

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 July 1981

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. B. C. Eastick) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G. D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.12 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.46 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

[Sitting suspended from 12.47 to 2.15 p.m.]

DEATH OF THE HON. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD

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

That the House express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, G.C.M.G., former member for Murray and Gumeracha, and former Premier of South Australia and place on record its appreciation of his public service, and, as a mark of respect, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

It is fitting that today we pay tribute to a great South Australian, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, G.C.M.G., orchardist, soldier, Parliamentarian, statesman and the architect of modern South Australia, who died on 16 June in his eighty-fifth year. Sir Thomas Playford was born in July 1896 when new milestones were being recorded in State Government tenure. The then Premier, Charles Kingston, had just eclipsed Thomas Playford senior's record term of three years as Premier. Also, at that time, the Kingston Government had been in office continuously for longer than any preceding Ministry. Both records, which were considered significant in their day, and all comparable records in the tradition of Westminster Government, were later to be dwarfed by Sir Thomas's own continuous term of nearly 27 years as Premier of South Australia.

Sir Thomas was born and lived throughout his life at Norton Summit. He attended the local public school where students then, as now, were summoned by ringing the bell which had been cast for the Reverend Thomas Playford's Bentham Street church in 1848. At the age of 13, Sir Thomas worked his father's orchard and began marketing the family's produce at the East End Market. It was in this close-knit hills community and in Sir Thomas's 'university' on East Terrace that he learned the value of probity, honesty, compassion, humility and diligence—qualities which were to distinguish his leadership throughout a long career of public service.

In 1915 Thomas Playford enlisted in the 27th Battalion A.I.F. and saw service at Gallipoli and on the Western Front. At Flers in November 1915, Lance Corporal Playford was wounded in action and in January 1919 he was commissioned and promoted to the rank of Lieutenant. Sir Thomas was elected to membership of this House as third member for Murray in April 1933. Following the abolition of multi-member constituencies three years later, he was returned as member for Gumeracha in March 1938 and held that seat for the next 30 years.

In April 1938 Sir Thomas became Commissioner of Crown Lands, Minister of Repatriation and Minister of Irrigation. Seven months later, on the retirement of Sir Richard Butler, he was elected leader of the Liberal and Country League and was commissioned to form his first Ministry. Sir Thomas held the offices of Treasurer and Minister of Irrigation continuously from November 1938 to March 1965, together with the portfolios of Repatriation in

1938, and Industry and Employment from 1948 to 1953. In the 16 months immediately preceding his retirement he also occupied the office of Leader of the Opposition.

In the New Year's Honours List in 1957, Sir Thomas's incomparable record of public service was acknowledged when Her Majesty conferred upon him the Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Saint Michael and Saint George.

Mr Speaker, it is simply not possible on this occasion to do full justice to Sir Thomas Playford's contribution to South Australia or to record precisely the full debt of gratitude owed by the people of this State, and by South Australians yet unborn, for the foundations which he laid. I can do no more than touch on the outline. Over the period of 27 years in which Sir Thomas was Premier the State's population increased by 66 per cent; employment was trebled; the number of factories grew by nearly 200 per cent; water storage capacity more than doubled; power generation capacity increased eight-fold; completed house construction doubled; and grain production doubled.

At the helm of this unparalleled era of development, involving himself personally in every new venture, stood the resolute form of Tom Playford. He was a man instilled with a vision of prosperity and security for all and an unyielding refusal to bow to adversity. When it appeared that Whyalla could not be developed for lack of water, Sir Thomas built the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. When it appeared that industry could not be induced to move into the area he attracted B.H.P. to build a shipyard and blast furnace. When it appeared that industrial growth could be impeded by power shortages, he developed Leigh Creek and established the Electricity Trust. Likewise, he persuaded scores of industrial enterprises to relocate in South Australia and built 56 000 Housing Trust homes to settle the new work force.

The legacy of 27 years of Playford Premiership cannot be better expressed than in the epitaph of Sir Christopher Wren, repeated by the Reverend Barrie Hibbert at Sir Thomas Playford's funeral service:

If you require his monument, look around you.

Together with that visible legacy of achievement, there are also, of course, our memories of Sir Thomas's character and conduct. Perhaps it is this which constitutes Sir Thomas's finest monument for, regardless of differences in philosophy, or politics, or background, or religion, the same memories recur in the testaments of all who knew him well: integrity, sincerity, modesty, honour, unpretentious simplicity, keen intelligence, prodigious memory, practical wit, perseverance, warm humanity, amiability and dedication. These are the strengths of mind and manner which invariably are used to describe the man who led South Australia for so long, and who, to many, was South Australia.

The seventeenth century English essayist, Sir Thomas Browne, wrote:

The iniquity of oblivion blindly scattereth her poppy and deals with the memory of men without distinction to merit or perpetuity. That fate, I may say, will not be shared by Tom Playford. His former achievements are our current benefits and the foundation of our future. His example has been an inspiration for others to follow. His name, already enshrined prominently and permanently in the community, will be further anchored in posterity by several initiatives it is hoped may be announced shortly by the Government, after consultation with the family.

On behalf of the people of South Australia, and for myself as a great friend and admirer, I take the opportunity to honour the memory of Sir Thomas Playford, statesman; and to convey our heartfelt condolences to Lady Playford, Margaret, Patricia and Tom.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased indeed to second the motion moved by the Premier, and

heartily endorse what he said. Sir Thomas was, to use the words of the former member for Norwood, the former Premier, Mr Don Dunstan, an old adversary of Sir Thomas, 'The outstanding political figure in the history of this State since its inception.' I think if ever a speaker had knowledge of his subject, Mr Dunstan was well qualified to make that estimate of Sir Thomas Playford's contribution.

Sir Thomas's death certainly brought us into reflection on the short span of history and the span of history of this State. His great grandfather, in fact, fought at the battle of Waterloo, which ushered in about 100 years of general peace in the world before the next Great War in which Sir Thomas himself fought, and he died only this year. His grandfather was born in 1837, just a few months after the founding of the colony of South Australia. He eventually became Premier. Perhaps ironically, when one considers Sir Thomas Playford's career, his grandfather was ultimately a Federal Senator and Minister, an outstanding politician and statesman of his age. His grandson, of course, was Premier of this State. The span of our history, looked at in those terms, is indeed short.

The story of the long and productive life of Sir Thomas Playford has been well told in the news media. Tributes have poured in, and rightly so, from those who knew, admired, and even revered him as a soldier in the First World War, as a devoted family man, as an honoured member of the Norton Summit community, and as a skilled and astute orchardist. I am certainly not able to add much at all to these genuine and fully deserved tributes.

I think what most fits this occasion is the remembrance of Sir Thomas Playford as a Parliamentarian, and some comment directly related to his performance as a member of Parliament and leader of this State for more than a quarter of a century is called for. There have been a number of testimonies to the late Premier's very special style both in administration and in his general handling of political issues. They all reflect very favourably on his tenacity and his supreme ability to engage in most profitable horse trading, enacting, if you like, that classic definition of politics as the art of the possible. When I say 'profitable' everyone here would understand without further explanation that the profit never accrued personally to Sir Thomas, but always to the wider South Australian community, for probity, as well as diligence, was a Playford hallmark.

He was ever an individual, and the Government that ruled South Australia from 1938 right through until 1965, I think history will show, was not so much a Liberal and Country League Government, as a Playford Government, tolerated at times, indeed perhaps objected to, by some of his Party conferees and accepted by those on the other side of the House.

For many years, for instance, there was a battle over price control, which his Party was firmly against, and yet Sir Thomas every year would rise in this House and move the continuance of that measure which he felt, aside from ideological considerations, was necessary in the context of the South Australian economy.

He was a man, too, with a liking for a touch of devilry. If there was a way of bypassing formal procedures to achieve a desired result, he would go that way. He worked most often through a group of dedicated and tested senior civil servants, who often feared what their master would ask them to do next. There are many anecdotes about that, some of which have been recorded in the press; others I hope will be collected in the biography that I understand Sir Walter Crocker is appropriately working on at present.

Labor Prime Minister, Ben Chifley, had a lot of time for Sir Thomas Playford and the feeling was reciprocated. Indeed, they were in many ways similar politicians, but coming, of course, from different ideologies and Party back-

grounds. On record is the remark of Mr Chifley that he had just traded three boilers with Tom Playford for two judges. This refers to the famous instance when the Premier wanted three large boilers to establish a particular industry in South Australia, and the Prime Minister wanted the services of a judge for a Royal Commission, and another judge to establish a security service, and a deal was made between the two leaders, ideology and attitude notwithstanding. They were men who were prepared to cut the red tape and trade a mutually acceptable deal. I think that personified in many ways Sir Thomas Playford's Premiership. As the study by Dean Jaensch and Neal Blewett, *Playford to Dunstan*, pointed out, 'His priorities were never in doubt. He was fully prepared to take political risks in pursuit of his economic objectives.' The famous campaign in relation to electricity supply in this State is a classic example of this.

Sir Thomas Playford has a bust outside this Chamber, a portrait in the Constitutional Museum next door, and a power station and one or two streets and suburbs in this State named after him. That does not exhaust the honours due to him. I hope that occasion will be made during the 1986 Jubilee ceremonies to pay some further public tribute.

He was certainly not a man about whom the Labor Party of the day could feel very happy, as he kept us from office for so long, and he did so on the basis of an electoral system that did not fairly reflect majority opinion. But in his willingness to consult and compromise on controversial issues he showed a sensitivity which made his opponents feel that he was prepared to act on many occasions in the interests of the whole State, and not just for some sectional advantage. He recognised the terms on which he was Premier and leader of this State: he developed that position accordingly and won the respect and indeed the affection of all as a result.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): In the first shock of hearing the news of Sir Thomas Playford's death on the day he died, I said that I felt as though I had lost my political father, and I still feel the same way about him. When I came into this House, he had already been Premier for 17 years and, for the first 10 years of my time here, he seemed to me always to be sitting on my neck to stop me doing one thing or another. A moment ago the Leader of the Opposition mentioned price control: in every year except my first as a member of this place (when I just did not have the temerity to do it), I opposed Sir Thomas on price control. My first experience of being defeated in a division was when I was rolled by about 37 to 1. I have had plenty of experience of that kind of thing since, and those early occasions have stood me in good stead.

I remember on one occasion, when I had not been here too long, overhearing a conversation that I was probably not meant to hear in which Sir Thomas said, 'Look, we will give Robin that job; it will give him something to do.' The result was that within a very few years of my coming to this place I found myself the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Chairman of the State Traffic Committee, a member of the Industries Development Committee and the Secretary of the Parliamentary Party. None of those jobs added up to a row of beans, of course, but they kept me occupied and, as Sir Thomas thought, they kept me out of mischief most of the time.

Regarding his shrewdness, I can remember one thing that one of your predecessors, Mr Speaker (the late Len Riches), once said to me about him long before Mr Riches was Speaker of this place when the Labor Party was still apparently hopelessly in Opposition. He said, 'You have to get up very early in the morning to get the better of Tom Playford.' That comment personified Sir Thomas's Parliamentary tactics and the way in which he ran the State. I

can think of so many occasions when, from his seat on the front bench, Sir Thomas would look around at his supporters with a thunderous glare, and that was the end of whatever the problem might be. There was no more trouble from his side or, indeed, from this side of the House.

I could say a lot about him: it would fill a book, I suppose, but this is not the occasion to do it, if ever there were to be an occasion. In later years he probably regarded me as rather wayward, but never did he reproach me for what I had done or said in politics. He became more and more a mentor, giving me very good advice and great help.

I was absolutely shocked by his death. It was you, Mr Speaker, who told me about it on that afternoon. I knew Sir Thomas was in hospital but I really did not give a thought to his not getting better, and there it was. I mourned his passing then and I mourn it now. Lance Milne, my colleague in another place, has asked me to mention that he feels just as I do about Sir Thomas from his different point of view of the man. We greatly mourn his passing. I have written to his son, Tom, I have sent my love to his widow, and all I can do now is support the motion of condolence to Lady Playford and her family and to honour as best I can now and always the name of a very great friend, a mentor and a marvellous South Australian.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): Very briefly, I want to support the motion. I do not propose to go over the ground already covered so ably by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Mitcham. I expect that almost every member of this House would know that Tom Playford was a personal friend of my late father. They served in the same battalion in the First World War, and the relationship they built up during that period, in spite of their politics, carried on throughout my father's lifetime. I always wondered whether Sir Thomas may have been a little kinder to me because of that relationship, but I do not think so, because I think he was the sort of person who treated everyone as he saw fit and, as far as he possibly could, as an equal.

I think of the great responsibility that he carried so lightly. He always had a streak of fun, and a playful pat on the back from Tom Playford was quite an experience; it almost put one through the floor. He was physically a very powerful man. For all the responsibilities he had, and for all the things he achieved, although he was very strong physically he was in many ways a very soft and understanding person; indeed, it was not unusual for me to get a telephone call at about Christmas time in which he would say, 'Des, I have left a box of cherries for the kids and your wife, and for you, if you can get in. You can pick them up.' That happened often.

Recently, he and I were invited to a function at the Electricity Trust, of which he was the father. It was on the occasion of the retirement of one of the members of the board. A car was sent for him and that same car picked me up at my home. The first I knew that he had arrived was Sir Thomas Playford walking down the drive of my home with the most beautiful bunch of flowers imaginable for my wife, Carmel. I know that she was deeply touched, and it was typical of the man and indicative of him. He was thoughtful about people.

He was a great family man. I know that Lady Playford will miss him sadly, as will every member of his family, and indeed the people who lived with him at Norton Summit will miss him greatly. I extend to them, as I have already, my deepest sympathy. I know that Gil Langley, the member for Unley, would want to join with me in what I have said, because he had similar experiences of Sir Thomas Playford. Sir Thomas was the greatest South Australian, certainly in my lifetime, and I would have to agree with what was said by my former colleague, Don Dunstan,

that Sir Thomas was the greatest political figure that this State has ever known.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): Apart from the member for Mitcham, I think I am the only member left who was in the 1965 election team, the last of the Playfords. I join with the expressions already made. Sir Thomas Playford, as the member for Mitcham has said, had a way with people who did something he did not like. The first division in which I took part in this House was on a motion by the then member for Port Pirie, Mr McKee, in relation to the introduction of dog racing in this State. I believed that, in that day and age, that should be done, so I crossed the floor and voted with the then Government.

I remember this great man just looking at me—never saying anything, and never commenting. He looked at me for about three weeks, and I became progressively shorter! I found myself in all sorts of trouble about that. I had new found friends, who got me into trouble. He did speak to me about it in later years, of course, when he said, 'Allan, you were probably right.' That was after certain things had happened. He was a wonderful friend and a wonderful mentor. About that erring vote from my Party, he said that it spelt out that democracy still lives.

That was Playford—and it does not need any words of mine to embellish his wonderful record of service to this State. As a member of his team, I join in the respects paid by the Premier, the Leader and the members for Mitcham and Hartley to one of our finest sons. It was a proud time for me when I was part of his team, and I express my condolences to his widow and family.

The SPEAKER: Before I call upon members to pass in the traditional manner the motion moved by the Premier and seconded by the honourable Leader, I would like to express, on behalf of the Parliament, condolences to the family of the late Sir Thomas Playford. I do so on the basis of so very few of us having had the opportunity of serving with him. In my case, however, I was able to be with him on the last occasion on which he sat in this House. I refer to the unveiling of the John Dowie bust, to which the honourable Leader alluded and which was unveiled on 23 February 1973. A little research into the docket associated with the unveiling of that bust showed that it was a recognition by this House of Parliament, which Sir Thomas Playford served for so long, of the effort he had undertaken for the State of South Australia, and I think it bears repetition this afternoon.

The speaker on that occasion, the then Premier of the State, made the following remarks:

We have a reputation in this State for being prepared to innovate, and today we are breaking new ground politically. At least I think we are the first State where a Labor Premier takes time off from an election campaign to speak at the unveiling of a bust of a former Liberal Premier. But I was delighted to be asked to do so. My past political differences with Sir Thomas—and those of the Labor Party—are well known. Certainly, we have not exactly kept them a secret over the years. But (and I know that here I speak for all members of Parliament) this does not blind us to his achievement. And today I want to speak about Sir Thomas Playford, the South Australian.

I think that those words, and other words in that speech, very clearly indicate the esteem with which this Parliament and the State of South Australia treasure the memory of the late Sir Thomas Playford.

The member for Hartley indicated the friendships which developed and which lasted through thick and thin. I can attest to a friendship which was to last over many years in the interests of South Australians and, more particularly, those South Australians associated with the ex-servicemen's movement. I know that each and every member, if able to take part in this debate this afternoon, would be able to give accounts of personal experiences which fortify the

statement which I have just read and which was made by the former Premier—that we are looking at recognising and remembering a true South Australian.

It is my intention to take the *Hansard* record of this debate and hand it personally to Lady Playford on behalf of this Parliament. I know that I will have the full support of all members in doing that. I now ask all honourable members to stand and pass the motion of condolence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[*Sitting suspended from 2.45 to 3.15 p.m.*]

FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency has been pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which Speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITION: LOTTERY AGENCY

A petition signed by 204 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a lottery agency at the Parabanks Shopping Centre, Salisbury, was presented by Mr Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOMES FOR THE AGED

A petition signed by 475 residents of South Australia praying that the State Government urge the Federal Government to provide increased financial support for the construction of homes for the aged was presented by Mr Randall.

Petition received.

PETITION: WOMEN'S ADVISER

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to immediately appoint a women's adviser for education programmes was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

Petitions signed by 479 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore the Beverage Container Act to provide that PET bottles be subject to a deposit were presented by Messrs Peterson and Evans.

PETITION: EMPLOYMENT

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement policies that would increase the number of citizens in employment in South Australia was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

A petition signed by 30 staff and parents of children at Gawler Primary School praying that the House urge the Government to ensure entitlement hours for school assistants are not reduced and that negotiations be entered into to determine equitable conditions of service for school assistants was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

A petition signed by 78 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to introduce a fair and equitable system of rent payments for all Housing Trust tenants was presented by Mr Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: SERIOUS CRIME PENALTIES

A petition signed by 1 434 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase the severity of penalties for serious crimes, especially rape, and grant the Police Department more power to act in such cases was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act—Regulations—Fees
- Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Logging Industry Fees.
- iii. Construction Safety.
- iv. Industrial Safety Code—Fees.
- v. Lifts and Cranes Act—Regulations—Fees.
- vi. Shop Trading Hours Act—Regulations—Hardware and Building Material Stores.

By the Minister of Public Works (The Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. West Terrace Cemetery Act—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Companies Act—Regulations—Board Members Fees.
- ii. Further Education Act—Regulations—Deduction of Salary.
- iii. Kindergarten Union—Report, 1980.
- iv. National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions) Act—Regulations—General Regulations.
- v. Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1980.
- vi. Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia—Report, 1980.
- vii. Flinders University of South Australia—By-law—Vehicle and Pedestrian Traffic.

Rules of Court—

- VIII. District Criminal Court—Local and District Criminal Court Act—Costs.
- IX. Licensing Court—Fees.
- X. Local Court—Local and District Criminal Court Act—Fees.
- Supreme Court—*
- XI. Administration and Probate Act—Various.
- XII. Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act—Various.
- XIII. Companies Act—Various.
- XIV. Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act—Repeal.
- XV. Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1975—Various.
- XVI. Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1978—Various.
- XVII. Criminal Law Consolidation Act—Criminal Appeal Rules.
- XVIII. Dentists Act—Repeal.
- XIX. Evidence Act—Reciprocal Procedures for Obtaining Evidence.
- XX. Family Relationships Act—Various.
- XXI. Foreign Judgments Act—Various.
- XXII. Industrial and Provident Societies Act—Various.
- XXIII. Inheritance (Family Provision) Act—Various Justices Act—Fees.
- XXIV. Various.
- XXV. Legal Practitioners Act.
- XXVI. Law Society Statutory Committee.
- XXVII. Trust Accounts.
- XXVIII. Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Act—Repeal.
- XXIX. Mental Defectives Act—Repeal. Service and Execution of Process Act—
- XXX. Repeals.
- XXXI. Various.
- XXXII. Settled Estates Act—Various. Supreme Court Act—
- XXXIII. Admission Rules.
- XXXIV. Land and Valuation (Amendment) Rules—Various.
- XXXV. Minors Contracts—Various.
- XXXVI. Superannuation Act Appeals—Repeal.
- XXXVII. Various.

By the Chief Secretary (The Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- Friendly Societies Act—Amendments to General Laws—
- I. Manchester Unity, Independent Order of Oddfellows Friendly Society in South Australia;
 - II. National Health Services Association of South Australia;
 - III. The South Australian District No. 81 Independent Order of Rechabites Friendly Society;
 - IV. Australian Natives Association;
 - V. Hibernian Society.

By the Minister of Marine (The Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Harbors Act—Regulations—Port Pirie Boat Haven.
- II. Marine Act—Regulations—River Murray and Inland Waters Navigation—Kingston Bridge.

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

By Command—

- I. Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 110th Meeting held in Hobart, Tasmania, 9 February 1981.

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Metropolitan Milk Supply Act—Regulations—Vendor Licences.

By the Minister of Forests (The Hon. W. A. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Proclamation under Act—Forestry—Forest Reserve Resumed.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Alsatian Dogs Act—Regulations—Exemption from Prohibition.
- II. Dog Control Act—Regulations—Various. Local Government Act, 1934-1980—
- III. Local Government Accounting.
- IV. Parking Regulations 1981.
- National Parks and Wildlife Act—Regulations—
- V. Fees.
- VI. Hunting Fees.

VII. Wildlife Fees.

- VIII. Planning and Development Act—Regulations—Land Subdivision Fees.
- IX. Regional Cultural Centres Act—Regulations—Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trust.
- X. District Council of Kanyaka-Quorn—By-law No. 19—Parklands.
- XI. District Council of Mannum—By-law No. 15—Caravans. By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- Motor Vehicles Act—Regulations—
- I. Licence Fees.
 - II. Number Plates.
- Road Traffic Act—Regulations—
- III. Traffic Prohibition—Campbelltown.
 - IV. Direction Turn Signal Lamps.
 - V. Parking of Vehicles.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- Lottery and Gaming Act—Regulations—
- I. Instruments of Unlawful Gaming.
 - II. Trade Promotion Lotteries.
- Racing Act—Rules of Trotting—
- III. Blood Typing.
 - IV. Driver's Licence.
 - V. Racing Act and Fees Regulation Act Regulations—Supervisors' Fees.

By the Minister of Health (The Hon. J. L. Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act—Regulations—Changes of Name.
- II. Builders Licensing Act—Regulations—Orders for Rectification.
- III. Fees Regulation—Regulations—Licensing Act Fees.
- IV. South Australian Health Commission—Regulations—Health Commission (Prescribed Government Hospital and Health Centre)—Incorporations.

By the Minister of Lands (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- Lands—Pastoral Act—
- I. Out of Hundreds—Ooldea—Resumption of Water Reserve No. 87.
 - II. Resumption of Travelling Stock Reserve.
- Real Property Act—Regulations—
- III. Fees.
 - IV. Strata Titles Fees.

By the Treasurer (The Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

- Report on long-term projections of the cost to the South Australian Government of the South Australian Superannuation Fund and related matters.

QUESTION TIME

STATE FINANCES

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say how he can reconcile his statement in yesterday's *Advertiser* that there is nothing wrong with deficit budgeting with his reply to the Opposition no-confidence motion on State finances six weeks ago, on 2 June, when he said that no Budget deficit represents good news? In view of this repudiation of his and his Party's dogma, will the Premier now reveal the hidden Budget deficit for 1980-1981? In the August Budget, the Premier planned a small deficit of \$1 500 000. On 12 February of this year, he told the House the deficit could be \$9 000 000 or \$10 000 000. The *Advertiser*, quoting the Premier, on 23 May last carried a headline, 'South Australia faces Budget deficit of \$15 000 000'. On 2 June, the Premier told the House that the probable deficit would be about \$10 000 000, but last week's notorious Liberal Party propaganda lift-out—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader not to comment in explaining a question.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Last week, in a South Australian Government paid advertisement in the *Advertiser* and the *News*, a deficit of \$8 000 000 was referred to. A document in possession of the Opposition indicates that the Premier transferred more than \$11 000 000 into the Budget from the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Fund just before 30 June. As the Budget shows only a planned \$3 700 000 transfer, there was an \$8 000 000 Budget bolstering grab involved in that. Public works payments have been slashed to \$190 000 000, and not the \$211 000 000 in the Budget, so it appears that the true deficit will be understated by about \$20 000 000 on this account as well, that is, a total of \$28 000 000.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition still does not give any real indication that he understands very much about State finances.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, on both sides of the House!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the Leader of the Opposition had spent a little longer in Government than he did as a Minister, he would know perfectly well that it is entirely appropriate at the end of the financial year to transfer certain reserves and to tidy up certain accounts. That is a recognised procedure which has been indulged in, I would think, by every Premier and Treasurer since this State came into existence. The Leader is really clutching at straws when he asks how I reconcile my statement that there is nothing wrong with deficit budgeting. He does not know the facts, or he does not want to understand them. There is nothing wrong with deficit budgeting when the future of the State depends on it, and the future of the State depends on being able to maintain the incentives, the concessions, being offered to people to come to live and work in South Australia and to develop and expand here. Those incentives must be offered at the same rate as they are offered in other States. I know that the Leader has made quite clear that he would raise taxation again in this State. In so doing, he would effectively—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell us about State charges.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Quite obviously, the other members of the Opposition are not very confident of the case that their Leader has put, because they do not want it answered. If we are to maintain incentives at the same level as is offered in other States, we have to go into deficit. One of the reasons why we have to go into overdraft is because the development of this State was so held back over a period of nine or 10 years under the policies of the Labor Government. The other States have been able to bring on those incentives, and we have had to bring them on, too. I am proud to say that we have been able to be very successful indeed by using those incentives.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You had a \$600 000 surplus when you started.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition would do a whole lot better if he were to get behind what is being done in this State to make up for the shortfall in development—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Like you did when you were in Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will assist Question Time if he will desist from interjecting.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not know, Sir. He is showing what a fool he is.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Opposition would do a great deal better if it were to get behind the efforts being made in this State to attract industry and development and to get the State moving again. If it means that we have to

go into deficit to do that, we will go into deficit to do it, because in a matter of two years we will see some of the royalties starting to flow into our Treasury from the Cooper Basin, and in another two years I hope that we will be seeing considerable royalties flowing in from Roxby Downs and other mineral developments. When that happens, we will be able to get out of the overdraft situation.

Is the Leader seriously suggesting that we should not go into deficit, that we should not offer these incentives? Does he want to raise taxes? Does he want to return to what was happening in the 1970s? Does he want to deny industrial expansion and development in South Australia? Does he want to deny the benefits of these to the people of South Australia, because that is what he is talking about?

I cannot understand the Leader, because in one breath he says that we cannot sack anyone, that we will put taxes up, and then he shows the same degree of shortsightedness as was shown by his predecessors in Labor Governments in this State and wonders why industry will not come to and will not expand in South Australia under a Labor Government. Deficit budgeting is all right under these conditions. It is not good news, and I repeat that it is not good news. If the State had been managed a whole lot better over the past eight or nine years, we would not have to worry about deficit budgeting. As it is, with the pressures applying to every State in the Commonwealth at present, there are deficit budgets of one kind or another, but we would have been in a far better and stronger position if we had not had the doldrums of Labor Government in the 1970's.

ANCILLARY STAFF

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Education provide details of the settlement agreed to yesterday in the Arbitration Commission concerning the long-standing school ancillary staff dispute?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A statement was released late yesterday afternoon by the parties involved. The agreement arrived at in settlement of the dispute covered eight different areas, as follows:

1. The total ancillary staff hours of schools that are over the 'tolerance corridor' which is five per cent above or below a zero base, will have their hours reduced by four per cent, or by a percentage to bring them back within that corridor, whichever is the greater. Once the staffing level at a school is within the corridor then the school must reach the 1981 formula through natural attrition.

2. The Public Service Association of South Australia Incorporated, and the South Australian Institute of Teachers, will cooperate with the employer by developing a programme of joint visits to schools. Representatives from both unions, the department and the Public Service Board will participate in such visits and cooperate in an effort to facilitate the rationalisation by voluntary means only.

3. Efforts will be made for such voluntary rationalisation to be completed by the end of term 2, namely, 28 August 1981.

4. Clause 13 (3) to enforce compulsory reductions (if necessary) will not occur until the end of term 3, 1981. No compulsory reduction of hours will take effect in 1981.

5. Schools that are presently under their actual ancillary staff entitlement will be brought up as nearly as practicable to their actual entitlement (calculated in accordance with the 1981 staffing formula) as soon as possible.

6. During term 3 as many currently employed temporary employees as possible will have their appointments confirmed before the end of term 3 in accordance with the normal contract of employment prescribed in the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award.

7. Subject to the needs of a school, all full-time employees (as defined in the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award) shall be retained. However, this does not preclude current full-time employees from participating in this rationalisation.

8. The parties will develop guidelines for voluntary transfers.

I know that answering interjections is not generally acceptable, but an Opposition spokesman on education said that

his own Government would support the removal of clause 13 (3) from the award. I remind him that that flies completely in the face of previous advice from a former Minister in his own Party in June 1977, when both of the other involved parties were told quite unequivocally that it was not on even to defer. In case the honourable member is thinking that this Government has not been prepared to negotiate, let me remind the House that it will have taken two years from the initial intention (February 1980) to finally achieve that rationalisation.

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is another interesting point.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and answering them is quite unnecessary.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is an inference that the Government has not negotiated. It was the Director-General of Education and the Minister who first of all took the issue to the Industrial Court before the Commissioner. The Commissioner was simply asked whether he was acting properly in instructing the Minister to extend the moratorium while not guaranteeing that the strike on the Friday would be called off. It was a unilateral recommendation, and we were simply asking whether the Commissioner was acting properly. The Commissioner deferred the hearing until the following Tuesday. There was no unilateral withdrawal from negotiations.

We returned to the negotiating table on a voluntary basis for several weeks after that, and once again it was this Government which chose to take the matter before the full bench of the Industrial Commission. I remind the honourable member who keeps interjecting that this Government did not have to do that, because it had everything to lose and nothing to gain. The previous Minister had all the cards in his hand, just as the present Government did in this issue, because the Government had the right to reduce hours, to dismiss and to transfer, and that right was confirmed by the full bench. It was confirmed a couple of months ago that the Minister and the Government still have that right. We have not exercised that right for two years, but the honourable member's Government previously exercised that right overnight and refused to withdraw clause 13 (3) from the agreement.

INTEREST RATES

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier join the Leader of the Opposition in a direct joint appeal to the Federal Treasurer to make home loan interest rates tax deductible and, if not, why not?

The Premier will be well aware that, unless the Federal Government provides some relief for people who are paying off mortgages, the level of repayments will be too high for many people in the community to handle. Indeed, since the recent 0.5 per cent rise in building society interest rates, I have had droves of people coming to my electorate office saying they will have to default on their mortgage payments because they simply cannot afford to keep pace with interest rate rises. The Leader informs me that he has received letters from people saying that they are having to cut back on essentials such as decent food for their families because of the interest rate burden. Will the Premier back Labor's plan of making home loans tax deductible on a means-tested basis for the next Federal Budget? I urge the Premier to agree to my request.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think I can do no better than read a letter which I have written to the Prime Minister on that subject. If the Leader of the Opposition is then still of the same mind, he might like to add his support to the

approaches which I have already made to the Federal Government. I would welcome such bipartisan support.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: When the question of interest rates came up again a short time ago, I had a long discussion with the Federal Treasurer by telephone. I suggested to him then that it would be desirable, in the interests of small businesses, of farmers, and, particularly, of home buyers if a scheme to allow for deductibility for housing loans, in particular, could be instituted. As a result of that discussion with the Federal Treasurer, I believe that he made a statement only a few days ago that consideration would be given to such a scheme. To regularise the situation, I have summed up the thoughts on the matter, my very great concern, and the letter has gone off to the Prime Minister today, as follows:

I view with mounting concern the current level of interest rates being applied by banks, credit unions, finance companies, building societies and other lending institutions. The recent rises in interest rates have caused increasing hardship in the community, particularly in the rural industry and for home buyers and small businesses. The prospect of further increases is daunting.

People who have sunk their life savings and hopes for the future into a new home or business venture are now facing the genuine prospect of losing almost everything. I fully appreciate that the interest rates set by lending institutions are influenced by some factors beyond the control of the Federal Government. However, I would ask you to consider as a matter of urgency implementing a scheme to allow tax concessions for certain home loans. Such a scheme could be aimed particularly at assisting people in lower income areas.

Possibly a scheme for tax concessions would be most suitable. The future level of interest rates is difficult to predict. Some authorities have indicated there could be further rises before rates reach their peak. It seems unlikely interest rates will remain at their current high levels indefinitely. When, eventually, they begin to drop, people at present experiencing difficulties will be more able to cope.

It would be a tragedy if in the intervening period home buyers, business people and people in rural industries lost their livelihoods or their major asset. I therefore ask you to give urgent consideration to some form of tax relief in this area to avoid the hardship being faced by so many people.

I have also written today to all the leading lending institutions in South Australia putting the same case to them and asking them to show compassion, where that is possible, where people are having difficulty in meeting their repayments because of increased interest rates. I do not think there can be anything more shattering for people who have saved, either for a business or for a home, to find that they are not able to maintain their payments, and, therefore, to run the risk of losing everything. I have suggested to those lending institutions that it might be appropriate at this stage to extend the term of the loan rather than to increase the level of repayments. That is possible, I think, in most instances, if not all. I have not yet had a reply, but the suggestion had been informally raised with one or two of the leading institutions, and I hope that they will act accordingly. I believe that community concern is very grave indeed, and it is something that I certainly share, as does this Government. I would be more than delighted to write to the Prime Minister again and to add the Leader of the Opposition's support to the proposition that I have put forward. If he concurs, I would be happy to write again to the banking and lending institutions indicating that this is a bilateral approach, too.

FOOD PLUS STORES

Mr GLAZBROOK: Because of the widespread concern, especially among small businessmen regarding food plus stores, can the Minister of Industrial Affairs inform the House what conditions would cover such shops? Since the announcement several months ago by a leading oil company

that it intended to go into food retailing from selected petrol sites, I have received numerous comments expressing general concern, and I believe that concern needs to be answered. Can the Minister explain the current situation in relation to these stores?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am aware of the considerable concern, particularly amongst small business people, about announcements by a number of oil companies to set up what they call food plus shops. A food plus shop predominantly sells food but, at the same time, it can sell petrol through a number of pumps on the site. As I understand it, the proposal is to open up a series of small shops that would be allowed to trade 24 hours a day. The newspaper this morning suggested, in a comment from the member for Norwood, that the Government was not aware of the problems involved and should very quickly do something about it.

I was surprised that a lawyer and a member of this House was completely unaware and ignorant of what was included in the Shop Trading Hours Act last year. That Act specifically dealt with so-called food plus shops. I would have thought that he should be aware of what those restrictions were. I shall outline to the House what the provisions are within that Act. First, any shop that wishes to serve petrol as well as food items can trade only with a total trading area of less than 200 square metres. Secondly, it has been clearly indicated by my Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment to the oil companies involved that an allowance would be made for the area where petrol would be served, including the area needed to get to that area and the area in which to drive away from the pump area. If one sits down and looks at the traditional small petrol outlet and the area involved, one can quickly assess that such an area would be at least 100 to 150 square metres.

If the total trading area of that shop is not permitted to be more than 200 square metres, and if it takes between 100 and 150 square metres to serve petrol, it is pretty obvious that the amount of trading space available for the sale of food stocks is extremely small, or reasonably small, and in most cases I would expect it to be less than 100 square metres, and in some cases perhaps down to as little as 50 square metres. If a shop is set up on that basis, I do not think it would be particularly viable, and I would doubt whether it could stand the fierce competition from other small businesses, particularly if it is going to trade on a 24-hour basis.

Mr Crafter: That's not what the department is saying.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is exactly what my department is saying. My department has been involved and is still involved in negotiation with one of the companies which put forward a firm proposal to the Government. I bring to the attention of the House that a number of such outlets already exist in the Adelaide metropolitan area. To name some of them—there is one at Upper Sturt, one at Belair, and a number in the southern suburbs, where petrol is already sold in conjunction with a shop that predominantly sells food.

Mr Langley: Not yet.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, they are there already. Again, the ignorance of members opposite is reflected in that comment by the member for Unley. Such comments do them no credit.

The other point that should be remembered is that any such shop, if it was to open 24 hours a day, could sell only foodstuffs during that 24-hour period unless it was in an area where petrol could be sold on a 24-hour basis. In the inner metropolitan area petrol cannot be sold on a 24-hour basis; therefore, food plus shops in the inner metropolitan area would not be permitted to sell petrol after hours, even though they may be open 24 hours a day selling foodstuffs.

The other point of which the honourable member should be aware and which I bring to the attention of those who are thinking of setting up such businesses is that any such shop cannot have a storage area greater than 50 per cent of the trading area of the shop. The Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment will require that the surface of the area occupied by the tanks, which, of course, are underground, is to be classed as part of the storage area, together with any other appropriate fittings that go with a storage tank. Again, I think that the honourable member can see that any storage area which can be associated with the shop and which could not possibly exceed 100 square metres could not be a particularly large storage area, when that point is taken into account.

Mr Crafter: When did you decide that?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That has been the case right through. The most important factor of all is that the setting up of new retail outlets is a matter that comes under the State Planning Authority and local government, because it needs their approval. It is up to the individual local government bodies and the State Planning Authority to make sure that any new retail outlet that may be established comes within the planning requirements as set out by legislation and regulation. An application for one such food-plus store has already been rejected by the State Planning Authority.

There is ignorance at best and perhaps some malice by some members of this House who are trying to create a false impression. When the Government drafted its legislation last year, I believe it was fully aware of the facts. I am surprised there is such ignorance on the part of members opposite; they obviously were not aware of the facts. However, I suggest that the legislation as drafted by the Government along with the planning requirements in this State quite adequately deal with the circumstances that we have before us.

PORT ADELAIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr WHITTEN: How does the Minister of Education explain errors contained in a letter published over his signature in the *Advertiser* of 15 July 1981 and in a press release issued under his name and dated 8 July 1981? Both the letter and the press release refer to the possible closure of the adult matriculation unit at the Port Adelaide Community College. The errors in the letter include the confusing of enrolment data. The letter states, in part, that enrolments have fallen from 91 in 1979 to 58 this year. In fact, the comparable figure for 1981 is 72, not 58, as both those figures refer to start-of-year enrolments. The 58 the Minister quotes for this year would need to be compared with a figure taken at a similar stage of the academic year in 1979, and that figure is 80.

The letter also refers to LeFevre High School and its matriculation classes. In fact, the adult matriculation unit of the Port Adelaide Community College operates out of Port Adelaide High School, not LeFevre High School. The letter also refers to the new headquarters of the community college in the old Adelaide Steamship building. In fact, it was never proposed that the matriculation unit move into that building. These errors were also made in the press release, and in addition the press release referred to a direct bus route from Port Adelaide to Kensington Park. Apart from the fact that the bus route is anything but direct (it takes one hour and 20 minutes to cover that distance), it does not service areas such as Henley Beach from where about 30 per cent of the present students at Port Adelaide Community College matriculation unit come.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member seems to have entered into this argument very belatedly, and I believe I can probably supply him with a happy conclusion, but meanwhile let me thank the member for Henley Beach and the member for Semaphore, who have already spent some time discussing this matter with me. Quite a number of questions were raised in the honourable member's tirade. The first point is that the recommendation was not a Ministerial recommendation from the outset, and perhaps I can show the honourable member files to that effect. It was a departmental initiative that came through the Director-General of Further Education. It was discussed at a confidential level, incidentally, between staff members in the Department of Further Education and the Principal of the Port Adelaide college, and someone chose to take the matter to the press before it had been brought to the Minister of Education. Since that happened and since I received a couple of deputations from members on both sides of the House, I chose to investigate very thoroughly the background to the recommendation.

Mr. Trainer: Just who are you reflecting on?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not reflecting on anyone. I am thanking members for being interested enough to approach me a couple of weeks ago, not in the House at the opening of the session. The matter is already finished—cut and dried.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I assure members that that is right. The Director-General of Further Education came to see me this morning with a small apology—a very big apology was not needed. He pointed out that inadvertently the figures in two columns had been transferred. What happened in fact was that there was not much difference. The February figures were 91, and down to 72 this year. The March figures (there is only a month difference) were 80 last year, and down to 58. So, the 91 and 58 have been transferred. To answer the question, a figure from one column had been transferred to the other.

An honourable member: Is that how the Premier does his Budget?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It does not matter, because 58 is this year's figure, and that is the relevant one. We are looking at this year's Budget.

Mr Whitten: In 1978 it was down to 60 and we had no intention of shutting it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Quite apart from that, the matter has been discussed at Ministerial and Cabinet level in the light of accurate and quite extensive figures which have been provided. We have gone into the number of people sitting on full-time and part-time. We have examined the number of people who carried on through the whole of the year instead of dropping out part time, and Port Adelaide, I must inform the House, does have the highest drop-out rate and the lowest pass rate of any of the four colleges. Quite apart from that, Cabinet—

Members interjecting:

Mr Whitten: The Education Department last year—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is not such a high drop-out rate among high school matriculants, and there is some high school matriculation study done at Port Adelaide's LeFevre High School.

Mr Whitten: It is not the LeFevre High School; it is the Port Adelaide High School.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A number of people from Port Adelaide take matriculation through the open college, and that was not considered by any of the members who came

to see me. A number of matriculation over-age students go to Kensington, and that was not considered by any of the members. Ultimately, we are probably able to give the honourable member a happy answer, and it is that we will not be closing the full-time matriculation course at Port Adelaide. More than that, there was never any intention of closing the part-time matriculation course. One honourable member who came to see me very early with the Chairman of the college council did inform the press generally that Port Adelaide courses were to be axed completely. I thought that unfair, because we had already told that gentleman and others who followed him that the matter was under consideration.

Mr Peterson: That's not true.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That is how the press came out.

Mr Peterson: Well, I can't—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Then the honourable member is in the same bind as quite a few of us. The report from a number of sources was that the whole thing was going to be diced. That was never on. The happy news is that the full-time course will not be closed down, but all matriculation studies have been put under considerable review as a result of this question during the past two or three weeks, and I thank honourable members for their interest.

HELICOPTER

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Chief Secretary inform the House of the extent to which pamphlets on the State-Wales rescue helicopter have been distributed and whether or not the distribution programme is to be extended? It was tragic that, some months ago, a fatal accident occurred on the South Coast, as a result of people not being aware of the State rescue helicopter. It would be most beneficial if the distribution programme of the pamphlets could be extended to include all outlying areas of the State.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am aware of the situation to which the honourable member has referred. Since 1980, when the rescue helicopter came into service, considerable efforts have been made to publicise its availability and the means by which the service can be obtained. The sponsors, radio 5AA, SAS 10, and the Bank of New South Wales, support the community service and they have been most active in their support of the brochures and in making the public aware of what the service is all about.

The means of distribution are various. The sponsors have made available, I think, about 25 000 copies, which have been spread throughout the metropolitan area and those areas the service reaches. The honourable member spoke of pamphlets. One thousand State-Wales rescue helicopter 'safety guide' pamphlets have been printed, and about 700 have been distributed throughout the area. The agencies that handle this matter are the St John Ambulance Service, the Police Department and the Country Fire Services. These agencies, together with the Surf Lifesaving Association, are the points of contact, particularly the CFS in the area to which the honourable member refers. A call to them will make this service available where an area of need is evident.

It is the Government's wish that this service reach any point where it is needed to bring a patient to hospital. Steps are being taken to see to it that the requisite helipads are available so that patients can be taken to hospital. I have a copy of the pamphlet, but Standing Orders prevent my displaying it in the House. I will make it available to the honourable member, or to any other interested honourable member. Since that unfortunate accident a great deal of publicity has occurred and brought the availability of this life-saving service to the notice of the public.

SOCCER POOLS FUND

Mr SLATER: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether any moneys have been received from soccer pools and paid into the Recreation and Sport Fund? If they have, have any of these moneys been allocated to any aspect of sport and recreation?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: All moneys received as the Government's commission from Australian Soccer Pools Ltd are paid into the Recreation and Sport Fund.

Mr Millhouse: How much?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am going to tell the House how much. Indeed, it is a requirement of the legislation passed in this House some months ago that moneys should be paid into a Recreation and Sport Fund. I cannot give the honourable member exact figures of amounts that have gone into the fund since the inception of soccer pools but I will get an accurate break-down of the amount being paid in week by week. I think the credit to the fund at present is about \$350 000 to \$400 000. I will get the honourable member the exact figures.

The honourable member asked what moneys have been paid out. The only money that has been paid out at this stage is the \$150 000 to the Aberfoyle Hub Recreation Centre (\$100 000 as a grant and \$50 000 as a loan). There is to be a payment of \$650 000 a year to match the Federal Government funding for the aquatic centre. I do not think, from memory, that any other amounts have been paid out at this stage. If the honourable member wants to take up the matter in further detail with me he is welcome to do so, but that is the question he asked, and that is the answer.

PORT LINCOLN ABATTOIR

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Agriculture tell me the stage that has been reached in the negotiations for the upgrading of Samcor works at Port Lincoln? About three months ago the Minister visited Port Lincoln to discuss proposals for the upgrading of the works. Since that time there has been little apparent activity, and this has promoted a strong lobby of local producers who are calling for action to be taken so that the local works can avail itself of potential export markets. The Port Lincoln Samcor works had recently to pass over a 300 head a week export order because of the standard of the works.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am aware of the concern of the honourable member for the condition and the ultimate upgrading of the Port Lincoln abattoir. I am aware also of the meeting to which he referred at Port Lincoln which I attended in the council chambers and later in a public place where growers and meat industry people, the honourable member who has asked this question, and the member who represents the upper region of the West Coast (the member for Eyre) were present. It is true that on that occasion a number of options were put forward as being possible for the future of the Port Lincoln works. One suggestion in particular recommended the further upgrading of the works, not just to an export standard, because it has an export standard licence already, but what was really sought by those people was a level of standard at the premises which would attract a United States Department of Agriculture export licence. There is a significant difference between the two.

The sum required to upgrade those premises to the standard desired is about \$200 000 initially and, to be on the safe side, one must consider the ongoing maintenance requirements that have been demonstrated to be required by U.S.D.A. inspectors throughout Australia. Therefore, another \$100 000 a year would be needed for that purpose.

That does not sound a lot of money but when one considers that funding requirement against the financial position of the Samcor arm of its works at Port Lincoln then such sums, or indeed any additional funding by the Government, must be seriously considered.

I think it is worth while saying that in 1977-1978 that particular works had an annual loss of \$1 298 000; in 1978-1979, when there was a marginal recovery, the loss was \$931 000; in 1979-1980, following a significant upgrading in management, morale and application to the job at that particular premises, the loss was \$749 000; and this year it is hoped that the loss will be a little less than that. That does not help the honourable member or the people on the West Coast, I hasten to concede.

An honourable member: That wasn't mentioned in the question.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I know it was not mentioned in the question, but I am mentioning it in the answer because I think it is relevant to do so. I believe it is also relevant on this occasion to convey to the honourable member, who is interested in the subject from a number of points of view, not the least of which is the employment situation in that district, yet again and this time publicly that for that works to ever meet its expenditure and break even there will need to be a greater annual throughput of meat.

The only way that the operators of that arm of Samcor can ensure a greater throughput is if they can get the co-operation of the growers generally, but more particularly of the growers on Eyre Peninsula, who have bypassed the facility provided by the Government over the years and have not given it the patronage it deserves, in order for the previous Government, this Government or for future Governments to ensure the long-term operation of that works.

Without the patronage, it is like any other co-operative or organisation: it must go bad. We are anxious to determine whether this additional money is justified to upgrade the undertaking to the level mentioned by the honourable member. I am anxious that that happen; indeed, I support it. That point is being considered by Cabinet and, in particular, by Treasury, and I expect that we will have an answer on that issue very soon.

But I remind the honourable member, and others in this House, that there was yet another matter raised at Port Lincoln whilst we were there for which a satisfactory answer was not given. That question was what would be the future of that works with or without a U.S.D.A. licence. On returning to Adelaide after that series of meetings on Eyre Peninsula, I checked the position. As a Government, we are committed to keep those works open. Our policy stipulates that, and we will honour that undertaking. The other options to which I referred earlier are all 'in the bag' of ultimate closure one way or the other.

Mr Keneally: He only gets one question a year. He has to make the most of it.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the question on this subject. In deference to the request from members opposite I will close off at this point.

The SPEAKER: I know that the honourable Minister will give due deference to all members of the House.

POLICY LEAKS

Mr MILLHOUSE: If the Premier can contain himself and hold his vessel for a few minutes, I desire to ask him a question. Will the Government give up trying to stop the leaks on matters of policy (I agree that the wording is appropriate) such as have been occurring with increasing frequency recently?

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: Let the Deputy Leader of the Opposition contain his vessel in patience, too. The Leader of the Opposition, in his question, mentioned a document which apparently had been leaked to his Party regarding Treasury matters. I understand that when its disclosure was known to the Premier he acted in just the same way as one of his predecessors used to do when the roles were reversed. It was reported earlier today on radio station 5DN that there had even been some talk of criminal charges as the result of a witch hunt in the Treasury over this matter. Recently, I was put in possession of a number of documents relating to the view of the Minister of Mines and Energy about the Aboriginal Heritage Act. I have seen a minute prepared and signed by the Executive Assistant to the Minister of Mines and Energy, a man called Kimpton, which was sent to the Minister of Environment, telling him what amendments should be made to the Aboriginal Heritage Act. I desire to quote just a couple of sentences from the document, originating from the Minister of Mines and Energy, which is dated 27 May as follows:

Environment's view is that a decision to refuse to recognise further land claims would be sweetened by protection of sites, etc., by a proclamation of the Act—

that is, the Aboriginal Heritage Act—

The Department of Mines and Energy has five concerns with regard to the Act as it currently stands.

I will quote only one of them. It states:

No provision is made in the Act requiring representation of the Department of Mines and Energy on the Aboriginal Heritage Committee or consultation with the Minister of Mines and Energy before an item of Aboriginal heritage is declared to be a protected area for the purposes of the Act.

What on earth it has to do with Mines and Energy, I cannot imagine. The minute goes on in another part to refer to the uneasy relationship between resource development on the one hand and preservation of Aboriginal culture and relics on the other, and we all know which side they are on.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked for leave to explain the question, not to comment.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. The minute concludes with a series of recommendations, the first being that a statement be made by the Minister of Environment during the 'current' session of Parliament, which was the last session, that it is intended to proclaim the Act as soon as it is amended along the lines described 'above'. I remind you, Mr Speaker, that on 12 June the Minister, out of the blue, did make a statement on the Aboriginal Heritage Act. I could not understand why at the time, but I can tell members that he was even provided with a prompt sheet to answer any questions that he got on the statement he had made in the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: That was provided by his own Director-General.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Is there anything wrong with the Director-General being involved?

Mr MILLHOUSE: All I can say is that a number of people in the Department of Mines and Energy do not approve of the way that that department is dictating to Environment, and I agree with them wholeheartedly. It is important that all these things be known publicly, and that is why I have taken the opportunity this afternoon to make known a portion of what I have on this matter. Obviously, the Public Service is of the same opinion and is leaking documents only when officers are at their wits end—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: —to know how to get some sense out of their political masters.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is, I may say, a matter of great concern to me and, I believe, to a growing number of people in the community that a rather peculiar set of standards is growing up in our community, and I do not think it does the honourable member credit, nor do I believe that he really believes in the attitude that he is putting forward to the House at present. It seems to me very odd and rather sad that there should be people in the Public Service and in other parts who are prepared to break their trust and their professional responsibility and to betray everything that the Public Service of South Australia has been known for and, in fact, praised for widely in past years. I would be very surprised if the member for Mitcham did not agree with that. It is of some concern, and I must say I have a degree of wonder that such standards should now become more and more accepted as the norm in a society such as ours, because in the past we have not been used to this sort of thing at all.

Mr Trainer: The poacher's turned gamekeeper!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Ascot Park can, if he wishes, register his disagreement and say that this sort of thing is allowable. I think it is quite contemptible and that those who break that professional trust are, in fact, contemptible. My feelings are only a little less strong for those who use and peddle that information. If the honourable member for Mitcham must make these comments and allegations he must expect to receive back a firm statement of opinion.

Mr Millhouse: I did, but I—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Some inquiries certainly have been made into where various documents may have been leaked. It would have been quite wrong and abrogating responsibility for the Government not to have made those inquiries. I have had reported to me the ridiculous statements made on 5DN today. The very fact that it was stated that criminal charges were being considered, and they are not, casts some doubt on the rather extravagant claims which I understand were made on the same programme.

On the specific example which has been widely talked up by the member for Mitcham in his question, may I say that we enjoy a close degree of consultation between all sections of Cabinet, all portfolios, and all Ministers. The specific example talked about was a report from a Ministerial office, and that was asked for and is a relationship which continues at all times. One of the best things about Cabinet and its members is that they can speak clearly to each other. They do so without rancour and push their case vigorously. They are not afraid to say what they think. I believe that is one of the strengths of Cabinet today. The action of the Ministerial officer concerned in writing a note to the Department of Environment and Planning is entirely proper.

Mr Millhouse: It was from the Executive Assistant to the Minister and not from Minister to Minister.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member has not been in Government for very long and that was a long time ago, so maybe he does not understand about these things. The point is that opinions are exchanged and considered, and they form the basis from which I believe a sensible compromise and balanced attitude is reached. Without that function, we would not make the worthwhile and firm decisions that we are able to make. I am not too sure what the member for Mitcham is talking about.

I repeat that it is a matter of grave concern to me that this rather unfortunate breakdown in standards is occurring. I still happen to believe that there are some things in our society—moral attitudes and matters that we talked about earlier when we were remembering a great South Australian—which still belong and should be preserved in our

society. As far as this Government is concerned, we will do everything we possibly can to ensure that they are preserved. If people are prepared to stoop to the depths to which I believe they are now stooping, then that is for their conscience alone. As to the matter of the media (and I do not intend my remarks to be taken as a widespread and all-embracing condemnation of the Public Service), in this regard it is only one or two people who are making a mockery of their professional responsibilities and thus giving the Public Service as a whole a bad name. Only one or two people in the media are involved. Just because somebody happens to be a member of the media does not make him any less responsible for maintaining high ethical standards of truth and probity.

Mr Millhouse: Are you saying—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can pass on to the member for Mitcham the fact that most, in fact the great majority of, members of the Public Service are bitterly opposed to the sort of thing that has been going on. It has been said to me that it is politically motivated and is for no other reason. I believe that it is a very sad day indeed for the standard of the Public Service and for the administration of this State when this sort of activity goes on. I believe very strongly that the people who will suffer in the long term are the people of South Australia themselves. I do not think for a minute that they support what is going on.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LEAKING OF INFORMATION

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation in response to the charge made by the Premier.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask all honourable members to recognise that a particular approach is required in respect of personal explanations. This has been explained to the House previously, and I ask any honourable member who seeks to make a personal explanation to stay totally within the guidelines.

Mr TRAINER: In reply to a question by the member for Mitcham regarding the leaking of information from within the Government, the Premier waxed indignant and, in the process of doing so, implied that I condone that practice. I understand that that was as a result of my interjection, when I referred to the Premier as acting as a poacher turned gamekeeper. I wish to have it clearly on the record that the Premier's charge that I condone the practice of leaking documents cannot be solidly supported whatsoever on his part, and that my interjection referred merely to the contradiction between the Premier's role when Leader of the Opposition and the attitude that he takes now that he is on the Government benches.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Under the guise of asking a question about the morality of leaked documents and action regarding that matter, the member for Mitcham sought to malign me and to impute to me motives regarding the Government's attitude on Aboriginal matters, as well as to impute to me and to the Department of Mines and Energy (and, indeed, I believe, to one of the members of my Ministerial staff) a grossly untrue and completely false statement. I well know the matter to which the honourable member has given some notoriety. Like the Premier, I was rather surprised to hear the disc jockey on one of the radio stations gloating over the fact that he had this world-shat-

tering piece of information that he was going to break to the world on Thursday.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to come to his personal explanation and not to make a statement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The facts of the matter are as follows. The Labor Party did not see fit to proclaim the Aboriginal Heritage Act, although it had passed through Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. The Deputy Premier has asked for and been granted leave to make a personal explanation, and what the Labor Party has to do with that personal explanation I fail to understand. If the Deputy Leader feels that he has been imputed by the member for Mitcham in some way, he has the right to reply to that, but he does not have the right to involve the Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: I am very close to accepting the Deputy Leader's point of order. In fact, I will make sure that the Deputy Premier returns to that point. I accept the position that the Deputy Premier, following my request that he get to a personal explanation and not make a statement, was setting a particular scenario. If there is to be a transgression beyond that point, I will certainly take the action that the Deputy Leader seeks of me.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is precisely what I was doing: I was setting the background to a minute that was passed between officers of two Government departments.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, between a group of officials in the employment of the Government who were discussing a matter of some importance. The fact is that that Act was not proclaimed, and it is perfectly obvious that it was not proclaimed because it was deficient. Indeed, it laid around for well in excess of a year. This Government reopened the matter with a view to seeing that the Aboriginal Heritage Act was workable and sensible and with a view to proclaiming it. In those circumstances, it is perfectly normal for interested parties to discuss the matter, and for the member for Mitcham to suggest that the Department of Mines and Energy had no interest at all in the matter of Aboriginal heritage and its effect in relation to a whole range of mining activities in this State shows that he is abysmally ignorant of the way in which this Government operates in relation to these matters.

It is a matter of consultation, and that consultation was occurring in relation to the Aboriginal Heritage Act. The Mines Department believed that there was a point of view in relation to mining operations which should legitimately be aired and discussed when any consideration about Aboriginal heritage was being considered. I would have thought that the member for Mitcham would regard that as a legitimate request.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable Deputy Premier continues in that vein, I will not allow him to proceed.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am explaining to the member for Mitcham and the House the motives, which were completely at odds with those he sought to impute to me, which led to that minute being written. As part of those discussions, a minute was written by one of my Ministerial officers, who takes part in a number of discussions with the Government where various points of view are exchanged, and ultimately, a Ministerial and Government decision is made as a result of that exchange of view. To suggest, as the honourable member has, that by some stretch of the imagination I or members of my department have no sympathy for the Aboriginal community, simply

because on a committee consisting of several people the Mines Department believed it should have a representative, is quite plainly ludicrous. I utterly refute the completely false conclusions that he draws in relation to my motives or those of my department. The Government's record in relation to Aboriginal Affairs is second to none in this nation.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1980

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill, 1980, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1980.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1980

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill, 1980, appointed by this House on 30 October 1980, have power to continue its sittings during the present session, and that the time for the bringing up of its report be extended to Thursday 6 August.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, and Messrs Duncan, Gunn, McRae, and Russack.

Library: The Speaker, and Messrs Lynn Arnold, Billard, and McRae.

Printing: Messrs Mathwin, Plunkett, Randall, Schmidt, and Slater.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That a committee consisting of Messrs Ashenden, Evans, Goldsworthy, Randall and Tonkin be appointed to prepare a draft Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament and to report on Tuesday next.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I am pleased to have the opportunity today to express my concern about development in new residential areas. I am particularly concerned about the development in and around areas such as Flagstaff Hill, which is within my electorate. Several months ago I instituted and embarked on a fact finding exercise to ascertain what were the needs of the community in this developing area, particularly in respect to the quality and quantity of living.

From the large response that I received to the questionnaires, it was interesting to see the picture that emerged. Many of the points raised by residents were the traditional matters covered by local government which, in developing

areas, has its resources strained because of the extent of the development going on. Some of the needs which were indicated in that area included footpaths, kerbing, drainage, cycle tracks, recreation grounds and more street lighting, as well as a good transport system.

I know the Minister of Transport is well aware of my concern about transport, bearing in mind that I have raised this matter on numerous occasions in this House. One of the other areas explored related to childhood services, an area where particularly in dental services to the youth, serious questions were evident in parents' minds, because the Flagstaff Hill Primary School, which is one of the biggest primary schools in the metropolitan area, does not have an on-site dental care service.

Because of the lack of transport facilities between Flagstaff Hill and Blackwood, where students are scheduled to go, or to Darlington, which is down on the plains on the other side of the hill, parents felt that this was a difficult situation with which to cope in getting to dental services. However, the area of most concern, and the one to which I now address myself, involved the question relative to the needs of the youth, ranging from the question of more kindergartens, primary schools and high schools, to more recreational facilities, especially for young people to use.

Indeed, in the Governor's Speech today mention was made of a project at the Aberfoyle Hub. In looking at the question of youth in that area, I found that in that part of Flagstaff Hill in my electorate of Brighton there was an estimated 2 000 children, and the needs of those children show that what we have not done in such developments is to look in a far-sighted manner into what should be provided for young people as they grow up.

In a few years the area will have many teenage children but, when the area was first developed, no thought was given to what could be done in regard to the needs of these young people. I know that the children of today and the youth of today have different interests when compared with those of children in the past. Therefore, I believe that we need to develop careful and well laid plans to cover the needs of today's youth and in providing modern facilities.

We may find that, if we do not address these problems quickly and efficiently, areas such as Flagstaff Hill could well become the breeding ground of tomorrow for juvenile problems and anti-social behaviour. I believe it is quite self-evident that what is needed is an urgent needs survey. We must pinpoint the resources needed to stem any incidences of behavioural problems that may occur. Such remedial action taken now will result in the saving of thousands of dollars, because to treat the problem once it is established will cost far more than providing the means to solve it before it starts. We need to remedy the short-sighted planning of yesterday and ignorance of today. As a layman in this area of youth, I find it difficult to pinpoint precisely what the youth of today wants, let alone the needs of the youth of tomorrow. The activities of the youth of my vintage were very different from those of today. I believe it is vital that such problems be thoroughly researched.

In the southern region, in the area covered by the Darlington police station, a number of breaking and entry offences and physical crimes are committed each month. It is of interest to note that nearly 65 per cent of those crimes and offences are committed by children aged between nine and 17 years of age. Many people and many social agencies have for many years tried to find the answers to these urgent problems. Some tell us that what we need is more drop-in coffee lounges; others will say that we should have more sports and recreational areas. But, of course, not all children are capable of taking up or have the desire to take up sports and recreation. Not all children want to make use of a drop-in coffee lounge.

Some people have suggested that perhaps we should have a facility where people can have theatrical productions, but not all children want to be involved in such productions. The problem needs to be looked at on a serious basis, and I believe it is the responsibility of the Government to look at these problem areas and to realise that it needs to solve the problems before they happen. Such remedial action must be taken now by spending some money for surveys to pinpoint those areas which are of grave concern.

One of the other things to which I should draw attention and which I previously mentioned concerns the transport situation in and around the southern area, because it plays an integral part in the overall problem of youth and their activities. If we cannot provide transport for young people to move between point A and point B on a regular basis, and that means also on weekends, then we prevent a great number of those children from participating in activities which other areas have developed over the years. I know that there are centres, such as the Marion community centre on Oaklands Road, which are developing fast and which provide a great number of useful and active ingredients for young people, but these are not attainable by people who have no facilities by which to get to such venues.

There are areas where children are unable to reach school sports after hours because once the school bus has left there is no other transportation unless Mum or Dad has a vehicle and can pick up the children and take them home. Again, at weekends, there is the same problem when a child wishes to play active sport. Therefore, I would urge the Government to give serious consideration to the provision of money for a needs survey in such developing areas, and to ensure in any further developments of housing and residential areas that the planning authorities look to the needs of families and consider the family impact statements that the Government introduced last year.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I wish to refer to a matter that has been in progress in my district and in particular in the suburb of Royal Park since about 1976. Upon attaining office, I took up this matter with the Department of Environment and Planning, and I was informed by the Noise Control Section of the department that the issue was being considered. The residents in that area were complaining about the dust, noise and associated problems that occurred because of the siting of an industry in what is now classed as a Residential 2 zone.

Some 18 months or two years ago, the situation began to affect the residents' way of life to the extent that it was said to me by a number of residents, 'One day, someone will go in and shoot the management.' The residents could no longer tolerate the noise emanating from that industry. This matter is serious and it deeply concerns me. My file on the matter is 2 inches thick, and I have much correspondence in this regard. I have gone on record in the Parliament and in newspapers, both suburban and State dailies, expressing my concern about the need for this factory to be relocated from its current site to Wingfield or some other industrial area.

As a result of my discussions with the residents of that area, and because of their hostility towards the Government because of its inaction, such as the passing off of letters backwards and forwards without any positive response, I received a letter yesterday from one of my constituents whose marriage is about to break down because of the situation. In April and May of this year I wrote to the Minister of Environment and Planning pointing out the many problems with which these constituents are confronted in relation to the noise emanating from this firm. The Minister in his correspondence stated that the noise

levels were excessive, and in subsequent correspondence dated 7 July 1981, in reply to a question I asked, he stated:

... the noise from concerns such as Allied Engineering is very variable. Throughout the long history of this case, there have been periods of increased activity from time to time, and complaints of workmen working late into the evening are not new. It would be impossible to determine whether the level of activity has actually increased.

I question whether the Minister is sincere. Quite clearly, he is trying to fob off the people of Royal Park.

Mr Randall: Because of—

Mr HAMILTON: I do not accept that this cannot be done. The Noise Control Unit is there for that purpose, to determine whether those measurements can be taken. It is no good for the member for Henley Beach to try to interject, because I will drown him out. It is obvious that this Government is not prepared to assist the people in the area.

I will come back to the situation of the crass stupidity of the Minister in what he quoted in previous correspondence on this matter about the problems being experienced by the people. If members opposite treat this as a joke, I do not. If they had listened to what I said, they would realise that statements have been made to me that the people concerned have reached the stage of considering shooting someone in the management. I am very concerned about that, and justifiably so, and it is no good for members opposite to try to make some political capital by talking about what happened under the previous Government. They are in a position to act to assist the people in the area.

In correspondence sent to me, the Minister said on page 3 of the document of 21 May 1981, in paragraph 7 (in part):

Naturally I am very deeply concerned about the welfare of both the adults and children living near Allied Engineering, as I am aware that noise can be very stressful for some individuals.

The Minister goes on to say in paragraph 8:

I would suggest that those residents who feel most severely affected by the noise avail themselves of the Beaufort Clinic, 96 Woodville Road, Woodville, where they will be referred to free professional help in dealing with stress related problems.

Yesterday, I was visited by a constituent who lives close to the firm and who said that she had been contacted by Mr Ken Smith, a psychologist or a psychiatrist at the Beaufort Clinic, in Woodville Road. She alleged that he told her that it was no good for these people to go to the clinic to try to overcome stressful situations unless the cause of their problems was removed. I implore the Government to consider seriously once again the need to relocate this industry. There is no doubt in my mind, because of the situation applying in the north-western suburbs, that the Government can justify—and I would support it—the relocation of this industry.

There is a need for additional housing for people in the area right throughout the north-western suburbs. There is an additional need for homes for the aged in the area. It could be used for a storehouse. However, the Government is not prepared to assist these people. Be it on the Government's head if anything should happen, and if the threats materialise. It concerns me very deeply indeed. I hope that the Minister will reconsider what he has done and that a message will be conveyed to him, because he is not in the House to hear me.

Mr Lewis: What about the previous Government?

Mr HAMILTON: It is no good for the member for Mallee to interject about the previous Government. His Party is in Government, and it is up to members opposite to take the necessary action to assist these people. If the Minister could take half an hour to talk to these people, he would hear about the problems that they are experiencing. He has not been to the area, to my knowledge.

Mr Lewis: He's already aware.

Mr HAMILTON: He is not aware of the situation, as is clear from the statements in his correspondence, and it is useless for the member for Mallee to interject. He is ignorant of what is happening down there. From his stupid remarks, it is obvious that he does not understand the seriousness of the situation.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Before tackling the subject matter I have chosen to grieve on today, I would like to underline the remarks made by the member for Brighton and to point out that, with him, I share the concern that emerges in this community and, indeed, is reflected by the recent riot scenes in Great Britain in the past fortnight, where people without appropriate activities with which to occupy their time ('appropriate' being defined in that context as 'gainful' and 'gratifying') have given vent to their energies in civil disobedience, lack of respect for the law and lack of respect for the need for order within the community in which they live, little realising the damage they are doing to the prospects of their personal security in the longer, and not so long, term.

Quite clearly, if we do not pay attention to emerging needs and provide facilities for activities greater in range than the kind of activities we presently provide for people who are not otherwise gainfully employed or occupied, then we can expect the same kinds of difficulty here. Goodness knows, in leisure time these days unless one is an expert basketballer and physically fit enough to play or, alternatively, interested in a choral society or drama group of some kind, one is made to feel a bit like a leisure time cripple. In this year of the disabled, disabled people certainly do not have access to adequate facilities to enjoy their leisure time in anything like the same way as have other people in the community who are able-bodied. The provision of art and craft facilities as a measure of investment of public capital in the community might be a good thing for Governments to consider, depending on the outcome of any research that may be done into that matter.

Having underlined the significance and importance of the remarks made by the member for Brighton, and to assume those people reading and interested that this matter is close to my heart, I now address myself to what I see as a problem of the Labor Party and the difficulties it is producing in the minds of the people of South Australia in coming to grips with the prospects for improving South Australia's economy, making it possible for us to provide the jobs we need for everybody who wishes to live in this great State of ours, and restoring this State to the prosperity it enjoyed during the era of the late former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford.

I refer particularly to the use of radioactive material in modern civilisation. As a matter of policy, the Labor Party has declared South Australia to be a nuclear-free zone. I believe that it would be disastrous for South Australia's agricultural research programme and its medical and other scientific research programmes if this State was, in fact, declared a nuclear or radioactive-free zone. Some people say that that is a matter of semantics—that nuclear is not radioactive. I fail to understand the difference—if red is not red, then what is red? The Labor Party says that it is not really referring to research programmes that rely on the use of radioactive energy obtained from radioactive sources where isotopes are made of particular elements, say, which have to be used in research programmes to label them and track them in the biological systems in which they arise. It does not refer to that as being part of its ban, which is quite hypocritical, since it suggests that to expose those elements in the first instance to radiation and expose the people who have to perform that job to the same radiation, the same gamma rays (there is no difference in them), is in some way acceptable, whereas to use the same energy

source to generate electricity, another form of energy which mankind can readily and cheaply transport around the civilised community in which we live, is somehow wrong.

It is like saying that a few murders, a few thefts, a few abortions, or a few brothels is okay, but that a large number is not. Where one draws the line, I do not know—it is either good or bad. The same position applies to nuclear energy, that is, substances which are radioactive.

Of course, it is quite apparent to me that the consequences for agricultural industry, upon which the majority of my electorate depends in no small way for its income, would be disastrous. The research techniques available to scientists in South Australia would revert to those of 25 to 30 years ago. Programmes of research in soil-water relationships with the plant would virtually cease. Many animal and human nutrition research programmes would be impossible. Most animal and plant physiology research programmes would also stop.

All plant breeding programmes that rely upon induced mutations for the introduction and development of the desired varietal characteristics would cease: that is, we would disband the new cereal breeding work associated with Dr Rathjen's programmes at Waite Institute, as well as the new grape variety breeding work being conducted by people associated with Dr May's work, both in the suburb of Urrbrae and in the C.S.I.R.O. at Merbein, which is outside South Australia, where the varieties are being tested, so that sort of work would go elsewhere. From this information summarised in this way, we can see that there are dire consequences for South Australia's agricultural research programmes under a Labor Government, and the same dire consequences would result wherever that same material is being used in other scientific research.

I want now to reflect quickly upon the kinds of things that indicate the hypocrisy and inconsistency there is in the Labor Party policy. The Leader of the Opposition said (and I am quoting him from the *Advertiser* of 21 February this year)—

Mr Slater: That is only what the *Advertiser* said he said.

Mr LEWIS: He can set the record straight if I am misquoting him. He said:

I do not think a major political Party has the right to be either alarmist or to react emotionally on an issue as important as this. Yet, on *Nationwide*, on 5 March, he said:

I believe that uranium mining at the moment has not been proved safe; that waste disposal has not been established; that international safeguards are no way in a state that would allow Australia to embark on the nuclear fuel cycle. It is reckless to do so. It is just not on.

That was only about a fortnight after the previous statement. On 23 June, about three weeks ago, he said:

A State A.L.P. convention would not go ahead with uranium development in South Australia at this stage.

Mr Slater: Who?

Mr LEWIS: Mr Bannon. I am quoting your Leader, in case you do not know. Regarding Roxby Downs, on 21 February he said:

We still see it as a major and possibly vital project for South Australia.

This Government does, too. However, on 15 May the Leader said:

In Roxby Downs in South Australia, we are looking at a project which will not be coming on stream for another 10 years or so. By then the French nuclear programme will have been scaled down by then and we might find there will be no market for any uranium from Roxby Downs.

Mr Olsen: Mitterrand had something to say about that.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed. Mitterrand, the new President of France, is going ahead. The Leader continued:

This will virtually leave Japan as the only market for uranium. The implications for Roxby Downs are enormous.

You are not kidding! What a disaster for South Australia if the A.L.P. were to win an election in the next 10 years, or at any time after that! I quote now a motion from the A.L.P. convention, for what it is worth, as follows:

That this convention calls for the declaration of South Australia as a nuclear free zone and requests the South Australian A.L.P. to examine the implications and report back to the next convention on the feasibility of such a declaration—

this is important—

and that the water catchment area of the Adelaide Hills be declared as a nuclear-free zone as a first step.

It seems to me that that comes into direct conflict with the statement that the Leader did not think a major political

Party had the right to be either alarmist or to react emotionally on an issue as important as this. If the A.L.P. referred to particular council areas or particular zones in South Australia, I could accept it, but obviously it is intending that there should be some emotional reaction to this statement and to the subject matter of this policy when it refers to 'the water catchment area in the Adelaide Hills'.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 21 July at 2 p.m.