenching one single employee on the State pay-roll. They are precisely the same controls and restraints which this year will permit the Government to absorb \$12 000 000 out of a total anticipated tax loss of \$28 000 000, again without reducing services or retrenching employees. And, if the Leader doubts the accuracy of that figure, then I invite him to find any other explanation for why only \$16 000 000, and not the entire \$28 000 000 shortfall, needs to be transferred from Loan to Revenue to balance that latter account.

The Leader's remarks in this debate have been characterised by error, inaccuracy and misinformation—all of which have occurred not only through his desire to score political points but also through a profound inability to understand the tabled documents. He has conceded, by omission, that his initial remarks of three weeks ago were wrong—in fact, nonsense—again through his inability to interpret the Budget papers, and he has compounded those inaccuracies with a new set of errors, all of which can be factually rebutted, as I have done, from the evidence of the Budget papers and the audit reports themselves.

Time will preclude me from dealing with the other speakers, who ranged far and wide in this Budget debate, but I say again that it is quite apparent that the Leader of the Opposition has a long way to go in even an elementary understanding of what these Budget papers are all about.

Bills read a second time.

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

That the House note grievances.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjourned of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I was interested to hear the remarks made by the member for Brighton last evening, during which he referred to the Auditor-General's Report in respect of the activities of the South Australian Lotteries Commission, the Totalizator Agency Board and on-course betting, and the sums that are invested by the community in this type of activity. The member for Brighton emphasised that the figures had increased tremendously over the past few years and that the Lotteries Commission's total sales had increased from \$24 900 000 in 1977-78 to \$47 900 000 in 1979-80. The honourable member said that South Australians spend about \$1 000 000 a day on lotteries, T.A.B. and on-course betting. His argument was that the increase in gambling was having an effect, in some way, on the trading activities of small businesses. I believe he said that the local delicatessen and the florist shop were feeling some effects of people investing their money in this form of activity.

I doubt whether that is the case, because the overwhelming majority of people who participate in these activities, particularly in activities associated with the Lotteries Commission, are those whom I would describe as not being inveterate gamblers. They are people, like housewives, who want to invest a dollar in X-Lotto, a lottery ticket, or something of that nature; they are not the real gamblers, so I doubt whether there would be any effect on the trade of small delicatessens or local florist shops because of these activities.

Of course, I accept that some people are compulsive gamblers. We read in the press from time to time of people who, unfortunately, get themselves into great difficulties because of a compulsion to gamble, but, like any other form of activity, this occurs when people over-indulge in alcohol or in activities that may be detrimental to their general well-being. Some people are inveterate gamblers, but I believe that the average person in the community invests within his or her means.

The member for Brighton referred to another form of gambling, a rather similar type, but one that is not recognised in the Auditor-General's Report. I refer to the speculation of investments on the Stock Exchange, the buying and trading of shares. That is an investment. The principle is the same and investors are seeking a return on their investment.

Mr. Randall: You always get some money back, though.

Mr. SLATER: That may be, but there are plenty of occasions when people invest in shares and fare rather badly. It depends, but it is a gamble and it depends on the type of investment. That is not recognised in the Auditor-General's Report, but it is a significant aspect of people investing in South Australia with the hope that they will obtain some kind of return.

I point out to the member for Brighton and the House that racing, trotting, dog-racing and other forms of gambling activity create a significant employment base throughout Australia, but I refer particularly to South Australia. Not only is there a direct employment base but peripheral employment stems from this activity. It is important, when looking at the overall picture, that this aspect be considered. I have a purely statistical table supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in regard to the amount of money spent in Australia on gambling, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

AUSTRALIAN SPENDING ON GAMBLING
\$ million

	Total	TAB	Book- makers	Lotteries
New South Wales	1 405.0	769.2	601.7	34.1
Victoria	1 147.2	636.8	450.2	60.2
Queensland	578.5	229.5	340.5	8.5
South Australia	296.8	116.9	174.4	5.5
Western Australia	267.2	188.3	73.3	5.6
Tasmania	83.0	35.3	47.7	—
A.C.T.	45.7	25.3	20.4	—
All States	3 823.4	2 001.3	1 708.2	113.9

Mr. SLATER: These statistics indicate the amount spent on gambling throughout Australia in 1978-79. Significantly, per head of population, South Australians gamble less than do people in other States. In Queensland the sum spent on gambling was \$578 500 000 while in South Australia \$296 800 000 was gambled in that year, so there is a significant difference.

Revenue that Governments accrue from gambling plays an important role in the Government's revenue gathering activities. I refer to a report that appeared in the press headed "Governments on winner" stating:

Australians pour almost \$1 000 000 000 each year into the coffers of State and Commonwealth Governments from gambling taxes.

As such, gambling plays an important role in Government revenue gathering activities—the extent to which is highlighted in financier A.G.C.'s *Perspective*, a digest of economic and financial reports.

In New South Wales, poker machines alone earned the New South Wales Government a record \$98 200 000 in 1977-78. I make it clear that I am not a supporter of poker machines being introduced to South Australia, but I am using these statistics to indicate the amount that is turned over and received by Governments from that type of gambling.

An in-depth study has never been undertaken on the social effects of gambling on family life and on the individual in Australia. There is no doubt that on some occasions it plays a role in relation to difficulties encountered by individuals and families but, as I say, there has not been to my knowledge an in-depth study into the effects of gambling in the community or on the individual.

I think that an in-depth study into gambling would be an important study, if it could be undertaken, for us to ascertain just what sort of effect gambling does have on individuals. In the future, an increased amount of money will doubtless be spent not only in this State but throughout Australia on all forms of gambling. We have heard from the Minister of Recreation and Sport that the Government proposes to introduce another form of gambling into South Australia—soccer pools. I have my doubts about the wisdom or otherwise of introducing soccer pools into South Australia. The most obvious reason for that is that it is proposed that those soccer pools be conducted by large, private entrepreneurs.

An honourable member: Is gambling a good idea?

Mr. SLATER: I make no comment on whether gambling is a good idea or otherwise; what I am saying is that it has an effect socially on some people; there are compulsive gamblers. However, it also has an effect on employment and Government revenue. It is a question for the individual to determine.

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

Dr. BILLARD (Newland): I want to address myself to a problem of immediate concern in my electorate and of general concern to residents of the suburbs of northern and north-eastern Adelaide: that is, the lack of arterial road connectors between the Tea Tree Gully area and the Salisbury-Elizabeth area. This problem rapidly made itself apparent to me when I moved to live in Redwood Park in 1978. As a resident of that area I had to tackle that problem myself when travelling to work in the Salisbury region. It was also one of the points that I made in my submission to the Golden Grove Development Committee early last year. Since my election as member for the area, it is a problem that has been reinforced to me again and again by residents who live in the path of traffic seeking to travel between these two regions. I have made representations to the Minister on a number of occasions and, as members would know, I asked a question on this subject in the past month or two of the Minister of Transport.

What is the problem that the people of the north-east face? Arterial traffic travelling between these two regions has a choice of four routes: one utilises Golden Grove Road, and Target Hill Road down to Main North Road; the second utilises Golden Grove Road all the way down to the Main North Road; the third utilises Yatala Vale Road down to Bridge Road and thence by other routes through to Salisbury and Elizabeth; and the fourth utilises Kelly Road, Murrell Road and Nelson Road through to Bridge Road and other points further west. Of all of these routes across the Para scarp, only one is classified as an arterial road, and that is the road that carries the least traffic of all those alternatives. I understand that the traffic on Target Hill Road is currently at a daily average figure of about 5 900 vehicles and climbing, and that traffic on Yatala Vale Road is at an average of about 3 800 vehicles a day and climbing.

Until recently, the traffic on Murrell Road had not been measured. Indeed, I pay a tribute to the officers of the Highways Department, who, after I contacted them in July seeking traffic count figures, of their own volition decided to collect figures on this road. They discovered at that stage that 5 400 vehicles were using Murrell Road from Tea Tree Gully and Modbury Heights through to Salisbury. I suspect that, although it is not possible to be definite because only one set of figures has been taken, the traffic on this road is climbing at the fastest rate of all. It is the last of all those routes that was completed, and many people in the region still do not realise that this connection exists. In fact, of all the routes, it is the shortest. I therefore suspect that the last route will find its traffic count climbing quite dramatically.

I was dismayed to find that the Highways Department currently has no plans in its forward projections for the next five years that would significantly alleviate this problem. True, there are plans to reconnect Nelson Road across a gully near Kesters Road, and that may to a certain extent offload some of the traffic from Murrell Road on to Milne Road, a local road, and other sections of Nelson Road that are also local roads.

However, it is ironic that the only route that is classified as arterial is Golden Grove Road, and its traffic count is 2 800 vehicles a day and steady, or perhaps even declining slightly. So, Target Hill Road carries twice the amount of traffic of nearby Golden Grove Road and, likewise, Murrell Road carries nearly twice the traffic of Golden Grove Road across the Para scarp.

How has this situation arisen? As we all know, Tea Tree Gully has grown rapidly throughout the 1970's and continues to grow rapidly. A proposal was established in the MATS plan 12 years ago that would have provided

adequate transport services for Adelaide. Although I do not comment on the justification for the decision of a former Government to reject the concept of highways and freeways, I believe that that Government stands condemned because it did not proceed at that point to offer any alternative.

So, we were left for a substantial period with the freeway concept being rejected but with no alternatives being provided. There is, in fact, a corridor for a freeway that would adequately connect Tea Tree Gully and a region near Tea Tree Plaza with Salisbury, connecting up with McIntyre Road. However, no plans are currently in train for that project to proceed.

In addition, wrong estimates were made about where the people of Tea Tree Gully travel to work. I know that this also impacted the NEAPTR studies, as they also made wrong assumptions about where the people of Tea Tree Gully go to work. It was assumed that the great majority of Tea Tree Gully people work in the city and that, therefore, we need only consider the transport corridor between Tea Tree Gully and the city as being of primary importance.

Of course, we know that, since the final NEAPTR report, those concerned have had drastically to revise their estimates of the patronage in that corridor. In fact, in the latter half of the 1970's a great proportion of Tea Tree Gully residents were travelling towards Port Adelaide, along Grand Junction Road and across to Salisbury and Elizabeth. This trend will continue and, indeed, increase.

In addition, the Golden Grove development stretches right across the back of the Para scarp and, in fact, has operated like a blanket to stop any planning for arterial connectors between these two regions. Indeed, the early plans of the Golden Grove development assumed even then that the main desire of people within the Golden Grove development would be to travel to and from the city. There was, even then, no recognition of the need for people to travel across to Salisbury and Elizabeth and back.

So, I believe that it is imperative now that the plans for arterial connectors in this region be revised, and that the Golden Grove Development Committee recognise that it must see its area as linking these two regions of Adelaide, with people desiring to travel from Tea Tree Gully to Salisbury and Elizabeth, and must therefore plan for arterial connectors. I believe that two significant additions of arterial connectors are possible, one being an extension, as I have mentioned, of McIntyre Road, the other being an extension of Smith Road in Salisbury.

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

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I want to refer to a submission which was put to the Minister of Education by the Aboriginal Education Foundation of South Australia for funding of a mini-bus to ferry Aboriginal children to and from kindergartens. The Aboriginal Education Foundation has been trying to operate on a shoe-string budget and with a skeleton staff and is finding it increasingly more difficult each year to operate efficiently and to carry out its purpose and functions.

In the 1979 financial year, an amount of only \$8 400 was granted to the foundation. This financial year it is proposed to increase that amount by a very meagre \$1 600 to \$10 000. Any increase in staff numbers has been prohibited by the almost static level of operational funding received by the foundation. I understand that the Minister has rejected the submission, even though I believe that the proposal could have possibly saved the Government an amount of money. When talking of expenditure controls in

his Budget speech, the Premier stated that firm and responsible control over all public expenditure represents the single most important element in the financial policies of this Government. In pursuing that policy he said that the Government has had regard to, first, ensuring that, within the aggregate, individual allocations are made responsibly to reflect community needs and, secondly, to ensure that resources are used to provide for those needs in the most effective way so that maximum benefit is obtained for each dollar spent.

So much for the expenditure controls of this Government and the reflection of community needs. I have a copy of the submission, which is rather lengthy, but I will quote extracts from it. The introduction states:

The Aboriginal Education Foundation was initially established in 1965 at a time when there was a complete absence of Government involvement in or financial commitment to Aboriginal education. The foundation was then necessarily active in providing assistance for Aboriginal students at all education levels, from pre-schooling through to post secondary and tertiary levels. In 1969, when the Commonwealth Office of Aboriginal Affairs initiated the Aboriginal Secondary Grants Scheme, the Aboriginal Education Foundation then concentrated its efforts on the area of pre-schooling and this has remained the focal point of its activities.

In the area of pre-school education, two functional aims have governed the A.E.F.'s operations, namely:

- (a) the location (through a comprehensive home-visiting programme) and enrolment of Aboriginal children at kindergartens, ensuring regular attendance by provision of taxi transport where necessary and by maintenance of intimate liaison between teachers and parents designed to prevent difficulties tending to culminate in absenteeism, and
- (b) the development of parental understanding of the role of kindergartens within the education system, their benefits in preparing children for school and, on a broader level, the encouragement of parental motivation towards and participation in their child's schooling.

In the period from July 1979 until March 1980, the Aboriginal Education Foundation has facilitated the enrolment and continued attendance of approximately 120 Aboriginal children distributed through approximately 40 kindergartens in the metropolitan and Murray Bridge areas. The majority of these children are provided with transport by the A.E.F., which now engages a total of 20 taxis to ferry them to and from the kindergartens. Of these children, 42 are currently attending the Alberton Kindergarten, 29 of whom travel to and from the kindergarten in six taxis.

The Alberton Kindergarten originated as a private centre established by Aboriginal people to meet the needs of Aboriginal pre-school children. Faced with funding and staff difficulties, after about 12 months operation, the organisers of the kindergarten were forced to apply to the South Australian Kindergarten Union for full branch membership, and the Alberton Kindergarten opened under the control of the Kindergarten Union in 1976.

Since 1976, the Alberton Kindergarten has maintained its strong Aboriginal identity, and its philosophy continues to be that priority must always be given to Aboriginal children. At all times, at least 85 per cent of enrolments have been Aboriginal. Its Aboriginal beginnings supplied the Alberton Kindergarten with the opportunity to establish a pre-school centre unique to its ability to comprehend and meet the needs of the Aboriginal community and thereby secure a high level of regular Aboriginal participation. The kindergarten has always concentrated on physical as well as educational development, and has therefore maintained full-day kindergarten, hot midday meal and sleeping programmes geared for children aged two to five years.

Contemporaneously, successive Directors have focused on encouraging parental understanding of and participation in their children's pre-school education through extensive home-visits in conjunction with A.E.F. officers and unrestricted invitations to attend.

The Aboriginal Education Foundation is becoming increasingly concerned that adequate funding levels be provided to enable it to not only maintain its existing service to the Aboriginal community but also cope with the predictable increase in work load. Costs associated with transport have spiralled alarmingly over the past couple of years, albeit predictably in view of international oil increases. In August 1977, taxi fares in South Australia increased by 12.34 per cent; on 1 December 1978 a further 8.48 per cent increase came into effect; and again on 10 December 1979 taxi fares increased by 9 per cent. The current taxi rates are as follows: flag fall, 60 cents; rate per kilometre, 37.03 cents; and waiting time, \$8 per hour.

For the same period, the Aboriginal Education Foundation expended the following amounts on taxis to ferry Aboriginal children to and from kindergartens: 1977-78, \$11 208.24 (representing 23 taxis); 1978-79, \$11 444.70 (for 22 taxis despite deliberate efforts by A.E.F. to minimise costs). By comparison, the taxi grants received by the A.E.F. from the South Australian Education Department were \$6 600 for the 1977-78 financial year and \$8 400 for 1978-79.

On each occasion, the Aboriginal Education Foundation met the deficit from its own funds. At the current running rate, the cost of conveying the children to and from kindergartens for the 1979-80 financial year will be about \$14 500, whereas the grant received for this year is \$8 400. The estimated short-fall of about \$6 000 will again have to be met from the foundation's own resources.

I do not know the reasons why the Minister rejected that submission. Obviously, questions will be asked when we go into the Estimates Committee on the Budget, but it seems to me that no attention has been given by the Government to the objections, or to the specific functions that the foundation performs, or to the effectiveness of those functions in meeting the needs of the community. It is the less advantaged sections of the community that suffer the most in this instance, yet the Government says that it will not permit this to happen. Earlier this year, the foundation put a submission to the Minister for this very purpose, and I understand that it has been rejected. That is indeed unfortunate.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 25 September at 2 p.m.